

## Chapter 6

# Archaeological Research and the Academic Process

Vance T. Holliday and Nan A. Rothschild

**The Topic** We are interested in your own experiences and views of the relevance of archaeological research in an academic setting. What opportunities have you experienced, and what constraints? What are your primary considerations as you develop your research? What is expected of your research in your respective academic positions? Have you faced university pressures with respect to research, fieldwork schedules, grant income, number of publications, and types of publications? To what extent, if any, have such pressures influenced how you have crafted or presented your research? Alternatively, has your university setting provided unexpected or unique research opportunities or directions?

### An Academic Path in the American Paleoindian West: Vance T. Holliday

Little did my first boss in archaeology know what he was saying when he described me as a “Texas dirt archaeologist.” It was a compliment (an important one at the time, when I was first starting out after I received my BA in Anthropology), but it was meant to mean a competent field archaeologist. But I really did become a “dirt archaeologist” (inspired, in fact, by that first boss), more commonly known as a geoarchaeologist. And since arriving at the University of Arizona I have been fortunate in being able to focus most of my research and teaching on the geoarchaeological aspects of my other interest, Paleoindian archaeology. Although my career path

---

V.T. Holliday (✉)

School of Anthropology and Department of Geosciences, University of Arizona,  
P.O. Box 210030, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA  
e-mail: vthollid@email.arizona.edu

N.A. Rothschild (✉)

Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA  
e-mail: roth@columbia.edu

wandered a bit, in my mind there is a fairly clear arc, and for the most part I have been able to do what I want to do in both teaching and research.

I have often said that until I was in college about all I knew of archaeology is what I saw in old Mummy movies. That is not far off. I have always been interested in the past and at all time scales: my parents' personal and family histories, the U.S. history, military history, prehistory, human evolution, and dinosaurs. But not until I was finishing junior college and planning to go to The University of Texas that I realized that people were trained in and employed in archaeology. The epiphany came when I happened to watch an old television special called "The Man Hunters" focusing on an interdisciplinary study of a rockshelter in France. When I saw it I realized THAT is what I wanted to do. And then I quite literally entered a whole new world. After receiving a BA and working in the very early days of what became CRM archaeology I was at Texas Tech University working at the Lubbock Lake site. It was research-oriented work and the focus was on Paleoindians. I was anxious to get out of the contract world and its many constraints, and I was always interested in the "oldest" or the origins: the oldest fossils, the earliest hominid, and the oldest sites in North America. Further, the interdisciplinary work at Lubbock introduced me to soils and geology. Because of the focus of the research, that experience was a wonderful entree – via conferences, field trips, field work, lab work, and report writing, as well as my thesis – to geoarchaeology, zooarchaeology, and Paleoindian archaeology, especially on the Great Plains. And I finally realized that I was more interested in the sediment surrounding the artifacts than I was in the artifacts themselves. That led me to study soils from a geologic perspective (along with Quaternary geology and geomorphology) as my Ph.D. in Geology from the University of Colorado. My soils research began at Lubbock Lake, which (along with some consulting) maintained my connection to archaeology.

My first academic position (as a Visiting Professor) introduced me to Geography at the University of Wisconsin (UW). As soon as I entered Geography I felt like I was "back home" even though I had little formal training in that field. Geography and Anthropology are so similar to one another: both are broad disciplines that include both social and physical sciences. And there are long historical ties between subdisciplines on both sides. Being immersed in Physical Geography was also important because the various subfields (geomorphology, soils, climatology, biogeography, and remote sensing) have so many applications in Quaternary geology and geoarchaeology. Indeed, many geoarchaeologists came out of Geography programs. The UW position helped land me another visiting position: a joint appointment in Geography and Anthropology at Texas A&M University. That was important because it brought me back directly into archaeology and my first teaching of geoarchaeology and Paleoindian archaeology. I ended up settling down in Geography back at the UW at Madison. I was hired to teach courses on soils and geomorphology, but also ran seminars that dealt with geoarchaeology and attracted a few graduate students who pursued geoarchaeology. I also had students from UW Anthropology in my classes and served on graduate committees over there.

