introspection" so perceptively noted by the first Airlie House discussants and applied some of our basic anthropological skills to the betterment of the resources we research and manage.

12

Perspectives from the Advanced Seminar

William D. Lipe and Lynne Sebastian

Cultural resource management (CRM) archaeology emerged in the mid-1970s in response to laws and public policies focused on resource management and planning, rather than on the "salvage" of sites that were "in the way of progress." As Davis (chapter 2) discusses, the ability of the archaeological community to win passage of the Moss-Bennett legislation in 1974 was a major turning point. In that same year, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation issued its initial Procedures for the Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties (36 CFR Part 800), and the Cultural Resource Management Conference in Denver (Lipe and Lindsay 1974) marked the appearance of "CRM" as a label for a new and more comprehensive approach to public archaeology. The mid-1970s also saw the development of CRM archaeology as a professional specialty distinct from employment in universities and museums (McGimsey 1974).

To those of us old enough to have been in the trenches long before 1974, CRM archaeology today is a huge success in comparison with the reactive, often poorly funded salvage archaeology that came before it. In most if not all parts of the United States, the great majority of the currently known archaeological sites has been recorded since the mid-1970s, and well-funded, multidisciplinary survey and excavation projects designed to "mitigate the adverse effects" of economic development have become

commonplace. CRM archaeology has produced great increases in our understanding of this nation's archaeological past and preserved tens of thousands of sites that might otherwise have been destroyed by development or looting. And the passage of NAGPRA and amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act has required CRM archaeologists and federal agencies to respond more systematically to the interests of Native Americans in ways that are still evolving but that increasingly show promise of mutually beneficial results, as T. J. Ferguson discusses (chapter 8). It is easy to imagine alternative scenarios for the past several decades that would have produced outcomes far worse for preservation and management of the archaeological record and for the delivery of public benefits from the expenditure of public funds on archaeology.

As all the chapters in this volume attest, however, CRM archaeology has its problems. Our goal in this book is to put forward a vision of what the field of CRM archaeology might become—how it might more nearly achieve its great promise. In the advanced seminar, we challenged ourselves not only to delineate aspects of that vision but also to describe some of the impediments to achieving it and what might be done to resolve or reduce those impediments. The contributors to the volume see it not as a cookbook filled with recipes for improving CRM archaeology, but as a way of encouraging those concerned about the future of American public archaeology to envision that future and to work toward making the vision a reality.

ELEMENTS OF A VISION FOR THE FUTURE

What follows is an attempt to capture the flavor of our discussions of several major issues, rather than recap the individual chapters—they speak for themselves. The main message of this chapter, and of this book, is that improving CRM archaeology is more a matter of changing the expectations of its practitioners—of changing the field's culture—than of tinkering with laws or federal regulations, although that may eventually be needed as well.

Public Benefits

Sebastian, in her introductory summary of the federal historic preservation laws that provide explicit statements about congressional intent (chapter 1), notes that in every case, the intent was to ensure that the nation could benefit, over the long-term future, from the active preservation and management of the country's heritage of archaeological and historical properties. Everything else in these laws and their implementing regulations is instrumental, designed to spell out what is to be done to pro-

vide those benefits. This perspective became a dominant theme during the advanced seminar: how can CRM archaeology do a better job of delivering public benefits, in both the short and the long term?

Numerous works have focused on archaeology's contributions to society (for example, Clarke 1957; Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008; Little 2002; McGimsey 1972; Petrie 1904; Sabloff 2008; Trigger 1986), but this topic is so basic that it needs to be continually revisited. Lipe (chapter 3) recognizes six kinds of archaeological resource values—preservation, research, heritage, educational, aesthetic, and economic—from which various segments of society can benefit and that provide the rationale for CRM archaeology.

