

# The California Archaeological Survey of 1948 - 1949: An Institutional History of its Founding

*Paul H. Fagette, Jr.*  
*Arkansas State University<sup>1</sup>*

## Introduction

The now defunct California Archaeological Survey (CAS) was the parent organization of the Archaeological Research Facility (ARF) at the University of California, Berkeley. It was founded on July 1, 1948. Located within the academic confines of the Department of Anthropology and the Museum of Anthropology, the primary purpose of CAS was to further the "systematic investigation of California prehistory." Indeed, it accomplished a great deal along these lines until its transformation into the ARF in 1961 (CAS, 'Survey,' 1949:1; and Regents' Records 1970). The story of the California Archaeological Survey involves more than the substantive numbers of artifacts, numerous publications, and cooperative investigative endeavors produced by its members, however. The foundation of the Survey presents a novel example of important changes occurring at local and state levels within archaeology in the early postwar era.

Interaction between professional archaeologists in academia, the federal government (primarily in the National Park Service and the Smithsonian), and museums and professional associations throughout the country has been the subject of several recent studies (Brew 1968; Griffin 1952; Taylor 1964; and Fagette 1996). Conclusions reached in these studies indicate that the institutional and political responses of archaeologists reflect the ways in which they were professionalized within the modern American industrial structure. There is currently insufficient scholarship to understand the many ways in which national efforts to professionalize anthropology during the Depression influenced archaeology at local levels. However an understanding of this relationship is important, for, prior to the Depression, American archaeology existed for nearly 100 years with limited articulation between regions or states (Hinsley 1981). Archaeologists' attempts to communicate with one another transpired only after archaeologists assembled together under the unique relief conditions spurred by the Depression.

During the Depression, archaeologists perceived a lack of adequate professional, centralized control in the 1935-1941 Works Progress Administration (WPA). They were concerned about the 'wrong' people, namely bureaucrats, making decisions about the future of archaeology, and so sought to gain control of their profession. After 1945, archaeologists continued the quest to control monies and access to financial sources. At the same time they sought to institutionalize surveys and cooperative expeditions as a means for training and publishing. Efforts to institutionalize were often marred, however, by perpetual concerns over government expansion into sensitive archaeological areas. In addition, the still-fragmented

---

<sup>1</sup>. Department of History  
P. O. Box 1690, State University, AR 72467

discipline often resulted in "turf protection," as well as competition for funding between organizations.

This paper documents the process of professionalization of archaeology, particularly as it occurred at the California Archaeological Survey. I have chosen the facility at Berkeley for several reasons. First, California in general stands as a microcosm of the archaeology at the state level for the time under discussion. The state exhibited a strong heritage of anthropological/archaeological endeavors. However, it also had multiple institutions not always working towards common ends which were often competing over funding. Second, UC -- Berkeley stood among the few universities that trained archaeologists. Third, the university acted as a cooperative host with government. Finally, Berkeley provided many of the personnel involved in the unification of the discipline both politically and institutionally.

In particular, this paper asks several questions. First, how did Berkeley create an institutional structure to compete for funding and act in a political manner? Second, how did archaeologists react to the new pressures of the postwar era? Third, how did these responses contribute to the creation of new training mechanisms? Finally, how did singular individuals play a formative role in building structures to channel decision-making?

Several premises direct this investigation. First, that the experiences and perceptions of the 1930s influenced organizational undertakings by archaeologists. The continued institutionalization of state survey methods practiced so extensively within New Deal programs sensitized the community to their purpose and role. Second, the inclusion of non-academic archaeologists in decision-making continued to concern professional archaeologists. Science, as Thomas Kuhn (1970) has noted, is well-rooted in the experiences of the everyday world. Archaeologists, conditioned by their past, extrapolated their future to meet the relative needs of a changing world.

## **Historical Background**

### *National Level*

New Deal relief programs created circumstances and perceptions that sensitized professional archaeologists to government procedures and frailties. Roosevelt's relief agencies, created to cope with the long-lasting Depression included the Civil Works Administration (CWA), the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA), the Works Progress Administration (WPA), and the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA). They resulted from political actions in which archaeologists did not play any formulative role. Represented only in an indirect sense by the National Park Service (NPS) or the Smithsonian Institution (SI), archaeologists were forced to react to these circumstances from the outside. As such, monies, procedures, explanation for resources, etc., unfolded within a policy environment foreign to normal academic endeavors. Opportunities did increase parallel to the expansion of the relief efforts. However, archaeologists became more concerned about the quality and coordination of the work conducted as well as the post-expedition analysis and publishing. By the late 1930s, they resolved not to be reactive again but proactive (Fagette 1996; and Marlowe 1983).

