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Archaeologists have an obligation to communicate the significance of data and research results to a fascinated but often uninformed public. How much the public understands about the field of archaeology is important to the profession. Through the media, people learn about the discovery of spectacular artifact treasures. This information often fosters the practice of treasure hunting, the looting and destruction of important archaeological sites. Via treasure hunting, along with land alteration and traffic in the sale of antiquities, the field of archaeology loses vast amounts of valuable information.

An interview questionnaire was given to 232 people with varying levels of education, and types of employment in an attempt to discover the depth and breadth of knowledge the general public has about the field of archaeology, and their willingness to support it financially or by other means. Finally, the need for educating the public is assessed and recommendations are made to the archaeological profession, particularly for more educational involvement with the public and with the federal government.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Objectives

There are three primary objectives to this study. The first is to discover the depth of knowledge the general public has about the field of archaeology. It would seem to be a natural assumption that people are interested in themselves and their heritage. Therefore, it appears logical that they would also be interested in archaeology. How far this interest actually translates into knowledge of the field will be examined in this study.

The second objective is to determine the degree of public approval of using federal funds for archaeological projects. The issue of spending millions of tax dollars to fund archaeological projects could be a highly controversial subject. Determining public preference for private or public funding for archaeological projects is valuable information to those seeking funding, and this subject will be examined as well.

The third objective of this study is to make recommendations for improving public awareness and knowledge of the science of archaeology and the work of archaeolo-
gists, thereby fostering greater communication between scientists and the public. This could do much to diminish the problems of site destruction due to misunderstandings with land owners, artifact looters, illegal traffic in antiquities, and poor communication with an uninformed public.

Only one paper and no major studies of this kind could be found in the literature, but, as outlined above, the need seems clear. Preliminary to discussion of this study, several topics will be examined: the definition of archaeology and how this has been manipulated by economic, political, and government institutions of the past; the history (1920-1987) of how archaeology in the United States developed a "public" or "contract" archaeology sector; and the evolution of the accompanying federal and state legislation that protects our cultural resources.

Assumptions

The assumptions of this study are based on the knowledge that thousands of people are intrigued with archaeology through artifact seeking, museum and site viewing, amateur societies, and some undesirable activities. Also, people are very interested in how their tax dollars are spent.
Therefore, my first assumption is that most people have an elementary knowledge of the profession, and my second assumption is that the majority would approve of some monies spent on archaeological projects, whether it be private or public funds.

Research consisted of an interview questionnaire conducted at the Kent Conservation League near Ada, Michigan. The members questioned were 232 young, middle aged, and older people with varying levels of education and engaged in a variety of jobs, activities, and professions. The responses were analyzed and compared to a previous study and to the assumptions stated above.
CHAPTER II

THE PROBLEM AND ITS BACKGROUND

Overview

Simply put, archaeologists have to interact with people because people own the property where sites are found. Therefore, they are sensitive about citizens' knowledge and attitudes toward their profession. E. M. Davis (1979:7) states, "the public controls the source of our data; the public controls the source of our funds; and the public sometimes destroys our data."

Because most of our archaeological information is buried in the ground, archaeologists have to depend on people who control the use of the land. As E. Davis notes, archaeologists have to deal with landowners, park superintendents, factory managers, county commissioners, highway engineers, bureaucrats and legal personages who interpret the legislation. It is these people who have jurisdiction over the utilization of the land for whatever purpose, whether it be for exploitation, conservation, research or any other endeavor.

Besides the obvious control the public has over the sources of data and funds, archaeologists who express their concerns about people's increasing interest and in-
volvement in the field (E. Davis 1979; H. Davis 1972; Emerson 1980; King & Lyneis 1978; Lipe 1977; McGimsey 1972; Place 1968; Wildesen 1980) are anxious for better education and communication between the public and themselves. Archaeology is popular with the public because people can participate in ways not open to them in other sciences. McGimsey & Davis state that widespread understanding of archaeology, as distinguished from popular interest, is still lacking (McGimsey & Davis 1977:79).

The profession of archaeology is often confused by the public with the disciplines of geology and especially paleontology; and with "people who dig for old bones," treasure hunters, and pot hunters. Archaeologists constantly encounter public misconceptions of their profession, which can lead to misunderstandings, frustration, time and money loss, ill feelings, and general communication problems. There is an urgent need for archaeologists to discover the extent of the public's knowledge and opinions about their profession because sites are rapidly being destroyed, large sums of tax dollars are being expended, and looted antiquities continue to be sold in the marketplace.
Definition of Archaeology

The following definition of archaeology is found in the Archaeological and Historical Data Recovery Program of the Department of the Interior under the National Park Service's Interagency Archaeological Services:

Archaeology is the scientific study of man's past through an examination of the physical remains of his activities. In North America, man's past extends back thousands of years, and for much of this time span buried physical remains are the only evidence left to tell us about daily life, relationships to the environment and to other groups, and many other aspects that have bearing on our life today. Even for more recent historic periods for which written documents are available, archaeology offers a candid supplemental or alternative view of daily life.

Archaeology utilizes a variety of theories and scientific techniques to help us understand mankind by reconstructing patterns of past human behavior. It is unique among the social sciences in its ability to provide insight into change over a long span of time, thus helping us understand processes as well as events (Keel 1979:2).

Archaeology is important because it is the study of man and his achievements which took place before written records. It is the story of ancient peoples who lived in small nomadic bands. In some areas, their descendants domesticated plants and animals and began agriculture. Complex societies with large populations developed, not only in the Old World, but in the Americas as well. Archaeology contains the longest part of humanity's past.
Archaeology has grown in the last hundred years from an amateur's pastime to an ever enlarging scientifical­ly-based profession as exemplified by the newer sub­fields of historic archaeology, marine archaeology, and lately urban archaeology.

State Uses of Archaeology

Fowler (1987) relates how the past has been used and manipulated by many governments, especially since ar­chaeology has become a discipline. It has been affected by politics, economics and government institutions of many nation states, and has been used to control and de­fend power and authority for national goals.

In the struggle between Sweden and Denmark-Norway from ca. A.D. 1500-1800 for domination of the Baltic Sea region, all claimed relationships with Goths, Atlanteans, the Teutonic god-king Odin, and with archaeological sites to attain national supremacy. In America, the Myth of the Mound Builders helped move the "savage" Indians out of the way of white "civilization"; the "savage" Indians' ancestors could not have been sophisticated enough to build those grand earthworks. European powers used ar­chaeological expeditions to search for Biblical truths and Near Eastern history generally, but also as a cover to gain control of that area (Fowler 1987:230).
Mexico's history traces rulers who used religious ideology to establish their genealogical links through time to the founding deities. These deities were the symbolic sources of authority and power. It did not matter if the rulers' claims were true or not. It was sufficient that their people and their opposition believed in the claims.

After the fall of Teotihuacan around A.D. 750, it still remained the "place of the gods." The Toltecs who followed claimed genealogical descent from the rulers and deity-rulers of Teotihuacan through Quetzalcoatl, their major deity, and used Teotihuacan for their power base. When the Toltecs lost their power around A.D. 1150, marauding groups moved in, including Culhuacan, who claimed direct descent from the Toltecs who still symbolized civilization and power. The last rulers, the Aztecs, manufactured their own genealogy by claiming authority back through Culhuacan to the Toltecs, and consequently to Teotihuacan (Fowler 1987:230-234).

