

# VAS newsletter...

NO. 52  
FEBRUARY 1986

A PUBLICATION OF THE  
VERMONT ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY, INC.

*Scott Dillon, Editor*

## Board Elects Officers, Reconstitutes Committees

There have been a number of personnel changes on the VAS Executive Board due to the recent election. Dee Brightstar stepped down as president at the January 13, 1986 board meeting, and was replaced by Douglas Frink. Tom Lawrence, a long-time member and consistently active on the board was elected vice-president. Bruce Flewelling remains the secretary and Joseph Popecki was again named treasurer/record-er (although he is an emeritus board member). The Board also welcomed new members Charles Paquin and Louise Basa, elected by the membership on a mail ballot at the fall (annual) meeting.

Other important board business included the reactivation of a number of standing and ad hoc committees. A list of these committees is given below, along with the name and address of each chairperson. Members who have an interest in serving on any of the committees should contact the appropriate chairperson(s). The next board meeting is scheduled for 7 pm, March 10, 1986, at the Anthropology department in Williams Hall at the University of Vermont (fifth floor). Interested non-board members should plan to attend as committee reports will be read and spring meeting plans will be finalized.

### COMMITTEES

**Publications.** Scott Dillon, chairman. Department of Anthropology, Williams Hall, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05405. 656-3029 (work); 893-1508 (home).



## Mark Your Calendar for the Spring Meeting, April 19

The VAS spring meeting will be held on Saturday, April 19, 1986, so keep your schedule free for that date. Hopefully more of you will attend than did at the last few meetings. Both the program and location are still tentative; final details will be included in the next issue of the Newsletter. Members interested in helping out or who have ideas for the meeting to contribute should get in touch with Jan Warren who is chairing the organizing committee. Jan can be reached at UVM's Anthropology Department, 656-3029.

## Reburial Issues Fail Resolution

BY Dena F. Dincauze

[Reprinted with permission from the Bulletin of the Society for American Archaeology.]

The conference on reburial issues sponsored jointly by SOPA and SAA was held on June 14, 15, 1985, at the Newberry Library's Darcy McNickle Center for the History of the American Indian, in Chicago. Twenty-three invited participants represented a range of groups whose interests converge around issues relating to disinterment, analysis, curation, and reinterment of human remains. Academic and administrative archaeologists, Indian spiritual and public leaders and tribal administrators, lawyers, cultural anthropologists and historians were among those present; many people represented more than one category... The geographical representation ranged from Maine and Ottawa [sic] on the north to Arizona on the south and from Massachusetts to California. Support for the conference was provided by The National Geographic Society and Conoco.

The conference was planned to bring together advocates of many different positions to present and discuss their several points of view in a non-confrontational manner. It was axiomatic that there might be irreconcilable differences within the group on some issues. However, all opinions were respectfully received, and both direct rebuttal and confrontational debate were minimized by prior agreement.

Discussions developed around an agenda with five major topics: (1) reasons for insisting on reburial, (2) reasons for objecting to reburial, (3) reasons for scientific study of human skeletal populations, (4) exploration of possible resolutions, and (5) the next step. A special feature of the agenda was a series of 62 statements that had been derived from position papers and articles submitted in advance by the participants. The statements were representative of advocacy positions taken on many aspects of the controversy, and served to stimulate and guide discussion under each topic. During the conference discussion was not neatly compartmentalized, since consideration of each topic in turn included anticipation of issues from that next following. Discussion was, however, civil and productive throughout.





## 1 ▷ Officers, Committees

**Projects.** Louise Basa, chairperson, 4133  
Consaul Road, Schenectady, NY 12304. 518-  
377-4389 (home); 518-457-3881 (work).

**Education.** Charles Paquin, chairman, 524  
Archibald Street, Burlington, VT 05401.  
864-7408 (home).

**Meetings.** Jan Warren, chairperson. 68 Morse  
Place, Burlington, VT 05401. 862-7679 (home);  
656-3029 (work).

**Finance and Membership.** Bill Noel, chairman.  
490 St. Paul Street, Burlington, VT 05401.  
864-0840 (home); 878-8687 (work).

