ANTH 385B How Archaeology Works: Think Like an Archaeologist
SPRING 2013 TR 10:30-11:45 a.m.
Kuykendall 310

Instructor: Dr. Miriam Stark
Office Hours: Wednesdays:1:30-3:00 p.m.
203C Dean Hall
and by appointment
Phone: 956-7552
E-mail: <miriams@hawaii.edu>

Course Description

Archaeologists use critical thinking skills to ask questions about the past, and we craft our questions around certain kinds of archaeological data. Students in this course learn basic scientific methods and tools that archaeologists use to study ancient peoples, their cultures, and past natural environments. We learn and practice strategies for creating, analyzing, and evaluating data to answer archaeological questions. Thinking like an archaeologist also requires thinking about professional ethics, and we do this to conclude our semester. All upper-class students are welcome to join the course, although completion of ANTH 210 (Introduction to Archaeology) is useful. This course is designed to prepare students for upper-division laboratory and analytical classes in archaeology. By the end of this class, students will be able to:

- Use their enhanced critical thinking skills through practice in the classroom, lab, and life outside the classroom;
- Understand selected classic and recent themes in, contributions to, and problems of archaeology;
- Formulate linking arguments between archaeological questions and archaeological evidence;
- Be familiar with some basic archaeological methods, theory, and interpretive frameworks; and
- Discuss ethical issues inherent in archaeological practice within and beyond the United States.

This course requires active learning, active thinking, and active problem-solving. After working through some basic introductory concepts, we will examine an archaeological theme each week through lecture, some readings, and in-class exercises.

COURSE READINGS: will be available as pdf files through Laulima. Some (but not all) of the in-class exercises and take-home assignments will come from the following three books:


**COURSE REQUIREMENTS**: Students are expected to submit all in-class exercises and weekly class assignments within a week of the due date; no credit is given for late assignments. Completing course readings, attending class regularly, and participating actively in class activities are essential for doing well in this course. This is not a writing-intensive course, but archaeological thinking requires archaeological writing. Students will have the option to revise and resubmit up to 7 of their assignments, in consultation with the instructor.

There is no textbook for this course, but weekly readings will be available on Laulima as downloadable pdf files.

**GRADUATE STUDENT PRESENTATION**: Graduate students must select a topic on which to make a 30-45 minute presentation that includes: (1) an oral presentation; (2) an accompanying PowerPoint presentation; (3) a 4-5 page hand-out that includes an essay that is not a verbatim version of the oral presentation; (4) a detailed lecture outline; and (5) a CD containing files for 2-4.

**Disability Access**: Students with disabilities and related access needs are encouraged to contact the UHM KOKUA Program for information and services. Services are confidential and students are not charged for them. Contact KOKUA at (V/T) 956-7511 or (V/T) 956-7612 or kokua@hawaii.edu. KOKUA is located on the ground floor, Room 013 of the QLC Student Services Center.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | **What is Archaeology? Who Does Archaeology? Why?**  
Readings: none |
| 2    | **Archaeology as the Study of Time**  
Readings: Rice 1998:184-193  
In-class exercise: Dendrochronology (Rice 1998:193-198)  
Take-home assignment: Dendrochronology (continued) |
| 3    | **Archaeology as the Study of Space**  
In-class exercise: Torralba site  
Take-home assignment: Prehistory of the Nebulosas Chain (D & D 1989:20-25) |
| 4    | **Vertical Space and Time in Archaeology: Stratigraphy**  
In-class exercise: Stratigraphy assignment  
Take-home assignment: Nagasawa Street (Barber 1994:86-90) |
| 5    | **Archaeology as the Study of Things: Lithics**  
Readings: Andrefsky 2005: 11-38  
In-class exercise: lithic workshop  
Take-home assignment: Stone tool assignment |
| 6    | **Archaeology as the Study of Things: Ceramics**  
In-class exercise: Ceramic technology (and shrinkage)  
Take-home assignment: Rice 1998:84-89 |
| 7    | **How Archaeologists Organize Things: Classification**  
In-class exercise: classification exercises from instructor  
Take-home assignment: Naja Typology (Barber 1994:138-148) |
| 8    | **How Archaeologists Build Chronologies**  
Readings: Rice 1998:91-100  
In-class exercise: Dating with pots: seriation (Rice 1998:100-107)  
Take-home assignment: Frequency Seriation Exercise (Rice 100-108) |
| 9    | **Archaeology as Culture History**  
In-class exercise: The Hacienda Plain (D & D 1982: 29-32)  
Take-home assignment: The Repton Barrow (D & D 1989:29-31) |
| 10   | **How Archaeologists Study the Landscape** |
Readings: Fagan 2012: 247-269
In-class exercise: Archaeological Survey Sampling
Take-home assignment: Archaeological Survey Sampling

