



# NEWSLETTER

Volume 6, Number 4

November, 1994

## Editor's Comments

Everyone is encouraged to submit articles for the *Newsletter*, preferably on DOS 3.5" computer disk (double sided, high or low density) as a WordPerfect document (version 5.0 or 5.1). Lacking this, any file from an ASCII word processor on any type of diskette will be acceptable (we will make a concerted attempt to retrieve or convert any format you may use). If you mail your diskette files to AI, he will make sure you get your diskette's returned. If you don't have access to a word processor, contact one of us about transcribing your paper copies.

You can Email direct to me articles, questions, or comments via the Internet or BITNET. My address is [lpiotrow@magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu](mailto:lpiotrow@magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu).

*Len Piotrowski*

## PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

*Mark F. Seeman*

A few days ago I overheard a 20-something year old guy talking about "disrespecting" somebody. In *Webster's Unabridged* we can find "disrespect" as noun or verb, but "disrespecting" (or dissin') somebody, is a new twist - although it probably will turn up in the next, 1995 edition of *Webster's*. Regardless of its strange ring, the intended meaning is clear enough.

As professional archaeologists, we are not alone. Our interest in understanding and interpreting the past is shared by other constituencies - Native Americans, amateur archaeologists, artifact collectors - even film makers and tour guides. All of these groups see themselves as having legitimate claims on history; that is, of "owning the past." Most of us have at one time or another tried to convince other groups or factions - or best of all, the general public - that our views and motives regarding the past are the correct ones. Compromise with potential competitors is a second-best outcome. I don't see anything inherently wrong with this perspective, just as I don't see anything inherently wrong or immoral with either American or Japanese

models of employee-management relations in the auto industry. In practical terms, however, we recognize that confrontation often breeds resentment and anger. Out of such contexts, I think, can grow a genuine disrespect for the past.

We need partnerships, not polarization, but where do these come from? Amateurs? Native Peoples? Steven Spielberg? Al Tonetti recently, and quite fairly, characterized the relationship between amateur archaeologists of the Archaeological Society of Ohio and the professional community as "cool" to a contributing editor of *Archaeology*. My own experiences in Ohio tell me that this characterization has a good bit of time depth, and that it is not likely to change over night. Maybe in some respects, relations were better when there was only one professional archaeologist in the state - Raymond Baby - working at a single bastion of professionalism - the Ohio Historical Society. At least with only one archaeologist rather than 200, it was understandable if Ray didn't have the time to look at a particular site or collection.

If relations with amateurs are cool, they are downright frigid with many Ohio Native Americans. Recent statements in the press, like those of Tom Montezuma, a Cherokee and Chairman of the Indiana Native American Council, get many local archaeologists in an angry mood. Montezuma, in reference to the GE Mound, is quoted as saying "What you like and don't like with respect to my ancestors, I could care less. These are my people, and I reburied them. I'm not worried about your science."

Several of the candidates for Trustee positions in our organization commented on the need to build coalitions and relations with other constituencies. I agree, but

### IN THIS ISSUE

Editors Comments .....	1
Presidents Message .....	1
OHPO .....	2
"Resource Partitioning...Late Prehistoric..." .....	3
"Save the Past For the Future II" .....	4
GE Mound Update .....	7
Publications .....	7
Training Opportunities .....	8

given our past history in Ohio, and our several agendas, which of us, as underpaid and overworked archaeologists, will be the Henry Kissinger of the 1990s? Where do we start? As a possible model, we might look slightly south.

This fall I had the chance to speak at the annual banquet meeting of the West Virginia Archaeological Society in Charleston. There were about 50 amateurs and five or six professionals at this affair. Altogether, the society has about 200 members. The meeting consisted of morning and afternoon sessions, and members presented a fine series of papers on topics ranging from frontier forts to Early Archaic site stratigraphy. There was even a short video for local cable T.V. on early B.A.E. work in the state made by Corps of Engineers archaeologist Bob Maslowski and the president-elect of the society and budding cinematographer, David Martin. Along the back wall of the meeting room were three or four well-documented artifact collections and a book display. What came through to me most clearly in Charleston was a sense of shared goals and collegiality. There was an understanding - which was actually stated at one point - that each group need the other in the endeavor of knowing the past. Disrespect wasn't on the agenda.

As with most interesting chemistries, there are probably several ingredients involved in West Virginia. First, it's clear that members have a certain esprit regarding the quality of their collections, chapter digs, and publications. They see themselves as somewhat different from other state societies, and I heard one off-handed comment that another state society "does have some good people, too." Second, the West Virginia Archaeological Society is relatively small. Small groups have different social dynamics than big groups, and are more likely to develop common values. Third, professionals in the state are willing to actively involve amateurs in their work, to participate in projects that amateurs initiate and/or control, and to work toward their goals. Amateurs are more than "informants," volunteers, or catalogers. Also, I think the archaeologists involved can demonstrate a real knowledge of the "facts" of archaeology; if you don't know the difference between a Guffey birdstone and Shinola, don't try to fake it with a knowledgeable collector.