Specifically, academic archaeologists wished to continue to catalogue the location, types, and numbers of sites available and threatened. They also prepared exigency plans ahead of postwar dam and reclamation programs. This feature had particular prominence due to the pace of building, breadth of the impact, and size of the archaeological explorations conducted under Major William Webb of the TVA. University-trained practitioners also wished to tighten their control over decision making and limit the influence and impact of amateurs and politicians in their area of expertise. This dilemma presented a serious challenge to a state such as California with its huge size, multiple sites, and many institutions. Another predicament for the discipline in the depression years was the lack of sufficient archaeological specialists. Many of the personnel were anthropologists with only limited field training and experience. By the end of that decade the few departments which included training in archaeologic methods perceived a need for expansion. They geared up to produce more students which raised issues of sufficient training mechanisms.

Several forces contributed to the creation of an archaeological unit within the Anthropology Department at Berkeley. Evidence suggests two main stages of development. The first spanned the 1920s through the end of the New Deal (about 1941); the second, the later war years through the early postwar era, 1941-1950. One national force was the ongoing professionalization of archaeology. This paralleled a concern over the nature of the professional linkage with the parent association, the American Anthropological Association (AAA). By 1941, the use of area or state surveys prior to and in conjunction with field work was fixed. A long term apprehension over funding existed in a discipline without many central support mechanisms. Archaeologists worried about the fragmented state and independence of institutions in regard to research in areas threatened by government programs and economic expansion. Academic archaeologists maintained an unfavorable view of the government and the Smithsonian regarding decision-making. Last, the influence of the non-expert in archaeological matters worried professionals.

Within California, Berkeley, as an institution, experienced several mitigating factors. First, the Department of Anthropology lacked a staff archaeologic specialist in California and Western pre-history. Second, a need persisted to coordinate survey and expedition work between a variety of public and private institutions. Third, a response was required to the imminent post-war federal plans that would involve California sites. Fourth, a mechanism was needed for archaeologists to meet their funding needs more exactly while expanding training. The first stage revolved around the founding of the CAS. The second stage witnessed the implementation of the CAS and a simultaneous preliminary reaction to its purposes.

## **The California Scene**

### *Personnel*

The major figures in the story of the rise of the CAF include Theodore McCown, E. W. Gifford, and the prominent ethnologist Alfred Kroeber. Along with Robert Lowie, Kroeber had worked to create one of the great anthropology departments and museums in North America. However, California archaeology usually stood as a secondary concern. As younger members of the Berkeley team, Gifford and McCown initiated a series of California studies in the 1920s.

Curiously, neither were trained primarily in archaeology or Western U.S. area studies. Gifford's specialty encompassed Pacific cultures. McCown, a physical anthropologist, concentrated on the Near East. Nonetheless, Gifford's interest and research date back to 1928 with ethnological inquiries into the Yuma and Kamia Indians of southern California. In a like fashion, McCown dealt with the Kawaiisu Indians of south central California in 1929. The following year, 1930, Gifford received further National Research Council (NRC) funding for a study of the Tolowa, a little known Athabaskan group in the northwest corner of California. Along with others in the department they conducted small, precise studies on groups rapidly disappearing (UCBA, NRC, circular February 1930; and letter December 15, 1931).<sup>2</sup> The demand for a full-time specialist became clearer through time since the growing needs created by the New Deal relief efforts siphoned off staff and students. This was demonstrated by the departure of W. Duncan Strong, who eventually settled at Columbia (Fagette 1996; and UCBA, NRC, letter March 20, 1934).

At the same time, A. L. Kroeber, one of the major figures in American anthropology during the first half of this century, maintained a dialogue and role in the process of professional unification. As a senior member of the department, his time and energies were devoted to actions at a national and even international level. The records indicate that much of the drive and initiative for the CAS lay in the hands of the younger, dynamic members. This is not to belie Kroeber's importance. An anthropologist of his stature carried significant weight for approval of any future plans. He gave tacit approval and his junior colleagues shouldered the vital work. His presence on several committees and correspondence with Carl Guthe, the active head of the Committee on State Surveys of the NRC, centered around the definition of the role of archaeology and the greater control of the disciplines by professionals. Kroeber became a more prominent player after some initial reservations and ultimately advanced the ideas of independent consolidation. An interesting aspect here was the institutional framework then for interaction. The NRC and its State Surveys Committee both created an atmosphere conducive to advancing long held ideas of survey and central control (UCBA, NRC, letters December 11, 1933; March 5, 1935; January 13, 1935; January 16, 1935; January 3, 1935; December 29, 1939; and December 12, 1942).

