

Gillam, J.C.

1966 "A View of Paleoindian Settlement from Crowley's Ridge," *Plains Anthropologist*, 41:273-286.

Saucier, Roger T.

1994 *Geomorphology and Quaternary Geologic History of the Lower Mississippi Valley*, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Vicksburg.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.10205>

Discrimination and Marginalization

Assembling the Past: Studies in the Professionalization of Archaeology, edited by Alice B. Kehoe and Mary Beth Emmerichs, 1999, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque. **Please see section VI of this issue for an errata announcement by the volume's editor.

Reviewed by

David L. Browman

Washington University - St. Louis

The *Assembling The Past* volume, which focuses upon the issues of discrimination and marginalization in archaeology, is the delayed publication of two 1989 symposia dedicated to the history of archaeology — one in January of that year at the First Joint Archaeological Congress in Baltimore, chaired by Alice Kehoe and Jane Waldbaum, and the other in November at the 88th annual meetings of the American Anthropological Association, chaired by Jonathan Reyman. Because of the time delay, in some cases the chapter authors have already published later papers, building on their presentations, so that the reader may already be familiar with part of the arguments presented. Nevertheless, I evaluate this work as a "must have" for any student of the history of Americanist archaeology.

The papers have been organized into three sections: *I - Multiple Pasts* (with 7 presentations), *II - Professionals May Not Be Women* (with 3 papers); and *III Southwestern Archaeology As Case Studies* (with 2 contributions). Alice Kehoe has written the general volume introduction of 18 pages, plus three short (3 or 4 pages) introductions to each of the three sections. In her general introduction, Kehoe argues that the papers all focus on a central theme, the "marginalization of uncredentialed, members of the wrong social class, women, and those with the wrong regional or academic connection" (p. 1), denying them access of entry into the ranks of professionals in archaeology until very recently. She argues in her introduction to Section II that the real break-through for women into archaeology was the 1964 Civil Rights Act (p. 118). She reiterates her comments from the general introduction in her introduction to Section I, where she once again argues that the cohort of "women, non-Protestants, non-whites, and people from working class origins" (p. 20) were systematically excluded from positions in the early years, because the professionalization of archaeology had been in terms of males, "sons of the old-money upper class", with advanced degrees from "Eastern Establishment" colleges. Kehoe suggests that this bias was so marked that there is sufficient reason to believe that Franz Boas was denied a position at Chicago after the Columbian Exposition in 1894 because he was Jewish (pp. 7-8, 21, and 22, note 1), but both McVicker (p. 46) and Halporn (p. 131) caution against this assumption, indicating that there is no unequivocal evidence to support that interpretation. Kehoe also highlights several other cases, such of that of the contributions of Alice Le Plongeon, who excavated at Chichen Itza and Uxmal, whose work, Kehoe says (p. 9), has been systematically "purged" and "expunged" from the record of Mayan archaeological studies.

Section I (Multiple Pasts) contains seven papers of varying perspectives by Elin Danien, Donald McVicker, Alice Kehoe, Neil Silberman, Lawrence Desmond, William Dever, and Stephen Dyson.

Danien is particularly interested the contrasting records of Robert Burkitt and George Byron Gordon with the University Museum in Philadelphia. Both men had started out in Engineering at Harvard, and were school friends from that period. While Gordon went on to get his Ph.D. in Anthropology from Harvard, Burkitt only obtained an undergraduate degree in Engineering, and ended up in Guatemala involved in commercial ventures. Gordon involved Burkitt in the 4th Copan Expedition in 1894, kept a correspondence up with Burkitt in the intervening years, and after many years of requests, inveigled Burkitt into collecting Mayan artifacts for the University Museum beginning in 1912, which Burkitt continued doing for the museum for the next two decades. On one hand, Burkitt collected some superb specimens over that period, but on the other hand, the Museum became increasingly uneasy because the materials were often illegally acquired (p. 30). Thus in 1930, when the University of Pennsylvania secured the contract to begin excavations at Piedras Negras, they ended their association with Burkitt, much to his displeasure.

