

logo
?????

KyOPA NEWSLETTER

Kentucky Organization of Professional Archaeologists

Volume 1 Number 2

June 1994

Reminders:

- KyOPA is sponsoring a contest to select a logo. The designer of the winning logo will have his/her registration paid for the upcoming joint SEAC/MAC conference. For more information contact Tom Sussenbach.
- Volunteers are needed to staff an archaeology information table at the Kentucky State Fair in Louisville, August 18-28. Contact Phil DiBlasi for more information.

setting case involving the criminal prosecution of several of the looters that resulted in the recovery of a number of artifacts from the site.

Federal authorities recovered several pieces of human bone, which have been requested for reburial. These are carved and drilled human jaws, similar to those found at several other Hopewell sites. The many other recovered artifacts are made of stone, animal bone, rare metals, shell, and other materials.

STATEMENT OF THE COUNCIL FOR THE
CONSERVATION OF INDIANA ARCHAEOLOGY
RE: THE POSSIBLE REBURIAL OF THE
"GE" MOUND ARTIFACTS
By Cheryl Munson

The Council for the Conservation of Indiana Archaeology (CCIA), founded in 1977, is the state's organization of professional archaeologists and avocational archaeologists who subscribe to the professional Code of Ethics. The CCIA works to protect Indiana's prehistoric and historic archaeological resources from destruction and degradation.

The CCIA offers the following public statement concerning the possibility of reburial involving the artifact assemblage recovered from the "GE" Mound site, on the property of the General Electric Company, Mt. Vernon, Indiana. The site is an extremely important Southern Indiana Hopewell Mound of the Middle Woodland period (ca. 200 B.C.-A.D. 500). The GE mound site was the focus of a precedent-

The Southern Indiana Hopewell people had placed these artifacts somewhere in or near the mound about 2,000 years ago, but in 1988 the looters destroyed the evidence as to exactly where the artifacts were placed. Although we'll never know for certain, some of the artifacts probably came from a tomb and had accompanied burials or cremations, while others are thought to relate to other types of activities.

The CCIA supported the initial agreement between GE and representatives of the Native American and archaeological communities, whereby the artifacts would be donated to an appropriate scientific-educational institution in the local area for use in educational and museum settings. Subsequently, however, the State's Native American Council has asked that the artifacts be reburied.

The professional archaeologists of Indiana deplore the circumstances that led to the destruction at the GE Mound site and the dispersion of

the artifact assemblage. Now there is the possibility of further destruction, in this case the destruction of additional information about the site by reburial of the artifacts recovered from the looters by state and federal authorities.

The CCIA wishes to record its opposition to reburial for the following reasons:

- 1) Reburial of the artifacts will destroy the only record we have available of this unique Hopewell site; there is no known site like GE Mound-not in Indiana, nor elsewhere.
- 2) Reburial of the artifacts would preclude their use for public interpretation and education concerning Native American history and lifeways, whether through study or exhibit.
- 3) Reburial in the southern Indiana climate would cause perishable materials to deteriorate, and then to disappear altogether. These materials include cloth bags containing copper celts, artifacts of wood and leather, and silver-jacketed "panpipes" that still contain pieces of their reed flutes. Many of these perishable items are unique to the GE Mound, having not previously been recovered at other Hopewellian sites.
- 4) Reburial of the artifacts may lead to diminished public support for historic preservation and enforcement of anti-looting laws. The strong public support for criminal prosecutions and recovery of the stolen artifacts in the GE Mound case was based on the assumption that they would be

able to see the artifacts in its museum exhibits.

- 5) Reburial would make it impossible for future investigators to study the artifacts with techniques presently in the process of development (such as the study of DNA residues on stone tools), or with methods that are now in their infancy, or are unforeseeable.
- 6) Artifacts that are reburied can be "relooted." Protection of the reburied artifacts would require extraordinary and costly long-term monitoring and security measures.

