

The Society for Pennsylvania Archaeology, Inc. Newsletter Winter 2004-2005

Archaeology in the State and the State of the SPA

At a time when the SPA faces declining membership, it's difficult to turn down an application for a new chapter of the society. That, however, is just what I and the other members of the board decided to do recently in the case of the Frankford Museum Society (FMS). We certainly need new SPA members (see my recent plea in *Pennsylvania Archaeologist* Volume 74, Number 1) and a new chapter is always welcome, but the FMS's petition came with strings attached. When the board members examined the FMS petition in detail and had a chance to consider some of those strings, we decided that opportunity for new members had to be sacrificed to principle. The whole experience was eye-opening for me in several ways. I believe it reflects some disturbing realities about the state of archaeology in Pennsylvania and the role of the SPA.

Last summer, we received a request from Gary Yannone, president of the Frankford Museum Society, to consider the petition of the FMS to become a new chapter. Having heard rumors about Yannone's activities at a site on his property and concerned that the petition was an indirect attempt to obtain legitimacy for those activities and validate the site, I suggested to the board that a delegation of SPA members visit Yannone and discuss the FMS's activities before making a decision. The delegation—Rick Geidel, Paul Nevin, Philip Perazio and myself—visited 36Cu190 and met with Yannone and Jeff Kottmyer of the FMS on August 24. All of us came away with serious doubts about the site, the activities of the FMS, and its petition to become a chapter of the society.

Those doubts fell under two general headings:

1. We saw no evidence that the members of the FMS had a substantial history of involvement with the SPA, or with the aims and practices of scientific archaeology in Pennsylvania. The members of a new chapter typically have had a long record of involvement with the statewide organization and one or more local chapters. Aside from Yannone and Kottmyer, none of the

FMS members seem to have been SPA members or to have familiarized themselves with the goals and methods of modern archaeology. There are other local chapters nearby. Why hadn't the FMS members involved themselves in the activities of those chapters?

2. The close ties between the FMS and site 36Cu190 suggested the lack of a broader basis of experience in Pennsylvania archaeology. The nearly exclusive interest of Yannone and his associates in the FMS seemed to be with the putative Paleoindian component at 36Cu190. Our visit left us with serious reservations about that component, the activities of the FMS at the site and, more importantly, the presentation to the public of those activities as responsible scientific archaeology.

Yannone has suggested that the site represents a Paleoindian "vision quest" site and that all the oddly shaped rocks he has collected from the site are, in fact, early rock art. During the visit, I saw perhaps two (unprovenanced) items that *might* have been bifacial tools (not rock art). None of the dozens of other items presented to us were convincing as anything other than naturally eroded specimens of locally occurring rocks. The natural setting of the site, in a steep-sided V-shaped valley with heavily eroded valley walls, is not consistent with the presence of old and stable soils. I find it hard to imagine that the soils from which these rock art specimens have been plucked are more than 200 years old, never mind 20,000 years. This assertion could be tested, but I doubt that it will be. While Gary Yannone is certainly free to propose and believe any theories he likes about what happened in prehistory at 36Cu190, the supporting evidence is just not there.

Nevertheless, Yannone and associates have presented the site as a 15,000-20,000 year old rock art site (Harrisburg *Patriot-News*, November 13, 2004), citing the confirmation of an "internationally recognized" Russian "rock art scholar." Why a Russian scholar had to be

enlisted to study an eastern North American rock art site is a question never addressed in the newspaper article. I responded to the November 13 newspaper article by calling the *Patriot-News* reporter and suggesting that he might want to dig a little deeper into the story and discuss the FMS and the site with other archaeologists. Fortunately, the reporter was interested and sensitive to the concerns I outlined. The result was a front-page article in the *Patriot-News* on December 15 that presented a considerably more balanced picture of Yannone's claims without turning the issue into a tale of David (the bold challengers to archaeological orthodoxy) versus Goliath (the heavies of the scientific establishment, including the SPA). I hope the rebuttal helped, but I believe that the experience with Yannone and the FMS forces us to confront some unpleasant realities about the nature of the public's interest and understanding of archaeology: what it's all about, what we know and don't know, and what constitutes good archaeological practice

On the basis of our experiences during the site visit, the delegation recommended that the FMS petition be declined. The board voted accordingly at its October meeting, citing concerns about the purposes to which the FMS's work at 36Cu190 had been put and the misrepresentation of archaeology to the public.

