
Ethics in Archaeology

Mark J. Lynott

My first field experience in archaeology was in the summer of 1971. Like most students at the time, my only opportunity to participate in archaeology was as part of a university field school in archaeological methods. I was a student at Western Michigan University, and the Anthropology Department was involved in a project to conduct salvage excavations at a site in Michigan's Upper Peninsula. The site was a mound and village complex on a point of land along the southern shore of Lake Superior. The opportunity for a summer of adventure in the beautiful north woods was more than enough to attract my attention. I did not realize at the time that, in addition to being introduced to archaeological methods, many aspects of that first summer of fieldwork would also introduce me to ethical issues that I and the archaeological profession would face in the years to come.

My summer of 1971 was spent at the Sand Point site near Baraga, Michigan. The site is comprised of a series of mounds and habitation areas on a point of land along the south shore of Lake Superior. In 1968, a significant part of the site along the lakeshore was privately owned, and the owner planned to greatly modify the landscape and build a resort with cabins and a marina. The presence of archaeological remains at that location became known when human bones were exposed by a bulldozer pushing soil from a sand knoll into swampy areas to level the site. Two years later, Western Michigan began archaeological investigations at the site. Most of the 1970 work focused on excavation of a large mound. My own participation in the project began a year later, and included work on smaller mounds and habitation areas. In addition to learning archaeological field methods, I was also informally exposed to three issues that continue to be relevant to archaeology today.

As a student just getting started in archaeology, I had little knowledge about the laws that govern the management and protection of archaeological sites in the United States. Our project of excavating mounds and village areas of the Sand Point site before they were destroyed by lakeshore developments seemed intuitively the "right" thing to do. It only made sense that someone should study archaeological sites before they were destroyed. Issues of stewardship and conservation of the archaeological record, which we see as a foundation of contemporary archaeology, were less widely discussed and not formally taught at that time. Although salvage archaeology associated with road, pipeline, and reservoir construction was practiced throughout the United States,¹ there was very little literature that addressed the philosophical basis for preserving and protecting archaeological sites. It was not until the appearance of Public Ar-

chaeology² by Charles R. McGimsey III in 1972 and “A Conservation Model for American Archaeology”³ by William D. Lipe in 1974 that archaeologists began to refine this paradigm.

During the summer of 1971, my fellow students and I excavated several small mounds at the Sand Point site. The mounds contained human burials and were built from beach sand and soil from the nearby village sites. I recall being thoroughly intrigued by the carefully organized bundles of bones we encountered, and fascinated by our instructor’s explanation of different mortuary practices. At the time, I gave no thought to the possibility that our excavations might offend some Native Americans. My own family heritage was unknown to me beyond my great grandparents, so I didn’t anticipate that other people would object to the excavation of graves that were a thousand or more years old. I simply viewed the excavation of these mounds before they were to be bulldozed as logical and important to understanding the past. In subsequent years, I would be exposed to the strong and diverse views that exist about archaeological excavation of human remains.

Our instructor in the summer of 1971 was Winston D. Moore, who has studied at Washington State University and worked with Richard Daugherty at the Ozette site near Neah Bay, Washington. The Ozette site is a late prehistoric Makah village that was covered by a mudslide and excavated as a cooperative effort between Washington State University and the Makah tribe. Our instructor’s experience at Ozette must have been positive, because in the summer of 1971 he arranged to have two local Ojibwa people join the archaeological field crew. Although he never instructed us on the ethical value of this action, it is plain to me in retrospect that he anticipated and respected their interest and desire to be involved in the archaeological study of their past. Thirty years later, this is still an important issue for archaeologists, and it is being incorporated into formal archaeological training.

Upon completion of my undergraduate training, I entered graduate school in 1973. In retrospect, I see now that my undergraduate years in archaeology were associated with a period when most archaeological research was the private domain of university and museum archaeologists. My graduate studies and subsequent career have been associated with the development of cultural resource management. During the past thirty years, I have had the good fortune to participate in the tremendous growth of the archaeological profession. During this time we have seen increasing opportunities for archaeological employment and tremendous public support for archaeological research. Along with these benefits there are also responsibilities and the need for archaeological ethics.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL ETHICS: ORIGINS

As a student in the 1970s, my formal training in archaeological ethics was unfortunately limited. This was typical for most students at that time, and the tradition continues to some extent today. The reluctance to discuss ethics in archaeological courses is probably due in part to the history of archaeology.

