

2012

UNESCO, URI, and Archaeology in the Deep Blue Sea: Archaeological Ethics and Archaeological Oceanography

William H. Krieger

University of Rhode Island, krieger@uri.edu

Bridget Buxton

University of Rhode Island, babuxton@uri.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/phl_facpubs

Terms of Use

All rights reserved under copyright.

Citation/Publisher Attribution

Krieger, W.H. & Buxton, B. J *Mari Arch* (2012) 7: 271. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11457-012-9092-y>

Available at: <http://www.springerlink.com/content/7vhx16u2306505v7/>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Philosophy at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Philosophy Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

**UNESCO, URI, and Archaeology in the Deep Blue Sea:
Archaeological Ethics and Archaeological Oceanography**

1
2
3
4 **Authors:**
5

6 *William H. Krieger*: Department of Philosophy, The University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI,
7 U.S.A.
8

9
10 *Bridget Buxton*: Department of History, The University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI, U.S.A.
11

12 Please send correspondence to William Krieger.

13 Email: krieger@mail.uri.edu

14 Phone: 401 464 2180

15 Address: URI Department of Philosophy. Kingston, RI 02881
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **Abstract**
23

24 Multiple groups have interests that intersect within the new field of deep submergence (beyond
25 the 50 meter range of SCUBA) archaeology. These groups' differing priorities present
26 challenges for interdisciplinary collaboration, particularly as there are no established guidelines
27 for best practices in such scenarios. Associating the term 'archaeology' with projects directed at
28 underwater cultural heritage that are pqv'guided by archaeologists poses a real risk to that heritage.
29 Recognizing that the relevant professional organizations, local laws, and conventions currently
30 have little ability to protect pieces of cultural heritage across disciplines and international
31 boundaries, the authors propose institution-specific mechanisms, called Archaeology Review
32 Boards (ARBs), guided by local and international laws and conventions concerning cultural
33 heritage, as the best means to provide oversight for academically centered archaeological
34 activities at the local level.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 **Keywords**
53

54 Archaeology. Ethics. 2001 UNESCO convention. Underwater cultural heritage
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 **Exploration of the deep**
5

6 We are fortunate to live in an age when scientific and technological innovation has resulted in
7
8 the creation of a variety of vehicles (both human driven and remotely operated) that have
9
10 extended our reach into the deepest waters. As a result, there have already been a number of
11
12 situations, both intentional and unintentional, where using these vehicles has resulted in the
13
14 discovery of underwater cultural heritage, and some oceanographic expeditions are indeed now
15
16 setting out with the precise purpose of discovering shipwrecks, underwritten by federal funding
17
18 for ocean exploration.¹ The creators and operators of these craft are ocean scientists and
19
20 engineers located in industry and in the oceanographic research community, and in addition to
21
22 developing the vehicles used for deep-water survey and exploration, they generally subsidize
23
24 deep-water archaeological work substantially or exclusively through their own financial means.
25
26 In fact, one of the highest premiums is on space on research vessels. Costs average \$30,000-
27
28 40,000 per day for the use of an appropriately equipped oceanographic research vessel, which is
29
30 well beyond the financial capabilities of most professional archaeologists (Ballard 2008); in the
31
32 commercial realm the cost of a work-class ROV vessel and its crew begins at \$50,000 per day
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42
43
44 ¹ A few recent examples of these partnerships include the National Oceanographic Partnership
45 Program 2010 study of the mid Atlantic <http://www.nopp.org/2010/nopp-sponsors-deep-water-hard-bottom-habitat-study/> (accessed December 21, 2011); Robert Ballard's 1997 exploration of
46 the Black Sea for the purpose of finding ancient dwellings inundated when this freshwater body
47 was flooded by rising sea levels approximately 7150 years ago.
48 <http://www.geo.edu.ro/sgr/mod/downloads/PDF/Ballard-MarGeo-2000-170-253.pdf> (accessed
49 December 21, 2011); NOAA's 2008 mission to discover historic shipwrecks off Turks and
50 Caicos islands <http://www.research.noaa.gov/spotlite/> (accessed December 21, 2011); the
51 PHAEDRA project, 2006
52 <http://oceanexplorer.noaa.gov/explorations/06greece/background/archaeology/archaeology.html>
53 (accessed December 21, 2011); and the many projects of the Wood's Hole Oceanographic
54 Institute, including
55 <http://oceanexplorer.noaa.gov/explorations/06greece/background/archaeology/archaeology.html>
56 (accessed December 21, 2011).

1
2
3
4 (Søreide 2011); in some cases, depending on the complexity of the job, commercial boats with
5
6
7 work class ROVs can average up to \$250,000 per day.
8
9

10 Some other groups interested in deep-sea industry, such as the oil and gas sector, now adhere to
11
12 federally mandated protocols under The Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) whose
13
14 jurisdiction covers all federal submerged lands, including the continental shelf, slope, and basin
15
16 up to 200 nautical miles.² Businesses engaged in deep-water activities are required, under certain
17
18 conditions, to employ archaeologists and adhere to BOEM's guidelines where cultural heritage is
19
20 concerned. In these commercial contexts, work cannot proceed without the guidance of a
21
22 professionally qualified archaeologist. This expert contributes to the expedition planning process
23
24 from the beginning, and must be physically present to direct, observe, and report on all diving
25
26 investigations. BOEM provides oversight of this process as the reviewing agency for all results
27
28 produced, and has published guidelines establishing everything from the correct format of
29
30 archaeological reports to the recommended height for towing sides-can sonar fish in a variety of
31
32 survey scenarios.³ The regulatory environment for the U.S. oil and gas industry with respect to
33
34 archaeological heritage is still evolving, but since 1966 the Minerals Management Service has
35
36 been responsible for protecting archaeological resources on the Outer Continental Shelf, and
37
38 industry has proven itself as a genuine stakeholder in the preservation of deep-sea cultural
39
40 heritage. The existence of positive legal requirements has even resulted in partnerships between
41
42 the industry and professional archaeologists. Excavations such as the *Mardi Gras* (Ford 2010)
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 ² <http://www.boem.gov/Regulations/BOEM-Governing-Statutes.aspx> (accessed March 27,
56 2012).