And that's the core of my concern: not that Yannone chooses to believe the he has an early rock art site conveniently located on his property or that that the site might be the locus of some vaguely defined Paleoindian vision quest, but that he has convinced the thirty other members of the FMS and a substantial chunk of the interested public that the activities at the site and this interpretation represent legitimate scientific archaeology. Yannone and the FMS have brought Boy Scout and school groups to the site, presented their findings in various public venues, and hope to expand their outreach to other segments of the wide audience for archaeology (through newspaper coverage, for example, like the *Patriot-News* article just mentioned). In his response to the letter denying the FMS petition, Yannone claims that he is "in search of science fact, not science fiction." But he persists in presenting to his audience the age and nature of the site as established and based on scientific archaeology.

We, the members of the SPA and the archaeological community in Pennsylvania, have failed in our goal of educating the public about archaeology if this sort of poorly conceived and executed "archaeology" is accepted as legitimate and scientific. Yannone's claims seem to have met with general credulity. I suspect that many people presented with these claims are incapable of evaluating their validity, not through any failure of logic or intelligence but because they haven't been educated about the goals and practices of archaeology as a discipline (see Philip Perazio's contribution in this newsletter). I can't help connecting our failures in public education to the declining membership of the SPA and the frequent hostility we as archaeologists face when public funds are expended for work that few seem to understand or value.

The FMS has marshaled a lot of enthusiasm and tapped a vein of public interest in archaeology and the study of the past. It's too bad that they have captured the attention of the public while the efforts of trained and competent archaeologists at dozens of fascinating sites across the state and the country are ignored. We all should understand the need for informing the public about the aims and methods of scientific archaeology; education is one of the SPA's core purposes. It is considerably more difficult to decide what to do. One suggestion: take some time to contact your local newspaper and let a reporter know about what is happening in archaeology in your area or about the many sites across Pennsylvania that are revealing important new glimpses of the past. If you don't feel confident in doing that, remember that the SPA is a network of hundreds of archaeologists, many of whom would be glad to help. A well-written article in your local paper might correct some misconceptions and would publicize good archaeology. Who knows, we might even attract some new members. **Paul Raber, President, SPA**

**LOST VALLEY, SCIENCE, AND
ARCHAEOLOGY**
Philip A. Perazio, Past President, SPA

During the past year, the Society for Pennsylvania Archaeology was confronted with the question of how to respond to the issue of the 'Lost Valley artifacts'. Our assessment of these purported pieces of Paleoindian sculpture is presented in the SPA's letter to Gary Yannone prepared by Paul

Raber (see previous article). I don't want to rehash the specific details of that issue, which are sufficiently discussed by Paul. Rather, I'd like to present for your consideration what I believe are the wider implications of this controversy. These are my own views, and there is likely to be some range of opinion among SPA members regarding my interpretation.

Although there has been some debate over the years, I think that most of us consider archaeology, at least as we try to practice it, as a science, or at least science-like. We want to understand how people behaved in the past, and why. We gather data in a systematic, controlled manner, derive statistical characterizations of what we find, develop and test hypotheses, try to identify similarities and differences in patterns of artifacts and their distributions, etc., etc. We hope that in this manner we can gradually come to a better and more complete understanding of the people we study.

As in any science, especially those dealing with human beings, we cannot expect to ever come to the one complete and perfect understanding of the past. Our knowledge will continue to grow as we develop new techniques and new methods of interpretation. We know more now than we did fifty years ago, and will know even more in the future. However, our understanding does not necessarily progress in a straight line. There are fits and spurts, periods during which we think we have a good grasp of a particular topic, and other times when nothing seems to make sense. That's the way science works. It's not always pretty, and sometimes there are what later turn out to be significant errors in interpretation. One need only think of the changes in our view of the peopling of the Western Hemisphere. A bit more than a hundred years ago, C. C. Abbott and others argued for a glacial age occupations in North America. Then, the pendulum swung to a very short chronology. Later, the Folsom find pushed the date back to the end of the last glacial. That ultimately led to the "Clovis First" orthodoxy, which stood, essentially unchallenged, for a number of years. Now, with Monte Verde, Cactus Hill, and perhaps Topper, the date may be pushed back yet again.

Were all previous interpretations simply wrong, examples of bad science? Sometimes that may have been the case, but more often the proponents of earlier views were doing the best they could with what they had available. It frequently takes a

new and completely unexpected discovery, or a novel way of putting together the pieces we already have to reveal a different and more comprehensive picture. There will always be those who diligently work away at filling the gaps in the existing framework, and those who push the envelope. The balance between the two is necessarily a dynamic one, but the bottom line is that for any new view to gain wide acceptance it has to be clearly better at putting the pieces together than the existing interpretation.

