



NEWSLETTER

Volume 6, Number 3

August, 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 Al, 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 lp Piotrow@magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu.

Len Piotrowski

PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

Mark F. Seeman

Everything changes, including the study of the past. Archaeologists, consciously or unconsciously, change the questions they ask. New standards develop, and what was once "normal" becomes *passee*. New standards require new conceptual tools, and in roughly chronological order, terms like "culture area," "focus," "primary forest efficiency," "band," "sedentism," "forager," "organization of technology," and "stewardship" have become part of the professional lexicon. These terms are not just fads or gimmicks, but developments that offer useful ways of organizing our thinking about archaeological problems. Not using new constructs in one's work does, I suspect, signal not simply an unwillingness to be faddish, but a real inability to keep up with the evolution of the field. American archaeology is continually changing, and having read a few articles on this subject lately, and also having talked recently with several OAC members whose archaeological practices are different from my own, I'd like to examine briefly in this column an important paradox. It seems that today we are faced with the task of creating an archaeology that is both more general *and* more specific than anything we have yet undertaken in Ohio.

It is estimated that over 70 percent of the professional archaeologists in this country are engaged in Cultural Resource Management. A review of our own membership suggests comparable figures. Many people working

in CRM feel that their academic training did not properly prepare them to function efficiently as professionals, and that new students continue to be short-changed. In a recent issue of *"The Grapevine,"* the Gray and Pape newsletter, Donald and Karessa Weir deplore the preparation of archaeology students for CRM work, and call for a total restructuring of academic programs. In particular, they decry the lack of technical training - a knowledge of surveying, mapping, excavation, and analytical skills. The implication seems to be that academic programs need to offer more specific, technical courses of study.

In order to see if these concerns were reflected in our own region, I had some interesting conversations with Kevin Pape (Gray & Pape, Inc.) and Charles Niquette (Cultural Resource Analysts, Inc.). Both agreed with the Weir's that professional training needs to be modified, but in both cases, the number one priority was not on increasing the number of specific analytical skills, but on more general abilities. Especially important to Chuck and Kevin were the ability of supervisory archaeologists to manage people, to organize and prioritize tasks, to develop and justify research proposals, to produce written reports in a timely fashion, and to develop positive working relationships with clients. Chuck, in particular, felt it was important that prospective middle and upper level employees have a good knowledge of *both* prehistoric and historic archaeology, and that they be able to move seemingly through a broad range of circumstances. Specialists with limited interests do not fit well into most CRM circumstances. In contrast to the Weirs' position, the conclusion might be that we are training our future archaeologists too narrowly (courses in archaeological business ethics, archaeological psychology, archaeological technical writing, and archaeological administration are not on any college curriculum that I know in Ohio).

IN THIS ISSUE

Editor's Comments	1
President's Column	1
OAC Statement: G.E. Mound	3
OHPO	4
National Historic Landmark Theme Study	5
Annual Conference Papers	5
"An Archaeological Study of a Prehistoric Site..."	6
Book Review	7
Publications and Position Openings	9

To be fair, both Niquette and Pape were concerned with some shortcomings in specific technical areas, in the sense of the Weirs'. For example, both felt it was important that prospective employees know how to find, identify, and properly locate archaeological sites in survey situations. Given the nature of most CRM projects, surveying skills take priority over excavation skills, a reversed emphasis from most academic training.

Where do we go from here? The addition of new courses to cover areas of concern for both a more specifically skilled and a more generalized future archaeologist will be hard to justify to university administrators who see enrollment figures as the bottom line. Further, at a time when we are increasingly being told to "do more with less," the prospect of hiring additional faculty members to cover all of these prospective courses is not a good bet. Several possibilities come to mind.

We could develop specific programs or tracts for future professionals explicitly interested in CRM work. The Masters of Science program at Ball State University provides a good regional model. Here, in addition to specific courses relating to CRM law and procedures, students have an opportunity to participate in a contract program that did over a million dollars in business over the past 10 years. Surprisingly, when I asked Chuck Niquette if employees coming from this kind of technical program did better than employees with other backgrounds, he said "No, they are just more arrogant." He went on to speculate that in many so-called CRM programs students have very few decision-making opportunities or real responsibilities. Perhaps a more controversial concern is whether or not public universities should put themselves in the position of competing for contracts with private firms in the first place.

Another model could be based on increased, formal cooperation between consulting companies, government agencies, and universities. These could come via the "information highway," or more traditionally, through guest lectures from established CRM professionals, the expansion of internship programs, and other means of collaboration. Bill Dancy informs me that Ohio State has an internship program with Archaeological Services Consultants, Inc. in the Columbus area. I would like to see our organization take a lead in exploring these kinds of prospects.

Before bringing this column on our shifting priorities to a close, it is perhaps necessary to remember that the CRM tail can never really wag the archaeological dog. True, the importance of training 70 to 80 percent of the profession for their future occupation would seem to represent an absolutely huge wagging tail, but I think the body of the dog continues to be our responsibility to educate the general public - not future professionals. Almost all of the people who view a museum display or

take an undergraduate course in archaeology are not interested in being "trained" to become professionals. They want to learn something important and interesting - as opposed to trivial - about the past. I think "interesting and important" are the real challenges; whether they lie in the area of traditional culture history, or in the area of increased stewardship for precious cultural resources. For example, I think many Ohioans were interested to hear this month about Dave Bush and Mike Pratt's discovery of an escape tunnel at the Confederate prison on Johnson's Island in Sandusky Bay. In contrast, and to paraphrase John Jameson, most Ohioans couldn't care less about what a Stanley point is, or what "seasonal round" means.