McVicker's focus is upon Frederick Starr, and his career at the University of Chicago from 1892 to 1923, but most particularly on Starr's machinations in the first decade of the Department of Anthropology at Chicago, and his relationships with the Field Museum. When Frederic Putnam tried to continue his connections to the Columbian Museum which Marshall Field has endowed in 1893, McVicker suggests that Putnam, and his replacement Franz Boas, were shut out in part because Starr had an intense dislike of Putnam (p. 38), but also because Frederick J. V. Skiff of the Museum, and Thomas C. Chamberlain, at the University of Chicago, had their own agendas, which did not include anthropology as Putnam and Boas envisioned it (pp. 41-42). McVicker argues that the Field Columbian Museum tried to "buy" instant prestige by hiring William Henry Holmes in the spring of 1894, forcing Boas out, but notes that Holmes himself lasted only three years before Skiff forced him out in 1897 (p. 48).

Kehoe's paper in this section continues her focus upon the rehabilitation of Daniel Wilson, and her argument that the Scottish Enlightenment was one of the intellectual roots of Americanist archaeology. She argues that because Daniel Wilson was middle class and Scottish, rather than English with a peerage, that Wilson's legitimate claim to developing prehistory in Great Britain has been usurped by Sir John Lubbock. Kehoe believes the fact that Lubbock belonged to the 'right' elite clubs, whose members included individuals such as Charles Darwin, Thomas Huxley, Joseph Hooker, Herbert, Spencer, etc., and that Lubbock's elite class 'racism' dominated the British scene, doomed Wilson's work to obscurity.

Silberman focuses upon Sir William Matthew Flinders Petrie and his tilt with eugenics. While I had known Petrie was a prolific archaeologist, I was still surprised to learn that Petrie had excavated more than 60 sites, and had written more than 100 excavation reports, and roughly 450 articles and 400 reviews. Silberman argues that much of Petrie's career was influenced by his interest in eugenics, which he had adopted in 1880, and that one of the guiding reasons for Petrie's first excavation was to show the superiority of Greek contributions to Middle Eastern cultures. While the site of Tell el Hesi in Palestine is often cited as the locus of Petrie's first use of stratigraphic control in the Near East, Silberman argues that significant component of the excavation focus was to test Petrie's theory of racial conquest, and further, that many of Petrie's excavations in Egypt also were utilized to bolster his racialist ideology (p. 73). The 1911 monograph, *The Revolutions of Civilizations*, which was assigned in a course I took to illuminate the historical development of Egyptology, was also, as Silberman notes (p. 75), one of Petrie's major works on "progress through eugenics".

Desmond examines the work of Augustus Le Plongeon, arguing that Le Plongeon conducted the "earliest thorough and systematic documentation" of a Maya site, but noting that because of his ideological

views, Le Plongeon's work has been systematically ignored by mainstream Maya archaeologists. Le Plongeon started out as a photographer, and is responsible for much of the artwork in Ephraim Squier's 1877 Peru, although typically for Squier, Le Plongeon's contributions were not acknowledged. Le Plongeon became convinced that the "cradle of civilization" was in America, not Europe, and he and his wife Alice spent a good deal of their careers trying to demonstrate this idea. To do proper archaeology, the Le Plongeon's argued, one had to learn the local language and culture first, and then excavate, making "systematic and thorough recording" of the architecture and artifacts so recovered (p. 83), a method which they employed in their work at Uxmal in 1875 and Chichen Itza in 1877. Le Plongeon's use of Freemasonry dogma to support his origins hypotheses, as well as his bitter feuds with prominent individuals of the late 19th century such as Louis Ayme, Daniel Brinton, Desire Charnay and Phillip J. J. Valenti, were significant contributors to his ex-communication from the mainstream. Desmond argues that for Americanist archaeology, that the feud with Brinton (p. 86) "was a major factor in his downfall."

Dever's interest is the linkage between William F. Albright and "biblical archaeology." Albright is argued to have been a religious conservative, who was particularly interested in utilizing archaeology to demonstrate the Bible as good history, as historically accurate (pp. 92-93). Albright's approach resonated with many American religious scholars, and Dever credits him with almost single-handedly creating the field of 'Biblical Archaeology'. However, it is Dever's take that "in summary, American Biblical archaeology, after nearly a century, has passed from the scene as nothing more than an historical curiosity" (p. 98).

