

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.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.10206>

***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

Reid (1986), Roger Anyon and Steven LeBlanc (1984), and LeBlanc (1986) for the “foundation and context for the conference papers in this volume”.

As is the case with many conference proceedings, *Sixty Years* contains a complex combination of papers summarizing a wide variety of topics and covering some new methods, theories, and archaeological knowledge. As is also the case with many conference proceedings, the 25 papers in this volume range from the compelling to the unconvincing, from the passionate to the indifferent, from the provocative to the unexciting. The volume is divided into five geographically-based sections: East-Central Arizona is examined in seven chapters; Southeastern Arizona is represented by three contributions; the Mimbres Region is considered in seven chapters; New Mexico: Other Regions includes seven chapters, and Chihuahua, Mexico, is contemplated in a token paper. There are too many papers in the volume to consider each individually, but they include settlement pattern studies (5), space and architecture studies (4), social (e.g. gender, division of labor, and mortuary pattern) studies (4), iconographic studies (2), descriptive/culture historical summaries (3), analysis of surface manifestations (2), and others.

The first section, on East-Central Arizona, might more appropriately be entitled “Grasshopper Pueblo and Other Sites” for five of seven of the papers cover Grasshopper Pueblo; Casa Malpais and Q Ranch Pueblo are the only other sites considered. The Grasshopper chapters include some of the strongest and most interesting in the volume. Some, however, are characterized by a parochialism that leads to unnecessary, or at least unsubstantiated, barbs:

“Some wags might argue that the return of [a consideration of] ritual to the American Southwest is a response to the various critiques of vulgar materialism offered by, among others, postprocessualists and postmodernists. This explanation might cover those field workers caught up in an eastern intellectual environment, but we do not think it explains the direction that research has taken in the American southwest, much of which is dominated by indigenous westerners (Reid and Montgomery, p. 23)”

Such anti-eastern sentiment could easily have come from the pen of Byron Cummings of the University of Arizona in the 1920s or Harold Gladwin and Harold Colton, of the Gila Pueblo Archaeological Foundation and the Museum of Northern Arizona, respectively, in the 1930s. Reid and Montgomery’s contention is therefore interesting in both historical and contemporary contexts and begs elaboration: Who are those wags? What, exactly, is that “eastern intellectual environment” and where is it located? Who are those indigenous westerners? (Indeed, how does one define an “indigenous westerner”? Might some of these “indigenous” folks simply be naturalized westerners?). Is this current anti-eastern establishmentarianism related to that present seven decades ago? If so, how is it related? Is it simply an appeal to ancestor authority? Is it a wistful yearning for archaeologically romantic days of yore, when the world was less complicated than it is today? In this global village, the archaeological community is neither as small, nor as homogenous, nor as clearly divided between east and west, as it was seven decades ago. Curious comments indeed.

One cannot argue, however, with Reid’s substantiated contention (Chapter 2) that Grasshopper Pueblo has been published in great detail. Though no comprehensive site report has yet been offered, this important Mogollon manifestation has received an incomparable level of attention over the last three decades (see the Grasshopper bibliography offered pp. 15 - 22). However, given the recent and prolific publication records of Whittlesey, Reid, (e.g. Reid and Whittlesey 1997, 1999) and the Grasshopper school as a whole, it might have been informative and politic to solicit for the volume chapters with alternative perspectives (e.g., those offered by Randall McGuire, Dean Saitta, E. Brandt, Kate Spielman, and David R. Wilcox) for balance.

The second section, on Southeastern Arizona, actually offers only two papers exclusively dedicated to

that region, one on excavations in the San Simon Valley (Chapter 8), the other on the Villa Verde site on the San Pedro River (Chapter 10).

Chapter 9, on late-prehistoric mortuary patterns in southeastern Arizona and southwestern New Mexico, could just as easily have been included in Section IV, on non-Mimbres regions in New Mexico.

The third section, on the Mimbres Region contains a number of interesting and innovative papers, especially on iconography (Chapters 13,14, 17), possible migration (Chapter 15), and microseriation of surface assemblages (Chapter 16). The diverse and often region- rather than site-specific analyses offered in this section contrast sharply with the more unified tone of the Grasshopper papers and supports Whittlesey's contention (p. xi) that Mogollon archaeology in New Mexico is dominated by cultural resource management projects while that in Arizona is still dominated by the academic field school tradition. A detailed social and historical analysis of the differences in our understanding of the prehistory on either side of the archaeologically arbitrary Arizona New Mexico state line is sorely needed, as is an analysis of the differences in understanding across the international border.

The fourth section, on New Mexico: Other Regions contains five papers, on subsistence (Chapter 18), the Archaic - Formative Period transition (Chapter 19), settlement pattern (Chapter 20), burned-rock features (Chapter 21), virtual reconstruction of the Victorio Site (Chapter 22), an archive-based analysis Salado architecture (Chapter 23), and the dating of Reserve Black-on-white pottery (Chapter 24). These brief papers constitute the most innovative section in the volume, though individual readers are bound to challenge some assertions and quibble with minor points. On the whole, however, this section is quite thought provoking.

