

New World Archaeology

Gordon R. Willey

As of 1991, the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research (first known as the Viking Fund) has been a major benefactor to New World archaeology for fifty years, or for the full lifetime of that Foundation's existence. As this is about one-half the lifetime of the discipline of New World archaeology – at least as that discipline has been recognized as an established academic and museum research enterprise – it is to be anticipated that the Foundation's role in the development of the discipline has been an important one. What have been the nature and the results of these Wenner-Gren benefactions to the New World archaeological field?

Before facing this rather broad question directly, it will be helpful to review briefly the history of New World, or Americanist, archaeology. Not surprisingly, New World archaeology began with speculations over the origins and antiquity of the American Indian civilizations that were discovered here by the Europeans. Most of these speculations attempted to explain or understand what was found in the New World with reference to what was known or imagined about the Old. Various and romantically, the natives of the Americas were related to those of far-off Hindustan or to the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel, or, sometimes, more prosaically – and as it turned out, more correctly – to immigrants from northeastern Asia. In such debates and discussions, the seventeenth-century European Enlightenment philosophies, with their beliefs in the inevitable progressive betterment of mankind, confronted concepts like that of the "noble savage," which had its roots in the eighteenth-century Romantic Movement. Later, in the nineteenth century, a more pragmatic and systematic archaeology tended to replace the more philosophical ones, here as well as in Europe. Archaeological sites were explored and described and their contents classified. John Lloyd Stephens visited the ancient ruins of Mexico and Central America in the 1840s and reported upon these in an objective manner. In so doing, he opened up the study of Maya archaeology which, a few decades later, Alfred Maudslay continued. In the last decade of the century, Cyrus Thomas of the Smithsonian Institution moved the highly speculative and romanticized "Indian Mound" archaeology of the eastern United States onto a more factual base; and in Peru, Max Uhle laid the foundations of systematic archaeology. As a result, by the end of the nineteenth century, New World archaeology was professionally established in universities and museums in the United States, Canada, Mexico, as well as in some other countries in Latin America.

After the First World War, New World archaeologists enlarged their research goals beyond those of description and classification to include geographical-chronological ordering of their data. This kind of organization and regional "chronology building" then proceeded with considerable success in several New World areas between about 1914 and 1940. In the North American Southwest deep refuse heaps associated with the pueblo ruins were ideal for chronologic, or stratigraphic, digging, and the highly fortunate adjunct of absolute dating through tree rings, or dendrochronology, inspired a number of dedicated researchers. By 1940 Southwestern archaeologists had extended a combined relative and absolute time scale from historic times back to the early centuries A.D., and, in addition, they had plotted out the major regions of cultural variation (Anasazi,

Hohokam, Mogollon) within that area. In Mexico, Manuel Gamio, carrying out stratigraphic excavations near Mexico City just before World War I, outlined a three-period sequence of Archaic, Toltec, and Aztec, which would serve as a general framework for archaeologists who were to follow him; and in the Maya area, in both highlands and lowlands, ceramics and architecture were successfully periodized into cultural chronologies. In the lowlands, this periodization was provided with some absolute dating by the correlation of the ancient native Maya calendar with that of Christian time-counting. In Peru, Uhle, using some stratigraphic information, plus gravelot seriations, fashioned a four-period chronology that ran from the Inca horizon back to pre-Tiahuanaco times; and this was filled out in greater detail by others who were to follow him. There were also significant beginnings in chronology building in some other American areas, including the Arctic, the North American Plains, the eastern United States, and the West Indies. Elsewhere, what was known of New World archaeology was to remain for some time as largely descriptive, and, for the most part, even this kind of information was rather spotty and scattered. One significant achievement, however, was the clear demonstration of the presence of Pleistocene man in America, although a more precise chronological placement of such early finds would have to await the advent of radiocarbon dating. Thus, by 1940 – or at about the time the Wenner-Gren Foundation was established – New World archaeologists had done enough to have some idea of both the size of the task that still lay ahead and of the general direction they were going in systematizing their discipline.