The advanced seminar discussions called for an attitude shift on the part of all participants in "the CRM system"—public agency resource managers, state historic preservation officers (SHPOs), CRM consultants, and the private-sector clients who often pay much of the cost of CRM work. Of course, there often are many steps between an on-the-ground CRM project and the production of something that will be seen as a benefit by some segment of society. The main point is that CRM practitioners, including resource managers, consulting archaeologists, and those from other fields, must think from the outset about how CRM projects might contribute—either directly or indirectly, short-term or long-term—to eventual public benefits. And they must design their work to promote, or at least not obstruct, the delivery of those benefits.

CRM archaeology is most often justified as ensuring that sites are preserved for research, educational, or heritage uses over the long-term future. This is well and good, if steps are taken to ensure that long-term preservation will actually take place and that appropriately justified uses are not arbitrarily prohibited. Much of the public seems comfortable with seeing preservation as a benefit either for its own sake or because heritage, aesthetic, or other values can be realized without affecting the sites themselves. But there are also public benefits that may involve some physical effects on sites from research, stabilization, increased visitation, and so forth. It is appropriate to consider when and how preserved sites might be made available for uses of these sorts. In other words, a concern for public benefits implies that in situ preservation will be coupled with a continuing management concern for the sites thus preserved.

CRM archaeology projects, whether they lead to in situ preservation of sites or to "data recovery," involve studies and activities that can and should contribute to societal benefits. These might include a published scholarly article, a museum exhibit or media treatment featuring archaeology, a state

site database with both research and planning potential, enhanced collaboration between archaeologists and descendant groups, an educational unit for a school—the list is limited only by our imagination. Individual, small CRM projects may not directly produce such benefits, but collectively they may show large-scale, long-term regional trends and patterns (as in the population estimates based largely on multiple CRM surveys in Varien et al. 2007). The CRM field must take responsibility for seeing that CRM archaeological activities, collectively and over the long run, lead to judicious realization of archaeological values.

Multiple Publics

There are of course multiple publics for public archaeology (McManamon 1991), including researchers, educators, descendant communities, federal and state agencies, developers, and the large but diffusely defined "general public." CRM programs and projects should be designed from the outset to take into account the various publics that might benefit and the ways they might benefit. One of the benefits sought by a wide segment of the general public is more and better insight into archaeological findings and the process of archaeology itself. CRM archaeologists may be able to satisfy this interest themselves, through popular articles, lectures, and the like, but also numerous specialists in print, digital, and visual media are constantly looking for content about archaeological results that they can communicate to the general public (see Crass, chapter 11, about interfacing with the media).

The relationship between CRM practitioners and the various publics that have stakeholder interests in archaeology is not entirely a one-way street, with CRM specialists producing "products" such as reports, publications, and educational programs, which are then "consumed" by the public. Rather, CRM programs and projects of all sorts often receive input, implicitly and explicitly, from various stakeholders. Certainly the views, practices, and interests of the research, historic preservation, and regional planning communities have substantial influence on the way CRM projects are designed and conducted. And Smith (2006) reminds us that "the public" plays an active role in defining public benefits, because individuals and groups find their own ways to incorporate and make sense of archaeological sites and artifacts, the information put forth by archaeologists, and the treatments of archaeology that they encounter in the media, in parks and monuments, and in museum exhibits.

The view that archaeologists should be in charge of defining the benefits that various engaged publics should receive has been challenged most

effectively in the field's relationship with descendant communities, especially Native Americans. These communities usually have their own views about what archaeological work is appropriate at ancestral sites and what kinds of research will meet their interests. Swidler and colleagues (1997), Watkins (2000), and Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson (2008) have discussed ways in which archaeologists and descendant communities may avoid confrontation and seek common ground. Ferguson (chapter 8) discusses in detail how members of Native American communities are increasingly becoming collaborators with CRM archaeologists in the shaping and execution of archaeological CRM projects.

As noted earlier, in situ preservation of sites is often the direct objective of CRM archaeology, under the presumption that preservation will in some way make these sites available for new or continuing public benefits in the future. For this reason, archaeology's multiple stakeholder groups have an interest in ensuring that sites thus preserved continue to be protected and that future uses are well justified and have conservative effects.