I agree with people such as Jameson and Brian Fagan who see our primary mission for the future as one of public education. Public involvement is absolutely critical, regardless of venue. Thus, in addition to any debate over *professional* training - specific or general - is the additional challenge of presentation. If your experience recently is anything like mine, it seems we are being asked to be all things to all people - do original research, teach, get extramural funding, speak at the local middle school, help avocational archaeologists, and so forth. We can not do everything, and archaeological triage isn't fun. In dealing with the specific mandates of CRM-driven training and public education, I suspect both stronger cooperation and an increased division of labor are on the Ohio horizon.

Further reading:

Athens, J. Stephen
1993 Cultural Resource Management and Academic Responsibility in Archaeology: A Further Comment. *SAA Bulletin* 11(2):6-7.

Fagan, Brian
1993 The Arrogant Archaeologist. *Archaeology* 46(6):14-16.

Jameson, John H., Jr.
1994 Public Education: An Emerging Emphasis in the Practice of Archaeology. *Archaeology and Public Education* 4(4):1,11.

1994 The Importance of Public Outreach Programs in Archaeology. *SAA Bulletin* 12(3):16-17.

Schuldenrein, Joseph
1992 Cultural Resource Management and the Academic Responsibility in Archaeology: A Rejoinder to Duke. *SAA Bulletin* 10(5):3.

Weir, Donald J. and Karessa E.
1994 Archaeological Training: A Time for Cooperation. *The Grapevine* 4(4):1-3.

**STATEMENT OF THE OHIO
ARCHAEOLOGICAL COUNCIL
RE: THE POSSIBLE REBURIAL
OF THE "GE" MOUND
ARTIFACTS**

May 18, 1994

The Ohio Archaeological Council (OAC) is the state's organization of professional archaeologists and is dedicated to the preservation and protection of Ohio's cultural resources, to public education, and to the advancement of archaeology. The Council was founded in 1975 and is comprised of approximately 90 members.

The GE Mound is one of the largest known Hopewell mounds and represents perhaps the most important collection of Hopewell artifacts uncovered this century. Many of the items are unprecedented, and the total collection offers an invaluable opportunity to study the social, political, technological, and mortuary aspects of this sophisticated prehistoric culture. Proper curation of these artifacts is not disrespectful, indeed, just the opposite. The GE Mound cultural remains and the knowledge they contain represent an important chapter in the human occupation of this land, and hence belong to all Americans to cherish and respect. Their loss through reburial will likewise be a loss to all Americans.

Because of the considerable amount of cultural information they contain, artifacts can be likened to books which can be "read" by applying various analytical methods. As succeeding generations of scientists devise new ways of examining these artifacts, they continue to provide us with more cultural information, thereby adding new chapters to the existing volumes. However, the act of destroying, dispersing, or making them inaccessible through reburial is comparable to burning books which have yet to be read.

The position statement drafted by the Council for the Conservation of Indiana Archaeology (CCIA) pertaining to the subject reburial was submitted to the OAC Board of Trustees [Directors] for review on April 6, 1994. At that time, the Board voted unanimously to support the position of the CCIA in this matter.

Therefore, the OAC wishes to record its opposition to the reburial of the GE Mound artifacts, and offer the following comments:

1) Reburial of these artifacts would not only destroy the physical record of this unique Hopewell site, but it would also prevent using them to educate the public on

prehistoric Native American culture either through study or interpretive exhibition.

2) The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) of 1990 was passed in response to an overwhelming public demand for protection of Native American graves on Federal and Tribal lands and to establish a national policy and procedure for the treatment of human remains administered by Federal agencies or institutions receiving Federal funding. This legislation was officially endorsed for passage by most major archaeological and Native American organizations in the United States. It has established an effective process whereby archaeologists and Native Americans consult together on the treatment and disposition of human remains. Since its passage, NAGPRA has become a national standard which has been used as a model even in instances beyond its jurisdiction. It is unclear as to why the principles of NAGPRA cannot be followed in good faith in the treatment of the GE Mound remains to incorporate the concerns of all interested parties. The General Electric Company can avail itself of this nationally recognized process by turning the subject artifacts over [to] the National Park Service or other educational institutions receiving Federal funds. This could alleviate the polarization which has developed.

3) Any scientific analysis which is conducted on the GE artifacts must not only be as detailed and technological as possible, but must include the participation of recognized experts in Hopewell archaeology. Such an analysis must also be submitted for peer review amongst the professional archaeological community. Anything less would not provide an accurate or acceptable documentation of this extraordinary collection.

4) Reburial of the GE Mound artifacts without review under an established process such as NAGPRA provides will set a damaging precedent for the future enforcement of cultural resource laws. Law enforcement officials and agencies will undoubtedly hesitate to prosecute such cases under the Archaeological Resources Protection Act and various local and state protection laws if they think that the recovered remains will be reburied.