As in most academic departments at large research-oriented universities, I was completely free to pursue my own research. The thread of it included both geoarchaeology and Paleoindian archaeology. I suspected that the National Science Foundation

(NSF) would not be interested in funding Paleoindian geoarchaeology, in part based on my lack of training and experience in (and therefore grasp of) archaeological method and theory, and because geoarchaeology seemed to fall between the disciplinary cracks. The major funding for the work came from NSF, but was out of the Geosciences Directorate. The work focused on various settings of late Pleistocene and Holocene sediments and landforms on the southern Great Plains and their paleoenvironmental record (valleys, dunes, and lake basins), spinning directly out of my Ph.D. research. These were also the settings for intact archaeological sites and so I was able to “bootleg” my geoarchaeological research into Paleoindian landscapes and environments and included most major and minor Paleoindian sites in the research. I am not sure why I was able to secure NSF funding for my work. In part I think the timing was good. I was asking questions about landscape response to environmental change and also asking questions about late Pleistocene and Holocene environments. I also worked with sympathetic program directors. I am not sure what direction my research would have taken without the NSF support. I think I would have tried to keep working on the southern Great Plains, but at a reduced scale. Pressure to provide funding for graduate students (not a lot of pressure from above, but a fundamental feeling of obligation to try and support students) may have forced me on an alternative research path.

Throughout those years at UW I had a disconnect of sorts between my teaching and my research on the Great Plains. Though I was heavily engaged in archaeology in the field, I did not teach archaeology per se because (1) I was not in Anthropology; and (2) I had my hands full with the classes I was teaching in Geography. The teaching was OK; I enjoyed most of my classes. Service courses took up a lot of time, however, and my more advanced courses rarely touched on my research. The work was very satisfying, but during my 17 years at UW there was little direct interest in my work anywhere on the UW campus with the exception of one or two faculty and a handful of students. Overall, however, UW was a great place to build a career. There was considerable support for and emphasis on research, and I had considerable leeway in developing courses beyond the emphasis on service courses. We also attracted top-notch students.

Everything changed in 2002 when I took my current position at the University of Arizona (UA). C. Vance Haynes, the eminent Paleoindian scholar and geoarchaeologist, retired and his position was open, advertised for a Paleoindian archaeologist/geoarchaeologist at the senior level. Over the years at UW, Haynes’ position was about the only one I ever thought I might leave for. But I never seriously thought that would happen. One of the first things I noticed after moving was the number of people across campus and off of campus with a keen and direct interest in my past and upcoming work on geoarchaeology and Paleoindian archaeology, along with an interest in my teaching in these areas. Both topics have a long history at UA. This was exciting and encouraging; invigorating, even.

The position is in both Anthropology and Geosciences. Most of my classes are graduate-level and draw from both departments (plus a few from Geography and other environmentally oriented departments on campus). I also teach a service course on World Prehistory and developed a course for undergraduate majors on Environmental Archaeology. My primary graduate courses in archaeology are

Geoarchaeology (newly developed) and Paleoindian archaeology (inherited from my predecessor). Both are fun but I admit that I am never terribly comfortable teaching a class specifically in Geoarchaeology. The subject is so broad and varied; it is more of an approach to research than it is one thing that can be adequately addressed in one semester (but I realize that many course topics can be similarly described). More importantly, the class invariably includes archaeology students with little geoscience background, and some geoscience students with little archaeology (this problem is universal in geoarchaeology classes in the U.S.). So choosing a particular “pitch” to my audience is very difficult and often, I feel, not successful.

Being back in association with a geology department, after all of those years in geography, reminded me how much of geology has no ties directly or indirectly to my fields of interest/research. UA Geosciences has a long tradition of ties to archaeology, however, so my “fit” there has been seamless. But my path as a geoarchaeologist usually working on my own or with a small team of archaeologists with a modest budget stands in sharp contrast to the “big science” that is common in many geology programs where big grants are used to pursue big questions (e.g., in tectonics or paleoclimate). Moreover, beyond hydrology and low-temperature geochemistry, few geology programs deal with surficial geology (geomorphology, Quaternary geology) of any kind, much less geoarchaeology. Though there are exceptions (UA being one), I have found geography departments to be more open to archaeology.

