

ARCHEOLOGY

Emil W. Haury

From its inception in 1941, the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research has held a unique position in the world of the social sciences. Ten years ago the late Alfred L. Kroeber made the statement that "The Viking Fund is the only foundation avowedly directed to the support and furtherance of anthropological endeavor." And now a decade later this still holds true. Time has produced some changes in the direction of interests but the Foundation has never wavered from its original intent to promote the Science of Man.

In quick succession the world has been plunged into the Atomic and Space Ages. Advances in these are dependent upon the solution of enormously complicated and costly problems within the physical and biological sciences. At the same time, commensurate gains have not been registered by the social sciences. We have been hesitant to admit that the understanding of man's behavior is as vital to survival as is the understanding of the functioning of his body, the nature of the environment in which he lives, and the new frontiers he is trying to conquer. Only by a painfully slow process are the social sciences winning a spot in the hierarchy of science.

Thus, any foundation devoted to the support of one of the social sciences, occupies a trail-blazing position. Its record, therefore, is subject to scrutiny.

Support of Research

High priority has been given from the start to basic research. Seventy to seventy-five per cent of the Foundation's funds have been absorbed in this way. Physical anthropology and archaeology have shared about equally in the aid received (about 30 per cent each), with ethnology (including social anthropology, cultural dynamics, personality and culture) receiving only slightly less (27 per cent). General and theoretical anthropology and linguistics (including folklore) share the balance (13 per cent). The gross amount of money allocated in any year is in the main dependent upon the earning power of the Foundation's capital investments and this figure varies. It may be noted that a decline in income has been experienced in the last decade over the first and that correspondingly less money has been appropriated. But the balance in the support given to the sub-disciplines has remained essentially unchanged. In the past five years total annual allocations in support of fundamental research have averaged somewhat less than \$100,000.

A quick calculation reveals that roughly \$700,000 has been earmarked for archaeological and related studies in the 20-year history of the Foundation. This averages out to \$35,000 yearly, a level of support which in the past decade

has allowed the initiation of 227 projects. Appropriations during the same period of time for cultural anthropology have numbered somewhat more than 200, and for the biological aspects of anthropology 150. During the year ending January 31, 1960, archaeological field projects were supported in North and South America, Europe, Africa, the Near East, India, Canary Islands, and elsewhere, a typical annual example of the geographical spread of Foundation underwritten efforts. In spite of reduced income, first felt in 1953, no change in either areal or topical interests has been noticeable. And through the years, whether the economic fortunes have been lean or bountiful, there has been the same willingness to support "risk" projects.

Subventions for archaeology and allied fields have been so varied in nature that discussion of them is best handled in broad categories. First are the projects of a "conventional" nature, calculated to make substantive contributions to the field as a whole. By far the greatest amount of money devoted to archaeology has gone into these efforts which ever remain the bedrock of the science. Culture histories, the interplay between people and a host of other cultural processes can be understood if data of a space-time, cultural content, and ecological nature are available. A reading of the lists of projects supported in the annual report provides an impressively complete roster of the kinds of problems archaeologists are interested in in the middle decades of the 20th century.

To list but a few as examples, the range includes topics as specific as the origin and spread of metal pendants from the early Roman Imperial Age and as broad as determining the Old Stone Age culture sequence across northern Africa; as intensive as systematic stratigraphic excavations in Argentina, and as extensive as surveys to determine settlement patterns in the Southwest and the Mississippi Valley. The list of places where field work has been done reads like a gazeteer: New Caledonia, Iran, Panama, Peru, France, New Zealand, Southern Rhodesia and countless more. Obviously, the projects in this category arise in response to the interest of the individual investigator resulting in what may appear to be a patchwork effort. But it is out of this stuff that the whole cloth eventually emerges.

The second category consists mainly of projects designed to extend the boundaries of archaeology by helping marginal disciplines able to contribute to it. These especially concern the physical sciences. This development within the Foundation is clearly attributable to the Director's deep interest in adapting new techniques devised in other fields to archaeological problems. Foremost recognition must be given to the Foundation's support of radiocarbon research by the Institute of Nuclear Studies at the University of Chicago, under the direction of Dr. W. F. Libby. Within 6 months of the announced discovery of Carbon 14 in nature in 1947, and while the application of radiocarbon dating to archaeology was no more than a tantalizing theory, the Foundation appropriated \$13,000 to further the studies. By 1950, over \$35,000 had been invested in the effort, but the price was small in comparison to the returns,

for in the space of a few years the practical use of radiocarbon dating of archaeological materials was demonstrated.