11 How Archaeologists Develop Interpretations: Analogical Thinking
In-class exercise: The “Lunch” site (Rice 1998:24-27)
Take-home assignment: Khina Ethnoarchaeology (D & D 1989:71-76)

12 How Archaeologists Study Social Status
Readings: Fagan 2012: 270-286
In-class exercise: Car Survey Exercise (UH Parking structure)
Take-home assignment: Mortuary analysis (from instructor)

13 How Archaeologists Study Power
Readings: Sinopoli 1991:143-160
In-class exercise: TBA
Take-home assignment: The Little Bison Basin (D & D 1989:57-62)

14 Archaeologists as Professionals
Readings: Fagan 2012:316-325
In-class exercises: (a) Who Owns the Past (VHS 18985) documentary and discussion; (b) Ethics scenarios
Take-home assignment: Ethical Dilemmas (select 1 of 3)

15 Archaeological Stewardship
Readings: Fagan 2012:298-315
In-class exercise: Bones of Contention (VHS 16163) documentary and discussion
Take-home assignment: Site Stewardship in Hawai’i: (1) the H3; and (2) the Rail Project

Group projects on following topics: (a) history of why each project was begun, resources involved, and what is at stake; (b) how state and federal legislation has guided planning and implementation of each project; (c) what laws apply now (i.e., 2013) and then (during the H3 time) to burials and sacred sites encountered during project construction, and steps that the state took or must take; (d) how descendant communities have reacted to and influenced the progress of these projects; and (3) how you think this particular example of CRM and site stewardship will affect future development.
Example 1. You are on a camping trip in a national park with some of your friends and your family. Your parents stop the car in the parking lot to visit a famous rock art site. You and your friends are walking up to the rock art when you pass a man and a woman carrying a bag. As you continue walking, you can see the large rock outcrop covered with rock art. You look closer and see that there is fresh red spray paint covering several of the rock art figures. The paint is still dripping down the wall as you arrive. What do you do?

• Run back to the man and woman and tell them it is against the law to damage rock art.
• Do nothing; mind your own business.
• Get their license plate number, description of the car and the people and report them immediately to the national park ranger.
• Use some of the wet paint to write on the rock art too. After all, the settlers and Native Americans wrote their names and symbols on rocks.
• Make a citizen’s arrest of the man and woman.
• Something else?

Example 2. You are on a camping trip to a national forest to visit an old historic ghost town. Your trip leader takes you into an old building where there are a lot of relics laying around, including bits and pieces of pottery. You know, from your knowledge of cultural resources protection legislation, that federal laws protect historic places: that you should take nothing but photographs and leave nothing but footprints. As you are leaving, you notice that your trip leader is picking up several pieces of pottery and some of the other artifacts. Several other campers are doing the same thing. When you tell the trip leader what the laws say about not taking artifacts, the leader answers by saying, “Taking little things like broken pottery doesn’t count.” What do you do?

• Act as though you saw nothing; let them take the pottery pieces home.
• Pick up just one piece of pottery as a souvenir.
• Do nothing, knowing that you were obeying the law by not taking anything.
• Report the trip leader to the Forest Service office.
• Something else?
WEEK 14: ETHICAL DILEMMA ASSIGNMENTS

Ethical Dilemma No. 1. Archaeology Gone Awry?

Characters: Dr. Sandra, archaeologist with a federal agency, Dr. Noreen, contract archaeologist, Mr. Ned, collections manager

A large, 5-year CRM contract is being concluded in northern California, in preparation for the construction of Macrosoft World, a corporate interactive, birth-to-death life-care community. The archaeological work included survey of a 70,000-acre watershed and then testing and mitigation excavations of 30 prehistoric and 25 historic sites. During the course of the project, over 280 archive boxes of artifacts, soil samples, and paperwork were generated. The designated curation facility lacks room for this massive collection. Standard curation fees are $750 for each box, making the project's costs $210,000 to store the materials. If the size of the collection could be reduced, Macrosoft World has committed to supporting cost savings to the project's public interpretation program.

Sandra is a 20-year veteran of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and a nationally recognized advocate for cultural resources, charged with providing oversight for legal compliance with federal statutes. She is opposed to any culling of the collections, arguing her agency's point of view that research questions change over time and therefore all recovered materials must be kept.

