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See You in Philadelphia!

2022 Conference on Historical and Underwater Archaeology
5–8 January 2022
The summer was a busy time, with the board meeting virtually in late June, advocacy work continuing, and conference planning underway. Highlights reported on at the board meeting include ACUA’s reaccreditation as an NGO to the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Underwater Heritage; Spanish- and French-language abstracts being added as a feature in the newsletter; and the appointments of Ross Jamieson (Canada-West), Steve Nagiewicz (USA-Northeast), Kelly Palich (USA-Mid-Atlantic), Paola Schiappacasse (Caribbean and Bermuda), and Ibrahima Thiaw (Africa) as new regional newsletter editors. I’d like to thank Benjamin Baker, Kenneth Kelly, Ben Resnick, and Fred Smith for their terms as regional editors and acknowledge the hard work of the late David Starbuck for his many years as coordinator for the USA-Northeast region. I am also excited to announce that Ben Ford is working on putting together a new co-publications series focusing on historical archaeology’s role in social justice, equity, and inclusion, and hope to have more details to announce later in the year. He is also working with the ACUA to produce a new volume, *Wreck Divers and Archaeologists: A History of Underwater Archaeology in California*, which will be a great new addition to a successful series highlighting underwater archaeology.

At the mid-year meeting, the board reviewed our progress on anti-racism initiatives and committed to continuing to support this important work. Through GMAC and the Development Committee, the society is sponsoring a virtual anti-racism workshop in October, following up on the successful and well-attended workshop last year. We have also signed a contract with consultant Jennifer Stollman to conduct a diversity audit of the society. The audit will begin this fall, and will take place over 18 months to focus on the strengths, opportunities, and barriers relating to creating an anti-racist society. Dr. Stollman will meet with the board, the executive director, committee chairs, and other key informants; hold focus group meetings with a sample of members; review the society’s governing documents; and develop a series of surveys. This collaborative work will result in a report that can guide future decision-making. If you are interested in donating to this important initiative, please contact Development Committee chair Chris Fennell.

SHA is also participating in a collaborative effort, initiated and led by the Society of Black Archaeologists, to address the ethics of curating human remains. We are in the early stages of planning a different audit, with the goal of passing legislation requiring that all non-Indigenous human remains held in federally funded repositories be documented (the inventorying of Indigenous remains and repatriation fall under NAGPRA). We will be meeting later in September with representatives of other professional organizations to begin working through these complex issues.
The Government Affairs Committee, working with the Coalition for American Heritage, continues to advocate for the passage of the African Burial Grounds Bill, maintaining focus on the vulnerability of many African American cemeteries through the media and through a series of meetings with and presentations to stakeholders and Congressional staffers. We have also been active in advocacy measures supporting the rights of educators to teach all aspects of American history, including the role of race in shaping our national experience. SHA will participate in a “listening session” sponsored by the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers later this month as part of their efforts to review the role of the National Register of Historic Places as a key component of the federal preservation program.

Conference planning has also been in the forefront of SHA activity this summer. Della Scott-Ireton recently stepped down from her long service as Conference Committee chair. I am very grateful for her hard work and for the many successful and fun conferences she has organized on behalf of the society. We are now looking for a new leader to take on this important job for the next three years. If you are interested, I encourage you to apply. You can find more information in this newsletter or contact Karen Hutchison (karen@sha.org) directly.

As we get closer to the 2022 annual conference, the health and safety of attendees is a top priority. COVID-19 continues to affect our plans as we consider the needs of members whose age, race, ethnicity, gender, vaccination status, and health differentially put them at risk. We are working to make the meeting as safe as possible. While we are hopeful that with booster shots gearing up, the current surge will have abated by year’s end, we are committed to taking protective measures. We will require all attendees to be vaccinated or present evidence of a recent, negative COVID test at the time of conference check-in. We will not hold the annual dance, and for a combination of safety and cost factors, have substituted an awards dessert reception in place of the sit-down banquet. The board will meet in mid-September to consider other options and will work with the Conference Committee to implement them. The rapidly changing parameters of the pandemic require creativity and flexibility. We will keep you updated via email, social media posts, and the website about additional changes that may arise. Despite these challenges, I am looking forward to seeing you in Philadelphia and hearing about all the great work you are doing.

Editor’s Column

I would like to thank outgoing editors Emma Dwyer (Great Britain and Ireland) and Jay Sturdevant (USA-Central Plains [Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska]). SHA appreciates their having served as editors for many years. I am seeking new editors for these slots; if you are interested, please contact me at patricia.samford@maryland.gov.

Errata: The photo (right) of the Palpite anchor shown in the summer 2021 SHA Newsletter should have been credited to Marcus Braga. This article was authored by Flávio Calippo at calippo@ufpi.edu.br.
The Society for Historical Archaeology’s 2022 Conference Committee invites you to join us in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, for the 55th Annual Conference on Historical and Underwater Archaeology. The SHA 2022 conference will be held at the Philadelphia Marriott Downtown on 5–8 January 2022.

Philadelphia is located at the confluence of the Schuylkill and Delaware Rivers. Home to the Lenape, in the 17th century the Delaware Valley was a contested ground, claimed by the Dutch, Swedes, and English. In 1682, William Penn, an English Quaker, established the city that would grow to be the largest in colonial North America. Philadelphia has a long and storied history. It was the site of the First and Second Continental Congresses, served briefly as the U.S. national capital (1790–1800), weathered a devastating yellow fever epidemic in 1793, and was home, long before the American Civil War, to a sizeable free African American community. Indeed, the African Methodist Episcopal Church was established in Philadelphia at the beginning of the 19th century. A city of immigrants and industries, and home to numerous cultural, intellectual, and educational organizations, Philadelphia has been called the “Athens of America.”

Modern Philadelphia is a vibrant, multicultural world city. Home to the Phillies and the Eagles, the famous Mummer’s Parade, and of course cheesesteaks and Gritty (the Philadelphia Flyers’ mascot), it is also one of the birthplaces of North American historical archaeology. John Cotter taught the first course in historical archaeology at the University of Pennsylvania in 1960, and Philadelphia and its environs have long been a living laboratory, studied by faculty and students from the University of Pennsylvania, Temple University, numerous CRM firms, and, of late, the Philadelphia Archaeological Forum.

This year’s theme, “Enduring and Elusive Freedoms,” reflects Philadelphia’s place in American history as a center of patriotic activity during the American Revolution (at least when the British weren’t occupying the city) and its critical role in the abolition movement. At the same time, our theme recognizes that the lofty ideals put forward two-and-a-half centuries ago remain imperfectly realized. The fight for liberty, freedom, and equality is not a single event, but a continuing process.
Historical archaeology, as history from the ground up, has much to add to this discussion and is a powerful tool for revealing and addressing injustices past and present.

CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

Conference Co-Chairs
Richard Veit (Monmouth University) and Christopher Matthews (Montclair State University)

Program Co-Chairs
Kyle Edwards (University of Virginia) and John McCarthy (retired)

Terrestrial Co-Chairs
Wade Catts (South River Heritage Consulting) and Ed Morin (AECOM)

Underwater Chair
William Hoffman (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management)

Popular Program Chair
Kelly Britt (Brooklyn College)

Local Arrangements Chairs and Tours Co-Chairs
Meta Janowitz (School of Visual Arts), Debbie Miller (Independence National Historical Park), Jed Levin (National Park Service), and Doug Mooney (AECOM)

Volunteer Coordinator
Meagan Ratini (AECOM)

Workshop Coordinator
Edward Gonzalez-Tennant (University of Central Florida)

Bookroom Coordinators
Adam Heinrich (Monmouth University), Rebecca Yamin (Commonwealth Heritage Group), and Allie Crowder (AECOM)

Traditional Crafts
Mark Nonestied (Middlesex County, NJ)

Social Media
Alexis Alemy (Hunter Research, Inc.)

Sponsorship/Fundraising
Richard Veit (Monmouth University) and Christopher Matthews (Montclair State University)

Accessibility and Inclusion
Nicole Belolan (Rutgers University)

Roundtable Luncheons
Jim Delle (Millersville University) and Mary Ann Levine (Franklin and Marshall College)

THE VENUE: PHILADELPHIA MARRIOTT DOWNTOWN

The Philadelphia Marriott Downtown is located at 1201 Market Street (guest entrance at 1200 Filbert Street), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 19107. This venue will host all attendees, conference sessions, and meetings. Daily room rates are $179.00 single/double occupancy. Additional persons in a room will be charged $20.00. Rooms in the SHA block are available 3–8 January 2022. The cut-off date for reservations in the SHA block at the Philadelphia Marriott Downtown is 13 December 2021.

To book your room in the SHA block at the Philadelphia Marriott Downtown, go to https://book.passkey.com/gt/218246738?gtid=6a819f99f392d00bbba362bc469f1a2d

Volume 54: Number 3 Fall 2021 Page 5
The Philadelphia Marriott Downtown is just steps from Reading Terminal Market and Independence Hall and offers the best of downtown Philadelphia at your doorstep. Explore the nearby Philadelphia Museum of Art, City Hall, Barnes Foundation, and Franklin Institute. Rooms and suites feature deluxe bedding, city views, and modern amenities. The hotel also offers a full-service Business Center and complimentary Wi-Fi in public spaces.

Parking at the Philadelphia Marriott Downtown

Philadelphia Marriott Downtown – Valet Only
1201 Market St. (Entrance on Filbert St.)
Valet Parking Only

Hourly Rates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>w/ Tax (22.5%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–2</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>$29.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–6</td>
<td>$29.00</td>
<td>$35.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–24</td>
<td>$46.00</td>
<td>$56.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversize</td>
<td>$56.00</td>
<td>$68.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On-site parking is limited; these additional parking options are within walking distance of the hotel.

Parkway Corp Garage – 24 Hours – Self Parking
1201 Filbert St. (access from Filbert, 13th, and 12th Streets)
Self Park Only 267.765.3665; customerservice@parkwaycorp.com

Daily Parking Times and Rates

- Up to 30 minutes $8.00
- 31 minutes to 1 hour $16.00
- 1 hr. 1 min. to 1 hr. 30 mins. $24.00
- Maximum #1 – 2hrs. 1 min. – 12 hrs. $32.00
- Maximum #4 – 12 hrs. 1 min. – 24 hrs. $39.00

In the unlikely event of inconsistency between the parking rates listed on the website versus the rates posted in the parking facilities, the rates posted in the parking facilities shall prevail.

Five Star Parking Lot – 24 Hours – Self Parking
1301 Market St. (corner of Market and 13th St., across from the Marriott)
Self Park Only

- 1 Hour $16.00
- 10 Hour Max $27.00
- 24 Hour Max $36.00

GETTING TO AND AROUND PHILADELPHIA

Airport
Philadelphia International Airport (PHL) is a hub for American Airlines and all other major and some minor airlines have numerous flights each day. There are no hotel–airport shuttles available. Cab fare from the Philadelphia Airport to downtown is $28.50 and rideshare services Uber and Lyft are also available.

Train
Train service via Amtrak is available through Philadelphia’s 30th Street Station.

Amtrak—Amtrak is a passenger rail service that connects Boston, New York, Washington, DC, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Portland (Maine), and other points nationwide.

Amtrak Acela—Created with business travelers in mind, Amtrak’s high-speed train Acela provides fast service along the Northeast Corridor High-Speed Rail between Washington, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston. Traveling at speeds up to 150 miles per hour, each Acela is fully equipped with power outlets and audio entertainment in-seat, bistro cars, elegant first-class cars, wide seats, conference and meeting areas, and other amenities.
Philadelphia and southeastern Pennsylvania also have a robust trolley/rail system, SEPTA (www.septa.org).

**Car Rental**
Most car rental companies are available in Philadelphia; however, parking is limited in Center City.

**CORONAVIRUS POLICY**

The Philadelphia Marriott Downtown is prepared to follow all COVID-19 protocols in place at the time of the conference to ensure the safety and well-being of our attendees. We expect all attendees to be fully vaccinated against the coronavirus. Proof of vaccination status will be requested at registration. Anyone without proof of vaccination will be required to show proof of a recent, negative COVID-19 test. Please bring your vaccination card or proof of a recent, negative COVID-19 test with you to the conference.

The Philadelphia Marriott Downtown has a mask requirement in place and the City of Philadelphia requires masks or proof of vaccination for entry into indoor public spaces. Advance tickets or reservations are recommended or necessary at many spots. Check online at https://www.visitphilly.com/covid-19-resources-for-greater-philadelphia/ for up-to-date information.

**THE CONFERENCE AGENDA**

**WORKSHOPS**

All workshops will be held on Wednesday, 5 January 2022.

**Wednesday, 5 January 2022**

**WKS-1 Identification and Dating of Japanese Ceramics from 19th- and 20th-Century Sites**

*Organizers:* Douglas Ross, Albion Environmental, and Renae Campbell, Asian American Comparative Collection, University of Idaho  
*Half-day workshop:* 9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.  
*Maximum enrollment:* 25  
*Cost:* $40.00 for SHA members, $50.00 for nonmembers, $20.00 for SHA student members, and $25.00 for student nonmembers

With the rapid increase in research on sites associated with Japanese immigrants in North America and the Pacific islands, there is an increasing need for researchers to be able to recognize, date, and properly analyze imported Japanese porcelain and other ceramics. Such knowledge is even more broadly applicable, because these wares commonly turn up on non-Japanese sites of the 19th and 20th centuries. Of particular concern is distinguishing them from Chinese ceramics, with which they are often confused, especially when found on Chinese sites. Here we offer a hands-on primer covering the identification of Japanese ceramic wares, common forms, decorative methods and motifs, and chronological indicators, and demonstrate how they can be distinguished from non-Japanese ceramics.

**WKS-2 Archaeological Illustration**

*Organizer:* Jack Scott  
*Full-day workshop:* 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.  
*Maximum enrollment:* 30  
*Cost:* $80.00 for SHA members, $100.00 for nonmembers, $50.00 for SHA student members, and $70.00 for student nonmembers

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

**WKS-3 An Introduction to Collections-Based Research**

*Organizer: Beth Bollwerk (DAACS)*

*Half-day workshop: 8:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.*

*Maximum enrollment: 20*

*Cost: $30.00 for SHA members, $40.00 for nonmembers, $20.00 for SHA student members, and $30.00 for student nonmembers*

WKS-3 is the first of a two-part workshop (with WKS-4) geared toward archaeologists who are in the initial stages of planning or conducting a research project that seriously engages with archaeological collections and data for their senior or master’s thesis or dissertation. Participants are welcome to enroll in either one or both workshops. Each workshop is priced separately. If you wish to enroll in both workshops, please check the appropriate boxes on the registration form.

The first half of the workshop will focus specifically on collections-based research (CBR). The goals of the morning session are to (1) introduce participants to the opportunities afforded by and challenges inherent in collections-based research (here defined as the practice of using existing collections to pose and evaluate scholarly questions [King 2014]) and (2) demonstrate how collections-based research can enable a comparative approach that asks new questions of archaeological data and informs the archaeological discipline.

The first section of the morning session will consist of lectures and three hands-on exercises that explore the process of collections-based research, including (1) crafting a research question; (2) identifying relevant collections; (3) ethical considerations; (4) applying for funding; (5) collecting, storing, and managing data; and (6) conducting analysis.

The second section of the workshop will consist of two case study exercises (presented by Dr. Ayana Flewellen and Dr. Paola Schiappacasse) that focus on the management and analysis of collections data. Both case studies will highlight how collections-based research enables innovative comparative analysis, outline the methods that are part of this process, and highlight the importance of this work for answering relevant questions and connecting archaeology to descendant communities and the public. These studies will highlight the researcher’s decision-making processes and how they addressed the challenges of working with collections data.

**WKS-4 An Introduction to Digging through Archaeological Data**

*Organizers: Jolene Smith (Virginia Department of Historic Resources) and Beth Bollwerk (DAACS)*

*Half-day workshop: 1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.*

*Maximum enrollment: 20*

*Cost: $30.00 for SHA members, $40.00 for nonmembers, $20.00 for SHA student members, and $30.00 for student nonmembers*

WKS-4 is the second part of a two-part workshop (with WKS-3) geared toward archaeologists who are in the initial stages of planning or conducting a research project that seriously engages with archaeological collections and data for their senior or master’s thesis or dissertation. Participants are welcome to enroll in either one or both workshops. Each workshop is priced separately. If you wish to enroll in both workshops, please check the appropriate boxes on the registration form.

This workshop will build on some of the ideas introduced during the morning workshop (WKS-3), but will not assume participants have attended the Intro to CBR session. The session will provide a high-level introduction to best practices, tools, and challenges of working with data, including collection, cleaning, management, and analysis. It will introduce the concepts of data lifecycles and management plans and provide resources for successfully completing these vital components of archaeological work that ensure data are properly prepared for future sharing and reuse. We’ll also review tools to clean, manage, and analyze data like OpenRefine, R, and RStudio. Finally, we will discuss the ethics of open science and open data. This workshop will provide practical resources for getting organized, handling messy data, and reducing common data-handling errors. We welcome participants with all levels of technical ability.
WKS-5 Practical Aspects of Bioarchaeology and Human Skeletal Analysis

Organizers: Thomas A. Crist (Utica College) and Kimberly A. Morrell (AECOM)
Full-day workshop: 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Maximum enrollment: 25
Cost: $80.00 for SHA members, $100.00 for nonmembers, $50.00 for SHA student members, and $70.00 for student nonmembers

This workshop will introduce participants to the practical aspects of locating, excavating, storing, and analyzing human remains from historic-period graves. It will also address the appropriate role of the historical archaeologist in forensic investigations and mass fatality incidents. Using coffin hardware and actual human remains, this interactive workshop is presented by a forensic anthropologist and an archaeologist who collectively have excavated and analyzed more than 2,000 burials. Among the topics that will be covered are effective methods for locating historical graves; efficient field techniques for in situ documentation and relocation of remains and grave goods; hardware seriation; the effects of taphonomic processes; appropriate health and safety planning; and fostering descendant community involvement and public outreach efforts. Participants will also learn about the basic analytical techniques that forensic anthropologists use to determine demographic profiles and recognize pathologic lesions and evidence of trauma. No previous experience with human skeletal remains is required to participate and benefit from this workshop.

WKS-6 Open Source Archaeology with QGIS

Organizer: Edward Gonzalez-Tennant, University of Central Florida
Full-day workshop: 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Maximum enrollment: 40
Cost: $80.00 for SHA members, $100.00 for nonmembers, $50.00 for SHA student members, and $70.00 for student nonmembers

This workshop examines the use of open source GIS for archaeology and cultural resources management (CRM). Topics covered will include an introduction to QGIS, working with various geospatial data, georeferencing and digitizing maps, and downloading and processing satellite data. This work is sometimes referred to as a desktop survey. No previous GIS experience is required.

WKS-7 Submerged Cultural Resources Awareness

Organizers: Kendra Kennedy (Argonne National Laboratory), and Amanda M. Evans (Gray & Pape, Inc.)
Half-day workshop: 1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Maximum enrollment: 25
Cost: $40.00 for SHA members, $50.00 for nonmembers, $25.00 for SHA student members, and $35.00 for student nonmembers

Cultural resource managers, land managers, and archaeologists are often tasked with managing, interpreting, and reviewing archaeological assessments for submerged cultural resources. This seminar is designed to introduce nonspecialists to issues specific to underwater archaeology. Participants will learn about different types of underwater cultural heritage (UCH) and some of the methods employed to help protect those sites. This seminar is not intended to teach participants how to do underwater archaeology, but instead will briefly introduce different investigative techniques and international best practices. The purpose of this seminar is to assist nonspecialists in recognizing the potential for UCH resources in their areas of impact.

Objectives:
Help terrestrial archaeologists and land managers to

(1) Identify the potential for underwater cultural heritage resources in affected areas;
(2) Recognize best practices for treatment of underwater cultural heritage; and
(3) Understand basic qualifications required for proper documentation of underwater cultural heritage.
TOURS

All tours will be on Wednesday, 5 January 2022.

