

I. Editorial

Interest in the history of archaeology is now being seen on the Internet in the form of various discussion groups known as "listserves". At the end of the current issue the BHA provides a listing of a number of listserves that interested readers may join. Frequently, each listserv has discussions relating to the history of archaeology. I encourage the readership to avail themselves of this important resources.

Douglas R. Givens, Editor

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.04202>

II. Discourse on the History of Archaeology

TEOCENTLI : AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL NEWSLETTER, EVER SINCE 1926

by

Richard B. Woodbury

An elitist anachronism (a semi-private old boys' and girls' network)? Or a unique window on the past (what archaeologists said informally, year by year, about what they were doing and thinking)? Or both? *The Teocentli* ("The" was later dropped) began in May 1926 when Carl E. Guthe, of the University of Michigan, sent a mimeographed letter to 45 friends and colleagues, proposing an informal newsletter or round-robin to provide periodic communication among archaeologists and others "who are working in various phases of those Indian cultures which came to owe their development to a knowledge of maize cultivation." He took the name "Teocentli" from the "native Mexican grass from which maize is supposed to have developed."

He began his letter by asking "How many of you can give the details of the work...[of] each of the forty-five men listed on the second sheet of this letter? I'll wager few of you can. Yet every one of them is working on archaeological problems which are related to those upon which you are working. Suppose we could get... together for a meeting.... Would you want to tell them of your work and listen to their reports?... Since such a meeting 'in the flesh' is out of the question, the next best thing would be a note from each one, wouldn't it?"

The list was lost, unfortunately, when Guthe's house in Ann Arbor burned to the ground in the 1950s. However, Charles R. McGimsey III (Bob) has reconstructed it from records compiled by Alfred K. Guthe, the second editor. The 39 contributors to the first two newsletters are probably close to the original list of 45.

Guthe said the idea had developed in informal discussion at the Christmas, 1925, meeting of the American Anthropological Association (AAA) in New Haven. He now asked each person

on his list to send him about one hundred words on what he had been doing during the past six months. "For heaven's sake don't get formal. This is...just an informal chat around the dinner table...." Guthe's plan succeeded, though modestly, the first issue having only 23 letters and the second 31. By December, 1945, the number had grown to 59 and in recent years has been steady at a little over 100. It has continued publication without a break, providing a unique, personal network of news, initially brief and only professional, later adding much more news, both personal and professional, as will be described below.

Guthe had been active in archaeology for a decade when he founded The Teocentli, beginning in 1916 with fieldwork at Pecos with A. V. Kidder, a Ph.D. at Harvard in 1917, work in Guatemala with Sylvanus G. Morley, and excavation in the Philippines for the University of Michigan. At Michigan he founded and directed its anthropology museum. In 1944 he became director of the New York State Museum in Albany. Almost single handed he created the Society for American Archaeology in 1934, having campaigned for the idea by mail and arrived at the Pittsburgh meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) with a draft constitution and a proposed slate of officers (both approved unanimously). Eleven of the 31 who signed the SAA Constitution that evening were Teocentlists.

The 39 contributors to the first two newsletters demonstrate not only Guthe's wide personal network but also provide a glimpse of the activities and attitudes of some of archaeology's practitioners three-quarters of a century ago. They consisted of the following:

Hiram Bingham, best known for his discovery of Macchu Picchu the "lost city" of the Inca. He was an amateur archaeologist and historian and said in his entry that because of his election to the U. S. Senate he had "been unable to finish my report on our excavations at Macchu Picchu" (a better excuse than most authors have).

Frans Blom of Tulane University, was director for 16 years of its Department of Middle American Research. He was described as "the last of the great explorers in the Stevens manner" (Byers 1966:406). His 1926 letter said a two-volume report on his 1925 explorations would soon be published.

Wesley Bradfield, a protégé of Edgar L. Hewett, was Associate Director of the San Diego Museum, and described his job as including cataloguing, exhibits, equipping a new laboratory, and archaeological surveys.

Kenneth M. Chapman, Museum of New Mexico, Santa Fe, had come to the Southwest as a "health seeker" after working as an artist in the Midwest. He is remembered particularly for his role in the revival of Puebloan pottery making. In 1926 he said that in cataloguing 15 years' accumulations in the museum he had "made some valuable finds and given the bum's rush to a lot of junk...."

Fay-Cooper Cole, University of Chicago, reported on the Illinois archaeological survey and excavations of mounds near Galena. The year before he had been an expert witness in the famous Tennessee trial of Thomas Scopes for teaching evolution.

