DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.16204

III. Oral history – Emeritus Professor Warwick Bray

'The Life and Times of Uncle Warwick'

Helen R. Haines, PhD.
Trent University Archaeology Research Centre

Recently, I had the privilege of hosting a session in honour of Dr. Warwick Bray at the 71st Annual Meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, in San Juan, Puerto Rico. The following is a forward to Pamela J. Smith's interview which introduces the reader to this wonderfully modest and endearingly understated man. His modest nature is exemplified in the title for my introduction which comes from a letter Warwick sent me in response to my request for his curriculum vitae – a document he humourously paralleled to children's book 'The Life and Times of Uncle Wiggley'.

If you were to meet Warwick it is highly unlikely that you would at first, or even second or third glance, realise his great intellect or the lasting contributions he has made to our discipline. Upon meeting Warwick the first thing many people notice is the wry smile, twinkle in his eye, and penchant for gently poking fun at both himself and pompous or overly serious colleagues and as a means of relieving nervous and uptight students. His sense of humour is more than a means of creating levity, it is a long standing belief of his that we take ourselves (archaeologists) too seriously, and we need to find more appealing ways of engaging and educating the public about the past. Warwick's desire to eschew technological jargon in favour of 'clear language' makes his papers a delight to read by students and colleagues as well as by the general public.

For many years Warwick was the only Latin American archaeologist in England, valiantly representing the New World among the hallowed halls of the Old World. His works span Mesoamerica from the Aztecs in Mexico through to the gold-working of Columbia and cultures of the Nazca Plain, Peru, while the students he has supervised range far wider than Latin America and span Iceland to Mesopotamia. While his academic contributions are important and numerous (over 100 articles and books over the course of 40 years and countless papers and presentations), perhaps the most telling sign for any teacher is how well he is remembered by his students and colleagues.

I had the great fortune to met Warwick over ten years ago when I decided to take my Ph.D at the Institute of Archaeology in London, UK. I was interested in studying Mesoamerican archaeology – specifically the Maya – and Warwick graciously agreed to be my senior tutor. I knew at the time that he had a wide ranging interest in Mesoamerican archaeology and a number of my Maya colleagues had preceded me as his student, however, it was not until much later that I realised just how wide and august the company was to which I was now a member.

It was shortly after Warwick retired from the Institute of Archaeology, UCL, that I desired to host a session in his honour as a means of recognising his contributions to Latin American archaeology. With the help of the staff at the institute I was able to contact a number of Warwick's former students, who all expressed a desire to participate in either the conference and/or to the festschrift currently in progress. It was then that I learned of the august nature of my academic 'family tree' which includes, among others, the following members: Richard Cooke (Warwick's first student and now with the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute in Panama), Roberto Lleras Peres (Director of the Museo de Oro, Bogata, Columbia), Ann Kendall (Director of the Cusichaca Trust, Peru), and Jaimie Awe (Director of the Institute of Archaeology, Belize). It is clear, from even this partial list, that Warwick's influence has inspired his students to reach great heights.

The support of my 'siblings' was met with equal support from Warwick's colleagues who also were

eager to come and celebrate his contributions. Dr. Jeremy Sabloff, University of Pennsylvania, was among the first of Warwick's colleagues to volunteer to present and lend his support to the endeavour. The session was entitled 'Inter-regional exchange and its role in the socio-political organisation of Pre-Hispanic Latin American cultures', an topic in which Warwick has had a great influence and long interest.

The papers fell into the three key geographic/cultural areas of Latin America in which Warwick had influenced – Mexico, The Maya, and Panama and South America. Agapi Filini presented a paper discussing agency and Teotihuacan symbolic structure, while Richard Diehl and Susan Scott presented a paper discussing the nature of turquoise among the Aztec and pre-Aztec cultures. Elizabeth Graham and Nick Golson also discussed Aztec culture, specifically ideas revolving around exchange, ideology, warfare and tribute in terms of resources control and what the maintenance of control entailed among the Aztecs and the Maya. My paper, presented with Michael D. Glascock, dealt with the implications of the obsidian trade as means of power displays, while Aline Magnoni also discussed trade but in the northern Yucatan at Chunchucmil and how it enabled people to migrate into otherwise agriculturally marginally areas. Richard Cooke talked about his research in Panama on sumptuary goods while Colin McEwen and Richard Lunniss looked further a field at changing trade goods in Ecuador. Jeremy Sabloff provided the keynote speech, summarising Warwick's contributions through the years as only a long-time friend and colleague could, while Gyles Iannone concluded the session with a wonderful reminiscence about what life was like as a student of Warwick's that had the audience in laughter and tears.

