
PENNSYLVANIA ARCHAEOLOGICAL COUNCIL

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

PENNSYLVANIA ARCHAEOLOGY IS CHANGING: MAKE YOUR VOICE HEARD

It's been two years now since Pennsylvania Act 70 was passed. It's been nearly as long since the BHP instituted its watershed model for survey priorities. Now PENNDOT is discussing changes in its cultural resource program as well. If one thing is clear as we reach the end of 1997, it is that the way we do archaeology in Pennsylvania has been and will continue to change.

Whether the changes are all good or all bad or mixed in their impact on cultural resources probably remains to be seen, but there remains a great need for PAC members to be heard as changes are being made. As professionals we do have something to contribute and our expertise and perspective is important. This isn't the time to be apathetic about PAC or about the political process in which we are going to have to participate. This is a time to pay attention to what is happening, to participate fully in PAC and to comment to your representatives about what is happening.

I am hoping that you will get involved. We need everyone to be committed to communicating the archaeological community's viewpoints to those who have a poor understanding of archaeology and cultural resources. PAC will continue to try to be a conduit to you of information about archaeology within Pennsylvania.

In this vein, we are beginning to have some data on the effects of Act 70 and we have included some of this information later in this issue. The Commonwealth Archaeology Program (CAP) under which PHMC is conducting Act 70 investigations and open-end subcontracts to consultants began during the last fiscal year and continued into this Fall. As of the middle of October, PHMC was tracking 93 projects affecting 167 significant sites related to Act 70. Both the CAP crew and several consultants have undertaken a variety of investigations to date. As the report indicates PHMC considers investigations to be completed at 2 sites while 19 sites have been destroyed and excavations, analyses or reports are in progress at 40 additional sites. Cultural resource issues have been resolved on 44 projects with respect to 59 sites. This leaves 47 additional sites on 21 additional projects which remain to be dealt with. Unfortunately, all funds except those needed to maintain the PHMC CAP crew itself have been expended for the current fiscal year. This means that a number of sites probably will not get investigated prior to the expiration of the Act 70 time limits. The job simply cannot be done with the money now allocated for it! What is going to happen to the projects in process and to the sites being impacted? This is certainly worth talking about among ourselves and to others!

Now is the time to speak up about this situation. I hope you will go see your state legislators and talk about the issues. Watch your mail for more information. I was directed at the Fall business meeting to share what is happening with you and to urge you to be a voice for archaeology. In the meantime, feel free to call me, or

anyone on the Executive Board regarding Act 70 and about other aspects of the way Pennsylvania archaeology is changing.

*Sarah W. Neusius
Department of Anthropology
Indiana University of
Pennsylvania*

COOPERATION COLUMN

It has been suggested that the PAC Newsletter could provide a medium in which requests for information regarding research questions / problems could be posted. If you have such requests, please forward them to the editor (see below) for inclusion in the next Newsletter.

NO SUBMISSIONS FOR THIS ISSUE.

CURRENT RESEARCH

In an effort to shine some light onto the "gray" literature, the editor requests submissions for the Current Research column. These should be short descriptions of on-going or recently completed work. Reference to the full report should be included, if available. Please forward such items to the editor (see below). Many thanks to those who contributed to this issue.

Heberling Associates

Phase I/II Studies in the Lewistown Narrows

Heberling Associates is conducting archaeological studies for the planned construction of an improved highway in the Lewistown Narrows, Mifflin and Juniata counties. This 6.5 mile section of S.R. 22 parallels the Juniata River as it cuts through Shade and Blue mountains. Well-preserved remnants of the Pennsylvania Canal (Juniata Division) lie between the present highway and the river, and have been examined and documented as part of the various cultural resource studies for the highway project (see report in the Spring 1997 PAC Newsletter).

The Phase I survey, completed in April 1997, revealed eight prehistoric archaeological sites, located on terraces and benches within the Narrows. Phase II studies are currently being conducted at four of the sites, selected to represent a variety of site settings and types. All of the sites seem to be temporary camps occupied during periodic movements through the Narrows. The Phase I survey yielded little information on the chronology or character of the sites, but Phase II investigations of the two sites examined to date, 36Ju104 and 36Mi92, have revealed substantial Middle, Late, and Terminal Archaic components. The sites are of particular interest since they document long-distance movement, raw material (e.g., rhyolite and jasper) procurement, and exchange through the Ridge and Valley region. The results from the studies at these sites will be compared with the existing data from comparable sites in the Aughwick Creek Valley and elsewhere in the Juniata and Susquehanna drainages.