T1 – Defending the Capital City—A Tour of Revolution

Tour time: 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Maximum number of participants: 40
Cost: $50.00 per person

In 1777, the capital of the fledgling United States of America was Philadelphia. In the late summer of that year, a Crown Forces army commanded by Sir William Howe supported by a British fleet commanded by Lord Richard Howe invaded the Delaware Valley. This day-long tour, led by Dr. David Orr and Wade Catts, will explore several of the sites of war from the Philadelphia Campaign where recent and/or ongoing archaeological work illuminate the historical record. We will begin the tour at the site of Fort Mercer at Red Bank on the New Jersey side of the Delaware River. One of a pair of forts built to protect Philadelphia, Fort Mercer was the site of a significant defeat for the Crown Forces. Our next stop will be the battlefield of Paoli, where a nighttime bayonet attack badly mauled an American force. We’ll then proceed to Valley Forge National Historical Park, where the American Continental Army commanded by George Washington spent the winter of 1777–1778, emerging from that encampment as a better-trained and more professional fighting force. Over the decades archaeology at Valley Forge has investigated brigade camps, headquarters, and training areas, and the Register of Professional Archaeologists Advanced Metal Detecting class was recently held at the park. These sites will be highlighted on the tour. Lunch will be box lunches. Tour limited to 40.

T2A and T2B – Walking Tour of Philadelphia Old City—History and Urban Archaeology in the City of Brotherly Love

Tour times: T-2A—10:00 a.m. – 12 p.m.; T-2B—2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Maximum number of participants: 20 per tour
Cost: $5.00 per person

Philadelphia is not only the site of some of the most significant events associated with the American Revolution and the founding of the United States, it is also one of the birthplaces of urban archaeology. This guided walking tour will visit sites connected to both aspects of Philadelphia’s history, including the President’s House (the first White House), the National Constitution Center, and Franklin Court, among many others. The tours will be led by Jed Levin and Rebecca Yamin, experts on Philadelphia’s history and archaeology who have led numerous excavations across the Old City. Lunch before or after on your own.

T3 – Historic Germantown: Freedom’s Backyard

Tour Time: 9:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m.
Maximum number of participants: 40
Cost: $75.00 per person

This tour of the longest National Historic District in the United States includes visits to three National Historic Landmarks: Cliveden, the Johnson House, and Stenton. These historic house museums, located in a dense, underserved community of northwest Philadelphia, strive to tell stories that reflect their neighborhoods through community engagement, both individually and collaboratively. Site visits will include discussions of on-site archaeology and the importance and challenges of telling stories centered on the African American experience. The Johnson House, built in 1768 by a Quaker family, became a station on the Underground Railway. Johnson family members were staunch abolitionists who worked with prominent African American leaders such as William Still to support freedom seekers on their journey north. Cliveden, a country house built by Benjamin Chew in 1767, found itself at the center of the American Revolution on 4 October 1777 during the Battle of Germantown. New interpretive approaches have focused on telling the stories of enslaved Africans and African Americans who lived and labored at Cliveden and other Chew properties. Stenton is the ca. 1730 country house of James Logan, William Penn’s agent and secretary. One of the earliest house museums in the nation, Stenton recently concluded a two-year community-inclusive project to plan and create a new memorial to Dinah, a once-enslaved woman who gained her freedom and was credited with saving the house during the Revolution. Lunch will be provided at Cliveden and the tour will end with beers (cash bar) and good cheer at Attic Brewing Company. Tour limited to 40.
T4 – Black Communities in Southern New Jersey

Tour Time: 9:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.
Maximum number of participants: 25
Cost: $50.00 per person

From the colonial period to the Underground Railroad, the postbellum era to the present day, New Jersey’s Black history is a rich tapestry of struggle, resistance, and perseverance. Led by Drs. Chris Barton, Marc Lorenc, and Guy Weston, this tour explores two Black sites in Burlington County: Timbuctoo and the James Still Historic Site. Timbuctoo was founded in 1826 by formerly enslaved people from Maryland, with some assistance from local white Quakers. The community operated as a terminus along the Underground Railroad. Timbuctoo was the focus of archaeological investigations from 2009 to 2013. Today, Guy Weston, a descendant of Timbuctoo resident Lambert Giles, continues a community-based research effort through the Timbuctoo Historical Society. The James Still Historic Site was once the office of James Still (1812–1885), locally known as “The Black Doctor of the Pines.” Freeborn, and largely self-educated, Still became a renowned physician and one of the wealthiest people in Burlington County. The site was the focus of a collaborative archaeology program from 2015 to 2018. Additionally, we will visit the Burlington Quaker Meeting House and Museum (1783–present day) for a presentation on Quaker and Black community ties in the region. Lunch will be box lunches. Tour limited to 25.

T-5A and T-5B – Guided Tour of the I-95 Archaeology Center—Indigenous Ancestors, Immigrants, and Industry

Tour times: T-5A—9:45 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.; T-5B—1:45 p.m. – 4:15 p.m.
Maximum number of participants: 40 per tour
Cost: Free

Located just north of Center City Philadelphia in the popular Fishtown neighborhood, the I-95 Archaeology Center is the temporary working laboratory and public-outreach venue for AECOM’s ongoing I-95 Girard Avenue Interchange Improvement Project. The project area extends for three miles through the ancestral lands of the Lenape (Delaware) people, later settled largely by immigrants who brought diverse cultures to the growing industrial Delaware River waterfront. Approximately one and a half million artifacts dating from 6500 B.C. to the early 20th century have been recovered thus far. The center’s interpretive exhibits explore change over time through the material culture of everyday life, the archaeology of local industries and their products, and more. During the tour, AECOM archaeologists will share details of the field- and lab work. Tour participants will also have an opportunity to investigate the creative technology currently being used to showcase project results. Staff will be on hand to discuss 3-D modeling and printing, augmented reality, interactive website and database development, and geospatial mapping.

Each bus group will be limited to 40 people. The tour will start at the entrance to Penn Treaty Park, across the street from the center. Buses depart at the end of the tour. Lunch should be taken before or after on your own. Located at 900 East Columbia Avenue, the center will be open 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. on Thursday and Saturday for participants who wish to visit on their own.

ROUNDTABLE LUNCHEONS

All roundtable luncheons are scheduled from 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. and will take place on Thursday, 6 January 2022, and Friday, 7 January 2022. Maximum of 10 people per roundtable luncheon. Cost: $30.00 per person.

Thursday, 6 January 2022

Luncheons time: 12:00 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.
Cost: $30.00 per person
Sandwich Choices (indicate choice on your registration form): Turkey Sandwich, Chicken Caesar Wrap, or Mediterranean Vegetarian Sandwich

RL-1 Historical Archaeologies of State Terror and Restorative Justice
Host: Edward González-Tennant (University of Central Florida)

On 13 May 1985 Philadelphia police dropped FBI-supplied explosives on the residential headquarters of MOVE, resulting in a blaze that destroyed 60+ buildings and killed 11 people. In 2021, the world learned how anthropologists mistreated the remains of children associated with this incident. This and countless other events echo centuries of colonial violence against historically oppressed communities in the USA and elsewhere. Luncheon participants will discuss the nature of state terror,
historical archaeology’s unique ability to reveal new truths concerning the ways violence operate in modern society, and how our discipline is supporting conversations on restorative justice. Our discussion will include an overview of emerging methods for communicating this research with the public while intersecting with other organized events at the 2022 meetings (e.g., Acknowledging Responsibilities: MOVE, the Morton Collection, and State Terror forum). In addition, we will discuss publishing opportunities and other prospects for those undertaking this kind of work.

**RL-2 Publishing with SHA**  
*Host: Benjamin Ford (Indiana University of Pennsylvania)*

You’ve done the research and synthesized the results, now you need to share your findings with the community. SHA can help you with that. SHA provides many ways to publish your results: the journal *Historical Archaeology*, *Technical Briefs*, books co-published with academic presses, and print-on-demand special publications. This luncheon will summarize these options and discuss what projects work for each and the benefits of publishing with SHA. There will be plenty of time to answer questions and talk about specific options.

**RL-3 Archaeology in the Age of COVID**  
*Host: Christopher P. Barton (Francis Marion University)*

The SARS-CoV-2, colloquially known as the COVID-19 virus, has ravaged the world, causing an estimated 4.2 million deaths. From lockdowns to mask mandates to online teaching, the pandemic has affected every aspect of archaeological practice. How can we continue to safely conduct work in the field and laboratory? How can we continue to develop relationships in the community when those interactions can lead to more outbreaks? How can we make archaeology relevant to the communities we serve when we cannot physically collaborate with others? The answers to these questions are complicated, especially when working as the host does in South Carolina, where conservative politicians ban public universities and local governments from instituting mask and vaccine mandates. This discussion details the successes and failures, the setbacks and triumphs of practicing archaeology during the age of COVID.

**RL-4 Building Partnerships in Decolonizing, Collaborative, and Indigenous Archaeologies**  
*Hosts: Diane L. Teeman (director, Cultural & Heritage Department, vice-chairperson, Tribal Council Burns Paiute Tribe, and University of Nevada, Reno) and Dr. Sarah E. Cowie (University of Nevada, Reno)*

The Western educational system is imbued with settler colonialists’ norms that have perpetuated institutionalized racism and silenced the knowledge systems of Indigenous North American communities. Progressive 21st-century scholars, understanding the problematic structure of historic mainstream knowledge creation systems, have taken to a praxis of self-reflexive critique to consider the partial relinquishment of the inherited exclusive control of knowledge creation systems. This, coupled with dynamic and innovative outreach efforts toward Indigenous communities, serves to create appropriate spaces and facilitate access to the Other. Finding Indigenous communities who are willing to partner with academic researchers for the purpose of making the research efforts more inclusive of multiple knowledge systems is one way to increase the validity of research outcomes. Additionally, partnering as collaborators on research projects allows for the researchers to identify research that is meaningful to Indigenous communities. Examples of these partnership building research efforts will be introduced.

**Friday, 7 January 2022**

*Luncheons time: 12:00 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.*

*Cost: $30.00 per person*

*Sandwich Choices (indicate choice on your registration form): Turkey Sandwich, Chicken Caesar Wrap, or Mediterranean Vegetarian Sandwich*

**RL-5 Jobs in Nautical Archaeology**  
*Host: Paul Johnston (Smithsonian Institution)*

What are the different job types and career tracks in nautical archaeology today? Our discussion will speak to public archaeology (U.S. NOAA, U.S. National Park Service, U.S. BOEM, Parks Canada, state programs, etc.); private-sector cultural resource management (contract archaeology, consulting); private foundations; academic positions and museum work (public and private); and treasure hunting. We’ll talk about the advantages and disadvantages of these various paths, as well as their current prospects.
RL-6 Getting to Tenure: Peer Mentoring from Outside of Your Institution  
*Host:* Kristen R. Fellows (North Dakota State University)  

Everyone knows that you need to publish to get tenure—publish or perish. But what else should you be focusing on as you work toward leveling up your academic career? How many department/college/university committees should you serve on? Should colleagues be visiting your classroom as a supplement to student evaluations? When do you start thinking about outside portfolio reviewers? Hosted by someone who just received tenure (2020), this roundtable luncheon is intended as a space to talk through questions and ambiguities among pretenure peers. Bring a copy of your tenure documents, compare notes, develop questions to ask colleagues at your home institution, and set some realistic goals to help enhance your portfolio. If all goes well, you’ll leave as a member of a cross-institutional cohort who will remain in touch and help each other through the daunting process that is tenure.

RL-7 Archaeology, Advocacy, and Engaging Communities  
*Hosts:* Allison Manfra McGovern (Richard Grubb & Associates) and Sarah Kautz (Preservation Long Island)  

How might archaeologists better engage with local communities to protect historical and cultural resources in and around their research sites? In this roundtable luncheon, we will discuss how to achieve meaningful equity between archaeologists and the public and highlight strategies for connecting archaeological research to community-based preservation advocacy. Discussion topics will include developing a community-driven research strategy; working within federal, state, and local regulations; curating and publishing; and making your research/results publicly accessible. Attendees are encouraged to bring their own experiences in community-driven research as we engage in an open and honest dialogue about successful and not-so-successful approaches to community engagement.

RL-8 Privies, Wells, and Other Shaft Features We Know and Love  
*Host:* John P. McCarthy (RPA, retired)  

The excavation of shaft features, such as wells and privies, characterizes much of the archaeology of cities. Hundreds of such features have been excavated in Philadelphia alone. Before the advent of modern sanitary infrastructures, urban lots had to make provision for the supply of water and the management and disposal of solid and liquid waste. This roundtable luncheon will consider issues of excavation strategy and data analysis and interpretation connected to such features. We hope to identify some guiding principles or best practices that can be widely applied.

**SPECIAL INVITATION FOR SHA 2022 CONFERENCE REGISTRANTS**  

AECOM has generously offered free admission to its I-95 Archaeology Center to SHA 2022 Conference registrants on Thursday, 6 January 2022, and Saturday, 8 January 2022, from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. The center is located at 900 East Columbia Avenue, across from Penn Treaty Park in Fishtown.

To take the SEPTA public transportation system to the I-95 Archaeology Center from the Philadelphia Marriott Downtown,  
1. Take the Market-Frankford Line at 13th Street to Girard Station. From Girard Station, it is a 0.6-mile walk to the I-95 Archaeology Center.  
2. Exit the station via N. Front Street.  
3. Head south on N. Front Street toward W. Girard Avenue  
4. Turn left onto W. Girard Avenue (a Wells Fargo bank branch will be on your right).  
5. Turn right onto E. Columbia Avenue. The I-95 Archaeology Center will be on your right.

**CONFERENCE WELCOME AND PLENARY SESSION**

**Welcome and Awards Ceremony**  
*Wednesday, 5 January 2022*  
*Time:* 6:00 p.m. – 6:30 p.m.  
Join us Wednesday evening for the opening session of the SHA 2022 Conference and for presentation of the Kathleen Kirk Gilmore Dissertation Award, the James Deetz Book Award, and the SHA Awards of Merit, followed by the plenary session.

**Plenary Session**  
*Wednesday, 5 January 2022*  
*Time:* 6:30 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.  
*Presenters:* Theresa Singleton (Syracuse University), Dave Orr (Delaware City, Delaware), and Meta Janowitz (School of Visual Arts, NYC)
The Society for Historical Archaeology’s 2022 Conference on Historical and Underwater Archaeology is being held in Philadelphia, a city known as a birthplace of modern freedom and democracy. We celebrate this history at this conference, but also recognize that the fight for freedom and democracy in the United States is far from complete. Tracing the roots and legacies of the struggle for freedom in Philadelphia from the battles of the American Revolution to the state’s policy of gradual emancipation to the founding of the African Methodist Episcopal Church to more-recent conflicts over the treatment of African American and Native American remains in the city’s museum collections, we encourage reflection on work that has happened and that still needs to be done. Thus, our theme for this conference is “Enduring and Elusive Freedoms,” a phrase we hope captures the story of Philadelphia as well as of the nation that was founded here. Our Plenary Session speakers will consider this theme in their remarks. As senior scholars, each brings extensive experience to bear on their work and a unique perspective and background to the archaeology of freedom.

PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY DAY
Saturday, 8 January 2022, 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.
Cost: Free and open to the public
Location: Independence Visitor Center, 599 Market Street, 1 N. Independence Mall W, Philadelphia

Public Archaeology Day is a free and family-friendly event featuring archaeologists, educational displays, and activities geared toward the general public. As part of the SHA annual conference, the event will focus on the unique and local history of the city of Philadelphia and the larger area. The event will be hosted in the Liberty View Ballroom at the Independence Visitor’s Center on Independence Mall, just steps from the conference hotel at the Philadelphia Downtown Marriot and many historic sites and attractions. A walking tour will be available for download for all to explore the unique archaeological sites of Philadelphia. Public Archaeology Day is not to be missed!

SHA BUSINESS MEETING
Friday, 7 January 2022
Time: 5:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.
SHA will hold its annual business meeting on Friday, 7 January 2022 from 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. at the Philadelphia Marriott Downtown. Join the SHA Board of Directors and congratulate the winners of the Ed and Judy Jelks Student Travel Awards; the ACUA George Fischer Student Travel Award; the Harriet Tubman Student Travel Grants; the ACUA Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Student Travel Conference Award; the GMAC Diversity Field School Competition; the Jamie Chad Brandon Student Paper Prize; the 2022 Mark E. Mack Community Engagement Award; and the ACUA Annual Photo Competition.

SPECIAL EVENTS

Wednesday, 5 January 2022
Opening Reception
Time: 8:00 p.m. – 11:00 p.m.
Cost: No fee for SHA conference registrants

Following the plenary session, greet old friends and make new ones at the first social event of the conference. Complimentary appetizers will be provided along with a cash bar.

Thursday, 6 January 2022
Past Presidents’ Student Reception
Time: 4:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.
Cost: No fee for student conference registrants

We will be holding an in-person Past Presidents’ Student Reception at the 2022 SHA annual conference. This special event will take place on Thursday, 6 January from 4:30 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. As with all previous Past Presidents’ Student Receptions, you will have an opportunity to talk to senior professionals about a variety of career paths in historical archaeology. These career paths include academia; cultural resource management; federal, state, and local agencies; museums—collections; public engagement; and underwater archaeology. Don’t miss out on this great opportunity to explore careers in historical archaeology!

Thursday, 6 January 2022
Reception at the Museum of the American Revolution
Time: 7:00 p.m. – 10:00 p.m.
Cost: $35.00 per person
Join us for light hors d’oeuvres and a glass of wine or beer at the Museum of the American Revolution (www.amrevmuseum.org).

The Museum of the American Revolution uncovers and shares compelling stories about the diverse people and complex events that sparked the ongoing experiment in liberty, equality, and self-government of the United States. Through the museum’s unmatched collection, immersive galleries, powerful theater experiences, and interactive elements, visitors gain a deeper appreciation of how this nation came to be and feel inspired to consider their role in ensuring that the promise of the American Revolution endures.

Located in the heart of historic Philadelphia, the museum was the site of an archaeological excavation, prior to the building’s construction, that unearthed nearly 85,000 artifacts. One of the most treasured findings is now on view in the museum’s galleries: an English delftware punch bowl featuring a picture of the brigantine *Triphena*. The excavation is detailed in a book by lead archaeologist Rebecca Yamin, which is available in the museum’s shop onsite and online. Visit www.amrevmuseum.org for more information.

The Museum of the American Revolution is roughly a 1-mile walk from the Philadelphia Marriott Downtown. Transportation will not be provided for this reception.

*Friday, 7 January 2022*

**Pre-Awards Cocktail Hour**
*Time:* 6:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.
*Cost:* No fee for conference registrants; cash bar

**Awards Dessert Reception**
*Time:* 7:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.
*Cost:* $25.00 per person
Join us for dessert with the 2022 recipients of the Cotter, Roberts, and Ruppé Awards and the J. C. Harrington Medal in Historical Archaeology.

**Awards Ceremony**
*Time:* 8:30 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.
*Cost:* No fee for conference registrants; cash bar
Join us for the presentation of SHA’s John L. Cotter Award, the Daniel G. Roberts Award for Excellence in Public Historical Archaeology, the Carol V. Ruppé Distinguished Service Award, and the J. C. Harrington Medal in Historical Archaeology.

**SHA TECHNOLOGY ROOM**
*Hours:* Thursday, 6 January 2022 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Friday, 7 January 2022 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

The Technology Room will feature a number of presentations of various underwater and terrestrial technologies with interactive elements on Thursday and Friday. Minimally, presenters will be there for a 2-hour block to engage SHA members and showcase technology usage in historical archaeology scenarios. Some presenters may be there longer.

**SHA BOOK ROOM**
*Hours:* Thursday, 6 January 2022 8:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Friday, 7 January 2022 8:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Saturday, 8 January 2022 8:30 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

The SHA Book Room is a marketplace for exhibitors of products, services, and publications from a variety of companies, agencies, and organizations in the archaeological community. Exhibit space is available on a first-come, first-served basis until 1 November 2021. All exhibitors will be listed in the final conference program. Fees and the Exhibitor Contract can be found online at [https://sha.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/2022-Conference-Exhibitor-Prospectus-fillable.pdf](https://sha.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/2022-Conference-Exhibitor-Prospectus-fillable.pdf). Contact Karen Hutchison at 301.972.9684 or [hq@sha.org](mailto:hq@sha.org) for further information.

**2022 ACUA ARCHAEOLOGICAL PHOTO & VIDEO COMPETITION CALL FOR ENTRIES**
SHA members and conference attendees are invited to participate in the annual ACUA Archaeological Photo & Video Competition and People’s Choice Awards. Images will be displayed at the SHA conference on historical and underwater archaeology. Winning entries are honored during the conference and posted to the ACUA web- and social media sites.
Deadline for online application and final digital uploads is midnight Central Time on 1 December 2021.