But research support at the scale of most U.S. archaeology and geoarchaeology has been a very different issue. Along with the position came a research endowment. It was set up by a wealthy donor to investigate the early peopling of the Southwest U.S. and Northwest Mexico. The amount of money is not huge but can nicely fund fieldwork plus provide some limited student support and analysis. After 8 years, however (i.e., since my arrival in 2002) the value of the fund has declined, especially in terms of student support. The State of Arizona significantly increased the portion of tuition and fees for research assistants that must be picked up on grants. Hiring a research assistant for the academic year is now difficult because of the bite it takes out of field-focused funds. Beyond Paleoindians and geoarchaeology I have related interests in the history of paleo-lakes in the Southwest and how they were utilized by and in turn affected Paleoindian populations. Three attempts at NSF Geology and one attempt at NSF Archaeology to secure broader student support and analytical support have been unsuccessful in furthering the goals of the endowment. In part this was due to large budgets. However, several of the proposals to NSF Geology were highly ranked and one proposal was recommended for funding by the panel. So besides falling between the disciplinary cracks, part of our problem is lack of support by program managers.

On the up side, and in a remarkable bit of good timing on my part, a few days after arrival at UA Anthropology we learned we had been awarded a 5-year NSF Integrated Graduate Education and Research Traineeship (IGERT) grant to support training in archaeological sciences. Geoarchaeology was an important part of this training so for the run of the program we had ample student support and attracted a remarkable group of talented students. We are now suffering from post-IGERT let-down!

I feel very fortunate to have the career I have. Over the years I have been relatively free to develop and teach courses that I wanted to offer (and that students were interested in) beyond the demands of service courses. The only constraints have been in (1) course sizes, and (2) team-teaching. I have found it aggravating to teach literally hundreds of students in one section of a service course, and then feel “heat” from above because I was teaching an advanced course with only six students. Team-teaching always raises the issue of who gets “credit” for the class. I understand the problem, but the issue always seems like another example of bean-counting taking precedence over effective teaching and training. I have also been privileged to work with an array of talented, enthusiastic, and hard-working students from a variety of disciplines (Anthropology, Geology, Geography, and Soil Science).

In terms of grant-getting I also feel fortunate that I never felt the pressure for that. It was never an issue that came up while I was working toward tenure at UW. In part I think that was due to the relatively low level of grant funds available in Geography. I think the pressure was also mitigated by the grant-getting success of UW as a whole. Ironically, I had better grant-getting success during my UW years than I have since arriving at UA; but fortunately that was mitigated by the research endowment I have. But a big part of that, I think, is that programs in Geosciences at NSF simply are not that interested in what colleagues and I want to do in the paleo-lake basins of the Southwest. So timing of research interests to NSF programs is very important.

I have also been entirely free to publish as I see fit. This includes my tenure-track years in Geography at UW. I had good advice from colleagues at the time, but, frankly, the tenure process seemed very obvious and “all” I needed to do was get some good papers into leading journals. What also helped is that in my early years as a Visiting Professor I discovered that I enjoyed writing scientific papers and sharing my research. Since then, keeping the publishing going has been as much habit as it has part of my professional duties. And I still enjoy it!

At the outset of this essay I noted my early career in the beginning days of CRM archaeology (it was not even called that when I started out). When I had the chance to pursue a more traditional path in research I took it. The research opportunities offered by work at Lubbock Lake fit my interests almost perfectly and I was allowed to run with them. The CRM work was limiting and rather haphazard, especially in those days. But I hasten to add that I got an amazing variety of field experiences, in all kinds of sites and all kinds of settings. I maintained ties to the CRM world, however. I did some consulting over the years; initially to make some money and to just take on different kinds of projects, but in more recent years I confine that work to projects I have a specific interest in. Tensions between the world of CRM archaeology and academic archaeology are well known. I was never directly caught up in these tensions in the field, perhaps because of my role on the “geo” side of things. The CRM archaeologists seem to appreciate having a geoarchaeologist around who would talk to them. In Anthropology departments the message has been more varied. Some would not and maybe still will not offer any sort of training pertaining to CRM work. Others, like my home at UA, regularly offer courses and we just started an MA in Applied Archaeology.