Most historians of archaeology point to the nineteenth century as the start of systematic archaeological investigation. At that time, there were no “professional” archaeologists. People who conducted archaeological investigations were either independently wealthy or had other employment to support themselves and their families. The development of museums in cities in the eastern United States in the last half of the nineteenth century generated a demand for artifacts associated with the earthen and stone monuments of North and Central America. This demand provided a number of self-taught individuals with employment to excavate mounds and earthworks in eastern North America, pueblo ruins in the southwest, and ruins and temples in Meso-America. As reports of these expeditions were published, eastern preservationists became concerned about the loss of important sites to looting and vandalism. This eventually resulted in the passage of federal legislation that protected archaeological sites on federal lands. The Smithsonian Institution and the Archaeological Institute of America were instrumental in passage of the Antiquities Act of 1906, and this likely represents the origins of archaeological ethics in the United States.

Throughout the first half of the twentieth century, archaeology was conducted by a small number of professionals in universities and museums. The number of archaeologists in these early years was small enough that the Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology was often held at a university in cities like Ann Arbor, Michigan, Norman, Oklahoma, and Lincoln, Nebraska. The first Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology was held in 1935 in Andover, Massachusetts with approximately 75 people in attendance.⁴

Due to the small size of the archaeological profession, the number of research projects and resulting reports were quite few. Even with the growth of the archaeological profession following World War II, the number of archaeologists was still sufficiently small so that all the archaeologists working in a region like the Plains knew each other fairly well. With archaeologists focused mainly on research and teaching, the need for formal statements about ethics was limited.

In a review of the history of archaeological ethics, Charles R. McGimsey III⁵ notes that the major federal funding through the River Basin Surveys in the late 1940s and 1950s awakened a desire among the archaeological profession to better define the basic qualifications of an archaeologist. Consequently in 1960, Jesse Jennings, President of the Society for American Archaeology, established a Committee on Ethics and Standards. A year later that Committee published a report titled "Four Statements for Archaeology."⁶ The four statements represent the first published ethics policy for the Society for American Archaeology and reflect the concerns of that time. The statements warn of censure or expulsion from the Society for disregard of proper archaeological field methods, buying and selling of artifacts, and willful destruction, distortion or concealment of archaeological data. The fourth statement recommends that archaeologists have formal training consisting of a B.A. or B.S. degree followed by two years of graduate study in archaeology and anthropology, with two years of summer field school experience under the supervision of a trained archaeologist. A Ph.D. in anthropology was highly recommended, but not required.

In 1971 when I participated in my first summer of archaeological fieldwork, this ethics policy was not part of the formal archaeological curriculum. During the 1960s and 1970s, students in archaeology were deeply concerned about changes in the paradigm of archaeology. The writings of Lewis R. Binford and his students promoted an interest in processual theory. Processualist views promoted problem-oriented research and the search for laws and theory through research designs and hypothesis testing. The change from a culture-historical orientation to a processualist orientation dominated archaeological discussion and debate even as the foundations of contemporary cultural resource management programs were being developed.

CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

When I was an idealistic student, it seemed only logical that archaeologists should conduct research at sites before they are destroyed by construction or other activities. The archaeological heritage that was salvaged by the TVA and River Basin Survey programs, although it did not live up to the standards of processual or "New" archaeology, still served as a reminder of what could be lost without archaeological salvage. Fortunately, through the efforts of archaeologists and other preservationists, the U.S. Congress passed the National His-

toric Preservation Act of 1966, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and the Archeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974. These three laws form the core of what has become known as Cultural Resource Management in the United States.

