

HISTORY, PROCESS, TRADITION, AND THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN CALIFORNIA ARCHAEOLOGY

ANTOINETTE MARTINEZ

History, process and tradition in California archaeology can be tracked through influential individuals whose ideas and perspectives have been transmitted through the classroom, in the field, and in print. When contemplating the prevailing theoretical approaches to archaeology in California, many personalities come to mind. Are any of them women? What roles have women played in shaping the character of California archaeology and what will their roles be in the future? This paper provides a preliminary assessment of women as teachers in the discipline.

INTRODUCTION

When first conceptualizing the symposium in honor of Mark Kowta, we became aware of his personal interests in history, process, and tradition in California archaeology. How did it come to be what it is today? What were the social contexts that cradled its development? However, when I contemplated his place in the field, I kept returning to his career as a teacher, as well as a scholar. The role of the teacher inherently must be one of the most important modes of cultural transmission - one of the more fundamental aspects of history and process. Academic lineage has played a critical part in the historical contexts and theoretical approaches to California archaeology. Some would believe our perspectives could be predicted with knowledge of our academic history, because, as anthropologists, we are aware that generational change is relatively slow. Because the role of teacher or mentor has provided a continuum of ideology as well as method in the historical contexts of California archaeology, I wanted to look into the history of women, particularly as teachers, in the development of our discipline.

But first, I acknowledge that "teaching" is multi-faceted and can be addressed in several different ways. As a student I often reflected on pedagogical styles: some teachers were dogmatic, opinionated, proselytizing their favorite theories; others tried to make you think for yourself. Many of us present at this symposium have squirmed in our seats when Professor Kowta asked, "What do you think?" I vividly remember him picking up the banana from his lunch bag and offering me

the "golden banana award" for one answer I gave and I am still puzzling over his exact meaning. However, I have never been in doubt of his unbiased support for all students and colleagues regardless of color, age, or gender.

Some teach by being role models and through the activities of their daily lives. In fact, many of our important female teachers have been Native American. Not academics, but mothers and wives who have sustained the traditions of the archaeology we study. With the development and elaboration of practice theory over the past 20 years, a growing theoretical corpus now exists on how the study of daily practices can provide insights into different peoples' worldviews, cultural meanings, and social identities (e.g. Bourdieu 1977, 1990; Giddens 1979; Lightfoot et al. 1998; Ortner 1984). These studies only enhance the potential importance of teacher-student interactions in developing theoretical and methodological traditions.

Today, many female archaeologists work in heritage resources management, for agencies and for private companies disseminating their knowledge in other ways. And our numbers are increasing in today's academic milieu. But, as we shall see, women were not prominent in academic contexts early in the history of California archaeology. The women influencing the course of anthropology and archaeology out here on the western boundaries were not teachers, at least in an academic sense. Using Claassen's (1994) generational approach to "Women in Archaeology," I would like to focus on a few California women who were influential in their own time, specifically from the 1880s to 1930s.

FIRST GENERATION PATRONS OF ARCHAEOLOGY WOMEN IN CALIFORNIA ARCHAEOLOGY AT THE TURN OF THE 20TH CENTURY (1880s - 1920s)

In the 1880s, female anthropologists began to hold marginal positions in museums, as loosely affiliated field workers, or as financial patrons (Levine 1994:11).

California anthropological research had its benefactress in Phoebe Apperson Hearst, one of the University of California's most generous patrons (Stadtman 1970: 206). In 1899 Mrs. Hearst provided funds for expeditions headed by competent archaeologists to augment her collections, which she proposed to give to the University. These archaeologists included the distinguished Egyptologist George A. Reisner, who was commissioned to make a five-year expedition to Egypt. "For work in Peru, she hired and outfitted a German archaeologist, Max Uhle" (Stadtman 1970:206). Alfred Emerson was sent to Europe to buy materials of Greek, Roman, and Etruscan antiquity; and a doctor of medicine, Philip Mills Jones, was placed in charge of collecting archaeological materials from California (Stadtman 1970:206).

The materials acquired through these expeditions began to arrive in Berkeley in 1901 and outgrew space made available, first in a large, vacated house on College Avenue and later in a 60-by-80-foot galvanized-iron warehouse built on campus at Mrs. Hearst's expense. In 1903, most of the growing collection was moved to a building of the Affiliated Colleges on Parnassus Heights in San Francisco. There, what became known as the Museum of Anthropology had its headquarters for 28 years, where in 1911, exhibitions were open to the public with a reception given by Mrs. Hearst; during the next two decades hundreds of thousands of visitors saw the museum's collections (Stadtman 1970: 207).

