

ANTHROPOLOGY 503

**SEMINAR IN
CULTURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT**

Adrian Praetzellis
Dept of Anthropology and Linguistics
Sonoma State University
adrian.praetzellis@sonoma.edu

Fall semester 2009

**Seminar in Cultural Resources Management
Anthropology 503
Sonoma State University
Fall 2009**

Instructor: Adrian Praetzellis
Telephone: 664-3950 (Stev. office, voicemail only)
664-2820 (Anthropological Studies Center)
E-mail: adrian.praetzellis@sonoma.edu

THE COURSE

Archaeological sites, old buildings, places of religious or cultural importance to ethnic communities—these are all "cultural resources." This course focuses on evaluating the importance of these places under established legal guidelines and what state and federal law has to say about how important sites are managed. Readings also address the practice of Cultural Resource Management in North America from the perspective of the consultant, who must respond to Requests for Proposals with technical proposals, budgets, and research designs, and perform their work in an ethical manner.

The class format consists of group discussion of assigned articles and short formal presentations by students and the instructor, and guest speakers. Most materials are contained in four sources (the rest are online), which are available at the SSU Bookstore:

- the Anthro 503 Class Reader,
- *Cultural Resource Laws and Practice* by T. King (2008)
- *Legal Perspectives on Cultural Resources* ed. by J. Richman and M. Forsyth (2004)
- *Assessing Site Significance* by D. Hardesty and D. Little (2009)

The first portion of each class normally will be divided between lecture, discussion of the week's topic, and perhaps presentations by invited speakers. The second portion will be spent in discussion of both that day's reading assignment and the supporting reading assigned for that meeting, as well as occasional role-playing case studies, and formal presentations of article reviews.

COURSE GOALS AND OUTCOMES

When you have finished this course, you should understand:

- the development of the legal structure for protection of cultural resources in the U.S. and California;
- how these laws and associated regulations are really made;
- how cultural resources on public land are protected;
- how CEQA, NEPA, ARPA, and especially Section 106 NHPA are implemented;
- the legal and political context of NAGPRA;
- the National Register of Historic Places and its use as a management tool;
- and have refined your writing skills.

GRADING

50% of the grade will be based on the written article reviews; 25% on the research paper, and 25% on in-class presentations, handing in discussion questions, performance in discussion sessions, attendance, and general contribution to the class.

CLASS REQUIREMENTS

1. *Attendance.* You are required to attend every class meeting. Please be on time, as latecomers disturb the flow. If some pressing matter will cause you to be absent from a meeting, send me an email in advance. Two absences with reasons such as "I was attending the SAA meetings" or "It's my brother's wedding" are acceptable. Additional absences without the excuse of a documented emergency will affect your grade. If you have a disabling condition that may substantially limit your ability to participate in this class, please contact the Disabled Student Services office in Salazar 1049, phone no. 664-2677, for confidential assistance and accommodation authorization. If you have a physical limitation that you think may affect your

ability to do perform class assignments, need special accommodations, or have any other concerns please contact me during the first week of class.

2. *In-class Presentations.* The class is run as a seminar, with much of the time given over to discussion of the assigned readings. To prepare the ground for the discussion period, each week one or two students will take a turn making a formal presentation on his or her assigned readings. The presentation is to be 5-10 minutes long; please don't read your review verbatim. The presentation will cover the main points of the writer's argument, alternative approaches with which the reader is familiar from previous assignments, and will offer the reader's own views on the subject. In addition, the presenter(s) will make sufficient photocopies of their written paper and distribute them to the class at the time of their presentation. Any student who has an insurmountable fear of having to make a public presentation (I don't mean one who just gets nervous at the prospect, but someone who truly freaks out) will be excused this requirement with the instructor's permission. The presenter(s) is/are primarily responsible for leading the discussion of their article(s).