5) Reburial is not the ideal protective action for these unique materials. It is highly probable that they will be re-looted, especially in view of their known commercial value and the publicity given to the case under which the original looters were prosecuted. It has been continually proven that no cultural resource site is either secret or vandal-proof.

In summary, the Ohio Archaeological Council officially objects to the reburial of the GE Mound artifacts, and strongly urges that curation, long-term study, and public education of this remarkable cultural collection be very seriously considered. We appeal to the General

Electric Company to become proper stewards of the past.

[Editor's note (Tonetti): With the exception of a sample of cultural materials returned by some of the looters of the GE Mound and a sample of those salvaged during a professional archaeological excavation after the looting had occurred, the GE Mound cultural materials were reburied near the GE Mound on GE property in May of 1994. The General Electric Company authorized and is paying for study of the sample of GE Mound cultural materials. A report on the results of this study is expected to be published in 1994]

OHIO HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE ARCHAEOLOGY GUIDELINES

The long-awaited *Archaeology Guidelines* have been published. The 89-page publication contain the standards and specifications by which the Ohio Historic Preservation Office reviews, evaluates, and comments on archaeological survey methods, results, recommendations, and reports, including, but not limited to, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act, Sections 149.53 and 149.54 of the Ohio Revised Code, and Historic Preservation Fund subgrants. Following an *Introduction* explaining the purpose and other key aspects of the guidelines, six sections outline the following topics: *The Review Process; Research Designs for Investigations; Report Standards; Personnel Qualifications; Curation Standards and Guidelines; and a Glossary*. The *Appendix: Guidelines for Investigations* outlines the level of work necessary to successfully complete the three phases of archaeological investigations covered by the *Archaeology Guidelines* when a project-specific research design is not prepared by the archaeologist.

The guidelines supersede all other letters, memoranda, guidelines, standards, and specifications previously issued by the OHPO on these matters. They are intended to ensure that the work and information generated from archaeological investigations under review authority of the OHPO are completed in accordance with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation* and the current state of the discipline.

A meeting discussing the implementation of the *Archaeology Guidelines* was held in Columbus on June 27. Consultants and agencies using these guidelines were in attendance. The primary concern of consultants in attendance was complying with the curation standards. The OHPO has approached the OAC requesting assistance in addressing such concerns.

Copies of the *Archaeology Guidelines* have been distributed to consultants and agencies. Additional copies of the *Archaeology Guidelines* may be purchased for \$8.85 (\$7.38 for Ohio Historical Society members) per copy, including tax, shipping and handling, from the Sales Office, Ohio Historical Society, 1982 Velma Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, 43211-2497, telephone (614) 297-2414. For further information about the *Archaeology Guidelines* contact Franco Ruffini, at (614) 297-2470.

STATE PLAN

The Ohio Historic Preservation Office is in the process of drafting *A Future for Ohio's Past: The Ohio Historic Preservation Plan*. Public participation has been a large part of the planning process. In June, a Vision Meeting was held to discuss implementation strategies for the state plan.

The twenty-seven participants represented a cross-section of statewide and local organizations and government agencies; this included federal, state and local government representatives in everything from cultural resource management to land-use planning, elected officials, certified local government representatives, state and local preservation organizations, etc. Archaeological interests were voiced by representatives of the Ohio Archaeological Council, the National Park Service, the U.S. Forest Service, and the Ohio Historic Preservation Office.

Two dominant implementation strategies resulted: education and partnerships. Education is needed first and foremost. There are many differing ideas on what historic preservation is and what it encompasses. Historic preservation needs to be made relevant to a large variety of people with varying needs and interests.

Once education is in place, partnerships can be formed. As people come to share an understanding of historic preservation, they can unite to "promote consistency between public and private interests." These partnerships can then use the common goal of historic preservation as a means to fulfilling a multitude of other interests and goals.

Other implementation techniques include legislation, funding, and local-level planning. Ideas generated from this meeting have been incorporated into the state plan, which will be available in draft form in September. A series of public meetings will be held in the fall to enable the public to review and comment on the draft plan. Any necessary changes will be made and the final version of the plan will be distributed in 1995. The public meeting dates will be advertised soon. Please be sure to come to a meeting to review the draft version to ensure that the state plan is meeting your needs and interests. Questions or further information about the

state plan should be addressed to Barbara Powers, Planning, Inventory, and Registration Department Head, at the number listed above.

PALEO-INDIAN NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK THEME STUDY

The Paleo-Indian National Historic Landmark Theme Study is a multi-year partnership between the National Park Service, the National Historic Landmarks Archeology Committee, and State and Tribal Historic Preservation Offices to recognize and protect nationally significant properties associated with this land's earliest inhabitants. Coordinators in each region will work with government agency managers, scholars, avocationalists, and historic preservationists to identify, collate, and summarize available scholarly research, inventory data, and historic preservation planning documentation associated with Paleo-Indian occupation. The project will utilize the NHL Theme Study framework to develop a nation-wide historic context to 1) identify, evaluate, and nominate Paleo-Indian archeological sites as National Historic Landmarks; 2) update documentation or clarify boundaries of existing Paleo-Indian NHLs; and 3) develop or refine planning guidance that can be used by State and Tribal Historic Preservation Offices, National Park System units, and other federal, state, and local agencies.