My Geosciences colleagues never seem to care about distinctions between “pure” and “applied” research, probably because there is so much applied geology being done (in the petroleum and minerals industry, for example). Anecdotally, I have heard that some old-timers in geology thought that consulting work was a kind of prostitution! But more broadly, my limited experience is that academic researchers in geoscience fields that are readily applied, work seamlessly with geoscientists on the private/industry side. This is likely because (1) the latter includes such a broad and diverse group of subfields (many as old as the field of geology itself) and (2) because many subfields of the geosciences are economically and environmentally significant. In my view, tensions between academic and applied archaeology are because (1) sloppy and even unethical applied archaeology was relatively common, especially in the early days of CRM archaeology, and (2) some academic disdain for the profit motive. To a certain extent, I see this as ironic given the almost mythical status of “salvage archaeology” (e.g., the River Basin Surveys). Ultimately, however, salvage archaeology was academically based.

The big question here, however, is the relevance of archaeology in my career. This has just never been a problem in archaeology, or in geology for that matter. I have been much more comfortable explaining archaeology than I was trying to explain geography. Explaining what geography is and what geographers do has long been a problem in that discipline. I simply have not faced the issue in archaeology. As we all know, archaeology is very popular with the public (distorted though their image of archaeology may be). We are fortunate here at UA because of the long tradition of archaeology on campus and the visibility, literally and metaphorically, of archaeology in the public realm in Arizona. Archaeology (both prehistoric and historic) is all around us: in state and national parks, and regularly in the news media. Broadly speaking, the citizens of Arizona seem to be aware of and appreciate our cultural heritage and seem to take academic archaeology for granted, certainly more so than any other state I have lived in (Texas, Colorado, and Wisconsin).

## **An Academic and CRM Path in Urban Eastern North America: Nan A. Rothschild**

One’s life path is often affected by random chance rather than careful planning. In my case two kinds of circumstances over which I had no control dominated my career trajectory (and I suspect this may be true for students in many fields). The first was the inspiration of two faculty members along the way, one when I was an undergraduate leading me to major in anthropology; the second when I switched my allegiance to archaeology. The other important element was the appearance of eclectic opportunities and my ability to be flexible and take advantage of them. Because of my own experience I believe that one must allow students at all levels the freedom to find their own paths and take advantage of unexpected opportunities. I also think that there needs to be more re-connection between anthropological subdisciplines – they

have become too separate. I consider myself an anthropologist, yes an anthropological archaeologist or an archaeological anthropologist, but see one of the strengths of our discipline as the ability to connect to and incorporate insights from other elements within anthropology or other disciplines. I have been particularly influenced by history and geography.

I had never heard of anthropology as an undergraduate but my first course in it was intellectually compelling. I began graduate school planning to be an urban anthropologist and study cities within socio-cultural anthropology. However, rather late in the process I became totally intrigued with the archaeological approach at New York University (NYU), studying under Howard Winters, Bert Salwen and Bob Bettinger. For example, Howard gave us six projectile points at the beginning of the semester, telling us on which terrace above the Illinois River they had been found, with the assignment of determining the group's settlement system by the end of the term. I was hooked! I evolved from a socio-cultural anthropologist to pre-Columbian archaeology and ultimately to historical archaeology, incorporating all that urban theory into archaeology. My theoretical orientation has also altered through these subdisciplinary shifts and continues to change as I learn from students and junior colleagues. Research issues have also evolved although a core of concerns remains throughout my work. I continue to focus on connections between people as members of society and as they reciprocally affect and are affected by the material elements of their lives and the landscapes in which they live.