57
58 ³ <http://www.boem.gov/Regulations/Notices-To-Lesseees/2005/05-G07.aspx>; see also the survey
59 guidelines in [http://www.gomr.boemre.gov/homepg/regulate/regs/ntls/2005%20NTLs/NTL2005-](http://www.gomr.boemre.gov/homepg/regulate/regs/ntls/2005%20NTLs/NTL2005-G07.pdf)
60 [G07.pdf](http://www.gomr.boemre.gov/homepg/regulate/regs/ntls/2005%20NTLs/NTL2005-G07.pdf) (accessed March 27, 2012).
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 show the potential for research collaboration beyond the basic commercial relationships that
5
6 already exist between the oil and gas industry and the CRM archaeological community.
7
8
9

10 However, in this new age of deep-water exploration outside of the jurisdiction of organizations
11
12 such as BOEM, the legal waters are still mostly uncharted (O'Keefe 1999). As a result, academic
13
14 institutions are lagging behind management agencies such as BOEM in establishing guidelines
15
16 for deep-water research activities that impact cultural heritage, especially when the research
17
18 takes place outside U.S. jurisdiction. In the absence of effective legal safeguards or even well
19
20 established models for best practices in many parts of the globe, a university-sponsored research
21
22 expedition that is either partly or entirely 'archaeological' in purpose (for example, finding
23
24 shipwrecks) can proceed without the same level of archaeological oversight that would be
25
26 mandated on an equivalent terrestrial project. In addition to the questions of oversight, such an
27
28 expedition can easily operate without awareness or respect for archaeological procedures or
29
30 priorities, or understanding of current international or local agreements on the proper care of
31
32 underwater cultural heritage. In the United States, there is currently nothing that parallels the
33
34 BOEM regulations concerning the appropriate behavior of U.S.-based ocean scientists
35
36 conducting deep-water survey in areas of high archaeological potential, and the United Nations
37
38 Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) and other applicable international laws do little to
39
40 clarify the situation.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 What then of more informal standards and regulations, of the kind established through long
51
52 practice and publication within the terrestrial archaeological community? Following in the
53
54 footsteps of other field changing texts, such as *Maritime Archaeology* (Muckelroy 1978) and
55
56 *Shipwreck Anthropology* (Gould 1983), the most comprehensive statement outlining an
57
58 oceanographic view of the nature, potential, and appropriate practices of deep submergence
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 archaeology from the perspective of the United States is *Archaeological Oceanography* (Ballard
5
6
7 2008), which showcases the achievements of twenty years of Institute for Exploration (IFE)
8
9 expeditions.⁴ This vision for deep-water archaeology captures the sense of almost unlimited
10
11 potential for discovery that the deep oceans represent. The technology of deep-sea exploration is
12
13 indeed awe-inspiring to the outsider, and the pioneering and innovative spirit that inspired the
14
15 first major American deep submergence archaeology (DSA) projects deserves admiration.
16
17

18
19
20 Despite the introduction of this new archaeological-oceanographic platform, it appears that no
21
22 one has yet stepped forward to ask the difficult but necessary questions this new disciplinary and
23
24 operational paradigm raises from the perspective of archaeologists. At the same time, from the
25
26 oceanographic perspective, there is a very real concern that the archaeological community cannot
27
28 understand the needs and perspective of oceanography as an academic discipline.
29
30

31
32 Communication and understanding are at the key issues here, complicated by the fact that both
33
34 oceanographers and archaeologists employ research terms (such as 'survey' or 'sample') that have
35
36 subtle but sometimes profoundly different implications within each discipline. That is why it is
37
38 not enough for archaeologists and oceanographers to simply hope for the best. There must be
39
40 mechanisms for ongoing dialogue and oversight. The stakes are high: if archaeologists and
41
42 oceanographers cannot learn to collaborate effectively within an agreed framework of guidelines
43
44 and responsibilities for the advancement of human knowledge, commercial treasure hunters will
45
46 move in to fill the vacuum, assuming technological and popular leadership in the field of deep
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 ⁴ Although partnerships between archaeologists and ocean scientists vary from country to
57
58 country, the authors of this paper contend that the issues raised here, from the perspective of the
59
60 United States, do carry over to these other locales. The universal nature of this problem is, in
61
62 fact, one reason that the proposed ARB (see below) has as one of its charges the evaluation of
63
64 extra-URI projects for credit toward a URI degree.
65

1
2
3
4 sea archaeological survey and excavation. Indeed, judging by popular television and news
5
6 coverage of these groups, one could argue that the treasure hunters already hold this position.
7
8
9

10 **Where are the archaeologists?**

11
12 As deep-water exploration that impacts evidence of past human culture and activity is going to
13
14 continue, and as water covers approximately 70% of the earth's surface, it is fair to ask what role
15
16 archaeologists will actually play in the field. This is especially important, as archaeologists are
17
18 not able to simply go to many sites: the 'field' is increasingly a place that can only be reached
19
20 using the most sophisticated and expensive equipment. In the race for archaeological
21
22 information, the owners and operators of this equipment are far ahead of the archaeological
23
24 community in the development of tools and strategies to locate and excavate deep-water
25
26 shipwrecks (Wachsmann 2011). Since the objectives of for-profit salvage operations are, for the
27
28 most part, in conflict with those of professional archaeologists, professional archaeologists have
29
30 determined that colleagues in the marine sciences would be the logical partners and allies for
31
32 DSA. But the difficulty in this partnership is setting our appropriate ground rules so that
33
34 oceanographers and archaeologists do not need to feel that their tools and expertise are
35
36 essentially being subordinated to the research goals of their partners' discipline.
37
38