The project is organized into three phases. Phase one, the project feasibility study, scheduled for completion by September 30, 1994, includes developing the project table of organization; delineating an initial project thematic, chronological, and geographic framework; outlining project task phases and schedules; compiling a preliminary project bibliography; summarizing the current status of Paleo-Indian scholarship, management documentation, and inventory information; and listing potential NHL property nominees and scholars willing to sponsor their nomination by providing documentation and reviewing nomination forms.

The second phase of the project will be preparation of a draft Theme Study document and initial nominations of properties as NHLs, to be completed by September 30, 1997. The third phase will focus on completion of all NHL nominations and preparation of the final Theme Study for publication, to be completed by September 30, 1998.

Al Tonetti, Archaeology Manager for the OHPO, will serve as Ohio's state coordinator for this project. The state coordinator acts as the principal liaison between the NPS regional coordinator and federal, tribal, state, and local governments in Ohio and Ohio's professional

and avocational communities. State coordinators will distribute documentation produced by the NPS to interested persons in Ohio, gather and evaluate their responses, transmit gathered information responses to the regional coordinator, and review all Theme Study and nomination documentation pertinent to their state's.

A brochure briefly describing this project is available from Al Tonetti. For a copy of the brochure or for further information about the *Paleo-Indian National Historic Landmark Theme Study* contact Al Tonetti at the number listed above.

CULTURES BEFORE CONTACT: THE LATE PREHISTORY OF OHIO

The OAC Education Committee met June 13 to review abstracts for the *Contributed Paper* and *Poster Sessions* for the annual conference, which will be held at the Quality Hotel Central, Cincinnati, OH on November 18-19, 1994. Ten abstracts were accepted for the *Contributed Paper* session. One abstract was submitted and accepted for the *Poster Session*. Posters are being encouraged from those who submitted *Contributed Paper* abstracts that were not accepted. The OAC also will consider for publication papers addressing the theme but not presented at the conference.

Cultures Before Contact: The Late Prehistory of Ohio will begin Friday afternoon, November 18, with a *Plenary Session* featuring scholars addressing a number of themes on the Late Prehistory of Ohio. Papers will be presented by the following scholars; some titles are tentative:

Brose, David (Royal Ontario Museum), *The Whittlesey Complex and the Late Prehistory of Northeast Ohio*

Carskadden, Jeff (Muskingum Archaeological Survey), *Fort Ancient in the Central Muskingum Valley of Eastern Ohio: A View from the Philo II Site*

Drooker, Penny (State University of New York, Albany), *Madisonville Focus Revisited: Re-excavating Western Fort Ancient from Museum Collections*

Griffin, James (The Smithsonian Institution), *Fort Ancient Aspects and Early Forays into the Late Prehistory of the Ohio Valley*

Henderson, Gwynn (University of Kentucky) and David Pollack (Kentucky Heritage Council), *Fort Ancient*

Cultural Development in the Bluegrass and Northeastern Kentucky

Nass, John (California University of Pennsylvania) and John Hart (New York State Museum), *The Monongahela Complex and the Late Prehistory of Eastern Ohio, Western Pennsylvania, and Northern West Virginia*

Otto, Martha (Ohio Historical Society), William Dancey (The Ohio State University), and Flora Church (Archaeological Services Consultants, Inc.), *The Cole Complex and the Late Prehistory of Central Ohio*

Stothers, David M. (University of Toledo), *Brass, Beads, and Beaver: Archaeological Reflections of the Protohistoric "Fire Nation" of the Southwestern Lake Erie Drainage*

The keynote address at the banquet Friday evening will be delivered by C. Wesley Cowan (Cincinnati Museum of Natural History).

Saturday morning will feature a short presentation on archaeological sites in the Little Miami River Valley to be visited as part of the Saturday morning bus tour.

Contributed Papers will be presented Saturday afternoon, November 19, by the following researchers on the following topics:

Julie L. Amon (Kent State University), *Subsistence Related Biological Stress Responses of a Fort Ancient Population*

Brett Harper (University of Cincinnati), *Changing Settlement Patterns in the Anderson Phase of Fort Ancient: New Evidence from South Fort Village*

Rebecca A. Hawkins (Algonquin Consultants, Inc.) *Coming Full Circle: An Overview of the Fort Ancient Circular Village*

Koralewski, Jason M., Timothy J. Abel (The University of Toledo) and George De Muth (Firelands Archaeological Research Center) *The Cemetery Ridge Site: A Transitional Eiden/Wolf Phase Sandusky Tradition Hamlet, Enclosed by a Peripheral Earthwork, Located in Sandusky County, Ohio*

Pitner, Gavine (Dayton, OH) *The Prehistoric Use of a Greene County, Ohio Rockshelter*

Riordan, Robert V. (Wright State University) *Small but Significant: Diversity at Late Prehistoric Components*

Stallings, Richard and Nancy Ross-Stallings (Cultural Horizons, Inc.) *Circular Village Plans: Their Origin and Development in the Ohio Valley*

Stothers, David M. and Susan K. Bechtel (The University of Toledo) *The Land Between the Lakes: New Perspectives*

on the Late Woodland (ca. A.D. 500-1300) Time Period in the Region of the St. Clair-Detroit River System

