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INTRODUCTION

What follows is a partially edited transcript of a symposium held at the 1980 Annual Meetings of the Society for California Archaeology at Redding, California. Plans for the publication of this transcript had not been made beforehand, and this has caused some minor problems in the identification of commentators, but because of the great interest that the symposium generated, we felt it worthwhile to make its contents available to a wider audience in this format.

We are indebted to Ed Clewett, Shasta College, the original stimulant for the symposium, for attending to the transcription of the tape and arranging for this final published edition.

As will be explicit in the transcription, the intent of the symposium was to review the genesis of the Society for California Archaeology for insights that such a retrospective examination might provide as to the nature of the Society at the present time and the role that it might play in the future. It is more than appropriate that those whose primary commitment is to the relevance of the past for the present and the future, should engage in this self-examination and find the effort eminently worthwhile.

Mark Kowta
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CLARK BROTT: I feel it necessary to explain the purposes of this gathering. When I was baptized into California Archaeology about eighteen years ago, a person could quickly memorize the names of all active professionals involved in the State. Without hurrying, you could probably read off the list in under two minutes. Malcolm Rogers was dead; Mark Harrington was retiring; Fritz Riddell and Paul Schumacher headed a then very sparse government staff. There were schools or theoretical approaches to which one could adhere or abhor, and the student clans of...*1 are the ones that I remember at that time. ...* at Davis, Red True ...* were up to their ...* in the graduate school. Meanwhile Treganza ...* and a few others, were quietly sifting the evidence when time and funds were available. Cultural Resource Management was not yet a concept. Neither the National Historic Preservation Act nor 11593 was born yet. Very few archaeologists bothered with Antiquities Act permits. SHPO,2 ACHP,3 and NAHC4 were acronyms far in the future. California archaeology was hampered by an elitism and professional snobbery which hobbled efforts to stay ahead of post-World War II highway, pipeline and civilian development. I say stay ahead; actually we were lucky sometimes to trot along behind the bulldozers.

The elitism I refer to was characterized by professional jealousy between clans in the universities, who also looked down upon their supposedly less adept brothers in state community colleges and museums. Federal and State Parks archaeologists seemed both insulated and isolated, though more allied to the state college and museum crew. Nearly every card carrying archaeologist looked with disdain upon avocationalists, as though self-trained pre-historians were somehow members of a different species. It was in this hostile climate that I shared in a letter campaign in 1965, encouraging California archaeologists to convene and present ideas on forming a unified, cooperating, coordinating and viable body. The intent was to harness our then scattered energy for a better fight for resource preservation, and to provide political clout for protective legislation. Not the least of our intention was to establish a code of ethics, which would enable avocationalists to understand and adopt a professional stance, thereby weeding out relic hunters and actualizing a valuable labor and intellect potential. It was always assumed that professional training imbued the card carrying folks with certain mandated standards, which we all unflinchingly supported.

The letter campaign resulted in a symposium of the idea of organizing

---

1 ...* Tape unintelligible at this point.
2 SHPO State Historic Preservation Office
3 ACHP Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
4 NAHC Native American Heritage Commission
our needs at the 1966 Southwestern Anthropological Association Conference at Davis. Those attending were considered the de facto members of a potential society, and a steering committee was elected on the spot to prepare an organizing document. Joe Chartkoff, Al Elsasser, Don Miller, George Coles, Adan Treganza, Rob Edwards, Tom King, Dave Fredrickson, and I (and I don’t think I missed anybody) gathered later at UCLA, where a revised version of the Washington State Historical Society Constitution served as a skeleton for our original constitution. Today many things have changed, but we are still plagued with factionalism and elitism, believe it or not. Today, we are faced with many challenges and opportunities, some new and some old. This examination of where we are now, with suggestions of our possible directions, will be the subject of the next several papers. Dave, I believe you're up first.

DAVE FREDRICKSON:

The Society for California Archaeology:
A Report from the Acting President 1966-1967

I used this title because I was acting president in 1966-67. I did issue a report, and I am drawing from that report for this discussion. During the 34th Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Anthropological Association held at Davis in April, 1966, a symposium was prompted by discussion within California regarding the need for cooperation and the conduct of the archaeological salvage program as it then existed. One result of the symposium was the formation of a state-wide Committee on Plans for Coordination of Archaeological Site Records. Clark and I have somewhat different specific recollections as to the origin and functions of the committee.

The committee was formed to study the feasibility of establishing through legislation a central state agency or a system of regional centers, for the compilation and maintenance of archaeological site records. The formation of the committee was an appropriate development from the symposium, since the invitation to attend (which was sent out to approximately one hundred persons, constituting virtually all of the working archaeologists in the state at the time) contained, among other paragraphs, the following:

"It is hoped that the symposium will result in the selection of a committee of archaeologists, who are active in California, to draft a program for cooperation and hopefully to formulate specifications for legislation necessary to establish the program."

The membership of the ad hoc committee was structured to include representatives of the various types of organizations concerned with archaeology, and included (in alphabetical order):

Clark Brott, representing the private museums
Joe Chartkoff, representing the University of California, Los Angeles
George Coles, representing Community Colleges
Al Elsasser, representing the University of California, Berkeley
Dave Fredrickson, representing the University of California, Davis
Tom King, representing avocational groups
George Kritzman, representing avocational groups
Fritz Riddell, representing the State Government
Paul Schumacher, representing the Federal Government
Albert Spaulding, representing the University of California, Santa Barbara
Adan Treganza, representing the State Colleges, assisted by Rob Edwards

The eleven person committee held several meetings, although not all were present at any one meeting, and engaged in voluminous correspondence in an attempt to arrive at a consensus. A legislative proposal was put together, but for a variety of reasons, the effort floundered. However, the members of the committee, at a meeting held in November, 1966, at UCLA, acted upon an idea put forward at an earlier meeting by Clark Brott, that a congress of California archaeologists be established. The action at that November meeting consisted of the founding of the Society for California Archaeology. The aim of the newly founded SCA was to promote, coordinate and set standards for archaeology in California. Personally, I regarded the most important aspect of the organization to be "establishment of a corporate spirit to work to resolve the many problems encountered in the archaeology of California."

The first annual meeting of the SCA was in San Francisco, held in conjunction with a meeting of the Southwestern Anthropological Association (SWAA), in March, 1967. In May, 1967, Albert Spaulding took over as first elected president of the SCA. Up to that time I had served as acting president, a position that fell to me by default as Chairman of the original Site Records Committee. When I passed over SCA material to Professor Spaulding, I included several pages of what I labeled as general comments. This morning I intend to read from and paraphrase these comments, so that we might obtain some notion as to the changes that have occurred over the past fourteen years, and to call attention to the problems that still exist.

In brief the general comments pointed out a need for:

"1) More comprehensive research coverage of different areas of the state;
2) Synthesis of extant archaeological data;
3) Development of a conservation viewpoint;
4) Development of the amateur and volunteer potentials of the state;
5) Establishing an intellectual community of persons with a common interest in California archaeology;
6) The elimination of parochialism and jurisdictional conflict;
7) The need for regional data repositories as an alternative to a centralized agency was also mentioned."