But, even by 1940, there were some American archaeologists who were dissatisfied with the narrow limits of this systematization, which seemed only to be concerned with the description, classification, and geographical-chronological ordering of their data. They thought that archaeology should go beyond these limitations and attempt to understand the functionings of ancient cultures and societies as well as to describe and date them. These thoughts and dissatisfactions were to lead in new directions for American archaeology during the 1940s and 1950s. One such direction was in the consideration of the interface between culture and environment. This relationship of people to their natural environment was closely linked to their food supplies and their subsistence, and, obviously, there was a link here to plant domestication and to concerns about the origins and rise of pre-Columbian agriculture. In turn, such ecological and agricultural questions and problems led to explorations and examinations of ancient settlement patterns, which offered the clues to prehistoric population sizes and social and political groupings.

After 1960, other New World archaeologists, continuing on from the concerns of the 1940s and 1950s, demanded a greater clarity in the objectives and research procedures by which archaeologists addressed such questions. The nature of culture change – its processes and its causes – was seen as paramount, and questions about process and causality began to define what came to be termed a "new archaeology," a processually and behaviorally oriented one, and also one strongly positivist, materialist, and evolutionist, or "neo-evolutionist," in outlook. These new views were influential, and they have been incorporated, in varying degrees, into Americanist archaeological research over the past thirty years. They were, however, to be challenged in the 1980s by a reaction to positivism and materialism, by what has come to be termed a "postprocessual" school of archaeological thought, and this outlook has had some effects in New World

archaeology.

The Wenner-Gren Foundation appeared on the scene in 1941, at about the time New World archaeology began to move from a rather limited archaeology as descriptive material culture history to archaeology as a way of understanding the functionings of past cultures and societies and of explaining why these cultures and societies had grown and developed as they did. Did the Foundation play any part in these changes in the discipline? Or would New World archaeology have gone along in the ways that it did without the presence of the Foundation? Admittedly, such questions defy any definite answers. However, it is certain that New World archaeology would not have moved along as swiftly as it did, over these last fifty years, whatever its directions, without the Wenner-Gren's important aid. For the Foundation very quickly – even within the early 1940s – became the single main source of financial research support for New World archaeologists, and it continued in this role for at least the next two decades, if not longer. As E. W. Haury stated in the Foundation's 20th Annual Report:

Never have so many in one discipline benefitted 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.

While Haury was speaking to anthropology at large, his words can also be applied to archaeology, and certainly to New World archaeology. Without Wenner-Gren support, there would have been far fewer archaeologists on the front lines of research over the past fifty years and much less accomplished. But did the Wenner-Gren Foundation, in the course of all this, make any conscious and concerted attempt to direct or influence archaeological thinking? A. L. Kroeber, in his summation of the Wenner-Gren contribution to anthropology on the occasion of the Foundation's tenth birthday, gave one answer to this when he wrote, "It [the Foundation] has in the main taken anthropology as it has found it and has supported and developed it, not trying to remodel it according to some preconceived ideas or goal." And this general answer about anthropology would certainly apply to the New World archaeological part of it. The Foundation has never laid down any specific guidelines about the kinds of archaeological research proposals that would be entertained. All that was required was that such proposals be the kind of serious statements of research planning that would pass the scrutiny of peer reviewers.

Yet in spite of this, I think it would be misleading, as well as unfair, to characterize the Wenner-Gren Foundation as having been completely neutral, or indifferently passive, in its attitudes toward archaeological research. Certainly, those of us who knew the late Paul Fejos, the Foundation's first director, will not remember him as a neutral or passive individual. On the contrary, he was a man of force and passion. While he was not professionally trained as an anthropologist or archaeologist, he was both a scientist (a medical researcher) and an artist (an innovative movie director of international acclaim). He firmly believed that the scholar should be free and unfettered in the pursuit of his ideas; but he also understood the importance of new ideas, and he was well aware that

any discipline, or any art, must change and grow – or stagnate and die. To take a single example, it is not at all surprising that Fejos went out of his way to be one of the very first to support and encourage W. F. Libby in his radiocarbon research, which has been such a revolutionary force in archaeological dating.

