J. C. Harrington Medal in Historical Archaeology

Charles E. Cleland 2002

There is a just a touch of irony in this celebration of Chuck Cleland's remarkable career because, over the past three decades, I have heard him emphatically and repeatedly declare that he is not an historical archaeologist—or any other sort of narrow, topical specialist. Throughout his professional life, Chuck has styled himself, first and foremost, as an anthropologist who pursues whatever lines of evidence are relevant to his broad interests. His research domain has never been circumscribed by temporal or regional boundaries, nor has he ever been inclined toward investigating the particulars of specific persons, places, or events. Rather, Chuck has sought to examine the processes of cultural adaptation in order to improve our understanding of how we as a species come to cope with our changing environment.

It is precisely that universal perspective that has made his occasional forays in the field of historical archaeology important ones. Moreover, for 35 years he ably taught several generations of students now active in the field of historical archaeology and played a pivotal role in the governance of our society, thus effecting lasting influences on the growth and development of our discipline. Accordingly, despite Chuck's unassuming disclaimers, the Society for Historical Archaeology has chosen appropriately and wisely in its selection of Charles E. Cleland as this year's recipient of its most prestigious award—the J. C. Harrington Medal in Historical Archaeology.

Historical Archaeology, 2002, 36(4): 1–9.
Permission to reprint required.

Before I actually met Chuck Cleland, as an undergraduate anthropology major in September 1972, I was already well aware that he was a figure of considerable standing on the campus at Michigan State University (MSU). After all, he held the impressive titles of professor in the Department of Anthropology and curator of anthropology at The Museum. I also learned that he was then president-elect of the Society for Historical Archaeology, a title that failed to impress me at the time, but for which I have come to have a much greater appreciation. The most striking thing about the man on first meeting, however, was that he was not at all the stodgy academic I was expecting. To the contrary, Chuck was then only 36 years old and sporting faded blue jeans, worn moccasins, and a full beard turned flaming red from fieldwork in the summer's sun. He looked to me more like a typical graduate student of the 1970s, hardly one's image of a senior faculty member!

For him to have come so far at a relatively young age would perhaps suggest the ambitious pursuit of a career focused on clear goals, but that was hardly the case. To the contrary, Chuck's rapid rise probably owed more to a generalizing strategy toward professional development marked by a truly exceptional adaptability to changing circumstances. Further, his rise was consistent with his willingness to take occasional risks when others might chose to follow a more conventional course of action.

Born in Kane, Pennsylvania, on 2 February 1936, Charles Edward Cleland is the eldest child of Margaret Elizabeth (Mason) and Charles E. Cleland. His parents were both doctors who met while in medical school at the University of Pittsburgh and later settled in the rural, northwestern corner of the state to open a joint practice. There they raised a family that in time would also include a daughter, Margaret Mason, and a second son, John Matthew (Jock). Although his roots are in small-town America, Chuck's father and mother instilled in him an appreciation for the world beyond their hearth and nurtured an abiding love of both science and the humanities. Chuck's eyes also were opened at an early age to cultural diversity unknown in Kane, and most rural midwestern communities, thanks to his father's frequent changes of duty station as a doctor called to active service in World War II. The war years carried the Cleland family to distant corners of the United States, and Chuck learned far more from his life on the road than from his attendance at six different grade schools during those turbulent times.

Back in Kane, after his father went overseas to serve with the air corps in the Pacific, Chuck at first struggled to overcome the spotty formal education he had received while moving about the country. He made substantial strides through his high school years, however, and even learned that he would be well suited to working either as a plumber or as an archaeologist. An aptitude test administered in the 10th grade had offered those seemingly disparate options, presumably on the basis of some required talents they hold in common, but neither his guidance counselor nor his parents were enthused with those prospective vocations. Life as a tradesman was simply out of the question for someone destined for college practically from birth, whereas a career in archeology—then as now—seemed wholly impractical. Consequently, by his senior year, Chuck hoped to make something of the many hours he had spent peering though his father's microscope and enrolled as a biology major at Denison University, a small liberal arts institution in central Ohio that his mother had attended.

Upon completion of his B.A. in 1958, Chuck decided to seek an advanced degree at the University of Arkansas, where he initially hoped to study parasitology. Before departing for Fayetteville, however, he wed Mary Gayley, who had been a classmate in high school. With new challenges to face, starting graduate school seemed an exhilarating prospect. Like many graduate students, though, he eventually would become disenchanted with his studies and began to have second thoughts about his choice of careers.