Archaeologists recognize that reburial is appropriate in various circumstances, both for human remains and for the artifacts that were placed in the graves. In cases of great antiquity, it is not possible, at least at present, to identify the closest living descendants. The nearly 2,000 year-old artifacts from the GE Mound represent just such a circumstance.

The CCIA is concerned that precipitous decisions may result in the loss to future generations of an important regional and national historical resource. We believe that because of the national significance of the GE Mound site that special consideration is warranted. The federal government has instituted two expert panels composed of Native Americans and scholars to deal with questions concerning the most appropriate steps to take in cases like that of GE Mound. The professional archaeologists of Indiana feel that the General Electric Company would especially benefit from the experience and expertise of these panels.

The General Electric Company will ultimately decide the fate of the

artifact collection because it is their "property." But we believe the Company is also the steward steward of this archaeologically significant collection. Therefore, the officers of General Electric have a duty to the citizens of Indiana and the nation to make sure the collection has long-term special care.

If the General Electric Company chooses preservation, one or more Native American groups, or perhaps the Indiana Native American Council, may have a role in saying who can have access to it, who can conduct studies, and whether any materials should be exhibited. We strongly recommend that this extraordinary collection be preserved as a part of the heritage of Indiana, in order that all present-day and future citizens may appreciate the extraordinary achievements of the Southern Indiana Hopewell culture. At an absolute minimum, detailed scientific and technical analyses of the artifacts must be conducted by recognized experts in Hopewell archaeology and other fields. Only by means of such thorough documentation can part of the unique story of the GE Mound people survive.

COUNCIL FOR THE CONSERVATION OF INDIANA ARCHAEOLOGY

April 9, 1994 To the Membership:

The CCIA has recently learned of plans by GE and certain members of the Native American community for the reburial of the artifacts recovered from the looted GE Mound site (12Po885). The CCIA has taken a strong position in opposition to reburial, at least pending extensive analysis of the assemblage, and has offered several alternatives to GE and concerned Native Americans for the resolution of

this issue. A copy of a press legally release summarizing events and detailing the CCIA's position is included in this mailing.

All members are urged to write ASAP to Mr. John F. Welsh, Chairman of the Board and CEO of the General Electric Co., expressing their concerns. Copies should be sent to the other individuals listed below. Telephone calls to all of these individuals would also be helpful. For additional information, contact any officer (Helmcamp, Wepler, Smith) or Board Member of the CCIA.

All members are also urged to attend the Meeting of the Indiana Native American Advisory Council on May 9, 1994, at 1:30 PM, Indiana Government Center, Indianapolis, Indiana. Be prepared to make a brief public statement detailing your concerns. Again, it is probably best to coordinate with the CCIA officers and Board.

Contacts:

Mr. John F. Welsh, Chairman of the Board and Director, General Electric Company, 3135 Easton Turnpike, Fairfield, CT 06431.

Dr. James Glass, Chief Executive Officer, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, 402 W. Washington, RM 274, Indianapolis, IN 46204, 317-232-1646.

Mr. Matthew Tanzer, Attorney GE Plastics, One Plastics Ave., Pittsfield, Mass. 01201, 413-448-6358

Mr. Timothy Ferguson Manager, Human Resources, Mt. Vernon Site, GE Plastics, 1 Lexan Lane, Mt. Vernon, IN 47620, 812-831-7000

Editor's Note: The reburial referred to in the CCIA article and letter to its membership has already taken place. It was felt that it was important to publish

the CCIA's position statement and to present the background of this case to the KyOPA membership. It is never too late to voice your opinion about reburial to your Congressional representatives or to the parties involved in this case.