Fejos also had more indirect ways of stimulating scholars to consider new ideas. I remember once he called John Rowe and me into his office. It was during the 1952 International Symposium that Wenner-Gren hosted in New York. He showed us a book of magnificent air photographs of modern cities, suburbs, and surrounding lands. "Look," he said, enthusiastically, "at what you can learn from pictures like these. They can tell you a story without using words. See how these buildings are grouped. Look at their relationships to roads and highways. From this you can infer all kinds of things – technological, commercial, social, and political things." He knew that I had just been doing archaeological settlement-pattern research in Peru; indeed, I had received a grant from the Foundation for that purpose, and he knew John had similar interests. Perhaps he was speaking to these, and he was letting me know that I should make every effort to get all that I could out of my air photographs in which the Wenner-Gren had invested. Or perhaps he was addressing himself principally to John, for he made him, and not me, a present of the book. Or perhaps it was all more incidental and accidental than that; but, whatever the case, it was always clear that Paul Fejos wanted archaeologists to explore in all directions and not to be overly constrained by the disciplinary precedents of the past. While the directions that archaeologists have taken have been those of their own choosing – ecology, settlement-pattern studies, neo-evolutionism and a search for process, or a return to more humanistic concerns – the atmosphere and the policy of the Wenner-Gren Foundation from its beginning to the present have always been such as to encourage a freedom to pursue one's own research interests, but with a special encouragement to innovation.

In turning to the nature of the Wenner-Gren's support for anthropology, and New World archaeology, it should be emphasized that this support was multi-faceted from its inception, and it still is. It included not only direct grants to individuals and institutions for their researches, but also funding for publications, for conferences, and for library and teaching facilities. Indeed, it is virtually impossible, even with the aid of the Foundation's published reports, to tally or compute all of these varied bequests. To approximate some totals for New World archaeology alone, I was able to count 436 research grants under the Small Grants category for the years 1941 to 1989 (inclusive); in addition, a substantial number of larger grants was given to several special or long-term projects. In publications during this same 1941-1989 time span, there are twelve of the fifty-seven numbers of the Foundation's own Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology series that are devoted in whole or substantial part to New World archaeological subjects. New World prehistoric data have also been included in the two big Wenner-Gren international conference volumes, Anthropology Today (A. L. Kroeber and others, eds., 1953) and Man's Role in Changing the Face of the Earth (W. L. Thomas, Jr. and others, eds., 1956). Beyond these, I totaled 729 Americanist archaeological items, ranging from book-length monographs to shorter articles, which were published with Wenner-Gren Foundation aid in this period. Such works have appeared in scientific or technical journals from all parts of the world; but among them are a good many that were brought out in *Current Anthropology*, a journal founded and

underwritten by Wenner-Gren. In Foundation-supported conferences, New World archaeological topics were the bases of eighteen Supper Conferences held in New York between 1946 and 1957, of six Burg Wartenstein gatherings between 1960 and 1980, and of at least fourteen symposia or seminars held elsewhere but with Wenner-Gren funding between 1962 and 1989.

In what follows, I should like to mention a selective sampling of these New World archaeological research endeavors and activities that the Wenner-Gren Foundation has supported over the past fifty years, presenting them by basic themes and by major pre-Columbian culture areas.

A theme or topic of major interest in New World archaeology has long been the one of humankind's antiquity in this hemisphere. As noted, by 1940 it had been widely conceded that there were people here in the New World – and especially in the North American Plains – by late Pleistocene times. Over the past half-century, Wenner-Gren has awarded approximately thirty grants for research projects and study conferences that, in whole or in part, were designed to examine this question of man's antiquity over North and South America. Particularly notable among these research efforts were those of Helmut de Terra and his colleagues in the discoveries of Pleistocene "Tepexpan Man" in the Valley of Mexico in the 1940s and those of E. W. Haury in his important studies at Ventana Cave, in Arizona. In addition, other Wenner-Gren supported efforts have involved the discoveries of early cultural remains in the Arctic and the continued finds in the North American High Plains and in the eastern United States that have added to the growing body of new data on the presence of Paleoindian hunters. The Foundation has also invested in critical reexaminations of old and controversial "early man" finds, as at Vero Beach in Florida and in the Lagoa Santa Caves in Brazil; and it has supported research into the highly controversial question of "pre-Paleoindian" man in the New World. Very recently, in 1989, the Foundation helped sponsor a major international conference on the "Early Peopling of the Americas," held at the University of Maine.