When I wanted to acquire field experience I was able to do so in New Mexico with Pat Watson, Chuck Redman, and Steve LeBlanc. However, my dissertation made use of collections rather than excavated material, another aspect of my education that I think was important. I continued my fieldwork education by doing some fairly standard CRM right after getting my degree: sewer surveys and similar projects in areas around New York City. At the same time, one of my mentors, Bert Salwen, involved all of his grad students in the emerging field of CRM with its legislation and rules. Regardless of whether one does fieldwork in CRM or in the academy, certain core requirements – planning, understanding the demands and restrictions, budgeting time and money while being adaptable – are all essential. Field archaeology has always been an important component of my teaching but the type of fieldwork has varied considerably. When I taught at Lehman and Hunter, within the City University of New York (CUNY), the field projects were done within the academic year, often on weekends because these students frequently had summer jobs; therefore these were projects in the city or close by. At Barnard/Columbia, students were more likely to be able to take 4–6 weeks off and I returned to New Mexico taking students first to the Zuni Reservation and then the Rio Grande Valley. I believe field experience is crucial to archaeology because it is the only way to understand the sometimes fragile basis on which a distinction between one stratum and another are drawn, and the tower of conclusions that may be based on a relatively small and sometimes contested observation. These experiences yield respect for the field process but can also provide understanding as to how challenges to seemingly solid conclusions may emerge.



My academic experience has been quite varied. Being married to someone who could not leave NYC meant that I taught in a variety of places (a year at Jersey City State College, 4 years at two branches of CUNY and a year at NYU) before finding a job at Barnard. The other aspect of being geographically restricted for a time and having young children meant that I was more willing to consider local urban fieldwork than others might have been. Some of the pre-Barnard positions were part-time and I had the opportunity to co-direct some large urban excavations in lower Manhattan at the Stadt Huys and Seven Hanover Square blocks. These were CRM projects on a large scale.

I have had two priorities structuring my research: my own intellectual interests and giving students the opportunity to experience fieldwork. The academic institutions in which I taught did not make specific demands on me for research; the demand was for publications and grants. The field work experience was my own requirement. And yes, types of publications were important. The large urban projects took a long time to complete and write up and CRM reports were not the kind of thing Barnard/Columbia valued. So once I was in that setting I only undertook small projects, incorporating graduate and undergrad students so they could understand this branch of archaeology. I thought and think it important for students to have varied experiences during their training so they have a greater range of opportunities when they finish school. Columbia and Barnard together have only had four to five archaeologists since I have been there so we encourage students to have a strong theoretical core, including socio-cultural anthropology; we encourage them to acquire specific skills in other settings. The most essential skills for students to learn are to think and to write.

Let me discuss the ways in which archaeology connects to other elements of intellectual practice. Collections research, which I used in my dissertation, makes use of existing archaeological data and objects. It is often challenging because of the diverse ways in which these collections were accumulated and recorded. It requires creativity to make use of them but offers much potential for new information as analytic techniques and research questions may have changed since the collections were amassed. And often, large collections compiled during CRM projects are under-analyzed and offer rewarding opportunities for graduate student theses and dissertations. The analysis of these sets of things connects to issues of materiality that have been emerging in theoretically exciting ways in archaeology and socio-cultural anthropology. We all know that anthropology and museums were once intimately connected, but for quite a while socio-cultural anthropology was not interested in objects; I believe this is changing and that archaeology has instigated this trend and is due credit for it.