### *Motivating Forces*

The idea to coordinate state activities and firmly establish an archaeological foundation matured within the Berkeley Anthropology Department and Museum. But that component needed independent funding reflecting the national concern. Additional incentive came with the reality of increased state and federal activity. For example, new trends in land reclamation and dam projects threatened multiple sites. Kroeber had been warned some months earlier by Julian Steward of the Smithsonian. An aside was inserted in a letter on conflicts over altering the AAA structure. Steward informed Kroeber in October, 1945 that the actions to preserve the Missouri River Basin meant concerted action to prevent a "repetition of WPA." Since the AAA was

---

2. The bulk of this circular reflected state surveys and included 6 other Berkeley people working on California: Dr. Gayton, Lila O'Neale, Ralph Beale, Isabel Kelly, E. M. Loeb, and C. A. Du Bois; with letter Guthe to NRC membership December 15, 1931.

directly concerned and not enough archaeologists were on board, new organizational responses would have to be created or valuable time could be lost (UCBA, Kroeber, letters October 5, 1945; October 10, 1945; October 12, 1945; October 13, 1945; October 16, 1945; October 17, 1945; October 25, 1945; October 26, 1945; October 29, 1945; November 5, 1945; December 7, 1945; and December 18, 1945).

In May 1946, E. W. Gifford authored a long proposal to the then-Chair Robert Lowie. Gifford outlined long range plans for the department including California archaeology. Both perceived this as a time of change (Gifford saw it as one of 'vanishing opportunities') and wished to be on the cutting edge. Gifford saw a "crying need in the archaeological field today" for "reconnaissance and excavation of key sites in areas which are to be flooded following the construction of dams in the immediate future." He further stated "there are considerable areas of the State that have not been investigated archaeologically, because the Department has never had sufficient funds or men to undertake a sustained statewide survey" (UCBA, Lowie, letter May 20, 1946; and letters May 20, 1946; May 22, 1946; and January 31, 1948).

Two other factors represented the increased sensitivity of the Berkeley anthropologists. First was the rapid expansion of government flooding and dam projects. Also not to be discounted were the major freeway and highway building programs which were beginning to appear on a major scale in California. The expansion of the bay areas with the war effort presaged a new, almost unbelievable period of economic vitality. This growth, of course, threatened sites in California, just as it had states such as North and South Dakota, Missouri, Nebraska, Kansas, as well as the Southern states affected by the River Basin projects (Nash 1985, 1990).

### *Moment of Truth*

According to Gifford, time stood defined as the essential factor and single, critical common denominator. Aging Indian groups were indeed disappearing. But the advance of canals and dams along with burgeoning cities created an environment similar to the salvage archaeology crisis presented by the 1930's Tennessee River Valley programs. Gifford proposed an immediate survey to map out sites and begin excavating the most threatened earlier cultures. Gifford correctly recognized that prehistory was among the least investigated and understood of the anthropological areas for the California. The previous focus had generally been ethnological. His plan included an ethnological investigation of the little known Diegueno, Panamint or Koso, and Ute-Chemehuevi Indian groups. It also consisted of archaeological methods, including a reconnaissance and excavation of those areas to be flooded (UCBA, Lowie, letter May 20, 1946).

A sense of urgency grew, especially after the Smithsonian had notified the Department of announcements by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Corps of Engineers to flood research areas. Construction of the Isabella and Pine Flat Dams were planned with preliminary work already underway. Gifford hoped for the rapid availability of federal funding but, if not, then state support should be attempted. Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau had already supplied base maps and outlines of the areas to be impacted. The first pressing concerns were for the Delta-Mendota Canal and the west side of the San Joaquin Valley. Still, the first order of business focused on the need to identify exactly what existed and precisely where. This meant an adequate and necessary state survey.

Comparatively, knowledge abounded for Humboldt Bay, San Francisco Bay, and the Santa Barbara regions but little in between. Around the San Francisco Bay area and Los Angeles, institutions and museums had been fairly busy. Central California lacked adequate exploration, especially Monterey County and those proposed research sites closer to Berkeley. Gifford's recommendations included those areas not only threatened but unknown (UCBA, Lowie, letter May 20, 1946). McCown and Lowie wrote letters of support and the proposal was forwarded to the next administrative level. McCown also posted a copy of his letter and the Gifford proposal to the young Berkeley graduate Robert Heizer, who had just been recruited from a position at UCLA (UCBA, Lowie, letters May 22, 1946).

### *New Leadership*

For thirty years, the work of the CAS, and later, of the ARF has often been associated with the dominant personality of Robert Heizer. Indeed his contributions to the organization are great. In addition to playing a vital role in the foundation of the CAS, he also directed its evolution until his retirement in 1976. However, his role has been purposely withheld from this history of the organization until this moment. The impetus to create a scientific avenue was already underway before he arrived on the scene. Yet, as with many sciences, the element of personality came to play a determinant role. This was especially true for this young discipline. Strong individuals can give direction and strength in small, developing institutions. Robert Heizer would fulfill this aspect with zealously into the 1970s (Hester 1982).