Cave Research Foundation Archeological Project

by Mary Kennedy and Patty Jo Watson, Department of Anthropology, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri

The Cave Research Foundation Archeological Project (CRF/AP) is currently involved in two studies in Mammoth Cave National Park, Kentucky. The first of these began in September 1992 with the collection of 12 paleofecal samples, six from Mammoth Cave and six from Salts Cave. This "new" project is a version of a long deferred research strategy conceived of by Patty Jo Watson and Joe Caldwell in the 1960's and dubbed by them, "Twenty Dated Dinners." The current project seeks to establish an AMS date and an analysis of the contents of 12 fecal samples (rather than the more ambitious 20 of the original scheme). The aim of the project is a more complete understanding of the transition to agriculture in the Eastern Woodlands. While over 100 fecal specimens have been analyzed for dietary content (Yarnell 1969, 1974, Marquardt 1974, Stewart 1974), only five had been directly dated by the ^{14}C technique (Watson 1969) before this latest set of fecal samples was collected.

The project was undertaken at this time for a variety of different reasons. One of these was a challenge from Bruce Smith in which he suggested that the dated fecal material from Salts Cave falls quite late in the Early Woodland period and therefore is not indica-

tive of general dietary trend during Early Woodland times (Smith 1993). While we follow his reasoning and concede that this is one interpretation of the five dates, given their very large standard deviations, we were of the opinion that other interpretations were not only possible, but also more likely. The five dates on feces are part of a much larger sample of dated material collected over the last 30 years from these two sites. The 36 nonfecal dates indicate that the overwhelming majority of cave use occurred in the period from 800 to 200 B.C. and it seemed likely that the fecal material comes from that entire time span. To strengthen our case for this interpretation, additional dates were needed as well as exhaustive studies of the contents of the dated samples.

In addition to establishing a stronger tie between the fecal material and the entire span of Early Woodland cave exploitation, we also wished to address a number of other research problems (Kennedy 1990). One of these was to obtain dates from areas of the sites that had not previously been dated. Another was to attempt to locate feces that date to the Late Archaic use of the sites. Yet another was a range of issues related to accuracy and precision of these new dates and those already obtained. Finally, we thought it highly desirable to obtain a state-of-the-science analysis for each specimen from a macrobotanical, pollen, parasitological, and biochemical perspective.

The ^{14}C determinations have been returned by the NSF-Arizona AMS Facility.

All determinations are expressed in radiocarbon years B.P., corrected

for isotopic fractionation, and uncalibrated.

Mammoth Cave Paleofeces

2335 ± 75 (a)*	AA-10079
2365 ± 70	AA-10082
2485 ± 70	AA-10083
2485 ± 70 (b)*	AA-10080
2575 ± 65	AA-10081
2605 ± 70	AA-10084
2700 ± 80	AA-10085

Salts Cave Paleofeces

2410 ± 70	AA-10087
2500 ± 80	AA-10091
2570 ± 70	AA-10086
2580 ± 70 (b)*	AA-10090
2590 ± 70 (a)*	AA-10089
2605 ± 80	AA-10088
2700 ± 60	AA-11738

* (a) is the sample with mold intact

(b) is the sample with mold removed

As can be seen above, these dates do consistently cover the same general time period as the nonfecal dates, and are unequivocally centered in the midst of Early Woodland. We were unsuccessful in locating any Archaic age samples. Portions of the samples are now being distributed to researchers for analysis (Kristen Gremillion, Ohio State University, for botanical remains; Kristin Sobolik, University of Maine, for pollen remains; Chuck Faulkner, University of Tennessee, for parasitological analysis; and Patricia Whitten, Emory University, for sex determination based on hormonal residues. [This type of work has been done on non-human primates, but to our knowledge this is the first attempt using human paleofeces]).

This research is funded by the Cave Research Foundation Archeological Project and by Washington University.

A second project has also been undertaken by the CRF/AP, at the request of and under the auspices of the National Park Service. The Park Service has recently entered into an agreement with EARTHWATCH, an international, nonprofit, membership organization that provides volunteer labor for scientific, environmental, and resource management projects. This agreement is designed to provide volunteer personnel to the Park Service for the conduct of resource inventories in over 200 National Parks. Mammoth Cave National Park is participating in the initial round of the "Expedition into America" with a three-year project aimed at a cultural resource inventory of the material inside Mammoth Cave. Patty Jo Watson is the Principal Investigator for the project; Mary Kennedy is the primary field supervisor; additional field supervision has also been provided by George Crothers, Christine Hensley, and Kurt Fiegal. The project manager is Robert H. Ward, Cultural Resource Specialist at Mammoth Cave National Park.