**PLEASE RETURN YOUR DUES RENEWAL  
NOTICE NOW. THANK YOU**

## 2 ▷ Reburial Issues Troubling

The full transcript of the meeting is in preparation; without the details before me, I can only report on generalities. The transcript, now being edited by Polly Quick, will present the discussion in full, and will be published as soon as possible.

Consideration of the first two topics--the cases for and against reburial--revealed the major issues between Indian peoples and archaeologists. There is far less adversarial feeling between Indian people and physical anthropologists or museum people, probably because of less direct familiarity on both sides. There was near-unanimity among Indian participants in favor of reburial; differences included the degrees of willingness to consider exceptions for special cases. All the Indians present agreed that reburials should be left in the ground, undisturbed. Diversity was evident among the Indians in respect to traditional burial modes, the degree of feeling against disturbance, and the feelings about analytical research involving human remains after disinterment.

It was clear that archaeologists and physical anthropologists have failed to communicate their research goals effectively. Few benefits from such research are perceived by the subjects themselves. There is, moreover, a strong suspicion in some quarters that research is undertaken for motives of personal advancement of the researcher, without intent to benefit the subjects. Exceptions to this general situation indicate that where efforts are routinely made, contacts established over long periods, and trust developed, Indians and archaeologists can communicate and cooperate in research. There also emerged troubling evidence that archaeologists, as a group, are relatively ignorant of the goals, methods and information potential of modern bio-anthropology, and tend to devalue such research.

Discussion of the benefits to be realized from archaeological and physical anthropological research continually bogged down in cases. Studies valued by anthropologists for their contributions to the understanding of the human species or to the solution of anthropologically defined problems were mainly rejected as uninteresting to tribal people, who define their past through tradition. Those people are, however, appreciative when such research helps in identifying and protecting cultural resources, or is publicized so that it increases understanding and respect for Indians in the larger society. Instances were presented in which requests from tribes for help through research on particular problems met indifference or were relegated to very low priorities by trained investigators. If traditional people realize no benefit from relations with anthropologists, especially from studies supported by long term curation of human remains, the case for such curation cannot be compelling to them.

At least two, apparently irreconcilable value systems were in evidence during the discussions.

The anthropologists presented their scientific values, and their commitments to professional responsibility and to knowledge for the sake of the human species. The Indians, for their part, presented aspects of traditional spirituality as those relate to feelings for the earth, the role of humans in nature, and the desire that human remains be allowed to return to an nourish the earth. It was eloquently explained that Indian spirituality is not an organized religion, but that it pervades and defines the life of each person, as it does the role of persons in the larger community and the world. There does not seem to be much hope for accommodation by the modification of either of these value sets:

---

**"The Indians...presented aspects of traditional spirituality as those relate to feelings for the earth, the role of humans in nature..."**

---

compromises must be sought by people of good will who respect each other's differences and who value cooperation.

Issues of professional performance standards and of ethics in fieldwork and in relations with native peoples were raised several times. The social anthropologists in the group were particularly insistent about the need for more effective training in ethics and interpersonal relations for archaeologists, and for sensitizing both archaeologists and bio-anthropologists to the feelings, beliefs and needs of others.

The fourth topic led to a great deal of talk about specific laws, regulations, and policies, particularly at the federal level. The Indian people are especially distressed about the definition, in the Archaeological Resources



Protection Act, of graves as "archaeological resources" since that emphasizes their "scientific" value above their traditional importance as the remains of ancestors. Tribal ordinances, state reburial laws and constitutional law were also explored. The unevenness of compliance processes between federal agencies was a recurrent problem. Potential conflicts between state laws and federal policies, and between some federal policies and constitutional guarantees respecting religion were considered, without expectation of resolution in the context of the conference. It was apparent as discussion proceeded that no single inflexible policy about graves or about the disposition of human remains would meet the variety of needs and situations that exist. There was, on the other hand, a great deal of support among many diverse factions for deciding cases on an *ad hoc* basis through consultation with interested parties.