39
40 Here, *Archaeological Oceanography's* answer seems a very appropriate one. To quote from the
41
42 introduction: "The term 'archaeological oceanography' sounds like the former is subordinated to
43
44 the latter but this is not the case. A geological oceanographer is a geologist working in the ocean.
45
46 An archaeological oceanographer is an archaeologist working in the ocean as well." (Ballard
47
48 2008, x). This begs the question of whether the term 'oceanography' is needed at all to describe
49
50 practitioners of this new sub-discipline, when archaeologists regularly collaborate with scientists
51
52 in other realms without needing to redefine themselves or their activities. Indeed, Søreide has
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 observed that "in reality there are no oceanographic archaeologists... there is archaeology that
5 occurs in deep water but it is simply archaeology" (Søreide 2011, 7). The question here revolves
6 around what it means to be an archaeologist.
7
8

9
10
11 That said, *Archaeological Oceanography's* definition of itself would seem to align perfectly with
12 the recently-ratified UNESCO 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural
13 Heritage (CPUCH), Annex rule 22: "Activities directed at underwater cultural heritage shall only
14 be undertaken under the direction and control of, and in the regular presence of, a qualified
15 underwater archaeologist."⁵ Although several important maritime nations, including the United
16 States of America, have not signed the CPUCH, many archaeological groups and research
17 institutions have formally or informally endorsed its core principles.⁶ In fact, one of the
18 significant differences between CPUCH and its annex is: "The Convention represents a
19 compromise text, as any multilateral treaty, between various views and perspectives. However,
20 the annex of the Convention was a unanimously adopted text. Its technical rather than legal
21 (and/or political) nature helped in achieving such a result (remarkable in a genuinely multilateral
22 negotiation)." (Carducci 2005, 1) This unanimous support in committee has been reflected in the
23 reception to the two documents in the larger world. While a number of countries (for a variety of
24 reasons) are reluctant to sign CPUCH, many governments and groups worldwide look to the
25 annex for support. An example of this spreading wave of archaeological agreement on the annex
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 ⁵ For the text of the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural
52 Heritage, see: [www.unesco.org/new/en/unesco/themes/underwater-cultural-heritage/the-2001-](http://www.unesco.org/new/en/unesco/themes/underwater-cultural-heritage/the-2001-convention/)
53 [convention/](http://www.unesco.org/new/en/unesco/themes/underwater-cultural-heritage/the-2001-convention/). A closely related document, and inspiration for many of the provisions in the
54 CPUCH annex, is the ICOMOS Charter on the Protection and Management of Underwater
55 Cultural Heritage: www.international.icomos.org/under_e.htm (accessed December 21, 2011).

56
57 ⁶ See for example the website of the Advisory Council for Underwater Archaeology
58 (<http://www.acuaonline.org>), which contains links to the CPUCH and ICOMOS documents, and
59 summarizes the objectives of the CPUCH as part of the official ACUA underwater archaeology
60 ethics press kit.
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 was a two-part international workshop and conference on this topic, which resulted in a report
5
6 (Greene 2010) and a statement of guidelines for best practices, based on the annex and endorsed
7
8 by a group of archaeologists working in maritime contexts. Other groups and institutions in the
9
10 United States, such as the Institute of Nautical Archaeology,⁷ the American Institute for
11
12 Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works,⁸ the Archaeological Institute of America,⁹ and the
13
14 University of Rhode Island Archaeology Group,¹⁰ have adopted the annex's guidelines as well.
15
16 Among the safeguards archaeologists take for granted with terrestrial sites (or underwater sites
17
18 within the state waters of a sovereign nation, or in areas designated as significant in federally
19
20 controlled waters) is the requirement that there be archaeological oversight of projects that have
21
22 the potential to discover or disrupt UCH.¹¹ As a part of this process, the archaeologist's
23
24 qualifications, experience, and research plan is reviewed before the survey or excavation is
25
26 approved, and a suitably trained archaeologist provides oversight. In the case of projects
27
28 undertaken by the oil and gas industries, although the government does not send its own
29
30 archaeologists on each survey, any archaeologist (Principle Investigator) that is contracted to
31
32 oversee these projects has to meet the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's requirements for a
33
34 professional marine archaeologist and prepare a report that is sent to the BOEM archaeologists
35
36 for review. As deep submergence research activities often occur in international waters,
37
38 archaeologists are concerned that there is no outside authority forcing the project leaders to
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 ⁷ http://inadiscover.com/about/ocomos_charter (accessed December 21, 2011).

51 ⁸ <http://www.conservators-converse.org/2011/08/aic-releases-statement-on-the-10th-anniversary-of-the-adoption-of-the-unesco-convention-on-the-protection-of-the-underwater-cultural-heritage/>
52 (accessed December 21, 2011).

53 ⁹ <http://www.archaeological.org/news/advocacy/93> (accessed December 21, 2011).

54 ¹⁰ <http://www.uri.edu/archaeology/> (accessed December 21, 2011).

55 ¹¹ This significance requirement is being reassessed by governmental agencies (such as BOEM)
56 as not providing enough protection to areas that have no such designation. See below for more
57 on BOEM's past and current practices on this issue.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 explain their goals or document their findings in an academically approved fashion. In fact, U.S.
5
6 projects designed for the discovery of UCH in deep-water (projects that would clearly be
7
8 considered archaeological in terrestrial contexts or in territorial waters) have already occurred
9
10 without adequate provision for archaeological oversight or appropriate support for the study and
11
12 publication of the project results. As there are no agreed upon guidelines for oversight of UCH
13
14 related projects outside of U.S. jurisdiction, there is no real means for major funding agencies, or
15
16 other non-archaeological groups, to conduct an effective review process for such projects. It does
17
18 not help archaeologists' case that they have, as a field, allowed themselves to be perceived
19
20 inaccurately in the media (somewhere between *Indiana Jones* and a beachcomber with a metal
21
22 detector), which has led the public to assume that the role of the archaeologist is essentially to
23
24 'find' things, and therefore to assume that anyone who is good a finding things should be
25
26 identified as an archaeologist, or at least empowered to act as one. Recent television shows,
27
28 including Spike TV's *American Digger* and National Geographic Channel's *Diggers*, which
29
30 glorify the recovery and sale of artifacts, solidify the public's perception that archaeology and
31
32 treasure hunting are one and the same.¹²
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 The answer to the question "where are the archaeologists?" on an expedition directed at the
42
43 discovery or disturbance of underwater cultural heritage should never be ambiguous. By
44
45 unanimous agreement of the international archaeological community, and in line with best
46
47 practices in terrestrial archaeology, a suitably qualified archaeologist must be fully involved and
48
49 physically present for all activities that impact cultural heritage.
50
51
52
53

54
55
56 ¹² Articles such as one by the Museum of Underwater Archaeology's Ben Ford highlight this
57
58 problem specifically for underwater archaeologists:
59 http://www.uri.edu/artsci/his/mua/project_journals/bf/bf_6-13.shtml (accessed march 27,
60
61 2012).
62
63
64
65

When is archaeology not archaeology?