Groups of 10 volunteers arrive for a 10-day stay in the Park during which they are first trained to recognize and document cultural resources, and then spend the remaining time engaged in the inventory. There have been four such sessions: two in July and two in October of 1993. A similar schedule will be followed in the remaining two years of the project.

The primary purpose of the project is to provide the Park Service with a cultural resource inventory that will aid in management and planning decisions. In addition to this primary emphasis, there is considerable potential for research on a variety of aspects of the distribution and association of artifacts and features in Mammoth Cave as well as the activities of prehis-

toric miners related to exploitation of the sulfate minerals found within the Mammoth Cave system.

The Cave Research Foundation (CRF) is a non-profit organization founded in 1957 for the purpose of supporting scientific research in caves and karst landscapes. The CRF/AP, under the direction of Patty Jo Watson, has been in existence since 1963. The archeological project's original focus was on the prehistoric remains in Salts Cave, Kentucky. Later, the project's efforts expanded to include research in other caves within the system and the Park and finally to caves outside the park that contain archaeological remains.

An offshoot of the archaeological project's original research in Salts Cave is the Shell Mound Archaeological Project, which has focused on the Shell Mound Archaeological District to the west of Mammoth Cave National Park, along the Green River in Butler and Ohio counties. Here it was possible to continue to investigate the origins of food production in the eastern United States, because the Middle to Late Archaic shell mounds represent an earlier time period than the exploration and use of Salts and Mammoth Cave in late Late Archaic and Early Woodland times. The theme that has unified all of these efforts and continues to focus the current project is an interest in the origins of food production in Eastern North America, but as with any long-term, multi-disciplinary effort, the research endeavor extends to many other aspects of prehistoric life in west central Kentucky (Carstens and Watson in press).

References Cited

Carstens, Kenneth C., and Patty Jo Watson, editors
in press Of Caves and Shell Mounds.
University of Alabama.

Kennedy, Mary C.
1990 An Analysis of the Radiocarbon Dates from Salts and Mammoth Caves, Mammoth Cave National Park, Kentucky. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Washington University, Department of Anthropology, St. Louis.

Marquardt, William H.
1974 A Statistical Analysis of Constituents in Human Paleofecal Specimens from Mammoth Cave. In Archeology of the Mammoth Cave Area, edited by P.J. Watson, pp. 193-202. Academic Press, New York.

Smith, Bruce D.
1993 Reconciling the Gender Credit Critique and the Floodplain Weed Theory of Plan Domestication. In J.B. Stoltman, ed. Archeology of Eastern North America: Papers in Honor of Stephen Williams, pp. 111-125. Mississippi Department of Archives and History, Archaeological Report No. 25: Jackson, MS.

Stewart, Robert B.
1974 Identification and Quantification of Components in Salts Cave Paleofeces. In Archeology of the Mammoth Cave Area, edited by Patty Jo Watson, pp. 41-47. Academic Press, New York.

Watson, Patty Jo, et al.
1969 The Prehistory of Salts Cave, Kentucky. Reports of Investigations No. 16. Illinois State Museum: Springfield.

Yarnell, Richard A.
1969 Contents of Human Paleofeces. In The Prehistory of Salts Cave, Kentucky, pp. 41-52. Reports of

Investigations No. 16. Illinois State Museum, Springfield.

1974 Plant Food and Cultivation of the Salts Cavers. In Archaeology of the Mammoth Cave Area, edited by Patty Jo Watson, pp. 109-112. Academic Press, New York.

Results of a Survey of Archaeologists Regarding Public Education Efforts in Kentucky
by A. Gwynn Henderson
Kentucky Archaeological Registry

Introduction

In 1992, Kentucky archaeologists were surveyed about their public education activities. A two-page questionnaire, modeled on one circulated in South Carolina by Gail Wagner (1991), was handed out to all archaeologists attending the Heritage Council's Task Force meeting in Murray, Kentucky, on February 28, 1992. Questionnaires were sent out to those not attending the Task Force Meeting, and reminder questionnaires were sent to others about a month later. A total of 53 people received the questionnaire either in person or by mail; 25 were returned for a return rate of 47.2%.