Harold S. Colton began a second career (his first was as a zoologist on the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania) as a Southwestern archaeologist. He and his wife, Mary-Russell Ferrell Colton, founded the Museum of Northern Arizona in Flagstaff in 1928. He wrote in Teocentli of doing research in both archaeology and zoology, the former a survey of house mounds in the Flagstaff area.

C. Burton Cosgrove also had a second career as an archaeologist. Not long after he established a hardware business in Silver City, New Mexico, he and his wife Harriet (Hattie) became interested in the Mimbres ruins in the area. Appalled at the looting of these sites, they purchased and protected one, the Swarts Ruin, which they excavated after securing professional advice from Neil M. Judd, A. V. Kidder, and others. Cosgrove wrote in his 1926 letter that "at times burials appear so rapidly below the floors of the rooms that it is strenuous work getting them recorded."

Samuel J. Guernsey, on the staff of the Peabody Museum, Harvard, had excavated with A. V. Kidder in the Kayenta district of northeastern Arizona in 1915-16. In 1926 his time was spent on "routine museum work and preparation of a paper on Explorations in Northeastern Arizona."

Carl Guthe reported on the "unpacking and preliminary study of the large ceramic collections obtained in the Philippine Islands... [and] the many small jobs incident to organizing and building up our recently created Museum of Anthropology."

Stansbury Hagar, Brooklyn, New York, was a lawyer and an avocational archaeologist interested in Native American symbolism and astronomy. He had published on Day Signs, serpent mounds, and the zodiac and in 1926 said he was expanding on these "mere skeleton outlines."

Mark R. Harrington had completed excavating at Pueblo Grande, Nevada, for the Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, but regretted that he'd dug only 60 out of 100 rooms. His letter said "I am now sitting at a desk writing reports and wishing I were back in the field again." He was also a historian and ethnologist (he said he'd done research on 43 American Indian tribes).

W. B. Hinsdale had retired in 1922 from the deanship of Homeopathic Medical College (at age 70) and taken charge of collections in the University of Michigan museum of zoology. When the anthropology museum was founded he moved to that. He wrote in 1926 that he'd devoted the summer to the archaeological survey of Michigan.

Ellsworth Huntington, Department of Geological Sciences, Yale, wrote that he was "trying to...find out...just what effects on human culture can actually be ascribed to geographical conditions." He had concluded that "the good land and the poor land select certain types of people as residents." He published voluminously on geography, climate, eugenics, and race.

J. A. Jeançon, State Museum, Denver, wrote, as would many in the years ahead, "The last six months have been taken up principally in office work and study [of the Ute]".

Neil M. Judd, on the staff of the U. S. National Museum from 1911 to his retirement in 1949, was one of the leading archaeologists of the day. He had nearly finished his seven-year excavation program at Pueblo Bonito in Chaco Canyon in 1926. He wrote, "I'm back on the desert again...this morning brought a steady five-hour rain; at this moment, in mid-afternoon, a sandstorm is blowing. Yes, it's still the desert."

Charles R. Keyes, professor of German language and literature at Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa, had been an amateur archaeologist since the age of 14. He was also a knowledgeable ornithologist and geologist. He said in 1926 that he'd spent the summer searching for "pottery-producing sites" in Iowa.

A. V. Kidder was the creator and exemplar of the New Archaeology of the 1920s, including sophisticated use of stratigraphy and ceramic typology. His work at Pecos was ending and he was turning to Maya archaeology and collaboration with his long-time friend Sylvanus G. Morley. His 1926 letter said he'd been working at Andover on his collections from Pecos and "writing my final report on the excavations. It isn't ready yet, nor will it be, apparently, for a year or more." (It was longer than that—his final report on Pecos appeared in 1958.)

Samuel K. Lothrop, Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, reported on a trip to the Guatemalan Highlands to "collect ethnological material and try to arrange a digging permit." Failing in the latter, he moved to El Salvador and excavated a site with "'Archaic,' Maya, and Pipil...the first stratification to be discovered between central Mexico and Ecuador."

J. Alden Mason, University Museum, Philadelphia, had done his first fieldwork in 1911 with Boas in Mexico. His interests included all of anthropology and his fieldwork extended from Canada to Colombia. In his 1926 letter he said he was slowly completing a major report on his 1922-23 fieldwork in Colombia.