An inevitable consequence of the Hearst archaeological expeditions was the development of a staff at the University to catalogue and describe the collections. The staff, organized in 1901 as the Department of Anthropology under F. W. Putnam of the Peabody Museum at Harvard, was financed almost entirely by Mrs. Hearst until 1906. "Because Professor Putnam could spend only three months of the year at Berkeley, most of the department's affairs were under the practical

management of a twenty-five year old Ph.D. from Columbia, Alfred L. Kroeber. In addition to serving as curator of the anthropology museum in Putnam's absence, it was Kroeber who taught the first course in anthropology offered by the University" (Stadtman 1970: 207).

Kroeber was a student of Franz Boas, who at this time was "working to shift the discipline's basic institutional context from museums and institutes to academia" and methodological movements from library study to fieldwork (Jacknis 2002:520). Ironically, Boas felt that "fieldwork coupled with advanced graduate training should take precedence over undergraduate instruction" and thus advised Kroeber (Jacknis 2002: 524).

SECOND GENERATION: ACADEMICS AND MUSEUM CURATORS (1920-30s)

Beginning in the 1920s, professional and educational opportunities opened up for women, who achieved greater visibility in academic and museum contexts. Women were being awarded Ph.D.s for their research in cultural anthropology as early as 1914, but not until the 1930s for women with an archaeological focus (Levine 1994:12). The first women of this cohort to obtain academic employment were Frederica de Laguna, Florence Hawley Ellis, Dorothy Cross Jensen, Dorothy Strouse Keur, and Madeline Kneberg (Levine 1994:12). However, no one in this early group represented California.

Before World War II, at least four female archaeologists had already launched successful careers as museum curators or directors: Francis Watkins, Katherine Bartlett, Marjorie Ferguson Lambert, and Elizabeth Crozer Campbell (Levine 1994: 17). Within this museum-affiliated group we finally find a name familiar in California archaeology.

Like some of the other women in archaeology, Elizabeth Crozer Campbell formed part of a husband-wife team, and there is no evidence to suggest that the Campbells ever received formal academic training in archaeology (Levine 1994:17). They moved to the California desert in 1925 and immediately developed a keen interest in the prehistoric occupation of that area (Hodge 1935: 7). According to Levine (1994:17), their

interest in collecting, preserving, and properly curating archaeological materials resulted in the establishment of the Desert Branch of the Southwest Museum, where, for several decades, Elizabeth Campbell held the position of director and, with the assistance of her husband, worked on numerous reconnaissance projects in the California deserts and other parts of the Great Basin. Their fieldwork is well documented in a series of reports published independently and jointly (Campbell 1931, 1936, 1949; Campbell and Campbell 1935, 1937).

In the 1920s and 1930s, the Great Basin was one of the least-known areas in American archaeology (Irwin-Williams 1990:13). However, Campbell is remembered as a pioneer for her contributions to the culture history of this region (Warren 1970:5). Yet, as Irwin-Williams points out, her achievements did not receive sufficient attention to warrant an obituary, and biographical details concerning her life as a museum director and field-oriented researcher are scant (Levine 1994:18).

It is ironic that another female name recognized in this region comes up in the context of "Ancient Man." In the *Reports of the California Archaeological Survey*, No. 2: "A Bibliography of Ancient Man in California" (Dec. 28, 1948), Ruth Simpson is cited, but I was hard pressed to find any biographical information on her. Did she ever teach?

How about Isabel Kelly? Her name is familiar to those who have studied California anthropology or archaeology. Born in Santa Cruz, California in 1906, she originally planned to major in physical education but by the end of the first semester decided to pursue a career in anthropology at UC Berkeley. The Berkeley faculty then consisted of Robert Lowie and Alfred Kroeber in anthropology "but it was Carl Sauer in geography who discovered and nurtured her talent, intelligence, and energy" (Levine 1994:33).