The Chinese use the past as a morality tale. The pre-1949 past is considered evil because it was run by evil rulers who made slaves of the people. The Chinese people take great pride in their cultural heritage in spite of past oppressive rulers. They believe the past is a testimonial to the Chinese masses whose slave ancestors created and moved forward to a glorious civilization despite their overlords, but the Chinese people
believe that their full potential was only released in 1949 (Fowler 1987:237-239).

On a smaller scale, here in Michigan, the controversy about where the 17th century French priest and explorer, Father Marquette, is buried became a heated dispute between the cities of Ludington and Frankfurt, both claiming his burial ground. Supposedly, Indians later removed his bones to St. Ignace. All of these claims, which cannot be authenticated, are good publicity for the tourist trade, one of the major industries in Michigan.

Destruction of the Archaeological Record

In current times, the critical issue is the destruction of the archaeological record, both intentionally and unintentionally, by individuals seeking to satisfy their interest in the past. Additionally, we must be concerned with the activities of people that are not related to direct investigation of the past, but nevertheless destroy the record of the past through activities such as urban development, strip mining, agriculture, road building and marine treasure hunting (Bator 1984; Cockrell 1981; E. M. Davis 1979; H. Davis 1972; Downer 1986; Fowler 1982; Knudsen 1981; McGimsey 1981; Newman 1987; Rippetoe 1979; Udall 1987; Vitalli 1980 and Wildesen 1980).

H. Davis (1972) describes the crisis in American archaeology in these terms:
The current crisis in American archaeology has been brought about by a combination of the greatly increased rate of destruction of unique, irreplaceable archaeological information and material and the lack of adequate funding for salvage of what is being destroyed. Since World War II, land alteration has increased almost geometrically. Land leveling, urban development, inexperienced or ignorant diggers, commercial dealers in Indian relics - these and many other agents of destruction are obliterating traces of the past. Anything that disturbs the ground where people once lived destroys forever whatever information is left about them and their way of life. (p. 272)

Davis states examples of archaeological information destroyed forever: hundreds of thousands of acres cleared for farmland in the Mississippi River Valley; sixty-five percent of known sites on the island of Oahu, Hawaii were obliterated due to urban and agricultural development; Indian sites were destroyed in the northern Great Lakes by rapid resort development; sites in the Illinois Valley of Western Illinois where prehistoric man lived for thousands of years were destroyed; in Vermont a large prehistoric site was bulldozed between 1960 and 1965 for a housing development; in Oregon and Florida sites were destroyed by the Corps of Engineers and state beach "nourishment programs"; a large prehistoric mound was removed for road fill in Mississippi. These examples can be multiplied world wide (H. Davis 1972:269).

In Michigan, developers advertised in the Detroit News in 1971: "140 acres, historical Indian grounds, stone carvings, lore, artifacts. Adjoins...Michigan's
only known petroglyph site. Top-notch land development” (cited in H. Davis 1972:269). Also, in Michigan, archaeologists became alarmed about the increasing groups of treasure hunters manned with metal detectors that have dug and mangled almost every historic site in the state.

Just as devastating in site destruction is the grave digging relic hunter. Dealers in the Mississippi Valley will locate an ancient cemetery, hire workers, and promise to pay them for each pot they find. Looting tombs in the Mediterranean area, Central America, and other regions is equally destructive.

Further examples of destructive relic hunting are cited in New Mexico:

Confining ourselves strictly to the field of historic preservation we must place at the top of the list of destroyers, the artifact hunter. Armed with detector, trowels, picks, shovels, whisk brooms, and back hoes, these unrestrained agents of destruction have riddled scores of New Mexico sites, ranging from early man hunting camps to nineteenth century ghost towns and military installations, and have almost eliminated any possibility of a thorough archaeological investigation of the Mimbres branch of the Mogollon Culture. The principal stimulus is, of course, financial gain (H. Davis 1972:272).

In the nineteenth century, Western Europe and the United States developed great museums by "acquiring" antiquities from other countries, e.g., Egypt and other Middle Eastern countries. Many nations in the late nineteenth century began enacting legislation to stop the flow of antiquities across borders to European markets,
the United States and elsewhere.

A general UNESCO conference in 1970 adopted provisions to stop the illegal antiquity trade which the United States and several other nations ratified (cited in Fowler 1982:27). However, no law implementing these provisions was passed until the 1986 Cultural Act: P.L. 97-446 (Downer 1986) made the United States the first importing nation to prevent the illicit import, export, and transfer of ownership of cultural property. The law established the Cultural Property Advisory Committee, located at the United States Information Agency, comprised of eleven members who represent the interests of archaeology, ethnology, anthropology, the international sale of art, the museum community, and the general public. The Committee's primary responsibility is to review requests from other countries for United States import controls on artifacts that are considered part of a nation's cultural heritage.
CHAPTER III

HISTORY OF PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY THROUGH FEDERAL LEGISLATION

Federal Laws

Early protective laws leading up to contemporary public archaeology through legislation will be reviewed. Recent attempts to curb international illegal trade in antiquities should not obscure the fact that a need for protecting cultural resources within our own borders has long been recognized.

Since the early 1900's, legislation has been enacted for protection of cultural resources. Archaeologists have reviewed these laws in the literature, among them Butler 1987; Downer 1986; Dworsky, McVarish, Perry and Robinson 1983; King and Lyneis 1978; Lipe 1977; McGimsey and Davis 1977; Schiffer and Gummerman 1977; and Wildesen 1982. Updated versions of laws pertaining to archaeology can be obtained from the Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, National Park Service; they are also published in the Bulletin of the Society for American Archaeology and the Society of American Archaeology Committee on Public Archaeology. A summary of the history of legislation and public archaeology pertaining to protection of our cultural resources will be reviewed pri-
mainly from the literature cited above.

The first legislation enacted was the Antiquities Act of 1906: Public Law 59-209 (Keel 1979). Destruction of ruins or monuments became a federal offense, punishable by not more than a five hundred dollar fine or ninety days in jail. The law was hardly enforceable as its intent was to patrol the huge expanse of government land, mainly in the Southwest.

The Historic Sites Act of 1935: Public Law 74-292 (Keel 1979) gave responsibility to the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service to secure and preserve data on historic sites, and to preserve archaeological and historic sites. Not until shortly before World War II was a large effort made to rescue archaeological information and material about to be destroyed.