Philip Ainsworth Means was a historian, who wrote from Peabody Museum of Harvard, "My work since 1919 has chiefly been connected with my 'Ancient Andean History,' " a semi-popular history published in 1931 as "Ancient Civilizations of the Andes." He was a respected authority on the Inca and vigorously disagreed with Bingham's identification of Macchu Picchu.

Harry P. Mera practiced medicine in the Middle West until moving to Santa Fe in 1922, where he served as county health officer, established a TB sanitarium, and developed a deep interest in Pueblo arts and crafts. For the Laboratory of Anthropology he collected contemporary pottery and carried out a systematic archaeological survey. He wrote in 1926 that he had representative sherd samples from 250 sites and expected to add hundreds more, with a catalogue cross-referencing types, areas, and periods.

Warren K. Moorehead was already an elder statesman of archaeology in 1926. He had been on Frederick Ward Putnam's staff in 1893 preparing exhibits for the Chicago World's Fair. His task had been to excavate in Ohio and the Southwest for exhibitable specimens. He went to Phillips Academy (Andover, Massachusetts) when it established a department of anthropology in 1901 and retired as director in 1938. He excavated in 32 states. His 1926 letter describes his excavation of 80 burials at Etowah, finding copper plates, engraved shell, a monolithic stone hatchet, 70,000 beads "and many other objects."

Sylvanus G. Morley began his archaeological career in the Southwest in 1907 as a fellow student volunteer with A. V. Kidder, but most of his life was spent studying the Maya, with the support of the Carnegie Institution of Washington (CIW). His letter reports a busy round of lectures, exploration, and astronomical observations.

Earl H. Morris, one of the best known Southwestern archaeologists of the time, wrote of digging for the University of Colorado and securing 200 Mimbres vessels, followed by fieldwork at Camp Verde, Arizona, and Canyon de Chelly, after which he returned to Chichen Itza to continue excavation for the CIW under Morley.

Nels C. Nelson of the American Museum of Natural History is best known for his pioneering use of stratigraphy in New Mexico. But in 1926 he wrote from China, where he was searching for Paleolithic sites and surviving the problems of travel, bandits, and typhoons.

Arthur C. Parker, director of the Rochester Municipal Museum, began his career with an apprenticeship at the American Museum of Natural History with Boas, Putnam, and others. In 1906 he was appointed the State Archaeologist in the New York State Museum and eventually became a national figure in the museum world. He wrote in 1926 of "sifting out the various aboriginal cultures in New York State," and identifying variations within Algonkian and within Iroquoian. One of his field parties was tracing Seneca migrations and another was digging an Algonkian site at Lamoka Lake.

J. E. Pearce, University of Texas, Austin, was well known as the founder of the anthropology department at the University of Texas "against the odds of prejudice, suspicion, and other antagonisms...when anthropology was little recognized and hardly respectable" (McAllister 1939: 361). He said in his 1926 letter that he had been "at work for ten years upon an archaeological survey of Texas" and particularly the middens of Central Texas.

Etienne B. Renaud, University of Denver, had come to the United States from his native France in 1907 and taught Romance Languages at the University of Colorado for some years before turning to anthropology in 1924. He wrote in 1926 of taking two of his anthropology students on a 1700 mile auto tour from Denver to Taos, to Chaco Canyon, to Pecos, and more, visiting pueblos, ruins, and colleagues. "I am now using my spare time preparing a report on comparative craniometry of prehistoric....undeformed skulls from both Americas...."

Oliver G. Ricketson, Jr., had studied anthropology at Harvard, then shifted to medical school, but after World War I he moved to Arizona and became interested in archaeology. In 1921 he went to Yucatan to work for Morley and by 1926 was in charge of the CIW excavation of Uaxactun. He reported for Teocenti that he was writing a prefatory chapter for a report on

Chichen Itza, and also preparing for a second season at Uaxactun.

Frank H. H. Roberts, Jr., wrote from Peabody Museum, Harvard, "I have nothing to tell about, having been at Harvard all year [working on his Ph.D. dissertation on Chaco ceramics]. This summer I am again going to the Chaco with Judd." That same year he joined the Bureau of American Ethnology, within a few years becoming one of the leaders of Southwestern archaeology.

Ralph L. Roys, Vancouver, B. C., with his brother Lawrence managed the family lumber business but found time for extensive scholarly research and publication in Maya ethnohistory. He translated some of the most obscure and difficult surviving Maya texts and in his 1926 letter wrote "I am working on a series of Maya medical prescriptions.... [They] are all in the Maya language and deal with nearly every ill to which the flesh is heir...."