Phase II studies at 36Ly116

Heberling Associates completed Phase II studies at 36Ly116, one of two sites investigated in connection with

the construction of the Lycoming County Water and Sewage Authority sewage treatment facility near Montoursville (see Spring 1997 PAC newsletter), on the West Branch of the Susquehanna River. Phase II testing consisted of the removal of topsoil by machine and hand in five 4 m x 4 m blocks within a narrow outfall corridor on the T2 river terrace. Despite the very limited exposure (80 sq m of subsoil), four prehistoric features were identified, as well as a cellar foundation apparently related to a nearby unrecorded mid-nineteenth century residence. The prehistoric features seem to be small hearths, two of which yielded radiocarbon dates: Beta-104973, 4290 ± 80 BP, a calibrated calendar date of 2890 BC; and Beta-104974, 4510 ± 70 BP, calibrated to 3330-3100 BC. The non-overlapping 1-sigma ranges suggest that the dates represent two distinct Archaic occupations dating, respectively, to the early third and late fourth millennia BC. The radiocarbon dating is consistent with the previous recovery of Lamoka-like points from the surface collection. Botanical analysis of the feature contents documented hickory, walnut, and oak nutshell fragments, as well a variety of seeds and berries. The results from 36Ly116 contribute to a small but growing database for the Middle and Late Archaic occupation of the West Branch.

Submitted by Paul Raber

National Park Service

GAI Consultants, Inc. of Monroeville, Pennsylvania has completed several projects recently for the National Park Service, Denver Service Center/Applied Archeology Center located in Silver Spring, Maryland. A listing of these project summaries are provided below.

Gettysburg National Military Park, Pennsylvania

- Battlefield Burial -

In August 1996, GAI Consultants, Inc. completed a field investigation involving the archeological recovery of a Civil War-period burial identified along the south bank of "the railroad cut" in the northern portion of the park. Fieldwork followed the accidental discovery of eroded skeletal remains by a Park tourist in March 1996. Ben Resnick (GAI), Sue Frankenberg (University of Tennessee) and Kristen Stevens (National Park Service) served as principal investigators; Karen Orrence served as field director. Goals of the project included, in part, the recovery of additional skeletal remains associated with the eroded bone; a determination of the individual's age, sex, race, cause of death, and military affiliation; and ascertaining the presence or absence of any additional associated skeletal remains in the area (trench burial?).

A total of four test units were investigated over a five-day period resulting in the recovery of additional human skeletal remains from a grave identified in the upper portion of the slope and from downslope talus deposits. Intact portions of the burial were encountered at the interface of the historic plowzone and B/C horizon, and extended into the subsoil, resting within a natural crevice in the bedrock, approximately one foot below ground surface. It is possible that the pit in which the burial was identified may represent a disturbed trench burial. Based on the condition and position of the bone, it appears that the body may have been pushed or rolled into the shallow pit, rather than being carefully interred.

Human skeletal elements recovered from the excavation include skull, mandible and teeth, clavicle, vertebra, scapula, pelvic and rib fragments, several long bones (including the right humerus, right and left radius and ulna, possible right fibula) and parts of the right? foot, in addition to numerous small unidentifiable fragments. In combination with bone previously collected in this area, approximately 60 to 70 percent of the body is represented by these fragments.

Osteological analysis conducted by Doug Owsley of the Smithsonian Institution and Sue Frankenberg indicates that the individual was a physically active, young adult, Caucasian male between the ages of 20 and 25. Based on burial location and context, suspected cause of death, bone condition, lack of a coffin, presence of an associated nineteenth-century glass button, and historic cartographic evidence, the interment represents a Civil War battlefield burial. Based on the analysis of recovered skull fragments, it appears that the individual was killed as a result of a bullet wound (i.e., minie ball) to the back of the head. This is partially reflected in the X-rays of cranial fragments indicating the presence of minute amounts of lead. The individual was interred in a flexed position on his right side, with the left arm crossed over the right arm. These elements and portions of the right foot represent the only articulations present within the burial and suggest that soft tissue was present in these areas at the time of interment. The overall poor preservation of the skeleton is probably related to several factors, including the presence of possible battle-related wounds to the chest, rapid decomposition of the body due to extended postmortem exposure, and/or other post-depositional factors.

The general lack of artifacts associated with the interment makes identification by army, division, company, or by name, nearly impossible. The location of the burial site along the south bank of "the railroad cut" does suggest, however, that the individual probably was killed during intense fighting in this area on July 1, 1863. The location and orientation of the burial is consistent with renderings of Confederate graves on the Elliot Map which depicts a number of interments laid out perpendicular to "the railroad cut" in this general location. The recovery of what is thought to be Confederate "buck & ball" ammunition in similar context to the burial also lends to the theory that this may be a Confederate soldier. It is speculated that this soldier may have been a member of General Davis's 2nd Mississippi or 55th North Carolina Regiments who were retreating to "the railroad cut" late in the morning of July 1, 1863. This is a tentative interpretation as to the identity of this individual and is not meant to be taken as a definitive explanation in this matter. One must note, for example, that nearly 150 men of the 6th Wisconsin Regiment were also killed in the field on this day. A draft technical report and popular report have been submitted to the Denver Service Center, National Park Service and Gettysburg National Military Park.

- Archaeological Investigation of Proposed Sewer Line -

GAI Consultants, Inc. has completed the second phase of an archeological data recovery at Gettysburg National Military Park and Eisenhower National Historic Site in Adams County, Pennsylvania. These investigations included the excavation of shovel test pits, small (2.5 x 2.5-foot) units and large (5 x 5-foot) units in association with the planned installation of a park-wide sewer system. Ben Resnick (GAI) and Kristen Stevens (National Park Service) were principal investigators. The field director was Karen Orrence.