3. *Participation in and Preparation for Discussion.* A large proportion of the class grade is assigned by assessing students' participation in discussion. To facilitate debate, each student will draw up a list of half a dozen discussion questions based on the readings and hand it in at the beginning of class. Unless you are absent from class, failure to hand this in each week will reduce your grade. The list must be typed and formatted in the same way as the review essay. No late work will be accepted. Again, remember that the presenter(s) is/are primarily responsible for leading the discussion of their article(s).

4. *The Tenor of Discussion.* Some of the issues addressed in class are controversial. Students will likely disagree either with opinions expressed in some of the readings, with each other, or with the instructor. However, all discussion will be carried out in a civil tone and with an attitude of mutual respect. In fact, the instructor will invoke SSU regulations and kick out any student who exhibits disrespectful or rude behavior.

5. *The Instructor and Grading.* The instructor has been known to employ humor and informality in class in order to encourage discussion and the flow of ideas. Students should not confuse a lack of formality with an easy "A." As long as SSU continues to employ the A-F grading system, the instructor promises to do his best to evaluate students' performance appropriately within these categories.

6. *How to Read.* Gradstudent-itis is a common but, hopefully, short-lived ailment. It takes the form of an excess of cynicism and hyper-criticism affected by the patient in the hope that this manner will convince the instructor of his or her sagacity and superior intellect. Sadly, the effect is usually the reverse of the intention. Students can be assured that none of the assigned readings have been chosen because their authors are particularly stupid and given to write silly things. Neither are they without fault and immune from criticism. They all have something intelligent to say and it is your job to point out what it is.

Some of the readings are indicated as being assigned "for discussion." Be sure that you read these. Other readings are for "background." Some of the latter will be technical, reference materials; you may want to skim some of this.

8. *How much time should you devote to this class?* This is a graduate class. Students should expect to spend about 10 hours reading and rereading the article they are reviewing, and writing and editing their weekly paper. The remainder of the weekly reading may take an additional 8 hours.

9. *Research paper.* Each student will prepare a research paper on any topic related to CRM. 5 double spaced pages, 11 point Arial font; title and references on separate pages, 1-inch margins, and double-spaced. Format is important.

10. *Written papers.* Each student will prepare a review paper on 5 of the readings assigned for discussion – no more than 2 per month. The paper will be no more than two pages in length in 11 point Arial font (500-600 words), with 1-inch margins, and double-spaced. I will not read anything beyond the second page of text. You do not have to quote other writers in the text; however, if you do so you must include an additional "references cited" page. The paper will have a separate title page containing: the student's name, citation of the reading in American Anthropologist style (www.aaanet.org/aa/styleguide.htm), and the class meeting number.

I assign these papers with two goals in mind: First, I want to give students practice in writing and being edited. The ability to write a piece of clear, grammatical English may be your most important asset in the job market; it is certainly essential for an MA thesis. Anyone who cannot express his or her ideas on paper is going to have difficulty in the "real world." The class is run as a tutorial in the European sense – I assume that everyone has done all the reading and has thought about it before they come to class so we can discuss it intelligently. Sadly, experience has shown that not everyone cooperates in this venture. Written papers insure that everyone reads at least *some* of the material. The paper should begin with a précis of the article, go on to explain the principal ideas and put them in context, and conclude with your own assessment of the piece. In many ways, the paper is similar to a book or article review that one might read in a professional journal. In this case, however, I'd like you to spend less space recapitulating the article and more space analyzing it. Using lengthy quotations with little or no interpretation is a sure way to get a low grade.

It goes without saying that essays that receive similar grades will have similar characteristics. I drew up the following list for a lower division class, but it may help you to emulate the good and avoid the bad. Don't try to impress me with unnecessarily long, convoluted sentences. *Do not write for the expert but as if to an intelligent but uninformed reader – someone who knows little about the subject but who wants to learn.* For more information, see "How to write an article review" after the class schedule.