The respondents represented two federal agencies (n=4), two state agencies (n=3), five private contracting firms (n=7), one museum (n=1), and four universities (n=10). The museum and one of the universities are not located in Kentucky. Sixteen men and nine women make up the sample population. A total of 16 of the respondents considered their educational activities important enough to list on their vitae.

Results of the Survey

Kentucky archaeologists' educational activities are concentrated in five general areas: public presentations; TV and newspaper interviews; working with field and laboratory volunteers; site tours; and exhibits. The first three areas account for most of the educational efforts.

The "general public," and school "kids" of all ages make up the audience when Kentucky archaeologists give presentations. The "general public" is a diverse lot. Represented are civic groups; youth organizations; groups especially interested in archaeology, history, or preservation; as well as museums, state parks, government officials, and developers. School "kids" include preschool, elementary, middle/jr. high, and high school; college; Donovan Scholars; and Elderhostel students.

Presentations are given upon the request of the organizations or teachers. They normally do not involve any follow-up, and are almost always done gratis. The presentations usually cover topics related to a particular site under analysis or excavation at the time the talk is given, or they are general presentations about archaeology or Kentucky culture history. But other subjects are covered, too, such as artifact identification, paleopathology, lithic technology, cultural resource management/Section 106 compliance, and archaeology as a career.

About as often as they give formal presentations, Kentucky archaeologists respond to TV and newspaper reporters. They talk mainly about the field projects they are working on, but other topics include site protection, ARPA cases, and Archaeology Weekends.

Most of the Kentucky archaeologists who responded to this survey involve volunteers in nearly all phases of their work. These volunteers are members of amateur societies, historical societies, youth organizations, and environmental groups, as well as school children. They excavate, wash artifacts, and catalogue artifacts side by side with professionals, gaining first-hand knowledge about how archaeologists do archaeology, about Kentucky's cultural heritage, and why it needs to be preserved. In some cases, Kentucky archaeologists have conducted projects especially for certain groups (school kids, handicapped kids, Girl Scouts, Junior Historians), or they participate in high school programs like the Mentor program or the EBCE (Experience-Based Career Education) program.

If interested people don't become intimately involved in the process of archaeology, many get to at least "see" ongoing research and laboratory facilities. Several respondents indicated that they give site and lab tours as part of their project activities or as part of special programs such as Archaeology Weekends. One respondent is proactive about this kind of education, contacting schools and the local press and inviting them to visit their excavations.

Another important public education venue is the preparation of exhibits that describe research findings from a particular site or project, general archaeological topics, or topics particular to Kentucky archaeology. These exhibits are shown at museums, Archaeology Weekends, public libraries, and visitor centers, or they travel and have statewide or regional distribution. When grant monies support archaeological education efforts,

most are awarded to fund exhibit preparation.

Kentucky archaeologists pursue other educational activities, but not nearly as frequently as in the five areas previously identified. Five deserve mention. Five respondents reported that they had developed curriculum materials either alone or with educators. These varied in subject matter, group targeted, and format. Examples included an independent study on lithics; a program for gifted students; a multi-topic middle school curriculum about frontier Kentucky that included archaeology as a subject; an archaeology curriculum for 4th-6th graders; and an artifact guide for a children's museum. Six respondents helped prepare educational video programs. Most of these programs described the results of excavations at historic archaeological sites. Five respondents had published books/articles on archaeological subjects for non-archaeologists. In all but one case, the targeted audience was secondary school/adults; in the fifth case, adults were the target audience, but as beginning readers (the book is also being marketed to a 4th-6th grade student audience). Five respondents had been interviewed about their research or archaeological topics on radio. Six respondents mentioned some involvement with legislators and archaeo-legislation; half were involved by writing letters urging site protection, while only two expressed their specific active involvement in the development of legislation.

