

Bernd Becker's article on the history of dendrochronology and radiocarbon calibration continues a discussion of the calibration issue. A. E. Douglass' identification in 1929 of the 'missing link' between the floating prehistoric pueblo samples and his back-dated sequence of living trees introduced the method to archaeology. In 1953, Edmund Schulman, a coworker of Douglass at the Tree-Ring lab, identified bristlecone pine stand as having significant potential, and began extending the sequence. By 1969, C. W. Ferguson had been able to extend the sequence back 7,104 years. In Europe, Bruno Huber was working on a sequence of German and Swiss oaks, and by 1966 had developed a 6,000 year long oak sequence. Other researchers continued work on the European Holocene oak calendar, working on oaks from Irish peat bogs, and additional northern European samples. By 1986, the European sequence was 9,925 years long, and the bristle cone sequence was 8,691 years long, allowing radiocarbon labs to employ dendrochronologically dated samples to refine the 'correction' calibration curve for radiocarbon determinations.

A review of the beginnings of accelerator mass spectrometry (AMS) is presented by H. E. Gove. Almost simultaneously in May and June of 1977, the first AMS determinations were conducted by a group at the University of Rochester and a group at Simon Fraser University, both using tandem Van de Graaff electrostatic accelerators, and a third group at the University of California at Berkeley, using a cyclotron. None of the groups was aware of the other group's efforts at the time. Rapidly a series of advances was made in the techniques of AMS work at several research facilities in Europe and North America. Gove is an avid supporter of the technique, predicting that AMS will replace decay-based techniques in the near future.

A number of the other presentations deal with the improvements made in dating, the use of radiocarbon variations as a proxy to estimate climatic variables, and the like, but the wealth of information in these contributions cannot be dealt with in this review. The reader is referred to the volume to follow up on these issues.

Two other sections deal explicitly with the history of the development of archaeology in various areas of the Old and New World. Donald O. Henry makes impressive use of new radiocarbon determinations to fine-tune his model for the origins of early agriculture in the Levant. Peter Robertshaw decries the absence of active dating labs in sub-Saharan Africa, seeing it responsible for the decline in the use of radiocarbon dating as a research technique by African archaeologists in the last two decades on the one hand, but also arguing on the other hand, that the overreliance of radiocarbon dating has reduced the ability of archaeologists to do ceramic analysis, with uncritical acceptance of dates, rather than being informed by stratigraphy, context, comparative studies, and seeing radiocarbon dates as being much more precise than they actually are.

In a fashion, Taylor makes the same comment for the New World, arguing that radiocarbon resulted in the shift in archaeology from chronology building to theory building. In this view, then, "New" or processual archaeology develops because archaeologists no longer need to be concerned with developing time-space systematics (the cultural historical paradigm), being freed from this business by radiocarbon dating, but could then begin to focus on cultural process, and the associated theory building that highlighted the decade or so of "New" archaeology.

In other papers on the impact of radiocarbon on New World archaeology, Scott Fedlick and Karl Taube detail how radiocarbon dating allowed the correlation to be made between the modern calendrical system and the Mayan calendrical system, and Rainer Berger summarizes the Tule Springs expeditions of 1962, and work at other California sites, in a discussion of the contributions of radiocarbon to the dating of early humans in the New World.

The volume is interdisciplinary in perspective, with a wide range of issues covered to direct interest to archaeologists. With respect to the themes of this journal, I would argue that several papers will be absolutely essential for any scholar assessing the impact of radiocarbon dating of the development, as well as shifts in paradigm in Americanist archaeology in the last half century.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.03207>

*60 Years of Southwestern Archaeology, A History of the Pecos Conference*, by Richard B. Woodbury, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque. 1993. \$29.95 xxvii + 497pp., bibliography, index (Cloth).

by  
Jonathan E. Reyman  
Springfield, Illinois

Among the least commendable characteristics of the New Archaeology is a marked anti-historical perspective. The history of archaeology and much, if not most, of earlier theory, method, and the results of fieldwork are considered not worth knowing or irrelevant, especially for graduate education: "graduate courses in anthropology should cease being histories of thought" (Schiffer 1976:193).

