



Ethical Principles and Archaeological Practice: Development of an Ethics Policy

Mark J. Lynott

American Antiquity, Vol. 62, No. 4. (Oct., 1997), pp. 589-599.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0002-7316%28199710%2962%3A4%3C589%3AEPAAPD%3E2.0.CO%3B2-9>

American Antiquity is currently published by Society for American Archaeology.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/sam.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ARTICLES

ETHICAL PRINCIPLES AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL PRACTICE: DEVELOPMENT OF AN ETHICS POLICY

Mark J. Lynott

Unsettling conditions surrounding the contemporary practice of archaeology have generated an urgent need for clear ethical guidelines. The Principles of Archaeological Ethics were developed to help meet this need and provided in draft form to the Society for American Archaeology membership for review as part of a Special Report (Lynott and Wylie 1995b). Since that initial publication, two additional principles have been developed, and the original six principles have been revised and published in this journal (61:451–452). The changes were made in response to comments provided by the membership and the Executive Board. The principles are intended to serve as ethical ideals rather than a code of professional conduct.

Las condiciones confusas que existen alrededor de la práctica arqueológica contemporánea han generado una necesidad urgente de guías éticas claras. Los Principios de Ética Arqueológica desarrollados para satisfacer esta necesidad fueron sometidos a revisión ante los miembros de la Sociedad de Arqueología Americana como parte de un Reporte Especial (Lynott y Wylie 1995a). Desde su publicación inicial, dos principios adicionales han sido desarrollados, y los seis principios originales han sido revisados. Los cambios se hicieron en respuesta a comentarios proveídos por los miembros de la sociedad y la Junta Ejecutiva. Los principios representan ideales éticos en lugar de un código de conducta profesional.

The practice and profession of archaeology have changed a great deal in the last 25 years. Due largely to the growth of cultural resource management, the focus of archaeological activities has shifted from a predominantly academic setting, to one in which archaeologists are employed in an increasingly diverse range of positions. As the archaeological profession has expanded beyond academia, archaeologists have been faced with ethical dilemmas unforeseen by previous generations. Reaching a consensus on ethical problems has been further complicated by fragmentation of the discipline.

As we look forward to theoretical and methodological advances in archaeology in the next century, we must also prepare ourselves to address the ethical issues that will face the discipline. It is critical to promote a working dialogue about ethical issues and develop some common ethical positions among archaeological practitioners. This will require that we develop a formal mechanism

for training archaeologists about ethical practices. While most graduate programs dedicate ample classroom time to archaeological method and theory, very few programs dedicate significant time to ethics and professional conduct. Indeed, very few archaeologists seem to be aware of the ethical policies/codes adopted by organizations such as the Society for American Archaeology, American Anthropological Association, Society for Historical Archaeology, and the Archaeological Institute of America. Consequently, most archaeologists develop their own ethical codes through informal observation of their faculty role models and postgraduate, on-the-job training. This approach has generally proven to be ineffective, and there is a growing recognition of the need for changes in academic training (Blanton 1995; Fagan 1993).

The current urgency for ethical guidelines in archaeology may be traced to some of the same concerns that led to the founding of the Society of

Mark J. Lynott ■ Midwest Archeological Center, National Park Service, Federal Building, Room 474, 100 Centennial Mall North, Lincoln, NE 68508

American Antiquity, 62(4), 1997, pp. 589–599.
Copyright © by the Society for American Archaeology

Professional Archeologists (SOPA) in 1976 (McGimsey 1995), plus a variety of new concerns that relate to the changing circumstances of contemporary archaeology. For many years, archaeology was performed by archaeologists in primarily academic positions. The main thrust of archaeological activity was research and teaching relating to problems and concerns identified by professional archaeologists. This is no longer the case. Archaeologists are employed in an increasingly diverse range of positions, and many nonarchaeologists now have an interest in the treatment and study of archaeological remains.

The most notable change in archaeology over the last 25 years is the explosive growth in the number of people who are paid to work at archaeology. The growth of employment opportunities in archaeology is clearly outside the traditional academic setting, with archaeologists now working at many levels of federal, state, and local government and in a variety of different types of jobs within the private sector. The diversity of these jobs and their associated nontraditional responsibilities have led many archaeologists to question the utility of their formal academic training (Zeder 1997:17). Within these rapidly developing employment spheres, archaeologists need ethical guidelines to help them navigate in new and rapidly changing work environments.