These investigations resulted in the discovery of more than 25 historic, prehistoric, and multicomponent sites and the recovery of over 35,000 artifacts. These sites will significantly add to the park's existing database of sites and will enhance our knowledge of the nature of historic and prehistoric adaptations throughout the park and region. The great majority of identified sites are associated with rural farmsteads located throughout the park which date from the late eighteenth century through the early twentieth century. Numerous cultural features have been identified in association with these occupations including, in part, the remains of several heretofore unidentified outbuildings, dating to the late eighteenth to late nineteenth century; a stone well; intact, nineteenth-century, domestic and military cultural deposits; former fencelines; and extinct roads. In general, military artifacts such as Minie balls, percussion caps, and artillery shell fragments were recovered in small quantities from disturbed contexts.

Although prehistoric artifacts were recovered from many of the investigated sites, potentially-significant prehistoric components were identified at the Snyder, Bushman, and Wills/Winebrenner Farms. In general,

these sites were located along low terraces above intermittent streams and contained a concentration of prehistoric lithics, most notably rhyolite. While they generally contained non-diagnostic lithic material, the recovery of a high percentage of rhyolite, in conjunction with several diagnostic artifacts (e.g., Koens-Crispin point base, possible Savannah River broadspear fragment), argues generally for a Late/Terminal Archaic occupation. A management summary has been submitted to the Denver Service Center, National Park Service and Gettysburg National Military Park. Artifact analysis and preparation of a draft technical report are in progress and will be completed later this year.

Lemon House, Allegheny Portage Railroad National Historic Site, Pennsylvania

Archeological investigations were conducted for the National Park Service at the circa 1834 Lemon House in advance of the construction of a proposed perimeter foundation drain. Constructed of stone, the structure is located at the head of Plane 6 of the Allegheny Portage Railroad. During the Portage Railroad's heyday, which lasted until the late 1840s, the building served as a tavern and occasionally as a hotel, even though it was not an official railroad stop. By 1855, the Portage Railroad was rendered obsolete by a more efficient all-rail link that eliminated the need for the inclined planes. Unfortunately for Lemon, the "New Portage Railroad" bypassed his tavern.

The goal of excavations was to provide archeological data for mitigating known or suspected cultural resources, prior to the restoration and rehabilitation of the Lemon House and Summit Level area to their appearance in the 1840s. Ben Resnick (GAI) and Jed Levin (National Park Service) were principal investigators on this project; Karen Orrence served as field director.

Fieldwork focused on the location of previously-identified porch foundations adjacent to the south and east elevations of the structure. Six excavation units were placed along the east facade of the Lemon House and resulted in the identification of a disturbed, inner porch foundation and associated posthole, a modern utility pipe and trench, and a previously-identified outer porch foundation. These investigations revealed that the historic grade deposit used by other researchers to date the foundation, was a highly disturbed context containing early- to mid-nineteenth-century and recent twentieth-century debris. Although this deposit may have once approximated an intact, early- to mid-nineteenth-century surface, extensive post-1961 landscaping efforts in this area have resulted in regrading and subsequent contamination of this deposit.

A section of the previously-excavated outer porch foundation located to the south of the structure was dismantled, in the hope that diagnostic artifacts would be recovered providing a construction date for this feature. The foundation was dated by previous researchers to circa 1832 and to the mid-nineteenth century. Although artifacts recovered during the present investigation could be consistent with either of these interpretations, the previous recovery of Portage Railroad demolition debris and other similarly dated artifacts from this context indicate that the feature was most likely built during the mid-nineteenth century. This date suggests that the feature may represent a secondary foundation, and that the original (earlier) porch foundation in this area may have been removed through regrading prior to construction of the current (later) foundation. Archaeological monitoring conducted at the Lemon House also resulted in the identification of several features including, in part, a section of the original south wall foundation to the west wing, a stone-lined well directly north of the Lemon House, a possible coal chute/cellar window along the structure's north wall, and the disturbed foundation of an early twentieth-century icehouse identified off the southwest corner of the structure. A final technical report has been submitted to the Denver Service Center, National Park Service.

Submitted by Ben Resnick

Bloomsburg University

Archaeology at the Streater Site, Bloomsburg, PA

The 1996 Bloomsburg University archaeological field school conducted excavations at the Streater site (no site number yet assigned) from mid-June through the first week of July. The site, well known to artifact collectors, is located on the Susquehanna River floodplain at the juncture of Fishing Creek with the river, on the western edge of the town of Bloomsburg. Although surface material from the plowed field suggested heavy Late Archaic occupation of the area, this would be the first professional excavation of the site and thus our main goal for the field school was to gain a preliminary assessment of the deposits. A total of 27 square meters were excavated, and included a series of 1x1 meter test pits, larger 2x2 meter blocks excavations, and a trench, with depths reaching one meter in extent.

Numerous lithic materials were recovered, including projectile points, drills, general bifaces, netsinkers, and abundant flakes. Raw material, not surprisingly, largely included local flint sources, although a small percentage of the distinctive Allentown jasper was also utilized. Only a few features were uncovered, and included postmolds (no definable pattern could be discerned), a few hearths, and amorphous smaller pits.