Regrettably, New Archaeologists generally adopted this perspective and attitude, and partly because they did not pay attention to the history of archaeology, they tended to confirm Santayana's "hypothesis" about the consequences of forgetting the past: many of the arguments and accompanying rancor in the current debate between New Archaeologists and Post-Processualists resound the confrontation of a quarter century ago between New Archaeologists - "the louts" as Florence Hawley Ellis called them (p. 307, this volume) and their predecessors. Furthermore, because the anti-historical bias became so widely adopted, it was difficult to publish on the history of archaeology, at least in the United States.

Fortunately, this bias seems to be diminishing. The past 5-7 years have seen a renewed interest in the history of the discipline: publications have increased; since 1988, a symposium on the history of archaeology has been held at the annual meeting of either the AAA or the SAA; the SAA now has a Committee on the History of Archaeology; and the *Bulletin of the History of Archaeology* is a direct product of this renewed interest. Now, amidst this revival and following closely the publication of an excellent biography of Alfred V. Kidder (Givens 1992), comes Woodbury's history of Kidder's best known and most enduring legacy, the Pecos Conference.

And what a book it is! What began as a "modest effort" (p. xxii) - a hobby according to Woodbury - grew into a remarkable history of Southwestern archaeology. It is all the more remarkable because, although the Pecos Conference Archive is at the Laboratory of Anthropology in Santa Fe, there is no consistent record of the proceedings: only 3 meetings were taped (1959-1960, 1987); and no official notes or transcripts were made although Pat Wheat (1948, 1951), Elaine Bluhm (1950, 1956), Lee Correll (1953), Carol and James Gifford (1957), David Brugge (1963-1967), Sharon Urban (1975-1983), and others such as Florence Hawley Ellis and Al Schroeder took detailed notes for some of the meetings they attended (p. 441). Using these records, numerous photographs, memos, letters, survey results compiled by Robert Euler following the 1969 Conference at Prescott, and his own notes, personal recollections, conversations with participants, and data from a questionnaire, Woodbury has pieced together the patchwork quilt that depicts the Pecos Conference from 1927-1988. In so doing, he has also chronicled the history of Southwestern archaeology for the same period. Moreover, his evocative writing style captures for the reader the atmosphere of the various conference locales, the spirits and personalities of the participants (e.g., the humor of Paul Reiter and J. Charles Kelley and the latter's passion, the cool and accurate assessments of Al Schroeder, the warmth and dignity of Kidder), and the tenor of the discussions and arguments; those who know the Southwest can read the text, then close their eyes, see the people, smell the dust of Chaco and the fragrance of Point of Pines, and feel the cool evening breezes at Flagstaff.

The Foreword by Emil Haury, a student at the First Pecos Conference (1927), is all the more poignant because he died shortly after completing it; his death leaves Clara Lee Fraps (Tanner) as the only surviving "Founder" of the original 46 participants (she also was a student).

Following the Preface and Acknowledgments, the book is divided into 3 parts containing a total of 15 chapters. Part 1/Creation of the Pecos Conference: Southwestern Archaeology in the 1920s; The First Pecos Roster; Conferences at Pecos, 1927 and 1929. Part 2/Persistence: Gathering "Where the Wind Could Blow Away The Cobwebs From One's Mind": The Early Years in New Mexico, 1931-1941; The Revival After World War II, 1946 and 1947; In Full Stride, 1948-51; Globe Trotting In The Fifties, 1952-57; The Wild Years, 1958 and 1959; Return Engagements And The Farthest South, 1960-63; From The Mountains To The Desert, 1964-67; The Touch-And-Go Years, 1968-71; Approaching Maturity, 1972-76. Part 3/Perspective: Celebrating The Fiftieth and Beyond: The Golden Anniversary at Pecos, 1977; Into The Eighties: The Pecos Conferences, 1978-1988; and Retrospect, 1927-88. Thus Woodbury chronicles the roots of the Conference and its early beginnings, its movement from one locale to another, and the changes it underwent along with the accompanying changes in Southwestern archaeology.