A possible response to arguments calling for archaeologists to be more involved in expedition planning and to be present on research vessels to provide oversight might be to claim that not all deep sea survey is directed towards the recovery of underwater cultural heritage. If a deep-sea voyage is planned solely for the purpose of exploration, and if these voyages are aimed at discovering (but not excavating) UCH, they might argue, that titles aside, these projects are not archaeological. The question is whether ocean exploration directed at finding shipwrecks (as opposed to mounting an archaeological excavation of those sites) should be subject to the UNESCO Annex rule 22 (thereby requiring archaeological collaboration). Although the arguer would be correct in one sense, that exploration is not the same as excavation, the reader should not be led to the further conclusion that these activities are not bound by the annex. In fact, the word ‘excavate’ is not a part of Annex rule 22: “Activities directed at underwater cultural heritage shall only be undertaken under the direction and control of, and in the regular presence of, a qualified underwater archaeologist.” If the annex is to guide procedure, then, at least to the archaeological community, oceanographic survey directed towards the discovery of UCH must be considered archaeology according to the terms of the CPUCH.

Obviously, archaeologists are not capable of (and are not at all interested in) policing all deep-sea voyages. The point of the discussion above (and the argument for the creation of ARBs below) is twofold. First, the authors want ocean scientists to understand why archaeologists feel a responsibility to be involved in UCH projects. Second, the authors want other stakeholders in ocean exploration to understand why a particular community – a group of professional, and here, specifically academic archaeologists (regardless of their particular academic posting) – feels a

1
2
3
4 need to control projects that are being used to represent archaeology, due to the impact those
5
6 projects can have on the sponsoring university, its students, and its faculty.
7
8
9

10 In the case of BOEM, these issues were originally addressed by designating certain areas under
11
12 their purview to be potentially of high archaeological significance, based on predictive modeling
13
14 from survey data collected in 1977, 1989, and 2003. Commercial operations requiring a permit
15
16 from BOEM must work with archaeologists to survey those areas first, and identify and if
17
18 necessary mitigate any damage to cultural material. According to this view, an oceanographic
19
20 expedition off established sea-lanes in the middle of the Atlantic or Pacific would not expect to
21
22 encounter significant cultural material; an expedition exploring the territorial waters of any
23
24 Mediterranean country would almost certainly encounter it. In other words, it is less the title or
25
26 stated purpose of the expedition that is important for determining the appropriate role of
27
28 archaeology and archaeologists, but more the area in which the exploration or work is taking
29
30 place.
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 There are problems with this geographical model for determining the archaeological significance
38
39 of a region (as forward thinking as it was when it was created). Although there may be large
40
41 concentrations of UCH in areas so designated (coastal areas, areas of known traffic, etc.), this
42
43 approach, one that makes decisions based on geography and not intent, makes little theoretical
44
45 sense and overlooks potential unknown areas of deposition. In addition to making it difficult to
46
47 study materials that are outside of these designated safe havens, this practice would have the
48
49 effect of skewing the archaeological record to reflect whatever biases caused certain areas to be
50
51 protected (to the expense of others). If only certain areas are protected, and if artifacts therefore
52
53 only come from those areas, any conclusions reached based on those materials will be skewed to
54
55 match the initial assumptions of the group creating the areas of high archaeological significance.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 The fact is that, given new technologies and theoretical models of sea trade, areas that have in
5 the past been considered of low importance could become critical in the future. Establishing
6 exactly when and how an archaeologist should be involved in any particular scenario is
7 something best done in consultation on a case-by-case basis. In fact, as early as 2004 there were
8 criticisms of the assumptions behind the aforementioned surveys, and as of March 2011, BOEM
9 changed their policies, now requiring archaeological assessment for all areas of the Gulf of
10 Mexico subject to seafloor disturbance by any activity under their authority.¹³
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 . Despite claims to the contrary, the greatest source of damage to UCH comes from activities that
23 have nothing to do with the primary goal of collecting UCH. As documented by Foley (2007),
24 the greatest danger to archaeological heritage in the ocean is modern industrial activity, and the
25 deployment of cables, nets, etc. that destroy underwater sites. As damage to UCH by industrial
26 use is unintentional, there would be a real benefit to having archaeologists ‘on call’ to provide
27 information and to work on problems on behalf of other groups whose work impacts on UCH.
28 Missions focused on exploration, at times, have an impact on UCH, and given the archaeological
29 contention that activities that are directed toward the discovery of UCH (survey) or the
30 disturbance or reclamation of UCH (excavation) are, to an extent, archaeological activities,
31 archaeologists definitely take the view that exploration undertaken for the primary or even
32 secondary purpose of discovering (but not excavating) UCH should be considered archaeological
33 survey, and subject to archaeological (in addition to oceanographic) rules and standards.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 In 2009-2010 the idea that the CPUCH annex should be seen as a guide to best archaeological
53 practices was the subject of an international two-part workshop on UCH issues. Mentioned
54
55
56
57