Vickery, Kent D. (University of Cincinnati) and Robert A. Genheimer (Cincinnati Museum of Natural History) *Preliminary Report of Excavations at the Fort Ancient State Line Site, 33HA58, in the Central Ohio Valley*

Willis, Nicole K., Patricia Zalewski, and Seana S. Connors (The University of Toledo) *The Sandusky Tradition: A Preliminary Documentation of the Floral Remains of the Prehistoric Wolf Phase and Protohistoric Indian Hills Phase*

AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL STUDY OF A PREHISTORIC SITE IN BUTLER COUNTY, OHIO

[Editor's Note (Tonetti): This article, shortened and edited for inclusion in the *OAC Newsletter*, was prepared as an educational brochure by 3D/Environmental Services, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio, pursuant to an (unexecuted) Memorandum of Agreement between the Ohio Historic Preservation Office, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Louisville District, and the Hamilton Land Trust. The Ohio Historic Preservation Office has distributed this brochure to local historical societies and libraries in Butler County]

Recently, archaeological investigations were performed at site 33BU477, a multicomponent prehistoric site dominated by a Late Archaic (3,000-900 B.C.) Maple Creek Phase component. The site is located in Fairfield Township, Butler County, Ohio, approximately one mile to the southeast of Hamilton. It is situated on a low hummock rising above the floor of an extinct riverbed which predates the last glaciation of southwestern Ohio. Prehistorically, and up until the artificial drainage of the area in the mid-19th century, this area was characterized by an extensive wetland environment. Recorded archaeological sites within this geographic feature are invariably located on terraces, terrace remnants, and hummocks similar to that on which 33BU477 was found.

The field investigations at 33BU477, as established by the Ohio Historic Preservation Office, consisted of 13 hand-excavated 1 meter by 1 meter units and approximately 200 square meters of mechanical stripping of the plowzone. Field work was conducted during December 1993 and February and March of 1994 by personnel of 3D/Environmental of Cincinnati, Ohio.

A total of 543 prehistoric artifacts were recovered at the

site, including chert flakes, chipped stone tools, glacial cobble hammerstones, and fire-cracked rock. While single projectile points dating to the Early Archaic (8,000-6,000 B.C.), 1 Big Sandy point, and the Middle Woodland (100 B.C. - A.D. 500), 1 Affinis Snyder point, were found, the majority of the culturally diagnostic artifacts from 33BU477 indicate an occupation during the Maple Creek Phase of the Late Archaic period as the major component of the site. The Trimble Side-Notched point type, indicative of the Maple Creek Phase, is the site's most frequently occurring diagnostic tool type.

Trimble Side-Notched points are quite small in comparison with other bifacial stone tools dating to the Archaic period. They most likely functioned as the tips of small spears, called darts, which were launched using an atlatl, or spear-thrower. These specialized tools enabled prehistoric hunters to propel spears for greater distances and with greater velocity than possible using the hand alone. Some researchers have controversially suggested that these points represent actual arrowheads, and that the bow was in use in the Late Archaic period, far earlier than generally accepted for North America.

Hand-excavation and mechanical stripping of the plowzone using a backhoe identified a total of 23 subsurface features at the site, most of which appear to be the remnants of prehistoric pits and hearths. Six of the features in particular have provided artifacts, radiocarbon dates, and remains of plant-foods which contribute to the understanding of the Late Archaic period in southwestern Ohio. Radiocarbon dating of charred organic material from several features indicates that the major occupation of the site took place around 1,300 - 1,000 B.C. Charred remains of hickory, walnut, hazel, and acorn nutshells, as well as persimmon and hackberry seeds, were found in many of the features. These data reflect an unspecialized utilization of typical wetland resources.

During the Late Archaic period people appear to have lived in small tribal units call "macrobands." These groups, presumably numbering several hundred individuals, maximized the locally available natural resources through a hunting/gathering strategy characterized as "collecting." Collectors acquire specific resources at various locations away from the main macroband base camp, and transport them back for consumption. This contrasts with the "foraging" strategy, in which small groups of hunter-gatherers relocate the base camp to a point where a variety of resources can be exploited in the immediate vicinity.

The archaeological sites formed by the resource acquisition activities of collectors generally exhibit evidence of the large-scale utilization of a single resource. A typical example of this situation would be processing pits containing the carbonized remains of large quantities of hickory nutshells and little else.

The data from 33BU477 raise many questions related to this issue. If people during the Maple Creek Phase of the Late Archaic were operating as collectors, why then do the plant-food remains from the features at this site indicate such a moderate and diverse utilization of the environment? One possible answer is that the inhabitants were hunting certain species of mammals or waterfowl in the wetlands which surrounded the site. This situation is difficult to prove, due to the fact that faunal remains, such as bone, were not preserved at 33BU477, eliminating any direct archaeological evidence of hunting and butchery which might have occurred. Other explanation are possible: it may be that people of the Maple Creek Phase operated as foragers, perhaps for just part of the year. Archaeologists always bear in mind the possibility that new information may substantially alter their time-honored theories and models, and their most deeply held beliefs. No single site will answer all the questions we have about prehistory, and most will probably only provide a small piece of a single puzzle.

