



# NEWSLETTER

Volume 8, Numbers 2-4

November, 1996

## 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).

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

*Len Piotrowski*

## EDITOR'S (Tonetti) NOTE

After eight years, four as your President and four as a Trustee and Chair of the Education Committee, I am leaving service as an officer of the OAC following the November membership meeting. Some of you may have noticed that the February issue of the newsletter was the last you received. There was no May or August issue. I apologize for this, but I also want to note that I received only one or two inquiries about these issues. That says to me that the newsletter is not a high priority for this organization. So, if you want a newsletter beyond this issue, let President Genheimer know how you, personally, will contribute to this effort.

## PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

*Bob Genheimer*

By now, many of you have read the National Park Service's "Draft Recommendations Regarding the Disposition of Culturally Unidentifiable Human Remains and Associated Funerary Objects" or heard the news report of the disposition of the human remains uncovered along the Columbia River in Washington State [11,000 year old human remains with Caucasian features were to be reburied by Native Americans soon after they were found on federal land]. Although, on the surface, these items appear to have little in common, they may represent a new era in the handling of Native American remains and artifacts. And, unless steps are taken to modify these positions, the hallmark of this era may be the unprecedented loss of cultural materials

from museums and academic institutions and, perhaps irreparable damage to our relationships with Native American groups.

Up until recently, NAGPRA has been a relatively painless exercise for Ohio institutions. Yes, hundreds of person-hours have been expended documenting and inventorying prehistoric specimens, but, for the most part, prehistoric human remains and associated artifactual material have been declared "culturally unidentifiable" at most institutions. And as NAGPRA was drafted, an absence of cultural affiliation meant there was no Federally recognized tribe with which to consult. Enter the NAGPRA Review Committee. In their attempt to remedy the problem of "culturally unidentifiable" remains, the Review Committee has re-defined "cultural affiliation" and "shared group identity." In doing so, they have effectively negated the role of "cultural affiliation" in the NAGPRA process. This is not a minor modification to NAGPRA; it is a re-definition that threatens to jeopardize the archaeological record of Ohio.

The Ohio Archaeological Council voiced its strong displeasure with the "Draft Recommendations" in a letter to the NAGPRA Review Committee. I want to thank Franco Ruffini, N'omi Greber, and the Native American Concerns Committee for drafting our response. Although this letter is printed in full in this issue of the newsletter, I want to briefly outline our concerns. As our letter to the Review Committee states, our greatest concern with the "Draft Recommendations" and the Review Committee's approach to NAGPRA is the posture each reflects. As an Act, NAGPRA was designed as a process of identification, affiliation, notification, and possible repatriation of human remains and associated artifacts. The process was designed to follow certain steps with various outcomes based on the

## IN THIS ISSUE

Editors' Comments & President's Message . . . . .	1
Letter to NAGPRA Review Committee . . . . .	2
Legislative Issues Committee Rpt & Gary McDaniel . . . . .	4
Board Approves Grant . . . . .	5
Arch Resources in Economic Development & Grants . . . . .	6
Publications . . . . .	7
Conferences . . . . .	8
Public History Award & Internet Addresses . . . . .	11
Other Web Site Info & Call For Papers . . . . .	12

results of the identification and affiliation exercises. The intent was never to repatriate all Native American artifacts - the process was designed to identify those remains and objects for which claims could be justified. We all agreed to this process during the negotiations that lead to the enactment of the legislation. It was with this understanding that agreements were made and compromises were reached. But the Review Committee is operating under a different paradigm - a model that disregards the process and suggests that every effort should be made by museums and institutions to divest themselves of any potential NAGPRA-related items. In this new paradigm, "cultural affiliation" is suddenly much less important. When the only goal of the process is repatriation, the steps in achieving that goal become secondary. In the end, when "repatriation" occurs, the question of "cultural affiliation" will still not be resolved. Is that repatriation, or a gift?

Under the proposed definition of "shared group identity", numerous Indian tribes could claim a "shared group identity" with large numbers of human remains and associated artifacts. The wording was purposely left non-restrictive to make certain that few remains could be determined to be "culturally unidentifiable". In their attempt to resolve the thorny issue of unaffiliated remains, the Review Committee has provided the avenue for broad-reaching claims and even multiple claims on materials for which we believe there is no clear connection to an extant cultural group. They have, in effect, demanded affiliation and repatriation.

The situation in Washington State, although not as clear-cut as the early newspaper articles would have one believe, raises another issue concerning repatriation and Native Americans. That issue is cooperation between Native Americans and archaeologists. Human remains are found - their heritage is questioned - archaeologists ask to perform identifying tests - Native Americans refuse! I do not wish to take issue with the Corps of Engineers in their decision to turn over the remains, since they must abide by the law as written. But, it is troubling that in a case such as this, where ancient remains are found, that archaeologists and Native Americans cannot come to some form of an agreement as to verification of the race of the individual. It seems clear that the archaeologists and Native Americans are not talking to each other, but past one another. One archaeologist commented that he thought the discovery would be a unifying event. Instead, it has highlighted the mistrust between the groups.

While Ohio has had no recent episodes on the scale of the recent Washington State discovery, our relationships with Ohio and other Native American groups can best be described as cool. And, while many Ohio museums and institutions have on-going relationships with Native Americans, there is a subtext of mistrust and apprehension which pervades the present calm. How

will the guidelines on "culturally unidentifiable remains" (if adopted) affect this relationship? It may be too early to tell, but large numbers of claims on prehistoric material that we consider to be "culturally unidentifiable" may strain these already tenuous relationships.

What is needed is a better dialogue among archaeologists and concerned Native Americans. But for this dialogue to occur there must be a sense of balance in the NAGPRA proceedings. If one or both sides perceive that they are not being treated fairly, or have not received a balanced review, they will mistrust the process and work against it. As our distaste for the draft guidelines and the lack of cooperation in the Washington State story illustrate, that has already occurred on each side. As in most disputes, there will not be a "working relationship" among archaeologists and Native Americans until each party agrees to respect the other's viewpoints and concerns. At present, such a relationship does not seem to be in place.

