Archaeology & Cultural Resource Management

1

The Future of CRM Archaeology

Lynne Sebastian

Sometimes the idea behind a book grows slowly through the accretion of experiences and thoughts over a long period. At other times, the idea of the book crystallizes in a single moment. This book is of the latter sort, and the idea arose from an assignment I was given for a symposium in honor of Bill Lipe at the 2002 Society for American Archaeology (SAA) meetings in Denver. The organizers asked me to speak about the influence of Bill's 1974 paper "A Conservation Model for American Archaeology" on the subsequent direction of archaeology in the field of cultural resource management (CRM).

In my chapter in the book that grew out of that symposium (Matson and Kohler 2006), I noted: "Reading the article again, I was immediately struck by the congruence between Lipe's vision for the future, as described in the article, and current historic preservation practice. I was also struck by the continuity between many of the problems that Lipe identified in 1974 and the problems that still vex us in CRM archaeology today" (Sebastian 2006:109). While preparing the chapter, I also realized that "the kind of broad-scale, long-range vision that Lipe articulated in this article is extremely rare in CRM archaeology today. We have become so bogged down in the regulations and guidance and standards, in the business and the practice of CRM, that we fail to pause periodically and ask critical questions: Are

we where we want to be, where we need to be in CRM archaeology? What are the major directions we should take as a discipline? What are the problems we will need to solve over the next 30 years?" (Sebastian 2006:124–125).

I formed, at that moment, a plan for bringing together a set of colleagues with great depth and variety of experience in the field of CRM archaeology, locking them up somewhere beautiful, feeding them great food, and coaxing from them a vision for the future of our profession.

This is not, of course, to imply that no one else is thinking about visions for the future. In one of a number of recent examples, one of the contributors to this book, Julia King, with William Lees, organized and subsequently published an excellent forum discussion among colleagues in historical archaeology (Lees and King 2007). This discussion asked whether the public was getting its money's worth from CRM and what could be done to improve the cost–benefit ratio. Despite such examples, it seems to me that the "broad scale, question everything, and think big" style of introspection that characterized the early years of CRM archaeology has become exceedingly rare and needs to be revived.

Without question, it would be valuable to identify needed changes and develop a vision for the future of cultural resource management in general, but in this book we have chosen to focus on archaeology rather than try to tackle the whole field at once. The problems and issues faced by those who deal with the built environment are very different from the problems and issues encountered in dealing with the archaeological record, and both differ from the problems and issues surrounding traditional cultural places or cultural landscapes.

ARCHAEOLOGY AND PUBLIC POLICY: A NEW VISION FOR THE FUTURE

With Bill Lipe serving as my co-organizer, I was fortunate to secure support from the School of American Research (SAR; now renamed the School for Advanced Research on the Human Experience) for an advanced seminar titled "Archaeology and Public Policy: A Vision for the Future," which was held in July 2007. SAR not only met the "beautiful place and great food" criteria admirably but also gave us the luxury of spending an entire week discussing and pondering a topic about which all the participants felt passionate. In addition, we had the honor of being chosen as the first Douglas W. Schwartz Advanced Seminar in Anthropological Archaeology. This biennial seminar series celebrates Doug Schwartz's 34 years of service to SAR. Even better, from our perspective, our selection as

a Schwartz Seminar meant that Doug sat in on many of our discussions and gave us the benefit of his broad and always thoughtful perspective on our deliberations.

My approach to inviting the other eight seminar participants was to select people who had a great deal of practical experience with compliance and cultural resource management archaeology, either in agencies or as consultants, or both. I wanted people who had strong ideas and were willing to let go of "how we've always done it" and think about "how it should be." I wanted people who could write and people with whom I could be locked up in the SAR seminar house in Santa Fe for a week without contemplating either homicide or suicide.