What was most gratifying was the number of people who heard about the session and contacted me with the desire to participate in the festschrift, including James Langley and George Bankes (both people I had been unable to contact for the session). Others, including Robert Lleras Peres, Ann Kendall, Jaime Awe, Elizabeth Baquedano, and Frank Meddens, all former students, while unable to attend the conference were ecstatic at the chance to contribute a paper to a festschrift in Warwick's honour.

Warwick's contributions (past and future for he shows no sign of slowing down!) will no doubt continue to be read and discussed by Mesoamerican students for years to come. While these works may give a measure of the scholar, it is perhaps the warmth and genuine deep affection that his colleagues and former students hold for him that is perhaps the most revealing measure of the man himself.

Professor Emeritus Warwick Bray

11 September 2000, recorded at the McDonald Institute, Cambridge University
by **Pamela Jane Smith**. (pjs1011@cam.ac.uk)

This transcript is incomplete. Portions of the interview, especially my comments, are inaudible.

We are talking to Warwick Bray, Professor Emeritus of Latin American Archaeology at the Institute of Archaeology at University College London. Professor Warwick Bray was just telling me his memories of Stuart Piggott, whom he admired.

It goes back to the days when I was still a Mediterranean archaeologist and, of course, Stuart Piggott was one of the people you had to read and talk to. I was doing my Ph.D in Sardinia at the time when *Animal, Vegetable, Mineral* was on the Television and Glyn Daniel, Piggott and Mortimer Wheeler were household names. One of the stories that comes to me [inaudible bit]. In Italian terms, it was just when Luigi Bernabo Brea was making important discoveries on Sicily and the Lipari Islands, and somehow or other, I don't know the story except when I got to be involved, the government there invited a set of scholars from Britain, mainly from Cambridge, to go and see all these new discoveries.

They chartered a fishing boat and filled it with academics. Glyn was there, Stuart was there, a number of others, and a group of students. I was in Sardinia at the time and I came over, and we went from island to island looking at excavations, and at every island, there was a reception with wine. We all had a good time. Where Stuart comes into this – we were talking about his breadth of interest, he was not a narrow-minded archaeologist – we were sitting around at one of these receptions, and Stuart came up with a poetic quotation and offered a bottle of wine to anyone who could recognise it. I was the only person in the room who also had a career in English literature. I got the quotation, and he paid up like a gentleman. Piggott could happily sit down and talk about anything.

[I say something about him being an historian.]

I think that's how he saw himself as well. He was certainly first and foremost a serious archaeologist but if you look at the breadth of what he wrote about, he wasn't one of those narrow specialists who only had one interest. He was capable of getting into any historical, archaeological or literary subject, and he was interested in people as well. He was very good with students.

Was he responsible for building up the Department at Edinburgh, as opposed to Gordon Childe?

I am not quite sure, because I only once went up there in Piggott's days. I really don't know, but it was very much his department when he was there. The students thought that he was marvellous. Gordon Childe was a very different personality. Whether he had the capacity to build up something or not, I simply don't know.

Who were some of Piggott's students?

One of the theses I had to read was Beatrice Blance's, who wrote about Mediterranean topics. I had to go up there to read her thesis once. [Inaudible bit.] Here was I, nobody very much from Cambridge, a fairly junior person. I arrived with no appointment. Stuart wasn't there. I came to his house and there I found him in a great woolly pullover. "Let's make lunch!" he said. We then had a very good lunch. "And how about Beatrice Blance? I have a problem with Beatrice," he said. "You can read the thesis but she came to my office not long ago and said 'Stuart, I think that I am going to drop out of Archaeology.'" Stuart said "Who is the lucky man?" And she said "No, I have been called by God. I am going to be a Missionary." And she never wrote anything else for him.

When was this?

It must have been around 1960.

When did you come up to Cambridge?

Early fifties. 1953, I think. I have to check; but I didn't come up to be an archaeologist. To understand how I fit in, you have to go a little bit back to the school days because one of the things that made me believe in Stuart Piggott was that I wasn't a specialist archaeologist either. Up to the age of 16, I was going to be a biologist, which means I had read all the evolutionary biologists at that stage, and when the New Archaeology broke upon the world, I didn't get it through Leslie White. I actually got it through biology. Then I did a switch and was going to be a writer and poet [small inaudible bit]. I did that for two years and realised that the course wasn't really about literature at all. It was about becoming a literary critic, and that was not what I wanted to be at all. After two years of this, I looked around for a change. When it came to it, there were only two things that I could change to. One was economics and the other was archaeology and anthropology, because they had one-year Part Ones. My family background, my father was a field geologist who had worked in Africa. So I had always been interested in other cultures and antiquities and landscapes and that sort of thing. Archaeology was the choice. That first year, the old Part One, was a real mind-blower. It was the most interesting single year of education I have ever had in my entire career, and I found I was good at it. I stayed and did Part Two in one year instead of two, just to get a proper archaeology degree, and at that point, came on the job market, the thesis market. At that stage, I had already decided I wanted to get a long

way from Cambridge. I had had enough of Cambridge, and I thought the biggest possible contrast there could be would be to go to a Catholic country far away. So I sent off letters for scholarships to Turkey, Portugal and Italy. Two said "no" and one said "yes". I ended up doing my Ph.D in Sardinia. That is the early stage of the career.