Linking Means and Ends

CRM archaeology has lofty, abstract goals, starting with the stated purposes of the laws that support it. The practice of CRM archaeology, however, consists of detailed technical procedures, usually based on federal or state regulations and policies. The challenge for CRM archaeologists and resource managers is to avoid reifying these procedures so that the process becomes the goal rather than the means to one or more beneficial ends. Although laws and regulations do constrain CRM procedures, they offer more flexibility than is typically assumed.

Chandler (chapter 6) gives some examples of innovative approaches to the mitigation of adverse effects to archaeological sites. In some cases, a portion of the funds allocated to mitigation were expended on producing regional data syntheses as alternatives to redundant excavations of types of small sites that were already well understood. In other words, the judgment was made that synthesizing the results of previous projects would be of greater public benefit than producing additional site-specific descriptive reports.

In chapter 7, King discusses the low visibility of CRM archaeology in both scholarly and public discussions of regional culture and history. She points out the benefits of allocating some portion of the funds spent on CRM archaeology to producing regional syntheses and problem-oriented studies that incorporate and make generally available the vast amount of information generated by CRM work. Mackey (chapter 9) also comments on the negative effects on CRM practice and on the reputation of CRM

archaeology that result from the lack of syntheses and wide dissemination of results.

Quality Counts

The seminar participants agreed that much of the best archaeology done in the United States in recent years has been done in a CRM context. There was also agreement that some CRM projects and practitioners are to be found at the lowest end of the performance scale. Substandard or "barely get by" work puts at a competitive disadvantage the individuals and firms who maintain high standards. It tarnishes the image of CRM archaeology generally, represents an abdication of responsibility by the public agencies presumably in charge, and seldom produces results that lead to public benefits. In chapters 9 and 10, Mackey and Bridges, respectively, address aspects of strengthening ethical and professional behavior in the field of CRM archaeology.

Cost-Effectiveness

Cultural resource managers and CRM archaeologists in public agencies and in consulting firms are responsible for the long-term fate of the nation's irreplaceable archaeological resources. Increasingly, CRM work determines most of what we know and can find out about the past as it is represented in the archaeological record. At the same time, agency cultural resource managers, and to some extent CRM consultants, also help to provide the interface between the archaeological record and the heritage concerns of descendant communities, particularly Native Americans.

Given the size and seriousness of their responsibilities, there is no reason for CRM archaeologists to apologize for the cost of what they do, provided that those costs are well justified. In the aggregate, the money spent on CRM represents a tiny proportion of federal and state budgets, let alone of development expenditures in the private sector. However, noble aims do not provide a license for inefficiency or unnecessary costs. Seminar participants thought that cost-ineffective work often resulted from rigid adherence to process for its own sake, to the detriment of outcome-based project design. And a clearer focus on actually generating public benefits would make it easier to justify CRM archaeology costs and fend off the field's detractors, nationally and for particular projects.

IMPEDIMENTS (AND SOLUTIONS)

In our discussions of how new visions for the future of CRM archaeology might be implemented, seminar participants examined features of

current CRM practice that pose common, though not universal, impediments to productive change. We discussed ways such impediments might be removed or circumvented. Because our ideas about solutions were linked to what we saw as problems, impediments and possible solutions are considered together in what follows.

Process Rigor Mortis

Barker and Sebastian, in chapters 4 and 5, respectively, discuss some of the problems with procedures that often seem to work against cost-effective, outcome-oriented project design and execution. One class of problems comprises multiple small, overlapping projects in areas of heavy development. In some cases, this leads to dealing repeatedly with the same sites, to uncoordinated, redundant treatment of common types of sites, and to "missing the forest for the trees." For example, Wilshusen (1995) discussed an area of heavy development in New Mexico where large-scale patterns such as Pueblo villages with scattered habitation units had been poorly documented despite numerous small surveys.

Barker argues that regional predictive models can avoid some of the limitations of site-by-site, project-by-project evaluations, reduce compliance costs, and lead to more effective recognition of large-scale archaeological patterns. This of course requires the public agency in charge to come up with the funds to implement a large-scale, regional-planning approach or to convince multiple development proponents that it is in their interest to support regional planning for an area larger than any of their individual development projects. Barker's example shows that this can be done.