Historical archaeology has opened the world of history to us; historical archaeologists need to examine a wide range of documents prior to excavations. It is important to clarify to the world at large that an anthropological/archaeological view of historic times will involve different perspectives than those offered by historians, although there are overlaps between anthropologists' and social historians' viewpoints. This offers an answer to the question of relevance; we are often asked why we need archaeology if we have documents? This issue is raised especially in reference to the nineteenth century. The answer is that there are many kinds of behavior (food consumption, just to name one) that are not recorded in documents



and that a material perspective offers a different vantage point on the past than that afforded by documents. We have seen that the recent past is also a valid subject of archaeological inquiry, as seen in work on archaeology of the contemporary past. An anthropological orientation has also brought forth a concern with descendant communities, requiring the use of interviews, and asking contemporary descendants for their input in designing research. Thus oral history and techniques used by socio-cultural anthropologists have become significant to archaeologists in specific settings. A meaningful difference between pre-Columbian archaeology and historical archaeology is the latter's ability to examine small-scale units: an individual or a household, and this forms another bond with socio-cultural anthropology through the life-history approach. Public-oriented interpretations of individual's lives have developed as another form of outreach that is appealing to a broad audience.

In sum, archaeology keeps expanding and reaching out to other audiences and other disciplines. It makes this an exciting time to be an archaeologist, regardless of one's specific niche.

## **Further Thoughts on Archaeological Research and the Academic Process: Vance T. Holliday**

Given our very different career tracks I am struck by several common themes in Nan's essay in mine. She hits an important (if unsettling) point in her opening sentence: the role of luck (or serendipity or opportunity) in our career paths. I did not even get into that in my comments! It should not come as a surprise, but it is rarely discussed in "career planning." There is not a lot that can be said about it. Some have commented that "we make our own luck." I do not fully believe that, but we what we can do is be open to new opportunities, and be as broad-minded as possible. That is how I ended up in Geography.

I am very unsure how or whether the tension between "pure" and "applied" research in archaeology will be fully resolved. Certainly CRM archaeology will not and should not go away. For that reason alone I think academic archaeology should embrace it as another aspect of research. And it will continue to be an important source of employment. Dealing with the publication of CRM or other sorts of consulting reports in terms of "counting" in academic careers is trickier. There are good reasons why so much emphasis is placed on peer-reviewed publications. But that tends to apply to journals rather than books and monographs. We all know of CRM reports that are more useful and informative than some traditional academic volumes. Ultimately, Anthropology programs will need to establish guidelines for assessing "applied" publications. I have no direct experience with this, but many other fields (e.g., geology, as mentioned, but also soil science) routinely confront this issue. In the harder sciences, however, it may be easier to "translate" data derived from applied research into peer-reviewed publications. One thing that is needed in academic archaeology is a tradition of incorporating CRM research in to more traditional academic outlets. There is no shortage of good data out there.

That raises another good point that Nan mentioned: the use of existing collections for research. In one of my publications I pushed for more of this sort of research, noting that there are entire field seasons of work awaiting us in extant collections. I was referring to old research collections of Paleoindian artifacts and faunal remains, but clearly the comments could be applied to any collections.

I strongly agree with Nan's comment (first paragraph) about maintaining or re-establishing connections between anthropology subdisciplines. In my experience the best departments for both faculty and students are those where cross-disciplinary research and teaching are encouraged, valued, and respected. I have seen disdain for and jealousy of other subdisciplines tear departments apart. My wife, Diane Holliday, is a bioarchaeologist who was first encouraged along this path as part of an MA in a heavily interdisciplinary and collegial Anthropology program, but suffered through a Ph.D. program where students who wanted to cross subdisciplines were, quite literally, viewed with suspicion by archaeologists. At one point, she was verbally accosted in a main public hallway by one faculty member because she did not have requisite signatures on a piece of paper that "allowed" her to work on a dissertation that included both archaeology and bioanthropology. Such a thing would be unthinkable in my present department.

I probably did not address "relevance" and "the public" in my original comments as directly as I should have. My basic philosophy about studying the past (all aspects) is that it will always inform us about our present condition (be it, e.g., our physical evolution, our behavior, or the environment) or the future (especially the future of the environment). Most broadly stated, this could apply to organizations that want to make money from our knowledge, such as the petroleum and minerals industry, but also book authors and publishers. Regarding the more traditional concept of "the public" as our local community, archaeology has fairly high visibility here in Tucson, in Arizona, and in the Southwest, as I noted in the first essay, I have started taking advantage of opportunities for outreach, explaining what I and my colleagues do. As many of us have found out, a lot of people are interested in the past. I have never had a bad experience trying to explain what I know.

