For some places in the United States, archaeology has had a tumultuous political year. In Florida and Georgia, laws nearly passed that threatened the integrity of local archaeological sites (for more information on each, search “Florida 2016 House Bill 803” or “Georgia 2016 Senate Bill 346” online). While archaeological advocates in each state were relatively successful in amending or preventing the passing of damaging legislation in 2016, legislative proposals like these are bound to show up again.

As young and future professionals, students must play an active role in advocating for the importance of cultural resource protection in the United States and internationally. Being an advocate can have a dramatic effect on the future of a student’s intended profession and, by becoming involved now, students have the opportunity to shape the future of the archaeological discipline.

There are many steps students can take to get involved. One of the best ways to make your voice heard is to foster a relationship with elected representatives at the local, state, and federal level. Visit them at their office, take them to tour a local site, or invite them to participate in a program hosted by your school, avocational, student, or professional organization. Getting to know elected officials and establishing a relationship with them before an issue is put before them is ideal.

Students likewise act as advocates every time they talk about their studies with someone outside the discipline. In the past, some have seen archaeologists as elitists; this might stem from a tendency to talk in terms that only other archaeologists can be expected to understand. Archaeology is full of acronyms and jargon, so it is best to remove that as much as possible when speaking to others. Share your enthusiasm for archaeology when speaking about research. Archaeology is inherently interesting to the public, so capitalize on that by showing just how interesting it is to you. Having an "elevator speech" that you can give on the fly about your research, your issue, or whatever it is you are advocating for is also incredibly beneficial. You never know when an opportunity to talk to somebody will present itself.

Finally, include outreach and education into your fieldwork or research whenever possible. By educating others about the relevance of archaeology to their lives and to the lives of others, students foster
“Now, are you going to believe this or not?” Elder Fred Graham, a member of the Narungga Aboriginal community, said this to me while we were on a boat off the coast of Yorke Peninsula/Guuranda, in South Australia. It preaced an anecdote that he recounted from an event that happened about 65 years previously; while he was fishing from the same spot we were at that day. It was a story about when he fell backwards off the dinghy at the same time that a great white shark, named Big Fred, was patrolling the waters; but, by some miracle, he came straight back up into the boat without getting wet on his front at all.

I adopted this quote as the title of my doctoral thesis and I also chose it to begin my SHA conference paper as it represents a number of the key ideas and issues of my overall study, undertaken at the former Aboriginal mission Point Pearce/Burgiyana (1868–1966), located on Yorke Peninsula/Guuranda—the traditional land of the Narungga people.

Research in Australia has not previously employed the maritime cultural landscape (MCL) framework, the conceptual approach used in this research, to explore maritime themes within Indigenous contexts. It must of course be recognised at the outset that MCL’s are a Western construct. While MCL’s draw on many ideas, the primary interpretive framework I used is “facets.” The 11 facets of the MCL framework are: ritual/cultic, cognitive, topographic, outer resource, inner resource, transport, urban harbour, economic/subsistence/sustenance, social, territorial/power/resistance, and leisure maritime landscapes. These facets were devised by Christer Westerdahl and are intended to contrast, as well as combine, maritime and terrestrial components and allow for cross-disciplinary analogies. I used each category to present the oral history, archaeological, and archival data relevant to that theme in my results and then to interpret those results.

The oral history collection included 13 interviews, both on ‘Country’—including on boats—and off-site. Archaeology included non-disturbance surveys across terrestrial, coastal, and submerged environments at Point Pearce/Burgiyana. Finally, archival research featured a range of historical newspapers, photographs, children’s crayon drawings and other primary sources from the archives collected from the mission.

The research question was: does a “maritime cultural landscape” approach provide a useful or suitable framework for exploring and interpreting the cultural landscape of Point Pearce Mission/Burgiyana, South Australia? Further, what issues emerge (positive or negative) from the employment of a maritime cultural landscape framework in an Indigenous, post-contact context?

In response to the first question, yes, the MCL approach, with the following cautions and qualifications, may be useful for incorporating areas of importance to Indigenous Australian communities such as beliefs, knowledges, and lived experiences. This brings me to the second question, and the cautions and qualifications, as several issues emerge from this research. Of the five broad issues...
identified in my thesis, I was only able to discuss two of these in my conference paper and will only discuss one here. The other four issues are: MCL facets need to encompass non-Western systems of knowledge; maritime archaeology discourse and underpinning attitudes need to be deconstructed; maritime archaeology in Australia is generally Eurocentric; and oral histories are an integral source for exploring Indigenous MCL’s.