For more information and to start the process, please visit [http://www.acuaonline.org/archaeological-photo-festival-competition/](http://www.acuaonline.org/archaeological-photo-festival-competition/) and download the Call for Entries and new guidelines: ACUA Photo Contest Call for Entries 2022.

Categories:
A. Color Archaeological Site Images
B. Color Archaeological Field Work in Progress Images
C. Color Archaeological Lab Work in Progress Images
D. Color Artifact Images
E. Black & White Artifact Images
F. Color Archaeological Portraits
G. Diversity
H. Artist’s Perspective (illustration of site or artifact)
I. Video

For questions about the revised Call for Entries and submission process, please contact photocontest@acuaonline.org

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS
The following schedule is preliminary and is subject to change. The newsletter only carries the outline schedule of conference-event scheduling.

**Tuesday, 4 January 2022**
8:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.   ACUA Board of Directors Meeting
2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.   Volunteer orientation
3:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.   Registration open

**Wednesday, 5 January 2022**
7:30 a.m. – 9:00 p.m.   Registration open
8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.   T1 Defending the Capital City – A Tour of Revolution
8:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.   WKS-3 An Introduction to Collections-Based Research
8:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.   SHA Board of Directors Meeting
9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.   WKS-1 Identification and Dating of Japanese Ceramics from 19th- and 20th-Century Sites
9:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.   T4 Black Communities in Southern New Jersey
9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.   WKS-2 Archaeological Illustration
9:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m.   T3 Historic Germantown: Freedom’s Backyard
9:45 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.   T-5A Guided Tour of the I-95 Archaeology Center
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.   T-2A Walking Tour of Philadelphia Old City
10:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.   Book Room Exhibitor Setup
1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.   WKS-7 Submerged Cultural Resources Awareness
1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.   Government Maritime Managers Forum
1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.   WKS-4 An Introduction to Digging through Archaeological Data
1:45 p.m. – 4:15 p.m.   T-5B Guided Tour of the I-95 Archaeology Center
2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.   T-2B Walking Tour of Philadelphia Old City
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.   Conference Welcome, Awards Ceremony, and Plenary Session
8:00 p.m. – 11:00 p.m.   Opening Reception

**Thursday, 6 January 2022**
7:30 a.m. – 5:30 p.m.   Registration open
8:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.   Morning sessions
8:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.   Book Room
9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.   Technology Room
12:00 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.   Roundtable Luncheons RL-1, RL-2, RL-3, RL-4
1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.   Afternoon sessions
4:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.   Past Presidents’ Student Reception
7:00 p.m. – 10:00 p.m.   Reception at the Museum of the American Revolution

Friday, 7 January 2022
7:30 a.m. – 5:30 p.m.   Registration open
8:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.   Morning sessions
8:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.   Book Room
9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.   Technology Room
12:00 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.   Roundtable Luncheons RL-5, RL-6, RL-7, RL-8
12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.   Past Presidents’ Luncheon
1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.   Afternoon sessions
3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.   ACUA Open Business Meeting
5:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.   SHA Business Meeting
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.   SBA Meeting
6:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.   Pre-Awards Cocktail Hour
7:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.   Awards Dessert Reception
8:30 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.   Awards Ceremony

Saturday, 8 January 2022
7:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.   Registration open
8:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.   Morning sessions
8:30 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.   Book Room
10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.   Public Archaeology Day at Independence Visitor Center
1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.   Afternoon sessions
5:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.   SHA Board of Directors Meeting

SHA CONFERENCE CODE OF CONDUCT

PREAMBLE

The Society for Historical Archaeology is committed to providing a safe, respectful environment for all attendees at its conferences. To that end, SHA will work to provide a harassment-free experience for everyone, regardless of gender, gender identity and expression, age, sexual orientation, disability, physical appearance, race, ethnicity, religion (or lack thereof), or any other category. SHA will not tolerate harassment in any form at any SHA-sponsored events. This policy applies to all SHA members and nonmembers who participate in an SHA activity.

DEFINITION AND EXAMPLES OF IMPERMISSIBLE CONDUCT

Harassment includes offensive comments or behavior related to gender, gender identity and expression, age, sexual orientation, disability, physical appearance, body size, race, ethnicity, religion, technology choices, sexual images in public space, deliberate intimidation, stalking, following, harassing photography or recording, sustained disruption of talks or other events, inappropriate physical contact, and unwelcome sexual attention. Outside of research presentations that include specific considerations of sexuality or sexual representations in the past, sexual language and imagery is not appropriate for any conference venue, including talks, workshops, parties, social media, and other online media.

Harassment under this policy refers to any behavior by an individual or group that contributes to a hostile, intimidating, and/or unwelcoming environment. Such conduct is harmful, disrespectful, and unprofessional.

OBLIGATION

All participants and attendees at the conference accept the obligation to treat everyone with respect and civility and to uphold the rights of all participants and attendees, including SHA staff, temporary staff, contractors, volunteers, and hotel staff, to be free from harassment.

Attendees are bound by the SHA Ethics Principles, the SHA Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Policy, and this Conference Code of Conduct. Attendees should also be aware that they are also bound by the codes of conduct at their home institution(s). This policy, which is consistent with the SHA Ethics Statement, does not supersede institutional codes, but is intended to reinforce their message.
By obtaining SHA membership and registering to present or attend SHA meetings, members and participants commit to maintaining respectful and ethical relationships in accordance with this policy. SHA reserves the right to remove an individual violating this policy from the SHA annual conference without warning or refund and prohibit attendance at future SHA conferences and/or activities.

Should SHA have concerns regarding an individual’s attendance at its conference creating a safety issue, SHA can bar the individual from registering and attending the conference. In the case of proven violations that took place prior to the annual meeting and that have been reported and documented prior to preregistration, proven harassers/assailants will be barred from participation. Late and on-site registrations will be rescinded immediately, should information be received documenting a proven violation. SHA will not conduct its own investigation, but will accept the investigations of law enforcement agencies, RPA, universities, EEOC, and employers. Documented harassers/assailants should be identified to SHA staff or leadership by survivors or other reporters as early as possible. Identification with documentation of adjudication needs to be provided to bar participation in SHA events.

REPORTING AT THE CONFERENCE

Conference attendees, who experience or witness harassment as defined by this policy, or who are aware that a conference participant is currently or has been sanctioned for assault or harassment by an adjudicating body and can provide documentation of the outcome, are encouraged to contact one of the following:

1. The SHA Executive Director directly at 240.753.4397;
2. A member of the SHA Board of Directors; or
3. A member of the SHA Code of Conduct Committee, whose name and contact information will be listed in the conference program.

These individuals will provide appropriate support to those who have witnessed or who have experienced harassment or feel unsafe for any reason at the conference. The SHA Executive Director or a member of the SHA Code of Conduct Committee will advise on the formal complaints process and, if requested, forward complaints to the full SHA Code of Conduct Committee for resolution.

Formal complaints should be as specific as possible about how alleged behavior constitutes harassment, as defined in this SHA policy. Any report received will remain confidential to the maximum extent possible when the SHA Code of Conduct Committee considers and investigates the complaint.

REGISTRATION


Submission of your conference registration also signifies your permission that SHA may capture and store photographs or recorded media of you during meeting events for use in SHA’s publications, website, and other media.

Conference Preregistration

Registration will open on Friday, 1 October 2021. Advance registration rates will be available until Wednesday, 1 December 2021. After that date, registration rates will increase. Conference preregistration will close at 5:00 p.m. PST on Wednesday, 15 December 2021. On-site registration will be available beginning Tuesday, 4 January 2022, in Philadelphia.

IMPORTANT: All presenters and session organizers at the SHA 2022 Conference are required to register for the conference at the full conference rate by 1 November 2021. Those who fail to register by 1 November 2021 will not be allowed to present their paper/poster or have their paper/poster presented for them. This policy will be strictly enforced. For papers or posters with multiple authors, only one of the paper/ poster’s authors must register for the conference by the 1 November deadline. All panelists and discussants must also register by 1 November 2021 at the full conference registration rate in order to participate in a session.
Rates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Until 1 December 2021</th>
<th>After 1 December 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHA Member</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
<td>$205.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmember</td>
<td>$280.00</td>
<td>$305.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHA Student Member</td>
<td>$85.00</td>
<td>$110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Nonmember</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td>$165.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THREE WAYS TO REGISTER

ONLINE  www.conftool.com/sha2022
The link to the online registration system for the SHA 2022 conference will be posted on the SHA website home page on 1 October 2021. Online registrations will close on 15 December 2021. After that date, registration must be done on-site at the 2022 conference.

FAX  866.285.3512
Fax your completed registration form with your credit card payment information to SHA by 15 December 2021.

MAIL
Mail your completed registration form and payment information (check or credit card). Your registration must be postmarked by 15 December 2021.

Society for Historical Archaeology
13017 Wisteria Drive #395
Germantown, MD 20874 USA

CANCELLATION POLICY
All registration refund requests must be received in writing by SHA no later than 8 December 2021. You will be refunded fees paid minus a $50.00 processing fee. No refunds will be given after 8 December 2021. Please note this Cancellation Policy applies in all circumstances (including medical) and as such we strongly recommend all registrants ensure they have purchased sufficient and appropriate travel insurance coverage. Refund requests should be emailed to SHA at hq@sha.org or mailed to SHA at the address above and received by 8 December 2021.

On-site Registration
Registration will be at the Conference Registration desk on the fourth floor of the Philadelphia Marriott Downtown.

The Registration Desk at the SHA 2022 conference will be open:
- Tuesday, 4 January 2022  3:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.
- Wednesday, 5 January 2022  7:30 a.m. – 9:00 p.m.
- Thursday, 6 January 2022  7:30 a.m. – 5:30 p.m.
- Friday, 7 January 2022  7:30 a.m. – 5:30 p.m.
- Saturday, 8 January 2022  7:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

Further Information and Updates
Detailed, regularly updated information will be available on the conference website at www.sha.org/conferences. Be sure to follow SHA 2022 on Facebook at www.facebook.com/SocietyforHistoricalArchaeology, on the SHA blog at www.sha.org/blog, and on Twitter at and #SHA2022. Any questions about the SHA 2022 conference can be sent to SHA Headquarters at hq@sha.org.
CONFERENCE REGISTRATION FORM

Registration for the SHA 2022 Conference will open on Friday, October 1, 2021. The advance registration period runs from October 1, 2021 to Wednesday, December 1, 2021. After December 1, registration rates increase.

Pre-conference registration closes on Wednesday, December 15, 2021. After December 15, all registrations must be done on site at the Conference. Contact the SHA office at hq@sha.org if you have questions on registering for the SHA 2022 Conference.

PLEASE NOTE: All presenters at the SHA 2022 Conference MUST register by Monday, November 1, 2021. If you do not register by this date, you will be dropped from the conference program.


Submission of your conference registration also signifies your permission that SHA may capture and store photographs or recorded media of you during meeting events for use in the SHA's publications, website and other media.

Three Ways to Register
FAX (866) 285-3512 Your completed registration form with your credit card payment information to SHA until December 15, 2021.
MAIL Your completed registration form with your credit card payment information received by December 15, 2021 to:
Society for Historical Archaeology
13017 Wisteria Drive #395, Germantown, MD 20874 USA

REGISTRATION CATEGORIES AND FEES

Full Conference Registration
Includes admission to all symposia, forums, general sessions, poster sessions, the Plenary Session, the SHA Book Room, Wednesday's Opening Night Reception, the SHA Business Meeting, the Pre-Awards Cocktail Hour, and the Awards Ceremony on Friday evening.

If you are presenting a paper or poster at the conference or participating as a panelist in a forum or discussant in a session, you must register at the Full Conference Registration rate by November 1, 2021. You may not register as a Guest if you are presenting a paper or participating as a panelist in a forum or as a session discussant.

Workshops, organized tours, roundtable luncheons, Thursday evening’s reception at the Museum of the American Revolution, and Friday’s Awards Dessert Reception are priced separately and are not included in the Full Conference Registration price.

To qualify for the Member Registration rate, you must be a 2021 or 2022 SHA Member.

Students must provide proof of current student status (copy of valid student ID) with their registration to receive the Student Registration rate.

Guest Registration
Includes admission to the Opening Reception, the Book Room, Friday’s Pre-Awards Banquet Cocktail Hour, and the Awards Ceremony.

Registered guests may purchase tickets for Thursday evening’s reception at the Museum of the American Revolution, Friday evening’s Awards Dessert Reception, and all organized tours. Guest registration DOES NOT include admission to any papers sessions. You may not register as a Guest if you are presenting a paper or participating as a panelist in a forum or as a session discussant.

The Public Archaeology Event on Saturday, January 8, 2022 will be held at the Independence Visitor’s Center and is open to everyone free of charge.

Please see Cancellation and Coronavirus Policies on page 4.
## CONFERENCE WORKSHOPS

All workshops will be held on Wednesday, January 5, 2022.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop ID</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Instructor(s)</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>SHA Member</th>
<th>Non-Member</th>
<th>SHA Student</th>
<th>Student Non-Member</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WKS-01</td>
<td>Identification and Dating of Japanese Ceramics from 19th and 20th Century Sites</td>
<td>Douglas Ross (Albion Environmental) and Renae Campbell (Asian American Comparative Collection, University of Idaho)</td>
<td>Half-day Workshop: 9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>□ $40</td>
<td>□ $50</td>
<td>□ $20</td>
<td>□ $25</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WKS-02</td>
<td>Archaeological Illustration</td>
<td>Jack Scott (Jack Scott Creative)</td>
<td>Full-day Workshop: 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>□ $80</td>
<td>□ $100</td>
<td>□ $50</td>
<td>□ $70</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WKS-03</td>
<td>An Introduction to Collections-Based Research</td>
<td>Beth Bollwerk (DAACS)</td>
<td>Half-day Workshop: 8:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>□ $30</td>
<td>□ $40</td>
<td>□ $20</td>
<td>□ $30</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WKS-04</td>
<td>An Introduction to Digging Through Archaeological Data</td>
<td>Jolene Smith (Virginia Department of Historic Resources) and Beth Bollwerk (DAACS)</td>
<td>Half-day workshop: 1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>□ $30</td>
<td>□ $40</td>
<td>□ $20</td>
<td>□ $30</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WKS-05</td>
<td>Practical Aspects of Bioarchaeology and Human Skeletal Analysis</td>
<td>Thomas Crist (Utica College) and Kimberly Morrell (AECOM)</td>
<td>Full-day Workshop: 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>□ $80</td>
<td>□ $100</td>
<td>□ $50</td>
<td>□ $70</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WKS-06</td>
<td>Open Source Archaeology with QGIS</td>
<td>Edward Gonzalez-Tennant (University of Central Florida)</td>
<td>Full-day Workshop: 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>□ $80</td>
<td>□ $100</td>
<td>□ $50</td>
<td>□ $70</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WKS-07</td>
<td>Submerged Cultural Resources Awareness</td>
<td>Kendra Kennedy (Argonne National Laboratory), and Amanda M. Evans (Gray &amp; Pape, Inc.)</td>
<td>Half-day workshop: 1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>□ $40</td>
<td>□ $50</td>
<td>□ $25</td>
<td>□ $35</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WORKSHOP TOTAL** $ _______
TOURS  All tours will be held on Wednesday, January 5, 2022.

☐ T-1  Defending the Capital City – A Tour of Revolution
       Wednesday, January 5, 2022 – 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
       Maximum number of attendees: 40
       #________ attending x $50.00 each  $________

☐ T-2A Walking Tour of Philadelphia Old City
       Wednesday, January 5, 2022 – 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
       Maximum number of attendees: 20
       #________ attending x $5.00 each  $________

☐ T-2B Walking Tour of Philadelphia Old City
       Wednesday, January 5, 2022 – 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.
       Maximum number of attendees: 20
       #________ attending x $5.00 each  $________

☐ T-3 Historic Germantown: Freedom’s Backyard Tour
       Wednesday, January 5, 2022 – 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.
       Maximum number of attendees: 40
       #________ attending x $75.00 each  $________

☐ T-4 Black Communities in Southern New Jersey
       Wednesday, January 5, 2022 – 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.
       #________ attending x $50.00 each  $________

☐ T-5A Guided Tour of the I-95 Archaeology Center
       Wednesday, January 5, 2022 – 9:45 a.m. to 12:15 p.m.
       Maximum number of attendees: 40
       #________ attending  No fee

☐ T-5B Guided Tour of the I-95 Archaeology Center
       Wednesday, January 5, 2022 – 1:45 p.m. to 4:15 p.m.
       Maximum number of attendees: 40
       #________ attending  No fee

TOURS TOTAL  $________

ROUNDTABLE LUNCHEONS  Maximum of ten people per Roundtable. Cost: $30 per person.

☐ Thursday, January 6, 2022 • $30
       12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.
       Sandwich choices (select one):  ☐ Turkey Sandwich,
                                       ☐ Chicken Caesar Wrap, or  ☐ Mediterranean Vegetarian Sandwich

       RL1  Historical Archaeologies of State Terror and Restorative Justice
            Host: Edward González-Tennant (University of Central Florida)

       RL2  Publishing with SHA
            Host: Benjamin Ford (Indiana University of Pennsylvania)

       RL3  Archaeology in the Age of Covid
            Host: Christopher P. Barton (Francis Marion University)

       RL4  Building Partnerships in Decolonizing, Collaborative, and Indigenous Archaeologies
            Hosts: Diane L. Teeman (Director, Culture & Heritage Department Vice-Chairperson, Tribal Council Burns Paiute Tribe and University of Nevada, Reno) and Sarah E. Cowie (University of Nevada, Reno)

       RL5  Jobs in Nautical Archaeology
            Host: Paul Johnston (Smithsonian Institution)

       RL6  Getting to Tenure: Peer Mentoring from Outside of Your Institution
            Host: Kristen R. Fellows (North Dakota State University)

       RL7  Archaeology, Advocacy, and Engaging Communities
            Hosts: Allison Manfra McGovern (Richard Grubb & Associates) and Sarah Kautz (Preservation Long Island)

       RL8  Privies, Wells, and Other Shaft Features We Know and Love
            Host: John P. McCarthy (RPA, Retired)

ROUNDTABLE LUNCHEONS TOTAL  $________

SPECIAL EVENTS

☐ Opening Night Reception
       Wednesday, January 5, 2022 – 8:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m.
       #________ attending (Cash Bar)  No fee

☐ Past Presidents’ Student Reception (for students ONLY)
       Thursday, January 6, 2022 – 4:30 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.
       #________ attending  No fee

☐ Museum of the American Revolution Reception
       Thursday, January 6, 2022 – 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.
       #________ attending x $35.00 each  $________

☐ Pre-Awards Cocktail Hour
       Friday, January 7, 2022 – 6:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.
       #________ attending (Cash Bar)  No fee

☐ Awards Dessert Reception
       Friday, January 7, 2022 – 7:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.
       #________ attending x $25.00 each  $________

☐ Awards Ceremony
       Friday, January 7, 2022 – 8:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.
       #________ attending (Cash Bar)  No fee

☐ Public Archaeology Event at the Independence Visitors Center
       Saturday, January 8, 2022 – 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.
       #________ attending  No fee

SPECIAL EVENTS TOTAL  $________
METHOD OF PAYMENT
Registration will not be processed without full payment.
Payment must be made in U.S. dollars.

TOTAL CONFERENCE FEES
Total amounts from pages 1, 2, 3 and 4 of this form

Registration .......................................................... $___________
Workshops ............................................................ $___________
Tours ................................................................. $___________
Roundtable Luncheons .............................................. $___________
Museum of the American Revolution Reception ............. $___________
Awards Dessert Reception ........................................ $___________
Contributions and Sponsorship .................................. $___________

TOTAL CONFERENCE FEES DUE ................................. $___________

METHOD OF PAYMENT
Registration will not be processed without full payment.
Payment must be made in U.S. dollars.

TOTAL CONFERENCE FEES $ _________________

☐ Check enclosed, made payable to SHA  ☐ Check #__________________________

☐ Credit card:  ☐ Visa  ☐ MasterCard  ☐ American Express

Card Number

Expiration Date

Name on Card

Authorizing Signature
STUDENT VOLUNTEER FORM

Student volunteers are essential to the smooth operation of an SHA Conference. By assisting with a variety of duties—from registration and Book Room setup to the special events and the sessions themselves—volunteers are a key component of the conference’s smooth operation.