A new interpretation cannot be accepted simply because it's bright and shiny, or suits the popular mood. It's validity has to be demonstrated by good, solid science according to procedures and criteria that are generally recognized by people in the field as being the basis on which credible work is done. Otherwise, the evaluation of scientific interpretations would be no better than a popularity contest, in which all viewpoints are considered equally valid.

William Henry Holmes and Ales Hrdlicka refuted the glacial age attribution of the Abbott Farm materials by demonstrating errors in the interpretations of stratigraphy and lithic technology. The Folsom find was ultimately accepted because of solid association between the point and the bones of an extinct bison. Over the past few decades, a number of purported pre-Clovis sites have been presented. However, none were found by the majority of archaeologists to measure up to the strict standards needed in order to overthrow the existing paradigm. Pennsylvania's Meadowcroft Rockshelter was among those that came the closest to fitting the bill. However, there was just enough doubt to keep the majority of archaeologists from taking the plunge. Now, with Monte Verde etc., we may now feel more comfortable about accepting pre-Clovis occupations at Meadowcroft. Does this mean that the majority was wrong in its reticence to embrace this site as demonstrating the existence of earlier occupations? Or, were Jim Adovasio and the others who championed the latter view better scientists than the rest? Neither is the case. This is simply the normal rough and tumble of how science works.

Many years ago, I attended an Archaeological Society of New Jersey meeting that included a presentation on C. C. Abbott by Herb Kraft. The title of Herb's talk was something like 'Right for the Wrong Reasons'. The point was that Abbott had been correct about human presence in North

America during the Pleistocene, if perhaps only at its very end, even though his evidence for that interpretation was not valid. Howard Winters, who was then my advisor at NYU, and who was also present at the meeting, remarked to me that he would rather be wrong for the right reasons than right for the wrong reasons.

Science improves our knowledge of the world by constantly testing and questioning. Sometimes the new understanding comes in little bits, and sometimes in big leaps. However, the process is grounded on an established base of knowledge and a set of procedures in which practitioners in the given field have confidence. We do not have to reinvent the wheel each time we drive a car. Similarly, in archaeology, we have developed a set of understandings regarding how to evaluate the context of artifacts and the patterns of their distributions and associations. This is not to say that either we or our methods are infallible. But, it does mean that anyone who wants to propose some new observation or interpretation that radically departs from the current understanding must be held to a high level of proof.

There continue to be people who believe the world is flat, that aliens have visited the earth, that cold fusion is possible, and myriad other ideas that float on the margins of science. Archaeology has certainly been plagued by such fringe interpretations (e.g., Chariots of the Gods, extensive Celtic or other ancient European or African occupations of the Western Hemisphere). Such ideas have a tendency to elicit a response from elements of the public who are ignorant of archaeology and often have little understanding of how science in general works. The difficulty many people have in judging the difference between what is within the realm of possibility and what is highly unlikely is, I think, a manifestation of the failure of our educational system to provide a basic grounding in the scientific method and the epistemology of science. This leaves much of the population open to all sorts of pseudo-science. Whatever seems to be the most splashy or comforting new idea attracts a credulous following. In such an environment, those of us who try to uphold the value of meticulous research based on established knowledge tend to be portrayed as stodgy old academics stuck in their ivory tower, and unable to see beyond their narrow preconceptions.

The SPA does not have the ability to overcome the effects of such massive mis-education.

Furthermore, the popular press, in an attempt to achieve a false balance and objectivity, will frequently present wildly unscientific conjectures on an equal footing with legitimate scientific hypotheses. Any attempt to actively counter the unlikely interpretation of the Lost Valley artifacts would quickly descend into an endless series of claims and counter-claims, with no basis for evaluating their relative merits other than transitory popularity. Such an effort would be a fool's errand. Consequently, we have decided not to pursue the issue beyond the response to Mr. Yannone already issued.

The Lost Valley artifacts do not appear to meet the necessary level of scientific proof for acceptance as objects deserving of serious examination. Perhaps we are wrong, and these objects represent an as yet unrecognized aspect of ancient Native American culture. If so, Mr. Yannone and his associates need to do a lot more solid scientific research in order to demonstrate this. A basic element in such research would be for members of that group to become familiar with the fundamentals of archaeology. We have presented an invitation to these individuals to join nearby SPA chapters and participate with us in archaeological research. We hope they will accept.