### *Early Institutional Format*

By 1946, the need to create a concentrated California archaeological effort was established. The appointment of Heizer, a 1941 Berkeley Ph.D. with strong interests in California archaeology, represented the first stage in the crystallization of the department's effort. The recruitment dated back to April 1946, a month prior to the Gifford letter (UCBA, Heizer, letters April 19, 1946; and April 23, 1946). Although, at that time Heizer's concerns centered on the courses he would be teaching and the possibility of taking over from Gifford some introductory and methodology courses, he was interested in the foundation of CAS, a junior member making himself as useful as possible to the department (UCBA, Heizer, letters April 23, 1946; and May 22, 1946). By May, 1946, his appointment was finalized. Heizer received a letter from Gifford commending him on his new position as Director of CAS along with encouragement for Heizer to conduct an archaeological methods course. Gifford was emphatic about a making the department a locus for the study of California archaeology. He anxiously awaited Heizer's return from an arctic expedition and research at the US National Museum in the Smithsonian over the summer. All they lacked now was the institution. Within that exercise a clearer picture of the state of archaeology emerges (UCBA, Heizer, letters May 16, 1946; and July 9, 1946).

In time, a state survey mechanism received final administrative approval. The proposed survey's exact nature was still nebulous but still received the last official boost from University President Robert Sproul. In a letter to Lowie in July, 1947, Sproul confirmed department hopes with the news that the proposal went in along with the University budget for 1948-49 (UCBA, Heizer, letter July 29, 1947). As the budgetary process moved ahead, the University was

apprised of the legislative success of the project (UCBA, Heizer, letters June 16, 1948; and June 24, 1948). Theodore McCown declared for the institution the official title of "The California Archaeological Survey." He felt it inferred an inclusive and state-wide field of investigation. The budget would be independent of anthropology and the museum, but would include its members for consultation. At this point the formal construction of an archaeological base would take place. The initial director Heizer would oversee the first field actions. However, the latter would go much more smoothly than the former (UCBA, Heizer, letters June 16, 1948; and June 24, 1948).

With the necessary legislative approval in July, 1948, the CAS began to take form. Administratively, an Advisory Board was created to "strengthen and broaden existing collaboration with other institutions and organizations throughout the State whose interests are akin to those of the Survey" (UCBA, Heizer, letter June 24, 1948). More directly, the board would provide an immediate degree of importance to the CAS. It would politically facilitate any cooperative endeavors with the other institutions within the state. Representatives from the other major museums would be included in its makeup (CAS, 'Survey,' 1949).

The first members of the advisory council numbered an expansive twenty-four. By that July, McCown suggested to Heizer that the number be cut down to no more than fifteen, including the Ex-Officio (UCBA, Heizer, letter July 14, 1948).<sup>3</sup> Heizer concurred. On July 20, McCown requested such of President Sproul and kept in touch with Heizer (UCBA, Heizer, letters July 20, 1948). Accordingly, the request was honored and a series of letters went out to the original members some with thanks and dismissal. Others were requested to stay on in staggered terms for a period of three years (UCBA, Heizer, letters October 8, 1948; and July 12, 1948). The composition of the board reflected the current status of who conducted archaeological work in California. Critically, Berkeley personnel dominated the panel. Like the remainder of the country, a host of institutions worked different parts of the state. The creation of a unifying body was indeed welcomed by the several museums and colleges around the state.

The first official working board was thus comprised:

*Ex-officio members*

The President of the University of California

The Director of the California Archaeological Survey

---

<sup>3</sup>. In addition to the original Ex-Officios, the complement of 24 included: Dr. George Bainerd of UCLA, Harold Gladwin in Santa Barbara, Dr. George Hammond of the Bancroft Library, A. E. Henning of the State Parks and Beaches Commission, Dr. Olaf P. Jenkins of the State Division of Mines and Geology, Prof. Kenneth Macgown of Los Angeles, Dr. Robert C. Miller of the California Academy of Sciences, Dr. Aubrey Neasham of the National Park Service, Dr. Carl Sauer of UC Berkeley Geography Department, Dr. R. A. Stirton of UC Berkeley Paleontology Department, Dr. Howel Williams of UC Berkeley Geology Department, and the final 8 that remained on the list.

The Director of the Museum of Anthropology, Berkeley Campus  
The Chairman, Department of Anthropology, Berkeley Campus  
The Chairman, Department of Anthropology and Sociology,  
Los Angeles Campus

#### *Appointed Members*

Mr. Allen L. Chickering (California Historical Society)  
Mr. Malcolm Farmer (San Diego Museum of Man)  
Mr. Mark R. Harrington (Southwest Museum)  
Mr. J. R. Knowland (State Division of Beaches and Parks and  
the California Centennials Commission)  
Dr. A. L. Kroeber (University of California)  
Dr. Theodore D. McCown (University of California)  
Mr. Phil C. Orr (Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History)  
Mr. Arthur Woodward (Los Angeles County Museum) [CAS, 'Survey,' 1949]

Initial field work would be directed by Franklin Fenega, who would be assisted by Francis Riddell (CAS, 'Survey,' 1949; and UCBA, California, letter June 8, 1950).