As an illustration, the issue discussed here is that colonial archives and local histories often silence Aboriginal peoples. To demonstrate this, I will use an example from the urban harbour landscape facet: lumping. Lumping was just one part of the involvement of Aboriginal people in wider shipping activities. Fred Graham described the transport of wheat and barley onto the sailing ships at Port Victoria/Dharldiwarldu: “They used to bring wheat and barley, same as everyone else, on horse and buggy. Big thing on rails, put all the wheat on and pull it out to the end of the jetty with the horse, and put it in the boats and dinghies and that sort of thing, and take it out to the big ships.”

Collaboration with Indigenous peoples can allow a glimpse of the invisible life of Aboriginal workers in the maritime industry which is largely undocumented in the colonial archive. The urban harbor facet highlights that it is imperative to envisage wider landscapes when considering the MCL approach for Indigenous post-contact contexts. Aboriginal peoples have provided labor to Australia’s maritime industry, lumping at a number of ports around Yorke Peninsula/Guuranda being a key area. Port Victoria/Dharldiwarldu may initially be considered a non-Indigenous maritime landscape, particularly given a lack of documentation of Aboriginal peoples’ involvement in port work (such as lumping) in local non-Indigenous histories. However, the results of this study indicate that it is equally important to the Aboriginal maritime landscape and reveals numerous insights into cross-cultural engagement.

In conclusion, this study evaluated the MCL framework and endeavoured to build upon this framework by applying it to an Indigenous Australian context. The interpretive framework of facets of a MCL was, in most instances, directly applicable and useful to the case study of Point Pearce Mission/Burgiyan. In other cases, subject to evaluation, the MCL approach needed to be adjusted and critiqued to enable it to become suitably applicable.

The neglected narrative communicated here must become household history and reinsertion into local narratives is required to decolonise the past.

I would like to express my deep appreciation to the ACUA for the George Fischer Student Travel Award, through which I was able to meet and discuss my work with a number of colleagues for the first time. The insights I gained about the discipline of maritime archaeology in America were also invaluable.

Still don’t believe this? Maddy Fowler’s PhD is freely accessible from https://wessexarch.academia.edu/MaddyFowler.
2017 George Fischer Student Travel Award

Are you a student outside of the United States who is planning to present a paper at the 2017 Society for Historical and Underwater Archaeology Conference in Fort Worth, Texas?

The Advisory Council on Underwater Archaeology is pleased to announce the 2017 ACUA George Fischer Student Travel Award. This award of $1,000.00 (USD) will be offered to help fund travel costs for the upcoming 2017 SHA Conference in Dallas, Texas, USA, and will be granted to an international student presenting a paper on an underwater or maritime archaeology topic at this Conference. Conference abstracts must be submitted directly to the Conference Organizers as outlined in the Call for Papers. Please refer to http://sha.org/conferences/ for complete details on abstract submission and deadlines.

To be eligible for consideration, students interested in applying for this award must currently be enrolled, and in good academic standing, in a graduate degree program (includes full-time, part-time, or thesis/dissertation hours only). For more information and how to apply, visit www.acuaonline.org and click on the Award PDF.

2017 SHA Student Paper Award Competition

The 16th Society for Historical Archaeology Student Paper Prize will be awarded at the 50th Conference on Historical and Underwater Archaeology, to be held January 4-7, 2017 in Fort Worth, Texas. The prize will be awarded to a student, or students, whose written version of a conference paper is judged superior in the areas of originality, research merit, clarity of presentation, professionalism, and of potential relevance to a considerable segment of the archaeological community. One prize will be awarded. The winning author(s) will receive a book prize consisting of titles donated by the many presses and organizations exhibiting in the SHA Conference Book Room (totaling almost $1,600 worth of items in 2016) and a letter of recognition from the SHA President.

For more information, visit https://sha.org/about-us.awards-and-prizes/

U.S. Naval History Conference
U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland
8-9 September 2016
http://www.usni.org/events/2016-naval-history-conference

NAS AND SCAPE Conference: From Land to Sea
University of Glasgow,
4-6 November 2016
http://www.nauticalarchaeologysociety.org/archconf16

American Anthropological Association Annual Meeting
Minneapolis,
16-20 November 2016
http://www.americananthro.org/AttendEvents/landing.aspx?ItemNumber=14722&navItemNumber=566

The Sixth International Congress on Underwater Archaeology
Freemantle, Australia
28 November-2 December 2016

Society for Historical Archaeology Annual Conference
Fort Worth, Texas
4-8 January 2017
https://sha.org/conferences/

Archaeological Institute of America and Society for Classical Studies Joint Annual Meeting
Toronto, Ontario, Canada
5-8 January 2017
https://www.archaeological.org/meeting/about

DeGuwa Conference
Kblansk, Germany
17-19 March 2017
http://www.deguwa.org/?id=12
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