Observations

The results of this questionnaire show that Kentucky's archaeologists are exploring a wide variety of avenues in an attempt to share what they are learning about Kentucky's

past with non-archaeologists. Kentucky's archaeologists do these things because they see them as a professional responsibility; they are generally not paid for their efforts. Instead, the costs of their educational activities are absorbed by their research projects.

Almost everyone gives public talks and grants interviews to the press when asked, and many give site tours during field research. Interested volunteers are commonly involved in all phases of archaeological research. Students, mainly elementary school students, and the amorphous "general public" are the principal groups involved in these public education activities. Educational efforts focused specifically on reaching teachers, developers, and special interest groups, like environmentalists, civic leaders, legislators, and federal managers, are spotty.

Far fewer Kentucky archaeologists step outside the archaeological world to prepare curricula, books, and exhibits that are geared specifically to the non-archaeologist. These activities take more planning and preparation time. Especially in historical archaeology mitigation/research projects, the preparation of books, videos, and exhibits for the public are project elements, or they are funded by special grants.

Future Goals

Two main public education goals to be addressed in the future were identified from the ideas and suggestions offered by the respondents, and from the survey results. These are (1) work with school teachers and (2) interpret the past to a wider audience through the

preparation of non-technical books, articles, and booklets.

The respondents expressed a concern over the serious lack of programmatic involvement of archaeologists with teachers. Respondents suggested holding teacher workshops or seminars, preparing learning modules for schools, and planning a teachers' archaeology day in association with the annual archaeology conference held by the Kentucky Heritage Council.

Books, articles, and booklets interpreting archaeology and Kentucky's past that are written specifically for the interested public, school children, resource managers, and others, are scarce and badly needed. Whether prepared as part of the scope of services for a research project or funded separately after a project's completion, and whether site specific or topical in content, these materials will make available to interested people information accessible now only to professionals.

Four other suggestions offered by the respondents deserve mention here, as possible future educational activities: hold a statewide Archaeology Week; work with KET to develop video programs on Kentucky archaeological topics; initiate an anti-looting campaign; and develop liaisons with the Kentucky State Parks department.

Conclusions

This 1992 survey of 25 Kentucky archaeologists has identified some of the strengths and weaknesses in the archaeological community's efforts to bring the results of archaeological projects to the Kentucky public. Most archaeologists are willing to talk to interested people about archaeology and

involve interested citizens and school children in their research. They are less involved in proactive educational efforts.

This survey also has identified some goals for the future, which echo some of the suggestions made recently by the Historic Preservation Task Force (1993). In the Education Section of its report, the Task Force recommended that opportunities be provided for teachers to use local heritage and culture as educational resources and that professionals work with KET to develop educational programs. These recommendations address some of the concerns voiced by the respondents to this questionnaire. Hopefully archaeologists and historic preservation planners alike will find the results of this survey useful as they develop a programmatic plan for future archaeological education efforts in Kentucky.

References Cited

Historic Preservation Task Force
1993 Recommendations of the Historic Preservation Task Force: Final Report. Kentucky Heritage Council, Frankfort.

Wagner, Gail
1991 A Preliminary Survey of Archaeology and Public Education in South Carolina. Archaeology and Public Education 2(2):1-3.

MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT

Nov 9-12, 1994. Southeastern Archaeological Conference/Midwest Archaeological Conference, Annual Meeting. This year the Southeastern Archaeological Conference and the Midwest Archaeological Conference will hold a joint meeting,

November 9-12, 1994, at the Radisson Plaza Hotel in Lexington, KY. A keynote address will be given by Dr. Alison Wyllie. This joint meeting is an exciting opportunity for archaeologists working in the Southeast and Midwest to exchange information and ideas. The local arrangements chair is Mary Lucas Powell. The program co-chairs for SEAC are John Scarry and Margaret Scarry. The Program chair for MAC is Richard Jefferies. Deadline for abstracts: August 1, 1994. Contact SEAC/MAC Committee, 101 American Bldg, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506-0100. Phone: 606-257-1944. FAX: 606-323-1968.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