If the "Draft Recommendations" do go into effect, the establishment of "working relationships" with Native American groups may prove crucial. And, as the Washington State story hinted, perhaps this could prove to be a unifying event in Ohio. Or it could prove to be divisive. What role will we play in the outcome? Hopefully, it will be one which recognizes the rights and beliefs of Native Americans, but also takes into account our responsibilities toward the protection of Ohio's important cultural resources. It may be a difficult line to walk, but the alternatives are certainly less appealing.

## OAC LETTER TO NAGPRA REVIEW COMMITTEE

Dear Review Committee: The following comments concerning "Draft Recommendations Regarding the Disposition of Culturally Unidentifiable Human Remains and Associated Funerary Objects" are on behalf of the Ohio Archaeological Council. Founded in 1975, the Council is the service group of professional archaeologists in the state of Ohio. Its more than 100 members include museum, university, and contract professionals, as well as dedicated amateurs, researchers, and students. The Council's mission is to promote the goals of professional archaeology and to educate its members and others on issues of archaeological importance.

Your "Draft Recommendations" as published in the August 20, 1996 Federal Register (Vol. 61, No. 162) are of deep concern to the Ohio Archaeological Council. Our concerns are broad reaching, and suggest that mere

alterations to the "Draft Recommendations" are not sufficient. The "Draft Recommendations" are a clear change in the direction of NAGPRA -- a change which we cannot support, and will work diligently to reverse if adopted.

Perhaps the most disturbing aspect of the "Draft Recommendations" is its posture. The NAGPRA Review Committee is operating under the paradigm that every effort should be made on the part of museums and other institutions to divest themselves of any and all items that are potentially NAGPRA related. With this paradigm in place, it is assumed that in the future if you still retain any potential NAGPRA items, you have not made a good faith effort to repatriate them. The overall tone of the "Draft Recommendations" assumes that eventually, all human remains will be "associated" via cultural affiliation of "shared group identity". It appears that the statute is being amended via regulation to eliminate the statutorily created category of "culturally unidentifiable human remains" in order to give, **not repatriate**, human remains to some Native American tribe or Native Hawaiian organization.

The reference to the need for amendments to NAGPRA to accommodate "decisions regarding the disposition of a small number of generally very ancient remains" is disconcerting in its vagueness, and to be honest, not a reflection of reality. It can be reasonably stated that in Ohio, the vast majority of all Native American skeletal remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects are **culturally unidentifiable**. The ramifications of the "Draft Recommendations" are thus of immense consequence to the archaeological collections of Ohio institutions. It is disturbing to the Council then, that the "Draft Recommendations" set up a method for the disposition of "culturally unidentifiable human remains" that is arguably applicable to even the most "ancient" of human remains. Under this process, any or all Indian tribes could ostensibly claim a "shared group identity" to any or all human remains, regardless of common ancestry, affiliation, or cultural connections. The phrase "a combination of geographical, temporal, and cultural links" (as a definition for shared group identity) leaves little possibility that any human remains will remain "culturally unidentifiable". This approach to "demanding affiliation" is inappropriate and inconsistent with the statute, but it is certainly understandable in light of the paradigm for repatriation the Review Committee has adopted.

Central to our concerns with the "Draft Recommendations" is the Review Committee's definition of "shared group identity" (SGI). This definition, and its use within NAGPRA, are problematic on at least several counts. First, the proposed definition is imprecise and open to multiple interpretations as the terms "relationships" and "direct historical links" leave open the question of what kinds of relationships and links are meant. As others

have pointed out, does this include relationships of trade connections, links based on the sharing of a few linguistic loanwords, a tradition of intergroup warfare, or displacement and sequential occupation of the same land? One may also point out that the concept of ancestry is missing from the proposed definition of SGI, which can lead to tying together clearly unrelated groups.

Second, by incorporating an expansive and vague definition of SGI, the Committee has, in essence, redefined "Indian tribe". The proposed definition changes the criteria, stated in statute, by which "cultural affiliation" is determined. In fact, it makes the concept of "culturally unidentifiable human remains," a category identified in the statute, virtually meaningless, or at least applicable in only the most restricted circumstances.

Third, the proposed definition of SGI would not only allow, but invite multiple claims for repatriation. While multiple claims are possible now, the vagueness of the definition of SGI expands the basis for multiple claims. In fact, it provides a convenient avenue for making claims on materials that otherwise cannot be associated with any one tribal group. Again, if your paradigm is to repatriate everything, the use of "shared group identity" and its weakening of "cultural affiliation" is understandable.

The problem of participation of non-federally recognized tribes in the NAGPRA process needs to be addressed. The Committee suggests that the Secretary of the Interior urge Congress to amend NAGPRA to provide a means whereby "legitimate" non-federally recognized tribes can participate in NAGPRA. Defining legitimacy and determining which tribes are "legitimate" presents a difficult and sensitive situation. The net effect should not be to place additional burdens on museums and institutions in this regard.

NAGPRA does not provide for the repatriation of culturally unidentifiable associated funerary objects. We feel this was done intentionally based on the published discussions associated with the passage of the statute. We see no need to change this, particularly given the Committee's recommendation to follow an approach similar to that proposed for the disposition of "culturally unidentifiable human remains." The net result would be to make any "culturally unidentifiable associated funerary object" associated with some or all Indian tribes, particularly as the antiquity of the objects increase.

When NAGPRA was discussed and negotiated prior to enactment in 1990, the anthropological community came to an acceptance of the Act, in part, due to a variety of agreements and compromises. One of those agreements was that when a clear connection exists between human

remains and descendant populations, we have no objection to entertaining claims of repatriation or curation restrictions. But, repatriation of all Native American remains, regardless of any clear or even tenuous ties to tribal groups is inconsistent with the Act and the participation of the anthropological community in its enactment.

It was also our understanding that NAGPRA is a process. That process includes 1) the identification of potential NAGPRA items; 2) the identification of affiliated tribal groups; 3) notification and consultation with those affiliated tribal groups; and, 4) disposition of materials depending on acceptance or rejection of any claims. The "repatriation at all costs" paradigm in use in the "Draft Recommendations" has made a mockery of this process, and has effectively eliminated cultural affiliation as a deciding factor in the identification and consultation process.