Both the Preface and the final chapter focus on Kidder's (1927) original concept: "The purposes of the meeting were: to bring about contacts between workers in the Southwestern field; to discuss fundamental problems of Southwestern history, and to formulate plans for coordinated attack upon them; to pool knowledge of facts and techniques, and to lay foundations for a unified system of nomenclature."

Chapter 1 provides the background for Kidder's creation by outlining the state of Southwestern archaeology in the 1920s: a great deal of work had been done since the 1870s, but there had been no concerted effort to bring together scholars to discuss matters of mutual interest. Truc, Neil Judd had brought a few people to Pueblo Bonito at Chaco Canyon in 1921, 1923, and 1925 (p. 14), but these meetings had a different focus: "Judd invited specialists in several nonarchaeological fields whose knowledge would help him and his archaeological staff understand the past of Chaco Canyon, whereas Kidder included mostly archaeologists active in the Southwest, to discuss a broad range of problems extending far beyond his work at Pecos" (p. 15).

Chapter 2 provides biographical data for the participants at the First Pecos Conference; most, but not all, were Southwestern scholars. Among the "outsiders" were members of the Carnegie Institution staff who worked in Mesoamerica (although Morley had worked with Kidder in the Southwest in 1907, during Kidder's initial fieldwork experience, as students of Hewett [p. 48; cf. Givens 1992: 11-28]), and a number of other scholars such as Kroeber, Spier, and Spinden whose main interests lay outside the Southwest (although both Kroeber and Spier had worked in the Southwest, especially in the Zuni area, and had published important papers on their Southwestern research). Indeed, one characteristic of each Pecos Conference is that, despite its Southwestern focus, it has always seemed to attract a few non-Southwesterners such as Geza Roheim (p. 164), best known for work with the Dead Sea scrolls.

Two other points are worth noting about the participants at the initial Pecos Conference: first, though the Conference was primarily archaeological, ethnology was well represented by Kroeber, Spier, and several others, probably more so than at most of the subsequent ones. The 10th Pecos Conference (1947 at Chaco Canyon) probably marked the highpoint for ethnology (p. 166), but Woodbury time and again comments on the general absence of ethnologists and raises the question of whether or not they were truly welcome (e.g., pp. 213-214, 448-450). When ethnologists did participate, they clearly made significant contributions to the discussions, e.g., Eggan's remarks on Anasazi, Mogollon, and Hohokam social organization (p. 162).

Second, eight students and "beginners" (p. 66) attended the First Pecos Conference: Monroe Anusien, Clara Lee Fraps (Tanner), Charlotte D. Gower, Emil W. Haury, Hulda Penner (Haury), Paul S. Martin, Harry L. Schapiro, and Robert Wauchopx. Yet the question of whether to invite or even to permit students to attend arose during the planning of subsequent Conferences through the

1950s. Ironically, Paul Martin was one of the most outspoken in opposition to having students present: "I think all students and hangers on should be excluded. Several students of mine wanted to come and I told them nix ... this should be a very informal conference for full-grown professionals only. Can't you restrict this meeting to Southwesterners who hold full time jobs in anthropology?" (p. 174). However, as Schroeder observed, students become professionals, and attending such conferences was an essential part of the process of becoming professional (p. 446).

The focus of the First Pecos Conference was "the classification of Southwestern culture periods (Kidder 1927), and this issue dominated several subsequent meetings. The resultant taxonomic scheme became known as the Pecos Classification; Kidder attributed it to Tom Waterman (Haury 1949), but both Woodbury (p. 92) and Givens (1992:72-73) believe that it was a collaborative effort. Another early issue was that of defining the prehistoric Southwestern cultures, and this effort continued during subsequent Pecos Conferences as first the Hohokam (3rd Pecos Conference, 1931; p. 123), and then the Patayan (9th Pecos Conference, 1946; p. 152), Mogollon (11th Pecos Conference, 1948; pp. 178-181), and Hakataya (19th Pecos Conference, 1956 p. 237) were defined.