ARCHAEOLOGIST. Consulting Environmental Engineering/Planning firm seeks an experienced Archaeologist with a graduate degree in archaeology or anthropology, a minimum eight (8) years experience, and previous supervisory experience in cultural resource management. Must have demonstrated ability to successfully implement Archaeological Reconnaissance Surveys and prepare Technical Reports which meet state and federal guidelines. Experience with, but not necessarily specialization in, southeastern archeology preferred. The individual must also have formal training and considerable experience in archaeological theory, methodology, analysis, interpretation, report writing and marketing/proposal writing. This is a new position and candidate will be responsible for building archaeological department. Submit detailed resume including an outline of present and future projects, references and salary expectations to:

CHESTER·IDE Associates Inc.
5556 Franklin Road, Suite 100
Nashville, TN 37220
An Equal Opportunity Employer

Notes from the Editor
by Pamela A. Schenian

The first issue of the KyOPA Newsletter stated that the printing schedule would be February, May, August, and November. I would like to alter the schedule to a January, March, June, September schedule, unless there are strong objections. This means there are will only be three issues this year unless I receive scads of submissions, in which case an extra issue will be prepared.

The next issue of the KyOPA Newsletter will be mailed on or about September 1. To submit materials to me, you have the following options:

1. Mail articles or disks (3.5" in ASCII) to my home address: 3200 Raintree Place, Louisville, Kentucky 40220-3364.
2. Fax articles to me at Fort Knox: 502-624-3679. The fax machine has a laser-quality printer and uses normal paper, so I will be able to read the print. The fax machine is in my colonel's secretary's office, so please put my full name and my office extension (4-6581) on the cover sheet.
3. INTERNET articles in ASCII to Phil DiBlasi at:
PJDIBL01@ULKYVM.LOUISVILLE.EDU
Include a note that it for me. He will download them on to a disk.

Although I work at Fort Knox, I am actually an employee of J.M. Waller Associates, Fairfax Station, VA, a private engineering firm which specializes in military contracts. Two years ago, they expanded the business from just engineering projects to include environmental and cul-

tural contracts, and they supply professional consultants in these fields to various installations. I have been asked on several occasions for assistance in finding candidates for Staff Archaeologist/Cultural Resource Manager positions at other installations. These positions usually must be filled in less than one month from the award of the contract to J.M. Waller, so they are unlikely to be advertised in the various archaeology newsletters.

Candidates must meet the Secretary of the Interior's standards for Principal Investigator; previous experience in the state in which the installation is located is a plus and previous experience working on a military installation is desirable. In addition to archaeology, the Cultural Resource Manager will probably be responsible for standing structures and cemeteries. Although these positions are not Civil Service, they pay the equivalent of the GS-9 to GS-11 ranks, depending on qualifications. If you are interested in hearing about these job openings, please drop me a note listing your day and evening phone numbers, and which states you would be interested in. A one-page resume would be helpful, but please hang onto a more complete vita until you are contacted by Mr. Waller.

My office is in the same building as the hunting-fishing license office, and thousands of people pass through the hallway each year. I have set up an information table in the hall with freebies concerning archaeology, local history, and historic preservation. If anyone has freebie materials of possible interest to the general public (e.g., posters, announcements of lectures, field school fliers), or

materials concerning military history or the archaeology of military sites (even if specialized), I would greatly appreciate copies. If the item is easily reproducible, you need only send one.

Fort Campbell is now sharing an archaeologist, Dr. Kimball Smith, with Fort Hood in Texas. His Fort Hood address is: Directorate of Engineering and Housing, DEH-EMB-MGT (ARCH), Building #44808, Fort Hood, TX 76544. I hope the archaeological community will assist him in establishing a program at Fort Campbell.

12

KyOPA Newsletter
3200 Raintree Place
Louisville, KY 40220-3364