58
59 ¹³ [http://www.boem.gov/Environmental-Stewardship/Archaeology/Gulf-of-Mexico-
60 Archaeological-Information.aspx](http://www.boem.gov/Environmental-Stewardship/Archaeology/Gulf-of-Mexico-Archaeological-Information.aspx) accessed March 27, 2012).
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 above, “The Penn-Brock statement of principles and best practices for underwater archaeology
5 and the stewardship of underwater cultural heritage in the Mediterranean” (Green 2010) is a
6
7 document that explores the definitions of UCH, the role of archaeologists in protecting UCH, and
8
9 the responsibility of archaeologists to work with other scientists and specialists to further their
10
11 understanding of and protection of UCH.¹⁴ Our challenge lies both in working out best practices
12
13 from an archaeological point of view, and in helping researchers outside our discipline
14
15 understand the situation from our perspective, as well as trying to be sensitive to our scientific
16
17 and engineering colleagues’ different foci of attention, theoretical models, and areas of expertise.
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 The issues and questions outlined above are of particular concern to academic institutions
25
26 supporting interdisciplinary research and teaching initiatives that involve cultural heritage, both
27
28 in the ocean and in terrestrial contexts, and the evidence is clear that universities, once apprised
29
30 of the issues, can and do change long-held policies in favor of compliance with archaeological
31
32 ethical standards.¹⁵ Based in part on the issues above, as well as on more global concerns about
33
34 the potential for abuses of projects being referred to as ‘archaeology’ at academic institutions
35
36 across the country, the members of the University of Rhode Island archaeology group (consisting
37
38 of 3 North American / Atlantic archaeologists and 3 Classical / Bronze Age / Near Eastern
39
40 archaeologists) decided to explore ways in which the core principles of the preeminent cultural
41
42 heritage conventions might be applied in practice at an institutional level.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 ¹⁴ The conference report is available as a pdf file, downloadable from
52 <http://www.archaeological.org/fieldnotes/reports/3291> (accessed December 21, 2011).
53

54 ¹⁵ Recent examples of universities changing policies in this manner include Yale University’s
55 2010 decision to repatriate Incan artifacts brought to Yale in 1911 by Professor Hiram Bingham
56 III by the end of 2012 and Wesleyan University’s 2010 decision to repatriate artifacts that
57 belonged to a variety of indigenous groups in violation of NAGPRA. In this case, the push for
58 compliance (and supervision of its implementation) was largely a result of action by a ‘local
59 level’ group comprised of professors and students from Wesleyan.
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 The guiding belief of this effort was that inertia or apathy on matters of archaeological ethics at
5 the level of our government and legal system did not justify the same approach at an institutional
6 level. Academic archaeologists at universities throughout the United States of America should
7 proactively determine the role that archaeology will play at their campuses, and at all university-
8 sponsored projects on land and in the water. By doing this at the institutional level, a university's
9 archaeologists could make sure that archaeological projects created at that university would be of
10 the highest caliber, that their students would participate in scientifically and ethically rigorous
11 projects around the world, and that the university as an institution would be associated with
12 archaeology's best practices. The need for URI's archaeologists to form a distinctive organization
13 in order to establish themselves as an authoritative voice for their discipline was partly because
14 the faculty themselves were spread across multiple academic departments, which is a common
15 situation in U.S. universities. However, even in cases where archaeological activities are
16 concentrated in a single department, the fact that other stakeholders interested in ancient culture
17 or artifacts exist at a university would provide good reason to create such an organization.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 As representatives of the academic archaeological community, URI's archaeologists have neither
40 the desire nor the ability to control projects by non-URI groups or by non-archaeologists. The
41 point of URI's proposed Archaeological Review Board (ARB), and of any ARB would be to
42 ensure that university-based archaeological projects live up to the international standards
43 outlined above, and that students participating in outside projects would have real assurances that
44 they were being steered toward the best the field has to offer. It is our intention that this model
45 would serve as test case for other university faculties in archaeology who are attempting to set an
46 example in matters surrounding archaeological best practices.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 **Implementation at URI: Adopting ethical guidelines and identifying competent authorities**
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Given the various stakeholders interested in UCH at the University of Rhode Island, the
5
6 challenge for our proposed ARB model will be to draw up a set of guidelines and procedures that
7
8 interpret the general recommendations of the relevant cultural heritage conventions within the
9
10 specific context of research, teaching, and supervision conducted under URI auspices, with
11
12 special attention paid to the strengths, needs, and limitations of our multidisciplinary partners.
13
14

15
16
17 A group invested in protecting UCH at the University of Rhode Island has decided to use the
18
19 CPOCH annex's guidelines, along with other sets of policies and procedures created by respected
20
21 archaeological organizations and conventions, to outline a proposed set of consistent and
22
23 appropriate best practices for all archaeological research conducted by or for URI. The CPOCH
24
25 holds a prominent place in this effort because deep-water archaeology and interdisciplinary
26
27 initiatives with oceanography and marine affairs are a focus of URI's institutional and faculty
28
29 driven research interests. Rather than invoking the 2001 CPOCH annex and related documents as
30
31 position papers, this inter-field group is looking at ways of transforming the recommendations
32
33 into actual procedures endorsed and applied by our University for all activities directed at
34
35 cultural heritage (on land and underwater).
36
37
38
39
40

41
42 The first step was to use the CPOCH to determine how decisions should be made in regards to UCH
43
44 policies. The convention states that these decisions are to be made by 'competent authorities'.
45
46

47 The CPOCH describes this in article 22.1:
48
49

50
51 In order to ensure the proper implementation of this Convention, States Parties shall
52 establish competent authorities or reinforce the existing ones where appropriate,
53 with the aim of providing for the establishment, maintenance and updating of an
54 inventory of underwater cultural heritage, the effective protection, conservation,
55 presentation and management of underwater cultural heritage, as well as research
56 and education.
57
58
59
60
61
62

1
2
3
4 In the attached CPUCH Annex, rules 2, 9, 11, 12, 22, and 34 explain the roles that these
5
6 competent authorities play on all aspects surrounding the care of underwater cultural heritage,
7
8 including the provision that archaeologists must be physically on hand in positions of authority
9
10 on expeditions directed at underwater cultural heritage.
11
12
13

14
15 Who are these competent authorities? The CPUCH was designed to address states, but as laid out
16
17 in Varmer et al (2010) the United States has not signed the convention (arguing that it could be
18
19 used as a means to undermine national security on a couple of levels), there are no proactive
20
21 'competent authorities' at a national level. Since university faculty are hardly in a position to
22
23 assume the power and responsibilities envisioned for government agencies, the question is: who
24
25 would the competent authorities be, and how would their abilities allow them to both know
26
27 international ethical guidelines and to create university policies for the protection of UCH?
28
29
30
31