Beyond that, I took a simple, Noah-like approach: two federal agency archaeologists, two state historic preservation office archaeologists, two CRM business owners, and Bill Lipe and Hester Davis to serve as CRM archaeology elders and provide both "institutional memory" and new perspectives. I also wanted someone with experience in tribal CRM programs and tribal issues, and a balance between easterners and westerners. The practice and realities of CRM archaeology are very different in the American West, with its arid environment and vast tracts of public land, and the East, with its heavy vegetation, dense population, and largely private land tenure.

When our "ark" was populated, we worked together to identify a set of basic topics to be addressed at the seminar. Each participant not only provided thoughts on critical issues but also queried his or her network of colleagues for additional suggestions. Eventually we settled on the following:

- Significance, information potential, and eligibility—how can we do a better job of evaluating the significance of archaeological sites?
- Mitigation, excavation, and research—how can we learn more for the money being expended?
- Preserving sites, conserving sites, and learning about the past—where is the balance?
- Managing the past—what are the appropriate roles of agencies, reviewers, consultants, professional organizations, and tribes and other descendant communities?
- Disseminating what we have learned—who controls the data? How do we deal with the gray literature? How do we maximize public access and benefits?

After everyone had carved out his or her seminar topic, we found that

we had done a surprisingly thorough job of covering these organizing concepts and several other important issues as well. With only 10 people and strict page limits on our book, we could not possibly cover everything, and indeed the book was not intended to be the encyclopedia of CRM archaeology. We all chose to cover what we knew best and felt most strongly about. Two important topics that we ultimately chose not to address were the curation crisis and the issue of how to prepare students for career paths in CRM, as opposed to academic, archaeology. Although these are critical issues for the future of CRM archaeology, they are so broad and complex that they would easily fill whole volumes. Fortunately, both topics are also being addressed in a variety of other venues.[1]

In addition, as one of our reviewers pointed out, we have not focused heavily on technology. Fieldwork, analysis, planning, and information management and dissemination have all benefited enormously from technological advances over the past 20 years. Some of the most intractable problems in CRM archaeology—access to the gray literature, for example—may finally become manageable through the miracles of digital technology. As generally seems to be the case, however, these modern miracles generate their own sets of problems. For example, with more and more archaeological data being collected, manipulated, and stored in digital form only, how do we ensure that these data remain readable and accessible over the long term?[2]

The topics we chose to cover, which represent the basic processes and decisions of CRM archaeology, have received less broad-scale scrutiny within the profession than have the issues of curation and education. The bureaucratization of CRM archaeology has become so entrenched that many practitioners not only find it difficult to examine the process critically and envision substantive change but even feel threatened by the very ideas of critique and change. Federal agencies have periodically sponsored efforts to reimagine or reinvent the compliance process, but these efforts tend to focus on details and try to retrofit and readapt existing components of the process. They rarely or never question the viability of those components in the context of the process as a whole. My instruction to the seminar group was that the deck chairs on our ark did not require rearranging; our job was to apply critical evaluation and creativity to the larger issues of how and why we do archaeology in the public sector.

We gave our seminar the working title "Archaeology and Public Policy: A Vision for the Future" because we wanted to emphasize the publicly funded nature of CRM and the critical need to maximize both the public benefits and the professional quality of CRM archaeology. By most

estimates, as much as 90 percent of the archaeology done in the United States today is carried out in the field of cultural resource management. The impact of this work on the archaeological record, the archaeological profession, and the heritage of the American people would be difficult to overemphasize. CRM archaeology affects a wide range of federally funded or authorized developments. It influences the way we educate our students, work with indigenous people, and curate field records and artifacts. It has yielded an enormous wealth of data on which many recent advances in our understanding of North American archaeology depend. This is "public" archaeology in the clearest sense of the word: it is done because of federal law and policy, and it is funded directly or indirectly by the public.

PUBLIC POLICY AND THE LEGISLATIVE UNDERPINNINGS OF CRM ARCHAEOLOGY

Everything we do in CRM archaeology is based on and should be (but often is not) informed by the laws that mandate consideration and protection of the nation's heritage. Too often we become mired in the minutia of "compliance" with the law and lose sight of the central issue of "intent." Why are we doing this in the first place?