Mayer-Oakes (1979) divides the development of public archaeology through legislation into three stages (Figure 1). The first stage was the "salvage" era begun in the 1930s materializing under the federal Work Projects Administration (W.P.A.) and the Tennessee Valley Authority (T.V.A.). These were make-work projects in the Great Depression and many archaeologists began their careers directing salvage archaeology projects paid for by the government. In the 1940s and 1950s, river basin surveys, highway salvage and pipeline surveys were conducted. Archaeologists recognized the great need to rescue archaeological information before sites were destroyed.
STAGES IN U.S. DEVELOPMENT OF CONTRACT ARCHAEOLOGY

Salvage Stage
1930s - W.P.A., Tennessee Valley Authority
1940s - Reservoir work, Smithsonian River Basin Survey
1950s - Highway Salvage and Pipeline Surveys

Public Stage
1960s - Development of Antiquities Laws
1969 - N.E.P.A.
1971 - EO 11-593

Cultural Resource Stage
1973 - The concept of Cultural Resource Management comes into general use
1974 - Moss-Bennett Bill passes
1978 - Moss-Bennett Bill reauthorized

Figure 1. Three Stages of Activity in U.S. Archaeology (From Mayer-Oakes 1979).
This work was accomplished by an interagency archaeological program established by the Park Service, the Smithsonian Institution, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Reclamation (H. Davis 1972:268).

Mayer-Oakes' second stage, or "public" archaeology, developed from the contract "salvage" work which was sustained in previous years. In the 1960s, antiquity laws were developed as a result of the salvage projects begun in the 1950s. This brought about the Reservoir Salvage Act of 1960: (Keel 1979) to preserve historical and archaeological data. It was amended in 1966 to become the National Historic Preservation Act: 89-665 (Keel 1979) making the government directly responsible for the identification, protection, and restoration of historic sites in the United States. The President was authorized to appoint an Advisory Council for Historic Preservation and a State Historic Preservation Officer for every state.

In 1969 the National Environmental Policy Act: 91-190 (Keel 1979) was passed to assure Americans a good, safe and healthful place in which to live. In archaeology, an agency or private contracting firm in a land altering situation, had to document the possible effect of the project on related disturbance to environmental and cultural resources. If there were cultural remains, proposals for mitigation alternatives were required (Schiffer & House 1977:43). These laws provided policy,
procedures, and funding to carry out a vastly increased federally mandated program of archaeological survey, planning, and research (Wildesen 1982:52). Laws serve to determine limits, thereby letting the people know what can and what cannot be done.

Executive Order 11593: Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment (Keel 1979) was passed to provide leadership by the federal government for the preservation of the historic and cultural environment. Agencies were responsible for inventorying and evaluating cultural resources under their domain by July 1, 1973. The Secretary of Interior was made responsible for developing criteria for federal agencies' evaluation of cultural resources and for expediting action upon sites nominated to the National Register.

The third stage brought in the concept of Cultural Resource Management. The Moss-Bennett Act, named the Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act: Public Law 93-391 (Keel 1979), was passed in 1974. It authorized federal agencies to apply part of contract dollars up to the amount of one percent of the cost of a federal construction project for archaeological mitigation. The Moss-Bennett Act expanded the limited Reservoir Salvage Act to all federal or federally assisted or licensed construction projects, including airports and road construction, which could impact cultural resources. In 1978 the Moss-Bennett Act was re-authorized (Keel 1979).
In 1979 Public Law 96-95 (Keel 1979) was passed which protects archaeological resources and sites on public lands (owned or administered by the federal government), and Indian lands. In cases where removal is necessary, a permit must first be secured from the head of the agency having primary management over the land. The law also fosters increased cooperation and exchange of information between governmental authorities, the professional archaeological community and private individuals. Thus, public or contract archaeology came into being, with the public paying tax dollars supplemented by the private sector in funding archaeological projects.

Federal agencies hired archaeologists, archaeologists formed consulting firms, colleges and universities launched graduate programs in "cultural resource management," new organizations were formed (the Society of Professional Archaeologists, the American Society for Conservation Archaeology), and books were published (Wildesen 1982:53).

Since 1978 and up to 1987, millions of dollars have been allocated by Congress to protect archaeological sites from destruction or to salvage their contents prior to destruction. Of primary significance was the Moss-Bennett Act, a milestone for public archaeology legislation.

Protection and Preservation Laws of Michigan

In our own state of Michigan, protection and preservation laws have been passed. The following laws were
reviewed in Clerestory; published by the Michigan History Division (MHD) of the Department of State (1980). In 1913, Act 271 established the Michigan Historical Commission and gave the Commission the mandate to carry forth the State's historical programs. This act was the basis for placing the historic preservation program under the Michigan History Division of the Michigan Department of State.

In 1929, Act 173, the Antiquities Act, gave the State of Michigan exclusive rights in surveying or excavating sites on State land unless a permit was obtained from the Department of Conservation, now known as the Department of Natural Resources. Excavation was required to be under the supervision of an archaeologist. In 1977, Act 173 also declared it unlawful to remove "any relics or antiquities such as human or other bones; shells, stone, bone or copper implements; pottery or shards thereof or similar artifacts" from the premises of any landowner without the landowner's consent (MDH 1980:2). Violation of Act 173 is considered a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of not less than $10.00 or more than $100.00 or by imprisonment in the county jail for not more than 30 days, or both.

In 1955, Act 10 established the State Register of Historic Sites and provided for the erection of State Historic Markers. Both the registration and marker
programs today are administered by the Bureau of History (formerly the Michigan History Division) of the Michigan Department of State. This act qualifies certain public buildings and buildings owned by non-profit organizations to receive small State Historic Preservation Grants for restoration activities for State Register buildings. Grants are awarded competitively each year.

In 1957, Act 213, Local Historical Commissions, states that local communities can establish historical commissions and provide for their funding with revenue bonds under the provisions of this act. In some communities, these commissions may foster a wide variety of preservation activities.

Act 169, the Historic District Ordinances and Commissions Act, is the State's enabling legislation which governs the creation of historic districts and historic district commissions by local ordinance, which was passed in 1970. The Commission's powers may include the responsibility of reviewing all building permits which involve the construction, alteration, or demolition of any historic property in the district; the permit is not issued unless a "certificate of appropriateness" or waiver is provided by the commission.

In 1972, the passage of Act 241, the Wilderness and Natural Areas Act, created a means to establish and regulate wilderness areas, wild areas, and natural areas, to prescribe the functions of certain State officers, and to
require the promulgation of rules and penalties. This law applies to State land which has been dedicated and regulated by the Natural Resources Commission pursuant to this act. Among the characteristics of wilderness and natural areas are ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, scenic, or historical value. This has implications for the preservation of archaeological, and to a lesser degree, historical sites which are located on State lands (MDH 1980:3).

Signed into law in 1974, Act 116: The Farmland and Open Lands Preservation Act (Clerestory 1980), provides for the preservation of farm land and open spaces by allowing the land owner to enter into long-term agreements or easements of ten years at a minimum with the two parties jointly holding the right to develop the land or in which the owner relinquishes the right to develop the property in return for certain tax benefits. The definition of "open space land" in this act includes "any undeveloped site included in a national registry of historic places or designated as an historic site pursuant to state or federal law" and "any other area approved by the local governing body, the preservation of which in its present condition would conserve natural or scenic resources, including...the preservation of historic sites" (MDH 1980:3).

Act 166 of 1974, Protection of Memorials to the Dead, addresses vandalism or destruction of a burial
mound. The penalties are imprisonment for not more than five years or a fine of not more than $2500.00 or both.