32
33 To answer that question, it is necessary to search for regional or national organizations that could
34
35 undertake this effort. In fact, there are a number of competent national and regional
36
37 archaeological organizations that already exist in the United States (e.g. the Archaeological
38
39 Institute of America, the Society for Historical Archaeology, the Society for American
40
41 Archaeology, the American Schools of Oriental Research), as well as non-profit consultant
42
43 groups that specialize in these issues, such as the Advisory Council on Underwater Archaeology
44
45 and Register of Professional Archaeologists. Each group has a code of conduct, which is at least
46
47 recommended, if not binding on all members of those organizations. However, many who now
48
49 participate in the study of cultural heritage are not members of those organizations and may be
50
51 unwilling to defer to them as competent authorities where cultural heritage is concerned, and
52
53 none of these organizations are able to perform the specific tasks outlined in the CPUCH.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Additionally, even if regional or national authorities on UCH could be found, there would be
5
6 questions as to their local authority (an issue that will be addressed below).
7
8
9

10 In addition to the contention that top-down legislation or structure does not provide the practical
11
12 ethical safeguards that are needed at an institutional level, there are good philosophical
13
14 arguments to not put too much stake in the efficacy of institutions nominally adopting general
15
16 principles in lieu of local regulatory structures. This critical view of top-down legislation is far
17
18 more in keeping with the philosophy of archaeology itself as a discipline. Twenty-first century
19
20 archaeologists operate within a framework of international laws, conventions, and well-
21
22 established traditions, but archaeology is just awakening to the idea that these conventions must
23
24 work in concert with (and not in lieu of) good local decision-making. Project-specific approaches
25
26 were not always considered ideal in a field that is in some ways still struggling to define itself
27
28 between the realms of science, history, and belief. As documented in Krieger (2006), terrestrial
29
30 archaeology in particular has suffered from ‘law envy,’ spending the middle of the twentieth
31
32 century courting philosophical authorities on science to ground archaeology in a more scientific
33
34 framework. This attempt, which resulted in processual, or “new archaeology” (especially the
35
36 new archaeology of North America) did help to push the field forward, but this motion, instead
37
38 of unifying the field, caused it to fracture into its currently dis-unified state, one where
39
40 processual, post-processual, interpretive, and other global and local archaeologies make
41
42 competing claims about the interpretation of (and the content of) archaeological data.¹⁶ Many of
43
44 the arguments against the processual approach were directly related to the belief that this model
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 ¹⁶ Krieger (2011) argues that this is not a position to be feared. Despite the almost universal
57
58 belief that scientists can only work from within a unified field (and despite the obvious
59
60 counterexample, physics), archaeology has survived (and thrived) in a state of epistemological
61
62 and methodological disunity.
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 was created by an intellectual elite and applied in a colonialist manner, without regard to either
5
6 epistemological fitness or local concerns, and some current archaeologists have made great
7
8 strides to counteract this attitude, opening their digs to a variety of perspectives and stakeholders.
9
10 Perhaps the best known of these archaeologists and excavations (in terrestrialist circles) is Ian
11
12 Hodder at Çatalhöyük, but archaeologists worldwide are now making connections with
13
14 indigenous groups, non-dominant communities, and others who have been ignored by past
15
16 interpretations of the archaeological record.
17
18
19
20
21

22 The archaeological community is not the only group that has shown a growing distrust of trickle-
23
24 down governance. In the business world, this model is increasingly being seen both as an
25
26 impediment to creativity (a reaction to this is the open-source movement in computer software
27
28 and the Internet neutrality movement), and as an ineffective way to control behavior (despite the
29
30 work of early psychologists such as BF Skinner (1948, 1984). Ethicist Mollie Painter-Morland
31
32 believes that people should not depend on ethical guidelines coming down (by example or by
33
34 fiat) from the top, instead arguing for a more integrated approach to set a businesses' moral
35
36 compass:
37
38
39
40
41

42
43 That high-level individuals can and do play an important role in articulating priorities and
44
45 shaping the sensibilities of employees within organizations is not to be disputed.
46
47 However, if the role of such individuals is not to be denied, it is also not to be
48
49 overestimated. An analysis of business organizations as complex adaptive systems
50
51 suggests that the ineffable sense of normative congruence that develops among those who
52
53 participate in an organizational system over time may be of a far more complex and
54
55 relational nature. (Painter-Morland, 1980, 509)

56 In her article, Painter-Morland demonstrates a variety of problems that result in relying on the
57
58 “great man theory,” instead arguing for what she calls “systemic leadership.” This approach
59
60 argues that direction should (and must) come from all levels, including the ground level of an
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 organization. “The emphasis that is placed on interdependency, integration, and adaptation in
5
6 recent leadership literature suggests that the role and responsibilities that have typically been
7
8 attributed exclusively to those who were formally appointed to positions of authority within an
9
10 organization should be reconceived in more systemic terms.” (Painter-Morland, M., 2008, 519)
11
12 Painter-Morland’s systemic leadership approach (and other similar positions) addresses problems
13
14 with authoritarian business models in much the same way that archaeologists have addressed
15
16 top-down archaeological approaches, and the resulting system allows for decision-making to
17
18 come from all levels of the corporate structure. This model, she argues, results in better decision
19
20 making, greater flexibility, the possibility for real discussion of dissent, and a sense of trust that
21
22 decisions are well reasoned (a sense that is often absent when rules have been handed down
23
24 without explanation from the executive boardroom, or national authority). Given these views, in
25
26 an arena where absolutist directives might be regarded with suspicion or hostility especially in
27
28 cross-disciplinary conversations, an integrated approach, one that utilizes global agreements,
29
30 coupled with more local (here institutional) involvement and direction, seems to be the most
31
32 appropriate, and equitable means to achieve the goals of documents such the CPUCH annex.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 In fact, an example of a successful institutional model already exists for implementing a review
42
43 process for faculty and student activities directed at cultural heritage. For many years, the
44
45 program committee for the Institute of Nautical Archaeology in the U.S.A. has monitored good
46
47 archaeological practice admirably for projects under INA auspices. Since the program committee
48
49 draws on the expertise of nautical archaeology faculty at Texas A&M University, it is well-
50
51 positioned to evaluate projects both on their archaeological merits and their suitability for
52
53 involvement by Texas A&M students, as well as serve as an ongoing resource for the
54
55 management of INA-sponsored projects right through to final publication. INA’s example, as a
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 local review board, can be seen as an ARB ‘proof of concept. Local authorities, qualified to
5
6 speak on archaeological matters and empowered by the guiding principles of the CPUCH and its
7
8 annex, the Penn-Brock statement, and relevant conventions and laws already in force in the
9
10 United States and in foreign countries are the best candidates to create approval and oversight
11
12 processes for underwater projects impacting cultural heritage.
13
14
15