SHA is looking for student volunteers to give eight hours of their time during the SHA 2022 conference in exchange for free conference registration. If you are a student and would like to volunteer your time in exchange for the opportunity to attend the SHA 2022 conference at no charge, complete the information below and return it with your conference registration form to SHA Headquarters (hq@sha.org) by 1 December 2021. In the registration fee area on the conference registration form, write Comp/Volunteer. Should you wish to register for any workshops, tours, roundtable luncheons, the Thursday evening reception at the Museum of the American Revolution, or the Awards Dessert Reception, please include your payment for these events with your registration form. ALSO, please indicate below when you will NOT be available to volunteer (e.g., times when you are presenting or are participating in a tour/workshop).

Applications will be accepted on a first-come/first-served basis until 1 December 2021. You will be contacted by the Volunteer Coordinator regarding the date/time of your volunteer assignment.

Name: _____________________________________________________________________________________________________

Address: __________________________________________________________________________________________________

Telephone: ___________________________ Email address: ___________________________________________________________

Student at: __________________________________________________________________________________________________

Expected arrival date/time in Philadelphia for the 2022 conference: _________________________________________________

Expected departure date/time: _________________________________________________________________________________

I am NOT available to volunteer at the following times: ______________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Questions on volunteering at the SHA 2022 conference? Contact the Volunteer Coordinator Meagan Ratini at 2022SHAvolunteers@gmail.com

Society for Historical Archaeology, 13017 Wisteria Drive #395, Germantown, MD 20874 USA
Phone: 301.972.9684; Fax: 866.285.3512; Email: hq@sha.org
Looking for the Next SHA Conference Committee Chair

One of many advantages of SHA membership is the society’s annual conference, which provides a prominent platform for advancing research in the field of historical archaeology, for participating in society committees, and for networking with colleagues. SHA is now looking for the next Conference Committee chair. The next chair will be responsible for coordinating all aspects of the annual conference. This position entails working closely with the executive director, the board of directors, the Conference Committee, and current and prospective hosts for the conference to select conference locations, negotiate rates, identify venues for receptions and tours, develop conference themes, oversee the timely submission of paper and poster abstracts, and assist local conference committees with all aspects of planning to ensure a successful conference.

The Conference Committee chair will assume the position in mid-November 2021. We are looking for someone who has a long-term commitment to the success of SHA; strong organizational, interpersonal, and leadership skills; exceptional problem-solving skills; and the ability to travel once or twice per year to visit potential conference venues. Experience organizing a previous SHA conference is a plus, as is having attended multiple SHA meetings. We are seeking someone who has a clear understanding of what makes a successful conference and is committed to excellence. The incoming Conference Committee chair’s term will last for three years and may be renewable. If you are interested in this position or have questions, please contact Karen Hutchison (karen@sha.org) by 25 October 2021.

A conference reception will be held at the Museum of the American Revolution on the evening of Thursday, 6 January 2022. We hope to see everyone there!
REGISTER
OF PROFESSIONAL
ARCHAEOLOGISTS

ABOUT US
The Register of Professional Archaeologists is a community of professional archaeologists. Our mission is to establish and adhere to standards and ethics that represent and adapt to the dynamic field of archaeology and to provide a resource for entities who rely on professional archaeology services.

Register of Professional Archaeologists
411 East Northfield Drive, Box 9, Brownsburg, IN 46112

Phone: (317) 352-2262
Grievance Hotline: (410) 246-2150
info@rpanet.org www.rpanet.org

BENEFITS OF REGISTRATION

JSTOR ACCESS
JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books and primary resources. Our Registrants can access a specially curated collection of JSTOR resources.

INCOME
Registrants generally earn higher salaries and have greater job responsibilities than archaeologists who are not registered.

EDUCATION
We screen and certify continuing professional education programs and notify Registrants of these opportunities to improve their professional practice in diverse and dynamic discipline.

EMPLOYMENT
Registration is required to do archaeological work in many jurisdictions - and the list is growing. Networking opportunities also provide connections for professionals at all points in their career.

OUR SPONSORING ORGANIZATIONS
“Hand Over That Trowel!”

In January of next year, we will congregate in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, for the 2022 joint meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology (SHA) and the Advisory Council on Underwater Archaeology (ACUA). The city of Philadelphia has hosted the SHA-ACUA conference on two previous occasions—first in 1976 and again in 1982 (when the ACUA was known as the International Conference on Underwater Archaeology [ICUA]). The commemorative trowel featured here is one of several that John Cotter, conference chair, had created for distribution to conference participants at the 1976 meeting, which was held at the Hilton Hotel right behind the University of Pennsylvania’s Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology. During the conference some participants left the hotel with their commemorative trowel in the back pocket of their pants and were subsequently confronted by local police officers, who accused them of carrying a dangerous weapon. Out of fear that attendees would be arrested, conference organizers made an announcement instructing everyone to not take their trowels out in public. It is not known how many trowels were confiscated that week, but this one survived to tell the story.

In addition to displaying the dates and location of the 1976 meeting, the trowel features the conference logo, which includes the following text: “America’s Cultural Heritage: Awareness, Interpretation, Preservation.” We are glad this trowel was preserved and is now a part of the SHA’s cultural heritage.

Although it’s unlikely that commemorative trowels will be handed out again next year, the 2022 SHA-ACUA conference will surely be another great one. We look forward to seeing you all in Philadelphia this coming January, with or without trowels in hand.
In Memoriam

Peter Douglas Schulz (1944–2021)

The world of archaeology lost another of its most talented practitioners on 25 June 2021. Pete Schulz was a remarkable scholar and colleague whose interests were broad and deep. He will be greatly missed by the many people he encountered during his prolific life and career. Although struck down by a massive stroke in 2010, Pete showed remarkable resilience in soldiering on with the support of his wife, Jeanette; their son, Robert; and his various caregivers, in particular Carlito (“Lito”) Rivera, for another 11 years. For most of that time Pete hosted a weekly card game attended most often by long-time colleagues and friends, including Jim West, Dick Hastings, Bill Olsen, and Glenn Farris. Pete was a stickler for following the rules of a game for which he was the main arbiter. At the time of his death, he was in a hospital bed in San Francisco with positive prognostications about recovery from a recent heart problem, playing cards with Jeanette and Robert, and being generally very upbeat. Death came very quickly at the end.

Pete was born in Fairbury, Nebraska, and lived for a while in the Ozarks before his family moved to the Napa Valley. He graduated from San Francisco State University and then pursued graduate work in anthropology with an archaeology specialty, finally earning a doctorate at the University of California, Davis (UCD). He was employed by California State Parks for 40 years, ultimately becoming a senior state archaeologist before retiring in 2008.

A true scholar throughout his career, Pete ventured into a divergent series of studies that included Egyptian hieroglyphics, faunal analysis that morphed into a special interest in fish remains, human osteology with a particular interest in dentition, overseas Chinese immigrant archaeology, pre-Gold Rush Californian Mexican-era sites, mining archaeology, the history of medicine and pharmaceuticals, and most notably, the study of glass bottles found on archaeological sites. An early paper he authored dealt with the solar orientation of Early Horizon interments in the Central Valley of California. He used careful measurements of the direction toward which the bodies were oriented at interment, making a cogent argument for projecting the time of the year the deaths occurred.

His playful side came out in his affinity for Scrooge McDuck comics, ostensibly because of Uncle Scrooge’s travels accompanied by his nephew, Donald, as well as Huey, Dewey, and Louie. As a Scrooge aficionado myself, I quickly bonded with Pete when we met as fellow grad students at UCD. Often seen with a stogie clamped between his teeth, Pete bowed to the no-smoking sensibilities by not lighting up and so would have come up short in a Clint Eastwood look-alike contest.

In addition to monographs, Pete was very willing to join forces with other researchers to produce seminal publications. Examples would be his article with Sherri Gust (Faunal Remains and Social Status in 19th Century Sacramento); another was with Larry Felton (The Diaz Collection: Material Culture and Social Change in mid-19th Century Monterey), both published in 1983. In later years Pete collaborated with Bill Lindsey, Rebecca Allen, and Jeanette Schulz on a major work on glass bottles, Baffle Marks and Pontil Scars: A Reader on Historic Bottle Identification, published in 2016.

Vertical archaeology, a way of studying standing structures by comparing construction techniques and paint layers, was also an intriguing study for Pete in conjunction with his general interest in old buildings. A favorite research project was the study of the mainly vernacular architecture at the gold-mining town of Bodie in the high desert of eastern California. Among other sites near and dear to his heart was the mid-1850s Stanford Mansion in Sacramento.

Pete put in countless hours examining old newspapers on microfilm at the California State Library among other venues and amassed a huge collection of articles, ads, and other references that aided in dating the times of availability of various historic artifacts. His collection of fish specimens was also a treasure to those wishing to research piscine fauna. This collection was later donated to UCD to become the Peter D. Schulz Osteichthyology Collection. He was particularly interested in salmon and sturgeon and had a freezer full of specimens at the Parks Archaeology Lab in West Sacramento waiting to
be macerated. At one point, Pete took some time off to go to Hawai’i to work on fish collections at the Bishop Museum on Oahu.

An interest in overseas Chinese sites in California stimulated more research interests that resulted in trips to Hong Kong and Canton to track down market specimens. You can imagine the looks he often got taking his gems through customs. Fortunately, he did much of this work before 9/11 brought new levels of scrutiny by Transportation Security Administration agents. While working on a major project at China Camp Village in Marin County, Peter made friends with Frank Kwan, a descendant of the families who had lived in the village and was an active shrimp fisherman himself.

About the time he retired, Pete developed an interest in learning Korean and took courses in the language. He would frequently steer us to a nearby Korean restaurant for lunch. He was also known for organizing dim sum excursions in West Sacramento. Of course, when we worked in Old Town San Diego there were late afternoon margarita breaks, after which we would be herded back to work on the site until dark.

In sum, Peter was a truly remarkable character and is greatly missed by his friends and colleagues. For those interested in a fuller biographical reminiscence on his life, go to https://www.smith-funerals.com/obituary/Peter-Schulz.

With fond remembrances,
Glenn Farris

Peter with his wife, Jeanette, on the “North Side” of the campus of the University of California, Berkeley.
Please send summaries of your recent research as a Word file to the appropriate geographical coordinator listed below. Contributions are generally between 500 and 2000 words in length. An abstract of no more than 100 words is requested. Submit illustrations as separate files (jpeg preferred, 300 dpi or greater resolution; minimum 200 dpi). The slideshow feature also allows contributions to feature more photographs than in a print publication. Video should be supplied in FLV format; recommended bitrate is between 300 and 700 kb/s. Maximum file size for a video is 100 MB. Audio should be in MP3 audio format.

AFRICA
Ibrahima Thiaw, Université Cheikh Anta Diop de Dakar, ibrahima.thiaw@ucad.edu.sn

ASIA
Ruth Young, University of Leicester, rly3@le.ac.uk

AUSTRALASIA AND ANTARCTICA
Pamela Chauvel and Amelia O’Donnell, University of Sydney, thirtywest90@bigpond.com and a_od89@hotmail.com

CANADA-ATLANTIC (New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island)
Amanda Crompton, consultant, amandajcrompton@gmail.com

CANADA-ONTARIO
Jeff Seibert, Trent University Archaeological Research Centre/Seibert Heritage Services, jeffreydavid.seibert@ontario.ca

CANADA-PRAIRIE AND ARCTIC (Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Northwest Territories, Yukon, and Nunavut)
Amelia Fay, Manitoba Museum, afay@manitobamuseum.ca

CANADA-QUÉBEC
Stéphane Noël, Université Laval, stephane.noel.2@ulaval.ca

CARIBBEAN AND BERMUDA
Paola Schiappacasse, Universidad de Puerto Rico, Paola.schiappacasse@upr.edu

CONTINENTAL EUROPE
Natascha Mehler, Universität Wien, natascha.mehler@univie.ac.at

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

LATIN AMERICA
Dolores Elkin, CONICET (Argentina), lolielkin@hotmail.com

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

UNDERWATER (Worldwide)
Toni L. Carrell, Ships of Discovery, tlcarrell@shipsofdiscovery.org

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

USA-CENTRAL PLAINS (Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska)

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)
Kelly Palich, Howard County Recreation and Parks, kpalich@howardcountymd.gov

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

USA-NEVADA
Michelle Hannum, SWCA Environmental Consultants, michellehannum@yahoo.com

USA-NEW ENGLAND (New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont)
Stephen Nagiewicz, Stockton University, Stephen.Nagiewicz@stockton.edu

USA-PACIFIC NORTHWEST (Idaho, Oregon, Washington)
Michelle Hannum, SWCA Environmental Consultants, michellehannum@yahoo.com

USA-SOUTHEAST (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee)
Kendy Altizer, The University of the South, kmaltize@sewanee.edu

USA-SOUTHWEST (Arizona, New Mexico, Utah)
Michael R. Polk, Aspen Ridge Consultants, mpolk130@gmail.com

CURRENT RESEARCH BEGINS ON NEXT PAGE
AUSTRALASIA AND ANTARCTICA

Australia

From Immigrant to Settler: Diet in 19th-Century Institutions of Immigration (submitted by Kimberley Connor, doctoral candidate, Stanford University)

Abstract: Excavated in the 1980s, Hyde Park Barracks is one of Australia’s World Heritage-listed Convict Sites. However, most of the archaeology at the site is related to two later institutions, the Female Immigration Depot (1848–1887) and the Destitute Asylum (1862–1886). Kimberley Connor’s work reassesses material related to food and dining (faunal, botanical, ceramics, metal, and glass) to better understand how time spent in institutions of immigration shaped settlers’ dining habits.

Resumen: Hyde Park Barracks, excavado en la década de 1980, es uno de los sitios de convictos declarados Patrimonio de la Humanidad por Australia. Sin embargo, la mayor parte de la arqueología en el sitio está relacionada con dos instituciones posteriores, el Depósito de Inmigración Femenina (1848–1887) y el Asilo de Indigentes (1862–1886). El trabajo de Kimberley Connor reevalúa el material relacionado con la comida y la gastronomía (fauna, botánica, cerámica, metal y vidrio) para comprender mejor cómo el tiempo pasado en instituciones de inmigración moldeó los hábitos alimenticios de los colonos.

Résumé: Fouillé dans les années 1980, Hyde Park Barracks est l’un des sites de condamnés classés au patrimoine mondial de l’Australie. Cependant, la majeure partie de l’archéologie sur le site est liée à deux institutions ultérieures, le Female Immigration Depot (1848–1887) et le Destitute Asylum (1862–1886). Le travail de Kimberley Connor réévalue le matériel lié à la nourriture et à la restauration (faune, botanique, céramique, métal et verre) pour mieux comprendre comment le temps passé dans les institutions d’immigration a façonné les habitudes alimentaires des colons.

This project is reassessing food-related archaeological material from Hyde Park Barracks Museum in Sydney, New South Wales. Hyde Park Barracks (Figure 1) is a famous convict site, but most of the archaeology relates to the Female Immigration Depot (1848–1887) and the Destitute Asylum (1862–1886). These institutions provided accommodation and care for newly arrived female immigrants and for women who were unable to provide for themselves.

During excavations at the site during the 1980s, archaeologists found substantial subsurface as well as large underfloor deposits of materials trapped between the convict-era floorboards and the ceilings of the rooms below (Figure 2). Because these artifacts were protected, there is remarkably good preservation of paper, textiles and plant material. My project examines the food-related artifacts—faunal, macrobotanical, etc. (Figure 2). Artifacts were removed by hand from each numbered joist space before they were vacuumed and the material was sieved. (Photo courtesy of Hyde Park Barracks Archaeology Collection, Sydney Living Museums.)
glass, metal, and ceramics—in addition to historical documentation about the food and dining practices in the two institutions (Figure 3).

Preliminary results show that while the official diet was monotonous, the women were able to access other foods including seafood, fresh fruit, and purchased condiments, as well as alcohol for medicinal and social purposes. Approximately 11 plant species are reported that haven’t been identified previously on an Australian historical site, including banana, onion, quandong (native peach), cherimoya/soursop, woody pear, and corn (Figure 4). The project demonstrates the exciting potential of legacy collections and how a focus on food-related artifacts sheds light on both everyday life (official and illicit) in institutions and the process of integrating immigrants into settler communities more broadly.

**FIGURE 3.** There are surprisingly few ceramics from the site and they may be items brought by immigrants rather than reflecting institutional consumption. Instead, inmates ate off metal plates like the one shown here along with cutlery; these are typical of the large number of pieces found beneath the floorboards. Hyde Park Barracks Archaeology Collection, Sydney Living Museums. (Photo © Jamie North.)

**FIGURE 4.** Some of the desiccated macrobotanical material recovered from beneath the floorboards, including unusual dried citrus peel. Hyde Park Barracks Archaeology Collection, Sydney Living Museums. (Photo © Jamie North.)

Caribbean and Bermuda

**Antigua and Barbuda**

**Shipwreck Investigations in Tank Bay, English Harbour, Antigua and Barbuda** *(submitted by Christopher K. Waters, Heritage Department, National Parks Authority of Antigua and Barbuda; Jean-Sébastien Guibert, Université des Antilles History department / AIHP GEODE; Desley Gardner, Heritage Department, National Parks Authority of Antigua and Barbuda; and Hélène Botcazou, Ipso Facto):*

**Abstract:** The National Parks Authority of Antigua and Barbuda and the University of the West Indies are collaborating on the first archaeological investigations of a shipwreck site in Antigua and Barbuda. In June of 2021, the team ground-truthed and started an initial archaeological survey of the Tank Bay Wreck Site in English Harbour, Antigua, in the heart of the Antigua Naval Dockyard and Related Archaeological Sites UNESCO World Heritage Site. The wreck has tentatively been identified as the *Lyon ex. Beaumont*, a French East Indiaman turned blockade runner captured during the American Revolution.

**Resumen:** La Autoridad de Parques Nacionales de Antigua y Barbuda y la Universidad de las Indias Occidentales están colaborando en las primeras investigaciones arqueológicas de un sitio de naufragio en Antigua y Barbuda. En junio de 2021, el equipo confirmó la verdad y comenzó un estudio arqueológico inicial del sitio del naufragio de Tank Bay en English Harbour, Antigua, en el corazón del astillero naval de Antigua y sitios arqueológicos relacionados, declarados Patrimonio de la Humanidad por la UNESCO. El naufragio ha sido identificado tentativamente como el *Lyon/Beaumont*, un francés de las Indias Orientales convertido en corredor de bloqueo capturado durante la Revolución Americana.

**Résumé:** L’Autorité des parcs nationaux d’Antigua-et-Barbuda et l’Université des Antilles collaborent aux premières investigations archéologiques d’un site d’épave à Antigua-et-Barbuda. En juin 2021, l’équipe a vérifié et commencé une première
The National Parks Authority of Antigua and Barbuda and the University of the West Indies are collaborating on the first archaeological investigations of a shipwreck site in Antigua and Barbuda. In June of 2021, the team groundtruthed and started an initial archaeological survey of the Tank Bay Wreck Site in English Harbour, Antigua, in the heart of the Antigua Naval Dockyard and Related Archaeological Sites UNESCO World Heritage Site (Figure 1). The wreck has tentatively been identified as the Lyon ex. Beaumont, a French East Indiaman turned blockade runner captured during the American Revolution.

The wreck site was first identified in a benthic survey by the Royal Hydrographers commissioned by the National Parks and the Antigua and Barbuda Marine Register in 2013. Knowing that the area historically contained several wrecks from the Royal Navy Dockyard occupation of English Harbour (1725–1890), the survey included a heritage component. The data were returned to the National Parks in 2015 with one likely shipwreck site.

The initial data indicated a length of hull of more than 38 m in shallow water in Tank Bay (Figure 2). The area has been used since the 1950s as an anchorage for yachts, with there being several permanent moorings. Initial archaeological snorkel surveys and a hull fixed side scan sonar survey in 2016 in partnership with Antigua and Barbuda Search and Rescue (ABSAR) failed to locate the vessel (Waters 2018a).