Sites such as 33BU477 are under-represented in the archaeological literature, and are continually being lost to increasing development. Very little is known about the smaller extractive locations in the settlement systems of most prehistoric groups in the Midwest, resulting in an incomplete understanding of the ways in which people of the past related to the same landscape on which we now live. The public's interest in our heritage is the driving force of historic preservation. The involvement of private citizens in the planning and zoning decisions of their community can help to preserve or investigate archaeological resources which would otherwise be lost, without study, to development.

BOOK REVIEWS

ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE GREAT MIDWESTERN FLOODS OF 1993

AND

ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE 1993 FLOOD

Reviewed by Al Tonetti

Archaeology and the Great Midwestern Floods of 1993, edited by William Green and Robin M. Lillie, Research Papers Volume 19, Number 4, Office of the State Archaeologist, The University of Iowa, 1994, is a timely and important contribution to cultural resource management, particularly to the understanding of site formation/destruction processes in fluvial environments of the Midwest. The publication begins with an overview of the floods of 1993 and their impact on archaeological sites in the upper Mississippi River basin. Other chap-

ters document the effects of the flood on particular sites and clusters of sites in various regions of the study area through compilation of basic data intended to provide archaeologists, historic preservationists, and planners sample assessments for future management needs. Like published reports of the aftermath of the Exxon Valdez oil spill area in Alaska (e.g., *The Exxon Cultural Resource Program: Site Protection and Maritime Cultural Ecology in Prince William Sound and the Gulf of Alaska*, James C. Haggarty et al., Exxon Corporation, 1991, *Site Protection and Oil Spill Treatment at SEL-188: An Archaeological Site in Kenai Fjords National Park, Alaska*, Robert C. Betts et al., Exxon Corporation, 1991), and *Archeology and the 1993 Flood*, The Archeology Laboratory, Augustana College, 1994, reviewed below, this report adds to the growing number of so-called "disaster archaeology" reports. The timeliness of these publications, within a year or two after the "disasters," is a welcome reflection on the state of archaeological resource management in the nation. State Historic Preservation Offices, using emergency grant funds from the National Park Service and the National Trust for Historic Preservation, funded much of the research associated with the 1993 flood.

The articles in this volume provide background and contextual data for planning and implementing additional archaeological evaluations, data recovery, and site protection efforts in 1994 and beyond, for the great floods of 1993 also effect site stability and preservation for years to come. Weakened river banks and accelerated soil erosion are inevitable consequences of such phenomena.

The introductory chapter contains a particularly useful summary of the workings of fluvial systems, reminding us that flooding, even of this magnitude, is a natural occurrence, and that archaeological deposits are integral elements of floodplain geomorphology that archaeologists must understand in order to correctly interpret and protect the archaeological record. The floods of 1993 affected archaeological deposits in three main ways: 1) increased runoff accelerating soil erosion on hillslopes (colluviation); 2) long-term maintenance of high reservoir and fluctuating pool levels enhancing shoreline erosion; and 3) river floods causing both erosion and deposition (alluviation) in valleys. Cutbank inspection is the most economical way to assess erosional damage in stream valleys.

The remaining chapters discuss the impact of the flood on archaeological sites in various stream valleys in the flood-affected areas. Most chapters include ample photographs documenting severe cutbank erosion, and summaries and recommendations for future research, salvage, stabilization, etc. One chapter includes cost estimates for stabilization and salvage at 10 prioritized sites in southeastern North Dakota totaling \$1,064,000. Costs range from \$34,000 to \$254,000. Stabilization of cutbanks are about 25% of the total cost; the rest limited

salvage or in one case, that of a human burial site, complete excavation.

Flooding of this magnitude can be expected in the Ohio Valley/Great Lakes region. This and other similar publications to come should provide baseline data upon which to build an effective emergency response program.

Archeology and the 1993 Flood represents the proceedings of a workshop-symposium sponsored by the National Trust for Historic Preservation, held at Augustana College, Sioux Falls, SD, between April 26-28, 1994. This conference brought together consultants from various regions to address the following flood-related issues: 1) understanding the full range of effects flooding can have on archaeological sites; 2) what resources can be utilized to monitor and study these effects; 3) discussing options for mitigating effects of flooding and flood-related impacts; and 4) appraising affected State Historic Preservation Offices of the nature and extent of flood-related impacts so that management plans can be implemented.

The first paper in this publication is a brief overview of activities and research data available from the Earth Resources Observation Systems Data Center (EROS or EDC) in South Dakota. EDC is a national archive and distribution center for spatial data (i.e., satellite imagery, aerial photography, and digital thematic maps) with staff experienced in the coordination and execution of diverse types of basic and applied multidisciplinary research. Databases on levee locations, floodplains, LANDSAT imagery, aerial photography, AVHRR Satellite imagery, National Wetlands Inventory, land use/cover, soils, elevation, and other point data, such as archaeological sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places, are on-line at the EDC and were extensively used to study and graphically display the results of the 1993 floods.

The second paper discusses erosional and depositional processes associated with high magnitude floods and their effects on cultural resources in floodplains, alluvial terraces, and uplands. Conclusions drawn in this article are that erosional forces caused more damage to archaeological sites than depositional forces - there was acute erosion of stream banks and increased surface runoff caused gullying in uplands. Some of the worst damage to archaeological sites was seen at, above, and below large reservoirs. Downstream, the release of large volumes of impounded water caused severe bank collapse and erosion. Impoundment caused serious erosion along reservoir shorelines, especially in the flood pools. Site stabilization by rip-rap is seen as only a temporary solution at best, with excavation of archaeological sites seen as the only viable long-term alternative due to the inevitability of future "disasters."