Who did you have in Part One?

All sorts of people were teaching in those days. It just overlaps with the end of the period you are most interested in.

[I asked something inaudible about G. I. Jones.]

Jones, yes, and Geoffrey Bushnell was there.

Did he teach American archaeology?

Not very much. He sometimes gave a token course on American archaeology. It was never something that Cambridge did, but he was a good academic. They more or less gave him a token course. Jack Trevor did physical anthropology. It was the end of the Burkitt era in Palaeolithic. There was Clark, McBurney, Audrey Furness, John Coles and, of course, Glyn Daniel.

John Coles?!

Yes, just beginning. I was here a long time, changing subjects and doing a Ph.D. All of those at one time or another taught me, very exciting people to listen to.

Charles McBurney was there?

Yes, I didn't do a great deal of Palaeolithic because I knew that was not where my interest was going to be. But he was certainly one of my teachers and I dug with him as an undergraduate and graduate student as well.

Lethbridge?

No, he was a presence of someone who had been there before. Extraordinary people came along. Glyn Isaac, Paul Mellars, Nic David. There were lots – strange things used to happen. McBurney could not organise flash photographs and was never quite sure how much to compensate. So he used to go out in the dead of the night to photograph his excavation sections, so there would be no interference from sunlight and the flash. All sorts of strange and wonderful things were happening. It was a very good and very varied department.

Could you say something about Burkitt?

When I first came into contact with him, he was virtually at the end of his career, a long career, and everybody knew and he himself knew that he was no longer on the cutting edge of things. Remember, McBurney and Grahame Clark were teaching in the same building. The comparison was very cruel to Burkitt. He did most of his teaching to first-year beginners. It is probably a good idea to begin small and then become more complicated. His lectures were enormously enjoyable, partly because the man himself was so obviously enjoying them. It was almost as if your favourite uncle was up there, reminiscing about olden days. You didn't get a great deal of very new archaeology. He didn't say much beyond what was in his book, *The Old Stone Age*. You didn't go there to get the new, but what fascinated me was that he was so obviously a bridge to the past. He had been there and had worked with the Abbé Breuil in the old days, and nobody else had. Clark and McBurney were the rising stars. They hadn't worked in sub-Saharan Africa. They weren't particularly interested in art. The world that Burkitt would talk about was a different world, not enormously relevant and certainly not the way things were to go, but I have always liked the history. I used to find it fascinating just to listen to the asides and anecdotes.

[Inaudible question by me.]

The person who most often came up was the Abbé Breuil. He didn't actually teach about the excavations he did with Obermaier in any formal sense, but he was full of references to that world. If you ever got him over a cup of tea, there would be more of that. He looked a happy man in those days, and it was infectious. We all felt, I felt happy too, just to be there for an hour relaxing, after all this hard-core stuff in the other courses.

What about The Old Stone Age?

Yes, it was used for the want of anything better. There were not a lot of general textbooks on the Palaeolithic in those days. As soon as I got to Part Two level, I sold it. It was clearly not the textbook for the future.

What about Archaeology and Society? Was that used?

Yes. We didn't have formal textbooks in the American sense where you have a course book but this was one of the books that most of us bought. The lectures went beyond that. He didn't lecture from the book as I remember. That was certainly a book I bought. But we weren't advised to. It wasn't a formal part of the course training.

When did you have Grahame Clark?

Mainly in Part Two. Having done Part One, the question was, where to specialise? I knew I wanted to travel. I first tried to get into Mesopotamia archaeology, but Munn-Rankin sat me down and gave me a cup of tea and told me why I was unsuitable for this. Quite rightly, no hard feelings, but I was turned down there. I had a go at Egyptology. I eventually found a home in what was then the Neolithic, Bronze and the Early Iron Age Option. Remember, Grahame wasn't just a Mesolithic man, but was teaching the whole prehistoric economy of Europe. He taught us more about that than the Mesolithic. I found it absolutely fascinating, because it was personally where I was at. I had always had an interest in landscapes and what people have done with them. It combined ethnographic analogies and things that you could relate to that were being done by real people. Clark, as an archaeologist, is still my great hero. I still kept his book on *Prehistoric Europe: The Economic Basis* long after I'd sold others.