16 17 **Rationale for an ARB** 18

19
20 Although there is no national standard for such a review board (although the authors of this paper
21
22 hope that their efforts will prove helpful for others working on the same issues) there is strong
23
24 precedent for such a review board at any university. There are a number of groups on any
25
26 research university campus that are held to high standards, both professional and ethical. In order
27
28 to make certain that these groups work with the highest degree of integrity, universities and
29
30 professional groups have created 'review boards' for each of these disciplines. An Archaeology
31
32 Review Board would study and approve projects in the same way that any University with a
33
34 marine science program has a diving safety office and control board, and any social science
35
36 program has a committee that reviews research proposals involving human subjects, or any
37
38 biology program has an animal care division and protocols for using animal subjects.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 An ARB would thereby assume the role (in principle, if not in a legally binding sense) of the
46
47 'competent authority' designated by the CPUCH. A central committee of UCH-centered faculty
48
49 members would be the best (in fact, the only) group that would meet the standard of
50
51 'competency' from both an academic perspective and from any university's institutional
52
53 perspective (an important distinction, which will be addressed in the next section of this paper).
54
55
56

57 In terms of the academy, any university (with a faculty and/or program in archaeology) has hired
58
59 a group that is charged specifically to teach its students, to present research in its name, and to
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 represent the university in archaeological matters before the international community. URI is
5
6 fortunate to have, in addition, a number of other faculty members who focus on cultural heritage
7
8 from different academic perspectives (such as people interested in ancient textiles, a variety of
9
10 earth and ocean scientists, classicists, and ethicists). These individuals and departments,
11
12 inasmuch as their disciplines and interests focus on cultural heritage, need to be represented on
13
14 the ARB. Rather than swell the board, URI's proposal (as of now) would be to have a standing
15
16 core committee representing archaeology (and other core disciplines that are concerned with the
17
18 protection of cultural heritage) with an additional list of on-call members, representing other
19
20 disciplines, including oceanographers and other underwater scientists for projects in the water,
21
22 textile or faunal specialists for land projects, etc. These specialists would rotate in to the group to
23
24 evaluate projects that connect with their fields of expertise. In terms of institutional
25
26 qualifications, this is the only body that is able to set policy (i.e. to determine whether an outside
27
28 project meets the ethical, theoretical, and methodological standards to be allowed for credit
29
30 toward a URI degree). Any other group of people, regardless of their personal or professional
31
32 credentials, would not have this ability, and as such, could only be called upon in an advisory
33
34 capacity.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **The ARB's Contribution to Archaeology**

45
46 Given the fact that local features will have a significant impact on archaeological practices, a
47
48 campus-based ARB would spend the majority of its time addressing local problems, depending
49
50 on the expertise, needs, and types of projects being pursued at that particular university, with
51
52 occasional questions arising on regional, national, or international problems. Whether these
53
54 larger issues could be handled 'in house' or in consultation with other scholars (or other ARBs,
55
56 either privately or at conferences), by keeping focus on the institution, the ARB would be the
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 means to ensure proper oversight for all archaeological projects, whether they take place on land,
5
6 in territorial waters, or in areas that are outside the normal organizations and territories where
7
8 strict cultural heritage laws and ethical guidelines are already enforced. An ARB would endeavor
9
10 to be informed about all university activities that impact cultural heritage, to obtain expert
11
12 guidance when needed, and to provide a wide range of information to excavators, students,
13
14 scientists, and administrators. As the nexus of archeological ethics, the board would perform two
15
16 primary functions:
17
18
19
20
21

22 First, the ARB would be charged with assisting academic archaeologists and other groups
23
24 interested in the exploration of UCH in creating archeological projects. In this way, projects
25
26 would be able to use the combined resources and knowledge base of the board's membership in
27
28 creating educational and research opportunities for faculty and students alike. This function of
29
30 the board would not be in any way intended to be a stumbling block for new or existing projects,
31
32 and its actual operations and procedures would need to be worked out carefully in order to avoid
33
34 a situation where campus archaeologists would create additional obstacles and red tape for
35
36 themselves without effectively increasing oversight in the areas where it was needed.¹⁷
37
38
39
40

41 Operational details aside, there are clear ethical principles and professional standards that an
42
43 ARB would endeavor to uphold, wherever possible, by providing helpful advice and by
44
45 promoting knowledge of good archaeological practices through a variety of positive and collegial
46
47 initiatives. The goal of this body would be to offer guidance and to ensure that all university-
48
49 based archaeological projects would be models of academic, ethical, and scientific practice.
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 ¹⁷ The authors of this paper are well aware that forming this sort of regulatory body will involve
57 a number of institutional and ethical decisions that will be institution specific. These
58 considerations, though vitally important to the success of individual ARBs, fall outside the scope
59 of this paper.
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Second, the ARB's members would evaluate external archaeological projects prior to approving
5 these courses for student participation and before accepting those courses for transfer credit or
6 other research activity toward an undergraduate or graduate degree at the ARB's home
7 institution. This final role is one that archaeology faculty members perform routinely already.
8
9 However, unless there was a committee already performing many of the functions outlined
10 above, this process would be idiosyncratic and performed only on an ad hoc basis at the request
11 of particular students. An important duty of the ARB would be to make field program evaluation
12 more consistent, and to endow the process with institutional recognition and approval.
13
14