Karl Ruppert had excavated with Byron Cummings and Neil Judd before joining Morley in 1925 in the Carnegie Maya program. He not only excavated and reported on many of the buildings at Chichen Itza but explored extensively for other Maya sites. He said briefly in 1926 that he was continuing graduate work at Harvard and then would join Morley for another field season in Yucatan.

Marshall H. Saville, a protégé of Frederick Ward Putnam, did pioneering excavation in Copan, Honduras, in the 1890s and in Ecuador early in the 1900s. In 1926 he was on the staff of the Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, and later was Loubatt Professor of American Archaeology at Columbia University. He wrote to Teocentli "from my bed...after two major operations" and said he would shortly go to the West Indies for two months of recuperation.

Henry C. Shetrone, Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, Columbus, is another good example of the curious routes by which people might become archaeologists a century ago. At the age of 22 he joined the U. S. Volunteer Signal Corps in the Spanish-American War and in 1903 used his new skill to become telegraph editor, financial editor, and feature writer for several Columbus newspapers. He became interested in the excavations of W. C. Mills of the Ohio State Museum from reporting on them and in 1915, at the age of 37, he left his job to join Mills as his assistant. In 1928 he succeeded Mills as director of the museum. In his 1926 Teocentli letter he wrote of the completion of his report on "exploration of the great Hopewell Group" followed by digging in the central Seip Mound, finding "woven fabrics in colored designs, and a number of large effigy animal and bird pipes."

Herbert J. Spinden wrote from Peabody Museum, Harvard, that "In a few words I can hardly hope to give much information about the explorations in Yucatan and Honduras, which extended from January 1 to May 23 of this year, the first part in a schooner along the east coast of Yucatan and Cozumel Island."

John Teeple was a consulting chemical and industrial engineer with a 1903 Ph.D. from Cornell. His avocation was Maya astronomy and chronology and in 1926 he wrote of a forthcoming article that "...covers the Maya Venus Calendars...[to] determine a real correlation between Maya and Christian chronology. The result...differs from Morley and Spinden by only a few years."

Alfred M. Tozzer's first major fieldwork was a pioneering ethnographic study of the Lacandonnes of southern Mexico but the rest of his research career was devoted to Maya archaeology, in which he was widely recognized for both his scholarship and his inspiring teaching. He wrote from Harvard in 1926 of progress on his "long delayed report on the collection from the Sacred Cenote at Chichen Itza.... I am [also] spending a part of the summer in bringing out an annotated edition of Diego de Landa's Relacion."

E. P. Wilkins, with an address in Philadelphia, does not appear again in Teocentli and all we know of him is in his 1926 letter. He says "I hope soon to be able to tell you something about Maya magic and ritual. I am rather pleased with an analysis of the names of metals in both

Maya and Aztec; they reveal some underlying beliefs....My main purpose...is to work up a fresh linguistic interpretation of the Maya problem and supplement the work of the archaeologists.”

Clark Wissler, American Museum of Natural History, received his Ph.D. in psychology in 1901 but soon turned to anthropology, which he taught at Columbia and later at Yale. Joining the American Museum in 1906 he rose from assistant curator of ethnology to director of its anthropology department. He greatly strengthened both the collections and research of the department. His 1926 letter concerns a visit to the Arunta of Australia, with observations on their stone working and on research by Australian geologists—”Some of their finds are all but conclusive and it is a good bet that pleistocene man saw Australia.”

Although these 39 contributors to *Teocentli* in 1926 were drawn from Carl Guthe’s personal network of colleagues, they probably included a substantial percentage of active Americanist archaeologists at the time. Eight of them had a Ph.D. in anthropology. Although six of the others had doctorates in other fields, the group as a whole was strongly avocational in its archaeological activities. One of Guthe’s aims with the newsletter was to bring “professionals” and “amateurs” into closer contact and overcome the prejudice that some in each group had for the other. This was also one of his main hopes when he led the way in founding the Society for American Archaeology eight years later. Initially he was quite successful but gradually “professionals” came to dominate in both groups as avocational archaeologists became relatively fewer or perhaps preferred their local archaeological organizations.

In 1926 there were few positions for archaeologists in universities and colleges. Only seven out of the 39 were based on campuses. In contrast, 19 were at museums and five were at research institutions—the CIW and the Bureau of American Ethnology.