Another general topic of equal interest has been that of native American agriculture. Over thirty Wenner-Gren research grants have been devoted to seeking the solutions to questions concerning New World agricultural beginnings and subsequent cultivation practices. To R. S. MacNeish's important work on early plant domestication in Mexico, we can add ancient plant pollen analyses from the same country by P. B. Sears, Dolores Piperno's phytolith and pollen identifications from Central America, and the archaeological plant identifications from the North American Southwest by H. C. Cutler and his associates. Investigations of prehistoric irrigation systems in Mexico by Pedro Armillas, and of raised fields in the Maya area and Ecuador, have been another source of information on pre-Columbian New World agricultural practices; and a monograph in the Wenner-Gren Viking Fund Publication series (R. A. Donkin, 1979) has surveyed ancient agricultural terracing throughout much of the hemisphere. In tropical-forest South America, the recent Wenner-Gren-aided archaeological excavations and surveys of A. C. Roosevelt have thrown new light on the early cultivation and uses of manioc and maize and the chronological occurrences of these two plant foods in that area.

To shift to a culture-area review of some Wenner-Gren New World archaeological projects, let us begin with the far north – the Arctic, Subarctic, and Northwest Coast areas. The Foundation provided support here for at least twenty-five projects designed to study later pre-Columbian cultures. One of their first grants went to the Danish

archaeologist, Helge Larsen, for his excavations of the fascinating, pre-Old Bering Sea Ipiutak culture, with its distinctly Asiatic-appearing ivory art. This was to be a first step in the opening up and deepening of Eskimo prehistory. New discoveries in the Aleutians by W. S. Laughlin, A. P. McCartney, and others also pertained to post-Pleistocene cultures. Explorations into Eskimoan and earlier microblade cultures were carried out from the Arctic slopes of the Brooks Range in Alaska (by K. H. Schlesier) and as far east as Greenland (by T. H. McGovern). The Foundation helped in the publication of Hans-Georg Bandi's 1967 overview of Eskimo prehistory, and it contributed to L. R. Binford's methodological study of modern Nunamiut Eskimo behavior and "site formation processes." Farther south, on the Northwest Coast, Wenner-Gren support was crucial to Frederica de Laguna as she went about laying the groundwork for the archaeology and ethnoarchaeology of that area.

Moving still farther south into the various areas of western North America – the Interior Plateau country, California, the Great Basin, and the Plains – we can count a total of about thirty Wenner-Gren-funded projects, including field and laboratory operations, conferences, and publications. The California archaeology of coastal shell mounds deserves special mention for its pioneering of quantitative and physical analyses of sites and remains, as well as the development of culture historical sequences. Conferences on Great Basin and Plains archaeology were backed by the Foundation, and these contributed rapidly to culture historical syntheses for these two areas. (This work was presented in a series of publications by J. D. Jennings.)

Eastern North America, or the Eastern Woodlands, the setting for the "Moundbuilder" archaeological investigations of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as well as for the intensive Federal Relief archaeological projects of the 1930s, has benefited from at least forty Wenner-Gren-sponsored field operations in the past fifty years. In addition to these grants, there have been numerous others for publication subsidies. One of the earliest of the projects was the path-breaking archaeo-environmental study of the Boylston Street Fishweir, discovered under a Boston, Massachusetts street. This was an extensive Archaic Period fish-trap of hundreds of wooden stakes that were found preserved in the wet coastal soils. Another early Foundation bequest for the area was the financing of the publication of the George C. Davis site, a pre-Caddoan site in east Texas (H. P. Newell and A. D. Krieger, 1949). The site, with its cultural ties to Louisiana and the Southeast, and possibly to the northern fringes of Mesoamerica, was of key importance in the development of Eastern United States prehistory. Florida was the scene of intensive Wenner-Gren-supported archaeological study in the 1940s. Some of this derived from what was then recent fieldwork, but much of the data was drawn from museum collections and field notes that had accumulated from Federal Relief archaeology of a decade before but whose publication was made possible by Wenner-Gren aid. In connection with this, the Foundation backed an important Florida conference held in 1949. In the early 1950s, J. B. Griffin began his Central Mississippi Valley archaeological survey with Wenner-Gren help, and in 1952 he brought out the major volume of collected essays, Archaeology of the Eastern United States, partly under the Foundation's aegis. W. A. Ritchie's New York state archaeology was another early beneficiary. In more recent decades the Wenner-Gren Foundation has continued this support for a variety of Eastern Woodland area programs, underwriting research on early climates, on Asiatic-North American