Sebastian explores some alternatives to site-by-site evaluations based on the very general National Register criteria. In many cases, the standard approach may be a poor fit for the characteristics of archaeological sites, the way archaeologists assign value to them, and their potential for eventually supporting public benefits through research or education. Sebastian suggests some alternatives to the standard Section 106 process that she thinks might produce better results more cost-effectively. She would base decisions about site significance on a set of "generally useful attributes" distilled from what archaeologists actually rely on when they do research or archaeological education.

In general, it seems to us that the process-related problems identified by Sebastian, Barker, and others at the advanced seminar stem from the application of one-size-fits-all procedures to a huge diversity of archaeological distributions and characteristics. Also, since the 1960s, archaeological research has typically focused less on the study of distinctive sites or even

"type sites." Rather, research commonly depends on studying variation within and among regional populations of sites. Procedures commonly used to implement Section 106 seem, however, to represent typological rather than population thinking (see Binford 1964; Mayr 2000). That does not mean that we cannot think of ways to use Section 106 to more appropriately address an archaeological record viewed as populations of features, sites, and settlement patterns. Chapters 4, 5, and 6 by Barker, Sebastian, and Chandler, respectively, lead us in this direction.

Self-Limiting Views of "the System's" Potential

Among the impediments to making the CRM "system" work more effectively to deliver public benefits is a long list of "can't do's" that seems rooted more in CRM traditions than in law or regulation or even policy. Although provisions for educational products and activities are increasingly appearing in archaeological scopes of work, especially for large mitigation projects, it still is generally off-limits for CRM archaeologists to get paid to produce publishable articles reporting what their work has contributed to the sum total of knowledge about the human past. This despite the fact that such publications would take advantage of the well-established system of journal and book publishing through which archaeological results are disseminated among scholars. These are the very sources upon which journalists, other media specialists, museum exhibitors, and educators also depend when they develop treatments of archaeology for larger public audiences.

This particular "can't do" seems to us to be a holdover from the early days of CRM archaeology, when agencies and consultants timidly approached development proponents with offers of archaeological "clearances" for their projects. This term implied of course that archaeological sites were nuisances standing in the way of progress—attractive nuisances perhaps, but nuisances nonetheless that needed to be "cleared" so that the more serious interests of society could forge ahead.

Out of this same formative period came a reluctance to label as "research" anything that CRM archaeologists did (Lipe 1985), despite the fact that they were excavating sites precisely because they met the National Register criterion of being "likely to yield information important in American history or prehistory." This reluctance was perhaps inherited from the salvage era, when analysis and reporting were often left unfunded under the presumption that these activities would be accomplished as a matter of course by the academicians who were at the time the ones usually in charge of salvage projects.

In the post-salvage era, funding for the production of long, highly detailed excavation and testing reports has become routine, but the work is curiously referred to as "data recovery," as if "data" are somehow discovered in the ground rather than being created from observations and measurements made by archaeologists through a process indistinguishable from other types of archaeological research. We are not complaining here about the production of technical "descriptive" reports, many of which are excellent and will serve as important data sources long into the future, provided that researchers and educators can discover their existence (see King, chapter 7, and Mackey, chapter 9). Rather, the point is that the culture and history of CRM archaeology may be keeping it from delivering some of the societal benefits that provide the justification for doing the work in the first place.

People who work in the CRM field can offer additional examples of "can't do" notions that keep us from developing products or carrying out activities that would increase societal benefits from the expenditure of public funds. But we can also cite examples in which "pushing the system" has resulted in improvements. The Fruitland Coal Gas project described by Chandler (chapter 6), for example, required that competing energy companies and competing CRM firms work together to create a unified archaeological approach to what would otherwise have been hundreds, perhaps thousands, of separate Section 106 undertakings. Although this created great gnashing of teeth at first, all the participants came to see the benefits of the approach, and soon attitudes shifted from "We've never done it this way" to "Why can't we do other projects this way?"