Unexpectedly, no obvious stratigraphy based upon sediment changes could be defined in the site's profile (given the region's predilection to flooding it had been assumed at the outset that both natural and cultural strata would be observed). However, past occupational floors were readily apparent during excavation based upon increased density of cultural materials, textural changes, and the appearance of wood charcoal smearing.

The evidence thus far indicates two significant periods of occupation at the site; an early Early Archaic level represented by LeCroy Bifurcate projectile points at approximately 70 to 60 cm. below the present surface, and what remains of a dense Late Archaic strata located just below the plow zone (and undoubtedly part of the plow zone itself). Given the importance of such a well-stratified site, numerous soil samples were gathered for paleoethnobotanical analysis and wood charcoal was also hand-collected during excavation for radiocarbon dating.

A series of five samples of wood charcoal, including oak, hickory, and pine taxa, were submitted to Beta Analytic Inc. for radiocarbon dating this past summer. The dates returned from the samples were more than gratifying (the dates reported represent Conventional C14 Age). Sample #1 (Beta-105849) was wood charcoal from a small hearth at 32 cm b.s. and returned a date of 5,250 +/- 60 B.P. Sample #2 (Beta-105850) was from a large heavily-burned hearth in our trench, 45 cm. b.s. in the profile, and dated to 4,250 +/- 70 B.P. Sample #3 (Beta-105851) was from a postmold that appeared at 70 cm. b.s. and yielded a date of 8,820 +/- 70 B.P. Sample #4 (Beta-105852) included wood charcoal smears from an apparent occupation floor at 55-60 cm. b.s. and produced a date of 8,720 +/- 70 B.P. Lastly, Sample #5 (Beta-105853) was taken from the same area as #4 at 60-70 cm. b.s. and yielded a date of 8,530 +/- 170 B.P. Thus, with the calibration of the radiocarbon age to calendar years, the dates seem to verify the preliminary hypothesis of an Early Archaic occupation at the site from around 8,000 to 7,000 B.C. and a later occupation from circa 4,000 to 2,600 B.C. The university hopes to conduct future excavations at the Streater site and other adjacent sites with an aim to contributing to the archaeological research of an important river system in the eastern United States.

*Submitted by Dr. DeeAnne Wymer
Dept. of Anthropology, Bloomsburg University*

PUBLIC EDUCATION

[In order to encourage the very important task of developing public support of and involvement in archaeology, members are asked to submit short items describing how they, and their firms, institutions, and organizations are interacting with the general public. This column is inaugurated with the following submission.]

Our ASD annual meeting of the last several years has been devoted to reports on CRM work by consulting firms and non-profits within the State of Delaware. [At this year's meeting] we had speakers on various sites including myself from MAAR, Ned Heite from Heite Consulting, Keith Doms from UDCAR as well as Cara Blume (from DNREC, not a firm) and someone reporting from two other non-profits. Most of us consider speaking to local organizations a must. Mike Patriglia from Parsons Engineering Science, for instance, will be talking on Tuesday to a retired chemist group at DuPont. We all cooperate with the press, of course, and on many of our Virginia projects we are expected by the VDHR to submit posters, brief flyers or brochures, talks and/or museum displays. I really think the profession is doing more than ever in the way of public outreach.

Ron Thomas, MAAR Associates, Inc

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Survey Priorities Committee

The Survey Priorities Committee met with Dr. Kurt Carr on February 18, 1997 to discuss the implementation of the PHMC's research priorities policy. Determination of need for Phase I surveys is guided by the July 1996 policy statement entitled The Development of Prehistoric Settlement Pattern Research Priorities in Pennsylvania. The document identifies 19 watersheds as having the highest quality of settlement pattern data for upland settings.

Dr. Carr explained some of the specifics of implementation of the policy. Project areas that are in a watershed with a high quality of settlement pattern data for upland sites do not require Phase I survey. If a project area is a high-quality watershed has both riverine and upland settings, survey is required only in the riverine zone. The definition of the riverine zone varies according to the size of the stream. Upland areas are defined as distant from 3rd order or higher streams. Areas other than riverine settings that previous research has identified as having a high probability for prehistoric sites also require survey. These are defined in the July 1996 policy (p.11) and include "upland saddles and major spring heads on the Unglaciated Plateau, Pleistocene beaches on the Erie Coastal Plain, marl soils in the Great Valley, and high fertility soils in the Ridge and Valley Province."

Regarding historic sites, Dr. Carr indicated that if recorded, standing historic structures were present within the project area, survey was required in the vicinity of the structure only. At present, the BHP only reviews standing structure site files, not historic maps and atlases. In addition, the research priorities are not used in urban areas; criteria related to the history of the area are used to determine the need for survey. It was noted that many urban projects do not involve ground disturbance, particularly those undertaken by HUD.

At present there is no method of tracking the implementation of the Research Priorities Policy, nor are there plans to develop a system. The purpose of a tracking system was questioned by the BHP, given that such a system would be difficult to implement and would involve additional paperwork.