Other interdisciplinary ventures of note have included Late Pleistocene geochronology coordinated with the archaeological record in Iraq and similar studies in France; extensive multidisciplinary studies in Africa which have shed so much light on the Australopithecine types and the primitive stone pebble culture; paleobotanic studies as a means of establishing climatic history in Mexico and New Mexico and Africa; research in soil chemistry as an approach to determining the relative ages of archaeological sites in California; further support of tree-ring studies in the Southwest; in ethnozoology; and in bringing ethnology and archaeology closer together. Some of these have been long-range projects involving the team approach.

A third, and somewhat diverse, category of support includes grants to individuals to study museum collections in foreign countries; to produce English summaries of significant contributions to archaeology available only in foreign languages; completion of manuscripts; publication subsidies and support of meetings with a special problem orientation.

By and large, most of the funds made available to archaeology have been expended in the field. This is as it should be for there lies the investigator's laboratory. But the contributions to knowledge run the full spectrum: investigative, theoretical, and methodological. The strength of the program rests on the steady accrual of data, concurrent development of concepts, the introduction of new techniques, and continuing synthesis.

Except for radiocarbon few startlingly new developments have stemmed from Foundation-supported projects in archaeology. The shining achievements that captivate the public's imagination may contribute less in the long run to anthropology as a whole than do the plodding researches which bring a suspected truth into sharp focus. With Foundation help archaeologists, as other scholars in anthropology, have been privileged to pursue their studies at a speed and scope not available to them before.

Not infrequently, only a few hundred dollars spell the difference between completing an operation or not doing it at all. This small-sum support is, unfortunately, a vanishing characteristic in science today, as is also possibly the individual investigator. Progress in the physical sciences is largely dependent upon closely-knit teams of collaborators, working on costly projects. But in the social sciences, and notably anthropology, this trend is not strongly apparent as yet. Valuable as team efforts are, anthropology stands to lose if the support for the single scholar is cut off. It is precisely here where the Wenner-Gren Foundation can operate to keep alive a traditional and effective mode of research. Furthermore, recognition must also be made of the value of awarding numerous small grants to ambitious and coming scientists rather than large blocks of money to the established few.

Applicants who have been unsuccessful in gaining support for their projects, often wonder on what basis rejections are made. Immediate limiting factors, clearly, are the availability of funds and the merit of the project itself. In the first instance, the matter becomes an internal administrative problem over which the Foundation must exercise complete control. In the second instance, the Foundation relies heavily upon the evaluation of other scholars in the profession. This step insures extra-Foundation guidance and removes the liability of dictating what the profession should do. In most instances a rejection slip does not mean that a project is worthless, although indeed there are such, but rather that limited funds can better be spent on other projects which in the eyes of the profession, promise greater gains to the discipline at the moment. This must be recognized as a realistic approach to the task of carrying out the Foundation's main objective of achieving a Science of Man with anthropology as the catalyst. (See *The First Ten Years*, p. 160.)

An administrative point in which Wenner-Gren Foundation grants differ from those of most other foundations is the fiscal responsibility of the recipient. Once an award has been made the scholar, financially speaking, is free to move within the limits of the project with maximum flexibility and minimum accountability. Experience has shown, I believe, that this trust is not often abused and that the release from time-consuming bookkeeping directs comparable energy into productive channels.

Institutional Aid and Fellowships

Another primary function of the Foundation is to strengthen education in anthropology through institutional aid of various kinds, fellowships and other assistance for young scholars. A cursory review of fund allocation reveals projects "To aid purchase of equipment for physical anthropology laboratory . . . basic anthropology text books . . . casts of human fossils . . . office equipment . . . to support visiting lectureship," and many others. Donations are also made of books, maps, and photographs. Of importance here is the fact that many of these enrichments satisfy a need which cannot be met by any other readily available source. A few hundred dollars well placed may, in the long run, stimulate a development as beneficial to anthropology as ten times as much devoted to some research.