Coincident with the development of increased employment opportunities for archaeologists has been an increased expression of interest among native people or First Nations in the archaeological record and the practice of archaeology. The interest of native peoples in archaeological resources has in some nations been codified through repatriation legislation and regulations. The response of archaeologists to Native American interest in archaeology and the archaeological record has been highly variable. Some have characterized repatriation legislation as anti-science (i.e., Clark 1996; Mason 1997), while others have been very supportive of these new developments (i.e., Powell et al. 1993; Zimmerman 1989). Although the passage of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) and similar state legislation has sent tremors through the discipline, there are abundant examples of cooperation between archaeologists and Native Americans

(i.e., Bruseth et al 1994; Knecht 1994; Mills 1996). Additionally, the interest of Native Americans in the archaeological record is documented by the development of tribal archaeology programs (i.e., Anyon and Ferguson 1995; Ferguson et al. 1993; TwoBears 1995). This increased interest in archaeology on the part of native peoples serves as an incentive for archaeologists to seek new partnerships in the study and protection of the archaeological record (Goldstein 1992) and requires substantial changes in the practice of archaeology.

Commercial interests in objects from the archaeological record have threatened the integrity of archaeological resources throughout this century, but the increasing commercial value of archaeological objects within the art market has led to a significant expansion in the market and the looting of archaeological sites (i.e., Harrington 1991; Pendergast 1991; Tubb 1995). Ethical questions regarding the use of data from looted sites or commercial excavations have been raised from a variety of contexts ranging from Moche tombs to shipwrecks (i.e., Alexander 1990; Elia 1992; Wylie 1995). Wylie (1996) uses four practical examples in archaeology to illustrate how the entanglement of professional activities with commercial exploitation of the archaeological record makes it increasingly difficult to maintain a clear distinction between scientific and non-scientific practice. These examples also illustrate how "practices that are morally exemplary by conventional wisdom may have deplorable consequences in one context, while, in another, practices that have been censured, often because of their consequences, may find (limited) justification under the very guidelines that prohibit them" (Wylie 1996:178). Wylie further notes that the contexts of archaeological activities are so complex, that "the dilemmas posed by competing commitments will not be resolved by establishing a simple rule for or against certain kinds of controversial practice (Wylie 1996:179). Resolution of these conflicts may only be achieved by integrating discussions about ethical considerations into the design and implementation of archaeological research, rather than as an addendum to research.

As archaeology matures as a profession, there is an increasing self-interest in developing standards to distinguish professional practitioners of

the discipline from avocationalists and others with an interest in archaeology. The distinction between professional and nonprofessional interests is important in determining who receives public funding and who receives permits to conduct research on public lands. The development of standards to recognize archaeological professionals may also serve the needs of archaeologists to better define their profession, as reflected in the Society of Professional Archeologists and the Institute of Field Archaeologists.

The Society of Professional Archeologists (SOPA) was founded in 1976 to meet a perceived need by the archaeological community and federal agencies to identify standards of professional conduct and recognize the archaeologists that met those standards (Jelks 1995). Plans for a registry of professional archaeologists were developed by a committee of the Society for American Archaeology (SAA), but concerns over legal liability eventually led that committee to establish SOPA as an independent organization (McGimsey 1995). Although SAA encouraged all qualified members to join the registry, some individuals felt that the need for certification only applied to archaeologists working in the cultural resource management sector.

For nearly 20 years, SOPA has taken the lead in advising the profession on ethical issues in archaeology. Its Standards of Research Performance and Code of Ethics have proven to be highly effective. The organization has also maintained a dialogue on ethical issues in its newsletter and has published a collection of papers about current ethical issues in North American archaeology (Woodall 1990). However, SOPA's impact has been limited by the relatively small size of its membership.

Changes in the practice of archaeology and the worldview of archaeologists are not restricted to the United States, but are being felt around the world (i.e., Cooper et al 1995; Greenfield 1989; Hunter and Ralston 1994; Murray and Allen 1995). These pressures and forces have had a notably unsettling effect on archaeology, and within this setting, in 1991, the Society for American Archaeology began a process of reexamining its ethical policy.

Ethics in Archaeology Task Force

Recognizing that publishing descriptions of looted

materials would increase the value of the objects in the art market, the *American Journal of Archaeology* adopted a policy that forbade the initial description of artifacts and archaeological materials from looted contexts (Kleiner 1990). Shortly after that, the first editor of SAA's new journal, *Latin American Antiquity*, Prudence Rice, adopted a policy that prohibited publication of papers based on looted data, and J. Jefferson Reid, then editor of *American Antiquity*, adopted the same policy. In May 1991 Alison Wylie made a presentation to the SAA Executive Board about the ethical issues associated with publishing research results derived from looted data (Wylie 1995). Recognizing that the existing SAA policy on ethics in archaeology was outdated, and that the editorial policies of the journals might not be fully compatible with the bylaws of the society, SAA's Executive Board appointed Mark Lynott and Alison Wylie as cochairs of a task force on ethics in archaeology.¹ From the beginning, Lynott and Wylie were convinced that an ethics policy could not be developed during short committee meetings at the society's annual meeting. Consequently, they developed proposals for a workshop to identify the important ethical issues facing archaeology today.