In the mean time, we chose to base ourselves in the current state of knowledge, which has been painstakingly built over many years. We may be wrong, but if so, we're wrong for the right reasons.

**Pennsylvania Historical and
Museum Commission
Bureau for Historic Preservation
The Commonwealth's
Archaeology Program (CAP)**

Recent Activities
Submitted by **Doug McLearn**

Site Excavations at 36LA1100

The CAP program of BHP has continued the exploration and excavation of Site 36LA1100, the "Quaker Hills Quarry Site", located in Lancaster County near Millersville. The site is a Funk-Phase, Shenks Ferry village that appears to cover about four acres. As already reported in this Fall's newsletter, it is estimated that about one half to two thirds of this total acreage lies within the

project area, while the remainder is on an adjacent property that has been used as a limestone quarry. If any parts of the site actually remain in this disturbed area, they are now buried under massive quarry fills.

During the summer, it was decided to expand the excavations to give a better idea of the site layout and to pinpoint the locations of refuse deposits and other potentially important features. To this end, a large area that extended beyond the previous year's excavations was selected.

Before topsoil stripping was begun, two controlled surface collections were made. When combined with the initial controlled surface collections made two years previous to the current work, three controlled surface collections have been conducted in this area. In each case, the method used was to first re-plow the area, using a traditional mold-board plow, and then subsequently disk it. Next, squares were flagged out on the site's three-meter grid. After sufficient rainfall, each square was then collected entirely. This summer had no shortage of precipitation, and the conditions of visibility for the collections were excellent.

Following the surface work, the collected area was stripped to subsoil, and cleaning and mapping was begun, using the invaluable help of volunteers, other BHP archaeologists, and students from both Temple and Franklin & Marshall universities. By late Fall, the stripped area had been completely cleaned and all features and disturbances had been mapped.

The mapping showed an interesting pattern that could not be discerned until after a large area had been opened. The pattern revealed appears to be that of two concentric rings of feature concentrations defined by areas of low density between them. Features consist of post mold concentrations, most of which appear to represent houses, as well as refuse-filled pits, hearths, and elongated trenches of undetermined function.

Two other Funk-Phase villages, the Slackwater and Murry sites, each contained a very large structure in the dead-center of the village. During this past Fall, exploration of what is estimated to have once been the center of 36LA1100 also revealed a very large (ca. 30 feet long) oval structure; however, this particular structure differed from those at the other two referenced sites in that it was smaller, more elongated and, to

some extent, more typical of a dwelling than either of the central structures at the other two sites. Also found in the center of 36LA1100 were various pits, trenches like those found elsewhere on the site, a burned area/hearth, and incomplete patterns of some other types of structures, including a discontinuous line of very large posts.

After the mapping of the entire surface-collected and stripped area was completed, several large features were selected for investigation across the site, and these were either entirely excavated or tested in section. Excavation of selected refuse pits involved hand excavation followed by total flotation of the features' fill layers. Contents included: ornaments such as bone and shell beads; Funk-Phase potsherds; small triangular projectile points; flakes, cores, and small debitage fragments; riverine mussel shell; fish bones; turtle shell; deer, bear, and other mammal bone; and charred botanical remains, including wild seeds, various nuts, and cultigens. Corn, bean, and cucurbits continue to be found, and the charred corn kernels and beans are relatively abundant. Also found were seed remains that have yet to be identified.

The goal this winter is to sort through the excavated samples and separate materials for analyses by faunal and botanical specialists. In addition, several radiocarbon samples will be submitted to help refine the dating of the site.

A piece of very good news is that the developer/owner of the site met with BHP and offered to extend the current time limits to one year beyond the previous agreement. This is a very fortunate circumstance and CAP is anticipating returning to the site in the spring to continue the excavations. As always, thanks are extended all volunteers, and any interested SPA members are encouraged to participate in the future investigations of this extremely important Late Woodland settlement.

The Pennsylvania Farm Show

In January of 2005, the PHMC presence at the Farm Show will consist of a 20-by-5-foot booth space which BHP will share with the Landis Valley Museum. And Robert Winters, whom most of you may remember from Archaeology Month at City Island, will be there as well. This year, CAP will present a display on prehistoric agriculture in Pennsylvania.