Levine (1994:19) notes that in 1929, the Laboratory of Anthropology at Santa Fe, a facility founded by John D. Rockefeller, awarded fellowships to six individuals, three men and three women. The women were Eva Horner, Francis Watkins, and Isabel Kelly (Watkins 1930:13). The scholarship recipients worked at Pecos under the guidance of A. V. Kidder, director

of the archaeology section for the Laboratory of Anthropology (Levine 1994:19). Watkins (1931:175) maintained that "There have been a great many American women in the field as assistants, secretaries, or relatives of the men in charge of expeditions, but never until the summer of 1929 was an expedition staffed entirely by women sent out by an authorized institution." Watkins (1931:176) states that "The boys worked on a larger ruin, and did about three times as much actual excavation, with excellent mapping while ours was smaller, but every bit of material and information worked out to the farthest degree. Dr. Kidder said that it was the tidiest little excavation he had ever seen - and we are still puzzling over his exact meaning."

In 1932 she was awarded the department's twelfth Ph.D. (Levine 1994:33). As a National Research Council Fellow for 1931-32, Kelly carried out postdoctoral research among the Southern Paiute. In 1935 she traveled to Mexico as a research associate to direct an archaeological project in Culiacan, Sinaloa. This project was supervised by Carl Sauer and Alfred Kroeber for the Institute of Social Science at Berkeley. In 1935 she returned to Berkeley to be a teaching assistant for Sauer (Levine 1994:33), and in 1946 Kelly was appointed Ethnologist-in-Charge of the office of the Smithsonian's Institute of Social Anthropology in Mexico City, where she did teach, as well as carry out research with students (Levine 1994:34). At last, reference to some sort of teaching opportunity.

Although Kelly received impressive financial assistance from foundations, the Anthropology Department at Berkeley, chaired by Kroeber, extended minimal professional support. Kelly's letters to Sauer throughout the 1930s and 1940s reveal her low opinion and distrust of Kroeber. Evidently, Kroeber offered little encouragement to women. Sauer, as well as Kidder, "expressed frustration that she never received the professional appointment she deserved" (Levine 1994:34).

This is not to say that no women were being awarded academic positions. In 1932 the Household Arts department hired their first Ph.D., with the appointment of Lila Morris O'Neale, a Berkeley graduate in anthropology (Nerad 1999: 91). Lila O'Neale also stands out as one of the oldest (44) graduates in a study by

Bernstein (2002:557) of the first recipients of anthropological doctorates. She contributed to a significant difference in the mean age at graduation between women (34.0) and men (30.5) in this early group (Bernstein 2002:557). Not only were there fewer women, but these women apparently were either becoming engaged with anthropology later in their lives or taking longer to graduate. These trends are discussed comprehensively in Melinda Zeder's 1997 book, *The American Archaeologist: A Profile*.

THIRD GENERATION: THE 1940S

In perusing old archaeological documents, I came across an original copy of the *Reports of the California Archaeological Survey*, No 1. (1948). It was of value to me because of its historical importance in the establishment of the California Archaeological Survey; because this copy had belonged to Anna Gayton, who was the first female Ph.D. out of the Berkeley anthropology department; and (now) because it mentions Mr. Francis Riddell as assistant archaeologist.

Four of the eight "appointed members" represent museums, but the gender of the museum representatives is quite obvious. They included Mr. Malcolm Farmer (San Diego Museum of Man), Mr. Mark R. Harrington (Southwest Museum), Mr. Phil C. Orr (Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History), and Mr. Arthur Woodward (Los Angeles County Museum). The other four members included Mr. Allen L. Chickering (California Historical Society), Mr. J. R. Knowland (State Division of Beaches and Parks), Dr. A. L. Kroeber (University of California), and Dr. Theodore D. McCown (University of California). The director was Robert F. Heizer. The fieldwork would be under the direction of Mr. Franklin Fenenga, assisted by Mr. Francis Riddell.

(By the way, this original copy of the California Archaeological Survey was sent to Dr. Anna Gayton Spier through the campus mail, to her department, the Department of Decorative Arts.)

WHAT DO YOU THINK?

At the turn of the 20th Century, women with money were influential. Female patrons played a critical role in the development of American anthropology and archaeology (Jacknis 2002). Even in the case of Elizabeth Campbell, there are allusions to her having the resources necessary to found a museum.