---

"The social anthropologists ...were particularly insistent about the real need for more effective training in ethics and interpersonal relations for archaeologists..."

---

The conferees concluded Saturday's meeting by discussing what should be done to capitalize on the spirit of cooperation engendered in Chicago.

A set of eight consensus statements were prepared (Jerome Cybulski, of the National Museum of Man, Ottawa, abstained from the consensus on technical grounds.) A subcommittee of the SAA Public Relations Committee was established to pursue several goals with which it was charged (see below). The subcommittee, chaired jointly by Duane Anderson (State Archaeologist, Iowa) and Carol Condie (Quivira Research Center, Albuquerque), and subgroups comprised of SAA members and non-member advisors working on several projects as directed.

#### CONSENSUS OF THE REBURIAL CONFERENCE

1. Human physical remains should always be treated with respect.
2. It is imperative for anthropologists and Native Americans to work together to resolve issues of common concern, particularly reburial and the investigation of mortuary sites.
3. Physical anthropologists, social anthropologists and archaeologists should think of the reburial issue in the broader context of anthropology.
4. Anthropologists and Native Americans should make joint presentations and appearances in dealing with agencies and the public whenever possible. Special emphasis should be given to public education.

5. Anthropologists and Native Americans should work together to solve problems of vandalism, looting and desecration.
6. Procedures should be developed for cooperation between anthropologists and native Americans.
7. The subcommittee shall prepare (for internal consideration) draft materials including the following: a statement on the ethics pertaining to excavation and reburial; possible changes to ARPA, NHPA and other appropriate federal laws and regulations; model state-level legislation (non-prescriptive); and it shall address the matter of deaccession.
8. The subcommittee shall make recommendations for future interaction of interested and relevant parties on the local, regional and national levels.

The consensus statements and the agenda they imply indicate the scope of the work and discussion that remain before notable progress toward resolutions of any of the problems can be claimed. SAA has declined to formulate a new policy on reburial at this time, given the complexity of the professional and human issues to be explored. The Society is reaching out to other professional groups for cooperative consultation on the issues. The subcommittee, representing a broad spectrum of special interests, will provide invaluable insight and advice as the search for mutually acceptable solutions continues.

#### *A Message from Your President*

At the last Board meeting, I was elected to serve as the next president of VAS. As my first official act, I would like to thank my predecessor, Dee Brightstar, for her hard work and dedication while serving as president. We are fortunate that, while Dee is stepping down from office, she remains on the Board and will continue to be active in VAS. I'm sure I speak for the entire membership when I extend a sincere thankyou to Dee.

One new and important policy change which I feel must be mentioned is that all board committees have been directed to seek committee members from among the general membership. This will serve two vitally important functions. First, it will provide a more active role for the membership, and second, it will prevent the board from being isolated from the membership. If anyone of you is interested in serving on any board committees, I strongly encourage you. Details of committee topics and the persons to contact are given in a separate article.

Thank you very much. I look forward to a productive and energetic year for VAS.

Sincerely,

Douglas Frink, President.



## *The View from the Editor's Desk*

Since this newsletter represents the first release under my editorship, I feel it appropriate to make several comments. First and foremost, I would like to thank my predecessor, Prudence Doherty. As I'm sure most of you are aware, Pru's insight and dedication were an invaluable asset, not only with regard to the newsletter, which under her five-year stewardship was of consistently high quality, but throughout the VAS organization. I will be hard put to maintain her standards of excellence and professionalism. Although Prudence is still a member of the Society, she currently resides in Bangor, Maine. We will sorely miss her direct involvement in upcoming VAS activities.

Secondly, I would like to apologize to the general membership for the long delay in publishing this issue. It is hard to believe that more than a year has gone by since the last newsletter was sent out. Both the Board of Trustees and myself are fully aware that a number of you depend solely on the newsletter as means of contact with the Society and Vermont archaeology. As editor, I accept full responsibility for the publication delay and will make every effort to prevent it from happening again. At the same time, and as is true in any organization which depends on volunteer effort for all endeavors, VAS members should be reminded that each of you has some measure of responsibility toward the day-to-day workings of the Society. With regard to the Newsletter, the more of you who can actually contribute time, whether in terms of publishable articles, news items or topic suggestions, the better off the publication will be.