There was a general discussion on how to improve the policy, specifically by more precisely defining high probability areas within the high-quality watersheds so as to refine the exceptions to the policy. Dr. Carr stated that a goal was to find something better to guide archaeological surveys to avoid unnecessary expenditures of time and money. He indicated a willingness to add other exceptions to the policy, if they could be defined and justified. This would require better models of what constitutes a significant upland site and where such sites are likely to be found. Better models would require data synthesis, which involves time and expense. Possible means of data synthesis were discussed, including grant money, creative mitigation (e.g., mitigation banking), and revision of the State Plan.

At the Spring 1997 PAC business meeting, the committee made the following recommendations, all of which were approved by the membership:

- PAC should send a letter to the Commissioners of the PHMC urging that funds be provided for an update of the State Plan.
- In the absence of funds to update the State Plan, PAC should consider how to accomplish regional syntheses of settlement pattern data to refine the Research Priorities policy and improve the means of focusing survey efforts on areas most likely to contain significant sites.
- PAC should send a letter to the BHP urging that they track the implementation of the Research Priorities policy. In addition, the letter should urge the BHP to consult historic maps and atlases in project reviews, rather than relying solely on standing structures files.

Submitted by Pat Miller

Public Education Committee

Essay Contest

The Public Education Committee would like to recognize the winners of the 1996-97 Essay contest. Their names are listed below. The award ceremony this past year in Harrisburg not only recognized these students, but also a group of students who have been working with the archaeologists from Eco-Science, Inc. on a large project for PennDOT. The students from the Delaware Valley Middle School, Tim Jones, and Rich Lewis from EcoScience, and Jamie McIntyre, Ira Beckerman, and others from PennDOT were recognized for this effort.

If you are working with students, let us know because we would like this to be a yearly part of our effort to recognize Public Education in the Commonwealth.

Note: Teachers are shown in parenthesis.

4th, 5th and 6th Grade

First Place: Aaron Libman, Foster Elementary School, Pittsburgh, PA (Mrs. Mary Hopkins)

Second Place (tie): Alex Kahn, Coopertown School, Bryn Mawr, PA (Mrs. Susan Mingey)

Second Place (tie): Ethan Landry, Coopertown School, Bryn Mawr, PA (Mrs. Susan Mingey)

Third Place: Tesla DeBoer, Delaware Valley Middle School, Milford, PA (Mrs. Sharon Siegel)

Honorable Mention: Jake Thowart, St. Mary's Parochial School, St. Mary's, PA (Mrs. Nekuza); Rachel Ferrand, Barrett Elementary Center, Cresco, PA (Mrs. Terhune); Kate Hauser, Latrobe Elementary School, Latrobe, PA (Mr. Hixson); Johanna Kryzyspiak, Rolling Hills Elementary School, Holland, PA (Mrs. Merilee Horvat); Bridget Mullaly, Poquessing Middle School, Feasterville, PA (Mr. Lou Palkovics); Cecelia Ratay, Lincoln Elementary School, Mt. Lebanon, PA (Dr. Francie Robb); Andrew Bartholomew, Chestnut Hill

Academy, Philadelphia, PA (Mrs. Melissa Dollinger); Octav Esteves, Southern Lehigh Middle School, Center Valley, PA (Mr. Hanks).

7th, 8th, 9th Grade

First Place: Harini Raghupathi, The Ellis School, Pittsburgh, PA (Dr. Ellen Bedell)

Second Place: Calley Baughman, Norwin High School, Irwin, PA (Mr. Socrates)

Third Place (tie): Holly Wendt, Line Mountain High School, Herndon, PA (Joyce Westbrook)

Third Place (tie): Celanie Polanick, The Ellis School, Pittsburgh, PA (Dr. Ellen Bedell)

Honorable Mention: Kelly Engel, Unionville High School, 750 Unionville Road

Kennett Square, PA (Mrs. Ann V.S. Schott); Marc Preston, Haverford Middle School

Havertown, PA (Mr. Williams); Emma Somers, Lycoming Valley Middle School, Williamsport, PA 17701 (Mr. James E. Donnell).

Special Recognition of Those Involved in the Shohola Flats Archaeological Video Project

Students: Ryan Blackman, Tesla Deboer, Caryn Eubank, Jacob Kennedy;

Reporters for WDVE;

Delaware Valley Middle School: Mrs. Sonya Cole, Principal & Mrs. Sharon Siegel, Teacher;

Eco-Science, Inc.: Timothy R. Jones, Director of Archaeology & Rich Lewis, Archaeologist;

Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, Engineering District 4-0: Charles M. Mattei, District Engineer & Jamie McIntyre, Cultural Resource Specialist;

Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, Bureau of Environmental Quality: Wayne Kober, Director & Ira Beckerman, Archaeologist.

Other News

Local History Project Support Grant funds were awarded to PAC for the development and production of nine teaching trunks focusing on Pennsylvania archaeology. These identical trunks will be designed to complement the teaching guide Project Archaeology: Pennsylvania, an archaeology curriculum for middle school grades five through eight, developed by PAC under a separate grant two years ago. Renata has been contacting the participants in the previous grant for their input.