I will discuss each of these in order.
1) Systematic areal coverage. It was clear in 1967 that so-called problem oriented archaeology had not provided effective coverage for all parts of the state with respect to obtaining information about the nature of archaeological resources, let alone culture history. By 1967, it was emergency or salvage archaeology that had provided most of the coverage which the state had enjoyed up to that time. Today, environmental archaeology continues in the salvage tradition, contributing toward the goal of comprehensive state-wide coverage.

2) Synthesis of extant data. Joe Chartkoff was one of the first to point out the need, at least in writing, for synthesis of California materials. In 1967 there was no adequate record of just what research had been conducted where. In 1956, the University of California Archaeological Survey published a summary of survey and excavation in the state, but nothing comparable appeared in the subsequent decade. In fact, it hasn't been until the last year or two, with the preparation of various regional and other specialized overviews, that such summaries have started to appear. The overviews currently in preparation or in the planning stages by various regional centers of the California Archaeological Site Survey, although primarily of a summary nature, hopefully will serve as a stimuli for much needed regional syntheses.

3) Conservation viewpoint. I found it interesting that in 1967, conservation meant primarily data recovery prior to site destruction. The present day concept of saving sites from destruction or of banking sites for the future, had not emerged fully into consciousness, primarily because the legislative and regulatory basis for such conservation had not yet emerged. It is worth noting that a text book now exists entitled Conservation Archaeology, and that data recovery is subsumed under that rubric.

4) Amateur and volunteer potential. In 1967, it was possible to state that amateurs in both Northern and Southern California had successfully conducted surveys in threatened areas, carried out emergency excavations, and prepared and published reports. However, in 1967, I had a somewhat naive perspective on the interaction between avocationals and professionals. I failed to recognize that effective cooperation between professionals and avocationalists was relatively rare, and still is, despite outstanding exceptions. It is apparent that the goals of the two groups are often sufficiently at odds with one another to restrict productive interaction. It is my observation that as scholars and professionals become influential in avocational organizations, membership in those organizations often drops, with those who are disaffected drawn elsewhere to practice their hobby.

5) A community with the common interest of California archaeology. I quote directly from my '67 comments:

"We must know what is going on throughout the State. Right now there are numerous persons involved in archaeological work, widely dispersed. Amateur groups, junior colleges, museums, state colleges, and the universities have in the past few years been active in archaeological research, quite often with no one having much awareness as to who was doing what. Normal publication of research results
have proved completely inadequate in California. In many cases excavation has been simply an end in itself, and despite the degree of competency with which it was carried out, the results are lost knowledge, since many times no descriptive analysis or report preparation, let alone publication commitment, has been made. I believe that it is vital to establish an intellectual community of persons with a common interest in California archaeology. The SCA can provide an extremely important service by actively encouraging all persons to carry through with the research responsibilities, to be concerned with the development of high standards, and at the very least to put on record a statement about what was carried out, where collections or notes are housed, even if publication does not emerge."

To a large extent the problem still exists. While regional centers have the potential to serve as information centers, and while environmental protection and historic preservation regulations usually insure adequate funds for analysis and report preparation, no intellectual community has yet emerged on a State level. However, on an upbeat note, the level Clearinghouse meetings and regional workshops have brought together individuals who have research interests in particular areas. The profession could surely benefit from expansion of such regional cooperation.

6) Parochialism and jurisdictional conflict. I suppose it was my naive optimism which prompted me to write in 1967, that with the corporate spirit, which I hoped the SCA could foster and assist in its development, perhaps we could eventually eliminate the taint of parochialism and jurisdictional conflict which has plagued us in the past. We could also hope that the large number of active workers in the state could help to minimize the significance of personality conflicts, which have in the past caused some tragic situations in California archaeology. From our 1980 perspective, it is clear that the history of California archaeology, since 1967, has been well marked by personality and jurisdictional conflicts. In many ways the SCA Clearinghouse system, the State regional centers, and the SCA itself have contributed to the problem, despite the many positive benefits. Attempts at guidelines and regulations that are tinged with misplaced moralism and economic competition, may well be major contributors to such conflict today.

7) Regional data repositories. In 1967, the idea was conceived to divide the state into a number of regions with a cooperating institution in each region, to be responsible for handling appropriate site records. The tentative division of the State, drawn up in 1967 by Fritz Riddell and Tom King, became the basis for the SCA Clearinghouse system, and subsequently for the state regional centers. In retrospect, by virtue of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the emergence of SHPO as an important institution, the basic problem of site records maintenance, which was a major factor in bringing the SCA into existence, has been solved. At least the apparatus for the solution exists and is working in different regions with varying degrees of effectiveness.
The solution, that of the regional center system under the general coordination of SHPO, was built upon the SCA contribution of the District Clearinghouses.

Other problems that I saw as important in 1967 are also in active process of being solved at this present time. Regionally, I feel comfortable in stating that communities of scholars have informally emerged on the regional level to discuss research questions and to formulate strategy: and more formally, have sponsored regional symposia, workshops and conferences. The problems I see which still remain are (1) the need for cooperation between avocationalists and professionals, and (2) parochialism, jurisdictional and other conflicts. As an afterthought I find it noteworthy that in 1967, I did not identify relationships with Native Americans as a problem area. Yet the last decade has seen this relationship rise to a crisis intensity, and then subside in terms of crisis, but with Native American involvement in professional decision making assured.

CLARK BROTT: The next paper is supposed to be delivered by Paul Chace and he sends a letter saying, "Because of certain scheduling uncertainties, it may be necessary to have Mr. David Berkenroad read my paper, "Cradle, Credo and Cross." David is here to give it, so you're on David.

PAUL CHACE: As you have heard, this paper is titled "Cradle, Credo and Cross." This report is a review of the constitutional history of this organization. It is historical in nature in order to provide a perspective.

"The Cradle:" The Society for California Archaeology had its genesis over a decade ago in a mimeographed newsletter. Beginning with issue Number 8 of October, 1965, the UCAS Archaeological Newsletter, mimeographed at UCLA, was mailed to all recognized archaeological institutions in California, and particularly to all amateur groups. Its principle editorial concern was the need for a central archaeological administration to coordinate site records throughout the State of California. The UCAS Archaeological Newsletter, issues 8, 9, and 10, led up to an announcement of a special symposium at the SWAA meeting at U.C. Davis. At the April, 1966, meeting the special symposium was entitled "The Future of California Archaeology, Archaeological Services, Cooperation and Survival." In spite of this title, the symposium chairman judiciously limited comments to the single topic of a central records agency. The one hundred or so participants concluded the meeting by establishing a pilot committee to further discuss the possibility of establishing a central state records agency through legislative proposal. The UCAS Archaeological Newsletter, Number 11 of May, 1966, was devoted entirely to reporting the meeting. The pilot committee was empowered to enlarge itself and to expand into a formal organization to pursue such a legislative project. The obvious and first preparatory step was to establish a state-wide archaeological society. This society would qualify active amateur archaeologists throughout the state to participate in and utilize the proposed site records files.
The initial thoughts raised were for a federation or congress of amateur archaeological societies, whose members would adhere to a credo of scientific ethics, and thus qualify for access to the proposed records archive. Such a federation "could establish a state-wide voice, which was obviously necessary for pushing on legislative proposals."