Act 168 of 1974, Protection of Human Remains, does not prohibit "the digging up, disinterment, removal or carrying away for scientific purposes of the remains of prehistoric persons by representatives of established scientific institutions or societies, having the consent in writing of the owner of the land from which the remains may be disinterred, removed or carried away" (MDH 1980:3).

In 1975, Act 197, the Downtown Development Act, states that one of its purposes is "to encourage historic preservation," however much of the language of the act is geared to new construction. Downtown preservation activities can be effectively promoted, however, under the legislation.

The Freedom of Information Act of 1976 (Clerestory 1980) also allows exemption of certain public records from review; among these are records which would reveal the exact location of archaeological sites. It further provides that the Secretary of State may promulgate rules to allow for the disclosure of site locations for purposes relating to the preservation or scientific examination of sites.

The Underwater Salvage Act of 1980, Public Act 184, protects, preserves, and regulates the taking of aboriginal records and antiquities within this state; preserves
abandoned property of historical or recreational value on the bottomlands of the Great Lakes and regulates the salvage of abandoned property of historical or recreational value; designates and regulates Great Lakes bottomland preserves; and prescribes penalties. "Great Lakes" means lakes Erie, Huron, Michigan, St. Clair, and Superior. This law is one of the best underwater salvage laws of any state in the United States (B. Mead, personal communication, 1988).

One of the more significant protective steps Michigan has taken is Executive Order 1974-4, Preparation and Review of Environmental Impact Statements. The order created the Michigan Environmental Review Board (MERB) which reviews Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) prepared by State agencies for major actions which significantly impact the environment or human life. It applies to State funded or State assisted undertakings, and full responsibility for compliance is invested in State agencies. A "major state activity" is declared and an EIS prepared when (a) requested by the Governor, (b) the proposed activity has "a significant possible impact on the environment or human life," or (c) the activity raises general public concern or controversy. Guidelines for the preparation and review of an EIS further defines "major state activities" in several ways, including "alteration or destruction of a significant element of the human, natural, amenity or historic resources of the
state." The guidelines state that an EIS shall contain "a brief comprehensive description of the existing environment, including specific description of ...archaeological and historical resources." A description is to be given of the impact of the action, its adverse effect, alternatives to the proposed action, and possible modifications that would eliminate or minimize adverse effects. For actions taken by a state agency, the decision to declare an action as major and prepare an impact statement is at the discretion of the department involved. If a statement is issued, it is first reviewed by the Interdepartmental Environmental Review Committee (INTERCOM), a body including a staff person from the Bureau of History who represents the Department of State. INTERCOM may determine that a statement is inadequately prepared pursuant to the above mentioned guidelines, in which case the statement is returned to the originating department for revision. If determined adequate, the statement is forwarded to MERB, which makes a final recommendation concerning the proposed action to the Governor. The Governor decides whether the action should proceed.

Many of the current problems that exist in archaeology is enforcement of the preceding laws. Michigan has a State Archaeologist and an Assistant State Archaeologist with limited personnel to oversee compliance with State laws. Only on a cycle of twelve years are the ar-
chaeological and historic sites on State lands checked. Although there are 3,000 shipwrecks in the Great Lakes, there is no State Marine Archaeologist. Barbara Mead, Assistant State Archaeologist, states that more funds will have to be allocated to better protect our State lands from vandalism and treasure hunters (B. Mead, personal communication, 1988). Unfortunately, sites on private lands are not protected by the law. Educating the public of the need to protect sites might help to offset the lack of enforcement problem.
CHAPTER IV

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

There is a paucity of relevant literature on surveys dealing with people's knowledge of archaeology. Actually, there is only one study (Gutierrez 1980) with which results could be adequately compared. One other survey (Feder 1984) has some small degree of relevance to the present study.

Public Opinion Survey

Gutierrez (1980) did a public opinion survey on people's feelings about cultural resources. The majority of her sample came from the Michigan State University community, with a small sample from outside the University (downtown Lansing, Michigan).

Similarities of her study to this survey were: (a) Questioning people's knowledge of cultural resources, (b) seeking opinions concerning funding cultural resource preservation, (c) attitudes toward looting and vandalism, and (d) determining how many people had visited archaeological sites.

Dissimilarities with this survey were: (a) Sampling people who primarily were from a university community,
i.e., professors, graduate students, undergraduate students, university employees, and a small portion of nonaffiliated university people; (b) not expanding on the subject of archaeology; and (c) using a campus mail system to distribute her questionnaire which allowed her less than a two-thirds return.

Gutierrez's (1980) results showed that most people were interested in their heritage, as this study also proves. Seventy-five percent of her sample favored the one percent funding for archaeological site preservation, while this survey shows a higher percentage of support. Because she used a sample composed of people who were mostly highly educated, their knowledge of cultural resources was rated at forty-eight percent. In this survey only a small number of people knew what cultural resources were, in spite of much probing from the interviewer. Gutierrez assumed that because her sample of 93 persons showed much knowledge of cultural resources that this would be representative of the population at large. However, this interview survey of 232 people engaged in a great variety of jobs, activities, education, and professions, with a broad age scale and educational range, did not reveal much knowledge of cultural resources or archaeology in general.

Not directly related to this survey, Feder (1984) produced a questionnaire concerning college students'
reaction to pseudo-scientific claims made in the name of archaeology and appearing in popular media. The results of the study proved that students were largely ignorant of archaeology and related subjects.
CHAPTER V

RESEARCH DESIGN

A questionnaire design using a personal interview survey was chosen as the best option to gain the most information and highest percent of response from informants (Banaka 1971; Dexter 1970; Douglas 1985; Howland & Cannell 1960; Mishler 1986). Basic goals of relevancy and accuracy were utilized so that information would be relevant to the purposes of this survey; to find out people's knowledge of archaeology and their willingness to pay for its research. The researcher attempted to be clear about the exact kinds of data required in this study; not only why the question was asked but what would be done with the information (as suggested by Linninger & Warwick 1975). Pretesting of interviewees (using a sample of ten informants) was conducted to achieve a smooth manner of interviewing, as advised by Howland & Cannell (1960), Linninger & Warwick (1975) & Robin (1986).

Instrumentation

A questionnaire of 14 questions, with a few sub questions, was preceded by short answer questions con-
cerning personal background information, unadorned by archaeological jargon. The independent variable was the demographic data and the answers to the questionnaire were the dependent variables. The complete questionnaire is in the Appendix.

The questions asked were based on the problems involving archaeologists and the public as reviewed earlier. Concerns of archaeologists center around people's lack of knowledge about their profession, cultural resource management, communication problems with the public, and federal funding for archaeological projects. Archaeologists recognize that if people were better informed about their profession, the possibility of less site destruction might be realized.