comparison, on Eastern Woodland-Northwest Coast comparisons in ground stone manufactures, on native copper technology, on the study of the "Southeastern Ceremonial Complex" or "Cult," on Iroquoian archaeo-ethnology, on a traditional culture synthesis in Canada, and on quantitative and "new archaeological" explorations and data treatments in Illinois archaeology. One very recent Wenner-Gren-supported conference pertaining to the Eastern Woodlands had as its theme a comparative developmental study of temperate woodland-based societies in Eastern North America and Poland.

The North American Southwest – Arizona, New Mexico, and parts of adjacent states as well as northern Mexico – long one of the more "advanced" archaeological areas of the New World – has had about fifty Wenner-Gren-financed research programs over the past half-century, and this does not count numerous subsidies to aid in the publication of results. E. W. Haury's University of Arizona archaeological field school at Point of Pines was one of the first of the Foundation's bequests in this period. Other grants of the 1940s and 1950s aided such efforts as: the publication of the Awatovi kiva murals (Watson Smith, 1952), a summary of tree-ring dates for the area (T. L. Smiley, 1951), intensive work in the Cohonina region of northwestern Arizona and in northeastern Arizona, further explorations of the Mogollon region, discoveries and definitions of preceramic complexes; and surveys into the Mexican state of Chihuahua. This same tempo of Wenner-Gren-funded investigation and publication has continued to characterize the more recent decades but with shifting emphases in research toward questions of cultural-environmental relationships and land-use, trade relationships among communities, and the sociopolitical organization of communities. The relative maturity of archaeology in the area is, perhaps, reflected in the fact that two publications on the history of archaeological research and teaching in the Southwest have appeared recently, both with the backing of the Wenner-Gren Foundation (J. E. Reyman, 1989; E. W. Haury, 1989.)

New World archaeologists desiring to study in Mesoamerica – the area comprised by the southern two-thirds of Mexico, plus Guatemala, El Salvador, and a portion of Honduras – have been well-served by the Wenner-Gren Foundation, with well over a hundred research grants as well as substantial publication aid. Two volumes devoted entirely to Mesoamerican subjects (I. Kelly, 1947; M. N. Porter, 1953) and three others treating partially of Mesoamerica (G. R. Willey, ed., 1956; R. J. Braidwood and Willey, eds., 1962; R. A. Donkin, 1979) have been brought out in the Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology series. Three Burg Wartenstein conferences dealt in whole or in part with Mesoamerican themes: "The Cultural Development of the Maya" in 1962 (E. Z. Vogt and A. Ruz, eds., 1964); "From 15,000 B.C. to the Thresholds of Urban Civilization" in 1960 (published as Courses Toward Urban Life, Braidwood and Willey, eds., 1962); and "Prehistoric Settlement Pattern Studies" in 1980 (E. Z. Vogt and R. M. Leventhal, eds., 1983).