The archaeological interests of Guthe’s colleagues, as represented in the 1926 letters, are strongly Southwestern (15) and Mesoamerican (12). This reflects the dominant archaeological interests of the time—archaeology in eastern North America seemed less “exciting.”

Although we cannot regard Guthe’s network of correspondents as representative of archaeology in 1926 it reflects the great variety of people active in archaeology, most of them without formal training in the discipline and many with careers in other fields. Entry into archaeology was certainly more informal than today, when “credentials” and “certification” have become passwords.

Each new issue of *Teocentli* brought a few additional names, while others dropped out of sight, so that the number of letters did not greatly increase. In Issue No. 3, June 1927, we find eight new names: F. W. Hodge, Museum of the American Indian; Odd Halseth, Museum of New Mexico; Harold S. Gladwin, Southwest Museum; Roland B. Dixon, Peabody Museum, Harvard; Byron S. Cummings, University of Arizona; P. E. Cox, Tennessee State Archaeologist; Charles Brown, Wisconsin State Historical Museum; and Peter A. Brannon, Alabama Department of Archives and History. A good many of the activities reported are in ethnology and history; several meetings of state or local archaeological societies are mentioned; archaeological fieldwork is described in varying degrees of detail.

Moorehead reported tabulating “polished...axes, celts, gouges and adzes, etc.” from all over the U. S.; he had 9,000 thus far but expected to reach 60,000 ! Nelson wrote from China that “...having just read the No. 2 Issue, I feel strangely moved by all your names, old and new, and by the succinct accounts of all your varied activities. I never felt so well posted on the home front.... From the other side of the world American Archaeology appears to be in a most healthy and thriving condition.” Kidder announced: “There is being planned for August 29-September 1 a conference at Pecos on the general problems of Southwestern Archaeology and all Teocentlists are most cordially invited.”

In December 1927 there were more new names: Malcolm J. Rogers, Escondido, California; W. C. McKern, Milwaukee Public Museum; George Langford, Joliet, Illinois; E. F. Greenman, Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan; and Henry B. Collins, U. S.

National Museum. Guthe had urged Teocentlists to suggest names to him and they apparently did, and though this request for names has been repeated up to the present it has brought a trickle of additions rather than a flood.

Two more names appear among the Teocentlists in June 1928: Paul S. Martin, Colorado State Museum, Denver, and Oliver La Farge, Tulane University. Guthe quotes anonymously some comments he received, including:

“I think the Teocentlist does fulfill its function admirably.”

“Is it not exceedingly human to be disinterested in the other fellow and his work?”

“To me the Teocentlists means that I learn what my friends and also my enemies are doing, which is what I want to know.”

“Officially I would encourage you, personally if I were you I would give it up.”

Guthe responded “My reaction is that the Teocentli is here to stay, and let us hope, to grow.”

Up to this point Teocentlists were all men, but in June, 1929, letters from two women appeared, this at a time when women in archaeology were still very few. Ruth Henley wrote from the Southwest Museum that she had been at M. R. Harrington’s “Nevada camp” to study “early Pueblo culture” and at the museum was developing “a Southwest culture stratification exhibit,” Basket Maker I through Pueblo V. The second woman was Zelia Nuttall, writing from her home in Coyoacan, Mexico, about preparing an international exhibit in Paris “dealing with the sun cult of ancient peoples, and particularly any traces of a recognition of the therapeutic value of the solar rays....” This issue also included the first appearance of William A. Ritchie, Rochester Municipal Museum (who is still a correspondent !); Matthew W. Stirling, Bureau of American Ethnology; W. Duncan Strong and Eric J. Thompson, both Field Museum of Natural History; Joseph B. Thoburn, Oklahoma Historical Society; Omar A. Turney, Turney Museum, Phoenix; Gregory Mason, New York City; and Frank Mitalsky (later, Midvale), Heard Museum, who wrote that, “To make up for a deficiency in exhibition material... we spent two months digging to the north of La Ciudad ruin....”

Guthe’s newsletter was obviously filling a need, as letters continued from a wide spectrum of archaeologists and other anthropologists, reporting, some briefly and some in great detail, on activities of many kinds. Today it is a treasure house of information on what people were doing, and how they felt about it, such as wishing to be in the field rather than writing a report or complaining of time spent on museum chores. In the 1920s many looked forward to seeing friends and colleagues at their two most important professional annual meetings, the AAA and the AAAS. Guthe regularly listed the names of any who informed him that they would be attending these meetings.