PAPER GRADING CRITERIA

GRADE "A"

Well structured and organized
Presents opposing arguments/theories/ideas relevant to the topic
Has interpretation and critical evaluation of the problem/article/data
Minimal spelling and grammatical mistakes
Use of the active voice where possible
Relevant quotations are used and explained
Appropriate use of citations in the text and application of the style guide
Has a strong conclusion

GRADE "B"

Descriptive paper with limited critical thinking
Has limited interpretation
The relevance of quotations is not clearly explained (I can read what the author **said**; you must explain what s/he **means**).
Arguments are limited or not very convincingly presented
Generally good use of the style guide and grammatical presentation

GRADE "C"

Mostly descriptive, poorly argued, or incorrect interpretation
Not well poorly organized
Unnecessary use of technical language or jargon
Some "fluff," irrelevant, or redundant information
Excessive use of the passive voice
Overly lengthy quotations with little or no interpretation
Inconsistent use of the style guide

GRADE "D"

Writer clearly does not understand or has not prepared the material
Irrelevant, rambling discussions and overlong quotations
Poor grammar and use of style guide
Argumentative or dogmatic style

2009 CLASS SCHEDULE

MEETING 1, 28 August

TOPIC: Introduction to the Course; presentation and review assignments

MEETING 2, 4 September

TOPIC: Perspectives on Who Owns the Past? (I do, and I want it back when you're done with it.)

DISCUSSANT:

READING ASSIGNMENT FOR DISCUSSION:

- D. Staley, "St. Lawrence Island's Substance Diggers"
- S. Goldberg, "Smithsonian suffers Legionnaires" disease. Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists May/June 1995

BACKGROUND READING:

T. Cripps, "So their eyes won't glaze over." **Wide Angle**, Volume 20, Number 2, April 1998, pp. 77-104. Access the article via SSU Library's database link to PROJECT MUSE.

E. Rothstein, "Who should tell history: the tribes of the museums?" NY Times 12/21/04

R. Cunningham, "The Twilight of Treasure Trove." Pp.37-60 in Richman and Forsyth (2004)

MEETING 3, 11 September

TOPIC: Overview of Historic Preservation Law, domestic and foreign; researching CRM on the internet

DISCUSSANT:

READING ASSIGNMENT FOR DISCUSSION:

- J. Stine, "The Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway and the Evolution of Cultural Resources Management."
- Phillips. D. "Who's my Daddy? Who's my Mommy" ACRA Edition 2003.

BACKGROUND READING:

- T. King, Chap. 1
- C. Carroll, "Administering federal laws and regulation relating to Native Americans"
- L. Sebastian, "Archaeology and the Law," pp. 3-16 in Richman and Forsyth (2004)

MEETING 4, 18 September

TOPIC: NEPA, CEQA, and the California Register

DISCUSSANT:

READING ASSIGNMENT FOR DISCUSSION:

- PUVUNGNA: Native American Heritage Com. v. Board of Trustees (Superior Court opinion, 1996)

BACKGROUND READING:

- E. Ruyle "Lies, Bribes, and Archaeology" (Several short articles on Puvungna)
- OHP "CEQA and Historical Resources" http://www.ceres.ca.gov/topic/env_law/ceqa/more/tas/page3.html
- GOPR, "Background on Historical Resources Preservation" and "CEQA and Archaeological Resources."
- OHP "California State Laws and Preservation..." <http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/pages/1069/files/10%20comb.pdf>
(*The two sources above are given for future reference only; they are quite long and complicated; no need to read them for class*)
- CEQA Process Flow Chart
- OHP "California Register and National Register: A Comparison..."
- T. King, Chap 2

MEETING 5, 25 September

TOPIC: Traditional Cultural Properties

DISCUSSANT:

READING ASSIGNMENT FOR DISCUSSION:

- Othole and R. Anton "A Tribal Perspective on TCP Consultation"
- K. Mulvaney, "Management Strategies and the Component of Indigenous Sacred Places... Australia."