Because of the long hiatus, we are facing a monumental news backlog which is only partially addressed by this issue. Thus, the next newsletter is schedule to be released in mid-March and should bring us back up to date. In addition to presenting the Spring Meeting program, the next issue will include updates on current activities at the Consulting Archaeology Program at UVM, and at the Division for Historic Preservation in Montpelier. Joe Popecki is also working up an analysis of the opinion poll which was sent out to all members in early January. Approximately 60% of the membership has returned them to date and this should give us a good cross-section of member opinion. I am also hoping to include summaries of the excellent talks given by David Lacey (Green Mountain National Forest) and Dr. Thomas Hemmings (Upper Connecticut River Survey) at the annual meeting this past fall.

Scott Dillon, Editor.

## Rolando and Friends Add Thirty Sites to State Register

Continuing industrial archaeology archival research, field inspection, and recording by VAS member Vic Rolando during 1985 has added thirty sites to the State Inventory. The sites are located in Addison County (9), Bennington County (10), Franklin County (1), Rutland County (7), Windham County (1) and Windsor County (2). They include charcoal kilns (remains of 11 mound, 12 stone, and 4 brick kilns at fifteen sites), 5 blast furnaces, 3 iron mines, 2 bloomery forges, 2 lime kilns, a cotton mill, a possible coke kiln, and a puzzling stone-lined pit. Field work at Mt. Tabor was rewarded by the location of a 36th charcoal kiln in the area where only 35 kilns traditionally have been known to exist.

Total 1985 contributed service to the Division for Historic Preservation by Vic was 430 hours, which will bring in about \$3,000 in matching funds from federal sources for preservation projects in Vermont. Included in this service was a week's vacation from GE to work in the Division office and a field inspection and report to the Division of potential impact on nineteenth century industrial sites along the Missisquoi River by the proposed Swanton Dam Hydroelectric Project.

For their current and past archaeological and recording work in the Green Mountain National Forest, Vic, Grace Rolando and Bob West (who participated in much of the field work) were awarded Certificates of Appreciation by Steve Harper, Forest Supervisor and Billee Hoornbeek, Forest Archaeologist. The award was made at a July luncheon in Rutland. Work in the National Forest currently includes a definitive inventory of all artifact remains of the nineteenth century charcoal industry.

At the Sheldon Museum's workshop, "Exploring Local Industry: Middlebury, 1800-1900", Vic made presentations on local ironmaking at two one-hour sessions. The 50 attendees and Workshop staff toured industrial sites on both sides of the base of Middlebury Falls on Sunday morning, followed by an afternoon tour of a blast furnace and associated remains at Forestdale.

Vic's plans for 1986 include continuing industrial archaeology activity concentrating on archival research, field research and recording of ironmaking sites, foundries, lime and brick kilns, as well as iron truss bridges, which are fast disappearing from the Vermont scene. He is especially anxious to find the site of Ira Allen's eighteenth century forge(s) in the Burlington-Winooski area.

In his spare time, Vic is Secretary and Treasurer of the Northern New England chapter of the Society for Industrial Archeology, and a technical editor at GE's Ordnance Division in Pittsfield, Massachusetts. His wife, Grace, who accompanies Vic on most of the field trips, is a Registered Nurse in Pittsfield.



# VAS Members in Print

DOHERTY, Prudence. Digging Up the Past: the Wright Roberts Site, West Rutland, Vermont. Rutland Historical Society, 1985. (Its Quarterly Publication, vol. XV, no. 3.)

This excellent sixteen page report is written by the former VAS Newsletter editor and program assistant for the Consulting Archaeology Program at UVM. It describes the discovery, analysis and evaluation of the Wright Roberts site, a late eighteenth century homestead located on the west bank of the Clarendon River in West Rutland. The site, designated VT-RU-82 in the State Inventory files, also encompasses a pre-historic occupation dating to the Late Woodland Period and was found in 1983 by the Consulting Archaeology program during a survey of the proposed Route 4 Bypass.