We strongly encourage that you rethink your approach to "culturally unidentifiable human remains" to reflect the NAGPRA process. This process should have repatriation as a potential outcome, but not as the only goal. Respectfully submitted, Robert A. Genheimer, President.

## OAC LEGISLATIVE ISSUES COMMITTEE REPORT

*Shaune M. Skinner, Chair*

The opponent hearing on H.B. 432, a bill revising Ohio cemetery law, was held on April 24, 1996. Our testimony was written by Attorney Brad Baker and Trustee Al Tonetti, and was presented by President-elect Martha Otto. Our testimony emphasized that while the OAC is in support of legislation that protects human remains, as written the proposed bill is not the appropriate method to address this issue. In particular, H.B. 432 a) does not establish a process to be followed when human remains are uncovered, b) does not establish an agency or review board to implement legislative intent, and c) does not clearly state changes to the existing laws which deal with privilege and how these changes will affect archaeological research.

Also providing opponent testimony was Steve Parker, then President of the Archaeological Society of Ohio. The ASO testimony stated that Ohio's current cemetery laws are sufficient and that the bill is anti-archaeology.

Buck Meyers, from the Butler County Council of Native Americans, and Mike Cochran, of the Ohio Township Association, also testified in opposition. Mr. Meyers read a statement from the Loyal Shawnee of Oklahoma and a statement from his own group. These statements

emphasized the lack of clarity for treatment and final disposition of human remains covered in this bill. They were particularly concerned that human remains do not get turned over to groups of alleged Native Americans in Ohio, who they say have no claim to the remains.

Finally, Mike Cochran spoke on behalf of the Ohio Township Association and expressed concern that the legislation will be a financial burden on townships, and that some remains may have historical import that townships would not be prepared to deal with.

Copies of the opponent or proponent testimony are available from Shaune Skinner. The Legislative Issue Committee thanks Brad Baker and Al Tonetti for their efforts in preparing our testimony, and Martha Otto for testifying before the committee.

### GARY McDANIEL

*Flora Church, ASC Group, Inc.*

To mark the passing of our friend and colleague, Gary M. McDaniel, we offer the following summary of his career as an Ohio archaeologist. At the time of his death on March 25, 1996, Gary was employed by ASC Group, Inc., where he had held the position of Curation Manager in addition to his position as Field and Research Staff Archaeologist (Prehistory); unofficially, he also served as staff photographer, particularly for artifact photos. Gary joined the fledgling company in 1986 and was its first and best employee. He was a member of the Ohio Archaeological Council, the Columbus Landmarks Foundation, the Archaeological Conservancy, and the Archaeological Society of Ohio.

Gary came to archaeology as a kid wandering the fields and woods around Hillsboro, Ohio, collecting arrowheads. A glimpse of his library reveals when he changed from collector to serious professional - as soon as he entered the anthropology program at Wright State University, where he studied with Dr. Robert Riordan, earning his B.A. in 1982. While at Wright State he participated in numerous locational surveys along the upper Little Miami River Valley through the Laboratory of Anthropology and the Regional Archaeological Preservation Office, headed by Al Tonetti. He was a crew member during this time on various site excavations including a Woodland hilltop enclosure in Greene County, the Pollack Works. Gary also served as field supervisor on the salvage excavation of a Late Woodland/Fort Ancient site in Preble County, Ohio. From 1983 to 1985 he held a summer position as a field archaeologist at the Dayton Museum of Natural History, where he assisted J. Heilman in the excavations at the Incinerator site (SunWatch Village). This was followed by a position at Southern Methodist University in 1985 to 1986 as a laboratory analyst, where he honed and

elaborated his skills as a lithic analyst.

As noted above, he was recruited by ASC Group, Inc. in 1986 and remained with the company until his death. He was the author or co-author of more than 100 cultural resource survey reports that ranged from Phase I literature reviews through Phase III site mitigations. He directed or helped direct excavations at the Hunter I site in Muskingum County, the Stowers I and II sites in Gallia County, site 33FR810 in Franklin County, the Brady Run Rockshelter in Lawrence County, Ohio, and the Saddle site in Marshall County, WV. Gary helped design, write, and install an exhibit on the Saddle and Bluebird sites for the Delf Norona Museum in Moundsville, WV.

These brief facts about Gary's career serve as artifacts of his existence for those of us who knew him - mere points of reference for the immensely careful knowledge, talents, skills, and enthusiasm he brought to archaeology. His knowledge of fieldwork and lithic analysis, especially, are sorely missed. He was a skilled supervisor - good at directing people in their tasks, working alongside them, always getting the job done with careful attention to details and yet maintaining his sense of humor. His luck at finding artifacts was legendary in the company, yet equally valuable was his dedication to writing his reports in a timely fashion and getting them right the first time. He was a sounding board for new interpretations, new methods, new ways of looking at old data.

He taught us all, shared those skills and talents and knowledge freely - with his colleagues, with cub scouts, with high school and college interns. He was adept at speaking to school groups for career days, and for years he taught pottery workshops in the parks and loved being there in the woods with the kids. In his last days and weeks he devoted his time and remaining energy to getting his personal collections in order - filling out proper site documentation and seeing to the curation of the material. This collection will ultimately prove invaluable in our understanding of the prehistory of the Paint Creek region. The *linn skinner foundation* has undertaken the task of publishing a description of this important collection.

This short summary does not begin to capture the depth and variety of Gary's life. He knew the natural and human-made landscapes intimately, naming all the trees, knowing the calls and sights of birds in flight. He had an artist's and landscape architect's feel for creating beautiful landscapes wherever he lived. He worked tirelessly for the AIDS Healing Weekends sponsored by the United Methodist Church, and left behind a large network of family and friends.

To honor Gary's love of an contributions to Ohio archaeology the *linn skinner foundation*, a non-profit

organization whose mission is to support education and research concerning our human heritage, has established the **Gary McDaniel Grant for Archaeology**. The grant will be awarded annually to a rural high school senior who plans to major in anthropology with an emphasis on archaeology at an Ohio institution of higher education. Donations may be made to the *linn skinner foundation*, earmarked for the **Gary McDaniel Grant for Archaeology**, 4620 Indianola Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43214. All donations are tax-exempt to the fullest amount allowed by law. We expect to award the first grant in the 1996-1997 school year.