BACKGROUND READING:

- US NPS, "NR Bulletin 38: Guidelines for Identifying and Evaluating Traditional Cultural Properties."
<http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/publications/bulletins.htm>
- T. King, Chap. 7

MEETING 6, 2 October

TOPIC: Research Design; ARPA; Abandoned Shipwrecks Act

DISCUSSANT:

READING ASSIGNMENT FOR DISCUSSION:

- "Townsites. Historic Context and Archaeological Research Design
http://www.sonoma.edu/asc/publications/HARD/Townsite%20Research%20Design_Draft2_Web.pdf
- Desio, P. "Crimes and Punishment" Ch 4 in Richman and Forsyth (2004)

BACKGROUND READING:

- H. Tower, Jr. "Investing in Treasure Ventures" (Unpublished ms.)
- M. Phelan and M. Forsythe "A Comprehensive Regime... Underwater Cultural Heritage" Ch. 7 in Richman
- S. Huff. The Civil Prosecution Process of ARPA. NPS Technical Bulletin 16.
<http://www.nps.gov/archeology/pubs/techbr/tch16A.htm>
- Hardesty & Little, Chap 3 deals with assessing scientific significance.

MEETING 7, 9 October

TOPIC: The National Register of Historic Places and Other Models of Evaluation

DISCUSSANT:

READING ASSIGNMENT FOR DISCUSSION:

- K. Dongoske et al. "Understanding the past through Hopi oral history"
- Hardesty, D. "Using historic contexts..." (re-read relevant part of "Townsites" and Hardesty & Little to understand what a historic context is)

BACKGROUND READING:

- R. McGhee, Aboriginalism and the problems of indigenous archaeology (for contrast with Dongoske!)
- T. Ferguson et al. "Working Together"
- L. Sebastian, K. Dongoske et al. "letters to the Editor" SAA Bulletin.
- US National Park Service, "NR Bulletin 15, How to Apply the NR Criteria for Evaluation"
- "36CRF60: National Register of Historic Places" (II-21 to 27)
- Nomination to NRHP: Fleischman Planetarium.
- King, Chap. 3
- Hardesty and Little, Chap. 1

MEETING 8, 16 October

TOPIC: Section 106 of NHPA; Part 1, Identification and Evaluation

DISCUSSANT:

READING ASSIGNMENT FOR DISCUSSION:

- 2005 Proposed amendments to NHPA (4 short articles)
- Federal Historic Preservation Case Law... Sandia v. USA. (NOTE: review this *and* "consulting" *together*.)
- ACHP "Consulting with Indian Tribes..."

BACKGROUND READING:

- "36 CFR 800: Protection of Historic Properties". (2004 regulations still current in 2009) *continued* →
- "Protecting Historic Properties" (*A quick intro to the 106 Process*)

- The Revised Section 106 Process Flow Chart and "Revised Section 106 Regulations..."
- "48 FR 44716-742, Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Archaeological Identification" [in "Archaeology and Historical Preservation: Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines"]
- King, Chap 4
- Hardesty and Little, Chap 2 and 3

MEETING 9, 23 October

TOPIC: Section 106 of NHPA: Part 2, Effect and MOAs

DISCUSSANT:

READING ASSIGNMENT FOR DISCUSSION:

- BIA Foreclosure case #1 and #2.
- "Selections from Programmatic .Agreement between Caltrans, FHWA, CalSHPO"

BACKGROUND READING:

- Re-read "Protecting Historic Properties"
- ACHP, Case Digest "Suicide Barriers for Golden Gate Bridge."
- ACHP "36CRF800: Recommended Approach for Consultation on Recovery of ..." Pp. 27085-27087.
- T. King, Chap. 4 and Appendix 4: Model MOA

MEETING 10, 30 October

TOPIC: Consulting: Ethics and Pragmatics

DISCUSSANT:

READING ASSIGNMENT FOR DISCUSSION:

- M. Reuss, "Government and Professional Ethics: The Case of Federal Historians"
- M. Glassow, "Ethical Issues Brought About by CEQA"

BACKGROUND READING:

- SAA "Ethical Scenario #1"
- K. Simpson, "Business 101"
- P. Garrow "Ethics and Contract Archaeology."
- R. Windmiller, "How to set your consulting fees."
- J. Jameson et al., "Federal Archaeological Contracting"
- US Forest Service, "Request for Proposal"
- RFP, Technical Proposal, Cost Proposal.
- National Council on Public History, "Code of Ethics."
- Register of Professional Archaeologists "Code of Conduct."