During the 2021 campaign, the Tank Bay area and the remaining portion of English Harbour were resurveyed with a towed side scan sonar. The survey reacquired the target from the 2013 benthic survey almost immediately and divers landed on the site within seconds of hitting the water.

Initial survey results indicate that this is an incredibly substantial wooden wreck. The site measured more than 40 m in length. The stern has been tentatively identified as pointing south. Approximately 20 m of the 72 cm thick keelson was visible, as were approximately 50 pairs of frames (double framed), each about 30 cm thick. Several single-layer strakes were also identified, each approximately 12.5 cm thick. The entire site was covered in granite ballast, a stone not found in Antigua and Barbuda.

The entire site is between 2.5 and 3.5 m deep in a narrow and silty bay at the farthest end of English Harbour. Visibility is low and exacerbated by the silty bottom which, when disturbed, releases plumes of fine particles into the water.
The site is also covered in seagrasses. The bay is fringed by a mangrove system, terminating approximately 15 m from the starboard side. There were also several moorings that appear to have been installed through the hull on the starboard side, causing some damage.

As there are only very limited conservation capabilities in Antigua and Barbuda, it was decided prior to the campaign that only very limited artifacts would be recovered and that the site would be preserved in situ (Antigua and Barbuda has ratified the 2001 UNESCO Convention for the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage). Three artifacts definitively associated with the wreck and a fourth item probably not associated with the wreck were recovered and are currently undergoing a desalination process. The artifacts include a lead covering plate with nail holes, a copper tack, an animal bone, and a brass pitch pipe, the last likely a postwreck intrusion. Additionally, several granite ballast stones and wood speciation samples were taken for further analysis.

These initial results marry well with the ongoing archival research. Started in 2015, maps and correspondence from the Admiralty collections at The National Archives in London, the United Kingdom, point to a French 40-gun vessel called the Lyon. Brought into English Harbour in December 1778 as a prize by HMS Maidstone, the Lyon was a 900-ton French East Indiaman turned private blockade runner supplying the Continental Navy with cordage from France (The Packard Humanities Institute). The Lyon was captured on 3 November 1778 off Cape Henry as she was trying to run the British blockade with a consignment of 1451 hogsheads of tobacco from the Continental Congress. Both the Lyon and the Maidstone were heavily damaged and limped into English Harbour six weeks later (TNA ADM papers 1/310/381 Maidstone off Antigua 22 December 1778). According to a map by the Dockyard Commissioner John Laforey in 1780, the Lyon was nosed into Tank Bay in shallow water (TNA ADM 140/1188; see also Nicholson 2002:14).

As a 900-ton French East Indiaman, the Lyon was built to warship-grade specifications. From the hull remains, we can see that the Tank Bay Wreck was significantly larger than the average shipping vessel visiting in Antigua (just under 80 tons between 1784 and 1787 with only 10 of 1505 vessels having a burthen between 351 and 408 tons [Waters 2018b:88–90]). Indeed, the prize cargo from the Lyon was so large that it required six merchant vessels to ship it to London for auction (Vaughan, Winne & Margetson 1781). The sheer size and scope of the Tank Bay Wreck, therefore, indicates that this vessel was of similar size to an 18th-century warship, rather than an interisland trader or transatlantic merchant vessel. Archival research is currently in progress in France to complete the history of the Beaumont/Lyon.

Additional circumstantial evidence pointing toward the identification of the vessel as the Lyon includes the fact that English Harbour was under the control of the Royal Navy from 1725 to 1890. As a military bureaucratic institution, the Admiralty produced significant archival materials, including reports on the conditions of Royal Navy vessels, the establishment of hulks, and the loss of vessels. Research into these reports has failed to identify a single British warship or other military transport that was hulked or scrapped in Tank Bay. The size and location of the vessel provide compelling evidence for a tentative identification of the Tank Bay Wreck as the Lyon.

This project is compelling from a number of different reasons. First, if the identification of the Lyon holds, this is the first and only known French East India man with any extant naval architecture, making this a compelling case study for nautical archaeologists. Additionally, a scale model of the ship built to show to potential investors prior to construction still exists in the Dieppe Museum, allowing for a comparative analysis (Figure 3).

Second, given its location in a shallow and sheltered bay and within a protected and monitored heritage site, this site can be used as a safe location to build indigenous maritime archaeology capacity in Antigua and Barbuda and the greater region.

Third, in terms of public interpretation the story of the Lyon is compelling for the diverse internal and external tourism audiences who visit the World Heritage Site. Launched in 1762 as the Beaumont for the French East India Company, the ship made four voyages around the Cape of Good Hope and into the Indian Ocean, where she participated in the trade in enslaved persons as well as in other high-value trading voyages. The Lyon was sold off in 1769 with the collapse of the French East India Company and served for two years as a 56-gun ship of the line in the French Navy. Around 1777, the vessel was pur-
chased by a French nobleman, Jacques-Donatien Le Ray de Chaumont, a sympathizer of the American Revolution and the French patron of the American ambassador Benjamin Franklin. He renamed the vessel the Lyon and outfitted it as a 40-gun blockade runner primarily to bring cordage for the first vessels of the Continental Navy. The cargo was successfully unloaded in New London, Connecticut; the Lyon then sailed to the Chesapeake to take on its consignment of tobacco, after which it was captured by the HMS Maidstone and brought to English Harbour, Antigua.

For our multinational audiences, the story of the Lyon is compelling. First and foremost, the Tank Bay Wreck site represents a tangible connection to the trade in enslaved persons and the activities undertaken by enslaved Africans in the dockyard, who salvaged the wreck for critical parts to help repair the Royal Navy warships on the Leeward Islands and North American stations. At the National Parks, interpreting the daily lives of the skilled enslaved laborers who comprised the majority of the workforce in the dockyard and surrounding military sites is a key area of engagement (Waters and Gardner 2022).

The archaeology and research into the Tank Bay Wreck site will continue for the next several years and will include a multinational archival component in France, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Antigua. The focus of the project is the archaeological survey and documentation of the site, which will include generating photogrammetry surveys for research and interpretation and developing a sensitive and sensible management plan to maintain the wreck site for the future (Figure 4).

This project is a collaboration between the University of the West Indies (AIHP GEODE), the Antigua and Barbuda National Parks, and the Association Archéologie Petites Antilles (AAPA) and Antigua & Barbuda Search and Rescue (ABSAR). It was funded by the French Ministry of Europe and Foreign Affairs, the Richard Lounsbery Foundation, and the Overseas Martinique Convergence Contract (Prefecture of Martinique and the Collectivité Territoriale de Martinique) and by in-kind support from the Antigua and Barbuda National Parks and ABSAR.

The team is composed of Jean-Sébastien Guibert (mission leader), Guy Lanoix (hyperbaric operation leader), Hélène Botcazou (shipbuilding study), Gilbert Labonne (archaeological diver), Gilbert Pachoud (survey leader), and Olivier Beauroy Eustache (captain) from the University of the West Indies; Christopher K. Waters (material culture study) and Desley Gardner from Antigua and Barbuda National Parks; and Dave Martin of ABSAR (Figure 5).
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Barbados

An Interdisciplinary Approach to Archaeology and Art on a Caribbean Plantation (submitted by Matthew C. Reilly, City College of New York, and Annalee Davis, Barbadian visual artist; www.annaleedavis.com)

Abstract: Despite a long tradition of plantation archaeology in the Caribbean, there has been little engagement between archaeologists and contemporary Caribbean artists who similarly think with and through material culture. We here outline an interdisciplinary project that incorporates archaeological and artistic practice as a lens through which to understand the history of plantation slavery in Barbados and the significance of its material vestiges in the present.

Resumen: A pesar de una larga tradición de arqueología de plantaciones en el Caribe, ha habido poco compromiso entre los arqueólogos y los artistas caribeños contemporáneos que piensan de manera similar con y a través de la cultura material. Aquí esbozamos un proyecto interdisciplinario que incorpora la práctica arqueológica y artística como un lente a través del cual comprender la historia de la esclavitud en las plantaciones en Barbados y la importancia de sus vestigios materiales en el presente.

Résúumé : Malgré une longue tradition d’archéologie des plantations dans les Caraïbes, il y a eu peu d’engagement entre les arqueólogos y los artistas caribeños contemporáneos que pensan de la même manière avec et à travers la culture matérielle. Nous décrivons ici un projet interdisciplinaire qui intègre la pratique archéologique et artistique comme une lentille à travers laquelle comprendre l’histoire de l’esclavage des plantations à la Barbade et la signification de ses vestiges matériels dans le présent.

Bridging the fields of archaeology and visual art, ongoing work at Walkers Dairy Farm, St. George, Barbados (Figure 1), is exploring the material past of a sugar plantation and how that past weighs on the contemporary landscape in the 21st-century Caribbean. The methods briefly summarized here are a marked attempt to combine traditional archaeological analyses of plantation life with the production of visual art to create an interdisciplinary lens through which to understand and represent changes unfolding on the Barbadian landscape beginning roughly 400 years ago. Of the many aims and research questions of the project, we here focus on two: (1) How can archaeological methods be used to explore changes to the planta-
tion landscape from the onset of the sugar and slavery system into the 21st century? and (2) How does the intersection of artistic and archaeological methodologies shift the way in which plantation spaces are studied?

Archaeological studies of Barbadian plantations have a long history, dating back to pioneering investigations by Jerome Handler and Frederick Lange (1978). With few features associated with enslaved populations visible on the Barbadian landscape, our study is partly inspired by previous attempts to locate significant sites of the African Diaspora that had been erased after centuries of intensive sugar production across the island (Handler et al. 1989; Armstrong and Reilly 2014). Field surveys conducted in 2018 and 2019, including over 100 systematic shovel test pits, targeted fields with topography, positioning, or historic names that hint at the locations of villages for enslaved plantation inhabitants in centuries past. Walkers, which now operates as a dairy farm, was initially established as Willoughby’s in the 1660s. Likely established by William Willoughby, who served as governor of Barbados from 1667 to 1673, the property is an ideal context in which to explore how plantation space was organized to maximize profit and implement a brutal regime of race-based slavery. As governor of the island during a critical period in the midst of what is often referred to as the “sugar revolution,” Willoughby inaugurated the sugar and slavery system on his own property as he oversaw the functioning of what was at the time England’s most profitable colony.

Building on previous investigations conducted by Reilly (2019) focusing on race and class on the margins of a Barbadian plantation, our surveys, in part, seek to understand changes in spatial organization on what was once an estate of over 300 acres over the centuries in which sugar was grown. Specific fields were selected for shovel test pit surveys (Figure 2) based on names that might indicate features or former functions, density of surface scatters of artifacts, and historical knowledge of where planters chose to place villages for enslaved person. Historic maps include field names like “Mansion,” “Stable Field,” and “New Ground.” Based on the fact that many villages for enslaved persons or spaces allocated for their provision crops were located in fields called “Negro Yard” (Handler 2002), it’s possible that “New Ground” was the location of a new village for enslaved persons during a period of reorganization or a village or provision plot for free Afro-Barbadian laborers after Emancipation. Such fields, potentially once home to enslaved persons, the residence of Governor Willoughby, or the plantation’s stables, are now used for cattle grazing, bearing no visible indication of their use in centuries past.

In fields surrounding the works of the plantation, test pits yielded household ceramics, glass bottles, construction materials, an abundance of locally produced sugar cones, and clay tobacco pipes. However, no features, such as foundations, have yet been identified despite the recovery of nearly 3,000 household and utilitarian artifacts. Of particular note is a dense concentration of locally produced earthenware used in the sugar production process found to the north of the plantation works (mill and boiling house). Future seasons will explore whether this was an area of pottery production or perhaps a midden created when the plantation shifted to mechanized centrifugal sugar production that no longer required the use of ceramics for drying. Surveys and analysis will continue in future field seasons, but the rediscovery of the village or other features is not necessarily

FIGURE 1. Aerial view, Walkers Dairy Farm, St. George, Barbados, W.I. (Photo credit: Paul Davis.)

FIGURE 2. Project team members from the City College of New York excavate a test pit in a field north of the windmill, July 2019. (Photo credit: Matthew C. Reilly.)
the top priority of our ongoing work. In foregrounding the process of archaeology in conjunction with the experiential components of land (past, present, and future), our work also involves more-creative outlets for the materiality of Caribbean plantations.

In exploring the making of race, plantation agriculture, and the relationship between Barbadians and the grounds beneath their feet, we are charting a new course for archaeological studies on the island by incorporating contemporary visual art. As a 21st-century Barbadian visual artist, Davis aims to investigate a complex place for which she has deep affection, and through her contemporary art practice is asking how she might come to know a place burdened by the death machine that was the plantation. Through a critique of plantation logic, her work questions whether the profound depths of any land could ever be measured or owned (Figures 3–5). New work inspired by walking the heavily mediated grounds of the plantation challenges historical renderings of the site buried beneath ceaseless cadastrals, surveys, and mappings. This work simultaneously pushes a reconsideration of an archaeological science that similarly maps and surveys through a positivistic paradigm. Importantly, her work acknowledges that these lands have their own language as layered substrates with restless histories running through them.

Davis’s work proposes walking as a ritual act and suggests that coursing through the landscape at dawn or dusk is one way to know a place that can complement or conflict with systematic archaeological investigations. It is during this time that Davis unearths ceramic sherds poking out of earthen tracks between fields, including bits of crockery originating from potteries in the north of England that crossed the Atlantic to be used by the settler-colonial class for drinking tea and serving food. Imported ceramics were similarly used by indentured and enslaved persons, eventually making their way into the soil, where they were mixed with locally made clay remains of sugar cones. These artifacts similarly comprise the archaeological assemblage collected during 2018 and 2019 surveys (Figure 6). Analysis and curation have been undertaken for the archaeological collection of nearly 3,000 artifacts, but materials collected by Davis during walks of fields and cart roads have been incorporated into vessels featured in the (bush) Tea Services exhibition (Figure 7) and *F is for Frances*, for example.
Repurposing these sherds collected from the surface along plantation cart roads, Davis included them in a set of tea cups, saucers, and a teapot in the form of a traditional water carrier called a monkey jar. From the tea set, she serves (unsweetened) varieties of bush tea collected from the fields of the former sugarcane plantation and adjoining rab lands. Sugar-sweetened tea, a psycho-tropical sweet stimulant, provided not only a moment to pause and refresh, but a cheap tool to prolong the working capacity of the enslaved in the field. For the enslaved, many of the herbs in these bush teas also offered medical uses in bush baths, for healing, and to prevent or terminate unwanted pregnancies.

Archival evidence is similarly informing archaeological and artistic practice. For instance, the last will and testament of Thomas Applewhaite, former owner of Walkers, written in August 1816, directed that six years after his death his “little favourite Girl Slave named Frances shall be manumitted and set free from all and all manner of Servitude and slavery whatsoever.” In addition to providing insights into the lives of those who lived and labored on the plantation (as well as potential evidence of sexual exploitation/violence), the will inspired a suite that maps Frances’s name in a series of seven drawings on ledger pages (Figure 8). The letters forming her name comprise 18th- and 19th-century sherds found in the soil suggesting fragments of history understood only in part—usually through the words of the white colonial settler and most often a male voice. With Frances, along with the remains of everyday items that were used by laborers (enslaved and free), other voices become tangible, audible, and visible.

In addition to this project being a collaboration between an American archaeologist and a Barbadian visual artist, multiple institutions have contributed to the research and artwork that has been featured at exhibitions around the globe. Students from the City College of New York, the CUNY Graduate Center, Brown University, and Columbia University have participated in archaeological excavations, while Barbadian students taking part in the Junior Curators program at the Barbados Museum and Historical Society have visited the site to learn how excavations and artifact analysis play a role in museum curation practices. As an inclusive, collaborative project, our research doesn’t prioritize one form of engaging with material culture over another. Rather, method and theory from the worlds of archaeology, museum curation, and contemporary art all inform the ways in which the built landscape of island plantations is experienced and understood.

Investigations of the past must grapple with the fact that Caribbean soils and the vestiges of plantation life are symptomatic of fragmented postcolonial Caribbean geopolitics and traumas unhealed by the passage of time. Artists in the Caribbean have critically engaged with historic material culture in their practice (Navarro 2018) and archaeologists working in the Caribbean are beginning to explore artistic outlets through their studies (Dunnavant 2021), but it is our hope that more projects will implement a collaborative framework that recognizes the overlap in archaeological and artistic practice. Through an interdisciplinary archaeology and visual art case study from Barbados, we suggest that material culture, though often
reserved for quantitative analyses, has affective attributes that subvert positivistic readings of the plantation landscape, asserting their importance beyond what they tell us about the past.

To see more of Annalee Davis’s archaeology-inspired work, visit the following pages:

https://annaleedavis.com
https://bushteaplots.wordpress.com
https://www.instagram.com/annalee.devere/
https://kunsthallebratislava.sk/en/event/potential-agrarianisms
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Guadeloupe

Local Voices: The Uses of Archaeological Heritage in the Caribbean/Voces Locales: Los Usages du Patrimoine Archéologique dans les Caraïbes (submitted by Dr. Joseph Sony Jean (Haiti), CaribTRAILS project, Royal Netherlands Institute of Southeast Asian and Caribbean Studies, the Netherlands; Katarina Jacobson (Guadeloupe), Musée Edgar Clerc, Guadeloupe; Dr. Eduardo Herrera Malatesta (Venezuela), Lorentz Center, the Netherlands)

Background
On Tuesday and Wednesday, 27 and 28 April 2021, the international virtual seminar “Local Voices: The Uses of Archaeological Heritage in the Caribbean” was held. This workshop was funded by the Wenner-Gren Foundation in partnership with the Departmental Council of Guadeloupe and the CaribTRAILS project (the Netherlands).

This workshop consisted of the discussion of three main questions:

(1) How do contemporary communities in the Caribbean engage with the material past? What is the role of local Caribbean individuals and communities in the creation and future of archaeological heritage?

(2) How can we address natural hazards and climate change and its impact on archaeological heritage?
In the Breakout Rooms: Discussing Issues

Engaging with the material past

Questions about identifying the key challenges related to archaeological heritage in the Caribbean region reveal fundamental details about the long-term future of the region’s cultural heritage. Due to the political configurations of the islands, the approaches, expectations, and policies of communities in the region may differ. Major issues that relate to the protection of heritage were identified by participants in the workshop from many parts of the Caribbean as well as by international researchers. These issues are mainly the looting of sites, land management, natural hazards, lack of funding, and the non-participation of local communities in decision-making. The voices of local Caribbean academics and nonacademics are crucial to addressing the impact of global trends and to debates on the uses of archaeological heritage and on its future, especially in the context of global economic, social, political, and environmental problems. Narratives about Caribbean heritage from various perspectives and various people may encourage the emergence of new models of heritage valuation, protection, and sustainability. The diversity of archaeological heritage is a result of the cultural dynamics of Caribbean history. The participants identified the forms of heritage that are more foregrounded in heritage making and displayed in museums. They highlighted the necessity of establishing long-term strategies for all heritage sites that represent the diversity of Caribbean culture. It is crucial to talk about all the communities who have left their mark on the cultural landscape of the Caribbean, amplifying the voices of Indigenous Amerindian populations and not obscuring African elements. Often colonial-period sites—places in which enslaved Africans survived during colonial rule—are used to attract tourists, while knowledge about these places is still absent in local debates. This calls for the fundamental shift of looking more deeply at these sites, so that knowledge of the past can be transmitted from generation to generation.

In terms of the dynamics of conserving heritage, the participants emphasized the importance of the active engagement of local communities, official institutions, and the private sector in protecting archaeological heritage ethically. For instance, in the process of safeguarding the Indigenous heritage, the descendants of the first peoples’ communities should be more involved with the boards of museums and policy making. This active engagement should encompass genuine discussions of the actions and strategies necessary to protect archaeological heritage. The participants highlighted that the looting of archaeological sites and the illegal circulation of archaeological objects at the local and regional levels are some of the key challenges in heritage conservation. Thus, it is important to implement national laws to tackle heritage issues. Legislation specifically adapted to Caribbean countries could be considered.