By my count, there are about 2000 members of the Archaeological Society of Ohio, and about 200 professionals in the Ohio Archaeological Council. Although we are getting a good many amateur archaeologists attending our OAC conferences, we've got to do more. The West Virginia situation suggests that maybe working with smaller groups, a willingness to share the agenda, and an ability to demonstrate that you have something to offer are ideas worth keeping in mind.

### Readings Of Interest

Converse, Robert N.  
1993 Three Different Types. *Ohio Archaeologist*, 43:18.  
("Unscholarly" professional archaeologists chastised)

Elliot, Rita F.  
1994 Did We Create a Frankenstein? *Archaeology and Public Education*, 4(4):5, 10. (Excavations with 6th-graders; archaeologists insist on being paid as a demonstration of their worth to the project)

Griffin, Gilett G.  
1986 In Defense of the Collector. *National Geographic Magazine*, 169:462-465. (Archaeology without publication is no better than collecting for profit; the true collector collects to share; collecting saves little-appreciated art)

Morell, Virginia  
1994 An Archaeological Culture Shift. *Science*, 264:20-22.  
(NAGPRA will give Native Americans the upper hand)

Prufer, Olaf H. and Douglas H. McKenzie  
1975 Introduction. In *Studies in Ohio Archaeology*, edited by O. Prufer and D. McKenzie, pp. xvii-xx. Kent State University Press, Kent, Ohio. (Amateurs in general, and the Archaeological Society of Ohio in particular, are abusing the past)

Sugarman, Aaron  
1992 The Treasures of America...Looted. *Conde' Nast Traveller*, July, 1992:80-85, 120-124. (Southwestern pothunter's perspective on artifacts)

## OHIO HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE

### HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND GRANT ANNOUNCED

The Ohio Historic Preservation Office has received notice from the U. S. Department of the Interior that its FY 1995 (October 1994 through September 1995) apportionment will be \$790,999, again fourth highest in the nation behind New York, California, and Pennsylvania. This figure represents a .0019% (\$1508) reduction from FY 1994's appropriation. For further information contact Mary Beth Hirsch, Education and Support Services Department Head.

## RESOURCE PARTITIONING IN A LATE PREHISTORIC COMMUNITY: IS THERE EVIDENCE OF SOCIAL DIFFERENTIATION AT THE BOSMAN SITE?

Dr. Flora Church, Midwest Faunal Lab,  
Archaeological Services Consultants, Inc.  
4620 Indianola Avenue, Columbus, OH 43214

Because resource partitioning has been used as evidence for social and political differentiation, a sample of 70,286 faunal remains from the Bosman site in Muskingum County, Ohio, was analyzed to address the issue of social differentiation in a Late Prehistoric Fort Ancient community. Essenpreis (1978) and Pollack and Henderson (1992) suggest that social differentiation was present during the middle-late Fort Ancient periods. However, Railey (1992) supports the view that community members were organized into egalitarian units. Correspondence analysis was used to determine the association between faunal remains and four distinct households identified at the Bosman site (Carskadden 1992). All calculations were performed using NCSS 5.8 software (Hintze 1990), following the methods outlined in Greenacre (1984) and Lebart (1984).

The results of the analysis indicate that large mammals such as deer, elk, and bear were distributed among all four households. Medium mammals such as beaver, raccoon, and porcupine as well as wild turkey suggest that whole carcasses of these animals were processed by individual households. These patterns do not suggest that different species were being consumed by separate households, one indication of higher status (Bogan 1983). Nor does it appear that preferred cuts of meat were being consumed by any one household, a second indication of high status. A third indication - that animals with status roles will be associated in high status structures - appears to be supported by the fact that bear paws were associated more frequently with Houses 3 and 4. However, this distribution could also be explained by other factors. Bears may have been considered a symbol of group identity, for example, not higher status.

In conclusion, the analysis of the faunal remains does not support an interpretation of differential access to resources at the Bosman site. Differences in the distribution of taxa and body parts of individual taxa among the four households may be explained by other factors, e.g., hunting or fishing prowess, participation in hunt-

ing episodes, the size of the animal, kinship, and spatial relationships between the households, and disposal patterns.