Once at Arkansas, Chuck settled into the zoology department and began writing his master's thesis, "The Re-introduction of the Wild Turkey into the Ozark Highlands," contemplating a career in wildlife management. Chuck soon came to the dismaying realization, however, that such work had less to do with managing wildlife and more to do with accommodating his fellow human beings. At this same time, Arkansas was in the throes of impassioned racial tension over the

attempted integration of Central High School in the capital city, Little Rock. The state legislature, irritated with federal law enforcement efforts in Arkansas, in turn responded by passing its own law prohibiting state employees from holding memberships in "subversive" organizations such as the Congress on Racial Equality and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Thanks to his liberal upbringing, Chuck was a card-carrying member of both CORE and the NAACP, and he was summarily fired from his teaching assistant position in 1959.

Uncertain of his future at the age of 23, Chuck happened into a chance encounter that proved pivotal in defining the direction his life would take. In the small museum on an upper floor of the campus administration building, he met Charles R. (Bob) McGimsey III, a young professor recently arrived from Harvard to start up an archaeology program at Arkansas. Upon learning that Chuck was a zoology graduate student, McGimsey asked whether he could identify animal bones derived from excavations. Moreover, he told Chuck that such a skill would be worth a paying job in the museum laboratory and could be the basis of an interesting thesis project. Not one to let a promising opportunity slip away, Chuck answered without hesitation that he had extensive training in the identification of animal bone—and then hastened off to the library, where he gathered up every book he could find on the subjects of mammalian and avian osteology. Before long, thanks to diligent study, Chuck could truthfully claim that he knew almost as much as anyone in the country about the subject.

Under McGimsey's capable guidance, though still a zoology student, Chuck began work on his new thesis, "Animal Remains of the Ozark Bluff Shelters." He also took his first course in archaeology, which at last put his assigned tasks in a broader context. Later he would meet Hester Davis, hired by McGimsey in 1959 to help build the archaeology program at Fayetteville. From modest beginnings, the program they started eventually would grow to be the Arkansas Archaeological Survey, which has ably served as a model for statewide field research programs throughout America. Chuck's introduction to archaeology at Arkansas was all too brief, but the influence of McGimsey and Davis on his thinking was considerable, and, in later years, the three would again join forces in the cause of establishing and maintaining professional standards for archaeology.

By spring 1960, Chuck first learned the delights of fatherhood with the birth of his daughter, Elizabeth Ann (Lisa). His thesis was near completion, but now with a young family to consider, Chuck again found himself at a crossroads. Again, fate intervened—this time in the person of James B. Griffin, the "grand old man" of eastern U.S. prehistory. At the SAA meetings that year, Griffin learned from McGimsey of Chuck's ability to identify animal bones, which by that time he had developed into a genuine talent. Griffin allowed that he could use such a person on his research team, so he called Chuck and invited him to pursue a doctorate in anthropology at the University of Michigan (U of M). Not entirely sure what he was getting into, but figuring it was bound to lead to something better, Chuck and his family were soon off to Ann Arbor.

Before the academic year began, Chuck had the opportunity to experience his first summer of excavations at the Feeheley site, a late-Archaic site in the Saginaw Valley of Michigan. With that experience for inspiration, Chuck was truly excited about his new graduate career and began his studies in earnest that fall. Having never taken a course in anthropology, at first, of course, he felt ill-prepared and deficient, feelings rather reminiscent of his grade school days in Kane. Chuck again proved himself to be a quick study, however, and before long he was enjoying the lectures of such luminaries as Elman Service, Eric Wolf, and Marshall Sahlins. Even the formidable Leslie White enthralled Chuck, who saw immediately that White's theories of cultural evolution fit well with what he had already learned about the natural world. In fact, Chuck so thoroughly enjoyed the teachings of Leslie White that he sat in on White's course The Evolution of Culture three times!

Equally important to Chuck's growing enthusiasm for his studies derived from his office environment at the Museum of Anthropology, where he interacted frequently with faculty researchers such as Griffin, Emerson Greeman, Art Jelenik, and the ethnobotanist Volney Jones. He was also one of a large cohort of bright, energetic, and deeply committed graduate students who challenged

and encouraged one another to explore new ways of thinking about the human condition. The synergy of their learning environment must have been truly marvelous, with every coffee break as stimulating as any formal seminar. Almost every one of those graduate students went on to distinguish themselves in academia.