So many people say that to me.

Interesting. I did go to tea once to his house. I got on my bike and set off to pedal to his house and the chain came off. I arrived there all covered with oil, half an hour late and very apologetic, and he looked at me and said "Well, it was tomorrow, anyhow." I tried again the next day. I never had any luck with Grahame Clark. I shaved a beard off in the middle of the term and he thought I was two people for a very long time. He did write beautiful books. He wrote like a dream and his drawings and maps were good.

Why did he ask you to tea?

He asked all the students.

[I say something about Jack Golson.]

The second time he asked me to tea, he had just done one of his tours around central Europe. He put a huge book on my lap and said "Ah, are you interested in Czech folk art?" He wasn't good with undergraduates.

[I say something about Clark helping Posnansky.]

The person who was my manager, because of the college connection, was Glyn Daniel. He was one of the world's great fixers, because of all his editorial and general work, he knew everybody. So, he

could get in touch with anybody. And, since he was teaching the Mediterranean part of the course, he was closest to what I was doing. Geoffrey Bushnell also looked after me, once I went to Colombia. Glyn was my minder for getting grants and getting introductions. Whether he got me the job I eventually got at Sheffield, I don't know. I can't even remember how I heard about it. Having finished my Ph.D, my father kept on entering me for jobs I had no chance of getting, and didn't want anyhow. So quite how the one at Sheffield came about, I don't remember. I remember what happened on the first day, but not how I got there.

[I say something about Sheffield.]

It is a long story. Since I was the only one who was there in those days, let's tell it properly. It was a combination of myself as the archaeologist and Professor Robert Hopper as the university politician. Hopper was Professor of Ancient History and there were also Professors of Latin and Greek. So, they had the Classics and Hopper was a very astute man. He realised that the market in straight Classics, people weren't doing Latin at the time, was obviously going downhill and doomed to go further. He also realised that this was just at the time that archaeology was becoming popular. So, the way his mind worked was that if he took on archaeology, it would build up his power base within the university. But also he was thinking in the long term; his ambition was that when he retired this joint department would split and that archaeology would become an honours degree, giving the department independence, and that is exactly what happened. He had a ten-year plan. He was a very good university politician. He was a Welshman with a loud voice and a belligerent manner. He must have been a devil to be with in a committee, and that may have been how he got away with it. He would announce his plans. The division of labour we had was that I would feed him archaeological ideas; what I thought the department ought to be doing archaeologically. He would 'politic' in committees. Basically, although I was the first-job junior lecturer, I was having major policy decisions on what a future department was going to do. He was a front man and we were a very happy combination. We got on well as people. He was a very reasonable man to work for, once you had his confidence. I know people who didn't. Once he felt that you were up to the job, he would allow you to contribute. I remember the day I got the job, I was so excited I fell down the front stairs of the university and got up again and said, "What would you want me to teach?" "Well, we paid you to tell us that," he said. I set the syllabus. I asked for the library to get at least two periodicals from every country in Europe, and they did it. It was to be a European Department.

Was that your idea?

No, I applied for a job in European prehistory, so the premise was set up before I put in. In those days I still was a European prehistorian. Again, it was Hopper's politics. I would like to acknowledge what this man did. Very few people there today know, and it is not talked about. He did everything he could to build archaeology up. This was in the days of easier state money. There was more money and a slightly more relaxed attitude. Every year we would deliberately overspend and the next year we would overspend again. We were robbing them blind. [All this was said in humour by Warwick Bray.] At the same time we bumped our members up by rather shamelessly taking people, malcontents from other departments, and turning them into quite reasonable archaeologists. Our numbers went up. Consequently, every few years we would get another lecturer. The second one was Colin Renfrew. The money was there, and having committed all these bureaucratic manoeuvrings, Hopper would then turn around and say "Look, we have so many students now, we need another lecturer." And we got one.

[I ask about Colin Renfrew.]

He had just finished his excavations in Bulgaria. He was obviously the man to watch. So much so that people occasionally come up to me and ask, what was it like working for Colin Renfrew? Then Paul Mellars turned up on a fellowship.

What year was that then?

1962 or '64 when I went up, and I was there for four years, and at the end of it we had two lecturers, one fellow and we were just about to get our third lecturer. In a matter of four to five years, we built up a small university archaeological department, and that was very much Robert Hopper's brainchild. He had the vision before I ever got there. He was the strategist. I was the tactician.

Did you ever write this down?

No, it was not something I ever wrote it down. It just shows what one can do with team work. It was a very happy place; there were a lot of bright people around, not just in archaeology. A lot of bright people started off there. It is still a good department. All of this is so long ago. In the early days, you didn't do an honours degree. It was just part of a more general course. I didn't see the founding of a definite school of archaeology known by your products, ex-students, PhDs. I missed that.