Initial thoughts of the society revolved around amateurs. Nowhere is it stated that such an organization also was needed to provide cohesion and coordination for the many professional archaeologists active in the state. SCA actually was formed on November 16, 1966, when the expanded SWAA pilot committee, composed of essentially non-amateurs, met at UCLA. Among themselves they adopted an organizational statement and temporary officers, as well as a draft bill, which was submitted to state officials in Sacramento within the month. These actions were announced in the UCAS Archaeological Newsletter. Henceforth, the newsletter of SCA was to be published at UCLA.

The organizational statement adopted an ambitious four point statement of objectives. The purpose of the SCA shall be to promote, coordinate and set standards for archaeological research in the State of California; by establishing a code of ethics; holding an annual symposium for the solution of interdisciplinary and intraprofessional problems; publishing a newsletter, which reports all research being conducted in California archaeology; and coordinate, through the state archaeological program, the activities and other research programs of the members of the Society. The first SCA Constitution and By-laws were adopted by a vote of those assembled at the first annual meeting held in San Francisco on March 23, 1967, in conjunction with the SWAA meeting.

Almost immediately governmental creation of an archaeological agency, legally empowered and authorized by the State of California to centralize archaeological activities, proved to be a frustrating dream. No State support has been achieved for the Society or for the Society's programs. The high points of these political efforts were AB 1788, the California Archaeological Survey Act, passed by the legislature but vetoed by Governor Reagan in December, 1971; also SB 215 of the same year. From the beginning the Society has had to operate on its own power and authority, which was coming exclusively from its own membership. SCA thus emerged in 1967. It was clearly designed to organize a large membership and constituency based on the lowest common standard, rather than on high principle and creed.

"The Creed:" The Constitution and By-laws are particularly weak in defining membership and ethics. Membership was opened to all. The code of scientific ethics was composed of three vague sections. Except to forbid the selling of archaeological specimens by members, the code is so vague as to be useless in establishing ethical behavior. Essentially the code of ethics would appear to place professional scientists in judgment over non-professionals. The code's strength is in the chapter of the By-laws, which authorizes the Society's Executive Committee to expel any member who does not conform to the code. No implementation of this authority has ever been carried out, however. Clearly the code is based on the lowest common principle for organizing the largest possible membership and constituency.
The Society undertook to incorporate late in its first year. Articles of Incorporation were prepared and signed on October 30, 1967, for the purpose of forming a corporation pursuant to the general non-profit laws of the state of California. The articles were duly filed in the Office of the Secretary of the State on October 11, 1968. Where they define the purpose and structure of the incorporated Society, the Articles of Incorporation take precedence over the Constitution and the By-laws.

In the summer of 1970, in response to changes in the State Highway Salvage Program, the SCA Highway Salvage Committee appointed SCA representatives as district archaeologists to work voluntarily with each of the eleven State highway districts in developing salvage contracts. By late 1972, with newly evolving environmental law requirements, these district archaeologists were being promoted to assist all local government planning bodies, and the position had assumed far broader political possibilities and financial opportunities. At the May, 1973, meeting of the Executive Committee a system was initiated of institutions designated by the Executive Committee to serve as volunteer district clearinghouses, to replace the individual district archaeologists, and to more effectively . . .* within the society, that have not been fully allayed. The only formally approved change of code of scientific ethics has been an addition, (voted approval in November, 1971, Newsletter 5, page 5 as Section 4). This included

"A. Members shall contact pertinent representatives of the Native American Community during the planning phase preceding archaeological programs and

B. No member shall excavate, nor otherwise disturb any location, cemetery, or other mortuary context which was used until recently.

C. Wherever requested by Native Americans, all human skeletal remains of recent date shall be reinterred following laboratory analysis."

Five other resolutions on ethics have been raised in recent years, but no actions were pursued to ratify or codify them in the By-laws. The Executive Committee has never acted to expel a member that did not adhere to the Code of Scientific Ethics. However, the membership has twice taken similar, but less specific action; once at the 1970 annual meeting, and again at the 1974 annual meeting.

Ethics and standards were a stated purpose in the first Constitution and are now a major concern of the Society. The Society began with a minimal set of ethical statements. Its . . .* has recently made efforts to set new and higher standards. However, these new ethics have not been ratified by the membership. Membership is delimited through the Code of Scientific Ethics. The original Constitution and Code permitted the broadest possible membership constituency. With new and different ethical standards, the Society's constituency and its membership funding base could be radically altered. While raising the standards, the Society's appeal and membership must remain broad in scope, and not become too narrow, so as to fully represent archaeological research interest throughout California. This can be achieved by having the full membership participate in ratifying new ethical standards in the
By-laws. Authority for the Society still remains only with the power and authority afforded by individual members. Membership dues remain as the only real income source. The Society must develop greater authority in order to implement its programs and standards effectively. Such a position of authority could be achieved by securing official State authority and recognition; by securing authority for archaeology with other State agencies, including universities, unions, County governments, etc.; or by securing funding resources from beyond its membership. Without greater authority, the Society remains entirely dependent upon the individual favor of its individual members, and can serve no effective leadership role in California archaeology.

CLARK BROTT: Thanks alot, Dave, for pitching in for Paul Chace. The next talk is by Albert Elsasser. Al, who is really one of our honored elder statesmen, can't be here. He is, unfortunately, suffering from a malady, which will probably be with him until he is gone. So, he sends us his greetings and hopes that the talk which he has recorded and sent to us will be of interest.

ALBERT ELSASSER: (Prepared Tape) I have been asked if I would prepare a retrospective commentary on what "used to be" in California archaeology, so far as I was concerned. I felt entitled to interpret this as an invitation to do some fuzzy reminiscing. Probably I am by no means the best qualified to do this, except in the sense that I have managed somehow to retire recently from anthropological jobs, which began in 1951. Certainly some conditions have changed greatly since I went on my first excavation as a student in 1949, and also I have not kept abreast of everything that has developed in California archaeology during the past three decades. Especially, I have been a bit removed from pertinent administrative or legislative matters, including the coordinating of large scale environmental impact studies. Nevertheless, on the theory that persons approaching, or who are in fact at the elderly condition, whether they are statesmen or not, might have a few lines worth listening to, I shall proceed in a sort of rambling manner. I hope at least that this is what Clark had in mind.