As a graduate student at Southern Methodist University, I had the opportunity to participate in a wide variety of contract archaeology projects throughout northern Texas. At that time, most of the archaeological research associated with Cultural Resource Management was being done by universities. Major projects like New Melones in California, Orme and Santa Rosa Wash in Arizona, and Cache River in Arkansas offered opportunities for enthusiastic young archaeologists to apply processualist approaches on an increasingly large scale. Private sector involvement at this time was just beginning, and public funding for archaeology was on the rise. At the same time, some of the same individuals who had worked to pass the laws that formed the basis for the new Cultural Resource Management movement were able to see the need for an expanded code of ethics for archaeology.

SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL ARCHEOLOGISTS

Throughout the first half of the 1970s, members of the Society for American Archaeology discussed the need for certification of archaeologists. After several conferences and meetings, a Society for American Archaeology committee met in Fayetteville, Arkansas in January 1976 and decided to develop certification procedures, a code of ethics, and standards of research performance for a new organization, totally independent of SAA and other existing archaeological societies. In May 1976, the Society of Professional Archeologists (SOPA) was incorporated in Illinois and began the process of establishing a registry of professional archaeologists.

Unlike the earlier ethics code developed by the SAA, the new SOPA code was more comprehensive and more specific. The Code of Ethics addressed the responsibility of archaeologists to the public, colleagues, employees, students, and clients. The Standards of Research Performance addressed the responsibility of archaeologists to be properly prepared and trained for any research they undertake, to implement the research in a systematic and scientific manner, to report the results of the research in a reasonable period of time, and to insure that the artifacts and records resulting from the research are

curated in an appropriate institution. The Society of Professional Archeologists also implemented a Grievance Procedure that allowed individuals to charge SOPA-certified archaeologists with violations of the Code of Ethics and Standards of Research Performance. After investigation by the Grievance Coordinator and a hearing in front of the Standards Board, an archaeologist who had violated the Ethics Code and Standards of Research Performance could be admonished, suspended, or expelled from SOPA. The creation of a mechanism to enforce the Code of Ethics and Standards of Research Performance represented a bold precedent for American archaeology.

Between 1976 and 1998, the Society of Professional Archeologists was the only organization in the United States that certified individuals as professional archaeologists. Although there was widespread support for the creation of SOPA, many archaeologists objected to the certification process and never joined the organization. The inability to convince substantial numbers of archaeologists to be certified and accept the Code of Ethics and Standards of Research Performance reduced the effectiveness of the organization. Although expensive, the Grievance Process proved effective and SOPA gradually built a body of case law about ethical behavior.

During this same period, archaeology experienced major growth in employment resulting from the passage of cultural resource management legislation. The number of archaeologists boomed from hundreds to thousands, and raised questions about minimum professional qualifications and standards of performance. During this period, SOPA was the only organization to regularly and explicitly address the ethical issues facing the archaeological profession. However, the relatively small number of dedicated SOPA members were unable to have the full impact they desired on the ethics of the archaeological profession.

1980s AND BEYOND

While the field of cultural resource management continued to grow, the threat to archaeological resources also grew. Illegal trade in antiquities threatened sites around the world, and archaeologists worked with legislators to pass laws to protect archaeological sites from looting by antiquities hunters. Despite serious efforts by many nations to protect their archaeological heritage, the antiquities trade continued to flourish. Archaeological organizations like the Archaeological Institute of America and the Society for Historical Archae-

ology developed policies to discourage archaeologists from working with looters and antiquities traders to avoid any appearance of approval of their activities.

At the same time, archaeologists were confronted by an increasing expression of interest among Native Americans in the archaeological record and the treatment of the archaeological record. This interest eventually grew into political activism that resulted in the passage of state and federal legislation relating to the repatriation of human remains and associated artifacts. While some archaeologists opposed these developments as anti-science, others argued that these laws offered an opportunity to build upon a history of cooperation between archaeologists and some Native American groups. However archaeologists felt about the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), it fueled further discussion about archaeological ethics.

In 1990, the editors of the *American Journal of Archaeology* (published by the Archaeological Institute of America) and *Latin American Antiquity* and *American Antiquity* (published by the Society for American Archaeology) issued policies that prohibited publication of papers that were based on looted data. In May 1991, Alison Wylie made a presentation to the SAA Executive Board about the ethical issues associated with publishing papers that utilized data from looted sites. The SAA Executive Board recognized that the Society's ethics policy was outdated and the editorial policies of their journals were not fully compatible with Society bylaws. The Executive Board asked Alison Wylie and me to cochair a task force on ethics in archaeology.