The Sample

Interviewing of 232 members of the Kent Conservation League was conducted from January 12, 1985 to June 27, 1985. The League, situated two miles northeast of Ada, Michigan, utilizes two club houses about one mile apart. Essentially a trap and skeet shooting club, the membership consists of an excellent cross section of around 350 to 400 young, middle aged, and older people engaged in a broad variety of jobs, activities, education, and professions. Club members waiting to "shoot a line" were either interviewed in the trap shooting club house or the skeet club house.
Data Analysis

The responses were coded and entered into the computer system at Western Michigan University. Discussion of the findings is found in Chapter VI.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

The results of this survey prove that the majority of the public is certainly not knowledgeable about the field of archaeology. It is easy to understand why archaeological resources can be destroyed because most people do not recognize the value of them.

Listed below will be a summary of the findings from the responses of the total test population with some crosstabulations of specific groups according to sex, occupation, education, and age. Some interesting answers and comments give a perspective of how archaeology and archaeologists are perceived by the public.

Of 232 people questioned, 40 (17.2%) were females, 192 (82.8%) were males, 157 (67.1%) were married, 75 (32.9%) were single. With respect to occupation, 34 (14.7%) were students, 45 (19.4%) were blue collar workers, 55 (23.7%) were professionals, 38 (16.4%) were business people, 52 (22.4%) were white collar workers, and 7 (3.0%) were housewives. The education survey findings had 46 (19.8%) people with less than a high school education, 30 (12.9%) were high school graduates, 64 (27.6%) were attending or had 2 years of college, 63
(27.2%) had college degrees, and 28 (12.1%) had advanced degrees, e.g., masters, doctorates, and were attorneys, medical doctors, dentists, osteopaths, engineers and chiropractors.

The age group of people 14-20 numbered 31 (13.4%), the 21-30 group had 38 (16.4%), the 31-40 group had 59 (25.4%), the 41-50 group had 58 (25.0%), the 51-60 group numbered 26 (11.2%), and the over 60 group totaled 15 (6.2%).

Correlations between the independent and dependant variables were sought; only the significant crosstabulations will be discussed.

Survey Question 1 was "What do you know about archaeology in general?" The results show that 12.1% of the total population of the sample group knew nothing about archaeology, 66.8% knew very little, 19% knew a moderate amount, and only 2.2% knew a great deal (Figure 2). In the crosstabulation groups, the white collar respondents knew the least with 1.9%. When comparing educational backgrounds, respondents with higher than a bachelor's degree knew the most about archaeology in general, 8.6%.

Question 2 was "What do you know about your state's archaeology?" 20.7% knew nothing about Michigan archaeology, 66.4% knew very little, 9.9% knew a moderate amount, and 3% knew a great deal (Figure 3).
Figure 2. Knowledge About General Archaeology.

Figure 3. Knowledge About Michigan Archaeology.
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Knowledge of state archaeology crosstabulations revealed that the professional group knew the most with 7.3%; in the educational category, those with more than a high school education scored 7.2%; in the age category, the over 60 group scored 6.7% while the 14-20 year old age group knew the least, 0%.

The results of question 3 asking, "What does an archaeologist do?", was surprising. The average respondent in all groups, or 60% to 78%, knew what an archaeologist did, although they had previously professed a high degree of ignorance about the subject in general. The answers of the 22 to 40% of the group who did not know what an archaeologist did included:

"Digs holes and looks for old relics."
"Looks for valuable artifacts."
"Studies rock formations."
"Studies earth formations."
"Digs in ruins."
"Digs for bones and stones."
"Digs for old 'whatever'."
"Digs for dinosaurs and bones."
"Looks at rocks."

Question 4, "Where would you locate an archaeologist?", produced 15 different answers. Out of the total population sample, 40.8% chose a college or university; 27.2% said a museum; 13.8% did not know; 1.7% said the Department of Natural Resources; 7.8% said the Yellow Pages; 0.4% answered equally state agencies, boards of education, local archaeological society, police department, high school teacher, word of mouth, information (telephone), and city government; 0.9% said the local li-
brary; and one person said "under a rock", which may or may not be taken seriously.

Of the specific groups, the professionals, those with higher than a bachelor degree, and the over 60 age groups had the highest percentage, averaging 62.7% knowledge about where to locate an archaeologist.

Question 5, "Have you visited any museums or archaeological sites in your state or others?", reveals that 97% of the total population sample visited archaeological sites and museums. The Grand Rapids museum was visited by 198 people, the Chicago Field museum by 86 people, the Smithsonian by 56 people, Fort Michilimackinac by 161 people, 58 respondents visited 58 sites and museums in foreign countries, 29 people visited the Norton Indian Mounds, and 16 people traveled to western sites. All of them expressed great pleasure and interest in these activities. No one specific group in the crosstabulation could be singled out as having a greater or lesser percentage of visitations.

Question 6 was "What media on archaeology have you been exposed to?". It consisted of six subquestions on exposure to the media of archaeological books, journals, magazines, television, newspapers and radio. Of the total population, 29.3% of the respondents had read books on archaeology. The 14-20 year age group read the most books with the highest percent of 45.2%, followed by the student group with 38.2%, professionals with 36.4%, while
the rest of the groups averaged around 24%. This observation could mean that archaeology is slowly entering the school systems.

Archaeological journals were read the least. Only 10.8% of the total population had ever read any journals. The highest percent in the crosstabulation of journal readers were the respondents in the higher than a bachelor degree category with 17.9%.

Magazine stories were read the most with 86.2% of the total population involved, marginally greater than television viewing (81.9%) and newspaper reading (82.3%). One reason for the high magazine reading percentage was the popularity of the National Geographic magazine, read by 198 respondents. The Smithsonian magazine followed with 56 readers. The professional group had the highest percent of magazine readers (94.5%) while the blue collar group had the lowest (77.8%). All the groups were in a high percentage range.

The housewife group ranked the highest, 100%, both in television viewing and newspaper reading. The rest of the groups were high, also.

Question 7, "Have you read anything on Michigan archaeology?", shows that 51.7% of the total population sample had read or studied Michigan archaeology. The crosstabulation groups did not differ greatly in comparison. Some of the respondents had mini archaeology classes in the public schools, some had classes in
college, while a few people had studied while on archaeolog­ical digs.

Question 8a asked, "Do you approve of supporting archaeology financially?" Of the total population sample, 90.5% approved, 9.1% did not, and 0.4% did not know. This was a higher percent approval than the 53% in Gutierrez's study who supported financing preservation of archaeological sites (Gutierrez 1980:9). Question 8b was "How would you support archaeology; tax funds, private funds, or both?" Of the sample, 33.6% would fund support by taxation, 24.6% would use private funds (corporations, foundations, grants, and private individuals), 30.6% would prefer taxes and private funds, while 8.6% would not give any support. Question 8c was "Would you rather support the fine arts in lieu of archaeology?" The results were surprising. Of the sample, 35.3% chose archaeology, 2.2% chose fine arts, 29.7% would support fine arts and archaeology equally, 6.9% would share support but would give the greater amount to archaeology, 17.7% sharing the disciplines would give the greater amount to the arts, and 8.2% would not give support to either one.

In the crosstabulation study on question 8a, all specific groups approved of financing archaeology. The percentage of approval ran approximately 90%. Questions 8b and 8c showed no significant variations for the specific groups compared to the total population sample with the exception of the student group. Student approval for
financing archaeology by taxation was 50%, 20% higher than other groups.