My tenure as archaeologist at U.C. Berkeley ended in 1961, at a time when there was a great deal of stress and strain in the field of California prehistory. Perhaps the founding of the SCA was consciously or subconsciously intended to ease some of these strains, especially in the matter of keeping organized site records, and in the possibility of essentially overseeing (or at least coordinating) a continuing program of excavation, surveying and publication of results among various groups scattered about the state. These groups probably were, in the main academic organizations which had some kind of ongoing financial support supplemented by such major grants as were available at the time, or some other professional societies which seemingly operated on membership funds alone. I had always envisioned a central site records file, administered by "someone," which would serve archaeologists in all parts of the State. I believed that this depended on a statewide system of
cooperation, in fact, recently attempted in the establishment of a system which includes regional offices, which in turn serve as clearinghouses for different areas.

Being effectively out of the sphere of field archaeology for almost eighteen years has left me in a fairly peculiar position of having a reasonably good grasp of the field activities of others, as well as a pretty good knowledge of publications, but at the same time practically illiterate in what had been going on administratively. Probably the regional offices just spoken of, and other Cultural Resource Management (CRM) programs, have already done much to bring some order into the former complexity, or rather I should say lack of organization. Also, since my time of field activity, other institutions or concepts have been developing to deal with what I understand are widely known as 'mitigation programs' on public lands on a scale unheard of in the 1950's, even taking inflation into consideration. I really only have a nodding acquaintance with these programs, and do not know whether there is what can be called healthy competition or factionalism between persons or groups involved in them. On the assumption that there are indeed some travails between them I would think that here is one area where the SCA could function most effectively as a state-wide coordinating institution.

It seems to me that some of the things that should be explored by future leaders in the Society, would be the possibility of acquiring and administering State and Federal funds to allow it to operate a small, permanent, paid staff, working under elected officers of the Society, plus a relatively long term committee to serve as advisors and administrators. Ideally, these trustees would be at least in part answerable to the membership of the Society, rather than to a bureaucracy in Sacramento or in Washington. I don't know if it is possible to arrange for such a set of circumstances.

Rather than belabor the feasibility or lack of this idea, I thought it might be worth something if I confined myself to commenting on the inherent difficulties which I had to face, although often only fleetingly, during my nine year active experience in the 1950's. Sometimes things which seem to be live issues today were then only thought of on very rare occasions. In the fifties the amount of interest or demanding to be heard by Native American groups or individuals was practically negligible. All of the time that I spent in Berryessa Valley in Napa County, for example, doing salvage excavation, or what is now called mitigation, at sites to be destroyed or actually being destroyed, I was not aware of one Native American who was present or even remotely concerned with the depredations by pot hunters of the numbers of prehistoric sites there, or of the excavations sponsored by the National Parks Service at the time. I strongly suspected that the depredations were being carried out by machinery operators hired by the United States Government to clear away the brush in the areas to be flooded. There was evidently no one to stop the pot hunting. I believe that this same sort of observation could have been made at any number of proposed dam sites and other areas at the time. An exception might be in the Hoopa-
Yurok region, where there is still a comparatively high population of tribal members living near archaeological sites. Surely the potential difficulty today offered by Native Americans who do not want any sites examined at all, particularly by professional archaeologists who happen to be part of the so-called dominant culture, have to be faced and adjusted in terms of the leadership function by the SCA. Whether again invoking a committee or board, which includes responsible Native Americans, is worth anything or not, it appears that the Society will have to recognize officially the feelings of Native Americans, partly in order to prevent the more militant ones from effectively disapproving of any excavations whatever in the future. In my opinion, such a negative policy should never be allowed to gain an effective foothold.

In looking back over the past twenty-five years or so, it seems to me that despite a persistent feeling of insecurity about the future of California archaeology, some excellent things have been happening. First of all, funding and staffing of operations on public lands have gained enormously during this time. Part of this great increase has come about because persons having the spirit of a strong SCA have been helping actively (lobbying, if you will) to bring about these conditions. Certainly there are going to be changing conditions, however, and a strong Society should be ready to meet them with a good continuity and membership. Again, I would hope for a small permanent or semi-permanent staff for proper implementation. The other good thing that has happened is that uncontrolled amateurs or vandals are having a much more difficult time operating than they used to. I remember a time in the fifties when it was a common event for sites on public land to be looted on weekdays during the spring or fall, when it was simply not feasible to muster up archaeological crews from the usual academic sources. The looters would simply disappear on weekends. Also, I could recite plenty of instances when valuable sites were simply pushed out of existence by bulldozers or loaders without anyone but the owner of the land or the developer and his hired hands knowing anything about it. Perhaps it is wishful thinking, but it seems only remotely conceivable that such blatant things could be happening today. There are simply too many interested persons or organizations which could be aware of such individual or corporate hoodlumism before it got serious.

I would like to discuss one more issue before closing off these maudlin reminiscences. This concerns the possibly diminishing returns in field archaeology in California. Obviously, one day most of the significant streams are going to be damned or altered in some way that will be damaging to the archaeological sites. In addition, it has been argued that most of the significant sites possibly have been excavated or destroyed. I'd like to assure all younger persons listening to this kind of thought, that when I first became interested in California archaeology (more than thirty years ago), the same discouraging or negative thoughts were given frequent expression. In view of all that has happened in these intervening years, it seems to me that there is, and will be, plenty of productive work to be done, and plenty of scope for an effective SCA to oversee these operations in some capacity or another. Even if it happens that field work is reduced from sheer attrition of sites,
it should be remembered that there exists in several locations literally
tons of material which have yet to be examined adequately. This is
something that archaeologists of the future should keep in mind, and
something that the SCA should have in mind to oversee.

CLARK Brott: The next talk, by Rob Edwards, prior to the coffee break
which will follow, is entitled "The Society for California Archaeology,
Regionalism versus Centralization." Rob, are you ready to step in here?

ROBERT EDWARDS: I was mentally debating in the last few minutes
whether to go ahead and give the talk that I prepared, or to take a
chance to respond. It is very interesting to me to listen to the papers
that have been given, because at the time this started I was not even
a graduate student. I was probably a senior at San Francisco State;
I was involved primarily as Treganza's staff person to keep track of
what was going on and what he said at various points in time. From
that perspective, as a senior and graduate student, I have a different
view than Dave Fredrickson and certainly Paul Chace had in historic
accounts later. In addition to all the other things that have over
the years contributed to a basic schizophrenic aspect of the SCA, is
the fact that it was really developed and carried by the graduate
students. There were some senior people such as Dave, Fritz Riddell,
William Olson and others, who gave their benign support--well, it was
even more than benign, in part. Then there was still Clem Meighan and
others who said go ahead and do what you can on it, but don't expect
much from us. But it was really a graduate student organization, and
it maintained that for a number of years. It is no accident that the
office of President of the SCA went on alternate years for the first
several years from a name like Dr. Spaulding to an activist graduate
student like Don Miller and then back to a "silver-backed" senior arch­
chaeologist. It was, and still is, an organization that is built on
volunteer labor and energy which is usually student originated. As
a result, we created something different, I think, than what was
planned and started.