With funding from the National Science Foundation and the National Park Service, the Ethics in Archaeology Task Force organized a three-day workshop, November 5–7, 1993, at the CRM Policy Institute, University of Nevada–Reno. Participants from the workshop were selected to provide a broad and diverse background.² Workshop participants, through highly productive and stimulating discussions, drafted six principles of archaeological ethics and identified a process for presenting them to the SAA membership. These six principles focused on issues of stewardship, accountability, commercialization, public education and outreach, intellectual property, and records preservation.

The six draft principles were made public that next spring at a forum at the 59th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology in Anaheim, California, where they were presented along with an introduction, six position papers on the draft principles, and commentaries from five discussants. The proceedings from the forum were compiled, edited, and published by the Society for

American Archaeology as a Special Report (Lynott and Wylie 1995b).

In the report, Lynott and Wylie emphasized that the principles were presented in draft form, and asked for comments and suggestions as to how they might be modified or improved. In an effort to ensure that everyone with an interest in commenting on the draft principles had an opportunity to do so, papers were presented at several regional archaeological conferences, comments were solicited from SAA members through the *SAA Bulletin*, and Lynott held two discussion sessions at the 60th Annual Meeting in Minneapolis (1995), where members had the opportunity to voice concerns or make suggestions about the draft principles. Through these venues, written comments were received from 15 people, and verbal comments were offered to the cochairs from nine more.

After reviewing the comments, the cochairs and the Ethics in Archaeology Task Force made editorial and other minor changes and developed a seventh principle dealing with public reporting and publication (Principle No. 6). The principles then were submitted to the Executive Board for approval in September 1995. At the same time, the task force recommended that SAA revise its bylaws to create a standing Ethics Committee, charged with promoting discussion and education about ethical issues in archaeology, and proposing revisions, as necessary, of the Principles of Archaeological Ethics. The task force also recommended that SAA add a tenth objective to the SAA bylaws: To promote discussion and education about the ethical practice of archaeology.

At its fall meeting in 1995, the Executive Committee adopted both recommendations regarding changes in the bylaws and instructed the Bylaws Committee to offer this language for vote by the membership on the next possible ballot. However, the Executive Board also expressed concern about Principles No. 3 (commercialization) and No. 5 (intellectual property) and recommended that an additional principle be developed (Principle No. 8: Training and Resources).

During the period when the draft principles were being reviewed by the SAA membership, the author served as the primary point of contact for questions and comments about the principles. This paper attempts to explain why the first six draft

principles were modified and why two additional principles were developed. It is not intended as an overview of the current status of ethics in archaeology or as a complete review of all comments received on the draft principles, but focuses instead on those issues that stimulated the most comments and that led to changes in the principles.

Principles of Archaeological Ethics

Principle No. 1: Stewardship

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

Principle No. 2: Accountability

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

Principle No. 3: Commercialization

The Society for American Archaeology has long recognized that the buying and selling of objects out of archaeological context is contributing to the destruction of the archaeological record on the American continents and around the world. The commercialization of archaeological objects—their use as commodities to be exploited for personal enjoyment or profit—results in the destruction of archaeological sites and of contextual information that is essential to understanding the archaeological record. Archaeologists should therefore carefully weigh the benefits to scholar-

ship of a project against the costs of potentially enhancing the commercial value of archaeological objects. Wherever possible, they should discourage, and should themselves avoid, activities that enhance the commercial value of archaeological objects, especially objects that are not curated in public institutions, or readily available for scientific study, public interpretation, and display.

Principle No. 4: Public Education and Outreach

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

Principle No. 5: Intellectual Property

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

Principle No. 6: Public Reporting and Publication

Within a reasonable time, the knowledge archae-

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

Principle No. 7: Records and Preservation

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

Principle No. 8: Training and Resources

Given the destructive nature of most archaeological investigations, archaeologists must ensure that they have adequate training, experience, facilities, and other support necessary to conduct any program of research they initiate in a manner consistent with the foregoing principles and contemporary standards of professional practice.

The Principles of Archaeological Ethics are intended to identify ethical ideals or goals. It is understood that these ideals for archaeological activities might not be easily attained amid the complexities of everyday life. However, they are designed to serve as a directional beacon by which individuals might steer their professional activities. Wylie (1996) has described the principles as “ceilings” of ethical behavior, as opposed to “floors” of professional conduct.