Three papers in this publication are edited versions of those that appear in *Archaeology and the Great Midwestern Floods of 1993*, see above. The rest of the papers focus on specific sites in various flood-affected regions of the upper Midwest. The final chapter is a commentary on the results of the workshop-symposium. A digitized database with a complete inventory of archaeological sites and surveyed areas at survey intensity level is seen as a high priority for managing archaeological sites in "disaster" areas. Without good and quickly accessible locational data it is difficult to deal with flood-affected sites. Other recommendations made include more study of the geomorphology of floodplains and archaeological sites therein, particularly with respect to flooding and channel migration; reassessment of rip-rap and vegetative covers as effective mid- or long-term stabilization strategies; and the realization that excavation is the only realistic option for preserving information from significant archaeological sites in flood prone environments.

[Editor's note (Tonetti): All of the above-referenced publications are on file in the File Room of the Ohio Historic Preservation Office. Contact Al Tonetti for further information]

PUBLICATIONS

Civil War Sites Advisory Commission: Report on the Nation's Civil War Battlefields

The U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, recently published the above titled report. This study was mandated by Congress in *The Civil War Sites Study Act of 1990 (PL 101-628)*. The report is the product of more than two years' intensive work to identify the nation's principal Civil War battlefields, to evaluate their relative historic significance and current condition, and to recommend alternatives for their preservation.

The report identifies and studies 384 principal Civil War battlefields. Of these, more than one-third are irretrievably lost or in immediate danger. By the end of this decade, two-thirds of the principal battlefields could be gone. The report outlines a national strategy, urging the Federal Government to take the lead through a comprehensive battlefield preservation program, in partnership with states, local governments, and private organizations.

For information on how to obtain a copy of *Civil War Sites Advisory Commission: Report on the Nation's Civil War Battlefields* contact the American Battlefield Protection Program, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Suite 250, Washington, DC 20013-7127, telephone (202) 343-9505.

[Editor's note (Tonetti): With respect to their military

importance, Ohio's two Civil War "battlefields," skirmishes really, both related to John Hunt Morgan's raids across the Ohio River, at Buffington Island, Meigs County, and his capture near Salineville, Columbiana County, are rated as Class C and Class D, respectively. Class C and D battlefields represent military operations with limited tactical objectives or enforcement and occupation (61% of all battlefields in the study). The report recommends that preservation of Class C and D battlefields should be of primary interest or responsibility of state or local governments or private organizations, not the Federal Government.]

Archaeology and Public Education

Archaeology and Public Education is a free quarterly newsletter of the Society for American Archaeology's Committee on Public Education. The Committee exists to promote awareness about and concern for the study of past cultures, and to engage people in the preservation and protection of heritage resources. The newsletter is designed to aid educators, interpreters, archaeologists, and others who wish to teach the public about the value of archaeological research and resources. To be added to the mailing list contact Dr. Edward Friedman, Bureau of Reclamation, P.O. Box 25007, D-5650, Denver, CO 80225.

POSITION OPENINGS

Cultural Resources Management (CRM) Archaeologist, Cleveland State University.

Qualifications are a Ph.D. in Anthropology with emphasis in archaeology and specializing in the prehistoric/historic archaeology of the Ohio, Great Lakes, and/or Ohio Valley region. Rank and salary associated with this professional staff position will be based upon experience.

The successful candidate will serve as principal investigator and field director of all CRM projects obtained through proposal submission. SOPA certification at the Principal Investigator level preferred. A strong commitment to participating in the public education and outreach mission of the Department of Anthropology is necessary. The position includes teaching responsibilities, not to exceed three courses, to be negotiated annually. Teaching experience in eastern North American prehistory, regional prehistory, archaeological method and theory, and/or historic archaeology is highly desirable.

A history of successful proposal preparation, contract negotiation, and project completion is required. CRM contracts and successful project direction within the Ohio Valley/Great Lakes region preferred. Experience

in supervising student participation as field and laboratory crew members is required. Evidence of successful public programming and teaching experience helpful. It is anticipated that CRM will become a major departmental focus within three to five years. Deadline for receipt of applications is August 1, 1994 for start September 19, 1994. Submit letter of interest, vitae, and names of three references to J. E. Blank, Search Committee, Department of Anthropology, Cleveland State University, Cleveland, OH 44115 or J. Blank @ CSUOHIO.EDU (INTERNET). CSU is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply.

Entry level, tenure track position in North American archaeology with regional specialization in Great Lakes/Eastern Woodlands, Department of Anthropology, University of Notre Dame.

Ph.D. in Anthropology completed. Position begins September 1995 pending budgetary approval. Candidate will teach general introductory anthropology courses, North American archaeology, archaeological method and theory, and other specialty courses as developed and assume responsibility for summer field school. Teaching load is 2 courses/semester. Preference given to candidates whose research complements the department's program in bioarchaeology. Experience in application of analytical models emphasizing site distribution studies and the use of remote sensing equipment is advantageous. Equal opportunity/affirmative action employer. Send letter, c.v., names of references by October 31, 1994 to Chair, Search Committee, Department of Anthropology, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556.