There is currently a large gap between the reality of what the SCA is
and what the SCA was. Ideally the SCA is similar to the Society for
American Archaeology (SAA) on the national level. The SAA doesn't take
positions; it's hard to get a controversial statement out of it; it
refers lots of things to committees; it comes up with the equivalent
of publications; it holds annual meetings; its a fairly benign and
passive organization. What was created out of the SCA is somewhat
different. The SCA became a "professional" organization in reaction
to the various federal and state laws and policies. The SCA was
carried by "proto professionals" at the graduate student level. The
standards that we tried to establish were standards derived from our
studies and our readings. We did not have the advantage of many prece­
dents. There had never been a National Environmental Preservation Act
(NEPA) or California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) or SHPO before.
There were a lot of mistakes made, but because of the guidance that
we got from some of the elders, like Fredrickson, Olson, and Riddell,
we were able to make some good progress and to get some recognition and some status; and we were able to convince a number of agencies of our (SCA) reality. We responded to the crisis of highway salvage archaeology. We developed legislation and a study of California archaeology. And then, of course, the SCA leadership responded to CEQA, the Mammoth Decision, and the Coastal Commission. Guidelines were established and the Directory compiled.

People (yes, even Virginia) actually feel like there is an SCA. Despite what may have happened in the recent years, a lot of people still believe there is an SCA. You and I know there isn't. It should be obvious that the SCA is you and I and the person sitting next to you. If those people aren't doing the work, then there is no SCA. When people criticize the SCA for not doing something, or more likely, for trying to do something, then that is a question of criticizing you or me or the person in that seat. These people are your peers, whether they reside in another region or are at different levels of professionalism; a bureaucrat as opposed to an administrator, as opposed to a research person, as opposed to a teacher. It is this kind of lack of understanding of the reality about the SCA, concerning the basic schizophrenia of the group as a professional organization rather than as organization for all those interested in the discipline, like the SAA, that has caused the tremendous misunderstanding of the SCA's purposes over time.

Now, what happened over the years is that the graduate students became professionals, and as we look around we see these former activists. As an example, we see who is the Regional Archaeologist for the U.S. Forest Service in California, Don Miller. Don was the person who, as you may recall, was the second President. It used to be that the people that have gone through the SCA Executive offices were easy to spot. It used to be that if you wanted to get out of California, you were elected SCA president, because immediately you would get a job in Colorado or New York, or wherever.

But if I can come back to the problem for the future. The problem is that we still have to deal with this basic schizophrenic organization of the Society, and try to decide what it is we really are. Historically we have excluded the amateurs. Yes! Yes! There was a big push year after year to try to get the amateurs in, to set them up with credentials and to somehow make "real" archaeologists out of them. Or at least ones that we could feel confident about giving what precious information we had to, in exchange for getting usually much more information back from them in a particular local area. But that's died out, we haven't even given lip service to having an avocational credentialing program for several years. I suspect that if you took the membership of the people who were here, and you took out the professionals and the students, people who would claim themselves to be avocationalists are very, very minor. I think that this is clearly expressed in the original organization of the Society, which had Tom King as the avocational member of the original organizing committee. The problem is that we were originally organized as an interest group, similar to the SAA. But SCA keeps trying to take professional stands on ethics, on the Directory, on review. The SCA, and that means you and I, really needs to decide whether or not we should or should not be concerned about professionalism.
In the pessimistic mood I am in, the recommendation that I would make is that the SCA should get out of the professional archaeological business. Some other organization should be set up that could respond, under a series of by-laws, to professional needs. We should get on with a special interest group and start coming out with publications, such as a journal of California archaeology that is subsidized and paid for by the people who are members of this group. We should get something back out to the public. Especially to those interested people who probably contribute about twenty to thirty percent of our membership, even though they are not at the meetings. They are avocationalists; they are not "almost professionals."

Until we decide what kind of organization we are going to be, we are going to have this continual conflict on what our actions should be. This expresses itself clearly in the SCA District Clearinghouses which have now for the most part been taken over by the regional offices. What are we doing there in the district clearinghouses? Are we really just raising the flag for archaeology and trying to say "do more?" If on the other hand we are really going to try to be a professional organization, under what kinds of standards are we to require work to be done? How are we going to insure that it is being done?

California has been ahead of the nation for the last ten years in responding to archaeological preservation issues. The organization of the Society of Professional Archaeology (SOPA) really grew out of the professional aspect of the SCA that was organized much earlier. The responses on a number of federal CRM policies really comes out of the 1972 and 1973 SCA memoranda on how to do that in California. I was involved in both the ASCA and the SOPA organization. I attended a number of meetings discussing how that should be set up on a national level. Basically they go back to the California model time and time again. California is also the leader in producing work that is not as good as it could be. This is being felt nationally. Currently we have somebody from the General Accounting Office investigating what the value is of the historic preservation funds that are being spent in California. Questions that are raised are: How many times do you want to force somebody to survey a half acre parcel in any given area? What is the value of the data being gathered by agency requirements? It is frequently said that we are not synthesizing that data. We are not using it in a professional way.

We are getting paid, that's one definition of a professional, but somewhere along the way SCA has to choose whether or not it is trying to be a professional organization and therefore come up with some enforcement of standards, or we ought to forget enforcement of standards altogether. Let the SCA be the type of organization that worries about the annual meeting and publications. We should become an interested avocationalist group, in essence, similar to the national model of SAA with a lot of professional backing.
CLARK BROTT: Chuck James has graciously offered to give us a few remarks that will lead to an open discussion to be led by Mark Kowta. If you haven't heard the previous talks, don't worry about it, this is going to be an open forum on your ideas for the future and for the SCA. I think Chuck will be a good one to send into the bullfight to make the bull mad.

CHUCK JAMES: This is going to be the quickest speech that I have ever presented since it was prepared in the last five minutes. As was mentioned earlier this morning, the SCA began developing in the line of an amateur group. Its roots were in trying to coalesce various amateur organizations across the State, and bring them under a bracket of ethics, if you will professionalism, to do good archaeology. A large number of the people that were involved in this effort were academicians. I am lumping undergraduate and graduate students who possess a large amount of energy and ideas and the professors who tend to balance that energy with reality, on most occasions, into that category.

What has happened in the fourteen or so years that the SCA has been in existence? The first and most direct impact is that the graduate students grew up, went out, and found jobs. And one of the first things that occurred was a standards shift. We have seen a movement from the idea that an archaeologist was a person who had a Ph.d. In 1970 it would have been quite phenomenal for a person with an M.A. (or shudder at the thought, a B.A.) to hold a professional position in archaeology. Generally if they did, it wasn't in the field of archaeology. They were basically apprentices working under a professor. They were gaining experience with the understanding that they had to go on and get their Masters and Doctorate, eventually ending up teaching young graduate students.

In 1980 we are looking at archaeologists who may have a B.A. or who may have a large amount of field experience, but have not taken the time to get their degree. We had those people before the founding of SCA that were generally, except for a few, passed off as avocationalists or amateurs. So in looking at the founding of the SCA, amateurs included those people who were professionals in every sense of the word but were working in another field while dabbling in archaeology as an avocation. The degree program has changed markedly in the last fourteen years or so.