Natural hazards are an issue that Caribbean countries have faced for a long time. Researchers have started to address them in relation to archaeological heritage. However, effective methodologies for and approaches to tackling these issues with the support of local communities and all actors involved in disaster prevention are much needed. Seasonal hurricanes, sea level rise, and marine erosion affect coastal archaeological sites. Other types of natural hazards, such as earthquakes and volcanic eruptions, which have multiple socioeconomic, environmental, and cultural impacts, also represent a challenge for citizens in the region. Nonmovable and movable cultural heritage can be deeply impacted by natural hazards, whether on a small or large scale. Hurricanes have destroyed houses and other buildings in the Caribbean. The actors involved in heritage protection should find the best places to store artifacts and archives for the long term. The Caribbean countries will continue to experience environmental challenges. Thus, scholars, policy makers, and local communities should develop a multicriteria analysis based on the participatory action of social organizations and citizens for finding and excavating endangered sites. Such work may increase public awareness of environmental challenges and their impact on people’s lives and heritage. The environmental contingencies that the Caribbean is facing call for an ongoing training program in emergency preparedness for Caribbean citizens involved in heritage. Long-term plans for disasters and climate change could be put in place at local and regional levels in collaboration with local and international organizations, museums, and Caribbean heritage trusts.
Disseminating archaeological knowledge and relationships with actors

The disseminating of archaeological results requires an alternative and practical transformation such that the lay public are considered to be important actors with whom knowledge should be shared. Initially, this transformation calls for the valuable involvement of local communities in archaeological and heritage research projects as well as for a strategy that brings new perspectives to research questions, plans, and results. Archaeologists need to have both emic and etic perspectives. Several participants talked about the “decolonization of archaeological practices in the Caribbean” as the best way for local voices to be heard. Thus, research objectives must be clearly defined by both researchers and community members. Collaboration that takes the forms not only of consulting with communities or just salary-based (“cash for work”) relationships during the fieldwork, but also of the mutual involvement in a research project, is the best way to uncover the past. As a crucial step in decolonization, disseminating knowledge should also encompass the repatriation of archaeological objects to the country or community where the archaeological research was undertaken. Local museums or interpretation centers can use these objects to share the region or country’s history with local communities.

Finding more ways to share archaeological results is important for maintaining relationships with different stakeholders in rural and urban areas. Besides academic output, it is vital that knowledge is transferred to the wider population. For instance, many media channels and social media sites are excellent platforms for increasing heritage awareness among the public. Moreover, direct interactions with stakeholders who do not have access to mainstream online platforms are crucial. To make things practicable and make people wonder, archaeologists should provide training in archaeology and heritage, as this would provide support to people working in these fields and allow for the active inclusion of academics and nonacademics in archaeological research in the Caribbean. Other actions could include school visits to sites and initiation workshops for the general public. Archaeologists should provide opportunities for children to learn about history via archaeology, as this is an excellent way to create new heritage ambassadors.

Countries in the Caribbean region have their own policies for archaeological heritage. As a result, the politics of conservation and preservation may differ from one country to another. Despite their differences in political configuration, Caribbean countries could establish long-term connections to share concerns about their archaeological heritage. In the context of climate change, a network between Caribbean countries with regional meetings could help with tackling heritage issues within a broader perspective and raising money for curation. Collaborative projects on curation should be established to maximize regional interest in heritage. Several participants agreed on the relevance of a local network for mutual aid in which communities, archaeologists, and heritage practitioners can share their skills and expertise to assist one another in short- and long-term collaborations, build an environment of resilience, and provide first aid for archaeological heritage during emergencies.

Looking Forward to the Future

As the outcome of this webinar, it seems important to continue to implement actions and programs for the preservation of Caribbean archaeological heritage. Therefore, we propose to undertake the following:

- A newsletter about archaeological news, the heritage actions of each of us, public and academic research, and ongoing research projects, etc.
- A second edited volume of *Local Voices*.
- Solid collaboration between regional heritage trusts, local associations, universities, and museums in establishing policies and training.
- Helping colleagues in the context of emergencies.
- A convention of Caribbean universities.
- An annual summer camp on heritage/archaeological practices.
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Abstract: The aim of this paper is to present the research on the archaeology and ethnography of the Southern Frontier (Buenos Aires Province, Argentina). The analysis of fortified sites and documents enables us to understand the cultural changes that took place in the indigenous societies, generated by the appropriation of their territories and the expanding state.

Resumen: El objetivo de este artículo es presentar las investigaciones en Arqueología y Etnohistoria de la Frontera Sur (Provincia de Buenos Aires, Argentina). El análisis de los sitios fortificados y los documentos permite comprender los cambios culturales ocurridos en las sociedades indígenas, generados por la apropiación de sus territorios y el avance del estado en formación.

Resumo: O objectivo deste artigo é apresentar a investigação em Arqueologia e Etnografia da Fronteira Sul (Província de Buenos Aires, Argentina). A análise dos sítios fortificados e documentos permite-nos compreender as mudanças culturais que ocorreram nas sociedades indígenas, geradas pela aproPRIação dos seus territórios e pelo avanço do Estado em formação.

Résumé: L’objectif de cet article est de présenter les investigations en Archéologie et Ethnohistoire de la Frontière Sud (Province de Buenos Aires, Argentine). L’analyse des sites fortifiés et des documents permet de comprendre les changements culturels survenus dans les sociétés indigènes, générés par l’appropriation de leurs territoires et l’avancée de l’État en formation.

At the beginning of the 19th century, in the context of a growing capitalism on a global scale, the nascent Argentine state sparked a struggle for dominion over territory. A group of elites south of the Salado River in the Province of Buenos Aires appropriated land belonging to the indigenous people in order to export primary products to Europe. Other interested parties were England and Portugal.

This generated the need to secure the internal borders by means of military enclaves, a process that lasted from Argentina’s gaining of independence in 1816 until the military offensive known as the “Desert Campaign” in 1880, which rendered the native populations invisible and expelled them from their lands.

Archaeological and ethnohistorical research has advanced our knowledge of topics related to everyday life on the frontier, notably interethnic relations, trade and supply circuits, and questions of gender and power (Langiano 2015), as well as the forms of the disciplining of the rural population (Rosas [1828] 1992) and of the “friendly Indians” (Ratto 2003). The only frontier roads were rastrilladas—deep parallel furrows that the “indians” had left with their constant comings and goings in the countryside and that formed a wide and solid road.

The rastrillada known as Camino de los Indios a Salinas Grandes (Barros [1872] 1975) or Camino de los Chilenos (Melchert 1873) (Figure 1) connected the low passes of Chile with the territory south of the Salado River. The study of a group of archaeological sites in the vicinity provided insight into the advance of the frontier from the beginning of the 19th century until 1880. Some of these sites are the following forts and fortlets: Independencia (1823), Blanca Grande (1828), Esperanza (1858), Lavalle (1872), La Parva (1858), El Perdido (1865), Fe (1872), and Arroyo Corto (1872) (Merlo 2014; Langiano 2015; Merlo et al. 2021).

Contact between indigenous and euro-creole peoples contributed to the transformation of both societies and their cultures. This process took place economically, linguistically, demographically, socially, and ideologically. There were moments of friction and moments of peaceful coexistence along this frontier, where different cultural expressions intertwined, family groups were broken up due to forced relocation, and new beliefs and customs were either imposed or brought closer together (Figure 2). These situations began to transform the indigenous society (Langiano 2015). In one document, General Lavalle stated that “he called Chief J.P. Catriel to Fort Lavalle and, surprisingly, without the consent of his parliament, made him sign
a contract that included the transfer of his family and eviction from their fields” (AGN 1875).

The colonized others and those considered modern and civilized (the dominant sectors) were both characterized by diversity. The “uneducated” could be “gauchos,” “chinas” (a derogatory way of naming women), “indians,” or “gringos” (Europeans), all of which were considered different, strange, and sometimes “dangerous” established ethnocentric representations. Gravano (2008) affirms this, in this sense that “conflict is the basis of culture... . At the time of the Conquest[,] . . . the Indians took ‘captives’ while the whites took ‘prisoners’” (108–109). If we take these conceptualizations and unpack them, we can affirm that there existed in 19th-century frontier society an ideological and power paradigm according to which “other” cultures were situated as subordinate, degraded, or marginal (Langiano 2015). Pozo’s photographs (1879) show images rationally thought out to offer a picture of the desert where social actors pose according to the photographer’s suggestion, thus showing more what was imagined than what was real, which is how these visual representations fixed valuable meanings for the nation-state (Figure 3).

The introduction of new ways of eating; the exchange of various goods and technologies; alliances; the reduction of indigenous territory; the granting of rations and military titles to Indian chiefs; and the manifestations of power, persuasion, and violence initiated cultural changes in the indigenous people. Symmetrical relations shifted toward a more hierarchical reciprocality. The appropriation of European goods and the possession of territory, cattle, weapons, and silver ornaments became the new symbols of prestige. The perspective of ethnicity was superseded by an ideal conception of the nation-state which, according to the official discourse of equality and national identity, prioritized the appropriation of indigenous territory and...
ignored the cultural ethnic diversity present on the frontier.

**Some archaeological sites**

Fort Independencia: This site is located in the urban area of Tandil. There are no visible remains of it nowadays; the fort, officially founded in 1823, was demolished in 1865 and the city was built over its footprint. At present, the Danish Church is located in the area of the fort. Archaeological excavations began in the original courtyard, which dates from 1873. Material was recovered from before and after the occupation of the fort that consisted of artifacts of indigenous origin as well as elements of European origin, with items that show the continuous use of the space up to the present day. With the permission of the current residents, test excavations were carried out in the courtyards of houses, public spaces, and buildings in the process of demolition. In Independence Park, the presence of human remains and lithic artifacts associated with European materials from the 19th century was recorded.

Cartography places the “indian friends” (Ratto 2003) nearby, who, in exchange for economic resources, cooperated with the settlers.

Fort Blanca Grande: This was founded in 1828 on the shores of the lagoon of the same name, 80 km west-northwest of the city of Olavarría. A year later it was abandoned by the government, leaving a settlement of colonists, indigenous people, and soldiers in its place. A second government occupation began in 1869 that lasted for 10 years. The archaeological remains come from different sectors of the site: discard areas, housing areas, and surface collections on the perimeter of the fort and in the southern area comprising the back of the fort and the lagoon (Merlo and Merlo 2018). We recovered fragments of glass, earthenware, kaolin pipes, metal, remains of weapons, buttons, and bones of native and introduced animal species. Cartography shows this site as the settlement of the Chief Chipitruz Indians (Figure 4).

Fortlet La Parva: This is located 10 km from Las Flores stream in the city of General Alvear. It dates

![FIGURE 3. Army chaplains, Desert Campaign of Roca and Alsina. (Photo by Antonio Pozo.)](image)

![FIGURE 4. Poster “The Frontier World”: upper right, map of tolderías of “friendly indians” in the area studied; center right, historical background on indigenous peoples of the area studied (“The caciques of the area”) (above) and excavation at and artifacts from Fort Blanca Grande (below); lower right, aerial view of the Fort Blanca Grande (1828–1879) site; lower left, background of and excavations at Fort Blanca Grande; center left, artifacts recovered during excavations at Fort Blanca Grande.](image)
from 1858; the inhabitants of the area “donated the bricks for the construction of the fort” (AJPS, Letter from neighbours to the Justice of the Peace of Saladillo, S/N, of September 1858).

Surface collecting (8 transects parallel to the pits in a plowed field) and the excavation of 10 grids in the central mound, 2 in the northeastern pit of the fortlet, and 6 in the ravine of the secondary mound (northeastern sector) recorded a high density of material of European origin as well as of native and introduced fauna (Merlo 2014).

El Perdido Archaeological Site: This is located in the basin of El Perdido-Tapalqué Stream, Olavarría, in the northwest sector of the Tandilia hills. Mensura N° 41 located El Perdido Fortlet in 1865 (General Geodesy Archive of the Ministry of Public Works of the Province of Buenos Aires). It also includes five natural ridges and seven euro-creole taperas (abandoned and ruined houses in fields).

Excavations of four grids in the fort’s mound, six in the main mound, and two in Lomada 1 and surface collecting led to the recovery of lithic tools, glass carved using indigenous techniques, artifacts of European origin, and bone fragments similar to those found at the sites mentioned above (Figure 5). In Arce’s cartography (1872) these lands are labeled as allotted to “the Indians of Chief Catriel” (Figure 2).

Fort Lavalle: This is located at the intersection of San Quilco Stream with the Camino de los Indios a Salinas Grandes. The traveler Armaignac (1974) mentions it as the most important of all the frontier fortlets of Buenos Aires Province due to its strategic position. At present, its architectural structures are obscured by agricultural work and the construction of a neighboring road. Surface collecting proceeded along 10 transects in a plowed field and 4 grids were excavated. We recorded material of European origin, material associated with native and introduced fauna, fragments of indigenous pottery, and side scrapers made of glass (Figure 6).
Conclusions

Documentary sources and archaeological data show the strategic place occupied by these sites for the domination of the native communities, settlers, and immigrants. In this complex frontier of the 19th century, we understand the panorama of the occupation of space through questions of power (Langiano 2015). The written documents consulted enable us to establish a complex system of interethnic relations, which at first was a reciprocal exchange between euro-creoles and the indigenous factions (i.e., Forts Independencia and Blanca Grande). As the population on the frontier increased, relations between the different actors became more conflictive, with moments of friction, establishing more-asymmetrical relations with the euro-creoles gaining greater control of the aboriginal space. European fauna and foreign materials were replaced by the region's natural resources. The making of artifacts from fragments of glass bottles using indigenous techniques, similar to indigenous tools made from lithic materials, indicates the interaction between euro-creole and indigenous people (Merlo 2014). In addition to this, there is cartographic evidence of the presence of “friendly indians” near the fortified posts (Merlo et al. 2021).

Questions for further research on the complex rural world of the 19th-century Buenos Aires Province frontier concern the dynamics of rural trade and the use value given to the various materials that circulated on the frontier and their sources.

Primary sources

Archivo General de la Nación [AGN] (General Archive of the Nation)

Archivo del Juzgado de Paz de Saladillo [AJPS] (Archive of the Court of the Peace of Saladillo)
1858 Carta de vecinos al Juez de Paz de Saladillo. S/N, de septiembre de 1858.
Dillón, J.
1872  Plano de las Suertes de Estancia del Azul, Fortín El Perdido y terreno destinado a los indios de Catrie (l) de 1872. Archivo Histórico Enrique Squirru de Azul, Museo Etnográfico Enrique Squirru.

Melchert, F.
1873  Plano General de la Frontera de Buenos Aires, levantado por el Sargento Mayor F. Melchert en 1873. Archivo Histórico Enrique Squirru de Azul, Museo Etnográfico Enrique Squirru.
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New 17th-Century Archaeological Site Discovered in Anne Arundel County (submitted by Andrew J. Webster and C. Jane Cox, Anne Arundel County Cultural Resources Section; pzwebs00@aacounty.org)

Abstract: Archaeologists with Anne Arundel County’s Cultural Resources Section have uncovered a previously unknown 17th-century archaeological site in Jug Bay Wetlands Sanctuary in southwest Anne Arundel County, Maryland. Archival research and diagnostic artifacts from a shovel test pit survey, including a broad hoe, colonial ceramics, and clay tobacco pipes, suggest that the site was occupied around 1680–1710. Research is ongoing.

Resumen: Los arqueólogos de la Sección de Recursos Culturales del condado de Anne Arundel han descubierto un sitio arqueológico del siglo XVII previamente desconocido en Jug Bay Wetlands Sanctuary en el suroeste del condado de Anne Arundel, Maryland. La investigación de archivos y los artefactos de diagnóstico de un estudio de pozo de prueba de pala, incluida una azada ancha, cerámica colonial y pipas de arcilla, sugieren que el sitio fue ocupado alrededor de 1680–1710. La investigación está en curso.

Résumé : Des archéologues de la section des ressources culturelles du comté d’Anne Arundel ont découvert un site archéologique du XVIIe siècle jusqu’alors inconnu dans le sanctuaire des zones humides de Jug Bay, dans le sud-ouest du comté d’Anne Arundel, dans le Maryland. Des recherches d’archives et des artefacts de diagnostic provenant d’une étude de sondage à la pelle, y compris une houe large, des céramiques coloniales et des pipes à tabac en argile, suggèrent que le site a été occupé vers 1680–1710. La recherche est en cours.

Archaeologists with Anne Arundel County’s Cultural Resources Section have uncovered a previously unknown 17th-century archaeological site in Jug Bay Wetlands Sanctuary in southwest Anne Arundel County, Maryland (Figure 1). The discovery was announced at a public event at Jug Bay on 14 May 2021 by C. Jane Cox, chief of cultural resources for Anne Arundel County.

Anne Arundel County, in collaboration with the nonprofit organization the Lost Towns Project, has been exploring archaeological sites within and around the County-owned Jug Bay Wetlands Sanctuary since the early 2000s. Along the Jug Bay segment of the Patuxent River there are nearly 80 unique archaeological sites recorded. The sites, ranging in type and time period, represent a unique continuity of human habitation from the earliest sites (dating to 13,000 years old), through the European arrival of ca. 1650, and on to the present day (Figure 2). Work is largely supported by competitive research grants, and the labor-intensive work of archaeology is supplemented by the incredible contributions of volunteers. Our citizen-science-based model has, over the past 30 years, resulted in intensive excavations of nearly 200 sites across the county.

In early 2019, the archaeology crew discovered a new site, now named Pindell Bluff (18AN1672), as part of a state-grant-funded project to survey and document archaeological sites around Jug Bay and to assess how natural processes like sea level rise and climate change might be affecting the archaeological record. Excavations in the summer of 2019, as part of a field school with Washington College led by Dr. Julie Markin, produced a rich variety of native-period artifacts, including a rare Clovis Point dating to up to 13,000 years ago. Along with the prehistoric ceramics, projectile points, and occasional
burnt animal bones the team would occasionally find a tiny fragment of historic-period pottery or deteriorat-
ed iron nails. However, the intensity of the prehistoric material overshadowed those small hints that people were also in this same space during the historic period.

In 2020, and with volunteer assistance, the crew conducted a systematic metal detector survey on the pe-
rimeter of the site and uncovered the blade of a broad 
hoe dating to ca. 1680–1700 (Figure 3). Unfortunately, 
after this discovery, the pandemic hit and all work was put on hold. The crew was able to return in April 2021 
to finish the last few excavation units and conduct one 
final shovel test pit survey before closing the site for 
the season. On the final day of the project, the crew, led 
by Shawn Sharpe and Drew Webster, alongside vol-
unteers Barry Gay, Kevin McCurley, and Dani Tafolla, 
excavated several shovel test pits with high concentra-
tions of colonial-era artifacts. The survey definitively 
showed that there had been a domestic occupation of 
this same bluff sometime between 1670 and 1730. Diag-
nostic artifacts included English and German ceramics 
dating to the late 17th and early 18th centuries, as well 
as clay tobacco pipes from the same period (Figure 4).

This discovery marks the earliest confirmed colonial-period site at Jug Bay, and is among the earliest historic sites in Anne Arundel County! Of the more than 1,700 recorded archaeological sites in the county, only 23 are historic sites that predate 1700. Most of those are located along the Chesapeake Bay shoreline. This site has the potential to tell us about a much-less-understood period of history, that of the 
first generation of European American people who settled Anne Arundel County along the Patuxent River.

Permanent European settlement in Anne Arundel County began in earnest in 1649, when 300 settlers—landowners, families, indentured servants, and later, enslaved Africans—arrived from St. Mary’s City and southeast Virginia to start a new settlement they called Providence along the Severn River and in the Broad-
neck Peninsula area. Soon the European population spread across lands in the West River area and on Her-
ring Bay. From those first 300 settlers, the population grew, and across all of the colony, historians estimate that there were about 33,000 people living in Maryland by 1680. Who might have been living at Pindell Bluff?