All of Chuck's excavation experience in graduate school was on prehistoric sites, such as the Holcombe Beach site, Spider Cave, and the Norton Mounds. He clearly enjoyed the excitement of archaeological fieldwork and its unconventional lifestyle. The state of Michigan was still relatively unknown archaeologically in those days, with only a handful of researchers actively pursuing field opportunities in the state, and so every new project added tremendously to a developing body of knowledge. Griffin placed senior graduate students in charge of excavations at various locations every summer and spent much of his time traveling from site to site, offering programmatic oversight as well as keen insights into the meaning of their finds. This was a style of research administration that Chuck himself would adopt in later years to good effect.

Chuck first came to recognize the potential for doing archaeological research on the historic period while a student in Ann Arbor, though it was hardly an emphasis of the U of M program. Griffin's close friend George Quimby, then at the Field Museum in Chicago, was particularly interested in understanding the dramatic changes introduced to American Native populations during the time of European contact, and Chuck began a long professional relationship with Quimby out of a mutual interest in the contact period. Chuck also followed closely the progress of MSU's continuing excavations at Fort Michilimackinac, which Moreau S. Maxwell had initiated in 1959 with assistance from another U of M graduate student, Lewis Binford.

Griffin had recruited Chuck specifically to analyze data derived from his 1960–1964 National Science Foundation research project on the correlation between prehistoric cultural complexes and the post-Pleistocene ecologies of the upper Great Lakes, which produced doctoral dissertation topics for Chuck and several others. Chuck's dissertation, "The Prehistoric Animal Ecology and Ethnozoology of the Upper Great Lakes Region," developed several original concepts concerning human subsistence strategies, particularly the focal-diffuse model, which he would develop further in a series of important articles later in his career. Before completing his degree, however, Chuck had been given the chance to teach at MSU in 1964, while Maxwell was in Denmark as a Fulbright scholar.

Upon Maxwell's return to campus in 1965, he became head of the new anthropology department, which had just broken away from its traditional connections with sociology. That reassignment left a vacancy at The Museum, where Maxwell had held an appointment as curator. Chuck soon found himself curator of anthropology at age 29, with the promise of promotion from instructor to assistant professor upon completion of his degree, which came to pass the next year. Maxwell's strong desire to build the fledgling department gave Chuck the opportunity to develop a program of field research in the upper Great Lakes, and he turned out to be a capable organizer who accomplished much with meager resources. He quickly formed an alliance with the small department at Western Michigan University, and the two universities, thereafter, conducted a series of joint field schools on sites in northern Michigan with shared personnel and equipment.

Coincident to Chuck's new curatorship at The Museum, came the addition of a son, Joshua Charles, to his family. Chuck recalls this 1965 event as spot of joy in an otherwise difficult period of his life. Although his future was now more certain, the demands on his time had become considerable with the need to prepare lectures for large introductory courses, while organizing and conducting an expanding program of field and laboratory research. Further, he was still in the final stages of studying for his comprehensive exams and completing his dissertation. As it so often happens with young academics, Chuck's marriage suffered under this added strain, and the couple began to grow apart; in time they would separate and ultimately divorce.

In that same year, Chuck recruited Lyle Stone, who had been one of Ray Ruppé's students at Arizona State, specifically to take over the research at Fort Michilimackinac after Maxwell began to refocus his interests on Arctic prehistory. Having worked at several fortification sites on the Great Plains, Stone was a natural to manage and analyze the growing museum collections

derived from that important 18th-century site and to continue the excavations into new areas. He also became Chuck's first doctoral student, completing one of the earliest dissertations based on historical archaeology in 1970.

In January 1967, Ed Jelks hosted the founding meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology, which had the official title of "International Conference on Historic Archaeology," on the campus of Southern Methodist University at Dallas. Chuck attended the small meeting and presented a paper entitled "Analysis of Economics and Natural Environment," in keeping with his attraction to the interplay between human populations and the world around us. He also took part in the first official SHA business meeting, though he was not a member of the special organizing committee chaired by Jelks.

That committee made several recommendations related to the naming and purpose of our society, and general discussion of each subtle nuance appears to have been both prolonged and lively. Aside from the well-known controversy over semantic distinctions between the terms "historic" and "historical," there was also considerable debate over whether to include the Old World as part of our legitimate disciplinary realm. According to the minutes from that meeting, in light of the recommended temporal emphasis on periods of "Exploration and Settlement, Contact Aboriginal, Colonial, National Development, and Modern," Cleland expressed the view that "the New World should be specified, for 'Colonial' was clearly a term related to the New World." This seems an oddly narrow view of the Era of European Expansion, at least for Chuck, but perhaps it can be forgiven in the context of an "international" conference that included only North American participants, most of them from the United States!