## BOARD APPROVES GRANT

The OAC Board of Directors approved a grant application from member Cheryl Johnston for the project *Hopewell Mound Group Human Skeletal Population: A Comprehensive Osteological Analysis*. The grant of \$1,000.00 is to cover the cost of supplies and materials, color slide film, photocopying, and partial travel expenses to and from the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago, where some of the human remains from the Hopewell Mound Group, those excavated by Moorehead in 1891-1892, are presently curated (the rest are at the Ohio Historical Society). The project will be completed one year after the remains are loaned to the applicant at The Ohio State University. Cheryl's dissertation committee includes OAC members Dr. N'omi Greber (Cleveland Museum of Natural History) and Dr. Christopher Carr (Arizona State University), along with Dr. Paul Sciulli (The Ohio State University).

This work is part of Cheryl's Ph.D. dissertation research. Data will be collected according to procedures recommended by the Paleopathology Association's Skeletal Database Committee, as described in *Standards for Data Collection From Human Skeletal Remains*. These data and those derived from human skeletal remains from several other Hopewell sites (Ater, Seip, Harness, and Mound City) will be used to address a number of research questions, including what is the demographic nature of the Hopewell Mound Group population, what type of postmarital residence pattern was used, what is the nature of the biological relationship between individuals represented by a single skeletal element ("trophies") interred with a complete individual to complete inhumations, what is the nature of the biological relationship between individuals represented by drilled or worked elements to complete inhumations, and how do age, sex, and stature vary with differing amounts and types of grave goods?

As with all OAC grants, Cheryl is required to report

to the membership on her work following its completion. For further information about this project contact Cheryl Johnston at 920 W. 11th Ave., Columbus, OH 43212, telephone (614) 488-3411. For further information about the OAC grants program contact Grant Committee Chair Franco Ruffini.

## USING ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

*Using Archaeological Resources in Economic Development* was the title of a session at the May 1-3, 1996, *Historic Preservation As Economic Development* conference in Akron. The session was designed to show that certain types of archaeological sites can be integrated into local socio-economic systems to enhance both the quality of life and sustainable economic development opportunities for communities and regions. The audience was mostly non-archaeologists. This session featured two presentations, the abstracts of which follow. A third presentation was scheduled, but the presenter was unable to attend. This abstract is also included. The OAC was a cosponsor of this conference.

*Great Lakes Maritime Heritage Tourism: Friend or Foe?* Ken Vrana, Director, Center for Maritime and Underwater Resource Management, Michigan State University.

The Great Lakes basin contains thousands of well-preserved historical and archaeological sites that contribute to an important regional maritime heritage. This heritage is marketed as tourism attractions and images of the past. The marketing of heritage resources provides economic impacts to local and regional economies. There are also physical impacts to these resources, and impacts to social and environmental systems within coastal communities. Social researchers, regional planners, and public resource managers have developed some methods for evaluating the benefits and costs of heritage tourism. The use of these methods in theory and practice are discussed in relation to the development of Michigan underwater preserves and the concept of maritime heritage parks.

*Building Archaeotourism into the Economic Growth and Development of Pensacola, Florida.* Judith A. Bense, Director, Archaeology Institute, and Full Professor of Anthropology/Archaeology, University of West Florida.

Pensacola is not Miami Beach; in fact, it is in extreme northwest Florida, 750 miles from Miami. While we fondly call it the "other" Florida, what we really mean is that we have lower population and are poorer than south Florida. As a result we are constantly looking for

new ways to pull visitors off the interstates into Pensacola. Our economy is about 50% military/government workers and summer tourists. Our main tourist attractions are the beaches in the summer season and military museums and forts. Downtown Pensacola has developed a historic theme and has local museums. With the cutbacks in military spending a redevelopment committee was formed to find other resources Pensacola can develop. One of those resources is archaeology.

Over the last few years the local university and preservation board developed an experimental demonstration public archaeology project to determine if the public is interested in archaeology if it is presented in a user-friendly manner. The publicity and success of this project, the Pensacola Colonial Archaeological Trail in downtown Pensacola, was successful. It has blended into the above-ground historical theme and there is little maintenance to the outdoor exhibits. More importantly, there is a new appreciation for archaeology in Pensacola as an economic resource that is good for the community. New public archaeology projects are underway at the Naval Air Station and at an underwater Colonial shipwreck in Pensacola Bay. This presentation will present the details of these projects and the concept of Archaeotourism.

*More Than Compliance: The Value of Archaeological Resources in a Sustainable Heritage Preservation System.* Paula A. Zitzler, Industrial Archaeologist and Heritage Education Specialist, Consultant to the Southwestern Pennsylvania Heritage Preservation Commission.

Within the nine-county region that the Southwestern Pennsylvania Heritage Preservation Commission calls home there are thousands of archaeological resources. What is the value of these resources in a system of heritage tourism and historic preservation? How do they contribute to the sustainability of the system? This presentation will illustrate some of the ways archaeological resources have enriched the development of the *Path of Progress*, the first national heritage route, and what these resources may mean in the long-term sustainability of the system.

## GRANTS

The National Center for Preservation Technology and Training will consider proposals for 1997 *Preservation Technology and Training Grant* awards for work in archeology, historic architecture, historic landscapes, objects and materials conservation, and interpretation. 1997 PTT Grants will be awarded competitively. The deadline for submitting proposals is December 20, 1996. 1997 PTT Grants will be awarded subject to funding availability. The complete 1997 PTT Grants announce-

ment - including the request for proposals and instructions on how to prepare and submit applications - will be available by mid-October exclusively via NCPTT's fax-on-demand computer (318/357-3214), NCPTT's gopher sites (gopher://gopher.ncptt.nps.gov, under About the Center.../Announcements/1997 Preservation Technology and Training Grants), and World Wide Web page (<http://www.cr.nps.gov/ncptt/>). Note that prospective applicants should not rely on previous years' versions.