Dyson's chapter is the last of seven in the first cluster in the 'Multiple Pasts' section. Dyson is interested why Classical archaeology remained mired in what Willey and Sabloff termed the "Classificatory-Descriptive" and "Classificatory-Historical" modes. His problem is handicapped, he observes, because (p. 103) "no history of modern Classical archaeology, and especially Classical archaeology in the United States exists", partly because the "North American Classical archaeology has proved to be a discipline singularly lacking in self reflection and analysis." He sees the origins of American Classical archaeology as deriving in large part from the "Brahmin amateurs" of the Archaeological Institute of America, with their passion for collecting having a significant impact on retarding the intellectual development of the field. Dyson argues that the willingness of the American monied elite to subsidize the "big dig" to recovery public architecture and beautiful objects led to the bureaucratic institutionalization of the field, stifling intellectual innovations (p. 109).

Section II, "Professionals May Not Be Women", includes three papers by James Halporn, Mary Ann Levine, and Susan Bender, all commenting on various aspects of discrimination against women in the field of archaeology.

Halporn is interested in the career of the Classical archaeologist, Abby Leach, the first woman president of the American Philological Association in 1889-1900, as well as the reasons for the lack of women in the field in the late 19th century. Abby Leach began studying Classics in 1878 at the Harvard Annex - the special institute for women students at Harvard which ultimately evolved into Radcliffe. At that time, the Annex was still in its infancy, there being only 26 women students enrolled in all classes there in 1879 (p. 125). After leaving the Annex in 1882, Leach then became a professor at Vassar in 1883, where she became chair of the Greek department in 1890. Halporn notes that Leach, as other women in America, gravitated toward the newly developing field of Classical archaeology, rather than the then more prestigious field of Classical philology. He sees four major reasons for this trajectory: (1) in Europe, women could attend lectures with male students, but for the most part this was not true in America, (2) the prestige of American male scholars as philologists was overpowering and created an exclusionary environment; (3) an interest in antiquity was seen as an appropriate intellect venue for

women; and (4) the newness of archaeology made the field more accessible to newcomers. By the period of 1900 to 1910, Halporn identifies seven American women active in Classical archaeological studies: Edith Hall Dohan, Hetty Goldman, Harriet Ann Boyd Hawes, Lida Shaw King, Ida Thallon, Esther Van Deman, and Alice Leslie Walker.

Levine is interested in identifying all women in Americanist archaeology prior to 1915. A critical issue, Levine argues, was that as American universities evolved in the 19th century, the Ph.D. degree became required for academic positions, a degree which until 1910 was not generally available to women (p. 134). Thus women were forced to develop their own alternative institutions, and one of the important ones was the Women's Anthropological Society of America, established in 1885. Levine reviews the founding and development of this society, indicating that amongst its members were two Classical archaeologists, Sarah Scull and Sophie Schliemann. Women were accepted into archaeological research, Levine argues, for reasons of biological determinism, quoting from an 1895 stereotype which saw women as appropriate candidates for archaeology because they exhibited the traits of "infinite patience, conscientious study, and a fine memory and broad general culture". As she has done in other works, Levine then investigates the contributions of Alice Fletcher, Mary Hemenway, Zelia Nuttall, and Matilda Coxe Stevenson. After nice brief reviews of the works of these four, works which were of instrumental importance in the early development of American archaeology, Levine concludes that (p. 147) "women were not absent from the practice of Americanist archaeology prior to World War I and that their alleged absence results in part from the almost routine erasure of their existence in our received histories." However, she also notes that the late 19th century world was not particularly welcoming of women archaeologists, and that the professional pathways open to the first generation of female archaeologists were mainly as museum researchers or financial patrons (p. 148).

Bender provides information on the career of Marian E. White in the middle 20th century, and the various strategies that White had to employ to succeed. Among those mentioned were the almost desperate ploy of crying "rape" to keep an aggressive male looter out of her excavations; the need to adhere to higher standards than her male colleagues in order to succeed; and the willingness to work with amateurs and in public archaeology - an area that her male colleagues eschewed. While White emerges as a first-rate field archaeologist, Bender notes that she had one failing in common with many of her male colleagues: she failed to publish much of her work.

Section III of this volume, "Southwestern Archaeology as Case Example", is limited to two papers: one by Don D. Fowler and one by Jonathan Reyman.