The Antiquities Act of 1906, the first historic preservation law in this country, established the principle that the federal government has a legitimate interest in protecting archaeological sites on public land from unauthorized excavation. The Antiquities Act established federal control over the archaeological record on public land and had an enormous effect on subsequent developments in historic preservation law in the United States. It did not, however, establish an explicit federal policy with regard to preservation or state why preservation matters.

The first national policy statement about the value of the country's historic heritage appeared in statute nearly 75 years ago in the Historic Sites Act of 1935. This law, which institutionalized within the National Park Service many of the New Deal programs pertaining to history and archaeology, begins with a simple declaration: "It is hereby declared that it is a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings, and objects of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States." Every historic preservation law enacted since then has begun at the same place: preservation of the national heritage in the public interest. The Historic Sites Act goes on to establish programs and procedures that appear repeatedly in subsequent laws: surveys of historic and archaeological sites, buildings, and objects; determinations about which of these are of value for commemorating or illustrating the

history of the United States; historical and archaeological research and investigations; restoration and rehabilitation of heritage sites; collection and maintenance of data about historic and prehistoric sites; and dissemination of this information to the public.

In the 1960s and early 1970s, the United States Congress passed a variety of landmark laws designed to achieve some balance between the need for infrastructure and development in this country and the desire of the American people to see more consideration given to protecting their natural and cultural heritage. The first of these laws to address cultural resources was the Reservoir Salvage Act of 1960, which explicitly referenced the purpose statement of the Historic Sites Act as the reason for its enactment. As the name implies, the act required collection and preservation of historical and archaeological data and materials that would otherwise be destroyed by federally supported dam and reservoir construction.

In 1974 the Reservoir Salvage Act was amended to cover all federal or federally approved ground-disturbing activities and was retitled the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act (colloquially referred to as the Moss-Bennett Act, after its congressional sponsors). The expanded law made it clear that federal agencies have a responsibility to determine the effects of their projects on archaeological and historical sites and are authorized to spend funds to mitigate, or lessen the severity of, those effects through data recovery. Like the Reservoir Salvage Act, Moss-Bennett specifically references the purpose statement of the Historic Sites Act, noting that the goal of preserving historic and prehistoric sites and the information that can be derived from them is to provide inspiration and benefit for the people of the United States.

Of all the conservation-focused laws of the 1960s and early 1970s, the National Historic Preservation Act and the National Environmental Policy Act have had the broadest influence on federal agency planning and decision-making.[3] The statements of federal policy and congressional intent in these statutes should be the guiding principles for policy decisions about archaeological resource management, but some people making such decisions, and even more of those who provide the data and recommendations on which such decisions are based, appear to have lost sight of that intent.

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), which became law in 1966, resulted from a grassroots effort organized by the National Trust for Historic Preservation and other preservationists, operating under the imprimatur of the United States Conference of Mayors (Glass 1990). The first section of the statute lays out, clearly and eloquently, the intent of Congress in passing the law:

The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) the spirit and direction of the Nation are founded upon and reflected in its historic heritage;

(2) the historical and cultural foundations of the Nation should be preserved as a living part of our community life and development in order to give a sense of orientation to the American people;

(3) historic properties significant to the Nation's heritage are being lost or substantially altered, often inadvertently, with increasing frequency;

(4) the preservation of this irreplaceable heritage is in the public interest so that its vital legacy of cultural, educational, esthetic, inspirational, economic, and energy benefits will be maintained and enriched for future generations of Americans.