Ferguson (chapter 8) discusses relationships between CRM archaeologists and Native American tribes and communities in terms of a "resistance" mode versus a "participation" mode. Many CRM archaeologists and tribes remain stuck in the resistance mode and seem to assume that this is simply the nature of the relationship. Ferguson provides examples, however, of a transition from resistance to mutual participation, leading to collaboration on the design and conduct of CRM archaeological projects. Furthermore, he argues that such collaborative efforts are considerably more likely to produce innovative and informative research results than are projects done in a resistance mode.

As yet another example, in the 1990s the Society for American Archaeology's (SAA's) Public Education Committee launched an effective drive to make archaeology more accessible to the public, helping to break down the prevailing expectations that archaeologists avoid "popularization" and communicate primarily with professional peers. In addition to helping

develop public events focused on archaeology, as well as school curricula that incorporate archaeological information, the committee's work led some agencies to require selected CRM archaeological projects to produce public educational materials, as well as technical reports.

A problem more difficult to solve is the need for regional and topical syntheses, including those that depend on data from many small and large CRM projects (as discussed by King, chapter 7). This is an "overhead" cost that may be difficult to charge back to individual development projects. Yet, such syntheses are extremely valuable, both for making the results of CRM work more widely accessible to scholars, interpretive specialists, and the general public and for orienting CRM practitioners as they design and implement individual projects. Chandler and King (chapters 6 and 7, respectively) each discuss several success stories in the production of archaeological reports that synthesize regional CRM literature, but they also note the lack of consistent sources of funding for these efforts. Still, an increased awareness of the importance of regional and topical syntheses, as well as the sharing of information about what has worked in various states and regions, will perhaps result in additions to King's list of successes.

Given that, in some cases, project scopes of work now include the production of public education materials such as brochures, exhibits, videos, and presentations, why can't scopes of work for major projects also specify the production of article-length synthetic and analytical research reports that can receive wide dissemination and thus be available to media and educational "interpreters," as well as to scholars? In the concluding section of this chapter, we discuss some ways of making existing major CRM reports and syntheses more available.

Preservation as Wishful Thinking

Much CRM archaeology has as its goal the in situ preservation of portions of the archaeological record. The preserved sites can thus continue to be available to meet various public interests now and in the future. This makes sense only if the sites will, in fact, remain intact over the long term and if there are ways in which these sites can be accessed for societal benefits in the future. In situ preservation is, however, often treated as a one-shot, passive solution, as if maintaining site protection and ensuring beneficial future uses will somehow take care of themselves.

Two kinds of concern were expressed at the advanced seminar. First, in areas where moderate to intense development is taking place in small increments, experience has shown that avoidance of sites on a site-by-site, project-by-project basis may not result in preservation. Instead, the cumu-

lative direct and indirect effects of multiple small and often overlapping development projects may result in loss of integrity for many or even most of the sites in an affected region. Barker and Chandler (chapters 4 and 6, respectively) each discuss aspects of this problem. In such cases, agency managers need to consider the big picture and propose mitigation measures ranging from "hardening" a sample of sites, to studies that will produce information about the past from sites that will be lost. Some agencies are also attempting to increase both the temporal and spatial scales of planning for developments such as drilling for oil and gas. For example, the Bureau of Land Management now has the option of requiring drilling proponents to work with the agency to produce Geographic Area Development Plans (BLM 2003), which promise to help avoid the cumulative effects of "one small project at a time" development.

The other concern is whether a passive approach to preservation will ensure that some future public benefits can be gained from at least some of the sites thus preserved. It is pointless to say that sites are being saved for research at some future time when information recovery methods will have improved, without providing some guidelines about how the arrival of that future will be recognized. That is, the possibility always exists that archaeological methods will be better in the future. If this possibility is always used to deny permission for investigator-initiated archaeological research projects or to recommend avoidance even when long-term preservation is far from assured, this will guarantee that the public benefits that could be attained through intrusive research will always be postponed into an indefinite future (Lipe 2000a). The same kinds of questions can often be raised if in-place preservation is justified because of a site's educational, heritage, or other value. The questions are, What are the criteria for permitting access for such uses? Will they have direct or indirect impacts on site characteristics? And if there are use-related impacts, can these be tolerated or adequately managed while still permitting the public interest to be served?