## **Final Thoughts on Archaeological Research and the Academic Process: Nan A. Rothschild**

I will write this in a kind of stream-of-consciousness mode, considering some ideas that Vance's "professional autobiography" has raised for me. First, I note that right at the outset he says he was interested in geoaerchaeology and the Paleo-Indian period. And I wondered how he acquired these interests so early on? Often a first field work experience is what establishes research interests for life; that was the case for me when I worked at Zuni, so I wondered if this were the case for him. In the next paragraph Vance notes the influence of an old movie on his career choice and I wonder how many people (shudder) have been influenced by Indiana Jones! I too was attracted by Paleoindian studies at the beginning and of course we

are all attracted by “the earliest” incidence of everything. I liked the concept of having a few artifacts that get analyzed intensively but of course have ended up in historical archaeology that sometimes yields literally tons of material.

In the next paragraph, I wondered why at the outset he was eager to leave CRM; later on (third paragraph from the end) he mentions that it was limiting and haphazard but I would like to hear more about his experiences with CRM. I have had quite a bit of experience with this kind of archaeology and have learned a lot from it. Not just in the realm of fieldwork but it has provided an education on the “real world,” and the workings of government. I was a consultant for a while to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and learned that their projects were conducted only because a senator or congressperson had recommended them (talk about politics!) And at that time the Corps always was required to take the lowest bid, often producing low quality archaeology. Having followed the development of the various codes of federal regulations that impact archaeology and then seeing how a series of federal budget cuts have eviscerated state historic preservation offices’ ability to protect sites has been another set of enlightening experiences. As in any other discipline there is a range of practitioners, from those who follow the notorious practice of low-balling on a bid and then “needing” more funds to finish the job, to really outstanding firms that encourage their archaeologists to follow the best research practices. I think that there need to be connections between academic archaeology and CRM because often the large firms have the kind of equipment that departments may not be able to afford. Since graduate students may often wind up doing some form of CRM, internships with good firms might be a useful opportunity for those who want the experience. A number of years ago, Professional Archaeologists of New York City (PANYC) held a conference on graduate education. Some speakers felt that the academy was not providing an appropriate education, given the number of students who worked in CRM, but the academics did not think that there was a way to include courses on topics that might be basic in running a business. But internships seem like they could bridge this gap. I believe the Applied Archaeology MA at UA incorporates these.

Vance raises some important issues (paragraph 4 and then later on) about getting funding for projects. We were able to take advantage of a no-longer extant program at NSF for “Systematic Collections” and get funding for properly housing some museum collections held by Columbia. Funding priorities change with trends as well as politics, but many of our students have been able to get dissertation funding from NSF or the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, and one of my graduate students used Earthwatch as a resource for fieldwork support. Grant getting in archaeology is more significant among archaeologists than socio-cultural anthropologists at the faculty level. And we all try to make use of small grants available in connection with the university as a strategy to test a fieldwork project, or get one set of data analyzed.

Elsewhere, Vance notes how happy he was to get to the University of Arizona and that resonates strongly with me. Working in the “right setting” is very important for everyone, if you can find it. I was very happy to land at Barnard where I have been in a small collegial department (as the only archaeologist) but also connected

to the larger Columbia department where there are additional archaeologists. Both the Barnard department and the archaeology subdiscipline have been extremely cooperative and supportive units. On the other hand, one does get the feeling at times that the university (not the college) administration is oriented toward priorities other than simply education. I recognize that these are difficult times, but this perception has not appeared only recently.

Finally, my last point relates to relevance, only for me the issue is the relevance of archaeology in the wider world, not the relevance of archaeology to me. I think it is essential that all of us do what we can, whether it is public outreach or cooperating with more “applied” specialties, to encourage understanding of the utility of archaeology: as fun, as a way of knowing the past, as productive of insights into the present. I am sure I sound like a Society for American Archaeology brochure, but if the public does not understand this, much of our support for research and for the protection of sites will be endangered.