The second section of the law establishes the federal government's policy concerning preservation of the nation's heritage:

It shall be the policy of the Federal Government, in cooperation with other nations and in partnership with the States, local governments, Indian tribes, and private organization and individuals to—

(1) use measures, including financial and technical assistance, to foster conditions under which our modern society and our prehistoric and historic resources can exist in productive harmony and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations;

(2) provide leadership in the preservation of the prehistoric and historic resources of the United States and of the international community of nations and in the administration of the national preservation program in partnership with States, Indian tribes, Native Hawaiians, and local governments;

(3) administer federally owned, administered, or controlled prehistoric and historic resources in a spirit of stewardship for the inspiration and benefit of present and future generations.

The proponents of the legislation that became the NHPA wanted Congress to do two things: to exhort federal agencies to be better stewards of historic places under their control and to require agencies to determine

how their actions will affect historic properties and to take those effects into account in planning. Congress addressed these goals in Sections 110 and 106 of the law, respectively.

In Section 106, federal agencies are enjoined to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and to provide the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) with an opportunity to comment on those effects. The agencies do this by identifying historic and prehistoric places that may be affected, evaluating their eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places, determining how the eligible properties will be affected, and formulating measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any effects that diminish their historical integrity.

Section 110 of the law requires that federal agencies assume responsibility for the preservation of historic properties under their ownership or control and establish programs to identify, evaluate, and protect such properties. This section also requires that an agency's preservation program and planning activities be carried out in consultation with state and local governments and Indian tribes, as well as the public.

The principles underlying these and all sections of the NHPA are public benefit and balance, or "productive harmony," as the law terms it, between government-sanctioned or government-sponsored development and preservation of the nation's prehistoric and historic heritage. The ACHP's regulation implementing Section 106 (36 CFR Part 800) reiterates this concept: "The section 106 process seeks to accommodate historic preservation concerns with the needs of Federal undertakings through consultation" (§800.1[a]).

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), signed into law in 1969, also established a policy to guide the actions of federal agencies. Section 101(a) says:

> The Congress, recognizing the profound impact of man's activity on the interrelations of all components of the natural environment,…declares that it is the continuing policy of the Federal Government, in cooperation with State and local governments, and other concerned public and private organizations, to use all practicable means and measures, including financial and technical assistance, in a manner calculated to foster and promote the general welfare, to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony, and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations of Americans.

In Section 101(b), NEPA establishes the goals to be met by this policy, among them the following:

> In order to carry out the policy set forth in this Act, it is the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means, consistent with other essential considerations of national policy, to improve and coordinate Federal plans, functions, programs, and resources to the end that the Nation may…fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations…preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity, and variety of individual choice.

NEPA and Section 106 of the NHPA create processes for informed federal agency decision-making. The shared language and concepts in the introductory sections of the two laws are a clear indication that both are intended to result in public policy decisions that yield tangible public benefits and reflect a balance between preservation and development.

THE RISE OF CRM ARCHAEOLOGY

Although archaeologists had carried out both large- and small-scale efforts to "salvage" archaeological data threatened by development activities since the Great Depression and the passage of the Historic Sites Act in 1935, those efforts had generally been ad hoc and almost always constituted crisis management rather than actual management of historic and prehistoric resources. The Reservoir Salvage Act began the movement toward routine, legally mandated consideration of the effects of federal projects on the archaeological record. With the passage of the NHPA and NEPA and the 1974 expansion of the Reservoir Salvage Act into the Archeological and Historic Preservation Act, the profession and the practice of archaeology in the United States changed profoundly over a short period of time. Suddenly, archaeology, which had been largely a pursuit for scholars and avocational enthusiasts, both of whom engaged in occasional bursts of data-gathering barely ahead of the bulldozers, became an integral part of land-use planning and federal agency decision-making.

In response to the burgeoning field of federally mandated archaeology, the archaeological profession engaged in serious debate and discussion about what the goals of CRM should be and how best to accomplish those goals in the interest of archaeological excellence and good public

policy. Mainstream journals such as *The Kiva* (Lipe 1974) and *Science* (Davis 1972) and major scholarly publishing houses such as Academic Press (Schiffer and Gumerman 1977) published important works on the theory, methods, and ethics of legally mandated, publicly funded archaeology. In 1974 the SAA organized and the National Park Service funded a series of six week-long seminars at Airlie House in Virginia. The resulting publication (McGimsey and Davis 1977) established a vision and direction that guided the practice of archaeology within the field of CRM for many years.