Secondly, this unbounded, and unbridled, enthusiasm and energy that the students had was channeled towards legislation and has helped in the passage of a multiplicity of preservation laws. Excluding the then existing 1906 Antiquities Act and the Historic Sites Act of 1935, we have seen laws such as NHPA, which gave rise to SHPO, ACHP, and various types of review procedures (especially 106), NEPA, Executive Order 11593 of 1970, both passed in Nixon's administration, and the Moss-Bennett Bill which was passed in 1974 and has recently been renewed. Also of critical importance is the American Indian Freedom of Religion Act (AIFRA) of 1978 and the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA) of 1979 which elevates the destruction of sites from a petty offense to a misdemeanor and/or felony. In addition, look at the promulgated
regulations that the government agencies have to deal with; #36/CFR/800 is a prime example. Let's not forget #36/CFR 61, 63, 64, and 66. And of course the #43/CFR series. These regulations lock various agencies into conducting "good cultural resource practices." And on the subject of laws, let's not forget the State. CEQA of 1970 has given a foundation for conducting archaeological surveys in some areas. Also there are local and county ordinances and regulations. You can trace some of these regulations, and a large amount of the energy going into helping pass the laws, back to the people who associated with the SCA and other State's Societies in the sixties. It was an age of activism, more so than just at the university campuses. Ironically, this passage of various laws has led to an inordinate demand for archaeological services, and a potential of not enough archaeologists to handle the services.

With the shift in the academic track and the passage of laws, we've seen a shift that I am going to refer to as an unholy double trinity with a halo. This is a summation of what I believe the current status of archaeology is in California. For the trinity I am first looking at the traditional track of academia. The professors on one hand and the graduate and undergraduate students on the other. People with some very firm ethical viewpoints, people who have an unbounded amount of energy and an unbounded amount of enthusiasm, and an extremely sincere concern about the resources.

The next leg of this trinity are the bureaucrats. These are those who manage contracts and document things with paperwork to be in compliance with the laws. The other half of this leg are the contractors, those people who are doing the work that allows the government to be in compliance with the laws. I am lumping them together because they go hand in hand. Without a contract you don't have contractors. Please remember contract work is not new in archaeology. The first contracts were in the early fifties at Vermillion Cliffs where, I believe, the work was funded by Southern California Edison. So the bureaucrats, that is government employees and contractors, have been with the SCA from its founding. This includes such people as Fritz Riddell, Bill Olson, Bill Wallace, Paul Schumacher, and others who were working in the government in non-traditional tracks, or on contracts.

The third part of the trinity are those interested amateurs and avocationalists that we keep forgetting about. They are interested in archaeology, in good archaeological practice and procedure, and in many ways they are interested in getting their hands dirty. But through matters of circumstance or the lack of education they are not involved in archaeology on a full time basis. A prime example of this is the Pacific Coast Archaeological Society.

If you look at this trinity there is a glue that holds them together. This is the concept of professionalism. If we look at ourselves as archaeologists I think we have a certain basic ethic, if you will, that holds us together. It is unspoken, it is unmentioned, but when it comes down to the bottom line it comes out.

Now let's look at the halo. Surrounding the trinity are the laws of
the land. They may be state, local or federal laws. But they are nothing more than codified ethics. They are what keeps the fringes of that trinity from drifting off base. They separate archaeologists from non-archaeologists. But we also have a darker side of the halo. Those are the individuals who are exploiting the resources for either their personal collections or for monetary gain. I think at the present time this is the state of the art.

In looking into the future, I really don't see these concepts shifting much. I think we'll still have academia, I sure hope we will, with students and the professors. I think that we will have bureaucrats, archaeologists that are trying to insure that Federal agencies are in compliance. I see this as a need as long as they have land disturbance projects on Federal lands. I also see the necessity of contractors. As long as we have the resource that needs to be managed during various projects.

Secondly, on the darker side, I still think that we are going to have vandals, especially until we can reach out with educational programs and explain the importance of cultural resources. I believe that this is one of the greatest lackings of archaeologists. We don't like to talk to the public. Children are growing up with their parents' values, values that say it is O.K. to go out and pick up sites, values that are very calloused towards other cultures or other people. This is a challenge to people to go out and talk to the elementary schools, talk to the high schools, talk to the children before they grow up. Let's try to break the cycle.

As for vandals, I hope that archaeologists stop dignifying their work by calling them pot hunters. A pot hunter is a term that suggests that a person is just out looking for something. We don't get uptight with deer hunters, why should we get uptight with pot hunters? It is like a benign acceptance. We should call them what they are, thieves, vandals or grave robbers. A person that is cutting down a historic building with a chain saw to sell the wood at four times the commercial value of high grade Douglas fir, I don't think he is a pot hunter, I think he is more than that. A person who digs up a Native American's great-grandfather, I don't think he is a pot hunter, I think he is a grave robber.

Another thing I would look forward to in the future, and I am talking for myself right now, is state licensing of archaeologists. What holds us together is our bracket of professionalism. As the dollar values increase in archaeology the potential of people doing archaeology for their own economic benefit increases. What is an archaeologist? At the present time it is the person who calls himself that. SOPA has come out with guidelines about what we would consider an archaeologist. The SCA has come out with guidelines about what we consider "professional" archaeologists. That term bothers me because I assume that if a person is an archaeologist he is a professional. We have no legal qualifications saying this person qualifies, that person doesn't. In a way, I don't see SOPA or the SCA filling that role for a very good reason: law suits. I think state licensing would get around that. If a person at that point violates professional standards, not ethics,
per se, then the state could remove that individual and not have to stand the challenge of a law suit. More importantly, if they do go into a law suit, they have the money to go ahead and not be frozen until it's resolved. I don't think the SCA is economically viable to carry out this charge. Nor do I see SOPA as being economically viable to carry out this action at the present time. Maybe that's a drastic theme because a lot of people don't want to consider licensing of anybody, so why should we license archaeologists. To digress, what I have done is put archaeology into a continuum. On the one hand we have applied research based in academia, in the center we have the contractor, and on the farther end we have those archaeologists dealing with government. They are all part of the same field, they are all part of the same value system. But we are stretched out and with this stretching we now have conflicts which do need resolve. At the present time the only resolution seems to be in the courts.

I see a major shortcoming at the present time with archaeology in all areas I have mentioned. Traditionally people have done projects and have presented papers on them. If students stay around long enough the papers get published. But most projects don't. I really think that we need to change this and focus on publication as a means of communication. Like all good archaeologists I still have ghosts in my closet that aren't published. I think this needs to change. I think we need to tighten up.

I see the need for archaeology to become a lobbying group, "shudder and horrors." The real world is comprised of politicians and lobbyists. I think that as we look at the new ARPA we're seeing results of what happens when you don't lobby, what happens when the individual members don't write their congressmen. We're seeing what happens when the various groups that believe archaeological and historical sites were not left in the woods to be at the beck and call of archaeologists, organize and lobby. We felt that Congress would look at the traditional scientific values and understand our plight. They passed a law, but there are a number of things in that, that I urge everybody to look at. We should also respond to this law because there is a response time for the enabling regulations. In the future I really think archaeology, actually the whole discipline of Anthropology, needs to look at lobbying.