Often people say that Cambridge was a 'School'.

Not in the intellectual sense that we all thought alike, but in the sense that we were the most dominant. This wasn't because it was 'better than anybody else'. But we were in fact the biggest and most powerful archaeological school in the country. The Institute of Archaeology was in its early days and only giving postgraduate diplomas. It didn't begin to teach undergraduates until just before I moved there. Oxford had people, but really no department. The new universities were only just setting up. Cambridge was statistically where most people were. It was a big department and a lot of the people who went into it, a lot of Part Ones came and those who went on to do archaeology at Part Two level, mainly did so because they wanted to be archaeologists. Most of them made it. A lot of good people every year were coming off the assembly line. It was just at the time when archaeology was opening up in places like Australia and New Zealand, and just when the African colonies were thinking about Independence and looking to set up a local school. So really Cambridge people went everywhere. You know that article 'Cambridge in the Bush'? Well it is true. It was like that. If you look around now, Cambridge dominance is no longer as marked as some think. There are people of good quality coming from everywhere. Cambridge had by far the 'critical mass'.

What was happening in Ireland?

What I remember was a long pub-crawl in Ireland.

Who was there?

The ones I knew were George Eogan and Michael Herity. Going around with Michael Herity was an experience, because he had his own radio show, so everybody knew who he was. You couldn't stop in any village without people saying "Ah, Michael, come have a drink and bring your friend." We had a very good time. And Brian O'Kelly was still in Cork. He had marvellous stories about smuggling and Spanish trawlers. It was a strange world there, rather wild.

[I say something inaudible.]

Yes. Irish Megaliths. I never really soaked myself in the prehistory of the British Isles at all. I worked on the Copper Age in Sardinia. I have always been more interested in continental Europe. Once I got the Part Two examinations out of the way, I never seriously read British prehistory.

What about the Department?

There were people working all over the place. Glyn knew everybody on the Mediterranean circuit. Glyn was certainly very Europe-minded, and if you look at Grahame Clark, all the economic work was on European prehistory. His excavations may have been here but he wasn't a British archaeologist, focusing entirely on that.

What about Clark?

Remember, Clark always did see Britain as part of a European phenomenon. This is in all his books.

If anything, the emphasis was on Europe. I don't remember detailed courses on just Britain. It was a very cosmopolitan course. Inevitably people did get jobs.

This makes sense.

Brian Fagan and people like that were going off to Africa, Wilfred Shawcross to New Zealand. All the people in my generation went everywhere. We were everywhere at that stage anyhow. Remember Grahame Clark's book on *World Prehistory*. That is really where he was. His fieldwork opportunities were in Britain, but he would be mortified if you just wrote him off as a British archaeologist. In later life, when he got pupils everywhere; he came back enormously enthusiastic from his tour of Australia. You see how you get people like Chris Chippindale when you have people like Grahame Clark. There were people who were doing these things, environmental science. He realised that the sorts of things he had done in *Prehistoric Europe* were being done all over the place, and he got a great delight out of this.

And the teaching?

All sorts of things happened while I was back and forth to Sardinia.

And where did the teaching occur?

There were lecture rooms and old-fashioned lanterns and slides in the museum. Bushnell was a 'hands on' director and encouraged people to handle things. The museum was very much a part of what I was doing. You could go out of the lecture and see what had just been talked about.

[Inaudible remarks by me about the difficulty of getting jobs.]

It was being said. I remember Glyn Daniel telling my father that it would be fine to be an archaeologist, but that there wouldn't be jobs in it. Most of the people still teaching there, though they were very professional about it, gave the impression of having some kind of money behind them, not doing it as a hobby exactly but possibly being able to support themselves. I was there just at the switch. Archaeology became popular. A lot more people came into it and a lot more came out. The other side of the popularity was that there were more jobs. This was certainly the situation in the former empire, as we have said. Over a short period, new universities were opening up with their new university departments. It was becoming feasible to make a professional career in archaeology. Most of the people who were contemporaries of mine were in that position. I was very near the beginning of that.

That would be when?

The very early sixties. Nearly all my contemporaries were people without serious private money who were looking for a paid career in archaeology and got one.

[I say something about jobs.]

In a way, one of the things that begins to creep in is that little edge of desperation that if you don't, you will die. There was one person who desperately wanted to be an archaeologist, and never was. It made people intense about archaeology. I came into Part One archaeology with no intent of being an archaeologist. I was going to get my degree and then go out into publishing or whatever. My closest college friends were in something else. At that stage, I had no intention of making it a career. In a way, this made it more fun. I didn't have that edge of earnest desperation. It was at the beginning of the end of the private income era.