Chuck's commitment to the emergent discipline was now on the rise, and he would soon co-author an article with Stone on the Erie Canal system, which would be published in the first volume of *Historical Archaeology* (1:63–70, 1967). Chuck also teamed up with Jim Fitting, a former classmate from the U of M, to write "The Crisis of Identity: Theory in Historic Sites Archaeology," which they presented at Stan South's Conference on Historic Site Archaeology later in 1967 (*The Conference on Historic Site Papers*, 1968, Vol. 2, Pt. 2, pp. 124–138). Influenced heavily by the teachings of Leslie White, and still cited today, that paper was a seminal contribution to the early debate over whether our discipline should be principally grounded in anthropology or history.

As a consequence of Chuck's growing involvement in historical archaeology, MSU began to acquire a reputation for research in the newly christened field of study. More graduate students were drawn to the department, and perhaps half of those who studied with Chuck took an interest in the early-historic period. Emphasis of the research program in the late 1960s and early 1970s was entirely on Native American and European sites associated with the interior fur trade, such as the Lasanen and Mill Creek sites at the Straits of Mackinac and Fort Ouiatenon in Indiana. It would eventually expand, however, to include much later American fortifications, such as Fort Brady and Fort Gratiot in Michigan and, in the early 1980s, several 19th-century town sites in Mississippi that would be affected by federal undertakings along the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, historic period fieldwork also took place intermittently at the Marquette Mission site in St. Ignace, Michigan, and at several other locations in the extreme northern parts of the state.

This is not to say that Chuck turned his back entirely on prehistory. To the contrary, he also attracted a number of excellent students to MSU whom he directed through various prehistoric research projects, including some that specifically came to work with him on topics related to the analysis of animal remains from archaeological sites. Indeed, in the 1990s, Chuck at last managed to combine his many varied interests in a multiyear survey project on islands within the St. Mary's River, which forms the border between the U.S. and Canada at the eastern end of Michigan's Upper Peninsula. Field investigations on Lime Island, Drummond Island, and elsewhere enabled him to work with students interested in middle- and late-Woodland problems as well as those who sought to examine early-Historic industrial sites and fortifications.

From time to time, Chuck continued to write articles on historical archaeology, often inspired by particularly interesting facets of his students' field research. Among those were his 1970 article "Comparison of the Faunal Remains from French and British Refuse Pits at Fort Michilimackinac: A Study in Changing Subsistence Patterns" (*Canadian Historic Sites: Occasional Papers in Archaeology and History* 3:7–23, Ottawa), his 1972 *American Antiquity* (37[2]:202–212) article "From Sacred to Profane: Style Drift in the Decoration of Jesuit Finger Rings," and "Merchants, Tradesmen, and Tenants: The Economics of the Diffusion of Material Culture on a Late-Nineteenth Century Site," which he published in the journal *Geoscience and Man* (23:35–44) in 1983.

It should be noted that for many years, the historical archaeology program at MSU consisted only of field opportunities and, much like Chuck's own experience at U of M, the constant interaction of students working at The Museum. Indeed, in the early days, Chuck probably learned more about historical archaeology from some of his students who had come to MSU with considerable practical experience than he was able to teach them about the subject. By the mid-1970s, however, he had developed two much-needed additions to the departmental curriculum: Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology and The Practice of Historical Archaeology, which was basically a lab practical in material culture analysis, known fondly as the "pots and pans" class. Those were arguably among the earliest formal courses in historical archaeology offered at any American university, and they were the core of the program for many years, supplemented only by independent study seminars and course work in history, geography, urban planning, and other related disciplines.

It was also in this period of professional growth that Chuck's personal life took a marked turn for the better with the help of Nancy Nowak who was pursuing a course of study in ethnobotany. The two met on a field project in northern Michigan and married in 1975. Their complementary interests and mutually supportive companionship have now sustained them through more than a quarter-century together, with Nancy frequently contributing to Chuck's research over those years. What's more, Nancy and Chuck had two daughters, Elena Mason (Ellie) in 1977 and Katherine Pearce (Katie) in 1980, who have added considerable pleasure to their lives.