**Acknowledgments:** I would like to express my appreciation to the following individuals for the support and encouragement they provided for this research. The project was initially funded by the Ohio Archaeological Council through the 1992 *Patricia S. Essenpreis Grant*. Jeff Carskadden provided access to the faunal remains from the Bosman site as well as matching funding for the grant. Shaune Skinner and Elsie Immel-Blei of Archaeological Services Consultants, Inc. (ASC), provided the wherewithal to complete the analysis and write up of the results. I would like to thank the ASC crew who spent long winter weeks washing and sorting bones - especially Grace Ellis, Mary Temple, and Joe Wakeman, as well as the ASC interns - especially Derek Hamilton and Andrea Isgro, and volunteers - especially Mitch Bellamy and Nick Teply. Finally, I would like to thank Paul W. Sciulli for his generous advice and support and invaluable assistance with the statistics. Any errors or omissions rest on my shoulders.

### References

- Bogan, Arthur E.  
1983 Evidence for Faunal Resource Partitioning in an Eastern North American Chiefdom. In *Animals and Archaeology: 1. Hunters and Their Prey*, edited by Juliet Clutton-Brock and Caroline Grigson, pp. 305-324, BAR International Series 163.
- Carskadden, Jeff  
1992 The Bosman Site: Muskingum County Ohio. *Ohio Archaeological Council Newsletter*, 4 (1): 4-5.
- Essenpreis, Patricia S.  
1978 Fort Ancient Settlement: Differential Response at a Mississippian-Late Woodland Interface. In *Mississippian Settlement Patterns*, edited by Bruce D. Smith, pp. 143-167. Academic Press, New York.
- Greenacre, Michael J.  
1984 *Theory and Application of Correspondence Analysis*. Academic Press, New York.
- Hintze, Jerry L.  
1990 *Number Cruncher Statistical System, Version 5.8, Advanced Tables*. Dr. Jerry L. Hintze, Kaysville, Utah.
- Lebart, Morineau and Warwick  
1984 *Multivariate Descriptive Statistical Analysis: Correspondence Analysis and Related Techniques for Large Matrices*. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Pollack, David and A. Gwynn Henderson  
1992 *Toward a Model of Fort Ancient Society*. In *Fort Ancient Cultural Dynamics in the Middle Ohio Valley*,

edited by A. Gwynn Henderson, pp. 281-294, Monographs in World Archaeology No. 8, Prehistory Press, Madison, Wisconsin.

Railey, Jimmy A.

1992 Settlement Cycles and Sociopolitical Nonchange in the Prehistoric Central Ohio Valley. Paper presented as partial fulfillment of the M.A. degree, Department of Anthropology, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.

## SAVE THE PAST FOR THE FUTURE II

Al Tonetti, Ohio Historic Preservation Office

Between September 19-23, 1994, I had the privilege of participating in the Society for American Archaeology's second *Save the Past for the Future* workshop in Breckenridge, Colorado. Though you will be reading and hearing more about this working conference through the *SAA Bulletin*, at the 1995 SAA annual meeting, and through other outlets, I would like to briefly discuss my impressions of what transpired in the thin air of the autumn-golden Aspen stands of the Colorado Rockies and its possible implications for cultural resource management.

I did not attend the initial *Save the Past for the Future* workshop in Taos, NM in 1989, though I wish I had. The result of that workshop was a welcomed increased focus on public education and law enforcement pertaining to site looting and vandalism. The SAA's Committee on Public Education, of which I am a member and state (of Ohio) coordinator, grew out of the contacts made there. A strategic plan to increase outreach to the public about the nature, magnitude, and mitigation of the site looting problem in the U.S. during this decade was prepared. This plan was published by the SAA in 1990 in the booklet *Save the Past for the Future, Actions for the '90s: Final Report, Taos Working Conference on Preventing Looting and Vandalism*.

The 1994 workshops addressed three major issues. Education (formal, professional, education networks, and education resource forum/centers), law enforcement (training, information sharing, interagency cooperation, prosecution, and investigative technologies), and [integrated] resource management (integrating cultural resources into ecosystem management). The education and law enforcement workshops were a direct outcome of the 1989 workshop - taking stock of where education and law enforcement were five years later, and a reexamination of the goals of the strategic plan proposed in *Actions for the '90s*. Although many objectives

have been met, much work remains to be done.

The integrated resource management workshop, in which I participated, was a seminal opportunity for the SAA to discuss integrating cultural resource management into ecosystem management, and I wish to address the rest of my comments to this topic. Following my comments is one of five workshop background papers on the subject. Please take the time to read it.

What is ecosystem management and what does it have to do with cultural resource management? Ecosystem management is a relatively new approach to land management. It attempts to manage ecosystems, the complex interrelationships between land, water, air, and life, including humans, at various geographical scales. It is an ecosystem-based approach to decision-making. It takes a holistic and conscious approach to maintaining and, where needed, rebuilding sustainable lifeways, ways in which humans live that do not deplete the biodiversity necessary to maintain life support systems. Instead of focusing on the viability of individual species, this approach looks at entire ecosystems, including the role of humans and the cultural factors we bring into the equation. This is an anthropological approach to environmental protection, one in which contemporary socio-economic factors are currently considered.