In the meantime, Heizer busied himself setting up cooperative endeavors with the Smithsonian and the Bureau of American Ethnology (BAE). Federal government activity intensified with California as a prime target.<sup>4</sup> Heizer recorded that sites at Farmington, Black Butte and Merced were slated for survey in October, 1948. Construction of the Isabella reservoir stood ready with Pine Flat up next and initial inquiries began about the Monticello Dam in Berryessa Valley (CAS, 'Survey,' 1949; and UCBA, Heizer, letter October 13, 1948).

#### *Purpose*

The statement of the early goals for the survey suggested two directions. The Survey was to be "statewide in its interests" with the primary concerns as collection and preservation of prehistoric remains and records. Close coordination would occur with staff from the Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara campuses. The inference seemed quite clear that this would be a university-based operation. Activities would be conducted within its confines. The Board functioned as a means for collaboration with organizations beyond the UC system.

The creation of a master file of data regarding California prehistory stood among the most important cooperative goals. The CAS immediately began to compile the file along with that data already gathered by the Archaeological Survey Association of Southern California, which was affiliated with the Southwest Museum. This was a major effort to overcome single forays without any long-range overall plan (CAS, 'Survey,' 1949; and Simpson 1947).<sup>5</sup> Ruth



Simpson wrote in 1947 that results traditionally saw the recording of sporadic site surveys. They were generally isolated or overlapping only by accident. Primarily descriptive reports of excavations followed. They tended to be self-contained without serious intent to show wider culture relationships. She felt that specimens and notes collected lacked inclusion into any meaningful data base (Simpson 1947). Few would quarrel that archaeological investigations were well coordinated and that an organized data base existed. Yet, considerable work had been accomplished (Moratto 1984). The tone and manner of the evidence presented in the Berkeley files indicated they wished to improve and expand systematic efforts rather than engender some sort of revolution. Thus, this meaningful inference offered a spirit of cooperation with the CAS as the means. This bid for leadership carried one step further when the Survey stated that it would lend "aid" (although undefined) to those local functionaries and carry out investigations

- 
4. Federal sources offer a clearer picture of the exact sequences for investigation. See: *The Sixty-Fourth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, 1946-1947* (Wash., DC: Government Printing Office, 1948). Franklin Fenenga, working out of the UC headquarters, surveyed 6 sites of proposed Corps of Engineers sites: Pine Flat, Terminus, Success, Isabella, Folsom, and Coyote Valley, in addition to 59 other sites and 8 recommended for excavation. *The Sixty-Fifth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, 1947-1948* (Wash., DC: Government Printing Office, 1949) notes that Philip Drucker had conferred with University personnel and the NPS in May. Ultimately, cooperative research with UC investigated reservoirs in the upper San Joaquin drainage. Drucker arranged for parties to be sent out in June. Clarence Smith also contributed surveys reservoirs in Dry Creek, Monticello, Kelsey Creek, Indian Valley, Sly Park, and Wilson Valley. Mariposa Reservoir was investigated in May by Albert Mohr and William King. Further information may be gleaned from Philip Drucker's works: 1947 *Appraisal of the archaeological resources of Isabella Reservoir, Kern County, California* (SI), 1948 *Appraisal of the archaeological resources of Kelsey Creek Reservoir, Lake County, California* (SI), 1948 *Appraisal of the archaeological resources of Monticello Reservoir, Napa County, California* (SI), 1948 *Appraisal of the archaeological resources of Pine Flat Reservoir, Fresno County, California* (SI), 1948 *Appraisal of the archaeological resources of Success Reservoir, Tulare County, California* (SI), 1948 *Appraisal of the archaeological resources of Wilson Valley Reservoir, Lake County, California* (SI), 1948 *Archaeological appraisal of Indian Valley Reservoir, Lake Co., Sly Park Reservoir, El Dorado County, and Dry Creek Reservoir, Sonoma County, California* (SI), and 1948 *Preliminary appraisal of the archaeological resources of Folsom Reservoir, Placer, El Dorado, and Sacramento Counties, California* (SI); also Osborne, D., 1948 *Preliminary appraisal of the archaeological resources of Mariposa Reservoir, Mariposa County, California* (SI); Fenenga, F., 1947 *Preliminary survey of archaeological resources in the Isabella Reservoir, Kern County, California* (SI), 1948 *Appraisal of the archaeological resources of Terminus Reservoir, Tulare County, California* (SI); Fredrickson, D. A., 1949 *Appraisal of the archaeological resources of the New Melones Reservoir, Calaveras and Tuolumne Counties, California* (SI); Riddell, F. A., 1949 *Appraisal of the archaeological resources of Farmington Reservoir, Littlejohns Creek, San Joaquin and Stanislaus Counties, California* (SI).
5. In this article, Ruth Simpson, the assistant curator of the Southwest Museum, advocates for an area-wide survey of the southern California region by the major museums and campuses in order to create a common data base.

with the knowledge and cooperation of local groups. The latter stood as a common practice of professional courtesy so as not to invade others' perceived turf or territory. Examples of such territorial infighting highlighted WPA work in the Southwest especially New Mexico. In California, the former statement of aid created different problems (CAS, 'Survey,' 1949).