Throughout much of his teaching career, Chuck also held a joint appointment in the Department of Racial and Ethnic Studies. In that capacity, he taught periodic seminars in ethnohistory and contemporary Native American issues, inspiring graduate students from several other departments to study under his guidance. Combining this subject matter with his interest in human subsistence, Chuck also entered a realm of research that would occupy him through much of his later career—namely, the origins and evolution of native fishing practices. Not only did that research lead to a number of important academic publications, most notably his 1982 *American Antiquity* (47[4]:761–784) article "The Inland Shore Fishery of the Northern Great Lakes: Its Development and Importance in Prehistory," it also led to dramatic changes in the lives of contemporary native peoples.

Chuck's ethnohistorical research was directed, like all of his research, by a desire to understand adaptation and change in the context of cultural traditions and history. His ability to meld documentary and archaeological evidence helped produce narrative accounts and interpret historic events in the light of evolving federal Indian policy. The research also led to his involvement with the landmark court case, *U.S. v. Michigan*, in which the federal government sued the state in support of tribal treaty rights. Along with other expert witnesses, Chuck gave testimony in U.S. Federal Court that ultimately led to victory for the United States in its quest to affirm fishing rights granted to tribes in Michigan under the 1836 treaty. In 1979, that decision was upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals.

He soon became a much-sought-after consultant on treaty rights, eventually working on behalf of better than a dozen Great Lakes bands in Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Canada. One notable case in 1994, *Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe v. Minnesota*, asserted the right of band members to hunt and fish free of state law on lands ceded in Minnesota and Wisconsin under the Treaty of 1837. Although decided in favor of the band, the state pursued a lengthy appeals process, with the

case ultimately going to the U.S. Supreme Court in 1999. Liberally citing Chuck's research, the justices rendered a majority opinion concurring with the lower court decision.

Indeed, every trial for which Chuck served as a witness was eventually resolved in favor of the tribe whose treaty rights were in question. That is not to say, however, that they were all easy victories. The case of *Crown v. Agwa*, for example, involved criminal charges against an Ojibwe fisherman charged with violating provincial game laws, despite his claim that the Superior-Robinson Treaty of 1850 gave him certain rights to fish. The defendant was convicted at trial, and that decision was subsequently upheld on appeal. The Canadian Supreme Court, however, ultimately affirmed the larger right of Canadian Indians to their treaty provisions under the new Canadian Constitution.

All of this research has lead to a spate of major publications in the past decade that form the capstone of Chuck's academic career. These include more than a half-dozen articles on his various ethnohistorical studies as well as two important books: *Rites of Conquest: The History and Culture of Michigan's Native Americans* (University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1992) and *The Place of the Pike (Gnoozhekaaning): The History of the Bay Mills Community* (University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 2001). Moreover, I have it on good authority that other major contributions to the literature are in the works, now that Chuck has more time to write, that is, when he is not excavating with a few volunteers on a late-Archaic site not far from his retirement home in northern Michigan.

It remains for us to examine the larger impact that Chuck Cleland has had on this discipline of historical archaeology and the profession of archaeology in general. As we have seen, Chuck's early substantive and theoretical writings include several well-known articles, but he continues to provide authoritative commentary on historical archaeology's current status and future direction, such as his lead article, "Historical Archaeology Adrift?" in last year's journal Forum (*Historical Archaeology*, 35[2]:1–8). More important to the profession, however, have been his frequent efforts on behalf of our discipline through political action.

Chuck, as I have already noted, participated in the founding meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology in 1967. The next year, he served an interim term on the board of directors before being elected to a full three-year term in 1970. In 1972, he returned to serve on the board, as president-elect, prior to beginning his term as our seventh president in 1973. Most of our past presidents have gladly retired from "archaeo-politics" upon completing their duties in this demanding office, but Chuck would again return to the board a decade later in 1982 for another term as a director.

During those many years on the SHA board, Chuck was a persistent voice of reason in society deliberations, and his efforts to advance both intellectual and practical causes were well known and widely respected. As president, he managed the society capably during a period of rapid growth and argued for the continued association of terrestrial and underwater archaeology in the society, when some thought that separation of the two was preferable and inevitable. In those years, the practice of historical archaeology began to coalesce into a distinct discipline, but Chuck was also determined to see that all of archaeology should join other pursuits as a true profession, like medicine and the law.