The only paper in the fifth section, on the colonial archaeology at El Carrizal in northern Chihuahua, is simply a progress report.

*Sixty Years of Mogollon Archaeology* is, figuratively and literally, loosely bound (my copy fell apart after a half dozen short commutes in my backpack). Given the title, I expected a much larger and more comprehensive historical component, as well as less restricted spatial coverage. The archaeology of entire regions and time periods critical to our understanding of the Mogollon receives little or no treatment, nor are the scholarly contributions many of our archaeological predecessors (e.g. Paul Nesbitt, Harriet and Burton Cosgrove, Joe Ben Wheat, etc.) analyzed, except for those by Emil Haury and, to a much lesser degree, Paul Sidney Martin. Nevertheless, this volume is a worthwhile resource for gauging the current state of Mogollon research, with its attendant bumps and wrinkles, and indicates that Mogollon archaeology is robust if not always especially rigorous. The brevity (average length seven pages, including data and figures) and either site- or topically-specific nature of the papers ensure that individual readers will find certain papers more useful than others. Given that the Mogollon concept was introduced sixty-five years ago, and that fifteen years have passed since the last, brief overviews of Mogollon archaeology were offered, it is clear that a modern, critical, comprehensive, and synthetic, historical review and analysis of Mogollon archaeology still needs to be written.

### References Cited

Haury, Emil W.

1936 "The Mogollon Culture of Southwestern New Mexico." *Medallion Papers, No. 20*, Gila Pueblo, Globe, Arizona.

Reid, J. Jefferson and Stephanie M. Whittlesey

1997 *The Archaeology of Arizona*, The University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

---

1999 *Grasshopper Pueblo: A Story of Archaeology and Ancient*, The University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Woodbury, Richard.

1993 *Sixty Years of Southwestern Archaeology: A History of the Pecos Conference*, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

## VI. Activities of Various Academic Gatherings Related to the History of Archaeology

October 22 and 23, 2000, the Cultural Collections Committee of the Department of Anthropology at the Field Museum in Chicago hosted an event celebrating the past, present, and future of Field Museum anthropology. The October 22nd program included a stimulating keynote address and public lecture by David R. Wilcox of the Museum of Northern Arizona entitled "Creating Field Anthropology: Why Remembering Matters." Wilcox's paper was followed by commentary by Jonathan Haas of The Field Museum, Elaine Bluhm Herold of the State University of New York at Buffalo, Alice Kehoe of the University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee, and Donald McVicker of North Central College. The October 23rd program included a formal dinner preceded by a cocktail hour in which special exhibits, a slide show of archived photographs, and a challenging treasure hunt that focused on objects originally collected for the World's Columbian Exposition in 1893. After dinner, guests were treated to short presentations by Sibel Barut Kusimba on Henry Field and Paleolithic archaeology, Bennett Bronson on Berthold Laufer and Asian anthropology, Steve Nash on George Dorsey, Jim VanStone on North American anthropology, and John Terrell on A.B. Lewis and Pacific anthropology. Gary Feinman and Steve Nash would like to edit the proceedings from the event and to publish a *Fieldiana* volume in 2002, coincident with the 100th anniversary of the American Anthropological Association. They would also like to thank the many anthropologists, archaeologists, and old friends, too many to name individually, who attended and supported this event.

## VII. Announcements/Sources Relating to the History of Archaeology

**\*\*Errata in *Assembling the Past*** (a volume edited by Alice B. Kehoe and listed in the May 2000, Volume 10, Number 1): Alice B. Kehoe apologizes to Donald McVicker and Douglas Givens for stating erroneously, page 1, that Jonathan Reyman had organized the 1989 AAA session for which several of the papers were prepared for this volume. McVicker and Givens were the organizers, and Reyman the discussant. Additionally, the University of New Mexico Press omitted the paragraph on Fowler in the list of Contributors, page 230: "Don D. Fowler is Kleberg Professor of Historic Preservation and Archaeology at the University of Nevada, Reno. Fowler has been President of the Society for American Archaeology, and contributed to the Reyman-edited *Rediscovering Our Past*. The Press also omitted, without notifying the volume editors, what was sent them for a frontispiece for the volume, a cartoon "Greetings from Tikal: by Alfred Bendiner (1899-1964), Philadelphia architect/artisan on University of Pennsylvania projects at Tepe Gawra and Khafajeh, Iraq, 1936-1937, and Tikal, Guatemala, 1960. This delightful overview of archaeology at Tikal was suggested by Elin Danien.

*The PARI Journal* has been reprinting selected portions of the Diary of Sylvanus Griswold Morley who was an Associate of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. The Institution had been engaged during the 20th Century in the excavation of archaeological sites in Mexico, Guatemala, and Honduras. Morley was an archaeological practitioner of many facets, educated at Harvard University, he was a scholar, explorer, and diplomat. While at Harvard, he was chosen by Alfred Tozzer to go as a volunteer to Yucatan. This was to lay the groundwork for many years working with the Carnegie Institution of