While ecosystem management broadens the scale and scope of environmental protection, it should not flat line the perspective that temporal factors bring into play. How various organisms, especially humans, have survived and affected the environment over vast areas through time should be an important contribution to ecosystem management. The cultural disciplines, especially history and archaeology, have the potential to significantly contribute to such efforts given their abilities to study and interpret the interactions of living organisms in nature at individual sites and throughout regions at various times in (pre)history.

The vast majority of cultural and natural resource information derived from cultural resource management studies is almost exclusively used by cultural resource management specialists. Few studies are translated for the public, and probably fewer make their way to scientists in other disciplines, especially ecologists and others working on an ecosystem approach to land management. Broadening our scope of inquiry and expanding dissemination of the information we have obtained was a significant topic of discussion at the integrated resource management workshop. How we do so in the current practice of cultural resource management was also discussed.

Much of the impetus for taking an ecosystem approach to land management has recently come from the Federal Government, especially the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the Forest Service. However, everyone

realizes that effective ecosystem management can not take place solely on public lands. Private property must also be included. Sixty percent (60%) of this nation is privately owned. Private land ownership in Ohio is 95%. How this is to be accomplished on private lands was also a subject of considerable discussion.

A comprehensive planning and decision-making approach that involves all elements of a landscape is needed for a more sustainable future, and I am committed (some of you may say I should be committed) to examining alternatives and furthering discussion of related issues. Integrating cultural resource management into ecosystem management is likely to result in a new approach to cultural resource management, one that may be disruptive and resisted by some. That should not, however, keep us from critically examining our current, and I believe less than satisfactory, approach to the identification, evaluation, and protection of significant archaeological and other cultural resources, and how what we do can contribute to sustainable lifeways. If we do not participate in the larger debate going on around us, I am afraid that we will further distance ourselves from related scientific disciplines and the larger environmental movement which is wrestling with such weighty issues, while fending off the burgeoning so-called "wise use" or private property rights movement, which seeks to dismantle much of this nation's environmental protection and historic preservation regulations. If we ignore the bigger picture, we do so at our own peril.

Theoretical and methodological approaches to natural resource management have already been greatly affected by looking at the bigger picture, by taking an ecosystem, as opposed to species-oriented, approach. I believe there are lessons here for us to learn. There is now a movement to push for a similar approach in cultural resource management. Changes to existing regulatory policies and possibly new legislation are likely if integrated resource management is to become a reality. Personally, I do not have a very clear idea of how such a transition and integration can be accomplished, or what a truly integrated resources management would look like. From participating in this workshop, I see that few of us do at this point. But I can tell you that the Federal Government is seriously examining the way the business of cultural resource management is conducted. In this time of rising opposition to environmental regulation, corporate and government downsizing, and fiscal restraint, policy-makers are looking for ways to modify existing programs and "do more with less."

I ask that you read the following workshop background paper on the subject of archaeology's role in ecosystem management. I welcome your comments, either to me personally or through the *OAC Newsletter*.

## *Cultural Resource Contributions to Ecosystem Management*

Pat Barker, Nevada State Archaeologist for the Bureau of Land Management

Western Civilization has developed a conceptual dichotomy between humanity and the environment through an artificial separation between the human and natural worlds. While this separation can be traced to biblical references, it was redefined during the Enlightenment, and subsequent industrial revolution, to create an opposition between humanity and the environment. This tension is best exemplified by Rousseau's concept of the "natural man" uncorrupted by the effects of civilization. Through time, this dichotomy has been heightened by the expansion of Western Civilization through the New World. During this expansion it was politically and economically expedient to deny the significance of indigenous cultures and to focus on the short term utility of the environment as a cradle for Western expansion. If there was no significant history prior to the appearance of Euro-Americans, then they were free to use the environment in any way they wanted. In contemporary society, this attitude persists through a focus on managing ecosystems with reference only to our understanding of environmental dynamics over the last few centuries.

Although American prehistoric archaeology developed to document the uncorrupted "natural man" as opposed to the corrupted "civilized man," archaeology is the only social science that has not been overly effected by the false separation of humanity from the environment. That is, American archaeology has always attempted to place human society in an environmental context by understanding the relationship between native cultures and environmental change. In doing this archaeologists have been forced to adopt a long term perspective in which the ebb and flow of human cultures is related to the ebb and flow of the environment. Beginning with arguments about megafauna extinctions, archaeologists have also made it clear that when humans occupy an ecosystem, we immediately begin changing it to meet our needs. While we are simply one more element in the natural world, we also have the cultural ability to effect significant changes in that world.