MEETING 11, 6 November

TOPIC: Surprise project

(No, it's not an exam but participation is mandatory); bring a calculator and some notepaper.

DISCUSSANT: Everyone

READING ASSIGNMENT FOR DISCUSSION:

- None; no review article is due this week.

MEETING 12, 13 November

TOPIC: Applying Section 106 of NHPA

DISCUSSANT: Everyone

READING ASSIGNMENT FOR DISCUSSION:

- "Case Study: Little Adobe Canyon"

READING ASSIGNMENT FOR DISCUSSION:

- There is no review article due this week, but please review the Sec 106 process.

MEETING 13, 20 November

TOPIC: NAGPRA and Repatriation

DISCUSSANT:

READING ASSIGNMENT FOR DISCUSSION:

- L. Hinton "Ishi's Brain"
- "SAA Position Paper and Clark's "Letter to the Editor" (review these two articles together.)

BACKGROUND READING:

- BIA Foreclosure case #3 (read this, it's short)
- ACPAC "Providence RI wins NAGPRA appeal"
- Bettinger, R. et al. "The Repatriation of Pleistocene Californians"
- J. Watkins "Education and NAGPRA"
- Judge Jelderks' Opinion in the Kennewick Man Lawsuit
<http://www.friendsofpast.org/kennewick-man/court/opinions/decision-020830.html>
- Letter to Col. Donald Curtis
- T. King Appendix 5: Model NAGPRA Plan

27 November 2009; NO CLASS. -- THANKSGIVING BREAK

MEETING 14, 4 December

TOPIC: Curation and Site Treatment

DISCUSSANT:

READING ASSIGNMENT FOR DISCUSSION:

- T. Childs "The Curation Crisis"
- Praetzellis and Costello "Don't Keep Everything" AND Greenwood and Hale "But let's keep enough." AND "Response to Greenwood and Hale."

BACKGROUND READING:

- SAA "Ethical Scenario #2"
- Dept of Water Resources "Oroville Facilities... Draft Historic Properties Management Plan" (printout of a PowerPoint presentation; for more info Google "Lake Oroville Relicensing")
- ACHP "Treatment of Archaeological Properties: A Handbook"
- State of California "Guidelines for the Curation of Archaeological Collections"
- FERC Guidelines for Historic Properties Management Plans" [URL in the reader.]
- T. King Chap 5

MEETING 15, 11 December

TOPIC: Making it all Better

DISCUSSANT:

READING ASSIGNMENT FOR DISCUSSION:

- State Historical Resources Commission/Archaeology Committee, White Papers #1 Introduction AND Standards AND Conservation
- State Historical Resources Commission/Archaeology Committee, White Papers #2 Protection AND Interpretation AND Curation

BACKGROUND READING:

- ACHP, Case Digest "Amendment to the Presidio Trust Management Plan."

NOTE: I suggest that you read King's entire book, not just the required chapters. Similarly, there are excellent articles unassigned in the Richman and Forsyth volume.

How to Write an Article Review

<http://adminwww.flinders.edu.au/cas/article.html>

(Note from AP: "the occasional weird spelling is due to the Australian origin of this article")

Before you start any assignment you need to be clear in your own mind about your audience. Your writing should be considerate of that audience. Article reviews and annotated bibliographies are written to provide others, fellow students or staff, with information about current literature in a particular field of study. In these exercises, you will be making decisions about what your readers need to know and want to know about the article under review or the listed literature. You should assume your readers have not read the material you are discussing and that their only knowledge of it comes from your review or annotations. You may need to improve your grasp of the subject area under review before you attempt your assignment. Make sure that you understand exactly what your lecturer requires in terms of length and presentation.