On the surface, the founding of the CAS appears to be the normal extension of specialization within a department responding to local, present needs. This was a process that had marked the development of early American archaeology. However, the basis of the Survey and how it functioned in regard to funding would eventually be called into question by Malcolm Farmer of the San Diego Museum of Man and M. R. Harrington of the Southwest Museum.

### *Community Response*

The first chinks in the armor of CAS appeared when the Southern California group applied for money. The Advisory Board denied their request and claimed the CAS was an operational mechanism solely for Berkeley archaeologists interested in California prehistory. Apparently they were correct. Reasons for this reaction are related to their perception of the definition of 'survey,' as well as the original goals of the organization. This stands as the second example of how impressions of the past and the experiences of the WPA and even the earlier NRC influenced how archaeological science came to be conducted. The earliest releases or statements about the CAS foresaw dual purposes, the basic departmental role came to the forefront.

In December 1948, M. R. Harrington wrote a meaningful letter to President Sproul augmenting an earlier missive from Malcolm Farmer. In it, he questioned the role that the CAS had played in regard to a change in announced policies and functions. At first glance, it appears to be an argument of semantics. Harrington interpreted the State Survey to be one for the entire state as had existed during the previous two decades. He believed, as did other southern California curators and directors, that the Survey existed for that primary purpose. Salvage work or an archaeological research project for the Anthropology Department were separate. He implied a degree of deception by referring to specific pieces of correspondence from Berkeley personnel he felt emphasized only the survey aspect. In fact, he requested that President Sproul to rectify the problem and establish a statewide survey.

The letter seems curious for another reason as well. The fact that both Harrington and Farmer focused on the University of California to deal with the survey problem further attests to the limited, State-based bureaucracy with which they had to deal (UCBA, Anthropology, letters November 15, 1948; and December 21, 1948).<sup>6</sup>

Answering for the University and the Department, George Pettit, Assistant to the President, and Heizer maintained that the group was not a State of California archaeological survey. It was the California Archaeologic Survey whose main purpose was to survey the state. The institution functioned within confines of the Department of Anthropology and Museum of Anthropology at UC Berkeley. Cooperation could occur with other institutions researching the

---

<sup>6</sup> Harrington's letter was, in fact, preceded by one of a milder tone by Malcom Farmer of the San Diego Museum of Man.

state (UCBA, Anthropology, letters November 30, 1948; November 22, 1948; and January 27, 1948). Heizer responded for the CAS and the University in this manner as a peaceful offer to explain the possible confusion over the word choice of "state-wide." He further indicated that the university existed as a state-wide educational organization and thus, did cover the whole of the research area (UCBA, Anthropology, letter January 27, 1948).

### *Memories of the Past*

Much more exists here than an etymological debate regarding state institutions' perceptions of the CAS. Recall that the NRC State Survey Committee in the 1920s and the New Deal relief programs accelerated unification within archaeology. Both retained the comprehensive state survey as a necessary preliminary working means prior to field work. The creation of the Society for American Archaeology in 1935 was then followed by the demise of the State Surveys Committee shortly thereafter. However, archaeologists continued to function through the WPA with its unique procedures, including the survey, until 1941.

Also consider that various institutional elements endured within the states while a national organization emerged by 1935 at the national level. A condition of dual evolution persevered for American archaeology. A rapidly coalescing national organization interfaced with the federal government and other academic associations. Yet, a multiplicity of state-based agencies struggled for cohesion and direction.

State surveys were maintained through the WPA, a point made by Harrington. They were the initial step for any archaeological work after which an institution applied through a central authority, such as the federal government, for funding and any relief labor. All of the various elements within archaeology were able to apply for funding through the federal government, bypassing previous academic venues. Academic archaeologists, museums, state and private institutions usually found some money.