As generalized ideals or goals, the principles do not offer prescriptions on how various ideals of professional behavior are to be attained. During the development of the principles, the task force and advisors consciously avoided the creation of a

code of conduct (such as maintained by SOPA) that specifies minimum standards of professional behavior. The principles are not intended to be enforceable, but are designed to serve as ethical guidelines.

Stewardship

The concept of stewardship has emerged in archaeology through the growth and development of cultural resource management. The term "stewardship" became widely used after a booklet, titled "These Are the Stewards of the Past" by Charles R. McGimsey III, Hester A. Davis, and Carl Chapman (1970), was published and distributed in the 1970s. The role of archaeologists in the treatment of the archaeological record was further defined by Lipe (1974) in a landmark paper in which he offered many excellent and rational reasons why archaeologists should work to protect and preserve an in situ body of archaeological data. More recently, Chippindale (1994) has published an eloquent dialogue on the merits of holding archaeological resources in "common" for everyone. Although archaeological training tends to promote the assumption that professionally trained archaeologists are the only people with a legitimate interest in the archaeological record, archaeologists are becoming increasingly aware of the interest that the general public and specific interest groups have in the use and management of archaeological sites and objects.

Within the Principles of Archaeological Ethics, stewardship is the central concept from which all the other ethical principles are derived. Although many different people may contribute to the stewardship of the archaeological record, archaeologists have a special role in the effort to understand the record and preserve it for the benefit of future generations. The responsibilities of archaeologists within the stewardship concept are clearly geared toward encouraging careful and thoughtful treatment of the archaeological record, including in situ materials and the records and collections resulting from archaeological research.

The discussion and comments about Principle No. 1: Stewardship were highly polarized and focused largely on whether we (Lynott and Wylie 1995a) intended to discourage research on sites that were not threatened by development or other devastating forces. There were also comments

about whether the principles as a group were intended to allow archaeologists to use the stewardship concept to claim some special privilege to speak for other interest groups or stakeholders in the use of, or access to, archaeological resources.

First and foremost, for archaeologists, the primary value of archaeological resources is the information they contain (Lipe 1974). Carver (1996) argues that the value of any part of the archaeological record is measured by the character of the archaeological deposits and contemporary research agendas. Since research agendas continually change through time, it is to be expected that the relative value of different sites will also change (Lynott 1980). As good stewards of the archaeological record, archaeologists should direct their efforts toward the in situ preservation of the archaeological record. Although, no site can last forever, our observations and interpretations of the archaeological record should last forever. When we do use our specialized knowledge and skills to study the archaeological record, our field research must be aimed at significant research problems and should damage only as much of a site as is necessary to collect the data required by the research design. Every project must include a technical report that documents the field and laboratory investigations, and establishes the basis for any interpretations that are offered (Principle No. 6). Archaeologists do not control access to the archaeological record, but we should be strong advocates for careful and thorough study of archaeological resources and the long-term preservation of the archaeological record.

The concept of stewardship does not, and should not, prohibit important research on protected sites. However, we must realize that the relative merits of any particular research problem may be highly subjective, so extensive excavations, and large-scale destructive research methods must be extremely well justified. Protected sites, such as those owned by the Archaeological Conservancy or the U.S. National Park Service, although generally safe and preserved, do contain information that is critical to specific research problems. If a researcher prepares a good research design to address a significant research problem, it would seem appropriate to permit minimally destructive investigations. The National Park Service does testing at many sites. These studies

are critical to the continuing growth and development of archaeology as a scientific discipline. However, as an ideal, whenever possible we must restrict more consumptive research to sites that are not actively protected. It might even be argued that consumptive research on protected sites should be delayed until the results of previous excavations on those particular sites have been properly reported. Considering the museum storage crisis (Childs 1995), most of us will agree that massive excavations should be avoided whenever possible.

Concern was also raised that the stewardship concept was being used to justify or claim special privilege, or access to, the archaeological record, for the profession of archaeology and archaeologists. By the nature of their training and specialized education, archaeologists have special skills in interpreting and understanding the archaeological record. In the past, these special skills have allowed archaeologists to act as the primary voice of concern for archaeological resources. However, the stewardship concept requires that archaeologists become aware of and respect the wide range of other legitimate interests in the possible uses of archaeological sites. We must accept that in some cases, such as cultural heritage tourism, these uses of the archaeological record may not always be fully compatible with the interests of archaeology. Having said this, the stewardship concept is not in any way intended to acknowledge or legitimize the interests of looters or private art collectors who use the archaeological record for personal gain or gratification. The stewardship principle is not intended to provide archaeologists with a claim for priority of access to archaeological resources. More than 20 years ago, Lipe (1974) argued persuasively that stewardship is in the best interests of archaeology. It is in the best interests of our profession to protect and preserve the resources we study, and to use them wisely when we do study them. While we may not be in agreement with others who have an interest in the archaeological record, we must take those interests into consideration when we plan and undertake research. The SOPA Code of Ethics states that an archaeologist shall be "sensitive to, and respect the legitimate concerns of groups whose culture histories are the subject of archeological investigations" (SOPA 1997:6:I.1.1.c.). One of the primary factors that sets professional archaeologists apart from looters

is that our specialized knowledge and skills may be used to serve a wider range of publics and interests. Due largely to this ability to study and enrich our collective understanding of the past, we must consider the broad, and sometimes diverse, interests the public has in the archaeological record (McManamon 1991).