Noreen works for a large CRM firm, and has been directing the mitigation program. She argues for allowing the project to develop guidelines to cull material with minimal research potential. She casts a practical eye toward what is traditionally packed away for "future study" and believes that archaeologists generating collections should sort out the grain from the chaff.

Ned is the new collections manager of the university curatorial facility that committed to receiving the Macrosoft World collection 5 years ago. His archive space is already crowded, and he struggles with a statewide curation crisis that has developed because CRM projects have increased in the past decade. He has applied to the dean to raise the archive fee to $1,000 per box; even this will not cover "in perpetuity" archiving.

Discussion: Can (or should) some artifacts be recorded in the field and left there? What are Sandra's and Ned's viewpoints? Should curation cost be a consideration in deciding what to keep and what not to keep? Are there any types of artifacts (bricks? flakes? undecorated body sherds?) that might not require curation after being recorded? Who should take responsibility for making sure we have adequate curation facilities in the future, and who should oversee guidelines for museums "discard" or deaccession policies?
Ethical Dilemma No. 2. Tourism, Heritage, and… Archaeology?

Characters: William Buckman, an archaeologist; and The Mining Company

In western Australia, several major mining companies have ore extraction projects, which inevitably cause massive disturbance to the land. Indigenous groups strive to preserve their heritage, which is embodied in the cultural landscapes the mining companies want to exploit. In general, mining companies pay for heritage surveys. The companies have a vested interest in recording as many heritage sites as possible because this will enable them to work in more areas, as they can say that the land has already been completely surveyed. At the same time, the government's Department of Indigenous Affairs also prefers to have as many sites as possible identified so they can protect sites under the law.

In practice, the mining industry and the Department typically “protect” sites by recording and studying them and then destroy them through mining processes. As a result, Indigenous groups typically seek to have the minimum number of sites recorded. By withholding information, they feel it gives them leverage in entering into dialogue with the Department and companies and also gives them more say about where and when mining can take place. For heritage sites that are still at risk following this dialogue, the great majority of Indigenous community members support detailed recording and salvaging. After all, a good handful of Indigenous community members economically depend on mining.

William Buckman recently began working in the region. As he becomes aware of these issues, he feels increasingly torn. He is being pressured by his colleagues at the Department and the mining companies that it is his duty to the archaeological record and as a professional archaeologist to record every archaeological site, even as he is being pressured by his Indigenous friends and colleagues to only record sites that are certain to be destroyed by a pending project. The mining company representative tells Buckman that these heritage sites are the intellectual property of all Australians; an Indigenous leader tells him these sites are of primary significance to Indigenous communities and are not necessarily part of the public record.

Discussion: What should William Buckman record? Should he work for The Mining Company? If he does not, what happens to the archaeological record? Should members of the descendant communities work for The Mining Company?
Ethical Dilemma No. 3. Art or Heritage? Archaeology and Descendant Communities

Characters: Mark R, a consulting archaeologist, José, a Pueblo elder

Part I. For his own aesthetic interests, Mark R had collected Pueblo Indian arts and crafts for many years before becoming an anthropologist. In spite of his interest in Southwestern ethnography, his main fieldwork was done in Latin America. Nevertheless, through some personal connections, he was invited by a non-profit environmental organization to conduct a brief ethnohistorical study in one of the Rio Grande pueblos. While he is working on this project, he learns that over a 30 to 50 year period, several regional museums had acquired a substantial number of religious items from many different Pueblo Indians.

As his study progresses and he interviews various tribal members, he learns from José—a respected elder of the pueblo—that an important ritual item, used by one of the religious societies in the community, has been missing for about 30 years. According to José, the stolen item was taken from a sacred cave, where ritual items are stored when not in use. José noted that because of shifting reservation boundaries the cave might not be on tribal lands, but such ceremonial items are still the responsibility of the entire religious society and cannot be owned by any single person. Ceremonies have not been complete since the item disappeared, José said, and crop failures and other community problems are partially attributed to this loss.

After obtaining a full description from José and checking this information with colleagues at a local museum, Mark realizes that there is a good chance that the item in question is similar, if not identical to one he had purchased 25 years previously from an art gallery in Santa Fe.

Discussion: What is Mark’s personal ethical responsibility, both as a professional archaeologist and also as a colleague to descendant communities? Do you believe that the Santa Fe art gallery is also implicit in this problem? If so, what do you recommend should be done? This item is sacred; if Mark gives the item back to José, do you think it is appropriate for José to return it to its hiding place rather than sharing it with his community?