Given this historic focus, archaeologists routinely gather and interpret data about past environments and the ways in which people have used and altered them. They have also collected a long term environmental record which shows that past environmental variation greatly exceeds the variability found in the short term, post

Euro-American, written record. Archaeologists can contribute, and should have contributed, to overall ecosystem and geographical area management by interpreting past environmental dynamics and by documenting human ecological effects, and responses, through time.

The development of the Federal land management system reflects the basic conceptual separation of humanity from the environment inherent in Western Civilization. Essentially, the system is divided into two competing camps, i.e., commodity production vs. environmental protection. In a schizophrenic legal environment, the government is charged with both maximizing the short term economic use of federal lands, while at the same time, maximizing long term environmental protection. The system has dealt with this opposition by fragmenting the land use planning system to focus on individual land use proposals and their environmental effects in isolation from larger systems. It has also developed a concept of the environment as an essentially biological entity in which humans operate without being a part of the biota.

In addition to the inherent contradictions in this system, archaeologists have not been used as a resource for direct ecosystem management because of a misperception about what archaeologists do. That is, archaeologists have been primarily used as compliance specialists who manage the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) section 106 process so that proposed land uses are not unduly hampered by cultural heritage concerns. The goal has been to meet the letter of the NHPA in order to maximize commodity production without the threat of legal entanglements. This limited role is fostered, in part, by the way in which archaeologists have allowed the section 106 process to be defined and in part by the legal parameters of the process itself. The result of this is a land management system in which individual land use proposals drive the focus of land managers and once the individual project has been approved, attention is redirected to the next project. Over time there is no synthesis or evolution of either our understanding of the natural world and humanity's places in it or our ability to increase efficiency in land management.

Recently the Federal Government has broadened its cultural resource management focus beyond an archaeological focus. As a cultural heritage program, the government now includes historians (historic archaeologists), Native American specialists (ethnographers), educators, public interpretation specialists, paleontologists, and museologists. At a time when we have broadened the scope of the program, in terms of disciplinary and interest group participation, it is critical to

broaden the conceptual scope of the program beyond single sites to include ecosystems.

In addition, to better direct management of the compliance process through a synthetic ecosystem approach, examples of some of the ways in which cultural resource specialists can contribute to ecosystem management include:

Supplying cultural resource inventory and excavation data to verify the presence or absence of specific taxa in specific locations and across geographic areas throughout the last 12,000 years of climatic variation;

Supplying cultural resource synchronic data for the baseline supportive information necessary for establishing achievable goals for both desired plant communities and wildlife populations within an ecosystem;

Tracking the ecological status of biotic communities through time and across the landscape to aid in defining critical habitat;

Relating changes in the physical environment and climate to changes in biotic communities;

Documenting the ecological effects of human land use in both prehistoric and historic periods;

Determining the historic limits of change in biotic communities;

Defining the "natural" environment, given that human alterations began around 12,000 years ago;

Dispelling popular myths that the desert was a "wasteland" until Euro-American occupation and development;

Using historic data on abandoned homesteads to determine recent biotic recovery processes and rates;

Using cadastral survey notes to develop biotic characterizations through time in geographic areas;

Identifying the historical presence of wildlife species and associated habitats.

This workshop can foster better ecosystem management by developing an approach to collapsing the false conceptual dichotomy between humanity and nature and by developing ways to better long term ecosystem management. It can also develop a programmatic statement that provides clear and compelling conceptual argument for including cultural heritage as a central concern in ecosystem management.

## GE MOUND UPDATE

[Editor's note (Tonetti): The following is the text of a letter included with the resolution of Indiana's Native American Council concerning the reburial of the artifacts from the GE Mound. The resolution passed 7 to 3. This letter, dated August 8, 1994, was addressed to Mr. John F. Welch, Chairman of the Board of the General Electric Company. Five papers pertaining to artifacts recovered from the GE Mound were presented at the Southeastern/Midwest Archaeological Conference in Lexington, KY on November 11, 1994]

Dear Mr. Welch,

*A majority of the members of Indiana's Native American Council protest in the strongest possible terms your company's recent reburial of the artifacts from the site 12PO885 (also known as the Mount Vernon site or the "GE Mound"). The reburial was conducted without adequate consultation with indigenous Native Americans and without the adequate study called for in our resolution of July 27, 1992.*