15
16 An ARB at any campus would be explicitly charged with making sure that university based
17 projects and credits are set up from within the framework of applicable laws and conventions for
18 best practices, and board members would need to have no financial or partnership stake in any
19 project brought up for review. In this way, the members would have the professional credentials
20 to speak on these matters, the ethical backing to approve or deny projects that have an impact on
21 the protection of cultural heritage, and the academic authority to speak on behalf of their home
22 institution.
23
24

25
26 As our administrators and colleagues have already shown that they take potential risks to cultural
27 heritage seriously, we are confident that the ARB will become a reality at URI in the near future.
28
29 By working to create strong internal research collaborations and by screening external projects
30 for URI student participation, the ARB will allow URI to be certain that its flagship field
31 expeditions and its students are promoting the highest standards of archaeology, both on land and
32 underwater.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Currently, the URI Archaeology Group is in the process of proposing the ARB to the University
5
6 and is using members of URI's faculty and administration (including members of other oversight
7
8 bodies at URI) to work out the many issues needed to bring our ARB from concept to reality.
9
10 Our broader hope is that our experience in interdisciplinary cooperation will create a positive
11
12 precedent, and a model for other university based archaeologists.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **Acknowledgements**

22
23
24 The authors would like to acknowledge a number of people and groups for their input into this
25 document. We would like to thank the members of the URI archaeology group for their ideas on
26 improving this paper, and for their ongoing commitment to addressing issues of archaeological
27 ethics at an institutional level. In addition, we thank URI's Hazen White Center for Ethics and
28 Public Policy for their financial support, for their comments on a series of presentations of our
29 material in preparation for this publication, and for their helpful advice on where to 'house' an
30 ARB at the University of Rhode Island. Also, we would like to thank the College of Arts and
31 Sciences, the URI Center for Humanities, and the URI Honors Program for their ongoing
32 support. The background issues that led the authors to propose the need for an ARB were
33 presented at a roundtable discussion on underwater archaeology at the American Institute of
34 Archaeology (AIA) in 2008, and issues surrounding the implementation of an ARB were
35 discussed at the 2010 meeting. We would like to thank our fellow creators and signers of the
36 Penn-Brock Statement on UCH for their insights during the workshop where we presented the
37 penultimate version of this article. We would like to single out co-participants in this workshop,
38 Ole Varmer and Jim Delgado, whose insightful comments helped us clarify our position on the
39 need for an ARB, leading us to submit our plan for publication. Finally, we would like to thank
40 the editor and reviewers at JMA for pointing out a number of errors and confusions in early
41 versions of this work. Their insights and edits were instrumental in bringing this piece to its
42 current form.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 **References**
5

6
7 Ballard, R. 2008. "Introduction." In Ballard R (ed.), *Archaeological Oceanography*, Princeton
8
9 University Press, Princeton, pp. x.

10
11
12 Carducci, Guido. 2006. "Current Status and Future Prospects for the 2001 Convention: The
13
14 UNESCO Perspective," *The UNESCO Convention for the Protection of the Underwater*
15
16 *Cultural Heritage: Proceedings of the Burlington House Seminar October 2005*. The
17
18 Nautical Archeology Society, Fort Cumberland, pp. 1-2.
19

20
21
22 Ford. B., Borgens, A., and Hitchcock, P. 2010. "Mardi Gras' Shipwreck: Results of a Deep-
23
24 Water Excavation, Gulf of Mexico, U.S.A.," *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology*
25
26 39.1, pp. 76-98.
27

28
29
30 Foley, B. "Impact of Fishing on Shipwrecks," Woods Hole Institute.
31
32 <http://www.whoi.edu/sbl/liteSite.do?litesiteid=2740&articleId=4965> (accessed June 1, 2011).
33

34
35
36 Greene, L., Leidwanger, J., Leventhal, R. and Daniels, B., 2010. "Toward Best Practice in
37
38 Mediterranean Underwater Archaeology: a report of a recent international workshop and
39
40 conference on the implications and implementation of the UNESCO Annex in international
41
42 context," in *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology* 39.2, pp. 437-439.
43

44
45 Krieger, W. 2006. *Can There Be a Philosophy of Archaeology?* Lexington Books, Lanham.
46

47
48 Krieger, W. 2011. "Removing the 'Grand' from Grand Unified Theories,'" Krieger, W. (ed.),
49
50 *Science at the Frontiers*, Lexington Books, Lanham, pp. 73-88.
51

52
53 O'Keefe, P. J. 1999, "International Waters," in S. Dromgoogle (ed.), *Legal Protection of the*
54
55 *Underwater Cultural Heritage: National and International Perspectives*. Kluwer Law
56
57 International, London.
58
59
60
61
62

1
2
3
4 Painter-Morland, M., 2008, "Systemic Leadership and the Emergence of Ethical
5 Responsiveness," in *Journal of Business Ethics* 82, pp. 509.
6

7
8
9 Søreide, F. 2011, *Ships from the Depths: Deepwater Archaeology*, Texas A&M University Press,
10 College Station.
11

12
13
14 Varmer, O., Gray, J., and Alberg, D. 2010. "United States: Responses to the 2001 UNESCO
15 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage," *Journal of Maritime*
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Bibliography

Buxton, B. 2011. "Lost Science, Deepwater Shipwrecks, and the Wheelbarrow of Archimedes,"
Krieger, W. (ed.), *Science at the Frontiers*, Lexington Books, Lanham, pp. 51-72.

Dromgoole, S. (ed.) 2006. *The protection of the underwater cultural heritage: National
Perspectives in Light of the UNESCO Convention 2001*. Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, Leiden.

Gould, R. (ed.), 1983. *Shipwreck Anthropology*, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

Muckelroy, K. 1978. *Maritime Archaeology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Skinner, B. 1948. *Walden Two*. Hackett Publishing Company, Indianapolis.

Skinner, B. 1985. "News from Nowhere, 1984," in *The Behavior Analyst*, 8: 1, pp. 5-14.

International Council on Monuments and Sites (ed.s) 2006. *Underwater cultural heritage at risk:
managing natural and human impacts*.