What sort of courses did you have?

We had all sorts of things in Part One. Looking back on it, Part One arch and anth was regarded as a sort of ragbag thing that people went into on a not very serious basis. It was a mixture of people

who were serious and the other half, very bright, but not archaeologists. They were good at what they did, but they haven't come through archaeology. At the end of Part One, the split came. They were a diverse and interesting lot of people. It made for good fun. How are you on the social politics of era? Because —

(End of Side 1)

The philosophy at that time was that basically anyone capable of university entrance should be allowed to go to university. If you came from a hard-up family, you received a full grant, and if you came from a richer family, you got less. It was graded, but the government's intention was that anybody capable of going to university should not be barred financially. So a lot of people who otherwise would not have come began to come to places like this from straightforward, non-private-income backgrounds with the need to get jobs at the end. Of course, there were no jobs guaranteed at the end. They guaranteed your entry into the university system. It did make it possible for a lot of people from perfectly ordinary families to come up and to be archaeologists in a way that it wouldn't have been in the period you are primarily interested in. There was social as well as intellectual change. Many of us are part of that.

Do you think that had something to do with the War?

It started there, with grants to returning servicemen. They tended to be older. Strangely enough, my next door neighbour from Sheffield was a university lawyer and Jack Golson was the best man at his wedding. So, I heard a bit about Jack Golson. Then, you had nothing to fall back on if you didn't make it as archaeologists afterwards.

Some have said to me that Grahame Clark was a 'scholarship boy' because there was that 'rawness' about him. Mary said this to me. Even though he went to a top Public School.

I didn't know this but I am not surprised. I don't think that you can categorize all people who went to a public school as rich. Sometimes families scrimped and saved to send somebody there. Some went on scholarships. It is not the public school as such, but rather real wealth *versus* not, and the two categories don't always coincide.

[Something about Clark was in a hurry.]

I think in a way I see what Mary was getting at. I was born and grew up in industrial Lancashire – my first ten years or more were there, where there was a tradition of coming from nowhere and becoming a self-made businessman. Whatever the financial situation was of Grahame Clark, he was very much a self-made businessman.

He was an intellectual entrepreneur.

T. S. Eliot's *The Wasteland* crack about the 'silk hat on a Bradford millionaire', it was that sort of slight sneering attitude toward those who had made it themselves rather than inherited it. Mary is from a moneyed background. Mary was very kind to me.

Mina [Lethbridge] always calls Clark 'rude'.

Grahame could not empathise with people. Other archaeologists from backgrounds either better or worse could. I think it was his personality. You cannot put it down to background. He was a very self-focused man. He was focused on his career, and sometimes couldn't see far beyond it.

I think that Mary's statement says something about how he pursued his career. I have often heard people refer to him as a 'Nazi' but in fact during the thirties he was quite left-wing. Such terms describe how people perceived his personality rather than his politics.

He actually wrote in detail against Fascism. He didn't believe that everyone was equal but he did

believe that everyone should have a chance.

Yes, I thought those statements address how people perceived the way he acted and were somewhat unfair.

He believed that the successful élite had the right to take decisions for the unsuccessful. Remember that late book of his? That reflects the attitude he had in his later years. The élite had rights and responsibilities.

[Inaudible comment from me.]

Another thing about British culture, not so much now but it certainly was in my childhood days, you may have noticed as an outsider from Canada – who are our heroes? They are gifted amateurs like Sherlock Holmes who have a natural genius. They do things casually. They don't stay up all night reading the small print and checking out museum labels. If you have done that, you pretend you haven't.

Why is that?

I have no idea why. It is a sort of cultural thing and Grahame wouldn't do it. He wanted his A for effort.

Yes!

He was serious. He did what was necessary but not tactfully.

Why is it considered bad taste to be hard working?

It is changing anyhow. It used to be rather bad taste.

Bad form!

It may come from the fact that for certain people who were in charge, they were mainly moneyed.

[I say something about Clark's push to 'professionalise' archaeology. Inaudible section follows.]

One point – if you read his books as a piece of writing, they are beautifully written. He doesn't let the effort show there. When you compare the literature since, the effort does 'hang out'. He was reverting to the great British tradition of being literate! That I liked about his work; no jargon. As a piece of presenting archaeological argument, both Garrod and Clark had clear minds. They produced clear books.

Unlike Burkitt.

I haven't read him since Part One year. It is a battle with students to get them to write as clearly as they talk.

PhDs were considered vulgar [inaudible portion] When I was writing my acknowledgements I had to be careful not to insult people by calling them 'Dr'.