Article review

If you think about film or book reviews you have read, you will recall that they begin with an overview or summary and go on to offer an opinion (or **critique**) about the film or book. The **summary** contains the main points of the piece in your own words; the critique states whether the author has done what he or she set out to do, and perhaps whether or not the work is an important contribution to the field.

Summary

- The summary is an objective report of what the article says. Avoid discussion or interpretation of the issues raised.
- Give a brief overview of what the article is about, and what the author wanted to achieve.
- Summarise the main points in the article, using the author's order of **presentation**.
- Make some observations about the author's style. What approach has the author used? Is it based on a particular theory, a debate considering different points of view, or a personal impression? For research-based articles, consider the methods used.
- Write a final paragraph about the conclusions drawn by the author (findings for a **research-based** article) and the significance that the author places on them.
- The summary should be no more than half the total length of your article review.

Critique

The critique is a personal but informed evaluation of a piece of writing. You are expected to express opinions and to support them with appropriate references. In fact this process of explaining your opinions helps you to understand the text more fully. Each review is different. Consider the context in which you have read the article. Pose some questions about the subject and relate them to your reading. The following questions are offered as starting points. **Not all will suit the requirements of your review and you may choose to work out more relevant questions for your subject area.**

Try to make your presentation as interesting as possible for your audience.

- Is the article easy to understand? For whom is it written - the general reader, or experts in the field? Is it clear and well set out?
- Are there any underlying or hidden assumptions? Do these weaken or strengthen the argument or findings?
- Does the evidence stand up to examination? Give reasons for your judgements and back them up with references.
- Is there a weak link in the overall chain of reasoning or procedure? For example, is the writer making wide generalisations from only a few limited examples? Was the sample size appropriate for the method used?
- Would the same results be obtained if the study were replicated? Do you know of other supporting evidence for and against the conclusions?
- Can you think of other ways of 'testing' the writer's findings? Are other theories or more appropriate methods involved in these?
- Is the main argument or hypothesis a new idea, or does it go over ground covered in other work on the same subject? Who else supports it?
- What is the **relevance** of the findings in the article? What problems in society or your area of study will be helped or solved by applying this understanding? Who can best implement the findings, and how, when and where?
- Does the article provide a useful introduction to a reader new to the field?

Does the article provide useful information for a reader already familiar with the area?

ANTHROPOLOGY 503
SEMINAR IN CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
FALL 2009
INSTRUCTOR: ADRIAN PRAETZELLIS

SELECTED REFERENCES (not including government, other non-copyrighted publications, and stuff that I accidentally forgot to include)

- Bettinger, R. et al. "The Repatriation of Pleistocene Californians" SCA Newsletter 39(2)
- T. Cripps, "So their eyes won't glaze over." **Wide Angle**, Volume 20, Number 2, April 1998, pp. 77-104
- Garrow, P.
1993 Ethics and Contract Archaeology. Practicing Anthropology 15(3):10-13.
- S. Goldberg, "Smithsonian suffers Legionnaires' disease". Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists May/June 1995
- Green, E.L. (ed.)
1984 Ethics and Values in Archaeology. Free Press
Pp. 108-116, D. Fowler, "Ethics in Contract Archaeology"
Pp. 208-223, C. Meighan, "Archaeology: Science or Sacrilege"
- Greenwood and Hale "...but let's keep enough." SCA Newsletter 36(4)
- Hinton, L.
1999 Ishi's Brain. News From Native California 13(1):4-9.
- Hutt, S., E. Jones, and M. McAllister
1992 Archaeological Resources Protection. Preservation Press.
Pp. 13-34, 152-179
- R. McGhee,
2008 Aboriginalism and the problems of indigenous archaeology. *American Antiquity* 73(4) 579-597
- Messenger, P. (ed.)
1989 The Ethics of Collecting Cultural Property. University of New Mexico Press.
Pp. 1-25, K. Warren. "Introduction"
- Meltzel, D., D. Fowler, and J. Sabloff (eds.)
1986 American Archaeology, Past and Future. Smithsonian Institution Press.
Pp. 395-414, R. Knudson, "Contemporary CRM"
- Mulvaney, K.
1999 Management Strategies and the Component of Indigenous Sacred Places. The George Wright Forum 16(4): 37-49.
(The George Wright Society, PO BOX 65, Hancock, MI 49930)
- Pelkofer, P.
1994 The ASA and State Law..."