Virtually no Mesoamerican region has been missed by Wenner-Gren-supported projects, and a great variety of themes, ranging from jade sourcing, to Maya hieroglyphics, to pre-Columbian urbanism, have benefitted. Only a sampling of these is possible here. In the 1940s and 1950s, central Mexican projects included studies in the Valley of Mexico's Teotihuacan urban zone, a large-scale ceramic survey of that valley, and intensive excavations at Chupicuaro, in Guanajuato. In these same years, the Foundation helped with excavations at Tonalá, in Chiapas, with others in the Panuco

region of Veracruz, with ceramic studies in the lowland Maya region, and with survey and digging on the far northern fringes of Mesoamerica. Other important early grants went to aid in the publication of a major volume of essays on Mexican archaeology (C. Cook de Leonard, ed., 1959) and two substantial volumes on Oaxaca archaeology (A. Caso and I. Bernal, 1952; and Caso, Bernal, and J. R. Acosta, 1967). More recent researches backed with Wenner-Gren grants include Isabel Kelly's study of the early Capacha pottery of Colima, Claude Baudez and Pierre Becquelin's Preclassic-to-Classic sequence at Los Naranjos, in Honduras, and W. L. Fash's and Olivier de Montmollin's respective analyses of ancient Maya settlement forms and their political implications. Other outstanding Wenner-Gren researches and publications of the latter decades would include, for the Maya regions: Norman Hammond's Preclassic Maya discoveries in Belize; W. L. Rathje's analyses of the function of trade and change among the Classic Maya; and David Pendergast's long-term program at Altun Ha. For highland Mexico, G. L. Cowgill's statistical treatments of Teotihuacan data and K. G. Hirth's work at Xochicalco are outstanding. From elsewhere, we should list L. A. Parsons' presentations of Late Preclassic art from Abaj Takalik in Pacific Guatemala, and Barbara Stark's excavations of preceramic complexes in coastal Veracruz. All in all, these Mesoamerican archaeological researches of the last half-century have revealed greater regional complexity and substantially more time depth than had been anticipated back in 1941.

About a dozen Wenner-Gren grants plus publication subsidies have helped pioneer the archaeology of the Intermediate area – or, in more conventional geographic terms, Lower Central America and Pacific coastal and highland Ecuador and Colombia. The "Intermediate" designation derives from the fact that this relatively little archaeologically explored territory lies between the better known archaeological realms of Mesoamerica and Peru-Bolivia. W. C. Bennett's early surveys in Colombia and Ecuador were helped by the Foundation, as were those of B. J. Meggers, Clifford Evans, and Emilio Estrada in Ecuador and G. R. Willey's in Panama. These several investigations revealed a very early (*ca.* 2000 B.C.) – presumably interrelated – ceramic horizon extending throughout the Intermediate area, and relative radiocarbon datings were to demonstrate that these Intermediate area ceramics were earlier than any pottery in either Mesoamerica or Peru-Bolivia. Since then other research leading toward a reliable time-space structure for the Intermediate area has been carried out in several Foundation-supported projects spread through Panama, Colombia, and Ecuador.

I could count only nine Wenner-Gren projects for the Caribbean area (Venezuela, the Guianas, and the West Indies); however, one of these, a 1941 grant to Yale University's Caribbean program, resulted in a number of key publications that laid the groundwork for archaeological chronologies for the area. Going forward from his earlier work in Haiti, Irving Rouse developed a time-space framework for all of the Antilles and linked this to the Venezuelan and Guiana mainlands, where other members of the Yale program (Cornelius Osgood and G. D. Howard) had been carrying out similar tasks. Other important work in the Caribbean area that received Wenner-Gren support includes J. A. Bullbrook's in Trinidad, Mario Sanoja's on Lake Maracaibo, J. M. Cruxent's in Venezuela, and A. C. Roosevelt's Parmana explorations on the Orinoco in Venezuela.

Only a half-dozen research grants can be noted for the combined Amazonian and East Brazilian areas. In Amazonia, systematic work has been carried out with Wenner-

Gren aid in the Territory of Amapá (by C. Evans), on Marajó Island (by B. J. Meggers and Evans), and elsewhere along the course of the Amazon (by A. C. Roosevelt); but, on the whole, Amazonian archaeology must still be considered to be in its early stages. (A recent Wenner-Gren International Symposium, "Amazonian Synthesis," organized by A. C. Roosevelt and held in 1989 in Brazil, was devoted to a reevaluation of the anthropology of Amazonia in light of the new archaeological research on the area.) The characterization as "early stage" applies with even greater strength to the big East Brazilian area, where W. R. Hurt's exploration at the Lagoa Santa caves is the only Wenner-Gren project. Referred to previously in my discussion of Pleistocene man, these Lagoa Santa caves or shelters also yielded up remains pertaining to later time levels.