As the ACHP, the National Park Service, and other federal agencies developed regulations and guidance documents in the 1970s and 1980s, the practice of CRM archaeology became increasingly standardized, and the directions taken by the field became the purview of federal and state bureaucracies rather than of the archaeological profession. With rare exceptions (for example, King 2002), post-1970s publishing in CRM archaeology was focused not on evaluating and redesigning current practice but on creating "how-to" manuals (Neumann and Sanford 2001) and introductory texts (King 1998) that, unfortunately, often served to reinforce the status quo. The loss of an intellectual focus on method and theory in CRM archaeology and the absence of a discipline-wide debate over how best to do archaeology in the public arena and for the public benefit contributed substantially to the schism between academic and public-sector archaeologists that developed in the 1980s and continues today. The SAA sponsored a series of regional conferences in the mid-1980s that attempted to foster discussion of standards and quality control (Irwin-Williams and Fowler 1986), but the effort received little notice in the profession. Likewise, in the 1990s the SAA and the Society of Professional Archaeologists, in partnership with the National Park Service, co-sponsored a series of working group conferences, "Renewing Our National Archaeological Program," as Hester Davis describes in chapter 2, this volume. This initiative led to the development of some additional guidance for the Section 106 process, but like the initiative reported by Irwin-Williams and Fowler (1986), it did not lead to widespread debate or substantive change.

A VISION FOR THE FUTURE

It has now been more than 30 years, counting from the Airlie House seminars, and more than 20, counting from the efforts reported by Irwin-Williams and Fowler, since archaeologists as a profession instituted a broad examination of how archaeology is done in a CRM context and a debate over how to do it better. Instead of continuing and building on these

efforts, we have allowed ourselves to fall into a bureaucratically imposed set of standard operating procedures that cost large amounts of money (some estimates run as high as $300 million to $400 million a year) and that often work against our ability to produce either good archaeology or good public policy.

Given the nonrenewable nature of the archaeological record and the substantial sums of public money being expended to manage that record, it is essential that our approach to archaeological resource management be both good archaeology and good public policy. Some of the fundamental questions being asked by people in our profession and by policy makers about publicly funded archaeology these days are the following:

- Is the public getting its money's worth from CRM archaeology?
- Are the dollars spent on managing archaeological sites necessary, and are they being spent where they will have the greatest return?
- Are the procedures used to evaluate the significance of archaeological sites really successful at distinguishing the "important" sites from those that are unimportant?
- Are the dollars being spent on the mitigation of effects to archaeological sites yielding a proportionate increase in our understanding of life in the past and serving to inform, inspire, and engage the public?

Many archaeologists who work day-to-day with the theory, practice, and regulatory praxis of CRM recognize that "business as usual" CRM archaeology is contributing both impetus and ammunition to those who would weaken protections for archaeological sites. The widespread interest in archaeology among the American people should provide us with a strong source of support for retaining and even strengthening the legal protections for archaeological sites. Instead, we have too often forfeited the public's support because we have failed as a profession to focus on major issues and broad insights about the past and to share what we have learned about these important issues with the public in an accessible and engaging manner.

Exponential increases in the rate of suburban and rural development are putting more and more of the irreplaceable archaeological record at risk. At the same time, considerable political pressure is being brought to bear to weaken legal protections for historical, cultural, and natural aspects of the environment. In recent years, for example, both administrative and legislative initiatives have targeted aspects of historic preservation law and practice that are essential to appropriate management and conservation of archaeological resources.