With funding from the National Science Foundation and the National Park Service, we were able to organize a three-day workshop (November 5–7, 1993) at the CRM Policy Institute, University of Nevada-Reno. At that workshop, a diverse range of participants drafted six principles of archaeological ethics and agreed upon a process for presenting them to the SAA membership. The six principles developed at the Reno Workshop addressed stewardship, accountability, commercialization, public education and outreach, intellectual property, and records preservation.

The six draft principles were presented to the SAA membership at the fifty-ninth Annual Meeting of the Society in a Special Forum in Anaheim, California. The Special Forum included an introduction, six position papers about the draft principles, and commentaries from five discussants. The proceedings from the Forum were compiled and edited and published by the SAA as a Special Report.⁷ The Special Forum and subsequent Special Report were intended to encourage discussion and inform archaeologists about the draft principles. Verbal and written comments were further solicited by the presen-

tation of papers at regional conferences and at discussion sessions at the sixtieth Annual Meeting of the SAA in Minneapolis in 1995.

After reviewing the comments that were received, the Ethics in Archaeology Task Force made editorial and other minor changes and developed an additional principle that addressed the responsibility of archaeologists to publish reports of their research. The principles were then submitted to the SAA Executive Board for review and approval in September 1995. At the next meeting, the Executive Board discussed the draft principles expressing concerns about aspects of two of the draft principles and recommending that an eighth principle addressing training and resources be developed by the Task Force. The Task Force made the recommended changes and resubmitted them to the SAA Executive Board, which adopted them in 1996.

PRINCIPLES OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL ETHICS

The Principles of Archaeological Ethics are statements of ethical goals or ideals. They are intended to guide archaeologists through the increasing complexity of conducting their professional lives in the modern world. The Principles of Archaeological Ethics represent what Alison Wylie⁸ has called “ceilings” of ethical behavior, rather than “floors” that might identify minimum acceptable levels of conduct. The Ethics in Archaeology Task Force, in developing the Principles, never intended that they be enforceable. The Principles were intended to stimulate discussion, encourage teaching about ethics, and serve as ethical guidelines.

PRINCIPLE 1: STEWARDSHIP

The archaeological record—that is, in situ archaeological material and sites, archaeological collections, records, and reports—is irreplaceable. It is the responsibility of all archaeologists to work for the long-term conservation and protection of the archaeological record by practicing and promoting good stewardship of the archaeological record. Stewards are both caretakers of and advocates for the archaeological record. In the interests of stewardship, archaeologists should use and advocate use of the archaeological record for the benefit of all people; as they investigate and interpret the record, they should use the specialized knowledge they gain to promote public

understanding and support for its long-term preservation.

PRINCIPLE 2: ACCOUNTABILITY

Responsible archaeological research, including all levels of professional activity, requires an acknowledgement of public accountability and a commitment to make every reasonable effort, in good faith, to consult actively with affected group(s), with the goal of establishing a working relationship that can be beneficial to all parties involved.

PRINCIPLE 3: COMMERCIALIZATION

The Society for American Archaeology has long recognized that the buying and selling of objects out of archaeological context is contributing to the destruction of the archaeological record on the American continents and around the world. The commercialization of archaeological objects—their use as commodities to be exploited for personal enjoyment or profit—results in the destruction of archaeological sites and of contextual information that is essential to understanding the archaeological record. Archaeologists should therefore carefully weigh the benefits to scholarship of a project against the costs of potentially enhancing the commercial value of archaeological objects. Wherever possible, they should discourage, and should themselves avoid, activities that enhance the commercial value of archaeological objects, especially objects that are not curated in public institutions, or readily available for scientific study, public interpretation, and display.