*The reburial appears to have been conducted at the prompting of Native Americans who are not culturally affiliated with the site, and who are neither members of tribes which historically resided in the region nor the legitimate representatives of the Native Peoples of Indiana. It is unconscionable that this reburial occurred without giving primary consideration to the opinions and participation of the Native Peoples indigenous to the region. Discussions about reburial, decisions about reburial, or reburial itself should not occur in Indiana without the primary input and participation from the people who historically resided or continue to reside in the region (primarily the Miami, Shawnee, and the Potawatomi). These groups should have been consulted and their opinions should not have been ignored.*

*It is especially disheartening to see an international corporation act so cavalierly, ignoring the Native Americans of Indiana and repudiating the need for careful and scientific study of a prehistoric culture that is a crucial part of the American patrimony. By reburying the artifacts before any studies could be reviewed by experts, you have violated the primary principle of science - that any study should be subject to independent verification. This seems contrary to your company's reputation for scientific excellence. The precipitous reburial deprived the Native Peoples of Indiana of a unique opportunity to learn about their prehistoric ancestors, just as it deprived all people the opportunity to learn from and about the accomplishments of an important prehistoric culture.*

*If your company had been a Federal agency or a museum receiving Federal funds, the reburial would have been a violation of Federal law under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. Although the letter of this*

*law apparently does not apply to your corporation, the reburial certainly violates its spirit. The Mount Vernon site happened to be located on your company's property, and your company is therefore the steward of an important and irreplaceable site. We are profoundly disappointed with the poor stewardship of the General Electric Corporation.*

## PUBLICATIONS

### *Federal Archaeological Programs and Activities: The Secretary of the Interior's Report to Congress*

[Editor's note (Tonetti): This article is adapted from the *Bulletin of the Society for American Archaeology*, 12(3), 1994] This report covers the wide-ranging work of archaeologists across federal agencies, from conducting excavations to preserving valuable sites for the public, while laying out government-wide objectives for the upcoming years. This report is the most thorough source of information for federal agencies to compare their efforts and share ideas for improving government archaeology. Everyone interested in the federal archaeology program should find this publication useful. The 112-page publication is available free of charge from the National Park Service, Archeological Assistance Division, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127, telephone (202) 343-4101, FAX (202) 523-1547.

### *Archeology and the Federal Government*

This is the latest thematic issue of the publication CRM. Published by the National Park Service to promote and maintain high standards for preserving and managing cultural resources, CRM is a free publication for parks, federal agencies, Indian tribes, state and local governments, and the private sector.

This publication, Vol. 17 (6), 1994, presents a summary of archeological activities of the federal government that address the *National Strategy for Federal Archeology*, issued by the Secretary of the Interior in 1991 [see OAC Newsletter 4 (3), August, 1992]. This six point strategy addresses issues of publication education and participation, public use of the archeological paleoenvironmental record, fighting looting and preserving the archeological record in place, interagency cooperation and information exchange, site inventories, and curation of collections and records. To obtain a copy of this and other CRM publications contact the Editor, CRM (400), U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Cultural Resources, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127, telephone (202) 343-3395.

### ***The Challenge of Underwater Heritage: Protection versus Public Access***

This publication is a compilation of highlights from a 1994 colloquium sponsored by the Department of Canadian Heritage and the Canadian Museum of Civilization. The aim of the colloquium was to increase underwater heritage awareness and to provide a forum to identify and debate measures in order to develop solutions for protecting the resource, while allowing for adequate public access and presentation. The objectives were to assist in setting priorities and developing a strategy, to facilitate communication and awareness within the marine heritage community, and to revitalize the marine heritage community and act as a catalyst to facilitate cooperative ventures and general development.

Included in the publication are reports on workshops addressing the following questions - "Protection versus Access: Is Sustainable Use the Answer?", "Protection versus Access: Can We Expand Access While Preserving Resources for the Future?", and "Where Do We Want to GO? What Do We Have to Do to Get There?" "Recommendations and an Action Plan" follow. "Case Study - Fact Sheets" are also included. For copies of this report contact the Department of Canadian Heritage, Archaeological Resource Management, 365 Laurier Avenue West, 7th Floor, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0C8, telephone (613) 991-5461, FAX (613) 952-5380.

## **TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES**

### **Remote Sensing/Geophysical Techniques for Cultural Resource Management: Cahokia Mounds State Historic Site, Illinois**

This workshop is designed to provide a practical application of geophysical equipment and aerial photographic techniques available for the identification, evaluation, and ultimately, the conservation and protection of cultural resources. Instruction will be given in the use of and the interpretation of data from magnetometers, conductivity meters, resistivity meters, ground penetrating radar, metal detectors, and magnetic susceptibility and their applications to nondestructive subsurface investigations. The major emphasis of the training will be on the field use of equipment. Instruction will also be offered in the use of and interpretation of aerial photographic techniques, and in the use of low altitude large scale aerial reconnaissance.