Archival research by Pat Melville and Dave Linthicum shows that the 300-acre property was first patented 
by Ninial Beall and called “Bachelors Choice” in 1669. 
While Beall first arrived in Maryland as an indentured 
servant, serving a Richard Hall of Calvert County for 
five years, he did not arrive in quite the same fashion as most other indentured servants. The Scotsman had been captured by Oliver Cromwell’s forces at the Bat-
tle of Dunbar in 1650 and transported to Barbados as a prisoner. He was sent to Calvert County, Maryland, in 1655, and placed with Richard Hall to serve out his sentence.
While Beall owned the property, records indicate that he likely never lived there. By sponsoring new settlers to the Maryland colony, Beall was granted over 4,000 acres of land by the time he passed in 1717. Initial research uncovered two leases associated with the parcel of land, from 1702 and 1704, respectively, which suggest the land was owned by Jonas Jordan, a carpenter, and his wife Mary and son Thomas. It is possible that the Jordan family lived on the land into the late 17th century until Jonas Jordan passed away. By 1702, Mary Jordan had remarried and leased all of Bachelors Choice to Seth Biggs, a tobacco planter and merchant. Court cases suggest he was living near the Western Branch of the Patuxent between 1680 and 1698, thus making him a likely suspect for our site’s resident. Biggs died without an heir in 1711. Combined with information from the artifacts, this archival research places the likely occupation of the site between 1680 and 1710.

This is just the beginning of research on the property. The cultural resources team has begun exploring research grant opportunities to fund more work and plans to reach out to our partners at area colleges to see if there is interest in a future academic field school. The goal is for this site to become a project where interested citizens can participate through the County’s Preservation Stewardship Program, which encourages local citizens, students, and scholars to get involved in exploring local history. To learn more about Anne Arundel County Cultural Resources Section or get involved, visit aacounty.org/cr.

Virginia

Excavations at the Historic Mt. Ararat Church in Williamsburg/Excavaciones en la Histórica Iglesia Mt. Ararat en Williamsburg/Fouilles à l’Église Historique du Mont Ararat à Williamsburg (submitted by Eric Schweickart, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation): This summer, the combined College of William and Mary/Colonial Williamsburg Foundation field school surveyed a small field in Williamsburg’s historic core in order to record and identify any archaeological deposits that would be impacted by the redevelopment of the lot (Figure 1). This field will be the new location of the Robertson Windmill, a well-known Williamsburg landmark, and will also be the new location of Colonial Williamsburg’s farming exhibition. In order to survey the site and mitigate any damage that might be caused by construction equipment, we excavated small test units at 10 m intervals across the whole field and excavated 1 x 1 m units under...
the windmill’s footers. The students and I were surprised to find that most of the field was covered with a thick layer of fill that was used to raise the ground surface between 30 and 60 cm sometime in the 1950s or 1960s. While this layer of fill was not very fun to dig though, it did do a marvelous job of protecting the archaeological deposits located within the site boundaries. While there were no significant features found where the windmill is slated to go, the students were able to identify and excavate several intact layers and features dating from the 17th to the mid-20th century.

In addition to excavating the test units, the students also performed a ground-penetrating radar (GPR) survey of the whole lot, which was very helpful in locating again several brick foundations that were uncovered and photographed in the 1940s when the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation first purchased the properties (Figure 2). While architects at the time mapped the brick foundations associated with an early 18th-century house and several mid-19th-century outbuildings, they neglected to map the foundations of one of the more-interesting buildings built on the site, the Mt. Ararat Baptist Church. This wood-framed building, which stood on the lot from 1887 until the mid-1930s, housed one of the many Black Baptist congregations located in Williamsburg in the 19th and 20th centuries. The congregation first began meeting in 1883 and by 1887 Reverend L. W. Wales and the congregation had raised enough money to purchase a lot on Francis Street and construct the church’s first permanent place of worship (Wales 1910). By 1930 the church had added several buildings to its lot, including a large structure that may have been used as a house by the church’s pastor. However, in 1933 the City of Williamsburg declared the structure a fire hazard and it was torn down soon afterwards (Rowe 2000). During the excavation this summer, we were able to locate the extent of the brick foundation of the 1887 Mt. Ararat Baptist Church building using GPR and exposed a portion of it in an excavation unit. Even more exciting was our finding, directly behind the church, of a sheet midden filled with artifacts from the late 19th and early 20th centuries, apparently associated with the congregation.

Among these artifacts were three small pieces of cased glass (Figure 3). All three fragments consisted of a layer of almost-opaque white milk glass cased with a layer of colored glass on the outside of the hollow form. Two of the fragments were cased with a light blue colored glass, while the third was cased with a green colored glass. None of the fragments were decorated with any cut patterns or etched with acid and the two layers of glass were about equally thick. Since cased glass only began to be manufactured on an industrial scale in the 1880s (Dodsworth 1984), these artifacts were discarded during the time the Mt. Ararat church occupied the property and were likely used by a member of the congregation. Cased glass is typically associated with art glass forms such as vases or centerpieces, but the absence of decoration on these pieces indicated...
cates a more utilitarian function (Dodsworth 1984). These fragments may have been glass light shades, associated with an oil or early electric lamp.

While gas- and oil-burning lanterns were first used to provide light in Williamsburg in the 18th century, the exorbitant fuel costs associated with these lighting methods meant that they were primarily used either in public spaces or as expensive luxuries for the wealthiest members of society (Crowley 2001). However, in the late 19th century gas and oil lamps became cheap enough to be used in the home and thick cased-glass light shades became fashionable within domestic spaces (Parrott 2009). One particularly common type of lamp advertised in the Sears and Roebuck catalog in 1898 was a “Perfection Student Lamp” (Figure 4), which was said to be the “best of all study lamps” and was apparently so common that a “description of it is unnecessary” (Sears Roebuck Catalogs 2010). Advertisements for perfection-style lamps indicate that while the cased shades were made in several colors, including opal, ruby, and amber, green seems to have been the most common color.

A quick search for undecorated cased glass with milk glass as the innermost layer in our database found that artifacts like these have been recovered from several other sites around town. Coincidentally, the three sites with the most cataloged lantern shade glass were also excavated by the William and Mary field school in previous years. These include the Brafferton site, a building on the William and Mary campus, which served as a dorm in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The Bray site, a house lot near the college, was occupied by a succession of working-class white families between 1888 and 1926. The last site, the Ravenscroft site, was the location of the Crump Restaurant and Hotel, a boardinghouse and eatery owned by one of Williamsburg’s most successful Black residents in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>BLUE CASED</th>
<th>GREEN CASED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MT. ARARAT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAFFERTON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAVENSCROFT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noteworthy that the Brafferton site only contained green lantern shade glass, unlike the other sites, which each contained a mixture of green and blue hues (except for the Ravenscroft site, where only one fragment of lantern shade glass was recovered), perhaps strengthening the association of the glass with the perfection style-lamps used by, or perhaps just purchased for, students. Additionally, while all of the sites were continuously occupied between the 1880s and the 1930s and were excavated using similar methodologies, the sites that had mostly white residents contain considerably more lantern shade glass fragments than the sites that were mostly occupied by Black residents. While it is possible that these differences may relate to the different functions of the sites (neither of the sites with primarily Black residents were only domestic in nature, since one was a church and the other a hotel), they may also relate to the different extent to which individuals of different groups bought into Victorian ideals of comfort and domesticity.

As we continue to process and analyze the results of our excavations this summer, we will further research these questions and more. Thanks to the students at William and Mary, we have a much better understanding of the site as a whole and we have mitigated any damage that might have been done to the archaeological resources of the town. We look forward to doing more research on the materials we have recovered in order to better understand the historic significance of this place over time.
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For the first time in over 30 years the Commonwealth of Virginia has an underwater archaeology program. The General Assembly funded the program in 2021 as one of three new positions/programs at the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR). Our new positions include a community outreach coordinator, Tim Roberts, and a cemetery preservationist, Joanna Wilson Green. These are two programs that we are all eager to see in place and at a very appropriate juncture in history. This past July I was honored to join the talented team at VDHR as the state underwater archaeologist. During the past two years there has been a ground-swell of support for reestablishing this important program. From the Archaeological Society of Virginia to Virginia’s native communities, the need to support preservation of our submerged cultural patrimony was heard. After clouds over the economic horizon cleared in 2021, the Virginia General Assembly sought to reestablish the program through the leadership of Del. Betsy Carr and Sen. Scott Surovell.

A number of years ago, Dr. John Broadwater established a robust underwater archaeology program in Virginia. Simply put, it left a legacy of discovery and preservation. John’s achievements, especially the Betsy project, are well-known and enjoyed by many today. However, the program ended in 1991. Even after John left the state, his support for Virginia’s maritime history and archaeology kept the flame lit for a future program. The need for maritime archaeological expertise in Virginia has been, and is, profound. Our commonwealth has firm roots in the water from the Chesapeake Bay to the Ohio drainage. Of the state-controlled land in Virginia, excluding military reservations and structures, 85.6% is submerged and includes a considerable portion of the largest estuary in the world. Superlatives aside, Virginia has been host to conflict, innovation, and inhabitation, all of which has left a tapestry of material culture beneath our rivers, lakes, and bay. Off our Atlantic coastline is an additional landscape of shipwrecks, ancient human landscape, and even artifacts from the dawn.

FIGURE 1. This small wooden ferry was recorded by Brendan Burke (VDHR) and Tom Klatka (VDHR) near Lexington, Virginia. A dam removal project in 2019 has revealed a number of historic structures and site components at Virginia’s newest riverine site, 44RB0577, Jordan’s Point. (Photo by the author.)
of human space exploration.

The VDHR Underwater Archaeology Program is designed to be responsive to constant threats to submerged resources and establish proactive ways to engage the community for preservation and education. There is a lot to do and we are excited to meet the challenges. In the first month of the program, we have been out on Virginia’s waters discovering new sites, updating the records of known sites, and shaking hands throughout the community to let folks know we are there to support them (Figures 1–2). Working closely with our regional archaeologists and other DHR specialists, the VDHR Underwater Archaeology Program is ready to respond!

Being prepared is also a major part of the program. Identifying sensitive areas in need of protection and understanding how our waterways are changing in a dynamic world is a big part of the program. We have partnered with the Shipwreck Tagging Archaeological Management Program (STAMP) to track migratory shipwreck components (Figure 3) and are working with several projects funded by the Emergency Supplemental Historic Preservation Fund as a response to Hurricanes Michael and Florence. These grants will establish a broad baseline for riparian resources throughout broad regions of the state that can help forecast and identify susceptible and sensitive areas. This work follows the comprehensive survey undertaken by the Virginia Canals & Navigation Society through the leadership of Dr. William Trout. However, we have new tools such as LiDAR to expand our vision beyond the riverbank and newfound talent to undertake site visits and to survey for new sites.

Virginia is proud to once again join her sister states in including maritime archaeology in the toolkit of the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). A rapidly expanding offshore wind industry, increases in recreational use of waterways, and major funding for infrastructure renewal and expansion projects offer challenges to our submerged resources. Through VDHR’s existing and new programs, we are uniquely equipped to meet these challenges and look forward to working with our many partners in preservation!
Rediscovering a German POW Camp on Fort Campbell (submitted by Ronald Grayson and Nichole Sorensen-Mutchie, U.S. Army – Fort Campbell; ronald.i.grayson.civ@mail.mil, nichole.e.sorensen-mutchie.civ@mail.mil)

Abstract: From 1943 to 1946, Camp (Fort) Campbell housed three separate German POW camps. An early cursory examination assumed all subsurface archaeological deposits were destroyed. A closer examination of documentary evidence indicated that portions of Camp D-D may still be intact. Despite the short occupation period, initial small-scale investigations confirmed intact deposits. Larger excavations have been conducted to gather data about this often overlooked and rarely excavated site type. Analysis is ongoing; however, interesting preliminary conclusions can be drawn.

Background

The Fort Campbell Army Installation is bisected by the Kentucky and Tennessee state line. Established as Camp Campbell in 1942, its mission went beyond training soldiers for the front lines of World War II. It also housed three separate prisoner of war (POW) camps/compounds, with the first prisoners arriving in 1943. These camps each held 1,000 German soldiers captured after Allied victories in North Africa. Those POWs were detained here for the following three years before returning to Europe.

During World War II, 375,000 German POWs and 60,000 Italian and Japanese POWs were interned within the United States: “During World War II the U.S. successfully held over 425,000 Axis personnel in 155 base camps and more than 500 branch camps within the continental United States” (Thompson 2008:207). Within Kentucky, there were a total of nine permanent base camps, three each at Fort Knox, Camp Breckenridge, and Camp Campbell.

Each of the internment camps at Camp Campbell, as well as throughout the United States, was built using an Army standardized plan. Buildings consisted of barracks, storehouses, latrines, mess halls, and additional administrative buildings. Each compound had a central road and was surrounded by a security fence with guard towers (Figure 1). At most locations, multiple compounds were built directly next to each other to form one large camp. At Camp Campbell, they were constructed at three separate locations on the installation as an attempt to reduce violence by separating ardent Nazis from conscripts.

There were four installations that had camps dedicated to the internment of “Anti-Nazi” soldiers; Fort Devens (Massachusetts), Camp McCain (Mississippi), Camp Ruston (Louisiana), and Camp Campbell (Kentucky). Two of the three camps at Camp Campbell were specifically built to house Anti-Nazi prisoners to...
protect them from Nazi retaliation.

After the war, all POW camps at Camp Campbell were demolished and the land was repurposed for later military construction. Camp Campbell went from a temporary “Camp” to the permanent Fort Campbell in 1950. Because of continuous construction activities, past researchers speculated that the camps had been destroyed and that no archaeological deposits remained. That all three German POW camps were completely destroyed by demolition activities and subsequent construction was accepted as fact.

Utilizing GIS, current Fort Campbell Cultural Resources Program staff overlaid a 1943 engineering map of Camp Campbell’s cantonment area with decades of aerial imagery to see whether this determination could be substantiated. Two of the camps had indeed been destroyed and have more-recent buildings in their footprints. The footprint of Camp D-D, however, is currently an open empty field. Analysis of the footprint of Camp D-D indicated that it had had a neighborhood, Lee Village, built on only the northeast portion in the 1950s. Lee Village was demolished in 2010. Aerial photo analysis indicated that the rest of the camp area appeared to have remained an unimproved field throughout the years (Figures 2–3).

In conjunction with review of a proposed housing development, additional analysis was conducted. Was the previous conclusion that the entirety of the German POW Camp D-D was actually destroyed correct, or was it possible that archaeological deposits were intact?

Excavations

Additional investigations by Fort Campbell Cultural Resources Program staff were conducted to see whether there was the possibility of any subsurface integrity with regard to Camp D-D. A pedestrian survey of the potentially intact area was conducted. The land did not appear to have been heavily modified. Surface artifacts and in situ municipal features, including a fire hydrant (Figure 4), were visible. Additional shovel testing, test units, and targeted metal detecting were conducted to assess integrity and better guide more in-depth excavations.

A research design was developed in consultation with the Kentucky State Historic Preservation Officer, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and representatives of the German Army. The equivalent of 175 1 x 1 m test units was excavated across the intact portion of Camp D-D during the spring of 2021. The units were placed in a variety of blocks, single units, and other configurations to answer a set of research questions.

The research focused on
• Corroborating the construction and configuration of the 1943 plans of the camp.
• Identifying personal and/or uniform items specifically from the detainees.
• Determining the method of demolition of the camp and whether it is comparable to that of other camps.
• Identifying any archaeological evidence of interaction of POWs and American soldiers and/or the local community.

Preliminary Results

Although the report of findings by our consultant, North Wind Resource Consulting, is not yet complete, there are some intriguing preliminary results. Four Store Houses were identified, some having intact rocky compacted gravel. Store House #3 contained poured concrete floors and a possible cellar, likely to store perishables below ground.

Areas of some of the 22 Barracks were investigated for architectural debris as well as personal items. Unfortunately, not many architectural features were identified, because they were built on the standard WWII Temporary Barracks design and on piers that were later removed.

Latrines were investigated because personal and uniform items at other POW camps have been identified by means of archaeology. Although located by the presence of a layer of mortar poured directly on the subsoil, the types of personal or lost uniform items found elsewhere were not discovered.

Several areas of ornamental vegetation (roses, yucca, daffodils) appeared to correspond with Barracks alignments and were likely deliberately planted by prisoners. It is possible that these plants, roses particularly, were brought in by prisoners who worked in the local community under Army supervision.

The analysis of the results is ongoing and will be presented in more detail at the 2022 SHA conference in Philadelphia.
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Documenting a Lost B-24 in the Galiuro Mountains—The Galiuro Firescape Project (submitted by Maxwell Forton, Binghamton University)

Abstract: In January of 1943 a B-24 heavy bomber, while on a training run, crashed near Bassett Peak in the south end of the Galiuro Mountains, killing all 11 men on board. The Galiuro Mountains are located in southeastern Arizona, with much of the range being preserved within the Galiuro Wilderness of Coronado National Forest. Due to the remote location of the Galiuros, much of the range’s cultural history remains undocumented by professional archaeologists, including the site of the B-24 bomber crash in 1943. Last year, staff of the Coronado National Forest began incrementally conducting controlled burns on sections of the Galiuro range as part of a larger fuels management strategy. The B-24 bomber crash is an historic site at risk of impact from the next stage of these controlled burns and thus presents an unconventional cultural resource for documentation by the Coronado National Forest Heritage Program. Documenting this site will shed light on an important, if tragic, event in the history of southern Arizona and is a unique opportunity to develop preservation strategies for atypical cultural resources located within areas affected by fuels management projects.

Resumen: En enero de 1943, un bombardero pesado B-24, mientras estaba en una carrera de entrenamiento, se estrelló cerca de Bassett Peak en el extremo sur de las montañas Galiuro, matando a los once hombres a bordo. Las montañas Galiuros se encuentran en el sureste de Arizona, y gran parte de la cordillera se conserva dentro del Yermo Galiuros del Bosque Nacional Coronado. Debido a la ubicación remota del Galiuros, gran parte de su historia cultural permanece indocumentada por arqueólogos profesionales, incluido el lugar del accidente del bombardero B-24 de 1943. El año pasado, el personal del Bosque Nacional Coronado comenzó a realizar quemadas controladas de manera incremental en secciones de la cordillera Galiuro, como parte de una estrategia de manejo de combustibles más amplia. El accidente del bombardero B-24 es un sitio histórico en riesgo de impacto de la siguiente etapa de estas quemadas controladas, presentando un recurso cultural no convencional para la documentación del Programa de Patrimonio Forestal Nacional de Coronado. Documentar este sitio arrojará luz sobre un evento importante, aunque trágico, en la historia del sur de Arizona y es una oportunidad única para desarrollar estrategias de preservación de recursos culturales atípicos ubicados dentro de las áreas afectadas por proyectos de manejo de combustibles.

Résumé : En janvier 1943, un bombardier lourd B-24, alors qu’il s’entraînait, s’est écrasé près du pic Bassett à l’extrémité sud des montagnes Galiuros, tuant les onze hommes à bord. Les montagnes Galiuros sont situées dans le sud-est de l’Arizona, et une grande partie de la chaîne est préservée dans la zone sauvage de Galiuro de la forêt nationale de Coronado. En raison de l’emplacement éloigné des Galiuros, une grande partie de son histoire culturelle reste non documentée par les archéologues professionnels, y compris le site de l’écrasement du bombardier B-24 de 1943. L’année dernière, la forêt nationale de Coronado a commencé à procéder à des brûlages contrôlés progressivement dans des sections de la chaîne de montagnes Galiuro, dans le cadre d’une stratégie plus large de gestion du carburant. L’accident du bombardier B-24 est un site historique à risque d’impact de la prochaine étape de ces brûlages contrôlés, présentant une ressource culturelle non conventionnelle pour la documentation du programme du patrimoine forestier national de Coronado. La documentation de ce site mettra en lumière un événement important, bien que tragique, dans l’histoire du sud de l’Arizona et constitue une occasion unique d’élaborer des stratégies pour préserver les ressources culturelles atypiques situées dans les zones affectées par les projets de gestion du carburant.

This past year the Heritage Program at Coronado National Forest undertook the first steps in documenting a 1943 crash site of a B-24 Liberator bomber in the remote Galiuro Mountains. Located northeast of Tucson, Arizona, the Galiuros are a seldom-visited Sky Island range rising out of the merging point of the Sonoran and Chihuahuan Deserts. These mountains are
obscure today, but nearly 80 years ago they were thrown into the national spotlight when 11 servicemen and their bomber went missing during a routine training mission (Figure 1).

New light was shed on this story with the first documentation of the crash site by professional archaeologists. Archaeologists from the Coronado National Forest Heritage Program located the wreckage of the B-24 Liberator as part of a larger fuels management project for the Galiuro Mountains. Working in conjunction with range staff from the Safford Ranger District, the Heritage Program archaeologists surveyed sections of the Galiuros, identifying cultural resources and developing preservation plans in preparation for prescribed burns intended to reduce hazardous fuel levels and restore native habitats; and also establishing a better understanding of the human history of the Galiuros. The B-24 crash site is a prime example of the diverse range of archaeological sites identified by the Coronado Heritage Program.