## PUBLICATIONS

The *Radiocarbon Database for Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia* has recently been published in the *West Virginia Archaeologist* in Volume 47 (1 & 2), Spring & Fall, 1995. The radiocarbon database contains over 1,900 dates, many from Ohio. The issue can be purchased from the West Virginia Archaeological Society (publisher of the *West Virginia Archaeologist*) for \$12.00 plus \$1.50 shipping and handling. Copies can be purchased by contacting Shaune Skinner, c/o ASC Group, Inc., 4620 Indianola Avenue, Columbus, OH 43214, (614) 268-2514. Make checks payable to the West Virginia Archaeological Society.

A *Bibliography of Muskingum County Archaeology, 1795 through 1995*, was recently published (1996) as Occasional Papers in Muskingum Valley Archaeology No. 18 by The Muskingum Valley Archaeology Survey. This book, co-authored by OAC member Jeff Carskadden and colleague James Morton, is only the second county-level archaeology bibliography in Ohio. The first was Mark Seeman's *Archaeology in Ross County, A Bibliography*, published by the National Park Service in 1995.

This publication includes 495 annotated entries, believed to be all references pertaining to Muskingum County archaeology since 1795. Annotated entries include books, journal articles, unpublished 19th and early 20th century letters and diaries, local newspaper articles, and contract archaeology reports, including those written since the publication of Murphy and Tonetti's *A Bibliography of Ohio Contract Archaeology: 1946-1985*, published in 1987. Pertinent quotes from most of the early references are reproduced so that the researcher may not have to search for the original documents.

This publication includes an 84 page introduction dealing with the history of archaeological research in Muskingum County. This section includes a history of the excavations at such well known sites as Philo II, Richards, Bosman, and the Philo Mound Group. A number of previously unpublished site excavation plans are also reproduced, along with a map of the county showing the locations of the areas surveyed and a list of

the county's 637 archaeological sites recorded on Ohio Archaeological Inventory forms with the Ohio Historic Preservation Office through 1995. All known published references to each of these sites is included. This should prove useful to anyone conducting contract archaeology surveys in the county.

This hardback publication is 388 pages, includes 26 figures, 6 tables, and an index. Cost is \$30.00 per copy, postage paid. It can be ordered from Jeff Carskadden, 24 South 6th St., Zanesville, OH 43701.

Hopewell Culture National Historical Park recently published its *Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Assessment*. This document is now available for public review and comment. As a unit of the National Park Service, Hopewell Culture National Historical Park is required to have an approved General Management Plan (GMP). The GMP sets forth a management concept for the park; establishes a role for the park within the context of regional trends and plans for conservation, recreation, transportation, economic development and other regional issues; and identifies strategies for resolving issues and achieving management objectives usually within a period of 15 years. Generally two types of strategies are presented - those required to properly manage the park's resources, and those required to provide for appropriate visitor use and interpretation of the resources. Based on these strategies, programs, actions and support facilities necessary for efficient park operation and visitor use are identified. Other park plans are consistent with the direction established by the GMP.

The GMP is a public document subject to review by organizations, agencies and individuals with an interest in the management of the park and its resources. A copy of the draft GMP will be available for public review through November 25, 1996 at the park's visitor center and Administration Building. For additional information please contact the park at (614) 774-1126. [Editor's (Tonetti) note: The Ohio Archaeological Council has a copy of the Draft GMP on file at the Ohio Historical Center]

Hopewell Culture National Historical Park and the National Park Service recently completed *People Who Came Before: The Hopewell Culture Curriculum Guide*. It will be tested in schools in Ross County, Columbus, and elsewhere, and available for wider distribution early in 1997. It is linked to the Ohio social studies curricula and is keyed to proficiency test strands and learner outcomes. The scope of the guide ties into topics and issues relevant to social studies curriculum and archaeological concerns throughout the region.

The guide was developed over two years to help teachers meet some of their mandated curriculum while making teachers and students aware of the rich cultural

history in southern Ohio. Activities and lesson plans for teachers can be used in the classroom and at the park. The guide is targeted at fourth through sixth grade classes.

As a companion to the guide, traveling trunks are being developed. The trunks are educational resource kits that the park will make available to teachers and provide out-of-classroom experience for students who cannot make field trips to the park. The Mead Corporation provided a grant to the park to develop the trunks. For more information about the guide or the traveling trunks or to arrange to use one in the classroom contact the park at (614) 774-1126.

## CONFERENCES

The 63rd Annual Meeting of the Eastern States Archeological Federation was recently held in Huntington, West Virginia. The following abstracts from this conference represent presentations of research by OAC members and/or on archaeological sites in Ohio. The abstracts are reprinted here courtesy of the Program Chair and OAC member Robert F. Maslowski.

Sarah E. Adams (NES, Inc.) *The Williams Tenant House Site 33CT561: An Examination of Site Usage Through Time.* During the mitigation of four prehistoric sites along the East Fork of the Little Miami River in eastern Clermont County, one historic site was located and examined. Because the project was not under a federal mandate, excavation of the historic site was set aside as a public education endeavor. Two field schools, attended by local high school students, were conducted, thus combining the archaeological process and public cooperation and education with extremely positive results. The Williams Tenant House site, 33CT561, formerly known as the Vorhees Site, clearly exhibits traits of changing usage through time. It progressed from what appears to be a primary or secondary residence of a middle to lower-upper class family to that of a lower class tenant structure and, finally, to the status of outbuilding and/or barn. The artifact assemblage and historic document research agree with this determination. The overall history of the site indicates that its period of occupation spanned ca. forty years, from 1820-1860, with its life as an outbuilding extending beyond this period at least thirty years. This examination of site usage will summarize the history of the site, up to and including its excavation, documenting its period of occupancy through detailed historical research and artifact analysis.