Federal, state, and local governmental cultural resource managers and specialists (i.e., archaeologists, historians, architects, and contracting personnel), private contrac-

tors, and university professors and students with specific responsibilities concerning the identification, evaluation, conservation, protection, and management of archaeological and other cultural resources are invited to participate in this workshop. Class size is limited to 50. The workshop will be held between May 22-26, 1995 (40 hours over 5 days). The cost is \$475.00 per participant. The course is co-sponsored by the National Park Service, the USDA Forest Service, and USAF Air Mobility Command. Lodging will be at the Holiday Inn, Collinsville, IL. Prospective participants must complete a nomination form (forms available from Al Tonetti, Ohio Historic Preservation Office) and remit a check for \$475.00 to the National Park Service, RMR-PPO, ATTN: Steve De Vore, 12795 West Alameda Parkway, P.O. Box 25287, Denver, CO 80225-0287 by close of business, March 15, 1995. Participants will be notified by March 31, 1995 as to their acceptance for the workshop. For further information contact Steve De Vore, National Park Service, Rocky Mountain Regional Office, (303) 969-2882.

### **Internships for Educators: Crow Canyon Archaeological Center, Cortez, Colorado**

Six internships are available in 1995. Responsibilities include working closely with educators to teach southwestern cultures and archaeology to school-age and adult groups and developing a content lesson and educational research project. Qualifications include experience in education, strong communication skills, and an interest in archaeology. Benefits include a \$350 travel allowance, room (tent or dorm) and board, plus a modest stipend (\$50/week) for expenses. College credit may be arranged independently. Students are encouraged to apply for these positions. Sessions are Spring, March 5 - May 27; Summer, May 28 - August 12; and Fall, August 20 - November 11. To apply call or write for an application which will be due as follows: Spring, December 10, 1994; Summer, March 10, 1995; and Fall, June 15, 1995. Contact Pam Wheat, Director of Education, Crow Canyon Archaeological Center, 23390 Road K, Cortez, CO 81321, telephone (303) 565-8975, FAX (303) 565-4859.

### **Ian M. Thompson Fellowship for Educators, Crow Canyon Archaeological Center, Cortez, Colorado**

Open to educators in the United States who are involved in archaeology education. Project proposals should focus on curriculum development or educational research based on archaeology or Native American studies. Educators who have been teaching for five or more years are encouraged to apply. The duration of the fellowship is the calendar year in which the fellowship is awarded. The fellowship provides up to \$5,000 for research expenses, documented travel expenses, and a



modest stipend. Application deadline is January 20, 1995. For application and further information contact Pam Wheat at the address listed above.

### **SUMMER WORKSHOPS, CROW CANYON ARCHAEOLOGICAL CENTER, CORTEZ, COLORADO**

Two summer workshops offer an intense probing of archaeology and how it can be adapted to the classroom. These workshops are offered separately but are designed in tandem. Educators at any grade level are invited. Current membership in Crow Canyon is required for participation. Individual adult membership is \$40/year.

*Archaeology in the Classroom* is a "sampler" program introducing educators to the method and theory of archaeological investigation and how to incorporate this into the classroom. The workshop begins with an introduction to material culture through a hands-on exercise called *Inquiries into the Past*. A tour of an archaeological site is given to learn about site formation.

Participants will work in the field and laboratory with Crow Canyon archaeologists and explore the environment from an archaeological perspective. A day is spent in an introduction to prehistoric lifestyles and technologies. Instructional strategies and resources for developing classroom lessons are presented. Three continuing education units are available. A separate fee is paid for these credits. Date: July 23 - 30, 1995. Cost \$725.

*Building An Archaeology Resource Unit* provides an opportunity to work with education specialists while you visit archaeological sites on the Colorado Plateau. Sites for study and visitation include Lowry Pueblo, Chimney Rock, Ute Tribal Park, Chaco Canyon, and others. These visits aid in the development of site specific lessons that relate archaeological concepts and aspects of cultural history. At the end of the workshop you will have a resource notebook containing detailed readings, lesson plans, and a pre-packaged slide set. Two continuing education units are available. A separate fee is paid for these credits. Date: July 30 - August 5, 1995. Cost \$825. For further information about the summer workshops contact Pam Wheat at the address listed above.

Crow Canyon Archaeological Center is an independent archaeological research and education institution. Founded in 1983, Crow Canyon has a full-time staff of scholars involved in excavation of Anasazi sites. More than 3,000 students and adults participate annually in Crow Canyon's programs in Southwestern Native American archaeology, history, and art. All programs and admission practices are available to applicants of any race, color, nationality, or ethnic origin.