At the onset of World War II, U.S. airpower was diminished and inferior compared to that of the Axis powers. As early as 1938 President Roosevelt advocated for expanding the capacity of U.S. aircraft, and no aircraft was considered more important for securing American air superiority than the four-engine heavy bomber. The first prototype of the B-24 Liberator was produced in 1939 by Consolidated Aircraft in San Diego, at the time the largest airplane of any kind in the United States (Baime 2014). By the end of the war, 18,482 B-24s had been produced, the highest number of any American combat aircraft in the war. The Liberator improved on the speed, range, and bomb load of the earlier B-17 Flying Fortress and saw extensive service in Europe and the Pacific. However, the B-24 had a higher rate of accidents, with 850 men of the Second Air Force killed in 298 separate B-24 accidents in 1943 alone (Dwyer 2020). Nicknamed by crewmembers the “Flying Coffin,” the B-24 was susceptible to fires and had only a single exit near the rear of the tail of the aircraft (Hickman 2020). This propensity for accidents may well have doomed the Liberator lost in the Galiuro Mountains in 1943.

The account of the events surrounding the 1943 crash remains incomplete, but research by Coronado Heritage Program staff into newspaper coverage of the crash and subsequent recovery efforts have constructed the most complete narrative to date. The only readily available references to the crash are found on websites and blogs of a few aviation and hiking enthusiasts. Aviation archaeology is often driven by avocationals, but professional archaeologists are increasingly recognizing the intersectional nature of these sites (Deal et al. 2015). Finding and documenting the Galiuro bomber crash elevated a previously untold story of the World War II home front that involved an historically significant aircraft.

On the night of 17 January 1943, a B-24 bomber took off from Davis-Monthan Field in Tucson on a routine flight to the Sahuarita Gunnery and Bombing Range located 25 miles to the south of Tucson. The aircraft had 11 men aboard, comprising 4 officers and 7 servicemen. The bomber was piloted by 2nd Lt. John Wasson, accompanied by bombardier 2nd Lt. Frederick E. Neal, bombardier 2nd Lt. Joe Fiero, Pvt. Murty Huckaby, S.Sgt. Stevens Safka, Sgt. Henry Pellister, S.Sgt. Ernest Breier, 2nd Lt. Charles Beaucond, Jr., Pvt. Henry Peterson, S.Sgt. Robert Story, and Sgt. Alman Porter. The crew was part of the 355th Bomber Squadron, an Operational Training Unit of the 302nd Bombardment Group (Maurer 1983). By 12:45 a.m. the next day the bomber and its crew failed to return and were declared missing by the base commandant.

Search planes were promptly dispatched from Davis-Monthan and newspapers from across the country reported on the missing servicemen. No sign of the bomber or its crew was found. Searches by military and Civil Air Patrol pilots continued into March, stretching across southern Arizona and into Mexico. On 3 March a second aircraft went missing with nine men aboard. This was a B-17 flying from Oregon to Lockbourne Field in Columbus, Ohio. Civil Air Patrol Pilot D. M. Cross spotted debris in the Galiuro Mountains on 7 March, which authorities presumed belonged to the missing B-17. With the Galiuro Mountains located over 40 miles northeast of Tucson and in the complete opposite direction from the Sahuarita bombing range, authorities likely did not suspect this wreckage belonged to the missing B-24 Liberator. A search party of
20 men was dispatched the afternoon of 8 March, with hopes of reaching the crash site by the next morning. For four days the recovery crew searched the rugged terrain of Kennedy Peak for the missing plane in vain. It wasn’t until the wreckage was sighted on Bassett Peak 12 miles to the south that the recovery team realized they had been searching the wrong mountain.

Upon reaching Bassett Peak, the recovery crew found the aircraft was not the missing B-17, but in fact the lost B-24 Liberator. All 11 servicemen had perished in the crash. Their remains were returned to their home communities across the country, with 2nd Lt. Charles Andrew Beaucond, Jr., a West Point graduate, being buried in Arlington National Cemetery. After the discovery of the Liberator and recovery of its crew, the story of the crash fell into obscurity. In the ensuing decades, time and nature obscured the crash site, with only a few hiking and aviation enthusiasts visiting the wreckage. At some point, an unknown person affixed a memorial plaque to one of the wings listing the names of the 11 servicemen who had lost their lives (Figure 2).

The Galiuro Firescape Project presented an opportunity to illuminate a largely forgotten event in the history of the Arizona home front in World War II. The goals of the project were to document the extent and condition of the crash site, investigate the nature of the original crash, and provide preservation recommendations in the face of the upcoming controlled burn. The exact location of the wreckage was unknown, but a survey crew from the Heritage Program was able to spot the wreckage from afar after ascending a ridgeline below the summit. It was quickly determined the debris field stretched across multiple levels of the mountainside, with only a portion being readily accessible.

The archaeology crew quickly determined the plane’s right wing is the most intact and accessible part of the crash site. The underside of the wing is in particularly good condition, with preserved painted numbering referring to the Alclad aluminum used to build the plane. One of the wing’s engines rests on an inaccessible ledge just below the cliff edge, while the second is missing from its mount. Downslope to the west are the disarticulated remains of the fuselage (Figure 3). Much of this is twisted beyond recognition, but one section remains comparatively intact, with a preserved midship window and interior. The crew was unable to find any easy or safe route down to the debris below the cliff face. Therefore, the left wing, parts of the fuselage, and likely the cockpit and tail of the aircraft remain undocumented.

Among the debris were pieces of clear plastic windshield and a wired device of an uncertain function (Figure 4). This device has a small piece of green fabric still attached to it, demonstrating the excellent preservation conditions of the site. A label on a piece of debris revealed this particular B-24 was manufactured in the Consolidated Aircraft plant in San Diego. Among the more-curious finds was a 1960s-era Gatorade can likely left by an early recreational visitor to the site. Scratched graffiti on the aircraft’s wing and the installation of the memorial plaque are additional testaments of visitation to the crash site. The lack of portable items, particularly personal effects, is likely due to the original 1943 recovery efforts and subsequent visits by looters. Aviation enthusiasts are known to make pilgrimages to remote crash sites and remove pieces of interest, such as weapons, personal effects, and recognizable instru-
ments (Deal et al. 2015:12). The missing second engine of the left wing may likely have been looted, along with any of the aircraft’s 11 machine guns. The B-24 crash site is a federally protected archaeological site and remains at risk of further damage from vandalism and looting.

What does the wreckage tell us about the events of January 1943? Presently the cause of the crash and how the bomber came to the Galiuros remains unknown. The condition of the wreckage does offer clues, though (Figure 5). The tip of the aircraft’s right wing is wrapped around exposed bedrock from the force of the impact (Figure 6). Molten aluminum from the impact explosion is dribbled down the rock surface below the right wing, indicating the wreckage has not shifted greatly from the point of impact. The direction of the right wing tells us the aircraft flew from the west, perhaps banking to the left to avoid impact with the mountainside. The archaeology crew noted a large outcrop to the west, which the Liberator may have clipped when banking. Whether the crash resulted from mechanical failure, human error, or adverse weather conditions is unknown. Until the full extent of the wreckage is mapped, the narrative will remain incomplete.

Conflict archaeology encompasses more than actual sites of violence in considering the entire societal infrastructure of warfare. The story of the Galiuro bomber crash is intersectional in terms of the many important aspects of the American war effort on which it touches. Of the close to 20,000 Liberator bombers produced for the war effort, only 13 intact aircraft survive to this day, along with a handful of crashed examples found around the world in varying condition. The crash site in the Galiuro Mountains is in fair condition, retaining many recognizable aspects of this iconic aircraft. The deaths of the bomber crew are a testament to the dangers faced by servicemen even before reaching the battlefront. The role of the Civil Air Patrol in locating the wreckage and the reporting by local Tucson newspapers reflect the civilian role in the war effort. Davis-Monthan was an essential airfield for training bomber crews and experienced additional accidents involving B-24s before the war’s end. Finally, the 11 servicemen came from communities in 9 different states, exemplifying the truly national scope of America’s participation and loss in World War II.

The B-24 Liberator crash site is a significant historic site necessitating additional research and documentation. Next steps include reaching out to the families of the 11 servicemen to integrate their voices into the narrative and seeking collaboration with Davis-Monthan Air Force Base for further archival research. We recommend additional site documentation to produce
a more comprehensive map of the debris field, including finding an access route to the lower portion of the crash. Presently the remote location and historical obscurity preserve and protect the site, but there are clear signs of recreational visitation and vandalism. The work of the Coronado Heritage Program ensures successful fuel treatments in the Galiuros and the documentation of a site significant for the fields of historical, conflict, and aviation archaeology. Through the identification of the location, nature, and extent of the crash site, the Coronado Heritage Program is taking steps toward ensuring the long-term preservation of the site and protection of it from prescribed fires. Further research will hopefully produce a more complete narrative of how the B-24 Liberator and its crew came to rest in the Galiuros Mountains.
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**Utah**

**Transcontinental Railroad Archaeology in Utah** *(submitted by Christopher W. Merritt, Utah State Historic Preservation Office, and Michael S. Sheehan, Bureau of Land Management, Salt Lake Field Office)*

*Abstract:* With the 2019 celebration of the 150th anniversary of the completion of the first transcontinental railroad in the United States, scholars and the Chinese descendant community have been investigating the lives of Chinese railroad workers in a remote corner of Utah. Managed by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, the ghost town of Terrace was home to the 3rd-largest Chinatown in Utah in 1870, but had largely disappeared from the landscape by 1910. What remains is a rich archaeological legacy of a bustling and metropolitan railroad town with a rich and diverse Chinese community. For two years, archaeologists, volunteers, and the Chinese Railroad Workers Descendants Association have been excavating a Chinese home in Terrace, the first-ever fully excavated Chinese railroad workers’ home in the United States. Volunteers from around the United States, organized through the Passport in Time program, recovered thousands of artifacts ranging from Chinese porcelain tableware to remains of food, such as coconuts, Chinese dates, and cuttlefish, helping us to learn more about the lives of these largely forgotten workers.

*Resumen:* Con la celebración en 2019 del 150 aniversario de la finalización del primer Ferrocarril Transcontinental de los Estados Unidos, los académicos y la comunidad descendiente china han estado investigando las vidas de los trabajadores
ferroviarios chinos en un rincón remoto de Utah. Administrado por la Oficina de Administración de Tierras de EE. UU., la ciudad fantasma de Terrace fue el hogar del 3er barrio chino más grande de Utah en 1870, pero desapareció en gran medida del paisaje en 1910. Lo que queda es un rico legado arqueológico de una bulliciosa y metropolitana ciudad ferroviaria, con una rica y diversa comunidad china. Durante dos años, arqueólogos, voluntarios y la Asociación de Descendientes de Trabajadores Ferroviarios Chinos han estado excavando una casa china en Terrace, la primera casa de trabajadores ferroviarios chinos completamente excavada en los Estados Unidos. Voluntarios de todo Estados Unidos, organizados a través del programa Passport in Time, recuperaron miles de artefactos que van desde vajillas de porcelana china hasta restos de comida, como cocos, dátiles chinos y seiches, ayudándonos a aprender más sobre las vidas de trabajadores en gran parte olvidadas.


The U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in Utah manages 87 miles of the original transcontinental railroad alignment as a Backcountry Byway, including trestles, culverts, cuts, and fills, and of course the archaeological legacy of towns and section stations stretching from Nevada to Golden Spike National Historical Park. In the year leading up to the 150th anniversary of the “Driving of the Golden Spike” in 2019, BLM and Utah State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archaeologists, in collaboration with the Chinese descendant community, planned field investigations at key historical sites along the Transcontinental Railroad. Collaboration with the descendant community has provided the authors and the team with a well-informed focus for the research and protection of significant archaeological resources in this remote corner of Utah.

The Chinese Railroad Workers Descendants Association (CRWDA) formed several years ago in Salt Lake City to organize and coordinate the celebration of the Chinese contribution to the construction and maintenance of the transcontinental railroad. In 2019, the CRWDA hosted a multiday event around the celebration on 10 May that saw over 300 attendees, formal presentations by archaeologists and historians, and a high level of participation in the events at Golden Spike National Historical Park. As part of this celebration the authors of this piece, with support from fellow archaeologists Michael Polk and Ken Cannon, led two all-day tours to the Transcontinental Railroad Backcountry Byway for over 210 members of the CRWDA, helping connect the abstract history of the railroad to the physical spaces and artifacts of their heritage (Figure 1).

During conversations with the CRWDA, BLM and SHPO staff listened to the distinct concern about the continued looting of and vandalism on sensitive archaeological sites on BLM lands and also the hope for formal archaeological investigations to uncover parts of this forgotten heritage. The BLM and SHPO responded to this descendant community input by starting to plan the first-ever intensive excavation of the largest townsite along the railroad grade, Terrace.

Terrace was established shortly after the 1869 completion of the Central Pacific Railroad (CP) portion of the Transcontinental Railroad, and was a major division point for the CP and later Southern Pacific Railroad (SP) until the late 19th century. While exact population numbers are difficult to ascertain, in 1870 Terrace boasted the 3rd-largest Chinese population in Utah Territory and at its peak in the 1880s the town likely had over 400 residents. Terrace had a roundhouse and repair shops for steam engines, several hotels, dozens of other businesses, a school, library, and even a pleasure garden (Figure 2). But with the decision to move the main transportation line of the SP across the Great Salt Lake via the Lucin Cutoff, that portion
of the railroad passing around the northern end of the Great Salt Lake (often referred to as the “Promontory Branch”) languished, seeing only local traffic between 1904 and 1942, when it was finally abandoned. Terrace, once glorious and metropolitan, dwindled and by 1910 was largely nothing more than some greasewood and sagebrush, with foundation holes filled with nothing but memories. The site, given its location and history, has been badly damaged by bottle hunters and looters over the last 50 years, but the surface deposit and the shifting Aeolian dunes left the potential for significant information to be gleaned from relatively undisturbed subsurface deposits.

By the 1980s, the abandoned right-of-way was slowly transferred back to the administration of the BLM and was interpreted in the BLM’s Cultural Resource Series by Anon Raymond and Richard Fike’s Rails East to Promontory in 1981. Still, no formal excavation had taken place on this amazing cultural landscape; that all changed in 2020. Recently, various project participants (Mike Polk, Chris Merritt, Mike Sheehan, and Ken Cannon) collaborated on a revised and greatly upgraded historic and archaeological volume on this landscape through the BLM’s Cultural Resource Series titled Rails East to Ogden: Utah’s Transcontinental Story, which can be downloaded for free at https://drive.google.com/file/d/1EaHuWSRmjPxnVfI6qI5Y2-tBFC3qXmu/view.

Despite the setbacks from the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, the BLM and SHPO initiated a Passport in Time (PIT) project at the townsite of Terrace in September of 2020. Six volunteers from Oregon, Idaho, California, and Nevada plus four staff were asked to self-quarantine before coming to the project and field supervisors dropped use of a communal bunkhouse in lieu of individual camping. These protocols, while not perfect, were successful in protecting the health and safety of the team (Figure 3). Crews returned for a second PIT project in May 2021, with eight volunteers, five staff, and over a dozen members of the CRWDA assisting. All team members were vaccinated for COVID-19 before the PIT project, maximizing the safety of the event.

All of this positive energy culminated in an extremely successful public day, with the visit of Utah’s Lt. Governor Deidre Henderson, State Senator Scott Sandall, and State Representative Karen Kwan, who is a descendant of a Chinese railroad worker (Figure 4). Connecting public officials to this site, its story, and archaeology was a major win for the overall project. We focused these two PIT projects on the excavation of a potential structure in the informal Chinatown portion of the Ter-
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 FIGURE 2. Terrace, ca. 1870s. (Photo courtesy of the Utah State Historical Society.)
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 FIGURE 3. Volunteers and staff of the 2020 Passport in Time Project. (Photo by Matt Stirn via drone.)
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 FIGURE 4. Lt. Governor Deidre Henderson (left) and State Representative Karen Kwan (right) excavating at Terrace. (Photo by Matt Stirn, 2021.)
race townsite and on a systematic bottle survey of Main Street, Section Foreman’s House, and Chinatown. While Utah still currently lacks a federally recognized repository for historic-period archaeological materials, the BLM and SHPO conducted excavations and full data recovery of uncovered material culture. A new State of Utah “Museum of Utah” is planned by 2024, with an historical archaeology repository incorporated into the design. All recovered materials will be curated at this facility and available for research, loan, and exhibiting at that time.

Guided by data from both a ground-penetrating radar survey conducted by Cannon Heritage Consultants and the surface manifestation of wooden posts emerging from the sand dune, crews completed 14 excavation units within a buried structure full of Chinese material culture. Located in the center of what surface assemblage suggests is Terrace’s Chinatown, this structure was fully excavated, making it the first excavation of its kind in Utah. The structure measured 10 x 7 ft. in size ([https://sketchfab.com/3d-models/excavation-block-1-terrace-655b04ebb3134864b6d10c02597740b01](https://sketchfab.com/3d-models/excavation-block-1-terrace-655b04ebb3134864b6d10c02597740b01)) with walls constructed of vertical planks. Both exciting and disappointing, there were intact floorboards within the structure, though they showed evidence of past looting with shovel-shaped cuts and a plastic scoop at the bottom of the excavation. However, this did not limit the scientific potential of the site, as crews recovered over 10,000 artifacts from this structure.

While at the time of this newsletter report the artifacts are still being cleaned and analyzed, some notable finds include all manner of Chinese table and storage wares (Winter Green, Bamboo, Double Happiness, spouted jars, etc.), gaming pieces (Go or Wei Chi), faunal and floral remains (peanut shells, coconut, Chinese date, etc.), and many other artifact types and classes. Perhaps the most poignant find for the authors was the discovery of a hand-carved Chinese inkstone rim, which links the present to the past, letting all participants picture that Chinese resident in this remote part of Utah, connected to the rest of the world by a thin ribbon of rail, writing letters home to family and friends (Figures 5–8).

We were incredibly lucky to have Bill Lindsey, of the Historic Bottle Website hosted by the Society for Historical Archaeology, and his wife Kathy join us as PIT volunteers. Bill’s encyclopedic knowledge was put to use in a systematic bottle survey of Terrace’s Main Street with additional samples around the Section Foreman’s house and Chinatown. The SHPO's GIS team placed a 50 m grid over the entire 400-acre townsite and we were able to conduct a finish, base, and maker’s mark survey of 10 grid units. As is the case with the excavation, final results of the bottle inventory are still pending, but working closely with Bill Lindsey offered the authors an opportunity to refine field methodology for this type of survey, and will be combined into an article submission in the near future. Initial results of this systematic survey clearly reflect the collapse of Terrace in the early 20th century, with rapid drop-off of bottle types from later periods (Figure 9). Also, we hope to tease date ranges and functions (saloon, restaurants, etc.) of the numerous foundation pits along Main Street in order to better understand the town’s layout.

Critical to the success of this project was the collaboration, contribution, and support of the CRWDA in all aspects of this project’s planning and implementation. During the two weeks of the PIT project the crew was supplemented by various members of the CRWDA and Chinese community, and they volunteered to keep us fed, sometimes making the three-hour drive from Salt Lake City just to feed the crew and return home. But far more importantly, on the last day of the field project the CRWDA led all visitors including the Lt. Governor in a powerful ceremony to honor the ancestors before we backfilled the structure (Figures 10–12). A tremendous thank-you goes out to the CRWDA and the Chinese community for their tireless support in helping to tell the story of their ancestors and for urging us to conduct this work on their behalf.
As a final note, the BLM in cooperation with the SHPO has undertaken the construction of substantial fencing around the townsite of Terrace. Looting and unauthorized vehicular traffic have long been problems at Terrace. Given the remoteness of the location, these are difficult and challenging behaviors to stop. In an effort to curtail these destructive activities, a protective fence was designed and constructed around the most sensitive areas of the site. With continued monitoring and interpretation, it is hoped that these efforts will result in minimizing damage to the site from visitors (Figure 13).

FIGURE 13. Site-protection fence under construction at Terrace. (Photo by Chris Merritt, 2021.)
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