PRINCIPLE 4: PUBLIC EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

Archaeologists should reach out to, and participate in, cooperative efforts with others interested in the archaeological record with the aim of improving the preservation, protection, and interpretation of the record. In particular, archaeologists should undertake to (1) enlist public support for the stewardship of the archaeological record; (2) explain and promote the use of archaeological methods and techniques in understanding human behavior and culture and (3) communicate archaeological interpretations of the past. Many publics exist for archaeology, including students and teachers; Native Americans and other ethnic, religious, and cultural groups who find in the archaeological record important aspects of their cultural heritage; lawmakers and government officials; reporters, journalists, and oth-

ers involved in the media; and the general public. Archaeologists who are unable to undertake public education and outreach directly should encourage and support the efforts of others in these activities.

PRINCIPLE 5: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

Intellectual property, as contained in the knowledge and documents created through the study of archaeological resources, is part of the archaeological record. As such it should be treated in accord with the principles of stewardship rather than as a matter of personal possession. If there is a compelling reason, and no legal restrictions or strong countervailing interests, a researcher may have primary access to original materials and documents for a limited and reasonable time, after which these materials and documents must be made available to others.

PRINCIPLE 6: PUBLIC REPORTING AND PUBLICATION

Within a reasonable time, the knowledge archaeologists gain from investigation of the archaeological record must be presented in accessible form (through publication or other means) to as wide a range of interested publics as possible. The documents and materials on which publication and other forms of public reporting are based should be deposited in a suitable place for permanent safekeeping. An interest in preserving and protecting *in situ* archaeological sites must be taken into account when publishing and distributing information about their nature and location.

PRINCIPLE 7: RECORDS AND PRESERVATION

Archaeologists should work actively for the preservation of, and long-term access to, archaeological collections, records, and reports. To this end, they should encourage colleagues, students, and others to make responsible use of collections, records, and reports in their research as one means of preserving the *in situ* archaeological record and of increasing the care and attention given to that portion of the archaeological record that has been removed and incorporated into archaeological collections, records, and reports.

PRINCIPLE 8: TRAINING AND RESOURCES

Given the destructive nature of most archaeological investigations, archaeologists must ensure that they have adequate training, experi-

ence, facilities, and other support necessary to conduct any program of research they initiate in a manner consistent with the foregoing principles and contemporary standards of professional practice.

STEWARDSHIP

The concept of stewardship is at the center of the Principles of Archaeological Ethics. It has become widespread in archaeology with the development of cultural resource management. The term became a catchword for archaeological site protection following the publication of a booklet titled "These are the Stewards of the Past."⁹ Stewardship responsibilities for archaeologists were further defined by William Lipe in one of the most important archaeological papers in the past three decades. In that 1974 paper, "A Conservation Model for American Archaeology," Lipe offered many excellent and logical reasons why archaeologists should work to protect and preserve the archaeological record for future study.¹⁰ A generation of archaeologists embraced this model and worked to weave it into the fabric of current cultural resource management practices.

Recently, Lipe has refined his thinking on stewardship and reminds archaeologists that understanding the past through the study of the archaeological record is the ultimate goal of archaeology. Since the value of many archaeological sites is tied to their information potential, well-designed and implemented archaeological research is important to the advancement of the discipline and benefits the public. "Long-term, frugal consumption of the archaeological record by well-justified research—both problem-oriented, and mitigation driven—must be an accepted and integrated part of the preservation program."¹¹

Although much of my own archaeological training emphasized that professionally trained archaeologists have the most legitimate interest in the archaeological record, the interest of the general public and specific interest groups in the use and management of archaeological sites and objects is clearly increasing. Coincident with the development of the draft Principles of Archaeological Ethics, Christopher Chippindale¹² published an eloquent dialogue on the importance of holding archaeological resources in "common" for everyone. Since the vast majority of archaeological research and archaeological site management is now funded by the public, this seems to be a practical as well as principled approach. Archaeologists have long recognized that one of the primary factors that distinguish pro-

fessional archaeologists from looters is that our training, specialized knowledge, and skills permit us to serve a wide range of public interests.