Public agency planning documents often do not address these questions effectively, even though they are supposed to provide guidance for future agency actions. The agencies responsible for preserved cultural resources need to develop policies to guide site protection, as well as policies that will permit beneficial uses in ways that balance public good against potential damage to preserved resources.

Toleration of Low Standards

Bridges, in chapter 10, reviews the professional and ethical standards of societies and associations relevant to the practice of CRM archaeology.

Seminar participants thought that most CRM practitioners attempt to conform to such standards, but they agreed that those who do not conform cause problems for the credibility and effectiveness of the CRM field. Mackey (chapter 9) reviews some of the negative effects of the "race to the bottom," cost-cutting, and professional disengagement.

Solutions discussed by seminar participants include the following:

- Efforts to increase enrollment in the Register of Professional Archaeologists and much greater publicity about its grievance process. The Register does not have enforcement capacity per se, but persons who become registered professionals agree to uphold its Code of Ethics and Standards of Research Performance. Furthermore, they agree that if there is a credible complaint about their ethics or performance, they will participate in the grievance process. As Bridges discusses, this can result in loss of registration and the Register's grievance coordinator's publication of a report on the violations.
- Increased opportunities and incentives for continuing professional education. Professional societies such as the SAA and the Society for Historical Archaeology (SHA), state and regional professional groups, and the public agencies that have cultural resource responsibilities need to develop and promote opportunities for continuing education. CRM consulting firms should also provide time and incentives for their employees to engage in professional education.
- Awards and other types of public recognition. Such awards can serve as incentives and produce role models for improving ethical and professional behavior. Although this is being done in some cases, the public recognition of "good actors" needs to be further developed by professional societies and groups at the national, regional, and state levels, as well as by public agencies.
- Improved graduate education in CRM archaeology. Although education for CRM careers was one of the topics not taken up during the advanced seminar, because of time and space limits (see chapter 1), this clearly is an area that needs improvement if the level of professional performance in CRM archaeology is to be raised (see Society for American Archaeology 2006). Mackey (chapter 9) reports that in his experience, graduate programs that treat CRM employment as a worthwhile and fully professional career are much more likely to produce graduates who adhere to professional and ethical standards

when employed. Our perspective is that academic programs that fail to value employment in the CRM field need to wake up to reality. More than half the professional archaeologists in the United States are employed in CRM. Most other disciplines recognize and prepare their students for both "applied" and academic jobs—think of psychology and economics, for example. A number of US university graduate programs in archaeology do an excellent job of preparing students for CRM careers, and the situation is much better than it was 20 years ago, but much more progress needs to be made.

CONCLUSION: WHAT'S NEXT?

In chapter 2, Davis quotes a comment by Frank McManamon that "it probably isn't necessary to spend a lot of time redefining what the needs are; more energy should be devoted to coming up with ideas for addressing them." If this book had an epigraph, that would be a good choice. Our instructions to the seminar participants were to deemphasize long discussions of "what's wrong about the way we do things now" and focus on how we ought to be doing things and how we might go about getting there—visions for the future.

As McGimsey points out in the foreword, many of the same issues that were worrying people at Airlie House in 1974 are still perplexing and worrying us in this volume. In part, this is because of the scale at which we tend to view these problems and their solutions. The most recent attempt to address some of these issues at a national scale—the "Renewing American Archaeology" conferences of the mid-1990s (Davis, chapter 2; Lipe 1997; Lipe and Redman 1996)—focused on high-level or large-scale solutions. There were, for example, calls for new archaeological guidance from the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and for requiring that all federal agency archaeologists meet the secretary of the interior's standards for historic preservation professionals. Some of these higher-level solutions have been implemented, at least to some extent, but these institutional kinds of responses are too far removed from the daily experiences of most archaeologists. For this reason, the Renewing conferences and some of their predecessors (for example, Irwin-Williams and Fowler 1986) failed to engage the general archaeological population in activities or debates or in the search for other solutions.