It is tempting to quote *ad infinitum* some of the now-forgotten accomplishments of the past. In 1930, for example, Harrington reported man and sloth co-existing in Gypsum Cave; Judd secured air photos of the Hohokam canals; Kidder said that the study of prehistoric material culture was at the level of biology a century earlier; Mera wrote that in their archaeological survey “we are constantly in the vicinity of bootleggers’ haunts which present a real menace if approached unawares;” Parker said he was writing “a boys’ book about reservation life.... The archaeological microbe must be passed along, and inoculation may best be done when the future anthropologist is young;” Strong observed, “No end of work in sight, for Nebraska seems to cry for systematic archaeology;” and marriages were reported by Eric Thompson, Frank Setzler, and George Vaillant, the sort of personal information Guthe had asked to have included in letters.

In the 1930s many letters mentioned visits to the fieldwork of other archaeologists, true busman’s holidays, perhaps stimulated by news in Teocentli. In spite of the Great Depression there seems to have been a lot of travel, usually by car and often with the whole family. As Guthe said in 1931, “The family and I had a grand summer running around the Great Lakes

region, ostensibly for archaeological purposes.” At the same time Kidder described driving west “in two Fords” with Mrs. Kidder, their daughter, and a friend, and seeing the fieldwork in progress of many colleagues, as well as the Hopi Snake Dance, the Gallup Ceremonial, and the Laboratory of Anthropology. In 1936 Glenn Black reported on his auto trip from Indianapolis to Mexico City and back with many archaeological visits along the way.

Contrary to his usual caution Colton in December 1930 wrote that “pit-houses covered by a fall of volcanic ash directed my attention to Sunset Crater. I hope we are on the track of an ‘Indian Pompeii.’” In the same issue Alden Mason said “I’ve been too busy to get anything done—you know how it is.” The next year Charles Amsden wrote that he was learning a trade so that he could earn his living if the Republicans won in 1932, the first political comment and one of very few to appear, although in the same issue Cosgrove said research funds were curtailed by the “business depression,” a phrase he said “should be taboo at present.” Means, too, commented on the political climate in 1935: “Hooray! I thought that Teocentli had died, like so many other blossoms, under the blast of Newdealism, Hueylongism, Coughlinism, etc.”

Guthe reported that the mailing list reached 81 in 1930 and again asked for names of people to whom he could send an invitation to take part.

By 1930 state or local archaeological surveys were being reported on with increasing frequency, including Michigan, Indiana, Iowa, eastern Colorado, Kentucky, northern Arizona, and southern California.

In June, 1931, the first obituaries appeared in Teocentli, of Wesley Bradfield and Andrew Kerr. Obituaries were published with increasing frequency, usually only a page or so but with a promptness possible only in such an informal newsletter.

In 1931 there appeared anonymously the first poem of the newsletter, a parody of Hiawatha, a scene “on the slopes of Chilam Balam.” Three years later Alden Mason presented his “report” in verse, but poetry remains very rare.

The Great Depression intrudes with increasing frequency in the 1930s. Louis Schellbach wrote in 1931 that the Museum of the American Indian had reduced its staff and he and others had lost their jobs, shortly after which Schellbach’s bank failed. Arthur Paker said his museum budget was cut by 90% and “The museum itself will be reduced to a storehouse with scant protection.” Frank Roberts wrote in 1933 “With Jokers Wild in the New Deal, the best we have been able to draw so far is no field work and no publications. By the next round we may not even be able to open.” Woodward wrote in 1933 that the Los Angeles Museum was closing from March through June and the staff was going on leave without pay.

Meanwhile, however, a good deal of research was reported. In 1933 Harrington dug a Basketmaker III pithouse in the area Hoover Dam would soon inundate, and with “a goodly force of CCC [Civilian Conservation Corps] boys” renewed work at Pueblo Grande de Nevada before it too was flooded.

Increasingly, fieldwork was done only when CCC, FERA (Federal Emergency Relief Administration), WPA (Works Progress Administration) or other emergency programs supplied labor. Although archaeology could use unskilled workers it was not always an ideal way to work. Keyes said in 1934 that the county supplied relief workers, most of them aged and infirm, although a few could actually handle a shovel.