The report focuses primarily on the historic component and, in particular, details the interplay between field data and data obtained from various historic documents. In this case, the phased archaeological research conducted at the site resulted in a determination of eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places, and led the Vermont Agency of Transportation to design the highway alignment to avoid and protect the site from future disturbances.

Copies of this issue may be obtained from the Society at 101 Center Street, Rutland, VT, at the price of \$3.

SD

## Silver Lake Contributes Two Dugout Canoes to 1985 Total

Divers James E. Purdy and Alan Rixon, volunteers in the Forest Service's archaeology program, completed an underwater cultural resource survey of portions of Silver Lake in Leicester, Vermont during the 1985 season. The work was conducted under a permit granted by the State of Vermont and supported by the Middlebury District of the U.S. Forest Service.

In addition to recovering a number of artifacts apparently related to the nineteenth century seminary which was located near the lake, the divers found the well-preserved remains of two dugout canoes in 20-30 feet of water along the west shore. One of the canoes is fully exposed on the lake bottom and is 16.17 feet long with an inside diameter of 1.7 feet.

The second, partially buried in silt, is slightly larger, with an overall length of 17.58 feet and a diameter of 1.2 feet. The U.S. Forest Service has allocated funds for the radiocarbon dating of these specimens and both divers plan to return to the find spots in the spring to obtain the necessary material. A third dugout was reportedly found in an upland pond east of Clarendon, but specifics on the exact location and condition are not currently available.

These 1985 finds bring the total of dugouts known to exist in Vermont to eleven. Three have been found in Shelburne Pond over the past decade (c.f., VAS Newsletter, no. 50, January 1985.) Two additional dugouts were once on display at the Shelburne Museum, and two more were recovered from Lake Champlain south of Chimney Point. The eleventh one was found in Joe's Pond in Cabot and Danville. A special session on aboriginal use of the dugout throughout eastern North America is planned for the annual meeting of the Society for American Archaeology in New Orleans, April 23-26, 1986.



A NEW ORDER OF THE

## OFFICIAL VAS T-SHIRT

has just arrived! They are available in all sizes from small to extra large, and you have a choice of a dark blue or purple background. If you can't wait for the Spring Meeting to buy yours, you can order them now. Just fill in the order form below (you can photocopy it if you don't want to cut up your copy of the Newsletter). The cost is \$6 each, with an additional \$1 for postage and handling. Please make your checks out to the Vermont Archaeological Society and address the order to the Society at Box 663, Burlington, VT 05402 0663.

The T Shirts are made of 50% cotton and 50% polyester, which makes them shrink resistant and fully washable.

Order a bunch for your family and friends. That will not only benefit the VAS, but it will put the Society's name out there for all Vermonters to see.

### VAS T SHIRT ORDER FORM

	Blue	Purple	Total
Small	_____	_____	_____
Medium	_____	_____	_____
Large	_____	_____	_____
X-Large	_____	_____	_____

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

Total ordered:

Amount enclosed \$ \_\_\_\_\_

TO: VAS, Box 663, Burlington, VT 05402 0663

IF YOU CAN'T FIND YOUR DUES RENEWAL NOTICE OR ARE A NEW MEMBER,  
USE THIS FORM



# APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP OR RENEWAL

NEW  
 RENEWAL

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

CITY OR TOWN \_\_\_\_\_

STATE \_\_\_\_\_ ZIP \_\_\_\_\_

PHONE NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

AGE \_\_\_\_\_ (If student or senior citizen)

DUES SCHEDULE:

Individual.....	\$ 5.00
Family.....	8.00
Sustaining.....	12.00
Student (under 18).....	3.00
Senior Citizen (over 65).....	3.00
Institutional.....	8.00
Contributing.....	25.00
Life.....	100.00

Make checks payable to: THE VERMONT ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY, INC., and mail to:  
The Secretary, Vermont Archaeological Society, PO Box 663, Burlington, VT 05402

---

VERMONT ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
SOCIETY, INC.

BOX 663, BURLINGTON, VT 05402

FIRST CLASS

TO