Question 9 was "Do you approve of supporting Michigan archaeology in the same manner?" The percentage of approval for supporting Michigan archaeology was about the same as archaeology in general. The degree of support ran in the 90 percent range as did the specific groups in the crosstabulations.

Question 10 asked "Would you like to find out more about archaeology?" The results show that 78.4% of the total population was interested in finding out more about archaeology. Of the specific groups, 92.3% of the females and 75.5% of the males wished for more information. By occupation, 100% of the housewives wanted more knowledge, while the rest of the groups averaged around 75%. By education, the bachelor degree group was the lowest with 73.9%. Among the age groups, the 21-30 respondents ranged the highest with 92.1% The rest of the groups averaged around 75%. These results revealed that a large number of people are interested in learning about archaeology if this survey is a reliable sample of the general public.

Question 11, "Would you like to find out more about Michigan archaeology?", showed an interest of 78.4% in Michigan archaeology, slightly lower than interest in general archaeology. However, the housewife group still had a 100% interest. They said they were eager to know
more about their own state. Seven of the interviewees were surprised to learn that the study of archaeology existed in Michigan.

Question 12 asked, "Are you familiar with the term 'cultural resource management?'" The interviewer probed very carefully by asking the respondents the definition of each word and how they would apply it to the field of archaeology. In spite of the probing, only 13.4% of the population knew. Of the crosstabulation sample, only 15.1% of the males and 2.6% of the females knew what cultural resource meant. In the occupational group, professionals had the highest percent of 18.2%, and surprisingly, blue collar workers followed with 17.8%. In the occupational group, the higher than bachelor degree group had the highest score of 17.9%. In the age classification, the 31-40 group had the highest score of 20.3%. These results were very low compared to Gutierrez's (1980) survey. Almost half of her responding population thought they knew what the term meant.

Question 13a was "If you found an artifact on your property, would you notify or consult with an archaeologist?" 83.6% of the total population would notify an archaeologist if they found an artifact, 6.9% would not, and 9.5% said it would depend on the possible value or uniqueness of the artifact. The crosstabulation groups averaged around 85% with the exception of the over 60 year age group which scored 100%.
Question 13b asked, "Would you donate the artifact to the state or a museum?" The results show that 66.4% of the total population would donate the artifact to the state or a museum, 8.6% would not, while 25% said it would depend on the value of the artifact. In the crosstabulation sample, the housewife group would donate 100%, the age group of over 60 years would donate 93.3%, and the rest of the groups averaged around 65% in their willingness to donate their artifact to a museum or state.

Question 13c was "If you had a collection of artifacts, would you share them or consult with an archaeologist?" The results show that 82.3% of the total population would share or consult with an archaeologist if they had an artifact collection, 17.2% would not, and 0.5% said it would depend on the value of the collection. A few of the respondents had artifact collections which they guarded closely. There was no significant change in the crosstabulation groups.

Question 13d asked, "Are you aware of any local archaeological society?" The majority of the total population, 91.8% had not heard of the local Coffinberry Chapter of the Michigan Archaeological Society. Of the crosstabulation groups, the blue collar respondents had the highest score of 15.6%. In the education category, the people attending college had the highest score of
14.1%. In the age groups, the 41-50 group had the highest record of 15.5%.

Question 14 asked, "Are you familiar with the magazine, *Archaeology*?" The scores were very low, although this magazine is a fairly popular bimonthly periodical, written so lay people can easily understand and enjoy articles about archaeology. Only 8.2% of the total population had heard of it. The percentage of over 90% occurred in both the total population and crosstabulation of respondents who had never heard of the magazine.

In the crosstabulation of specific groups, there was not one group that consistently knew more about the complete archaeological picture than the other groups. With few exceptions, each question produced about the same percentage of knowledge in each of the specific groups.

Conclusions

The conclusions drawn from the results of this survey are listed below.

The first assumption that most people have an elementary knowledge about the field of archaeology proved to be correct, as 66.8% of the respondents said they knew a little bit about the subject. Only 2.2% really understood the field of archaeology. However, the fact that the interviewees knew more about what an archaeologist did (60% to 78%) was thought provoking. It could
possibly mean that the respondents separate the subject matter of archaeology from the field work of the archaeologist. Or it could mean that an elementary knowledge of the subject is sufficient to discern what an archaeologist does. Knowledge of Michigan archaeology was about the same, 66.4%, while only 3% of the population knew a great deal about the subject.

While 68% of the interviewees knew where to find an archaeologist, some of them gave strange answers as stated in the summary of the findings.

The 97% of the population sample who had visited museums and archaeological sites showed a great interest in archaeology and their own heritage. In Gutierrez's study, 98% of her survey sample had expressed the same interest (Gutierrez 1980). Of the people who were informed about archaeology through the media, 86.2% were informed by magazine reading, 82.3% by newspaper reading and the 82.3% by television viewing, expressing great interest in archaeology.

The second assumption that the majority of the population sample would approve of supporting archaeological research financially proved to be 90.5% true, with people dividing their preference into 33.6% for taxation, 24.6% for private funding, and 30.6% for a combination of tax and private funds.

The fact that 78.4% of the total population sample wished to find out more about archaeology, especially the
housewife group, reveals the need to better communicate this information to the general public.

More proof that the public wants to cooperate and communicate with archaeologists is shown in this study where 83.6% of the total population sample would notify an archaeologist if they found an artifact, 66.4% of them would donate the artifact to the state or a museum, and 82.3% of them would share or consult with an archaeologist if they had an artifact collection.

The overall picture of archaeology shows promising public support. However, there is a communication problem between archaeologists and the public. Only a few of the respondents realized that their tax dollars were supporting archaeology, but only a small percentage of them complained when they did find out. Archaeologists, state and federal agencies could do a great deal more to provide the public with evidence and popular materials to prove that their tax dollars are doing an important job in reconstructing the past. In the following chapter, recommendations for the archaeology profession will be suggested.
CHAPTER VII

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE ARCHAEOLOGY PROFESSION

Recommendations for the archaeology profession derived from this study are as follows:

1. Have more responsible media exposure on archaeology released to the public.

2. Organize more archaeologists and supporters to work with the federal (most important), state and local legislative systems and their agencies, which control the funds for archaeological research programs.

3. Work with the National and State Councils for the Humanities.

4. Develop conservancy programs for important archaeological land sites. Seek voluntary protection from landowners for sites.

5. In large archaeological research projects, utilize media programs for public information.

6. Develop a program to make archaeological projects popular with the public, perhaps patterned after The National Audubon Society.
Media Exposure on Archaeology

This study showed that only 2.2% of the total population of 232 people interviewed were knowledgeable about the field of archaeology. Archaeologists and the media are not reaching the majority of our public. The media, particularly magazine reading (mostly National Geographic), television, and newspapers reached the most people. No one in the study had heard of any archaeological reports on the radio.

Recommendations for archaeologists would be to release more understandable mass media publications to the public, especially the media listed above, if we want the public to be properly informed about the field. The preservation of our cultural resources depends on the public's appreciation of them and knowledge of how to protect them. McGimsey states that you cannot influence anyone about a subject if you do not communicate effectively with her/him (McGimsey 1972:40).