During World War II *Teocentli* makes it clear that fieldwork was almost impossible—A. T. Hill, for example, wrote in June, 1943, “On account of the war taking all of our young men I have been unable to carry on... excavations.” Later he wrote that six of them had been wounded in battle but all survived. Many Teocentlists were in one or another branch of the armed forces, some continuing to send letters with such details as censorship allowed. Odd Halseth wrote that their son was flying a B-17 over Germany and in 1945 reported that he was home after two years in a German prison. Walter Taylor and Clifford Evans were also prisoners of war in Germany. However, few letters have complaints about gas rationing or the shortages of various kinds and

many report on continued research or ongoing museum curating. There were civilian contributions to the war effort; for example, Kate Kent and Frances Reynolds, both of the Denver Art Museum, wrote of "shows on the native peoples of the battle areas" for nearby army bases and Harold Colton investigated the possibilities of the lac insect as a substitute for the lac no longer available from southeast Asia and essential in shellac.

It is to Carl Guthe's great credit that he kept *Teocentli* going so well during the war, a flow of information among friends and colleagues less able to maintain contact than in peacetime. Only 15 *Teocentlists* were dropped because of undeliverable mail (most of them were eventually found). In June 1946 Guthe editorialized briefly on the completion of the newsletter's first 20 years and his hopes for the next 20. He also said that Paul Fejos, through the Viking Fund (later the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, Inc.) had met the costs of the two issues of 1945 (as he did for the next several years, at a cost of about \$1.30 per person per year). He also reported that the "active roster" was up to 128 but suggestions for additional names would still be welcome.

In the late 1940s and through the 1950s *Teocentlists* continued to report on their research and also on their travels, marriages, children, and sometimes their gardening or housebuilding. In June 1954, when Fejos' financial support stopped, Guthe sent out a questionnaire to 152 *Teocentlists* asking opinions on the future of *Teocentli*. Of the 77 who replied 21 favored continuing with two issues a year, but 41 preferred only a single annual issue. Nine "felt that this should be the final issue" and seven asked to be dropped from the mailing list as the newsletter "had outlived its usefulness." The idea of identifying an "older" and a "younger" group was opposed by many and 44 felt they belonged in an "older" category. The upshot was a change to a single issue, in October, and the start of an annual "voluntary" charge for copying and postage. As a consequence Guthe also began including an annual financial statement.

By the 1960s "salvage" archaeology was reported on with increasing frequency, sometimes with a bit of grumbling about having to do it at the expense of other activities. In 1975 Bob McGimsey observed that federal agencies were still trying to sort out their responsibilities in the light of federal legislation and directives on the protection of archaeological resources. But many *Teocentlists* seemed to be successfully dealing with the problems—Alex Krieger, for example, simply wrote about the never-ending task of raising funds from the state highway department for constant reconnaissance and excavation.

Meanwhile, the length of letters had increased from the early years. In 1926 they averaged a quarter of a page each, in 1930 were up to nearly a third of a page, and by 1960 the average was just under a half page. In 1990 the average was approaching two-thirds of a page. A result of this was not merely fatter newsletters but a great deal more news—solid information on research activities, often valuable for details that would not see formal publication for many years, if ever.

Another gradual change was the inclusion a small but growing number of women among *Teocentlists*. Zelia Nuttall and Ruth Henley, whose letters appeared in 1929, have already been mentioned. But the informal system of suggestions to the editor by correspondents was uncertain at best, not only for adding women but also men—growth was slow. In the 1930s Harriet Cosgrove, Katharine Bartlett, and Dorothy Cross Jensen began writing to *Teocentli* and in the 1940s letters appear from several more women: Isabel Kelly, Mary Butler, Bertha Dutton, Frederica de Laguna, Anna O. Shepard, H. Newell Wardle, Marjorie Lambert, Frances Reynolds, Marion Hollenbach (Saunders), Kate Peck Kent, Madeline Kneberg (jointly with T. M. N. Lewis), and Dorothy Luhrs, most of them familiar names and all archaeologically active. Additions were fewer in the 1950s and 1960s and in the 1970s the only new names were Anne Woosley, Linda Cordell, and Elizabeth Morris. In December 1950 letters from women made up only 6% of the total; by November 1970 they were up to 19%; and by October 1990 were 28%, a substantial increase.

When Carl Guthe died in 1974 *Teocentli* was nearly a half century old. He could feel great satisfaction in seeing it provide the sort of informal, person-to-person communication he had hoped for. The proportion of avocational archaeologists among its contributors seems to have declined however.