The Foundation's Pre-Doctoral Fellowship Program, launched in 1946, is open to departments of anthropology in the United States and abroad which offer the Ph.D. degree. Awards, carrying a stipend of \$1500, are contingent upon the availability of funds. They are wisely limited to one per institution at a time. This is a good way to insure early completion of the recipient's project. A high level of candidate-selection is maintained by placing this responsibility in the hands of the departmental staff. As a means of advancing students of exceptional promise, this program has much to recommend it. In recent years the number of recipients, divided about equally among U. S. and foreign students, has ranged from 5 to 10 annually. With rapidly

increasing student registration in anthropology an expanded fellowship program could be an instrument for incalculable good.

The recent report of the President's Science Advisory Committee contains a strongly worded statement concerning the "artificial and fundamentally wrong division" that is developing between research and teaching in the nation's universities. Where the fault for this situation lies may be a moot point. But the wide range of the grants of the Foundation for the conduct of basic research, for the training of scientists on the pre- and post-doctoral level, for strengthening an institution's teaching program, for visiting professorships, is a clear endorsement by the Foundation of the concept that teaching and research are inseparable.

Publication Support

No research undertaking may be considered complete until the results have been published. This final step, for many scholars the most difficult for lack of time or other reasons, must be of preeminent concern to any foundation in measuring the effectiveness of its awards and the total impact of its contributions to the discipline it supports.

Broadly speaking, three classes of publications spring from Foundation projects: 1) Technical reports resulting directly from individual research appearing in professional journals or as monographs. During the past decade the bibliographic entries in the yearly reports will easily average 150 annually. 2) Subventions to bring unfinished manuscripts to completion, to aid publication of existing manuscripts, to produce English editions of foreign language reports and to strengthen existing professional journals. 3) The publication of the Foundation's own series of monographs, *Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology*, conference reports, compendiums, and the newly launched *Current Anthropology*. Of great note also are the reports stemming from the internationally oriented symposia at Burg Wartenstein in Austria. These promise to add a completely new dimension to publishing ventures in anthropology and related fields.

In keeping with its philosophy that anthropology is global, not the monopoly of any nation or school of thought, and that its community of scholars reside in the small nations as well as the large, the Foundation has enthusiastically supported and launched a new quarterly journal *Current Anthropology*. The task of organizing and editing this significant venture was placed in the able and tireless hands of Sol Tax, to whom, along with the supporting agency, all anthropologists owe a debt of gratitude. It seems redundant to say that no other foundation, no national organization of anthropologists could, by reason of resources or disposition, have launched a journal of this kind.

Understandably, the Foundation's active support of publications of its own and others, has diverted research dollars to these purposes. But if one characteristic of the anthropological profession is to be singled out, it is that

most of us are over-researched and under-published. Foundation help has been an invaluable boon in closing this gap, both by direct subventions for completed manuscripts and by creating a publishing environment which has stimulated completion of unfinished works.

Symposia and Conferences and Travel Grants

Almost from its inception, the Foundation subscribed to the view that personal meetings between scholars were essential to good communication and cross-stimulation. Conferences first took the form of informal supper gatherings with invited speaker and scholars having kindred interests. The idea has grown to include somewhat more formal symposia, always on specific topics, summer seminars, and field conferences. Valuable contributions to the literature have grown out of many of these. Still later, inventory-type conferences were sponsored, such as those dealing with the broad topics *Anthropology Today* and *Man's Role in Changing the Face of the Earth*. In the latter particularly, the international interest of the Foundation made itself strongly felt by the invited presence of scientists from many countries.

Again, faith in face-to-face meeting was reaffirmed by the Foundation when it generously provided support for the Vth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences held in Philadelphia in September, 1956. This included a conference planning grant; travel grants to scholars from as far away as Capetown, South Africa; free gift book packets to foreign scholars containing over 6,100 volumes published by and for the Foundation; and the arrangement of special group discussions, one of which was between several of the officers of the American Anthropological Association and the Russian delegation of three, seeking agreements for increased information and personnel exchange between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.