Looting

Editorial proscriptions against the use of data from looted contexts is the issue that pushed SAA into developing the Principles of Archaeological Ethics. Discussions about this issue have been wide-ranging and very stimulating, particularly those on the international scope of the antiquities market and the impact that our research and publications has on that market. Wylie (1996) presents a thorough discussion of the issues that have been raised about using data from looted or commercial contexts in research and publication. Although we cannot fully document or quantify the impact our research has on looting and the antiquities market, we have a responsibility to consider the impact. We cannot stop looting, sale of artifacts, or collecting of artifacts, but we must continue to discuss what impact our work has on the antiquities market to avoid unnecessarily encouraging further damage to the archaeological record.

SAA has been a leader in promoting public and professional discussion about the impact of looting. Before publishing data from looted contexts, we must weigh the value of the information that is obtained from a looted collection against the potential harm that is generated by the implied endorsement of looting. Determining the most appropriate way to deal with artifacts and information from nonscientific contexts can be very difficult. Should collections from sites that were looted more than 50 years ago and now reside in a museum be treated differently from collections now held by antiquities/art collectors? Like most ethical concerns, the answers are rarely black and white, and resolution is best achieved through an open and honest appraisal of each individual situation.

The ethical problems faced by the medical profession in regard to medical data that were collected by Nazi experiments on human subjects in World War II may offer some useful instructions on the process needed to address the potential publication of looted data. The use of hypothermia

data from the Nazi concentration camps serves as an example (Moe 1984). The Nazi medical experiments with hypothermia were hideous, but yielded data that led to the development of cold-water survival clothing. Following extensive debate over the situation, the use of the concentration camp medical data for developing the survival gear was ultimately justified for the overall good that resulted. However, in published accounts using medical data from concentration camps, the authors express emphatically their opposition to the manner in which the data was collected. This extra step to avoid an endorsement of concentration camps and horrible experiments with human subjects might be useful to our situation. While I do not intend to imply that site looting is in any way equivalent to the Nazi atrocities, this process may be useful for archaeology. If a researcher were to incorporate data from looted contexts into publications, perhaps she or he should also speak about the damage looting does to future research and the archaeological record. Authors who feel compelled to use data from looted or nonscientific contexts in research should demonstrate that they have considered these issues and offer a clear explanation why use of the data is justified. However, as an ethical ideal, the use of looted data in research and publication should be avoided.

We cannot ignore the commercial value of the archaeological record. As William Lipe noted in a letter commenting on the draft principles, archaeologists earn a living studying it, the tourist industry makes substantial money promoting it, and art dealers earn money by selling objects from it. The primary responsibilities that archaeologists have is to conduct high-quality research that minimizes damage to the record, and to work to educate the public about the content and potential significance of the record.

Tom King (1985a, 1985b) has suggested that since the value of archeological resources lies in their information potential, we should revise our ethical positions to permit excavation of sites funded by entrepreneurs, who would be permitted to sell the artifacts after field and laboratory investigations are complete. King's position has more recently been supported by Hamilton (1995). However, a basic tenet of science requires that research results be described in a manner permitting a colleague to replicate those results in a sim-

ilar setting. In archaeology, the nature of each site is unique, and we destroy the archaeological record as we excavate. Consequently, the records and collections from our investigations must be complete and sufficiently detailed to permit colleagues to examine those records and collections and conclude that they agree with our interpretations. This is the basis for Principle No. 7: Records and Preservation, and the primary reason why we cannot follow the suggestion offered by King and others who have endorsed working with marine salvors.

Preservation of records and collections is one of the most important distinctions between scientific and nonscientific use of the archaeological record. Claims that archaeology is a science require that we emphasize the preservation of records and collections resulting from our research.

Intellectual Property, Public Reporting, and Publication

In its comments on the draft principles, the SAA Executive Board urged us to reconsider Principle No. 5 dealing with intellectual property. We were urged to redraft this principle in a manner that is more sympathetic to Native American interests and consistent with the implementation of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. Consequently, the principle was revised to support a researcher's primary access to original materials, rather than exclusive access to those materials. This change is warranted because the products of our research belong to everyone and should be shared with the public and our colleagues whenever it is reasonable and prudent.