If any PAC members, not directly involved in the original Project Archaeology: PA project, have any materials (1. other selected lesson plan packages developed in the past by contract archaeologists and archaeology educators throughout the state; 2. an archaeology book on Pennsylvania and/or archaeology in general, suitable for reading by middle school students; 3. videos on specific aspects of Pennsylvania's archaeological past; 4. videos which focus on how archaeologists do their work (e. g. flint knapping, site excavation, etc.); 5. selected reference books on archaeological methodology for use by the teacher; 6. artifact replicas or artifacts from which replicas could be made focusing on the cultural periods highlighted in the Project Archaeology: Pennsylvania curriculum (Paleoindian through Early Historic); 7. at least five slides which we can copy that visually highlight materials presented in any chapter.) which they would like to recommend for the trunks please get in touch with Renata immediately at e-mail "woly nec@edinboro.edu" or (814)734-4056 (home). A group of teacher volunteers will be evaluating the information. Thank you to all of you, in advance, for your help on this project.

Thank You

The PAC Education Committee would like to thank all of the members of PAC for participating in PA Archaeology Week events; contributing funds for the poster; facilitating Project Archaeology workshops; judging the essays; and contributing your time to the grant. Your assistance is always appreciated and always

needed.

Submitted by Beverly Chiarulli

FORUM

[Members are invited to submit comments on issues of current concern. With luck, varying points of view will be presented.]

Kennewick Man

The battle lines are drawn as to who has the rights to Kennewick Man. In case you haven't heard, Kennewick Man, a 9,300 year old skeleton with a Cascade point embedded in his hip, was found along the banks of Columbia River near Kennewick, Washington. Unfortunately, the Washington Post story of September 10, 1997 fails to identify spearpoint. Radiocarbon dating places Kennewick Man between 7265 to 7535 B. C. which makes it the oldest intact skeleton in the Pacific Northwest.

Local Native Americans have called the find "Oyt.pa.ma.na.tit.tite". They want all study and testing to cease and under NAGPRA they demand that the remains be turned over to them for reburial. The Army Corps of Engineers, who owns the property where Kennewick Man was found has confiscated the skeleton on the behalf of the Indians. In response a group of eight anthropologists and archaeologists including Douglas Owsley and Dennis Stanford of the Smithsonian have sued the corps. Their claim is that the find "represents a rare discovery of national and international scientific significance". It is intriguing that this skeleton appears to have certain Caucasoid characteristics. A federal judge overseeing the case has criticized the corps for acting prematurely.

In addition to the scientists against NAGPRA and the Native Americans, the Asatru Folk Assembly enters into the picture. This is a pre-Christian pagan group who claim to have descended from Northern European Ancestors. They pay homage to Odin, the one eyed god of war, poetry, wisdom and death, and they assert that this skeleton is "The Far Traveling One". He is one of their own and they lay claim to the remains. The Asatrus have hired their own attorney in order to press forward with their rights to "Kennewick Man" or "Oyt.pa.ma.na.tit.tite" or "The Far Traveling One". Stay tune to see what happens. If only the corps weren't such wimps!

Submitted by W. Fred Kinsey

EDITOR: This issue is complex, as evidenced by the following selection of viewpoints downloaded from various internet list services.

From ARCH-L:

This month's (October) Anthropology Newsletter has much for those interested in the Kennewick Man controversy.

The issue focuses on this year's theme - Race. One article describes the AAA's recommendation to OMB to eliminate race from the standards. Others explain why AAA believes the concept has no validity.

The most relevant is an article on p.3 by Alan Goodman (Hampshire College), entitled "Racializing Kennewick Man." He points to two studies where Native American skeletons were subjected to analysis. In one case, only one of nine were correctly identified, in the other case, only one of seven. Interestingly, one of these researchers is GW Gill, the same Gill suing the Corps of Engineers with the rest of the scientists. I'll just quote a few sentences so you get the flavor:

"In this light, Chatters should not have been perplexed [that the 9300 year old skeleton had Causcasoid traits]. He probably made a mistake in racial classification, a common one. What is uncommon is the subsequent effort to scientifically justify this likely, little mistake. Chatters and the reporters do not hint at how easy it is to wrongly think that a Native American cranium might be "Caucasian," especially when it is that old, not cradleboarded and only visually examined; they do not even hint at this. Rather they unambiguously accept the science of racial classification and the racial designation of "Caucasian," which leads them to promote a new theory of how the America were peopled. A small mistake leads to more."

There's much more food for thought in Goodman's article. I hope it will lead those who have initially supported the scientist's position on Kennewick Man to really examine this case in greater detail. Science is going to get a bad rap if the scientific community continues to support the suing scientists at face value.

Darby Stapp and Julie Longenecker

And from ACRA-L:

On Oct. 23, Julie Longnecker and Darby Stapp provide some quotations from a letter in the AAA newsletter to the effect that the physical anthropologists are most likely mistaken in their declaration that the "Kennewick Man" is dissimilar in physical character to the more recent Native American populations in that area.

The quote states "Chatters and the reporters do not hint at how easy it is to wrongly think that a Native American cranium might be "Caucasian," especially when it is that old, not cradleboarded and only visually examined; they do not even hint at this."

Jim Chatters has a web page that describes the observations made before the Army Corps of Engineers took possession of the remains.