Fowler investigates the career of Edgar Lee Hewett, employing as a foil the relationships of Hewett with the 'Eastern Establishment', especially as exemplified by Harvard archaeologists. Fowler uses Hewett's career to investigate the kinds of networks and alliances that contributed to the professionalization of American anthropology and the development of research institutions during the period of 1900 to 1930. To illustrate his argument, Fowler reviews the trajectories of five events: the Federal Antiquities Act of 1906; the founding of the School of American Archaeology; the participation of Hewett in the California-Pacific Exposition of 1915; the issue of access of non-local archaeologists to excavation of ruins in the Southwest; and the establishment of the Museum and Laboratory of Anthropology in Santa Fe in 1928. In all cases, Fowler looks at the "regional chauvinism of Hewett" (p. 196) in his attempts to outmaneuver archaeologists from Harvard, the American Museum of Natural History, the Carnegie Institution, and the Smithsonian Institution, the so-called "Eastern Establishment". The lasting results of Hewett's ability to create networks and organizations are to be seen in the Museum of New Mexico, the Museum and Laboratory of Anthropology in Santa Fe, the San Diego Museum of Man, and the Federal Antiquities Act.

Reyman looks at the treatment of women in Southwestern archaeology during the period of 1895 to 1945. Throughout this period, he contends, women were “considered secondary contributors” on the basis of sex (p. 215). He argues that women were frequently relegated to the field lab to clean, catalog, and restore artifacts, as this was seen as similar to women’s work in housekeeping — an observation of the stereotype of the proper place of women made by several recent scholars evaluating the role of women in all of science, not just anthropology, during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Reyman sees it as a significant deliberate mechanism “of men excluding women from what men perceive as a traditional male domain” (p. 217). He further provides explicit examples of men ignoring the scholarship of women — of Pepper ignoring Matilda Coxe Stevenson’s identification of textile fibers, and thus mis-identifying materials from Pueblo Bonito; and of many Southwestern archaeologists ignoring the observations of Marietta Wetherill on massive burials in the Chaco Canyon area, and thus using an assertion of presumed lack of burials to support an argument for a small resident population constructing the impressive Chaco centers. In addition to his more extensive treatment of Matilda Stevenson and Marietta Wetherill, Reyman briefly mentions contributions by Hattie Cosgrove, Bertha Dutton, Alice Eastwood, Nan Glenn, Florence Hawley, Dorothy Keur, Madeleine Kidder, Marjorie Lambert, Dorothy Luhrs, Ann Axtell Morris, Anna Shepard, and Janet and Margaret Woods, in support of his argument of the overlooked importance of women in the archaeology of the Southwest in this period.

The volume has a good index. References and endnotes are at the end of each chapter, so are more variable in nature. While some readers may not agree with the “spin” Kehoe puts on the issues in her introduction and chapter headings, the scholarship of the contributors and the topics covered make this a necessary volume in the library of any student of the history of archaeology, regardless of whether or not an individual is comfortable with the emphasis upon the issues of discrimination and marginalization.

Sixty Years of Mogollon Archaeology: Papers From the Ninth Mogollon Conference, Silver City, New Mexico, 1996, by Stephanie M. Whittlesey, SRI Press, Tucson, 1999.

Reviewed by
Stephen E. Nash
The Field Museum

“The diverse papers that were presented at th[e 1996 Mogollon] conference reveal the geographic, intellectual, and temporal scope of contemporary Mogollon archaeology, and almost nothing of the historical controversy surrounding the Mogollon culture concept (Whittlesey 1999:vii).

With these words, Stephanie M. Whittlesey makes it clear in the preface that *Sixty Years of Mogollon Archaeology: Papers From the Ninth Mogollon Conference, Silver City, New Mexico, 1996* (SRI Press 2000) contains few papers on the history of Mogollon archaeology. It might therefore be more appropriately titled “Current Research in Mogollon Archaeology.” The volume was apparently named to honor the sixtieth anniversary of Emil Haury’s 1936 publication *The Mogollon Culture of Southwestern New Mexico*, which described the Mogollon for the first time. As it stands, the “Sixty Years....” moniker implies an historical component to the volume that is simply not present, save for Whittlesey’s preface and J. Jefferson Reid’s examination of the recent Grasshopper - Chavez Pass debate (Chapter 2), though some chapters do contain brief literature reviews. Readers well versed in the history of archaeology may well read the title and, via free-association, think of Richard Woodbury’s *Sixty Years of Southwestern Archaeology: A History of the Pecos Conference*; the volumes could not be more different, however. Whittlesey (p. vii) simply refers readers to overviews of Mogollon archaeology presented by J. Jefferson