**Society for Pennsylvania Archaeology, Inc.
Call for Awards!**

Any individual SPA member, or SPA Chapter as a whole, may submit nominations in writing to the Awards Chairman of an **SPA MEMBER**, of any chapter, or an SPA member who is unaffiliated with any chapter, who is deemed worthy of an SPA award in the categories listed below:

1.	<p>ARCHEY Award: Nominee must be a member of SPA, not just a chapter. This award is presented to a non-professional who has given significant contributions, over an appreciable period of time, toward the unselfish furtherance of archaeology. The number of separate nominations and the significance of the reasons for the nomination are weighed in making the selection for this award. The individual's contributions toward archaeology may be offices held; numbers and kinds of speaking engagements; published articles or reports; number and kinds of sites recorded and/or excavated; work with young people to acquaint them with archaeology, etc.</p>
2.	<p>J. ALDEN MASON Award: This award is presented to an SPA member who is a professional archaeologist and is based on his or her contribution to education and encouragement of SPA members in the proper pursuit of archaeology. A professional in a related science, which similarly assists SPA members, may also be considered for this award. The nominee need not reside in Pennsylvania.</p>
3.	<p>JOHN WITTHOFT Award: This award is presented to the chapter of the SPA that recruited the most new SPA members or reinstated the highest number of delinquent SPA members since the previous SPA Annual Meeting.</p>

4.	<p>SHRADER/GEORGE Award: Nominee must be an SPA member under 18 years of age and be an example of the SPA's ideal youth, whose character, accomplishments, and unselfish effort have furthered the cause of Pennsylvania archaeology. Sites upon which the nominee has participated should be recorded and have a designated State site number and the nominee should have experience in recording such sites and properly cataloging artifacts from the sites.</p>
----	--

Nomination forms for all categories will be mailed to Chapter Presidents. Please provide adequate background and information on nominees as inadequate information or failure to meet the award criteria could result in disqualification. Deadline for nominations is March 1, 2005.

REMEMBER: All nominees MUST be members of the Society for PA Archaeology, Inc.!

Ginger Dlutowski
SPA Awards Chairman

**National Park Service's 2005
Archaeological Prospection Workshop**

The National Park Service's 2005 workshop on archaeological prospection techniques entitled *Current Archaeological Prospection Advances for Non-Destructive Investigations in the 21st Century* will be held May 16-20, 2005, at the Hopewell Culture National Historical Park in Chillicothe, Ohio. Lodging will be in Comfort Inn in Chillicothe, Ohio. This will be the fifteenth year of the workshop dedicated to the use of geophysical, aerial photography, and other remote sensing methods as they apply to the identification, evaluation, conservation, and protection of archaeological resources across this Nation. The workshop this year will focus on the theory of operation, methodology, processing, interpretation, and on-hands use of the equipment in the field. Special topic for this year is the introduction of geophysical techniques in archaeological excavations. In addition to the

workshop, there will be an equipment fair on Friday (May 20th) with the major geophysical equipment manufacturers attending. There is a tuition charge of \$475.00. Application forms are available on the Midwest Archeological Center's web page at <<http://www.cr.nps.gov/mwac/>>. For further information, please contact Steven L. DeVore, Archeologist, National Park Service, Midwest Archeological Center, Federal Building, Room 474, 100 Centennial Mall North, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508-3873: tel: (402) 437-5392, ext. 141; fax: (402) 437-5098; email: <steve_de_vore@nps.gov>.

Membership News

Your current **membership status** can be determined by examining your address label. The paid up year is printed on the upper right hand corner of the label. If your dues are not current, please send the appropriate amount to : Treasurer, SPA , P.O. Box 10287, Pittsburgh, PA 15232-0287.

If you are an officer in your local Chapter or a member of the SPA Board of Directors or Elmer Erb Trustees, you **MUST** be a member in good standing of the SPA according to the Constitution. Please confirm your status and correct if necessary, as soon as possible.

Nominations for SPA Officers

First Vice President: Paul Nevin
Second Vice President: Andrew J. Myers
Treasurer: Paul Cowin
Secretary: Judy Duritsa
Board of Directors: Kenneth Burkett
Robert Oshnock

Jacob L. Grimm IV C14 Award

The Society's C14 program was designed to help chapters and individual members with the cost of C14 dating. Individual applying must be a member in good standing to qualify for the funding. Applications will be reviewed and awards made at the SPA Annual Meeting if applications are received before the meeting date or April 22, 2004

Please address all requests for matching C14 dating funds to: James Herbstritt, BHP,

Commonwealth Keystone Building, 400 North St.
2nd Floor, Harrisburg, PA 17120-0093 or e-mail:
jherbstritt@state.pa.us

Discover and Preserve Brochure

A new printing of the popular "Discover and Preserve" brochure has been completed. The brochure may be used to promote proper recording of artifacts and collections and to encourage donations of collections to proper repositories. Copies of the brochure are available to chapters. A supply will be housed at the State Museum and may be obtained by contacting **Steve Warfel** at 717-783-2887 or email at swarfel@state.pa.us.