Yes, I knew people in academic life who thought that it was vulgar to be one; sort of pushy and a show off. And now you can't move without one.

Burkitt works hard to give the impression of a man of leisure in archaeology.

Burkitt gave the impression that he was very much at ease with himself.

[Inaudible bit.]

He must have known he wasn't up-to-date. He probably felt that he was doing a good job in the kindergarten part of the department and he was. He was very good for beginners.

[Inaudible.]

There weren't textbooks for courses. Remember you are concentrating on the academic part of the discipline. Even in my day, there was more archaeology going on in local societies then there ever was in universities. Every county had its society. The world was full of amateur archaeological societies. This was before the professional organisations. When I went to Sheffield, I found that the local society knew everything there was to know about what had been found within a bicycle ride from Sheffield, and very little about anything else. So, there was a world of archaeology but academic archaeology was new. When I was up at Sheffield, an excavation on an Iron Age village had been done by a miner who had dug it to fully professional standards. Unfortunately, he didn't have the literary skills needed. He invited Wheeler up to see it and Wheeler liked it; no formal education; no formal links. There were a lot of very good technicians out there who learnt to dig and knew their own local area very, very well. One of the differences between Britain and the States, one of the main roots of archaeology in Britain is geology. So there were people who understood about soils and stratigraphy. Most of what we as academics did was irrelevant. There was more stuff coming out of county journals than the *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, in the statistical sense. I am not mocking the academics, but statistically more was getting done day-to-day by amateurs. It puts us in our place. There's a parallel world out there at least in the early days.

Clark realised that. He was part of the Sussex Archaeological Society in the 1920s.

Yet Clark seemed to have realised that in order for archaeology to progress, particularly at the intellectual level, you had to get beyond the amateur weekend dig; those who would just dig and describe but who never got the big picture. This is where university education came in. You could understand the history of Yorkshire in the context of Europe, something that an amateur archaeologist would never have the time to do.

I think that was Clark's goal in the 1930s; to go beyond the local.

Clark was interested in changing the PSEA to the Prehistoric Society; to make it a national and international organisation.

[I mention my Proceedings article on the 'Coup'.] Let's talk some more about your career. You have your PhD. You are in Sheffield. How did you change to Latin American archaeology?

These are parallel stories. Lots of Cambridge people went off on undergraduate expeditions. I had been looking around for something to do and then at a party of Glyn Daniel's, and by 2.00 or 3.00 in the morning, everyone had drunk quite a lot and were relaxed. A man called David Orr, who was the son of Robin Orr, the musician and composer, who was a great friend of Glyn's —

And Robin Orr was in the same Photographic Intelligence unit as Dorothy Garrod during the war.

Yes. David Orr was Glyn's godson. He came over in the morning and said "There is an undergraduate expedition which wants to go Colombia, but we are not going to get anywhere unless we have someone along with an archaeological degree." I had a PhD, with nothing to do. So I signed up for it. I went, and we had a marvellous time. But this was meant to be a 'one off'. Lots of people were there. Then I went up to Sheffield but I had already fallen in love with Colombia, and Colombian archaeology particularly, because nothing had been done. I get more intellectual kicks out of being first and roughing it out than being the last in and doing the 73rd Roman villa. I liked the landscape and the people and the work, and I could see what we ought to do next. While I was up at Sheffield, I said "Could I go back and have one more go?" Although I was then teaching European archaeology, they said "Yes, go and do it". So I went back, and this meant I had been twice and everybody else had been only once. I carried on very happily at Sheffield [inaudible bit] and it happened that someone connected to the extramural department, a man called Harold Blakemore, a Chilean historian, had been invited down to become the Administrator of the newly founded Institute of Latin American

Studies in London. There was a time when the government felt that Latin America was being neglected and centres around the country were started for Latin American Studies with earmarked government money. In the bar at Sheffield he was telling me about this, and saying that "I think that we ought to have archaeology. Let's see if we can set up a joint cost-sharing programme between the Institute of Latin American Studies and the Institute of Archaeology which would have a world-wide scope," and this came to pass. So quite unexpectedly —

The bar – you met this man in the bar?

In Cambridge it was definitely the tea and coffee shop, and David Clarke would tell us his thoughts but – it never occurred to me that I might get this. I thought long and hard whether to leave. I enjoyed Sheffield but did want to get into Latin America. Since I was the only British person who had been twice to Latin America, I got it. It would never happen today. It was virtually being kept warm for a married couple who worked in Mexico, but they did not put in. So I got it. If it had been a strong competition, I never would have got near, but it was not fashionable to advertise for an American Americanist. I started in April at the end of our five-year plan and there were no courses going. So I said, "Look, we have all this money we have to spend. If we don't spend it, we have to give it back. I would like to go for three months to Mexico". So I was sent off to make contacts. It was a very small world in archaeology then. I knew an awful lot of people. I got my network in place. Then I stayed a lecture or two ahead in the course, the first year. This was when I moved to London. There was a year where I was doing both before they could find a replacement for me to teach Eastern and Western Europe. There was a time when I was doing two days a week down in London teaching American and back to Sheffield to teach European. I never really had a planned career.