Annette G. Ericksen (OAC member) (ASC Group, Inc.) *Early Archaic Settlement and Land Use Patterns in the Wakatomika Creek Drainage, Muskingum County, Ohio.* Archaeological survey of the Wakatomika Creek

drainage, a tributary of the Muskingum River in Muskingum County, Ohio conducted by ASC Group, Inc., has identified a relatively dense Early Archaic occupation of the region. These sites are associated with glacial outwash terraces and upland ridges. The predominance of Early Archaic sites is resultant, in part, to the presence of high grade chert outcrops including the Upper Mercer and Vanport members. Initial analysis of the lithic assemblage from these sites has indicated that although lithic reduction and tool manufacture were conducted, other subsistence activities were also carried out. Site location and function is examined in light of environmental parameters and socio-economic changes from the late Paleo-Indian period that precedes them.

Timothy King (NES, Inc.) *The "Sand Ridge" Site (33CT159a). a Multicomponent Habitation in Southwest Ohio.* Prior to developing land along the East Fork of the Little Miami River a Cincinnati area developer financed archaeological excavations at several prehistoric sites. One of these sites has been known as the "Sand Ridge" since at least the 1880s. Even then the site was identified both by its geologic uniqueness and the presence of prehistoric Native American archaeological materials. This presentation details the mitigation effort undertaken at the site by NES, Inc. Excavation revealed a multicomponent occupation that included most of the Archaic period as well as the Late Woodland. Features included hearths, pits, midden deposits, and burials dating to the Archaic period.

Jeannine Kreinbrink (NES, Inc.) *Prehistoric Settlement Patterns Along the Little Miami Drainage.* Several prehistoric sites excavated in the spring of 1996 by NES, Inc. are situated on terraces along the East Fork of the Little Miami River in Clermont County, Ohio. The complex terrace and floodplain geology of the drainage has created a series of terraces that lay perpendicular to current river flow direction. These old landforms contain evidence of prehistoric occupations spanning much of the Archaic period as well as some utilization during the Late Woodland. Differential use of these terraces through time is evident based on the lack of utilization during certain periods of time. This study compares these sites with other sites along the Little Miami River drainage in terms of topographic setting, site type, and time period utilized.

James A. Robertson (OAC member) (Commonwealth Cultural Resources Group) *Ten Thousand Years of Prehistory at Seneca Rocks.* Data recovery excavations at the Mouth of Seneca Site (46PD1) revealed intermittent occupation for approximately ten thousand years. One hundred fifty years of plowing has destroyed *in situ* deposits of most of the earlier occupations. Sub-plowzone features and postmolds comprise the bulk of the remaining *in situ* deposits. Some features date to the Late Archaic and Middle Woodland time periods but



the predominate occupation is represented by portions of two Late Woodland villages. This paper summarizes the cultural and radiocarbon chronology and spatial distribution of the occupations at the Mouth of Seneca Site.

James A. Robertson (OAC member) and Daniel G. Landis (Commonwealth Cultural Resources Group) *Prehistoric Lithic Assemblages at the Mouth of Seneca Site*. Lithic artifacts are by far the most ubiquitous prehistoric cultural remains recovered from the Mouth of Seneca Site. Manufacturing technologies and tool assemblages are examined in relation to material type categories, feature contexts, and temporally or spatially distinct occupations. Cultural selection of material for specific reduction technologies and differences in tool assemblage composition are considered in conjunction with other elements of human behavior.

Mark F. Seeman (OAC member) (Kent State University) *GE Mound: Modern Controversy and the Hopewell Past*. The GE Mound was one of the most spectacular Hopewell sites ever discovered in the Ohio Valley. What can be pieced together on site structure and assemblage composition supports an expanded interpretation of Hopewell interaction, emphasizing both social and symbolic relationships. At the same time, the partial destruction of the site by highway construction, the Federal prosecution of looters, and the quick reburial of cultural remains by Native Americans assures that the site has importance far beyond regional culture history. The GE Mound provides an appropriate context for addressing a variety of issues facing contemporary archaeology in eastern North America.

David M. Stothers and Jason M. Koralewski (University of Toledo) *Evidence for Huber-Fisher, Sandusky and Whittlesey Tradition Interaction: New Perspectives on the Origins and Identity of the 'Fire Nation' Confederacy*. Recent excavations at Miller's Ridge, a Sandusky Tradition village site located south of Sandusky Bay in northcentral Ohio, has recently disclosed an encircling ditch enclosure, overlapping internal habitation structures and associated pit features containing Fort Meigs phase and contemporary, but foreign derived northeastern Ohio Whittlesey Tradition ceramic types. Distinctive ceramic types of both the Sandusky and Whittlesey Traditions, as well as vessel segments which display a miscegenation of attributes and stylistic motifs which are characteristic of the Sandusky, Whittlesey, and Huber-Fisher Traditions were recovered from within the same subsurface features, demonstrating their absolute association. This ceramic association is suggested to represent a Berrien phase population influx relating to the earlier Sandusky Tradition Wolf phase radiation from northcentral Ohio ca. A.D. 1350, which established independent but related "daughter" populations in the western Lake Erie Maumee River Valley, the eastern Lake St. Clair drainage area, the

Saginaw Valley of eastcentral Michigan and the southwestern Michigan drainage area, which is postulated to have established the foundations of the independent but culturally, ethnically and linguistically related tribal groups which comprised the 'Fire Nation' Confederacy of early historic times. The 'La Salle Fillested' and 'Danner Cordmarked' ceramic types which characterized certain protohistoric 17th century native populations in Wisconsin and Illinois are stylistic analogues, respectively, for the Whittlesey Tradition 'Tuttle Hill Notched' and the Sandusky Tradition 'Fort Meigs Notched Applique' ceramic types, which are, respectively, suggested to represent the historically documented Kickapoo and Mascouten, both of whom represented displaced tribal groups whose prehistoric homelands were located in the southern Lake Erie drainage region.

At the recently held 41st Midwest Archaeological Conference the following papers were presented by OAC members or on archaeological site research in Ohio:

Tom Berres (OAC member) (University of Illinois) *Oneota Interaction in the Prairie Peninsula: New Perspectives on Langford and Fisher Cultures*. This paper presents insights on the dynamic nature of Oneota societies in the Prairie Peninsula by examining the relationship between Fisher and Langford manifestations occupying the Rock River Valley in northern Illinois. Interpretations are based upon analyses of ceramic vessels and faunal remains recovered from feature contexts at two riverine habitation sites, Lawrence and Keeshin Farms. The conclusions suggest that migration and interaction among these non-hierarchical peer polities, characterized by a kin-based system of reciprocity and broad-spectrum subsistence economies focused on productive wetland habitats, account for their long-term success.