He speaks of "standard forensic examination and measurements" made, of dental X-rays, of CT scans, and states a number of non-metric character observations.

As far as racial identifications, Chatters reports that the physical pattern of the orbits of the skull are typical of neither modern Native American populations nor modern caucasoid peoples. He reports the dental pattern as fitting the Sundadont pattern that Christie has described as characteristic of southern Asian populations. This is a very far cry from the situation as represented in the quote, "...only visually examined."

The folks at the AAA may have good and valid reasons for opposing the lawsuit by some physical anthropologists. But if they have to resort to supporting their arguments with such questionable assertions of their own ("It was all a mistake because they only visually examined them.") when information to the contrary is so easily available, they won't be doing their cause much good, or changing many unsettled opinions, either.

Richard D. Davis

COMPUTER USER'S COLUMN

by Mark A. McConaughy

The rapid advance of computer technology often makes it difficult to keep up with current trends and requirements. Should you buy a computer or upgrade what you have when new technology and software surpasses the capability of your current IBM compatible machine? Any 486 CPU or less computer should be replaced. The advantages of Pentium-based systems far outweigh any consideration of upgrades for older systems. The ability to run concurrent programs, use 32 bit instead of a 16 bit pathways, processing requirements of many programs and the drastic drop in price of Pentium systems all make it cost effective to replace older systems. However, if you have a Pentium system and are short of memory or hard drive space, it may be more cost effective to upgrade those components instead of buying totally new systems. I recently found myself in the latter category with my home computer, an old 60 MHz Pentium system with a 0.5G hard drive that was filled. I decided to purchase and install a 3.2G hard drive (\$265.00 for the new hard drive) and a faster modem. This column will describe my experiences installing these items.

Before installing a replacement hard drive one should always back up all programs and data files that are on the old hard drive. I backed up my system on a tape drive and planned to download the old hard drive's software from the tape after the new hard drive was installed. I also made a new bootable diskette in case something went wrong with the hard drive installation. Next I gathered all my original system disks and had them ready for reinstallation after the replacement drive was set up. It was particularly important to have the DOS, Windows and driver disks for CD ROMs and tape drive backup systems ready to make the machine boot and run after the new hard drive was installed. These latter program disks should be available whether or not the system was backed up on a tape drive, diskette or CD ROM, as I found out.

Installing a new hard drive is not physically difficult. It usually only requires opening the computer and finding the old hard drive. The location varies between tower and desktop systems. The replacement hard drive had instructions showing where to look for the old hard drive in both types of systems. Instructions were provided for removal of the old drive and installation of the new drive. This required me to remove screws holding the old hard drive in place (this usually is between 6 and 8 screws depending on how the drive is installed). I pulled the drive out of its housing (it is a self-contained unit about the size of a paperback book) and unplugged the power and cable cords in the rear of the drive. A new hard drive may require adjustments to some dip switch settings depending on your system. The instructions provided information on how to set the switches. However, most systems probably will not require changes from factory settings and mine did not. The power cord and cable cord were reconnected to the new drive and it was placed back in the hard drive housing. The screws were replaced and the computer case closed. It took me about 15 minutes to install the new drive, and I had few problems following the instructions.

Once the new hard drive was installed, it had to be formatted. Formatting the new 3.2G hard drive had certain limitations because I had an old BIOS and operating system. Any BIOS made prior to 1995 (and usually a message will appear when you boot your system giving the name and copyright date of the BIOS) can only handle up to a 0.5G logical hard drive. Thus, any larger drive has to be partitioned into a series of 0.5G (or whatever size smaller than 0.5G) logical hard drives. These usually are automatically labeled drives c, d, e, etc., by the formatting software. It is possible to obtain a new BIOS for installation from the company of the old BIOS that permits formatting the drive into partitions up to a maximum size of 2.1G. A partition of 2.1G is the largest Windows 95 can address. The hard drive installation manual recommended obtaining a new

BIOS to replace any pre-1995 versions. They are safer and more stable than using a software fix for the BIOS problem that came on a 3.5 inch floppy disk with the hard drive. The software fix also permitted the hard drive to be formatted to 2.1G without an upgrade of the BIOS. I used the software fix instead of getting a totally new BIOS. The new hard drive was automatically formatted when I booted my system. When I was given the option of how many drives to set up, I set up 2.1G and 1.1G drive partitions. These were labeled drives c and d respectively by the formatting software.

Before program software can be reinstalled on a new hard drive, any other devices on the system besides an A-drive floppy probably require appropriate drivers be reinstalled. These devices might include a tape drive, CD ROM, ZIP Drive, etc. This is where I ran into the only major problem I had upgrading the system. I have a CD ROM and tape drive. I had little problem reinstalling the driver for my tape drive from its original 3.5 inch floppy disks. However, I ran into a problem downloading the tapes I had made of my old hard drive. The tape twisted or was bad and crashed. I was not able to reinstall all my software from tape as I had planned. I had to reinstall everything from original disks or CDS.