Other methods of educating the public recommended by Emerson (1980:12) for the archaeology profession are: presentations; lectures, slide and tape shows; film or video shows; interpretive programs; visitor orientations; brochures; involvement with local amateur or preservation groups; internships for pay, credit, experience; education coordinators on staffs; assisting in development of education curricula; assisting with workshops, training
sessions, and conferences.

Archaeologists and the Agencies Legislature/Government

Archaeologists agree with this survey study that archaeological knowledge has to be communicated to the public for protection and preservation of our cultural resources (E. Davis 1978; H. Davis 1985; Emerson 1980; Fowler 1987; Friedman 1974; Frison 1984; Gumerman 1988; Keel 1979; Knudsen 1981; Macleod 1977; McGimsey 1972; Pritchard 1973; Reinburg 1981; Rippeteau 1979; Walthall 1979).

The professional responsibility for archaeologists to work with the government is stressed by the following scholars: Emerson (1980), Fowler (1987), Friedman (1970), Macleod (1977), McGimsey (1972), Reinburg (1986), and Vitalii (1980). Archaeologists must work with the federal government because it supports most of the archaeological research programs (Macleod 1977:72). Macleod states that archaeology has to be sold to the government because it has access to public thinking and reaction on a broad basis, and, of course, the public ultimately supplies the funds. McGimsey (1972:5-7) believes archaeologists should learn how best to involve and enlist amateurs in the discipline for further support in communicating with the public and government.

McGimsey (1972), Macleod (1977) and Vitalii (1980)
emphasize the importance of learning the legislative process, its jargon, and the use of simple archaeological language to get needed bills passed. McGimsey (1972:34) suggests having a shepherd, or a good lobbyist, to herd the bill through the various necessary steps and stages until, finally, it is signed into law. Macleod encourages professionals to recognize allies in government, learn the legislative language, and then use it to the archaeologist's advantage (1977:69).

Vitalli explains how legislation is a useful educational tool. Laws against the sale of pillaged artifacts are helpful for impressing on the public the seriousness and reality of illicit trade. She points out that dealers in artifacts have a very powerful lobby and are on a first name basis with congressmen. Dealers conduct seminars and lectures where they suggest disastrous consequences if these protective laws are passed. They never attack their opposition but merely call archaeologists naive. They have convinced museums and private collectors (coins, antiques, and other art forms) that their innocent hobbies and treasured investments are threatened by any protective legislation (Vitalli 1980:558-561).

There are examples of archaeologists working successfully with government agencies. Fowler (1987) relates how the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) has worked closely with the Secretary of the Interior, Donald Hodel, and the Office of Surface Mining to resolve issues
on federal rules governing treatment of cultural re-
sources threatened by strip mining. Fowler also strongly
believes that archaeologists have a professional respon-
sibility to initiate and back laws protecting our cul-
tural resources (Fowler 1987:214-216).

Another example is described by Reinburg (1986:3-4). Fiscal year 1987 funds for the Historic Preservation Fund were to be drastically reduced from the previous year, and intensive lobbying had to be undertaken in order to retain HPF funding levels.

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1966 and implementing regulations stress the need for public awareness and participation in policy, planning, and programs (Friedman 1979). Friedman states that federal agencies are conscious of their responsibilities to serve the public, and meet these responsibilities by holding public workshops and meetings so proposed programs and policies will become known. These are published in the Federal Register, and mailings of these programs are also sent out to interested and concerned people (Friedman 1979:31).

Emerson (1980:12-13) describes how various agencies are addressing the needs of the general public. The Interagency Archaeological Services are encouraging site visitations by the public as well as having professional student interns and land managers. The Bureau of Land Management emphasizes brochures, site interpretative
programs and visitor orientations, and slide and tape shows. The National Forest Service centers on brochures, presentations, lectures, slide and tape shows, and involvement with local groups. They have training programs for their own personnel, including technical training on legal responsibilities and site recognition. The main emphasis in State Historic Preservation Offices is on the development of, or participation in, workshops, training sessions, and conferences. Following closely in importance are presentations and lectures; involvement with local groups; non-technical publications and brochures; internships and volunteer programs; and slide and tape shows. Some states have assisted in the development of public school education curricula.

National and State Councils for the Humanities

Many academic and professional archaeologists have discovered they can reach new audiences by working through the National Council for the Humanities (NEH) within their own State Council for the Humanities. There are Councils in each of the fifty states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Each Council makes grant awards through a competitive review process to nonprofit organizations and groups for public projects in a wide variety of settings: museums, libraries, college campuses, Indian reservations and church and grange halls (Anthropology Newsletter 1988:1).
Two examples of cooperative efforts through state Councils for the Humanities can be found in Arkansas and Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. The Arkansas Endowment for the Humanities (AEH) collaborated with the Arkansas Archaeological Survey and the University Museum at the University of Arkansas to produce "Crossroads of the Past," three 16-panel traveling photographic exhibits that focus on the state's prehistoric and historic Indian cultures. The exhibits will feature photographs from the Paleo-Indian Period through the time of their historically recorded Caddo, Quapaw and Osage tribes. It will also cover both the 19th Century Indian immigrants to Arkansas and contemporary Native American cultures in the state. The exhibit will give out information about recent archaeological findings to a widespread audience without risking the artifacts themselves. Hester Davis, Arkansas State Archaeologist, will act as project coordinator and Charles McGimsey III will supplement with other written material (Anthropology Newsletter 1988:1).

The Center for Archaeological Investigations at Southern Illinois University (Gumerman 1988:1) has, with grants from the Illinois Humanities Council, produced a slide and tape presentation on the archaeology of southern Illinois. This presentation is loaned to schools and local groups. The grants also funded publication of a booklet called "The Prehistoric Peoples of Southern Illinois" by James S. Penny, Jr. In this manner, archaeolo-
gists are giving back results of their research to the wider public who underwrite their activities (Gumerman 1988:1).

Conservancy Programs

Conservancy programs are not unusual for environmentally sensitive and significant lands. Public lands are protected by law. Archaeologists could purchase archaeological sites on private lands, which are not protected and thus are subject to the whims of the owners. Stewart Udall (1987), chairman of the Archaeological Conservancy for site preservation, states that forty-one of the most important archaeological sites left in the United States have been saved through conservancy projects and work is being done to save as many as possible. Funds are solicited from archaeologists, the public, foundations, and corporations. In seven years, over 2.2 million dollars have been spent in buying archaeological sites in Ohio, Kentucky, Arizona, Missouri, Colorado, California, New Mexico, Arkansas, Oklahoma and Texas. Land sites are obtained by purchase, trade, and donations. The land sites will be managed on a 100 year plan in accordance with the principles of conservation archaeology. They will be only available to qualified researchers who will leave a portion of sites unexcavated for scholars of the future.