Jeb Bowen (OAC member) (Ohio Historical Society) *Agate Basin-type Points of the Greater Ohio Region*. A few dozen Agate Basin-type points have been reported from the greater Ohio region. An approximately 20,000 square-km Upper Mercer chert lithic supply zone can be identified. Two alternative hypotheses regarding the peoples who manufactured Agate Basin-type points in the Ohio region 10,000 years ago are explored. One is that these people denote a population influx from the west. The other is that they reflect a shift in projectile point form by local populations.

Robert Cook (Dayton Museum of Natural History) *Reconstruction as a Tool for Exploring Archaeological Data: Multiple Interpretations of the Past at the Incinerator Site (33MY57), Montgomery County, Ohio*. House reconstructions at the Incinerator Site, an Anderson Phase (Middle) Fort Ancient village in Dayton, Ohio,

have been based on archaeological data, ethnographic analogies, and ethnohistoric documentation. After a review of these efforts is presented it is argued each provides unique data that assist in the reconstruction process. Archaeological data should always be the primary source and can often, alone, support multiple interpretations (i.e., equifinality). The variety of archaeological reconstruction hypotheses are testable by further excavations; experimentation in these structures can determine functional aspects that do not preserve archaeologically (e.g., thermal efficiency), and ethnography and ethnohistory can lend critical insight into construction methods and details that have not been recovered archaeologically.

Matthew P. Purtil (OAC member) (KEMRON Environmental Services, Inc.) *Preliminary Investigations of the Late Fort Ancient Component at the Driving Range Site (33 Ha 586), Southwestern Ohio.* In 1992 archaeological investigations for a proposed sewerline in southwestern Ohio resulted in the discovery of the Driving Range Site (33 HA 586). Located near the Little Miami River the Driving Range Site represents a multicomponent occupation characterized by a diverse artifact assemblage and associated features. This study presents preliminary results of an analysis concerning the Late Fort Ancient (ca. A.D. 1400) component of the site. Specifically, this report focuses on a descriptive analysis of the artifact assemblage, intra-site organization, and inter-regional site comparisons.

Bret J. Ruby (National Park Service, Hopewell Culture National Historical Park) *Current Research at Hopewell Culture National Historical Park: Recent Excavations at the Hopeton and Spruce Hill Works, Ross County, Ohio.* Hopewell Culture National Historical Park was created in 1992 through legislation expanding the former Mound City Group National Monument to include four additional Hopewellian mound and earthwork centers in Ross County, Ohio (Hopeton, Hopewell, High Bank, and Seip). A long-term research program has been initiated to provide a baseline assessment of the new park units and to evaluate additional sites in the region for possible inclusion in the park. This report will describe recent excavations in the earthwork walls at the Hopeton Works and at the Spruce Hill Works, a unique Hopewellian stone-walled hilltop enclosure.

Bret J. Ruby and Scott J. Troy (OAC member) (National Park Service, Hopewell Culture National Historical Park) *Hopewell Centers in Context: Intensive Survey in the Vicinity of the Hopeton Works, Hopewell Culture National Historical Park, Ross County, Ohio.* The Hopeton Works constitute a major Hopewellian mound and earthwork center in Ross County, Ohio. Recent acquisition of the Hopeton Works as a unit of Hopewell Culture National Historical Park has prompted intensive surface surveys and limited test excavations in the vicinity of this monumental center. This report will describe the nature

and distribution of artifacts and features in the vicinity of the Hopeton Works to provide a more comprehensive context for the interpretation of Hopewellian mound and earthwork centers.

Lauren E. Sieg (OAC member) (University of Illinois - Urbana-Champaign) *The Middle Woodland Ceramic Assemblage from the Fort Ancient Site, Ohio.* Pottery assemblages from Middle Woodland hilltop enclosures in Ohio are not widely known, but excavations at the Fort Ancient site between 1990 and 1993 have produced a large collection of Hopewell ceramics. The sherds represent a wide range of contexts, from domestic areas to stone pavements lining the edge of ponds. This paper examines the variability and trends in the Fort Ancient hilltop enclosure ceramic assemblage. The pottery is then compared to ceramics from other Ohio Valley Middle Woodland sites, including both hilltop enclosures and mound sites.

Kenneth B. Tankersley (Kent State University) and Richard Hendricks (Indian Trail Caverns) *Sheriden: A Clovis-Cave Site in Northern Ohio.* Sheriden Cave (33 WY 252) is a deeply buried, stratified and radio-carbon dated Clovis-Cave site located in northwestern Wyandot County, Ohio. The cave is part of the Hendricks Cave System which includes Hendricks Cave (33 WY 1) and Indian Trail Caverns. Clovis artifacts recovered from the cave include a beveled foreshaft, Clovis blade, Clovis point preform, two bifacial thinning flakes, chert debitage, large mammal bone with cut marks, and burned bone. Most of the flaked-stone artifacts are manufactured from nonlocal cherts and were recovered from a late Pleistocene stratum containing the osseous remains of extirpated or extinct species such as *Rangifer*, *Ursus*, *Cervalces*, *Odocoileus*, *Platygonus*, *Castoroides*, and *Arctodus*.

Contract archaeologists and others may be interested in *Preservation of What, For Whom? A Critical Look at Historical Significance*, a March 20-22, 1997 conference sponsored by the National Council for Preservation Education, the National Park Service, and Goucher College. The conference will take place at Goucher College, Towson, Maryland, between Baltimore and Washington, DC. This is the first in a series of conferences focusing on critical issues in the field of historic preservation. It will examine the concept of historical significance as it has been, and as it might be, applied to historic preservation public policy and professional practice.

A major purpose of this conference is to bring together persons with varied backgrounds to exchange ideas. Anthropologists, archaeologists, architectural historians, cultural historians, cultural and historical geographers, folklorists, landscape historians, social and urban historians, etc., are among the targeted audiences. Publication of the proceedings is anticipated.