Although the pro-development, anti-regulatory political climate of

recent years, with its emphasis on short-cutting review processes and limiting environmental protections, seems to be changing somewhat, economic pressures and new, high-impact developments such as solar energy will continue pushing archaeologists and resource managers to reexamine their standard operating procedures. Our goal in writing this book is to get ahead of the coming changes and bring the debate about the appropriate conduct of public-sector archaeology back under the intellectual guidance of the archaeological profession.

Our contributions to this debate begin, as all good archaeological projects do, with culture history—in this case, the culture history of professional archaeologists. In chapter 2, Hester Davis offers an engaging narrative of the process by which archaeologists organized themselves into an effective, recognized profession able to track, influence, and ultimately manipulate legislation and regulations affecting cultural resources. She also describes archaeologists' efforts to adjust, as a profession, to a whole new way of doing archaeology that was created by the very laws they helped to form.

In chapter 3, Bill Lipe reminds us that although we say "public benefit" when we speak of the importance of giving good value for the money spent on archaeology in this country, there is a multiplicity of "publics" with interests in what we do. He argues for a "values-based" approach to archaeological resource management, one that considers what resource values sites may have and how those values can be realized as public benefits. The archaeological resource values he discusses are preservation, research, cultural heritage, education, aesthetics, and economics.

The authors of the next three chapters examine specific aspects of the historic preservation compliance process: identifying historic properties, evaluating the significance of archaeological properties, and mitigating the adverse effects of federally funded or authorized projects on archaeological sites. Pat Barker, in his aptly titled chapter 4, "The Process Made Me Do It," advocates an approach to archaeological resource management that is regional in scope and focused on outcome rather than process. He argues that decisions about identifying and managing archaeological resources should begin with land-use planning and should be carried out, to the maximum extent possible, on a programmatic rather than a case-by-case basis.

My chapter 5 is focused on deciding which archaeological sites are "important" enough to be considered in federal planning. I contend that we archaeologists have (wrongly) come to believe that eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places is the only basis for making these decisions. I argue that we should instead embrace a more comprehensive

approach to archaeological significance and use it as the basis for managing the archaeological record—an approach that would yield both better archaeology and better public policy.

Susan Chandler, in chapter 6, looks at the issue of mitigation of adverse effects on archaeological sites. She examines a variety of measures for avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating effects on archaeological sites that have been used to supplement, augment, or replace standard data recovery through excavation. Noting that approaches that "achieve broader public involvement with archaeology can lead to increased appreciation of the past and a greater willingness to expend public funds in the pursuit of preservation goals," she provides detailed descriptions of the advantages and problems of several important alternative mitigation projects.

In chapter 7, Julia King addresses access to archaeological information—specifically, collections data and the "gray literature," or limited-distribution reports of surveys and excavations. She also addresses the potential for generating usable syntheses of information about the archaeological record from a variety of sources. As she notes, although digital technologies are an important part of the solution to these issues, digital technologies come with their own problems—cost, long-term viability, and obsolescence, for example.

T. J. Ferguson, in chapter 8, takes up one of the most pervasive and sensitive topics in American archaeology today: the involvement of Native Americans and other descendant communities. He describes five modes of interaction between archaeologists and descendant communities—colonial control, resistance, participation, collaboration, and indigenous control—that affect all aspects of the conduct and outcome of CRM archaeology. Although the participation mode meets the basic legal requirements for consultation, Ferguson argues, the collaboration mode yields richer and more culturally sensitive archaeological research. He also notes that the establishment of tribal historic preservation officers, pursuant to the NHPA, moves CRM on Indian land toward indigenous control.

The next two chapters, 9 by Douglas Mackey and 10 by Sarah Bridges, concern the issue of improving the quality of archaeology carried out in a CRM context. Mackey addresses this issue by focusing on archaeological practice. He argues that high-quality research and up-to-date methods and tools are not only central components of good archaeological practice but also essential components of a successful CRM business.