In the 1930s, only a few Ph.D.-granting anthropology departments had field archaeology programs, namely California, Chicago, Columbia, Harvard, Pennsylvania, Southern California, and Yale (Guthe 1967:435). Columbia had research connections to the southwest, and this school produced many female doctorates in the 1930s (Rossiter 1982: Table 7.5). As a result, references to female scholars in the history of southwestern archaeology are common. With two Ph.D.-granting departments in California, why are our numbers so small? Not only are female teachers practically invisible, but in the 1940s women also seem to lose ground in the museum director context.

In the latest SCA *Newsletter*, Fritz [Riddell] picks up the story where I now leave it – the Heizer years - to continue my personal search into the next few generations. Much has changed for women since the early days of California archaeology. The social contexts have changed, but the process has been a long and difficult one - why? I continue to puzzle over the exact meaning. What do you think?

REFERENCES CITED

- Bernstein, Jay H.
2002 "First Recipients of Anthropological Doctorates in the United States, 1891-1930." *American Anthropologist* Vol. 104, No. 2, pp.551-564.
- Bourdieu, Pierre
1977 *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
1990 *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford University Press, Palo Alto, California.
- Campbell, Elizabeth W. Crozer
1931 An Archaeological Survey of the Twenty Nine Palms Region. Southwest Museum Papers 7.
1936 Archaeological problems in the Southern California Deserts. *American Antiquity* 1(4): 295-300.
1949 Two Ancient Archaeological Sites in the Great Basin. *Science* 109:340.
- Campbell, Elizabeth W. Crozer and William H. Campbell
1935 *The Pinto Basin Site*. Southwest Museum Papers 9.
1937 The Mojave Site. In *The Archaeology of Pleistocene Lake Mohave*, Southwest Museum Papers 11:6-44.
- Claassen, Cheryl (editor)
1994 *Women in Archaeology*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
- Giddens, A.
1979 *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Guthe, Carl
1967 "Reflections on the Founding of the Society for American Archaeology." *American Antiquity* 32:433-440.
- Hodge, Frederick Webb
1935 "Forward." In *The Pinto Basin Site*, pp.7-8. Southwest Museum Papers 9.
- Irwin-Williams, Cynthia
1990 "Women in the Field: The Role of Women in Archaeology before 1960." In *Women of Science: Righting the Record*, edited by G. Kass-Simon and Patricia Farnes, 1-41. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Jacknis, Ira
2002 "The First Boasian: Alfred Kroeber and Franz Boas, 1896-1905." *American Anthropologist* Vol. 104, No. 2, pp. 520-532.
- Levine, Mary Ann
1994 Creating Their Own Niches: Career Styles Among Women in Americanist Archaeology Between the Wars. In *Women in Archaeology*, edited by Cheryl Claassen, pp. 9-40. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
- Lightfoot, Kent, Antoinette Martinez and Ann M. Schiff
1998 Daily Practice and Material Culture in Pluralistic Social Settings: An Archaeological Study of Culture Change and Persistence From Fort Ross, California. *American Antiquity* 63(2), pp. 199-222.
- Lillard, Jeremiah B., R. F. Heizer, and Franklin Fenenga
1939 *An Introduction to the Archaeology of Central California*. Sacramento Junior College, Department of Anthropology, Bulletin 2.
- Nerad, Maresi
1999 *The Academic Kitchen: A Social History of Gender Stratification at the University of California, Berkeley*. State University of New York Press.

Ortner, Sherry B.

- 1984 Theory in Anthropology Since the Sixties. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26:126-166.

Preucel, Robert W. and Meredith S. Chesson

- 1994 Blue Corn Girls: A Herstory of Three Early Women Archaeologists at Tecolote, New Mexico. In *Women in Archaeology*, edited by Cheryl Claassen, pp. 67-84. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Rossiter, Margaret W.

- 1982 *Women Scientists in America: Struggles and Strategies to 1940*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Stadtman, Verne A.

- 1970 *The University of California 1868-1968*. McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Warren, Claude N.

- 1970 "Time and Topography: Elizabeth W.C. Campbell's Approach to the Prehistory of the Californian Deserts." *Masterkey* 44(1):5-14.

Watkins, Frances E

- 1930 "My Experiences as a Field Archaeologist." *Masterkey* 4:13-20.
- 1931 "Archaeology as a Profession for Women." *Masterkey* 4:173-178.

Zeder, Melinda

- 1997 *The American Archaeologist: A Profile*. Alta Mira Press.