Call for Papers Reminder

Meetings will include an open session on the archaeology of Pennsylvania. All papers will be limited to 20 minutes. If you are interested in participating, please submit a preliminary title by February 1, 2005. The due date for the full abstract is March 1, 2005. Abstracts should be limited to 150 words. Please note that all presenters must be both current members of SPA and pre-registered for the meeting. For further information, contact Program chair:

James Herbstritt

Commonwealth Keystone Bldg.
Bureau for Historic Preservation
400 North Street, 2nd Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120-0093
Email: jherbstritt@state.pa.us

Announcements

Volunteer Opportunities: Online listing of fieldwork opportunities worldwide, provided by the Archaeological Institute of America at www.archaeological.org/fieldwork/ is ready to be accessed.

April 23, 2005: *Third Annual Material Culture Symposium for Emerging Scholars*. Winterthur Museum, Winterthur, Delaware. Email emerging.scholars@gmail.com or visit the website at <http://materialculture.udel.edu>

Society for American Archaeology (SAA) 70th Annual Meeting will be held March 30-thru April 3, 2005 at the Salt Palace Convention Center, Salt Lake City Utah. See the website for more information: www.saa.org New 2005 publications from the SAA Press can also be found at this website.

TRIP: The Cave Paintings and Cuisine of Southwestern France, sponsored by the **Ringling School of Art and Design**, Continuing Studies and Special Programs Department. This is the Sixth Annual Expedition beginning June 5 thru June 18, 2005 with escort Clayton Eshleman, Ice Age Cave Art Expert. Information can be found at www.ringling.edu/continuingeducation

Books and New Publications

Now available (sorry about the earlier publication delay)

JACOB MY FRIEND His 17th Century Account of the Susquehannock Indians

By Barry C. Kent

In hard cover or soft cover

Published by Xlibris

A novel and history portraying colonial events and changing Susquehannock culture during the periods of the terrible clash with Europeans and other Indians. The story is based in history, archaeology, and anthropology and is brought to life through actual accounts and a vivid fictional narrative of the Dutch trader known to the Indians as Jacob My Friend.

Specifically it applies to the area of Chesapeake Bay, the Susquehanna and Delaware River valleys. However, in a general way it is the story of all Native Americans.

617 pages, 3 maps, endnotes and bibliography.

To order: Call 1-888-795-4274, or order online at www.xlibris.com, or visit your local bookstore.

The Rock-Art of Eastern North America Capturing Images and Insight

Edited by Carol Diaz-Granados, James
Duncan

ISBN 0-8173-5096-9 paper \$34.95
ISBN 0-8173-1394-X cloth \$65.00 (To be
released Feb. '05)

The University of Alabama Press

A compilation of 20 recent papers by 18 professional and avocational archaeologists. It is the first extensive overview of rock art that focuses exclusively on Eastern North America. The book includes discussions of artist gender, history, ethnography, recording methods, dating, analysis of sites and integration with known archaeological data.

Of special interest in our region are chapters by Paul Nevin on the Safe Harbor (PA) Petroglyphs, Ed Lenik on the Bald Friar (MD) Petroglyphs.

456 pages, 6 1/8 X 9 1/4, 182 illustrations, index

Orders placed via the Susquehanna River Rock Art website benefit petroglyph research at Safe Harbor and include tax & free shipping. Use the "Rock Art" link at www.SusquehannaRiver.net or call (717) 252-4177

AltaMira Press

Announcing a New Journal: Archaeologies: Journal of the World Archaeological Congress to be available as a semiannual journal appearing with a first edition in June 2005. It will be the official journal of the World Archaeological Congress (WAC) and members will receive the journal as part of membership. For additional information or to subscribe from the publisher, contact AltaMira Press, 15200 NBN Way, Blue Ridge Summit, PA 17214, phone 800-273-2223; fax 800-338-4550; www.altamirapress.com or email journals@rowman.com at \$42 per year for individuals and \$99 per year for institutions.