ACCOUNTABILITY AND PUBLIC EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

The principles of accountability and public education and outreach reflect the growing awareness among archaeologists that our obligations extend beyond the archaeological community. When I first became involved in archaeology, many archaeologists viewed talking with the media or giving a lecture at a rotary luncheon as something to be avoided. This is clearly changing. Not only do the principles encourage archaeologists to share their specialized knowledge about the past with the diverse public, but archaeologists recognize that most of their work is sponsored by public funding. At a time when there is increasing competition for public funds at all levels, it is clearly in our best interest to share our knowledge and discoveries with the public. The Society for American Archaeology has established a nationwide network of Public Education Coordinators who work with local archaeologists to arrange and schedule public lectures, assist teachers and administrators in adding archaeology to school curricula, and organize and schedule statewide archaeology week activities.

There is also growing awareness among archaeologists that our research and professional activities affect many individuals and groups beyond the archaeological profession. Archaeologists have always been aware of their responsibilities to landowners on whose property they wish to work, but now there is increasing awareness of responsibility to the people whose past we study. Many native people around the world are interested in what archaeology can tell them about their heritage, and some are uncomfortable with the methods of archaeology. In the United States, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act recognizes that Native Americans should have a voice in the treatment of human remains and associated funerary objects recovered from archaeological sites. Similar legislation in Canada and other nations is encouraging archaeologists and First Nations to communicate and collaborate on the study of the past.

COMMERCIALIZATION

The loss of archaeological sites and damage to the archaeological record from looters is a major problem throughout the world. A search of almost any American flea market will reveal a dealer selling arrow heads and other artifacts. While many of these may, in fact, be recent replicas, they demonstrate the market for even common and broken objects from the past. The finest archaeological objects usually sell through international auctions. The demand for antiquities is worldwide and is big business. Competition among museums to display the best and finest artifacts also fuels this market. The demand for antiquities is encouraging illegal and unscientific excavation of archaeological sites all over the world.

One of the oldest, and still most important, ethical problems for archaeologists is deciding how to deal with collections owned by amateur archaeologists and art collectors. Archaeology in general, and professional archaeologists in particular, have benefited greatly from information provided by amateur archaeologists. Most professional archaeologists are comfortable working with amateur archaeologists and landowners who collect surface artifacts, record their provenience, and report site locations to professional archaeologists. What becomes more difficult is deciding how to treat individuals who dig for artifacts without proper training.

Ten years ago, *Archaeology* magazine published a special report on the extent of looting in Arkansas.¹³ The report emphasized the extent and intensity of the problem. Since it is largely rural and one of the poorest states, many people in Arkansas see digging for artifacts as a way to increase their income. Individuals have been digging prehistoric graves to collect pots and other artifacts for sale for more than a hundred years, and Mississippian and Caddoan pottery from Arkansas is found in private collections and museums around the world. Unfortunately, when an archaeologist examines artifacts from a private collection and provides an opinion about their age, function, or authenticity, that opinion may be used to legitimize the artifacts. A professional archaeologist's opinion might also result in an increase in the sale price of artifacts. This is even more likely when an archaeologist incorporates data from looted contexts into their research and publications. By increasing the commercial value of looted collections, archaeologists unintentionally provide fuel for further looting of archaeological sites. Art and antiquities collectors are very much aware of the literature of archaeology, and opinions, writing, and activities of professional archaeologists have an impact on collecting activities and interests.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND PUBLIC REPORTING AND PUBLICATION

As a student, one of the first informal lessons I received in ethics was a discussion by a professor about the importance of writing reports that describe our excavations. The professor never really said why reporting was important, but it was clear that failure to do so would tarnish our reputations. With most archaeological research today is supported by public funding, the obligation to prepare reports is still widely accepted. The need to publish our research results, particularly books and papers that synthesized work from cultural resource management projects, is particularly important. Most cultural resource management reports are produced in very small numbers, and they are only accessible to specialists and close colleagues. This "gray literature," as it is known, contains a tremendous amount of information that is inaccessible to many professionals and most of the public. For most people working in cultural resource management, it is difficult to find the time needed to synthesize projects and prepare papers and books for publication. However, it is widely understood that this is necessary if we are ever going to fully justify the continuing expenditure of public funds on archaeology.