Topics to be addressed include the challenge of communicating historical significance to popular and professional audiences in the private and public sectors, differing views of significance among contributing historical and related disciplines, who defines historical significance, ongoing changes in the concept(s) of historical significance, and relationships between historical significance and taste.

For further information about the conference contact Michael A. Tomlan, Project Director, National Council for Preservation Education, 210 West Sibley Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853, telephone (607) 255-7261, FAX (607) 255-1971, email [mat4@cornell.edu](mailto:mat4@cornell.edu).

### **PUBLIC HISTORY AWARD**

Contract archaeology firms and others in the field of historic archaeology should note that at its spring 1996 annual meeting the Ohio Academy of History approved a Public History Project Awards Program to focus attention on the accomplishments of public historians. The first public history awards will be presented at the Academy's 1997 annual spring meeting.

To be nominated a public history project, publication, or program must have been accomplished within the previous two years and completed by January 15 of the award year. The postmark deadline for submission of nominations is January 15 of the award year.

Public history fields included in this awards program include exhibits, publications, audio/visual documentaries, oral history, public programs, symposia, archival projects, and historic preservation education programs. Nominations are encouraged which demonstrate meritorious achievement beyond the routine functions of everyday work.

Nominations must demonstrate that original research adds to a greater understanding of the past, creativity in the way the project, program, or publication is organized and presented, originality or uniqueness in design and historical interpretation, accomplish a goal of educating or communicating with the intended audience, and follow commonly accepted rules of evidence and logic in providing proof of statements, facts, and conclusions.

Nomination forms and general rules can be received from the Local History Office, Ohio Historical Society, 1982 Velma Avenue, Columbus, OH 43211-2497, telephone (614) 297-2340.

## **ARCHAEOLOGY AND EDUCATION INTERNET ADDRESSES**

Archaeology: information and review of sites at  
<http://www.lib.uconn.edu/~lizee/WebRev/archonw3.html>

Archaeology and anthropology for K-12 teachers at  
<http://www.execpc.com/~dboals/arch.html>

Archaeology Magazine at  
<http://www.he.net/~archaeol/index.html2>

ArchNet at  
<http://spirit.lib.uconn.edu/ArchNet/ArchNet.html>

Chaco Culture National Historic Park at  
<http://www.chaco.com/park/>

Crow Canyon Archaeological Center at  
<http://www.swcolo.org/Tourism/Archaeology/CrowCanyon.html>

Florida archaeology at  
<http://www.dos.state.fl.us/dostate/dhr>

Jamestown Historic Site at  
<http://www.widomaker.com/~apva/>

MayaQuest at  
<http://www.mecc.com/mayaquest.html>

National Education Standards for history at  
<http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/nchs/>  
for math at  
<http://www.enc.org/online/NCTM/280dtoc1.html>  
for science at  
<http://www.nap.edu/nap/online/nses/html/>  
for Standards summary at  
<http://www.mcrcel.org/standards-benchmarks/docs/contents.html>

National Science Foundation at  
<http://www.nsf.gov>

Native American resources at  
<http://hanksville.phast.umass.edu/misc/NAresources.html>

Newton's Apple - archaeology at  
<http://ericir.syr.edu/Projects/Newton/11/archeology.html>

Public education in archaeology at  
<http://www.usd.edu/anth/pubed.html>

Pueblo Cultural Center at  
<http://hanksville.phast.umass.edu/defs/independent/PCC/PCC.html>

Social studies lesson plans and resources at  
<http://www.csun.edu/~hcedu013/>

Society for American Archaeology at  
<http://www.saa.org>

Southwest Archaeology Group at  
<http://seamonkey.ed.asu.edu/swa/>

Time Traveler at  
<http://id-archserve.ucsb.edu/timetraveler/main.html>

### OTHER WEB SITE INFORMATION

The West Virginia Archaeological Research Library can be found on the Internet at the following address:  
<http://www.wolc.wvnet.edu/wvarl/archp.html>.

Anthropology Resources on the Internet, compiled by Allen Lutins, is a comprehensive list of Internet Resources directly relevant to anthropology and archaeology. It's URL is:  
<http://www.nitehawk.com/alleycat/anth-faq.html>.

The Kennewick Man - the debate that spans 9,000 years is a WWW site created by the Tri-City Herald, a Washington state newspaper, to document the controversy over the dating and study of the "Kennewick Man". It's homepage can be found at:  
<http://www.tri-cityherald.com/bones/>.

### CALL FOR PAPERS

The Fourteenth Annual Kentucky Heritage Council Archaeological Conference will be held at Natural Bridge State Resort Park in Slade, Kentucky, March 14-16, 1997.

Those interested in presenting a paper should send an abstract no later than January 10, 1997 to David Pollack, Kentucky Heritage Council, 300 Washington St., Frankfort, KY 40601, telephone (502)564-7005. Participants will be allocated 20 minutes for paper presentations and selected papers from the conference will be assembled and published by the Kentucky Heritage Council. The maximum length of papers accepted for publication is 40 double spaced pages. Information on the format of conference papers will be provided to participants at a later date.

## OFFICERS OF THE OHIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL COUNCIL

President: Bob Genheimer (513) 345-8503  
 President-Elect & Secretary: Martha Otto (614) 297-2641  
 Treasurer: vacant  
 Archivist: vacant  
 Trustees: Kolleen Butterworth, Chair, Nomination Committee, (614) 466-5105; Robert Riordan, Co-Chair, Education Committee, (513) 873-2667; Franco Ruffini, Chair, Grants Committee, (614) 297-2470; Al Tonetti, Co-Chair, Education Committee, (614) 297-2646; Kent Vickery, Chair, Membership Committee (513) 556-5787.

PLEASE ADDRESS ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO  
 THE OHIO ARCHAEOLOGICAL COUNCIL,  
 P.O. BOX 82012, 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) 292-3687  
 Al Tonetti ..... (614) 297-2646

Ms. Martha Potter Otto  
 Ohio Historical Society  
 1982 Velma Avenue  
 Columbus, OH 43211