Beyond that, I really don't have any conclusions. I think that we are at a point in time when we are seeing archaeology in a very dynamic period. I have a feeling that this dynamicism is going to continue for a long period. I see us having to deal more and more with Native Americans. I think that nothing but good is going to come from that because it is going to make us rethink traditional values. I see us as an organization becoming more involved in different types of legislation, and I hope that we as individuals also become involved in legislative actions that occasionally come up.

Besides, I think I have rambled on enough. I hope that this might foster some ideas or discussion from the members. I hope that it might give you some food for thought. I also hope that nobody agrees with me entirely. Because, if they do, something is wrong.
MAKOTO KOWTA: I'd like to mention first of all that one of the persons who should be given credit for getting this symposium started is Ed Clewett. Some time ago he had mentioned concerns about the state of archaeology today, and he felt that it would be a good idea if we reviewed the history of the organization and some of the developments that had taken place since the early days. That idea for a review was brought to fruition by Clark Brott who contacted key individuals and arranged for this symposium. The whole idea of the symposium is that the past should give us insights as to the nature of conditions today and what might be done in the future. Our outgoing President, Chuck, has mentioned some of the things that he sees for the future. Other speakers have given us information, data, and insights as to why we are the way we are at the present time. At this time I would like to open the discussion for additional ideas as to the nature of things at the present time, and more importantly, where we ought to be going in the future. I invite you to come up to the podium and share with us your ideas.

DONALD MILLER: I think this is a very interesting idea, and everyone is to be complimented. Being one of the old-timers, (earlier I found out I was an activist, which I had forgotten about) I would like to make a few comments. Mainly in agreement about the past. I think that a lot of things occurred this morning. There are a couple of key things that I think are very important about how the SCA was formed, and more importantly, the people actively involved in it. That is the fact that it was done primarily by students at that time, and still is. Chuck stimulated a lot of things, so I will talk mainly about now and the future. Speaking from my position in the Federal government, not to make Rob angry, I think SCA is something more than the people. The SCA is going to be around for a long time after we all leave. There are going to be other people, of course it is composed of people. I think that the spirit of SCA, and that spirit is the changes, also indicates to us that it is an institution. It is something that is a little bit above all the people who are involved, "superorganic," if you will.

I think dealing with laws is very good. I get very bored with it all the time, talking about compliance. I think that we are approaching a change where, in terms of getting us recognition, that just talking doesn't work very well any more. I think really what we are talking about is that by dealing with laws and becoming public, we are public. We're responsible to a public Congress who passed these laws, and Congress speaks for the public. That's probably the greatest challenge we have now, learning how to deal with all of the publics, not just the archaeological or the academic public or the contract public, but all the publics. We should try and do that with some sort of equality, and not just focus on one public over another in the long run, though at certain periods of time we may have to focus that attention.

Chuck's model of unity emphasized professionalism and I agree with that. But I would also like to state that professionalism is a little more
than what we have been talking about. Here, I tie it back into our professional responsibility, our responsibility as professionals to all the other professionals and the other people. When talking about having to deal with the public, and when I talk about public I mean everybody, the major thing to remember is that we suffer in archaeology under this tremendous burden of being confused with classicists and biblical archaeologists, or with Jacques Cousteau. We haven't really changed the image that was going around when I was an undergraduate at San Francisco State where I had to go to the Classics Department to read American Antiquities. I am sure they probably have it over in Anthropology now.

This is the greatest opportunity we have ever had to be Anthropologists, and to exercise a lot of the concepts, methods and so forth, that we learned (regardless of our speciality) as undergraduates and graduates. I think the real challenge to us as archaeologists is to start talking a lot about ethnic groups, a subject that is becoming a popular concept in the Federal agencies. I think we should pursue that. As a matter of fact many of the archaeologists in the Federal government are not even calling themselves archaeologists, as it is too difficult for them to communicate with various aspects of the public when using that label. I think there is great challenge in the future, and many people are already getting involved.

In 1974 or 1976 (somewhere in the deep past of the last ten years), I proposed state licensing for archaeologists in a paper on certification. I'm not so certain that I would take that position now, although it is good for legal purposes. All of the various agencies that hire and employ archaeologists have standards, definitions of what is a professional. I think probably the best thing to do is to continue what we have been doing, having common understanding of what those standards are. The standards are generally similar, although some may be a little bit more particular than others.

It is most important for all of us to take stock of where we have been. As prehistorians, we should understand this. And it can be done through organized symposiums, such as this, or in our own personal lives. Taking stock of what our thoughts were, even last year, is important because everything is changing so fast. We're so public, we're spending millions and millions of dollars. It is shocking how many millions of dollars the Forest Service is spending on CRM. This is increasing yearly and I believe it will continue to increase. Once that happens you have to be accountable, and that is one of the major things we have to look forward to in the future. We have to be accountable. I'd say that we have to quit fighting with each other, we have to quit suing each other, we have to quit all of this stuff that really brings discredit to the profession and the Society. Thank you.
LINDA KING: As your incoming President, I have listened very carefully to everything that was said today. I've heard a call for various sorts of actions, particularly, I think, an end to muddling through as the SCA has sort of done since its inception. I've heard a call for many kinds of activities, including licensing, professionalism (whatever that is, or however it is defined), for amateur participation, and for organization of funding through the State for a working office. We already have an office but it could be on a much larger scale. I've heard a call for dealing better with the public, a very, very important function. I would like to remind you all that in spite of the fact that the SCA has a superorganic component, action takes place on an organic level. That means that action takes place on the part of your members. I sincerely extend an invitation to each of you. If you are interested in seeing some of these things fulfilled, come up to me and volunteer your services. Head a committee, investigate, do something. Some of these areas are extremely difficult to implement, particularly the licensing challenge, which has been tried and explored before. I am going to be here all three days and I would love to hear your ideas. Please talk to me, I want to start committees, I want to get people working on these things. It will never be done by our "superorganic" component. Thank you.

IDENTITY OF SPEAKER IS UNKNOWN: What I have heard here is something that has been bothering me for a long time. I think Chuck's paper was a prime example. We are talking about bureaucrats, a term which I intensely dislike, being in the Federal government. We are talking about contractors, we are talking about academicians. I don't think that those categories are really germane. We are all interested in the same goal, and I think it is something we ought to be working for. We are working toward regional research. I think that those of us in government are having a hell of a time defining what to do with cultural resources in terms of significance, which relates back to regional research and state planning. Yet there is virtually no coordination in my experience within any of these three groups, bureaucrats, contractors or academicians. I know right now there is an ongoing State effort to put out regional overviews, and that's something that is happening unilaterally. We weren't aware of it. So what I am proposing, and I think that Linda has a good point, is that some of us (and I might as well open my mouth now and volunteer) work on a committee to get some kind of coordinated effort, if nothing else, to publish in the newsletter or in a separate vehicle, the work on coordinating research. I think that the challenge that we're really facing now is unifying the SCA, which is in my mind a society only once a year.