However, with the exception of the early CWA digs, the effort was not centrally controlled as far as any standards regarding the quality of the work. In order to prioritize and catalogue a state's prehistoric array, reserves were subjected to a survey. Personnel then submitted requests based upon that study. Field operatives worked largely on their own regarding the scientific aspect of their work. The federal agencies focused their attention on the labor and cost elements. Ultimately, professionals reacted to this action, but not until later. Most in the field felt that somehow the SI still oversaw the work, just as it had in the limiting CWA days. Good science was thus perceived to be the order of the day. With the discovery that some of the WPA work failed to meet these levels, the SI received the blame. The initial idea of field expeditions with central monitoring and an efficient and professionally staffed national headquarters fostered an important perception. It created a strong repercussion by the end of the New Deal as it became apparent this nascent discipline did not have universal training and standards and that the archaeology accomplished varied from place to place.<sup>7</sup>

Reaction to these events culminated in a stronger conjoining of archaeology at the national level. This would most certainly have been understood in California, because many of the Berkeley staff played a role in the New Deal and postwar actions. California archaeology appeared to reflect the larger fragmented whole. The University of California had sponsored

several of the work relief programs, including those involving paleontology. In fact, one of the first New Deal expeditions was directed by W. Duncan Strong in Central California. Strong later moved on to fill the chair in archaeology at Columbia where many young archaeologists completed their terminal degrees in the post-New Deal era. Therefore, this experience influenced both the founding of the CAS and some of the misunderstandings over its exact role (Fagette 1996). In short, learning from two examples, Berkeley personnel understood that an organized response was necessary to influence the direction of new policies that affected their domain.

### *Reaction*

In a series of memoranda and letters, the Administration and Department attempted to resolve the crisis. By January of the next year, most ruffled feathers had been smoothed -- although the perception from the Berkeley standpoint indicated a different motivation for the inquiry. In a memo to President Sproul, George Pettitt summarized the feelings of the participants:

The crux of the problem is that Mr. Farmer, and one or two other administrators of private archaeological groups in Southern California, thought this might prove to be an opportunity for them to move in on State money. They have pressed hard on the point that we should give them part of the \$10,000 budget . . . Whether the letter I have written will satisfy them, I have some doubt. At least I have tried to firmly but diplomatically close the door [UCBA, President, memorandum November 30, 1948; and memorandum November 22, 1948; and letter December 7, 1948].

Pettitt obviously did not share too similar a perception of the problem. So how did Berkeley settle the dilemma? First, a consortium of Berkeley personnel attempted to resolve the various concerns of the Board members. Then, within the three year period allotted for its existence, the University allowed the appointed board to die a natural death (UCBA, President, letter September 20, 1951). Ultimately, the resolution was to eliminate the board and close that door. However, how does that solve the problem raised? In an institutional sense, it fails, at least from a single agency perspective. The CAS went on to continue its salvage work, compile a state

---

7. The Committee for Basic Needs comprised the first reaction. The appointment of a series of federal archaeological directors to oversee the WPA work was the second. However, their appearance came late in the relief experience and had little effect on directing the quality and results of New Deal archaeology. The actions of academic archaeologists to resolve these crises again forced greater cooperation and articulation of the standards they sought. Accordingly when the government again planned to create huge energy and reclamation programs in the postwar period, archaeologists immediately reacted. They worked to forestall the problems they associated with allowing policy to sweep by them without being involved in the planning stages and voicing their needs (Fagette 1996; and Marlowe 1983).

data system, and provide a mechanism for archaeological training within the Department of Anthropology. It did not work to create any unified organization along the older, prewar approaches. Instead, California's survey would be a cooperative endeavor more suited to its institutional tradition.

That October, the CAS followed up with an extensive list of cooperative endeavors conducted with a variety of groups. This reflected the intention of its original mission plan. Other than Harrington and Farmer raising the flag on the sharing of funds, the Survey functioned relatively smoothly. The only real excitement came when the appointed UCAS archaeologist for 1950-51, W. Wallace, was discovered not to have a driver's license. He had apparently deceived the department as to having one in his possession (UCBA, Heizer, letters October 11, 1949; and November 17, 1950). The CAS then began its archaeological journey down a more clearly-defined path, one which led to and from Berkeley.

### *The Final Form*

In conclusion, this postwar California experience reflects the larger picture reasonably well. The forces involved mirror internal conditions unique to California but those endemic to the national condition. The establishment of the CAS and accompanying misconceptions, conflict over turf, and competition for funding, forced a clearer redefinition of its role. Truly, the post-war years were ones of transition into a brave new world of new directions and self control but ones also of lingering fears and fragmentation.

## **Acknowledgments**

Most of the research material utilized for this article draws upon the excellent facilities at the Bancroft Library, UC Berkeley. The staff exhibited considerable patience in finding little-used and apparently well-hidden papers. Gratitude and thanks are extended to Anne Shaw at the Office of the Board of Regents. Sheila O'Neil allowed access to the Robert Heizer Papers. Dr. Kent Lightfoot, Director of the ARF, extended professional courtesy and willingness to open the proverbial doors. Additional appreciation is offered to the Southwest Museum and the San Diego Museum of Man. Dr. Tom Hester at the University of Texas, Austin, also supplied pertinent records and information. Dr. Jay Siegel of the University of California, San Diego, gave penetrating critique and encouragement.

## **References Cited**

*American Antiquity* 50 (April 1985).

1985 The entire volume commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the SAA discusses these issues.

Brew, J. O.