A hallmark of the First Pecos Conference was the discussion of important issues and the airing of disagreements within an atmosphere of friendliness, civility, and informality, traits that reflected Kidder's personality and influence (pp. 84-87). As Woodbury documents throughout the book, this general atmosphere continued for many years, and it was this atmosphere, combined with the opportunity to renew friendships and to engage in informal and intimate discussions of archaeological problems, that made the Conference so attractive and welcome for many long-time participants, as well as newcomers. This is, perhaps, best reflected by the fact that Walter W. Taylor frequently chaired sessions at various Pecos Conferences despite the widespread resentment that arose from the criticisms he directed toward Kidder, Haury, Roberts, and others in *A Study of Archeology* (Taylor 1948). And given his criticisms of Kidder and Haury, the photograph (p. 203) of the three men at the 1950 Pecos Conference (13th) at Flagstaff is remarkable and indicative of the prevailing spirit of the earlier Pecos Conferences: enmity was put aside, if only temporarily. During the 1960s, however, much of this earlier spirit was lost with the increased size of the Conference and the arrogance of the emergent New Archaeologists (pp. 307-308).

I have been discussing the Pecos Conference as though it was always known as such, but the name was not officially adopted until 1949 (12th Conference, Santa Fe) when Katharine Bartlett proposed it "in honor of Kidder and the first Conference at Pecos in 1927" (p. 161). Up to that time, Kidder considered its name to be The Southwestern Archaeological Conference (p. 161; cf. Haury 1949), although the 1931 meeting in Santa Fe had been billed as "The Third Biennial Pecos Conference" (p. 115). This also indicates that it was not originally intended as an annual event, and did not become so until 1946, the 9th Pecos Conference (pp. 149, 432). Furthermore, it is Woodbury who has designated the 1st-5th Chaco Archaeological Conferences (1937-1941) as the 4th-8th Pecos Conferences (pp. 129-146) on the grounds that they continued the function of the original Pecos Conference. It is a reasonable argument and one that was implicitly accepted by those who organized the Pecos Conference following World War II.

As Woodbury discusses, that the Conference, at first, was not held annually and that it was not held at all during World War II has led to some confusion in its subsequent yearly designation, e.g., the 1977 Conference at Pecos was the 40th meeting, *not* the 50th Conference, though it was the 50th anniversary of the original 1927 meeting; the 50th Conference was not held until 1987 when it was again at Pecos.

The Conference format has remained fairly consistent over the years: sessions on field reports, one or more sessions on specific topics or problems, evening campfire sessions (when held outdoors rather than on a campus), often with entertainment after the discussions, and a short business meeting. Participants originally spoke extemporaneously, but in recent years, and especially since 1969 and with the rise of the New Archaeology, there has been a move toward the presentation of more formal, written papers; this increased formality has not been universally welcomed, particularly by older participants (Chapter 11).

The first systematic review of the Pecos Conference, its organization and functions, was made by Robert Euler following the 1969 (32nd) Conference at Prescott (pp. 308-318). The data collected by Euler, especially participants' suggestions, were forwarded to the planners of the 1970 Conference at Santa Fe. Predictably(?), the 1970 Conference ran into problems and was marked by conflict as its organizers tried to achieve a balance of "the best from traditional Conferences with at least some of the innovations urged in Euler's survey" (p. 318). The Conference was held, the varying views were accommodated, and, in retrospect, the innovations seem less extreme than first proposed (p. 330). A greater threat arose 11 years later when confusion and misunderstanding over the scheduling arrangements threatened to divide the 1981 Conference into two rival meetings. The differences were eventually smoothed over, and the 44th Pecos Conference was held at Fort Burgwin (pp. 398-400).