The good news is to be found in one of the lessons derived from Davis's chapter 2: again and again in the history of public archaeology, we see that individuals or small groups of determined people have succeeded in

bringing about extraordinary changes. McGimsey, Chapman, and Corbett looked about one day in 1968 and said, with breathtaking naivety, "Well, couldn't we just get a law passed?" And amazingly enough, they did. Many other people helped, but it took only three determined persons to start up that change engine.

Nothing that any of us propose in this book would require anything as extreme as a change in the law or regulations. Even our most ambitious proposals would require only changes in guidance. Much of what we propose could be implemented tomorrow or next month or this year, given an advocate or advocates and sufficient determination. As part of a recently initiated project at Fort Benning, Georgia, for example, Sebastian and several colleagues are developing a significance-based site evaluation process of the type discussed in chapter 5 and will assist the cultural resource staff at Fort Benning as this approach is incorporated into planning and management.

Every archaeologist has unique talents, interests, passions. Some of us cringe at the very thought of congressional visits and lobbying; others relish the "inside the beltway" experience. Some devote endless hours to public education and outreach; others would rather be beaten thoroughly with a large stick than be locked in a room with 30 first-graders.

But each of us has something we care passionately about, something we think needs to be changed. Each of us has an area of current archaeological practice that we think is the perfect candidate for the SDSS[2] (stop doing stupid stuff, start doing smart stuff) approach to improving CRM archaeology. Figure out what your issue is, where you can contribute, and then go for it. Are you worried about shoddy excavation or substandard surveys? Become an RPA yourself and work with other RPAs in your area to convince clients and land-managing agencies to require registration as a condition of receiving contracts or permits.

Are you sick of churning out endless, repetitive, negative survey reports that cost your clients time and money and do nothing to advance archaeological knowledge or improve site management? Find a few like-minded colleagues and design a streamlined, programmatic approach that still makes needed information available but frees up agency, SHPO, and consultant time and money to be spent on things that actually make a difference for archaeology and yield a public benefit. Does it seem impossible to find new hires with the needed skills and knowledge? Work with local firms and agencies to develop a mentoring group for students at the local university who want to go into CRM. Are you disheartened by the constant loss of archaeological sites to uncontrolled local development? Find or create a champion on your city council and start working toward development of a local archaeological ordinance.

The possibilities are endless. For example, during our seminar discussions, we were struggling with how to get syntheses of local or regional archaeology done, make them available, and keep them updated and current. Someone said, "Contract reports for large projects often have wonderful syntheses, but the reports have such limited distribution." Someone else noted that MA theses and PhD dissertations also have excellent, very current syntheses in them but that these documents have even *more* limited distributions. The ideal would be for authors to turn those report or thesis chapters into articles for publication, but this takes time and energy that many of us just do not have.

"Well," someone said, "what about the low-energy solution? Have a Web site where people can post their synthesis chapters as PDFs in an 'as is' format." The Web site could be hosted by the state archaeologist or the state professional council or one of the university anthropology departments, and all this great information could be readily available without the authors' having to put in much additional work. Also, universities are increasingly permitting or requiring theses and dissertations to be submitted digitally, and they often post these on the university library website. Some universities are cooperating in a program called "The Research Exchange," in which research-related documents can be posted and the links be kept up-to-date by university library staff. For example, Lipe recently helped set up a Research Exchange "community" focused on theses and other reports relating to the Cedar Mesa Project in southeastern Utah (see https://research.wsulibs.wsu.edu:8443/dspace/handle/2376/735).

Think about the problem; think of as many creative solutions as possible—high-tech, low-tech, high-energy input or low-energy. There is not an issue raised in this book that cannot be addressed, at least in part, through individual or small group efforts. The history of American CRM archaeology has been formed in this way; its future can be as well.

Archaeology & Cultural Resource Management

Visions for the Future

Edited by Lynne Sebastian and William D. Lipe

SAR
PRESS