1968 *One Hundred Years of Anthropology*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Fagette, Paul H., Jr.

1996 *Digging for Dollars: The New Deal and American Archaeology*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

- Griffin, James B. (editor)  
1952 *Archaeology of Eastern United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hester, Thomas R.  
1982 "Obituaries: Robert Fleming Heizer, 1915-1979." *American Antiquity*. 47(1): 99- 107.
- Hinsley, Curtis M., Jr.  
1981 *Savages and Scientists: the Smithsonian Institution and the Development of American Anthropology. 1846-1910*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Kuhn, Thomas S.  
1970 *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 2nd ed., enl. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marlowe, Gregory Jon  
1983 "Preservation and Profession in American Archaeology: From 'Basic Needs' to the Committee for the Recovery of Archaeological Remains, 1939-1945." Paper presented at the Pacific Coast Branch, American Historical Association, annual meeting, San Diego, California August 11, 1983.
- Moratto, Michael J.  
1984 *California Archaeology*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press, Inc.
- Nash, Gerald D.  
1985 *The American West Transformed: The Impact of the Second World War*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.  
1990 *World War II and the West: Reshaping the Economy*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Simpson, Ruth D.  
1947 "A Job That Needs To Be Done." *The Masterkey* 1(3): 102-103.
- Taylor, Walter W.  
1964 *A Study of Archaeology*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- University of California  
1970 Records of the Board of Regents, Office of the President. *The Centennial Record of the University of California, 1868-1968*, Anthropology, Oakland.
- University of California Berkeley Archives (UCBA)  
1949 California Archaeological Survey (CAS). "The California Archaeological Survey: Establishment, Aims, and Methods." *Reports Of The California Archaeological Survey* 1(1).  
Record Group CU 23, AAA. Kroeber File to 1945. Letter Mead to Kroeber October 5, 1945; letter Kroeber to Barnett October 10, 1945; letter Kroeber to Steward October 10, 1945; letter Steward to Kroeber October 12, 1945. Letter Kroeber to Kluckhohn October 13, 1945; letter Kroeber to Tozzer October 16, 1945. Letter Kroeber to Mead October 17, 1945; letter Kroeber to Steward 25 October 1945; letter Steward to Kroeber 26 October, 1945; letter Steward to Kroeber October 29, 1945; letter Kroeber to Steward November 5, 1945; letter Steward to Kroeber December 7, 1945; and letter Kroeber to Barnett December 18, 1945.  
CU 23, Anthropology Papers, Box 22. Letter Harrington to Sproul December 21, 1948; letter Farmer to Heizer November 15, 1948; letter Pettitt to Farmer November 30, 1948; letter Heizer to Pettitt November 22, 1948; and letter Heizer to Harrington January 27, 1949.  
CU 23, California State, Misc., Box 9. Letter Heizer to Pettitt June 8, 1950.  
CU 23, Robert F. Heizer Papers, 1945-1954. Letter Lowie to Heizer April 19, 1946; letter Heizer to Lowie April 23, 1946; letter Heizer to Lowie May 22, 1946; letter Gifford to Heizer May 16, 1946;

- letter Heizer to Gifford July 9, 1946; letter Sproul to Lowie July 29, 1947; letter McCown to Davis June 16, 1948; letter McCown to Davis June 24, 1948; letter McCown to Heizer July 14, 1948; letter McCown to Sproul July 20 July 1948; letter McCown to Heizer July 20 1948; letters Sproul to Appointed Members October 8, 1948; letter Sproul to McCown July 12, 1948; letter Heizer to Robert October 13, 1948; letter Heizer to McCown October 11, 1949; and letter Heizer to McCown November 17, 1950.
- CU 23, Lowie File, Box 29. Letter Gifford to Lowie May 20, 1946; letter McCown to Lowie May 22, 1946; letter Olson to McCown January 31, 1948; letter Gifford to Lowie May 20, 1946; letter McCown to Lowie May 22, 1946; and letter McCown to Heizer May 22, 1946.
- CU 23, National Research Council, 1929-1930. Circular prepared by M. W. Stirling February 19, 1930:4-5.
- CU 23, National Research Council, 1934. Letter Guthe to Kroeber March 20, 1934.
- CU 23, National Research Council files, 1933, 1935-1936, 1937-1954. Letter Guthe to Kroeber December 11, 1933; letter Guthe to Kroeber March 5, 1935; letter Kroeber to Britten January 13, 1935; letter Gifford to Britten January 16, 1935; letter Britten to Lowie January 3, 1935; letter Guthe to Kroeber 29 December 1939; and letter Murdock to Kroeber December 12, 1942.
- CU 23, President's Files, Box 22. Memorandum Pettitt to Sproul November 30, 1948; letter Pettitt to Farmer December 7, 1948; memorandum Heizer to Pettitt November 22, 1948; and letter Sproul to Chickering September 20, 1951.