Pp. 114-118, in R. Woodward and C. Moore (eds.)
Underwater Archaeology Proceedings ...
Society for Historical Archaeology.

Phillips, D. "Who's my Daddy? Who's my Mommy" ACRA Edition 2003.

Praetzellis and Costello "Don't Keep Everything" SCA Newsletter 36(3)
Praetzellis and Costello "Response to Greenwood and Hale." SCA Newsletter 37(1)

National Council on Public History
ND Code of Ethics.
Register of Professional Archaeologists
ND Code of Conduct.

E. Rothstein, "Who should tell history: the tribes of the museums?" NY Times 12/21/04

Slagle, A.
2002 Unfinished Business: Protecting Native American Sacred Sites. News from Native California 16(1):48-50.

Society for American Archaeology Position Paper
"The Secretary of the Interior's September 21, 2000 Determination of Cultural Affiliation for Kennewick Man" October 14, 2000
<http://www.saa.org/Repatriation/lobby/kennewick8.html>

Sonoma State University
1999 Cultural Resources Management Plan (for Los Vaqueros Reservoir)

Smith, G. and J. Ehrenhard
1992 Protecting the Past. CRC Press
Pp. 9-18, 21-25, 2437-252, 283-287

Stine, J
1992 The Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway and Evolution of Cultural Resources Management. Public Historian 14(2):7-30

Wilson, R. and G. Loyola
1987 Rescue Archaeology. Preservation Press
Pp. 178-191

Woodall, N. (ed.)
1989 Predicaments, Pragmatics, and Professionalism.
Society of Professional Archaeologists, P.O. Box
60911, Oklahoma City 73146.
Pp. 37-49, M. Glassow, "Ethical Issues brought
about by CEQA"

American Association for the Preservation of Archaeological Collections (CPAC) *Newsletter*, June 1997 "Providence RI wins NAGPRA appeal"

American Antiquity 57(4):595-598. V. Deloria, "Indians, Archaeologists, and the Future"

Current Anthropology 1997, 38(5):761-794. B. Haley and L. Wilcoxon. "Anthropology and the Making of Chumash Tradition."

Journal of Field Archaeology 20(3):347-355. D. Staley, "St. Lawrence Island's Subsistence Diggers"

Native Peoples, Winter 1993: 24-31. K. Dongoske et al, "Understanding the past through Hopi oral history."

Common Ground Fall/Winter 1996:64-65. P. Pelkofer, "A question of abandonment."

Common Ground Fall/Winter 1996: 60-66. C. Zander and O. Varmer, "Closing the gaps."

CRM Vol 16, Special Issue 1993. C. Carroll, "Administering federal laws...)

CRM Vol 18(4) 1995. E. Linenthal, "Can museums achieve a balance between memory and history?"

CRM Vol 18(6) Supplement, 1995. D. Hardesty, "Research Questions and Important Information."

Society for American Archaeology, Committee on Repatriation
10/14/00 "Position Paper on Kennewick Man"

Society for American Archaeology, Ethics Committee
1997 "Ethical Scenarios" by Anne Pyburn and Julia Costello

Society for American Archaeology *Bulletin* Vol. 13(3): 3-4, 13. "Letters to the editor"

Society for American Archaeology *Archaeological Record* March 2001, p. 3 "Letter to the Editor"

SOPA (Society of Professional Archaeologists) *Newsletter*, Vol. 21(4-6):3J. Watkins "Education and NAGPRA".