Although all Pecos Conferences have had a strong traditional element dating from the 1927 Conference, changes and innovations have occurred during the 66 years of its existence; these have usually reflected changes in Southwestern archaeology but also in American archaeology in general. One important feature is that the Pecos Conference has been "a spawning ground for new organizations" (p. 171); it has reflected, especially in the field reports, the rise in importance of Indian Claims and Salvage Archaeology in the 1950s (pp. 197-199), the increased role of the National Park Service in Southwestern archaeology (e.g., pp. 224-225), an increased willingness to view the Southwest as part of a larger Mesoamerican-Southwestern continuum (pp. 260-261), the growth of Cultural Resource Management programs in the 1960s and 1970s (pp. 368-370), the development of the New Archaeology, as already noted, and the direct intrusion of politics into scholarly research with the unique cancellation at the 51st Conference (1988, Dolores, Colorado) of a scheduled session on prehistoric cannibalism (pp. 422-423). Among the lesser changes are the presence of booksellers (since 1959, and perhaps earlier, p. 438), and the sale of an official Pecos Conference T-shirt (1977, p. 439), T-shirts and jeans having become the

required mode of dress for anyone under the age of 65. Nevertheless, the heart of the Conference remains the opportunity for scholars to meet informally to renew friendships, discuss work, and exchange ideas. For these traditional purposes, the outdoor Conferences have succeeded better than the indoor meetings; as Ned Danson noted, "I have always felt that the most successful Pecos Conferences were those held out-of-doors, where people could not show their slides, and where the wind would blow away the cobwebs of one's mind" (p. 438). Finally, in reviewing the passage of time and the chronicle of change, Woodbury's writing evokes an almost ineffable sadness: the yearly business meeting recounted the names of those who had died since the last Conference; so many good friends lost, as the recent deaths of Al Schroeder and Watson Smith, both frequent Conference participants, make especially clear as of this writing.

The book ends with the 1988 (51st) Conference at Dolores, but Woodbury provides locations and attendance figures for the 1989-1991 meetings (p. 432). Given the wealth of detail - names, dates, places, facts, figures, etc. - there are very few typographic errors, none of them serious. One minor correction of fact: Woodbury states (p. 148) that Walter Taylor completed and then defended his dissertation in 1943 before entering military service. Taylor (personal communication) enlisted in the Marine Corps in 1942, but he returned to Harvard to defend his dissertation before shipping overseas. I also disagree with the statement regarding the 1929 (2nd) Conference: "...three of the five archaeology students were women, contrary to the anthropological folklore that archaeology was not receptive to women students in the field" (p. 104). Some archaeologists such as Cummings and Hewett welcomed women in the field, but it seems to me that recent research indicates that most male archaeologists did not. Kidder, himself, felt that young women were likely to get married and, therefore, were an "unreliable element" on field crews (Babcock and Parezo 1988:v). Other studies have documented pervasive, systematic discrimination against women, both as students and archaeologists (cf. papers in Reyman 1992). Finally, to my knowledge, of the women cited (p. 106), only Isabel Kelly pursued a career in archaeology.

This is a minor disagreement, however, and others may disagree with various points made by Woodbury; scholars will always disagree, but one hopes that they do it with the "dignity and maturity" that Haury observed at the 1927 Pecos Conference (p. 84). Nor does this in any way detract either from Woodbury's scholarship or the result of his research. As noted earlier, this is a remarkable book, and it is a bargain, to boot! Perhaps no one but Woodbury could have written it; surely no one else could have written the history of the Pecos Conference this well. The book should be required reading for all Southwestern archaeologists and anthropologists, as well as by everyone interested in the history of American archaeology.

#### References Cited

- Babcock, Barbara A. and Nancy J. Parezo  
1988 *Daughters of the Desert: Women Archaeologists and the Native American Southwest*, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- Givens, Douglas R.  
1992 *Alfred Vincent Kidder and the Development of Americanist Archaeology*, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- Haury, Emil W.  
1949 "The 1948 Southwestern Archaeological Conference", *American Antiquity* 14(3):254-256.
- Kidder, Alfred V.  
1927 "Southwestern Archeological Conference", *Science* 66(1716):489-491.
- Reyman, Jonathan E. (editor)  
1992 *Rediscovering Our Past: Essays on the History of American Archaeology*. Avebury Press, Aldershot, Great Britain.
- Schiffer, Michael B.  
1976 *Behavioral Archaeology*. Academic Press, New York.
- Taylor, Walter W.  
1958 *A Study of Archeology*. American Anthropological Association Memoir No. 69, Menasha, Wisconsin.