Windows 95, the operating system, was on a CD and I had to install the driver for the CD to load it. Unfortunately, the setup software for the CD ROM defaulted to making it drive d. The hard drive had been partitioned and used d for the designation of the second partition. This created a conflict with the CD ROM driver installation causing its setup program to crash. There was no option presented to change the default drive setting by the installation program for the CD ROM driver. Thus, I could not run the CD ROM and install Windows or other programs. However, I had to install Windows 95 so I could run the system and install other software. There was no other option available. I finally called Gateways (manufacturer of my computer) service line for help. They were very nice and their technical person talked me through reinstallation of the CD ROM driver so it became drive e on my system. He also had me set up a file to fool the Windows 95 CD, an upgrade version requiring Windows 3.11 (or at least a key file of Windows 3.11 as the technician told me) be on the system before Windows 95 would install. If he had not given me a method of fooling Windows 95, I would have had to entirely reinstall Windows 3.11 before Windows 95. I finally reinstalled Windows 95 from the CD ROM after creating a windows file as directed by the technician. The rest of my software was reinstalled from CD ROMs or 3.5 inch floppies using the add/remove program in Windows 95.

I was very happy with Gateways technical people. They did not question me about changing the system or about installing non-Gateway equipment. They helped me out and quickly had solutions to my problems. I have dealt with technical people from many different computer companies. None have been as supportive and helpful as the Gateway technical people (and no, Gateway did not pay me to make those statements!).

The other upgrade I made to my system was to purchase (\$79.00) and install a new 33.6K fax/modem. Modems are very easy to install if you have a free 16 bit slot for them. It is recommended that Windows 95 users purchase modems listed as plug-and-play because they are designed to work with Windows 95. I removed my old modem from the machine and installed the new one in about 5 minutes. I reconnected the phone lines and rebooted the machine. Windows 95 recognized the new modem and configured it to my system. The entire modem installation process took less than a half hour from start to finish and resulted in a fully functional modem.

I was able to change my system in one night and had all of my important software reinstalled by the end of a second evening (I have a lot of software!). The system now has sufficient hard drive space to run all the programs I have and plenty of free storage space above that. The new modem increases speed of access to the Internet and permits me to spend more time Web surfing. I am happy with the results of the upgrades. The entire process would have been greatly speeded along if the tape backup had not failed. However, it did

permit me to discover some problems I had not anticipated when backing up my system. The necessity of having the original installation disks readily available for all system drivers quickly became apparent. I also did not anticipate the problem of reinstalling the CD as a different drive than its original configuration. I do not know if this is a common problem with all CD installation drivers or just the one for my system. Even with the problems I encountered, I would recommend making these upgrades if purchase of a new system is not feasible. They extend the useful life of the system.

MEETING AND EVENTS CALENDAR

Middle Atlantic Archaeological Conference

Date: 3-5 April 1998

Place: Cape May, NJ

Pennsylvania Archaeological Council

Date: 24 April 1998

Place: Holiday Inn, New Cumberland, PA

Society for Pennsylvania Archaeology

Date: 24-26 April 1998

Place: Holiday Inn, New Cumberland, PA

Ohio Archaeological Council

Date: 15 May 1998

Place: Ohio Historical Center, Columbus, OH (tentative).

Program: Forum on training and education of future archaeologists for work in CRM.

Contact: OAC President-Elect William S. Dancey, Department of Anthropology, The Ohio State University, 124 W. 17th Ave., Columbus, OH 43210-1364, (614) 292-9770, FAX (614) 292-4155, email dancey.1@osu.edu, or he can be contacted through the OAC at P.O. Box 02012, Columbus, OH 43202

Date: 9-10 October 1998

Place: Toledo, OH.

Program: Historical Archaeology, including: protohistoric/historic American Indians, military, rural/farmstead, industrial, residential/urban, and the "recent past" (application of archaeological method and theory to forensic matters/forensic archaeology).

Contact: Dr. G. Michael Pratt, Chair, Ohio Archaeological Council Education Committee, Heidelberg College, Tiffin, OH 44883; Phone: 419-448-2070, FAX: 419-448-2124, Email: mpratt@nike.heidelberg.edu.

** Please send notices of upcoming events to the editor.

PLEASE NOTE

The PAC Constitution requires that PAC members also belong to the Society for Pennsylvania Archaeology. It is important to foster communication between professional and avocational archaeologists. Moreover, membership in SPA supports Pennsylvania Archaeologist in which PAC members often publish.

SPA annual dues are \$14.00 for individuals and \$16.00 for families, which should be sent to: Archaeological

Services, P.O. Box 386, Bethlehem, CT 06751-0386.

EDITOR'S NOTE

Materials for the PAC Newsletter should be sent to: Philip A. Perazio, KAR, Inc.,
P.O. Box 1117, Stroudsburg, PA 18360
Phone: 717-620-2591; FAX: 717-620-0186
EMAIL: kittarch@sunlink.net

Please send contributions on disk (Wordperfect 6.1 preferred), accompanied by a hard copy. You may also attempt to send submissions as email attachments. However, not all systems are compatible, so this does not always work. Short items, 1 page or less, may be submitted in hard copy or by FAX.

Deadline for next issue:

1 April 1998.

NOTE: Please make sure PAC has your current FAX and/or Email addresses so that we may distribute urgent information as quickly as possible. Send updates to Mark McConaughy.