My student training also included informal lessons about intellectual property. As noted in Principle 5, the knowledge and documents that are created as part of archaeological research are just as much a part of the archaeological record as are artifacts and objects. When I first started in archaeology, many archaeologists viewed their records and notes as personal property. Although they accepted that the artifacts from a project belonged in a museum, they kept the written notes and records in their personal possession. The importance of properly curating records and notes with artifact collections is also addressed in Principle 7. More than one older research collection has been reduced in value through the loss of records and notes that describe the provenience of artifacts or the circumstance of their discovery.

It is logical that project archaeologists should have primary access to the original records and documents for a limited and reasonable period of time. However, when a project report is complete, collections and records should be made available to others. Our stewardship responsibilities require that we share our knowledge, notes, and records with colleagues, to maximize the information potential of the archaeological record.

RECORDS AND PRESERVATION

From some of our earliest years in school, we are taught that scientific research includes systematic, objective, and precise experiments or observations that can be replicated under the same circumstances. In archaeology, the process of excavating a site removes artifacts from their original context. This process is destructive in that it leaves little or nothing for future researchers to study, except the artifacts, photographs, notes, and records of the excavation. Once excavated, a site cannot be reconstructed and excavations cannot be replicated. Consequently, we must preserve the artifacts and records from our research so that other archaeologists can decide if they concur with our interpretations of the archaeological record.

The stewardship principle recognizes that the artifacts, records, notes, and photographs from archaeological research are an important part of the archaeological record. Preserving these materials in a museum or curatorial repository is as much a part of a successful archaeological project as developing a research design. We must recognize that the products of our research are valuable resources that permit us to restudy the archaeological record, even after the site(s) from which the data came has been destroyed. The federal government recognizes that artifacts and records from archaeological research are important resources and worthy of preservation, and the Secretary of the Interior has issued detailed guidelines for the preservation of these materials.

The growth of cultural resource management has produced a crisis in the management of archaeological collections. Although some new facilities are being constructed, and some existing facilities are being expanded, there is not enough museum or repository space to properly house all the existing collections. As archaeological research continues, it is essential that we work to help develop new facilities. The preservation of these collections is important to the continued study of the archaeological record, and it is each archaeologist's ethical obligation to insure that artifacts and other products of research are properly curated.

TRAINING AND RESOURCES

The growth of cultural resource management has made archaeology a significant business in the United States. Thousands of people are

employed in archaeology every year. Increasing competition for contracts and grants have led some archaeologists to undertake projects for which they were not fully qualified. Since archaeology is a destructive process, it is important that practitioners be properly trained for the research they undertake. Principle 8 was developed to remind archaeologists that we must have the appropriate training, experience, preparation, and facilities before undertaking an archaeological project.

REGISTER OF PROFESSIONAL ARCHAEOLOGISTS

While the Principles of Archaeological Ethics were being developed, the Society for American Archaeology, Society of Professional Archaeologists, Archaeological Institute of America, and the Society for Historical Archaeology were discussing the creation of a Register of Professional Archaeologists. The Register was formally established in 1998, from the Society of Professional Archeologists under the joint sponsorship of the other three organizations. The Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA) adopted most of the procedures developed by SOPA, including the Code of Ethics, the Standards of Research Performance, and the Grievance Procedure.

The grievance procedure and certification process are at the heart of the RPA. Through the certification process, individuals submit their credentials to demonstrate that they have met the minimum education and experience levels necessary to be registered as Professional Archaeologists. Individuals listed on the Register also agree to accept the Code of Ethics and Standards of Research Performance. By doing this, individuals agree to participate in the grievance process if there is a credible challenge to their conduct or research performance. The grievance process establishes a system where any concerned individual can ask that the actions of anyone listed on the Register be reviewed by a panel of professional archaeologists.

The grievance process represents a mechanism, with more than twenty years of success under SOPA, by which archaeologists can investigate the conduct and performance of colleagues. This self-policing program provides a venue where legitimate complaints are reviewed, and if necessary, sanctions recommended against individuals who perform substandard work.

Since the establishment of the RPA in 1998, the number of ar-

chaeologists who have applied for and received certification as professional archaeologists has more than doubled. While only a small fraction of the individuals currently working at archaeology have been certified by the RPA, the substantial increase in applications for certification is encouraging. This implies that more and more archaeologists recognize and accept that there is a need for a formal ethics code for archaeologists.