Bridges examines archaeological ethics. She surveys the wide range of ethics standards and principles that have been adopted by archaeological and anthropological organizations and notes the presence of several basic

values. She believes that a broader recognition of these shared values would benefit not only the archaeological resource base but also the interests of professional practitioners and various concerned communities and publics.

In the final chapter, 11, it is David Crass's role to bring us back to the reason we are doing all of this in the first place: the public benefit. It does us no good to improve the compliance process and the practice of CRM archaeology if the results of our work never become "a living part of our community life…in order to give a sense of orientation to the American people," in the words of the NHPA. Crass observes that we have made progress in some areas since the Airlie House report described a "crisis in communication," but we have far to go. He offers a series of tactical suggestions that virtually any archaeologist can use to enhance his or her communications, as well as more strategic recommendations for improving our ability to communicate with multiple publics.

It is interesting, in light of the 30 years that have passed since Airlie House, to compare the topics that the organizers of those seminars chose to address with those that we found compelling. Some of the Airlie House topics were at the top of our list as well as theirs—the "Crisis in Communication" is indeed still with us—but the awareness of multiple publics and multiple heritage values, as explored here in Lipe's chapter 3, was still many years in the future. Other Airlie House topics, particularly "Archeology and Native Americans" and "Certification and Accreditation," reflect the very beginnings of archaeologists' efforts to address these issues of concern to the profession. A comparison of those reports with the Ferguson and Bridges chapters (8 and 10, respectively) gives an encouraging sense that perhaps we have made progress in at least some areas over the intervening years.

The Airlie House seminars "Law in Archeology," "Cultural Resource Management," and "Preparation and Evaluation of Archeological Reports" remind us that the intractable bureaucratic process that Baker (4) and Chandler (6) and I (5) wrestle with in our chapters has not, despite its fossilized state, actually been around since the Pleistocene. In the mid-1970s archaeologists were faced with new legal mandates and a virtual absence of regulations and guidance about how to carry out those mandates. They responded by getting a group of professional archaeologists together to propose a vision and a process. Thirty years later, we are proposing that archaeologists shake off the psychic constraints of "we've always" and "we never" and "we can't," reexamine the process, and recommit to the vision.

Our organizing principles for both the seminar discussions and our chapters were these: describe what you see as the "ideal" state for the future; identify the obstacles keeping archaeologists from reaching that ideal state; and propose measures to overcome those obstacles. As our brains began to overload in Santa Fe, we decided that it all came down to what we called "SDSS[2]," or "stop doing stupid stuff; start doing smart stuff." The more tired we became, the funnier that seemed, but unaccountably, the folks at SAR Press did not view it as a suitable title for this book. Maybe you had to be there. Nevertheless, it is our hope that this book will serve as an impetus for dialogue and debate in American archaeology on how to implement the SDSS[2] philosophy so that in the future, CRM projects and programs will yield both better archaeology and better public policy.

Acknowledgments

Notes

1. See Childs 2004 and Sullivan and Childs 2003 for good discussions of the curation issue. For recent discussions of the issues in graduate education, see the special section "Revisiting the Graduate Curriculum: The Professional Face of Archaeology" in the November 2006 issue of the *SAA Archaeological Record* (www.saa.org/Portals/0/SAA/Publications/thesaaarchrec/nov06.pdf) and the special section "A Model Applied Archaeology Curriculum" in the January 2009 *SAA Archaeological Record* (www.saa.org/Portals/0/SAA/Publications/thesaaarchrec/jan09.pdf).

2. This issue, too, is being addressed in a variety of venues. See, for example, the Web sites for two such initiatives, Digital Antiquity (http://tdar.org/confluence/display/DIGITAQ/Home) and Archaeoinfomatics (http://archaeoinformatics.org/).

3. It is not my intent to downplay the important role of narrower statutory provisions such as the Archeological Resources Protection Act and Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act in preserving specific segments of the national heritage. These statutes, however, like the Antiquities Act, establish controls and restrictions but have not, in a general sense, established national policies with regard to heritage.