State Archaeologist. Minnesota Historical Society.

Qualifications are a graduate degree in anthropology with a specialization in archaeology and at least five years of experience in archaeological research, administration and/or cultural resources management; specialization in pre-European and Euroamerican archaeology with further specialization in Midwestern archaeology preferred; demonstrated ability in the identification of cemeteries/burial sites, work effectively with the Minnesota Native American community, successfully manage complex research programs, oral and written communication, and work with diverse public and government agencies. Term of appointment is four years. Annual compensation is approximately \$45,790 plus an additional amount approximately equivalent to the value of benefits available to state employees. Funding is dependent on continued appropriations by the state legislature. Submit letter of application and resume no later than August 15, 1994 to Trustee Committee - State Archaeologist, c/o Office of Director, Minnesota Historical Society, 345 Kellogg Blvd. West, St.

Paul, MN 55102-1906. Direct questions to Gary Goldsmith (612) 297-5863.

Lead archaeologist. GAI Consultants, Inc.

Qualifications are M.A. or Ph.D. in archaeology/anthropology with three years experience as principal investigator with a cultural resource management firm and SOPA certification in prehistoric archaeology. Demonstrable ability to work independently, high quality writing and research skills, effectively manage and supervise field crews, ability to maintain good client relationship, experience in prehistoric lithic or ceramic analysis, knowledge and experience with MacIntosh and MSDOS word processing, spreadsheet and data base programs, GIS and statistical background preferred. Position includes proposal writing, design, implementation, and supervision of field and laboratory work, data analysis, and report writing with primary emphasis on eastern North America prehistoric archaeology. Must be willing to relocate to Pittsburgh area. Limited travel throughout eastern U.S. Submit resume to GAI Consultants, Inc., Human Resource Department, Attn: AD# 335, 570 Beatty Road, Monroeville, PA 15146. EOE M/F/V/H.

Principal Investigators. Landmark Archaeological and Environmental Services.

Qualifications are M.A., M.S. or higher degree and two years field and laboratory experience in North American prehistoric archaeology, historic archaeology, or cultural resource management; and the ability to complete archival research, reconnaissance, testing, laboratory analysis, site forms, archaeological reports and other related work as required in a timely manner. Applicants must be self-motivated and responsible individuals willing to perform archaeological investigations throughout Indiana and the Midwest. Successful applicants must work well alone or with other professionals, travel extensively, devote long but flexible hours to meet often unrealistic deadlines, and always maintain the highest standards of conduct personally and professionally. Starting annual salary is \$25,000. Qualified applicants should respond with a resume and sample of their writing by September 1, 1994 to Gunta Beard, Director, Consulting Services, Landmark Archaeological and Environmental Services, 5640 N. SR 421, Lebanon, IN 46052, telephone (317) 325-2682.

Archaeological field supervisors. Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

Qualifications are M.A. in Anthropology with emphasis in prehistoric/historic archaeology or eastern and/or southeastern U.S. and/or cultural resources manage-

ment; minimum two years experience successfully supervising cultural resources project field crews at Phase I or higher level; proposal and budget preparation experience; excellent report writing, interpersonal and verbal skills; and knowledge of historic preservation laws and practice. Some travel required. Reply by resume to Michael Baker Jr., Inc., P.O. Box 12259, Pittsburgh, PA 15231. EEO employer.

CONFERENCES

Archaeological Remains, In Situ Preservation is the theme of this year's International Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management annual conference October 11-15, 1994 in Montreal, Canada. Archaeologists, managers, and project designers will attempt to develop a dynamic and integrated approach to land management. For more information contact Secretariat, ICAHM Montreal 1994, Ville de Montreal, Service de l'habitation et du developement urbain, 303, rue Notre-Dame Est, 5 etage, Montreal (Quebec), Canada H2Y 3Y8; telephone (514) 872-7531; FAX (514) 872-0024.

1994 Calendar Of Events

- November 4-6: Eastern States Archaeological Federation annual meeting, Best Western Airport Inn, Colonie (Albany vicinity), NY. Contact Dean Snow, SUNY at Albany, Department of Anthropology, Social Science 262, Albany, NY 12222, telephone (518) 442-4700. Local arrangements contact Sandra L. Arnold, 147 Scotch Church Road, Pattersonville, NY 12137.
- November 10-12: Joint meeting of the Southeast Archaeological Conference and the Midwest Archaeological Conference, Radisson Plaza Hotel, Lexington, KY. Contact SEAC/MAC Committee, 101 American Bldg., University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506-0100, telephone (606) 257-1944, FAX (606) 323-1968.

November 18-19: Ohio Archaeological Council semi-annual meeting and annual conference *Cultures Before Contact: The Late Prehistory of Ohio*, Quality Hotel Central, Cincinnati, OH. Contact The Ohio Archaeological Council, P.O. Box 02012, Columbus, OH 43202, telephone Al Tonetti (614) 297-2470, FAX (614) 297-2546 or Bob Genheimer (513) 345-8503, FAX (513) 345-8501.

**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 (614) 644-7582; Ann Cramer (614) 592-6644; Franco Ruffini (614) 297-2470; Al Tonetti (614) 297-2470; Kent Vickery (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