ETHICS AND THE FUTURE

After nearly thirty years of participating in archaeology, it is obvious to me that change in our profession, just like society in general, is occurring at an increasing rate. The Principles of Archaeological Ethics that have been adopted by the Society for American Archaeology are intended to serve as guidelines to help archaeologists make informed and wise professional choices in a rapidly changing world. The principles represent ideals, and they are intended to encourage discussion and formal training about archaeological ethics.

Until recently, ethics were not commonly part of formal training in archaeology. This is changing as archaeologists become more informed about their ethical responsibilities and the conflicts that confront us throughout the profession. Continued discussion about the Principles is essential, because we cannot possibly anticipate all the future ethical issues that will face us individually and collectively in the coming years. Consequently, the Principles must be reviewed regularly, and possibly updated or revised as needed. Formal discussion and training about ethics is important to this process, and is the best way to introduce future professional archaeologists to the difficult choices they may face.

As archaeology matures as a profession, there is an increasing need for ethical guidelines. The recent, rapid growth in the archaeological profession has clearly created an environment where the Principles of Archaeological Ethics (developed by the Society for American Archaeology), and the Register of Professional Archaeologists both serve an important function. The combination of ethical ideals, professional certification, and standards of minimally acceptable conduct from these two ethical codes offer guidelines to operate in most of the practical real-world situations being encountered by contemporary archaeologists.

NOTES

1. Robert Silverberg, *Men Against Time* (New York: MacMillan, 1967).
2. Charles R. McGimsey III, *Public Archaeology* (New York: Seminar Press, 1972).
3. William D. Lipe, "A Conservation Model for American Archaeology," *Kiva* 39 (1974): 213–245.
4. Carl E. Guthe, "Report, Society for American Archaeology," *American Antiquity* 1 (1936): 310.
5. Charles R. McGimsey III, "Standards, Ethics, and Archaeology: A Brief History," in M. J. Lynott and A. Wylie, eds., *Ethics in American Archaeology: Challenges for the 1990s* (Washington: Society for American Archaeology Special Report, 1995).
6. J. L. Champe, D. S. Byers, C. Evans, A. K. Guthe, H. W. Hamilton, E. B. Jelks, C. W. Meighan, S. Olafson, G. I. Quimby, W. Smith, and F. Wendorf, "Four Statements for Archaeology," *American Antiquity* 27 (1961): 137–138.
7. Mark J. Lynott and Alison Wylie, eds., *Ethics in American Archaeology: Challenges for the 1990s* (Washington: Society for American Archaeology Special Report, 1995).
8. Alison Wylie, "Ethical Dilemmas in Archaeological Practice: Looting, Repatriation, Stewardship, and the (Trans)formation of Disciplinary Identity," in M. J. Lynott and A. Wylie, eds., *Ethics in American Archaeology* (Washington: Society for American Archaeology, 2000).
9. Charles R. McGimsey III, Hester A. Davis, and Carl Chapman, "These Are the Stewards of the Past" (Columbia: University of Missouri, Extension Division, 1970).
10. See note #3.
11. Ibid.
12. Christopher Chippindale, "The Concept of the 'Commons,'" *Antiquity* 68 (1994): 191–192.
13. Spencer P. M. Harrington, "The Looting of Arkansas," *Archaeology* 44 (1991): 22–31.

SUGGESTED READINGS

- Green, Ernestene L., ed. *Ethics and Values in Archaeology*. New York: Free Press, 1984.
- Lynott, Mark J. "Ethical Principles and Archaeological Practice: Development of an Ethics Policy." *American Antiquity* 62, no. 4 (1987): 589–599.
- Lynott, Mark J. and Alison Wylie, eds. *Ethics in American Archaeology*. Washington: Society for American Archaeology, 2000.
- Messenger, Phyllis Mauch, ed. *The Ethics of Collecting Cultural Property: Whose Culture? Whose Property?* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1989.
- Vitelli, Karen D., ed. *Archaeological Ethics*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press, 1996.