CHUCK JAMES: I should clarify one point. When I am talking about archaeologists as being bureaucrats, as being students, as being avocationalists, as being contractors, etc., I hope nobody misunderstood me. We are all archaeologists, and more importantly, I think we are all anthropologists. We keep forgetting this. If you look at your degrees, they say Anthropology as opposed to Archaeology or Cultural Resource Manager or anything else. I think this is extremely important. As Anthropologists we should understand that human behavior is somewhat
variable, in that each person's perceptions may be slightly different than our own. I think this is very critical because we try to come up with standards that all people fit into, or we try to come up with ethics that a person fits into. The problem is that sometimes these exclude a large part of the profession as a whole.

When I first took the presidency, in a very, very brief speech last year, one of the things I mentioned was that I hoped that during my term the members would start communicating with each other, and with different groups, as a way of finding out what their common values were. In a way that has happened, although not quite in the fashion that I had hoped. Various groups of people are talking to each other and, on occasion, to their lawyers. I think that this is healthy. It is helping us to take a look at our values. But I hope that we keep in mind that we are Anthropologists and we are looking at common goals at the end of the line, and communication is probably one of the most important things. Hopefully this is open communication, and hopefully we can have healthy disagreements. I guess that's it.

DICK LERNER: Since this is supposed to be projecting into the future, I would like to take a stab at something Chuck has just been talking about. In the last few years involvement has grown with Native Americans. Now I think that kind of involvement is going to have to expand into other ethnic groups as more concern is being shown with historic archaeology. Related to this is a program which SHPO is involved with, which is identifying sites of ethnic importance for a number of groups throughout the state. Archaeologists, I think, are going to have to interact with a lot of different ethnic groups, particularly about their historic roles in the State. The perception of the broader anthropological concerns, which archaeologists are supposed to have, are going to be challenged. I think these concerns are going to have to be put into practice a lot more when dealing with different living communities that are concerned about their past, and the impact that the archaeologists have with their research on the ethnic identities and the continuity of culture for these different groups. I think the same thing will apply in urban areas as well. Not just in places like Old Sacramento, but places where people have been living in small towns or cities for long periods of time and are still living there. As our population gets older and our communities get older, we are going to have more and more of a role in being part of a living culture, looking at the past and being involved with the same people in the present.

ROBERT EDWARDS: I am glad Linda made the comment on the "superorganic," otherwise we would have had a theoretical discussion on an old, old issue, I am sure. I would like to also add that lawyers do not increase communication. The point that I really wanted to make is that when we talk about professionalism being the bond that holds us together, I think that it is a bunch of bullshit. We are here because we have an interest in, and many of us have a love for, archaeology and what you can do with it. Whether it is on the anthropological level, or whether it is an appreciation for an exceptionally beautiful
piece of material culture. It is that kind of bond that diverted us out of physical anthropology, linguistics, or other areas and into archaeology as a way to do our intellectual or academic trip. Professionalism is, I think, in many cases a way that restricts our group, and has traditionally restricted it. We need to get back to the source of what our interest is and what our original goals were.

After my blast before the coffee break, a couple of people said, "Well, O.K., what are we supposed to do then?" Other than trying to get the graduate students to carry it on again, as they have in the past and did originally, maybe what we should do is to have the decisions concerning what the SCA is going to do, and what it is going to take positions on, more broadly based. Perhaps one of the choices that ought to be made is, are we going to try to include within the role of the SCA, in essence, a California SOPA? That should be a decision that is made by the society as a whole. In the past there has been a group of officers, people who become the "superorganic" each year to carry on the Society, who made decisions more or less in a vacuum. I know this. I've watched it. I've made decisions and I've made the decisions and I've seen them made by others.

Perhaps what we should do is look at what we want the Society to be. Do we want it to be a professional organization? Or do we want it to be a generalized organization with a professional component in terms of economic aspects, but retaining the ability to go to court without a conflict, to make comments without a conflict, to put on meetings, etc., without the conflict that a particular person is really doing it for his own professional benefit? That's what I propose. I would be even willing to work on a committee (although I wouldn't want to chair it), that would collect information, prepare a ballot with discussion on one side or the other, and put it out for a vote to see what the SCA wants to do. I would like to make one further comment. Visiting us is Joe Chartkoff, who is intimate with the original organization of the SCA, and has since gone off to other places. Perhaps he might want to offer us a long distance perspective.

JOE CHARTKOFF: This is something that struck me completely out of the blue, in that I didn't know I was going to be in this room until about thirty minutes ago. I certainly had no idea that I was going to be standing in front of you. I hope you will excuse me if I hem and Haw a bit. I really go back to ancient history in SCA, because it was after the Davis meetings of the SAA in 1966 we had a big get together there of all the archaeologists who were really unhappy about the State highway salvage program, and Fritz Riddell, who was trying to catch all the flack, didn't have enough hands to do it with. At that meeting a committee was formed, headed by Don Miller (standing in back there), to try and come up with some ideas about doing something about this situation. Just a month later my wife and I were sitting in a coffee shop in Santa Monica, and we thought that what we needed was a state-wide organization that could get together all of the disparate interests in California archaeology. Not to bring them together under one cover because there was only one kind of archaeology
that ought to exist in this state, but as a forum for the many archaeologies that exist. Almost in the sense of what Castenada means when he talks about alternate ways to knowledge. We had in mind at the time that there was no organization other than the SWAA (which only existed for two days a year) that could draw these interests together. Certainly there was no organization that could make a front on behalf of the study of California archaeology, or to work for favorable legislation, or for government programs, or work for the coordination of the many disparate research interests that existed in the state. Out of that meeting came the meeting at the UCLA student union, in which the SCA was conceived and the original charter was drawn, and the mailing was sent out around the State inviting people to join. From that date to this, obviously, there has been an enormous amount of change in the state of California's population, in the kinds of interest groups that are now impinging themselves on California archaeology, and on the nature of the different archaeologies that exist in the State. Certainly, in those days, there was little inkling of the contract programs that go on today. But that is really only part of the story. It strikes me, as someone who has by distance and inclination kept himself quite removed from the day to day politics of California archaeology, how much things are the same, not how much they are different. What remains the same is unfortunately the lack of integration of the different archaeologies that exist in the State. I don't think fourteen years ago that we had in mind the different archaeologies should cease to remain different. They should be able to interact with each other however, and find some kind of interface, and the SCA should provide that. I think that fourteen years later this is still the struggle that faces us. What we require is not another committee, but the rekindling of our awareness of the need for this particular kind of interaction.

CLARK BROTT: I think this could probably go on for a while yet, and there are several people that have expressed a desire to say something, but out of courtesy to the next symposium (we have already eaten up some of their time), I think we should close. If you have pertinent ideas, contact Linda King, Ed Clewett, or Chuck James. Offer your assistance. Or get appointed like I was, and we'll go forward from this symposium with some of the ideas that I think Linda was very clever in summarizing. Thanks a lot for your attendance.
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