The era seems so different.

You couldn't do it these days. Everybody is super-specialised. There was less to know. For a period of about five years, I knew most of what was to be known in European, and you certainly couldn't do that now. There is still hardly anybody on the American circuit who taught the whole of Latin America. You tend to be a Mayanist, or whatever. I am a product of a slightly different era.

[Inaudible comment by me.]

There are two overlapping things going on. One is that you no longer can know all, but the other thing is that the profession has specialised. I have always been a generalist by inclination rather than a narrow specialist. I was happy with this and did my best. Most people seem to prefer to hyper-specialise. This is what the job requires today. There are now very specialised people coming out, whereas the earlier generation, myself and Norman Hammond, we were self-taught. Norman was the first person in Britain to do a Ph.D in American archaeology since Geoffrey Bushnell. Perhaps the beginning of the change comes between him and me, in a very short time.

You were Norman's Examiner?

Well, there wasn't anybody else. Geoffrey Bushnell and I did it, because we were the only people in Britain. The situation I have just been describing was a joint appointment between the institutes. The Institute of Archaeology wanted me to teach archaeology, but the Latin American Institute wasn't archaeologically based. It was mainly interested in sociology, economics, history, literature and the world of development and politics. Archaeology was a fringe thing for them. Anybody coming there as a student had to speak Spanish, whereas there was no Spanish required at the Institute of Archaeology. For one, I had to teach what could be read in English, and for the other, I had to teach what could be read in Spanish. So to avoid getting bored and teaching the same thing twice, I did courses on archaeology and Latin American archaeology in general for the Institute of Archaeology and one on Aztec ethnohistory, where the main contributions were made by Mexican scholars in Spanish, as a complement. Generally only people from the Latin American Institute who spoke Spanish took that one. I taught these two courses until eventually the institutes split. The Institute

of Archaeology had begun to take undergraduates a few years before I came but the Institute of Latin American Studies was a postgraduate institute, so I was teaching some of both.

Were you the only one teaching this?

There was really nowhere else to go for that. There has been a bit of a boom in the art. There are art historians in Latin American. There are a few general archaeologists elsewhere, but the institute is still teaching the only specialised American archaeological course in Britain. I got another colleague a few years before I retired, José Oliver, who teaches South American archaeology. My replacement is Elizabeth Grahame, Canadian. For a very long time, I was alone.

What was the Institute like?

The institute was a happy place to work. I was personally always very happy there. It was a bit lonely intellectually, but once we began to build up a few PhDs, that made life much more exciting.

May I ask you to say something about David Clarke?

I knew a different David Clarke from most because when I first met him, he was an undergraduate. As you were saying, coffee used to be the thing in those days. We would all go for coffee in the morning to a cafe that did coffee, sausages and mash. We used to have long talks. The archaeologists were on one floor and sometimes the geographers, we would have long coffee-breaks there. It was mainly my year and the year above, but somehow David got in on this group. It was hilarious. He had a tremendous sense of humour. He was a person who things always happened to. There was one that took place as he came out the side door of the museum and trod on a dug-out canoe. He rocked back and forth for a long time and ended with a crash. He was accident-prone and very, very funny; obviously very bright and thoughtful. This was just at the stage when he was gestating the ideas that went into his great theory book. Remember his Ph.D was on Beakers. There was nothing particularly special about that, but he was already beginning to converse about the things that went into the book. That was badly received in some quarters, and well in others. I think it is one of the great, formative books because it is entirely individual, almost entirely self-generated, genuine and original, grabbing from other disciplines. It doesn't owe anything to the American stream. It was a great book. People began to take him seriously. And he became more famous and rather less fun. He began taking himself more seriously. You see what Cambridge does to people. He became a grand young man.

Thank you so much. Few people have memories of him.

I should say something about geography and its influence.

But we are running out of time and you should say something earthshaking about yourself first.

If I die tomorrow what would I put on my tombstone? "He always returned his library books." I was always there at the right time. Back to geography, almost at the same time that David was working and not entirely independently, the New Geography with Peter Haggett and the use of statistics happened in Cambridge. There was quite a lot of cross over between that and David's work. They knew about each other and talked, perhaps through a College connection. Just after that, when I became a postgraduate, I shared a flat with one of my c. And he influenced David Clarke with his book —

(End of tape)