## **POSITION OPENINGS**

### **Colonial Period Archaeologist, in a joint program of Northwestern State University, the Louisiana Division of Archaeology, and the Louisiana Office of State Parks.**

The archaeologist will define research priorities and objectives for the early eighteenth century presidio and mission site of Nuestra Senora del Pilar Los Adaes, which is a National Historic Landmark located in western Louisiana; survey and test sites in area; collaborate on preservation, interpretation, and development plans for Los Adaes; and share information about archaeology and archaeological preservation with governmental representatives and the public. The archaeologist in the Los Adaes position will be part of the Regional Archaeology Program coordinated by the Division of Archaeology. The highly visible program has strong public support and offers the opportunity to develop research interests. The archaeologist will be on the staff of Northwestern State University in Natchitoches and will have office and lab space at Los Adaes State Commemorative Area, operated by the Louisiana Office of State Parks. EOE/AA/ADA.

A Masters in anthropology or archaeology is required; a PhD is preferred. Completion of a historical archaeological study must be evidenced by a thesis, dissertation, or equivalent report. Experience in eighteenth century Spanish colonial archaeology is highly desirable. Also helpful are experience in organizing independent research, word processing, public speaking, report writing, and experience in working with governmental representatives. Starting salary \$26,500. Applications accepted until November 15, 1994 or until a suitable candidate is found. Send letter, vita, and names of three references to Thomas Eubanks, Division of Archaeology, P.O. Box 44247, Baton Rouge, LA 70804, telephone 504-342-8170.

### **Research Associate and Southeastern Regional Archaeologist, in a joint program of Louisiana State University and the Louisiana Division of Archaeology**

The person in this position will define archaeological research priorities and objectives for southeastern Louisiana within the context of surveying and recording sites, testing sites, interacting with property owners, and suggesting site preservation strategies. The person will be responsible for sharing information about archaeology and archaeological preservation with governmental representatives and the public. Limited university teaching may be possible after the program

is well established. The highly visible statewide Regional Archaeology Program has earned strong public support, and it offers a great deal of autonomy as well as the opportunity to develop research interests. The regional archaeologist will have the position of Research Associate in the Museum of Natural Science, Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge. EOE/AA/ADA.

A Masters in anthropology with a specialization in archaeology is required; a PhD is preferred. Completion of an archaeological study must be evidenced by a thesis, dissertation, or equivalent report. Experience in both historic and prehistoric archaeology of the Southeast is desirable. Also helpful are experience in organizing independent research, word processing, public speaking, report writing, and working with landowners. Starting salary \$26,500, plus travel allowance. Applications accepted until November 15, 1994 or until a suitable candidate is found. Send letter, vita, and names of three references to Thomas Eubanks, Division of Archaeology, P.O. Box 44247, Baton Rouge, LA 70804, telephone 504-342-8170.

#### **Southwestern Regional Archaeologist for Louisiana, contingent upon funding**

This position is identical to the above position in duties, qualifications, salary, and application information.

## CALENDAR OF EVENTS

**January 4-8, 1995:** *The Society for Historical Archaeology annual Conference on Historical and Underwater Archaeology*, J.W. Marriott Hotel, Washington, DC. Contact Henry M. Miller, Historic St. Mary's City, P.O. Box 39, St. Mary's City, MD 20686, telephone (301) 862-0974, FAX (301) 862-0968.

**May 3-7, 1995:** *The Society for American Archaeology annual Meeting*, Minneapolis Hilton and Towers, Minneapolis, MN.

May 19, 1995:

*The Ohio Archaeological Council semi-annual Meeting*, The Ohio Historical Center, Columbus, OH. Contact Martha Otto (614) 297-2641 or Robert Genheimer (513) 345-8503.

## OFFICERS OF THE OHIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL COUNCIL

President: Mark Seeman (216) 672-2705 or 2570

President Elect: Bob Genheimer (513) 345-8503

Secretary: Martha Otto (614) 297-2641

Treasurer: Don Bier (614) 297-2647

Archivist: Kolleen Butterworth (614) 466-5105

Trustees: Bruce Aument, Chair, Nomination Committee, (614) 644-7582; Ann Cramer, Co-chair, Education Committee (614) 592-6644; Franco Ruffini, Chair, Grants Committee (614) 297-2470; Al Tonetti, Co-chair, Education Committee, (614) 297-2470; Kent Vickery, Chair, Membership and Certification Committee, (513) 556-5787.

PLEASE ADDRESS ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO  
THE OHIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL COUNCIL,  
P.O. BOX 02012, COLUMBUS, OH 43202

#### Schedule For Submission:

<u>Deadline</u>	<u>Issue</u>
January 1st	February
April 1st	May
July 1st	August
October 1st	November

#### *Editors*

Len Piotrowski ..... (614) 292-5558  
Al Tonetti ..... (614) 297-2470