A second example of preserving sites and providing
public education is a plan proposed by the Tennessee Archaeological Society. The state buys the land and develops it for public education. This plan consists of preparing the site, staffing it with competent management, instigating long term excavation, reconstructing important features, displaying the artifacts in a museum on the site, and using Indian guides for the interpretation of Indian sites. Ten of the finest sites will become state parks. Examples of these sites are: Chucalessa Site in T.O. Fuller State Park; Hugh Link Farm and Dover Flint Quarry; the Mississippi Ceremonial Site of Obion Mounds near Paris, Tennessee; and the Fortified Mound Bottom Site in Cheatham County (Pritchard 1973a:121-124, 1973b:141-146).

A third conservancy program suggested by the author would be to seek voluntary protection from landowners who have archaeological sites on their property. Two examples of cooperation with landowners and archaeologists are the Spoonville and Zematis sites located on the lower Grand River in Ottawa County, Michigan. These landowners allowed archaeologist Richard Flanders and his students permission to excavate sites on their property for an unlimited time period (R. Flanders, personal communication, 1988). Under this type of scenario, if funds are not immediately available for site study, landowners could be enrolled in a site preservation program and agree not to disturb the site through development, farm-
ing, or other site destructive processes.

Media Programs for Large Archaeological Projects

Two examples of large archaeological projects which have used media programs are the Illinois Interstate 270, a five year right-of-way project forming a twenty-one mile transect around the greater St. Louis metropolitan area, and Michigan's extensive, two year archaeological study of the US-31 freeway corridor stretching twenty miles across central Berrien County from Matthew Road northwest of Niles to I-94 near Benton Harbor.

Illinois devised a program consisting of four major media efforts. Publications consisted of popular brochures and booklets and a series of scientific reports. Public lectures, slide presentations, and on-site inspections were undertaken. An interpretive display by the Public Affairs Bureau at the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT), including regional prehistory, was seen by 25,000 people at the Illinois State Fair, and audiovisual presentations producing a series of videotape and film documentaries of I-270 archaeology research was distributed around the county (Walthall 1979:2-4).

In Michigan, the US-31 freeway corridor project under the Department of Transportation was a similar situation. Media efforts consisted of a popular booklet, a series of scientific reports, public lectures, television and radio coverage of the ongoing excavations, slide
presentations, and on-site inspections by local Indian groups. The media efforts were observed by the author, a crew member on the project.

The results of these two communication projects for the public have been encouraging. They have generated a surprising amount of public interest in the projects. The US-31 Project had problems with Native Americans who thought their sacred burial grounds were being violated. However, these problems were eventually resolved in meetings with the Native Americans and the Project group. Another result has been a better understanding and appreciation of archaeology by construction personnel and public officials.

A National Amateur Archaeology Society

Formation of a National Amateur Archaeology Society is suggested by the author. The public is fascinated by archaeology, although they are not very knowledgeable about the actual workings of the discipline. If the National Audubon Society could successfully form the first (1886) bird preservation organization in the country led by George Grinnell and eastern society women, why cannot archeologists do the same for archaeology and site preservation? Junior archaeology clubs in classrooms could be patterned after the Junior Audubon Club, started in 1910. In twenty-five years, more than 24 million children passed through the program. Today, the Audubon So-
ciety has 550,000 members, promotes field trips, education centers, and protects over 250,000 wildlife acres (D. Newhouse, personal communication, 1988).

Local amateur archaeology societies are not well known by the public, although the public seems interested in learning and participating in archaeology programs. Perhaps professional archaeologists could form a committee to organize a program for interested amateurs, coordinating local levels, regional levels with the national level at the top to promote a good National Amateur Archaeology Society. Using the media, archeology leaders could inform the interested public about this possibility. This society would communicate knowledge and responsibility for preservation of our cultural resources, as well as be an advocate for the necessary legislation, enforcement, and funding needed to further the goals of our discipline.
APPENDIX

Demographic Questions and Survey Questions

Demographic Questions

Question 1: Sex?
0 = Male
1 = Female

Question 2: Marital status?
0 = Married
1 = Single

Question 3: Occupation?
0 = Student
1 = Blue collar
2 = Professional
3 = Business
4 = White collar
5 = Housewife

Question 4: Education?
0 = Less than high school
1 = High school diploma or equivalent
2 = Attended college, no 4 year diploma
3 = Bachelors degree
4 = Masters, Phd., attorney, MD, DDS, etc.

Question 5: Age group?
0 = 14-20
1 = 21-30
2 = 31-40
3 = 41-50
4 = 51-60
5 = over 60
Survey Questions

Question 1: What do you know about archaeology in general?
0 = Nothing
1 = Very little
2 = Moderate amount
3 = A great deal

Question 2: What do you know about your state's archaeology?
0 = Nothing
1 = Very little
2 = Moderate amount
3 = A great deal

Question 3: Do you know what an archaeologist does?
0 = No
1 = Yes

Question 4: Where would you find one?
01 = College or University
02 = Museum
03 = Don't know
04 = Yellow pages
05 = Department of Natural Resources
06 = State Agencies
07 = Board of Education
08 = Library
09 = Local Archaeological Society
10 = Police Department
11 = High school teachers
12 = Word of mouth
13 = Information
14 = City government
15 = Under a rock
Question 5: Have you visited any museums, or archaeological sites in your state or others?

0 = No
1 = Yes

Question 6a-f: What media on archaeology have you been exposed to?

Question 6a: Books?

0 = No
1 = Yes

Question 6b: Journals?

0 = No
1 = Yes

Question 6c: Magazines?

0 = No
1 = Yes

Question 6d: Television?

0 = No
1 = Yes

Question 6e: Newspapers?

0 = No
1 = Yes

Question 6f: Radio?

0 = No
1 = Yes

Question 7: Have you read anything on Michigan archaeology?

0 = No
1 = Yes
Question 8: Do you approve of supporting archaeology financially?

0 = No
1 = Yes

Question 8a: How would you support archaeology? Tax funds, private funds, or both?

0 = No support
1 = Tax funds
2 = Private funds
3 = Both equally
4 = Both but more money coming from private funds
5 = Both but more money coming from tax funds

Question 8b: Would you rather support fine arts in lieu of archaeology, or would you rather they share support?

0 = No support
1 = Support the arts instead of archaeology
2 = Support archaeology instead of the arts
3 = Share support between the two
4 = Share, but more support for archaeology
5 = Share, but more support for the arts

Question 9: Do you approve of supporting Michigan archaeology in the same manner?

0 = No
1 = Yes

Question 10: Would you like to find out more about archaeology?

0 = No
1 = Yes
Question 11: Would you like to find out more about Michigan archaeology?
0 = No
1 = Yes

Question 12: Are you familiar with the term Cultural Resource Management?
0 = No
1 = Yes

Question 13: If you found an artifact on your property, would you notify or consult with an archaeologist?
0 = No
1 = Yes
2 = Depends

Question 13a: Would you donate the artifact to the state or a museum?
0 = No
1 = Yes
2 = Depends

Question 13b: If you had a collection of artifacts, would you share them or consult with an archaeologist?
0 = No
1 = Yes
2 = Depends

Question 13c: Are you aware of any local archaeological organization?
0 = No
1 = Yes

Question 14: Are you familiar with the magazine "Archaeology?"
0 = No
1 = Yes
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