Brian Fagan reminded us in his comments that we failed to make explicit the archaeologists' responsibility to prepare reports on our investigations. Since most aspects of field archaeology damage or destroy the archaeological record, this is a clear professional responsibility. Consequently, we have developed Principle No. 6. As a group, archaeologists have always emphasized the importance of writing reports about their research (Champe et al. 1961), but we have often failed to live up to this goal (Fagan 1995). It is important that this principle be articulated as a central tenet of archaeological practice.

As we have attempted to articulate in Principle

No. 7, we must take individual and institutional responsibility to ensure that the records and collections resulting from our research are available for future study. This message is at the heart of most courses that provide an introduction to archaeology and is a focus of all field methods courses. However, as a profession we often fail to follow our own teachings. Are the collections and records from contract investigations being curated in a manner and location that will ensure they are available for future study? All too often, the answer is no. There are abundant stories of rental storage units filled with archaeological collections and records. Universities and museum collections are not immune from criticism either. In fact, the crisis in archaeological archive and collections storage is immense. Most of us tend to view this as an institutional issue. However, we each have an individual responsibility to work to see that the records and collections resulting from our own research are preserved for future study.

Training and Resources

The SAA Executive Board also requested that the Ethics in Archaeology Task Force consider developing a principle that would address the responsibilities of archaeologists to seek adequate training, experiences, and facilities before initiating field or other destructive investigations. This responsibility is clearly addressed by the Society of Professional Archeologists' Standards of Research Performance (SOPA 1997). Since most of the research performed by archaeologists is destructive, we must ensure that we have appropriate training, experience, preparation, and facilities before undertaking archaeological investigations. Although this principle does not directly address the importance of having adequate financial support to undertake a project or study properly, this concept is implied in Principle No. 8.

Future Considerations

In March 1996, after making revisions based on comments received about the draft principles, the Ethics in Archaeology Task Force resubmitted the principles to the SAA Executive Board; they were accepted at the April 1996 Board Meeting (Kintigh 1996). These principles are not intended to be the final word on archaeological ethics. Just as archaeology has changed greatly in the last two decades,

further change is inevitable. The principles will need frequent attention and periodic review to meet the needs of archaeological practitioners. This has been accomplished through the establishment of a standing Committee on Ethics. That committee will maintain the principles, make revisions as needed, and promote discussion and education about ethical issues among the membership. The Ethics in Archaeology Task Force recommended that SAA not empower the proposed Committee on Ethics with enforcement responsibilities, but the task force encouraged discussions about the possible creation of a Registry of Professional Archaeologists (McGimsey et al. 1995).

The principles have been defined as ideals. The task force consciously chose to identify ethical ceilings or ideals that should serve as the goals for professional behavior, rather than to define standards of minimally acceptable conduct among archaeologists (Wylie 1996). We hope that these ideals will be responsive to the changing realities of archaeological practice and offer some guidelines to operate in the practical real-world situations being encountered daily by archaeologists.

The archaeological record is a part of our cultural heritage and belongs to all of humanity. Archaeologists, by the merits of their specialized education and training, serve as researchers and educators about the archaeological record, and to a degree even define what is significant within the record (Carver 1996). We cannot ensure or guarantee the preservation of every archaeological site, but we can advise our fellow citizens about the importance of the archaeological record and the need to protect it for future generations. Within this context, the Principles of Archaeological Ethics have been developed as guidelines to help professional archaeologists navigate in a rapidly changing world.

Acknowledgments. The development of the Principles of Archaeological Ethics has been a truly collaborative effort. Throughout this entire process, Alison Wylie served as task force cochair and has been a leader and facilitator. Her thoughtful participation made this project more rewarding and pleasant. Members of the Ethics in Archaeology Task Force included Richard E. W. Adams, Christopher Chippindale, Ellen Herscher, Larry Murphy, David Pendergast, and Karen D. Vitelli. In addition to the task force members, participants in the Reno workshop included Mary Beaudry, James Brown, Don Fowler, Lynne Goldstein, Christopher Hamilton, Ralph Johnson, Leigh Jenkins, Frank