For many years Carl Guthe produced the newsletter almost single handed. Starting in 1954 his son, Alfred K. (Ted) Guthe, became Associate Editor and managed the duplicating and mailing at the Rochester Museum of Arts and Sciences, gradually taking over all the duties of editorship. He continued the newsletter virtually unchanged until his death in 1983. Hester Davis and Bob McGimsey of the Arkansas Archaeological Survey immediately volunteered to edit *Teocentli* in Fayetteville and have continued to do so, with little basic change in form or style (although it is now produced by desk top publishing, a far cry from the initial mimeograph stencils). As Carl Guthe had said in 1928 *Teocentli* appeared to be "here to stay."

Although its immediate purpose is prompt communication among archaeologists and other anthropologists of information about their research and writing, it can also be viewed as an important resource for the history of archaeology, although we often wish for more details. One can select a scholar of the past (or present) and follow year by year what he or she wrote about their activities. Here is an ongoing record in their own words from, to name only a few, Wilton Krogman, Fay-Cooper Cole, A. V. Kidder, Zelia Nuttall, Frank H. H. Roberts, Oliver LaFarge, Paul S. Martin, Bertha Dutton, William A. Ritchie, Isabel Kelly, Frederick W. Hodge, Anna O. Shepard, and James B. Griffin. The list could go on and on.

Another way to look at the past through *Teocentli* is cross sectional, examining, for example, how archaeology was affected by the Depression years or by World War II or looking at the transformation of "salvage" archaeology to mitigation and archaeological resource management. The sample of peer-selected letter writers is not statistically random for the profession as a whole, of course. However, each letter is a personal statement as of that moment, of accomplishments, frustrations, and hopes, without benefit of the sort of hindsight and "correction" that can occur in more formal publication.

In contrast to "Current Research" in *American Antiquity* of recent years, there are reports in *Teocentli* of relatively few research activities but they include personal observations on family, travels, and such, all lacking in the formal, cut-and-dried style of "Current Research." But the earlier "Notes and News" of *American Antiquity* was rather sparse in what was reported, hardly matching the information provided in *Teocentli*. Nevertheless, all are indispensable to anyone interested in the history of archaeology—what was actually going on, not just what was written for formal publication later.

Teocentlists quite early began to include a few who did not deal with Native Americans dependent on maize, such as biological anthropologists and more recently historic archaeologists. In reporting the responses to a 1993 questionnaire to Teocentlists, McGimsey and Hester said that a large majority were against an "interest in corn-growing cultures" as a prerequisite for membership. They commented that there's little logic in excluding those interested in manioc-growing cultures or Paleo-Indian studies, for example. A large majority of responses opposed attempting "some sort of balance among interests." Better to just have people "with some track record in the field for doing interesting things." There was a general feeling expressed in the responses that the newsletter should not get too large, but perhaps it could approach 200. Having gone from 40 to 110 in 68 years, the editors say, "that rate of growth we can handle!" But no one wanted to "completely change the present intimate intercommunication network we now have."

The questionnaire's responses approved the policy of no "subscribers." There should be two-way communication, although a lapse in letter writing of two or three years is forgivable. And the retired, as an exception, could continue receiving the newsletter even if they did not write for it. The policy of no institutional subscribers continues, although copies go to three

anthropological archives. The editors conclude, "The overwhelming view seems to be to maintain Teocentli essentially as it has been in the past..."

Many of us who read *Teocentli* are glad that it has not grown to equal the membership of the Society for American Archaeology—it would be a burden to read rather than a pleasure. Many who write for it enjoy the stimulus of looking back once a year and informally summarizing their recent successes (and failures) for communication to a circle of friends and colleagues. It is a unique publication, long-lived because it fills a significant communication niche.

Acknowledgments: Valuable suggestions have been made by Hester Davis, C. R. McGimsey, III, and Nathalie F. S. Woodbury.

References Cited

Byers, Douglas S.

1966 "Frans Blom, 1893-1963", *American Antiquity*, 31:406-407.

McAllister, Gilbert

1939 "Obituary" [of J. E. Pearce, 1868-1938], *American Antiquity*, 4:361-362.

III. Bibliographic/Archival Material Relating to the History of Archaeology

A. Recent Work by Subscribers

Trigger, Bruce G.

1994 "Paradigms in Sudan Archaeology", *The International Journal of African Historical Studies*, 27(2):323-345.

Willey, Gordon R.

1994 "Emil Walter Haury, 2 May 1904-5 December 1992," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 138:427-430.

B. Doctoral Dissertations/Masters Theses

Smith, Pamela J.

1994 "The Fenland Research Committee and the Formation of Prehistory as a Discipline at Cambridge University," Lucy Cavendish College, Cambridge, Master's thesis.