Toward that end, beginning in 1974, Chuck was a member of the Society of American Archaeology's Committee on the Recovery of Archaeological Remains, serving with his early mentors from Arkansas, Bob McGimsey and Hester Davis, and nine others, who later liked to think of themselves as the "Dirty Dozen." For all intents and purposes, the committee essentially seceded from the SAA and founded the Society of Professional Archeologists in 1976. Chuck was elected successor to Ed Jelks, as SOPA's second president (1977–1978), and later served twice on the board of directors (1986–1988 and 1993–1995) as the SHA's elected representative, defeating yours truly for that honor in the 1993 election.

He would later be instrumental in advocating the transformation of SOPA into the Register of Professional Archaeologists, which occurred in 1998 and, subsequently, has nearly tripled in size

under sponsorship of SHA, SAA, the Archaeological Institute of America, and, most recently, the American Anthropological Association. His most important contribution to the cause of professionalism in archaeology, however, is without doubt the two years he served as SOPA's grievance coordinator (1985–1987). In that crucial position, Chuck faced the challenges of investigating allegations of professional misconduct in several extremely sensitive cases. In that capacity, he employed considerable skill and finesse to negotiate settlements among parties, earning a reputation as a firm but fair defender of professional integrity as well as the integrity of SOPA's disciplinary procedures. Even today, under the Register of Professional Archaeologists, grievance coordinators still may call upon Chuck's wise counsel whenever dealing with particularly troublesome cases.

Finally, there are Chuck's academic progeny—the many students who have gone on to make careers in historical archaeology and the broader profession. He is justifiably proud of his four children, of course, but Chuck's extended family also includes the impressive number of graduate students he guided to degree completion over the past 35 years. Through 1999, as he was preparing for retirement, he had signed off as committee chair on 12 master's theses as well as 25 doctoral dissertations, and another ten students were then nearing the end of their degree programs. Of the nearly 50 students whose committees he chaired, no fewer than 20 are now principally involved with historical archaeology, whether they work in academia, government, museums, or private business. Further, most of the other students at MSU who concentrated on prehistoric archaeology, even those directed by other faculty members, were first introduced to the essentials of historical archaeology under Chuck's tutelage.

It is also worth noting that many of Chuck's students also have emulated his long dedication to professional service. Seven have served on the SHA board of directors, and three of those went on to election as president. In fact, there has been at least one Cleland student on the SHA board in every year since 1990, and four of his former students ably hosted our annual conferences in the past decade.

Most of the other major professional societies have similarly benefited from the contributions of Chuck's students, including the Society for Industrial Archaeology, the Society for Archaeological Sciences, the Society for American Archaeology, the American Cultural Resources Association, the Society of Professional Archeologists, and its successor the Register of Professional Archaeologists. In short, Chuck Cleland leaves the archaeological profession a living legacy that will continue to have extensive and recognizable influences on our discipline well into the 21st century.

In his keynote address at the 1981 SHA conference at New Orleans, Chuck offered up his vision of what historical archaeology needed to do in order to achieve its full potential. Indeed, he has regularly returned to that theme whenever called upon to provide sage commentary on the state of the art, witness his 1987 paper "Questions of Substance, Questions that Count" (*Historical Archaeology,* 22[1]:13–17, 1988) from the Savannah Plenary Session and his 2001 journal Forum already mentioned.

Of the many propositions Chuck put forth 20 years ago, sadly, few have yet been fully realized by the discipline. He set our goals high, and we continue to strive toward them. Chuck's closing statement, however, still stands out in my mind. He said that our ultimate mission as researchers should be "to push intellectual frontiers, to make more mistakes, to improve models, to advance theory." In so doing, he acknowledged the risks taken each time one of us offers a new interpretation of the past as we boldly venture, in J. C. Harrington's words, "beyond the strictly historical."

Chuck Cleland has persistently challenged us to pose questions that count, imploring us to seek answers that expand upon our understanding of the human condition. He has also helped lead us toward an elevated sense of professionalism as we endeavor to follow his example. In a career that now spans parts of five decades, Chuck has been the recipient of many accolades, including the Distinguished Faculty Award from Michigan State University in 1978 and the Distinguished Service Award from the Society of Professional Archeologists in 1991. To those high honors, we are privileged to add one more, and I suspect he will quietly treasure it above all others.

For the outstanding role he has played in making historical archaeology a distinct and vital field of inquiry on a global scale, the SHA proudly honors Charles E. Cleland with the J. C. Harrington Medal in Historical Archaeology.

VERGIL E. NOBLE