McManamon, Nancy Parezo, and Joe Watkins. Ricardo J. Elia, Christopher Hamilton, Phyllis Mauch Messenger, Larry Zimmerman, and K. Anne Pyburn and Richard R. Wilk prepared comments for the sponsored forum at the 59th Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology. Charles R. McGimsey III and Janet E. Levy prepared papers, and Christopher Chippindale and Edward B. Jelks permitted us to reprint previously published papers, for the Special Report, *Ethics in American Archaeology: Challenges for the 1990s*. The development of the Principles of Archaeological Ethics also benefited greatly from contributions provided by Roger Anyon, Brian Fagan, Janet E. Levy, William D. Lipe, Charles R. McGimsey III, and Tristine Lee Smart, who were regular commentators throughout this process. The support and encouragement of the Executive Board, particularly past SAA Presidents Prudence Rice, Bruce Smith, and William Lipe, have been greatly appreciated. Former Executive Director Ralph Johnson and Managing Editor Janet Walker played critical roles in making this project successful. Funding for the project was provided by the National Science Foundation, the National Park Service, and the Society for American Archaeology. The author appreciates the thoughtful and helpful comments provided by four anonymous reviewers on an earlier draft of this paper. The opinions expressed in this paper about the Principles of Archaeological Ethics are solely those of the author, and do not represent the official position of SAA or the Committee on Ethics. And, finally, thanks to María Nieves Zedeño for translating the abstract.

References Cited

- Alexander, B.
1990 Archaeology and Looting Make a Volatile Mix. *Science* 250:1074-1075.
- Anyon, R., and T. J. Ferguson
1995 Cultural Resources Management at the Pueblo of Zuni, New Mexico, U.S.A. *Antiquity* 69:913-930.
- Blanton, D. B.
1995 The Case for CRM Training in Academic Institutions. *SAA Bulletin* 13(4):40-41.
- Bruseh, J. E., J. E. Corbin, C. E. Carter, and B. McKee
1994 Involving the Caddo Tribe during Archaeological Field School in Texas: A Cross Cultural Sharing. *SAA Bulletin* 12(1):9-10.
- Carver, M.
1996 On Archaeological Value. *Antiquity* 70:45-56.
- Champe, J. L., D. S. Byers, C. Evans, A. K. Guthe, H. W. Hamilton, E. B. Jelks, C. W. Meighan, S. Olafson, G. S. Quimby, W. Smith, and F. Wendorf
1961 Four Statements for Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 27:137-139.
- Childs, S. T.
1995 The Curation Crisis. *Federal Archeology* 7(4):11-15.
- Chippindale, C.
1994 The Concept of the "Commons." *Antiquity* 68:191-192.
- Clark, G. A.
1996 Letter to the Editor. *SAA Bulletin* 14(5):3.
- Cooper, M. A., A. Firth, J. Carman, and D. Wheatley (editors)
1995 *Managing Archaeology*. Routledge, New York.
- Elia, R. J.
1992 The Ethics of Collaboration: Archaeologists and the Whydah Project. *Historical Archaeology* 24(2):105-117.
- Fagan, B.
1993 The Arrogant Archaeologist. *Archaeology* 46(6):14-16.
1995 Archaeology's Dirty Little Secret. *Archaeology* 48(4):14-17.
- Ferguson, T. J., K. Dongoske, L. Jenkins, M. Yeatts, and E. Polingyouma
1993 The Roles of Archaeology and Ethnohistory in Hopi Cultural Preservation. *CRM* 16:27-37.
- Goldstein, L.
1992 The Potential for Future Relationships between Archaeologists and Native Americans. In *Quandaries and Quests: Visions of Archaeology's Future*, edited by L. Wandsnider, pp. 59-71. Occasional Paper No. 20. Center for Archaeological Investigations, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.
- Greenfield, J.
1989 *The Return of Cultural Treasures*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hamilton, C. E.
1995 A Cautionary Perspective. In *Ethics in American Archaeology: Challenges for the 1990s*, edited by M. J. Lynott and A. Wylie, pp. 57-63. Special Report. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, D.C.
- Harrington, S. P. M.
1991 The Looting of Arkansas. *Archaeology* 44(3):22-31.
- Hunter, J., and I. Ralston
1994 *Archaeological Resource Management in the UK*. Institute of Field Archaeologists, Alan Sutton Publishing, Phoenix Mill.
- Jelks, E. B.
1995 Professionalism and the Society of Professional Archeologists. In *Ethics in American Archaeology: Challenges for the 1990s*, edited by M. J. Lynott and A. Wylie, pp. 14-16. Special Report. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, D.C.
- King, T. F.
1985a The Whiddah and the Ethics of Cooperating with Pothunters: A View. *SOPA Newsletter* 9(3-4):1-3.
1985b Sheep Don't Take Very Good Care of Themselves: A Response to Lees. *SOPA Newsletter* 9(6):4-8.
- Kintigh, K. W.
1996 SAA Principles of Archaeological Ethics. *SAA Bulletin* 14(3):5, 17.
- Kleiner, F. S.
1990 On the Publication of Recent Acquisitions of Antiquities. *American Journal of Archaeology* 94:525-527.
- Knecht, R.
1994 Archaeology and Alutiiq Cultural Identity on Kodiak Island. *SAA Bulletin* 12(5):8-10.
- Lipe, W. D.
1974 A Conservation Model for American Archaeology. *Kiva* 39:213-245.
- Lynott, M. J.
1980 The Dynamics of Significance: An Example from Central Texas. *American Antiquity* 45:117-120.
- Lynott, M. J., and A. Wylie
1995a Stewardship: The Central Principle of Archaeological Ethics. In *Ethics in American Archaeology: Challenges for the 1990s*, edited by M. J. Lynott and A. Wylie, pp. 28-32. Special Report. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, D.C.
- Lynott, M. J., and A. Wylie (editors)
1995b *Ethics in American Archaeology: Challenges for the 1990s*. Special Report. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, D.C.