Another gathering of note was the Wenner-Gren Foundation—American Anthropological Association Ph.D. Curriculum Conference held in Washington, D. C., November 23-24, 1958. This provided a much-needed opportunity for representatives of American institutions offering the Ph.D. degree in anthropology to review problems in graduate education.

In retrospect the foregoing experiences were clearly pointing to a development best characterized as the capstone of the conference concept. I refer, of course, to the Foundation's European Conference Center, Burg Wartenstein, an hour's drive south of Vienna, Austria. Formally opened in August, 1958, Burg Wartenstein has already provided the congenial retreat for 14 international conferences where participants can deliberate on specific topics, unhurried, uninterrupted, worry-free, and, most important of all, where they get to know and understand each other. It may be taken for granted that the results of these conferences will not be uniform, depending upon a variety of factors, such as language and personality problems, and the ease or the difficulty encountered in establishing a common meeting ground. But this is one of the challenges and people with heart are bound to look upon one of these

conferences as a memorable intellectual experience and return to their desks personally and professionally enriched. Published results will, of course, testify to research gains but at the same time they also symbolize the Foundation's practical insistence on promoting the Science of Man globally.

Final Considerations

In this brief assessment of the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research no more than the principal activities have been touched on. There are more. Its extensive library is available to scholars, as are its meeting rooms; it functions as a clearinghouse and aids in every way possible the dissemination of information about anthropology. Whatever its many-pronged services are, the central dominating idea, namely, encouraging the development of a vigorous and unified Science of Man, remains ever the same. The significant enlargement of the concept came late in the 20-year life of the Foundation with the declaration that it would henceforth bend its efforts and resources towards encouraging the growth of anthropology as a world-wide science. For this position, the Foundation has the solid endorsement of the profession, for it too, must have a clear vision of the essential unity of scholars wherever they are.

Consistent with the foregoing, the direction of the Foundation's support has changed. It no longer is strictly a grant-making institution for research projects. Its main resources support *Current Anthropology* and the interdisciplinary symposia in Austria. A fervent hope is expressed here that the trend, while wise and laudable from every point of view, will not end with the complete loss of support for research. The need for this continues generally in anthropology and especially in areas of science related to anthropology where cross-fertilization can yield large returns and for which aid is difficult to obtain from other sources. To do otherwise would run counter to the national pattern. A tri-polar balance between research, publication, and conferences will keep the science viable.

On May 1, 1951, The Viking Fund became the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research. This name change, effected without policy alterations, accomplished two things: it appropriately recognized the role of the Founder, Axel L. Wenner-Gren, and specifically called attention to the discipline the Foundation serves. Apart from having certain administrative advantages by removing question about the organization's function, the direct identification with anthropology is declarative of one private foundation's specific interest in the social sciences. Anthropology has benefited.

At the 20-year mark, by all criteria, the Foundation's development has been orderly and its achievements bear the marks of true distinction. For this, credit must go to a small but effective Board of Directors, a devoted and well informed administrative staff, and above all to the skill and perceptive leadership of the President and Director of Research, Paul Fejos. It is no exaggeration to say that he knows more anthropologists than any other living person

and has an equally wide grasp of research areas in the core and at the edges of anthropological endeavor. These capacities of the Director of Research lend uniqueness to the management of Foundation interests and they are largely responsible for its successes.

As one of several anthropologists who have been invited to review the Foundation's record, I gratefully acknowledge the wide-ranging opportunities for research and growth that have been made available to anthropology. Never have so many in one discipline benefited in so many ways from a single foundation. Through the broadened range of research programs, the development of new concepts and methods, expanded publication opportunities, and the encouragement of communication among scholars on a wide scale, the Foundation's support has brought stature to anthropology and at a time when it was much needed. Beyond these direct benefits lie unnumbered, but perhaps not uncalculated, fringe consequences. By energizing active research programs in departments of anthropology, administrative attitudes have changed and this has led to stepped-up internal support.

These capital gains have been registered because of the extraordinary sense of devotion manifested by the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, first towards the discipline it has chosen to underwrite, and second the responsible stewardship of the funds entrusted to it. One can only hope that the nature of the profession's response has adequately shown an awareness of these gains.