- McGimsey, C. R. III
1995 Standards, Ethics, and Archaeology: A Brief History. In *Ethics in American Archaeology: Challenges for the 1990s*, edited by M. J. Lynott and A. Wylie, pp. 11–13. Special Report. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, D.C.
- McGimsey, C. R. III, H. A. Davis, and C. Chapman
1970s *These Are the Stewards of the Past*. Arkansas Archeological Survey, Lafayette.
- McGimsey, C. R. III, W. D. Lipe, and D. Seifert
1995 SAA, SHA, SOPA, AIA Discuss Register of Professional Archaeologists. *SHA Newsletter* 28(3):10–15.
- McManamon, F. P.
1991 The Many Publics for Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 56:121–130.
- Mason, R. J.
1997 Letter to the Editor. *SAA Bulletin* 15(1):3.
- Mills, B. J.
1996 The Archaeological Field School in the 1990s: Collaboration in Research and Training. *SAA Bulletin* 14(5):1-8-20.
- Moe, K.
1984 Should the Nazi Research Data Be Cited? *The Hastings Center Report* 14(6):5–7.
- Murray, T., and J. Allen
1995 The Forced Repatriation of Cultural Properties to Tasmania. *Antiquity* 69:871–873.
- Pendergast, D. M.
1991 And the Loot Goes On: Winning Some Battles, but Not the War. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 18:89–95.
- Powell, S., C. E. Garza, and A. Hendricks
1993 Ethics and Ownership of the Past, the Reburial and Repatriation Controversy. In *Archaeological Method and Theory*, vol. 5, edited by M. B. Schiffer, pp. 1–42. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
- Society of Professional Archeologists
1997 *Directory of Certified Professional Archeologists*. 22nd ed. Baton Rouge, Louisiana.
- Tubb, K. W. (editor)
1995 *Antiquities Trade or Betrayed, Legal, Ethical and Conservation Issues*. Archetype Publications, London.
- TwoBears, D.
1995 A Navajo Student's Perception: Anthropology and the Navajo Nation Archaeology Department Student Training Program. *SAA Bulletin* 13(1):4–6.
- Woodall, J. N. (editor)
1990 *Predicaments, Pragmatics and Professionalism: Ethical Conduct in Archeology*. Special Publication No. 1. Society of Professional Archeologists, Oklahoma City.
- Wylie, A.
1995 Archaeology and the Antiquities Market: The Use of "Looted" Data. In *Ethics in American Archaeology: Challenges for the 1990s*, edited by M. J. Lynott and A. Wylie, pp. 17–21. Special Report. Society for American Archaeology, Washington, D.C.
- 1996 Ethical Dilemmas in Archaeological Practice: Looting, Repatriation, Stewardship, and the (Trans)formation of Disciplinary Identity. *Perspectives on Science* 4(2):154–194.
- Zeder, M. A.
1997 The American Archaeologist: Results of the 1994 SAA Census. *SAA Bulletin* 15(2):12–17.
- Zimmerman, L. J.
1989 Made Radical by My Own: An Archaeologist Learns to Accept Reburial. In *Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions*, edited by R. Layton, pp. 60–67. Unwin Hyman, London.

Notes

1. Other members of the task force were Richard Adams, Christopher Chippindale, Ellen Herscher, Larry Murphy, David Pendergast and Karen Vitelli.
2. Participants in the Reno workshop were Richard Adams, Mary Beaudry, James Brown, Christopher Chippindale, Don Fowler (director, CRM Policy Institute, University of Nevada–Reno), Lynne Goldstein, Christopher Hamilton, Ellen Herscher, Ralph Johnson (former SAA executive director), Leigh Jenkins, Mark Lynott (cochair), Frank McManamon, Larry Murphy, Nancy Parezo, Leanne Stone (coordinator, CRM Policy Institute, University of Nevada–Reno), Karen Vitelli, Joe Watkins, and Alison Wylie (cochair).

Received November 25, 1996; accepted February 28, 1997; revised May 5, 1997.