Returning attention to the western side of the South American continent, we might note that Peruvian archaeology was the context in which the Wenner-Gren Foundation – or Viking Fund – had its field research beginnings. Paul Fejos led an expedition in 1940-41 to discover and describe a large Inca site in the Cordillera Vilcabamba of that country, and in the early 1940s the Foundation gave generously to the University of Cuzco to establish an archaeological program there. The Virú Valley expedition, to the north coast of Peru, in 1946, was also one of the first substantial research fundings of the Wenner-Gren. This was a combined archaeological-geographical-social anthropological study of a single Peruvian coastal valley, which resulted in a series of major monographs and articles, including the first large-scale settlement pattern study in New World archaeology. A 1947 Supper Conference held in New York City, which resulted in the volume of essays, A Reappraisal of Peruvian Archaeology (W. C. Bennett, ed., 1948), was in large part a spin-off from the Virú Valley program. Bennett, who organized the conference and who was already an established leader in the field of Peru-Bolivian archaeology, continued researches in the area after this with Wenner-Gren support, as did another member of the Virú group, W. D. Strong. Even before this, J. H. Rowe had enjoyed Foundation support for his 1943 publication on the highland site of Chanapata, the early, or pre-imperial, Inca city in the south highlands of Peru. Rowe went on from this to his Inca and other studies on the south coast of that country. Maria Reiche's long-term studies of the strange desert markings of the south coast, the so-called "Nazca Lines," were funded by the Wenner-Gren, as were Stig Ryden's surveys in the altiplano territory to the east and south of Tiahuanaco. The Foundation also gave generous support to large projects undertaken by Japanese archaeologists in the Peruvian highlands, at Kotosh in the 1960s (S. Izumi and K. Terada) and in the Cajamarca Valley in 1979 (Terada and Y. Onubi). Wenner-Gren grants made possible J. A. Mason's general textbook on Peruvian archaeology (1957), the publication of two major art books on Peru by Heinrich Ubbelohde-Doering in 1952, and a significant new monograph on Andean archaeology and ecology – this last the result of a 1983 Wenner-Gren symposium (published as Andean Ecology and Civilization, S. Masuda, I. Shimada, and C. Morris, eds., 1985). Other recent researches that have benefited from the Foundation have been Rosa Fung's 1973 monograph on the huge preceramic-to-early ceramic site at Las Aldas, and D. J. Wilson's impressive settlement pattern survey of the Santa Valley (published 1983). I counted a total of about fifty research grants for the Peru-Bolivian area. The publication record from this work has been outstanding.

The remainder of South America has had relatively little Wenner-Gren research or publication investment; however, I think this has been the result of a limited number of

applications from archaeologists interested in these far southern areas rather than lack of interest on the part of the Foundation. Six grants were made for work in the South Andes area (north and central Chile and northwestern Argentina), and in this zone the Argentine archaeologist A. R. Gonzalez has been the outstanding contributor, defining important stratigraphic sequences at several sites in northwestern Argentina and, in effect, being the one to begin chronologically controlled archaeology in that nation. Farther south, in lowland Argentina, only a single publication, one on the archaeology of the Argentine Pampas (G. Howard and G. R. Willey, 1948), received Wenner-Gren funding.

This rapid survey of the Wenner-Gren Foundation's support to New World archaeology over the past half-century has overlooked many of the efforts that the Foundation has encouraged or sponsored and that have been of great importance to the field. Among these are obsidian dating, various metallurgical analyses, investigations into native medicinal plants, and the application of computer science to archaeology. I have barely mentioned others, such as radiocarbon dating, which has been of such great significance to prehistoric archaeology here in the Americas, as elsewhere in the world. Nor have I given attention to areal, topical, methodological, or theoretical themes, except in passing in area summaries or with reference to special conference or symposium volumes made possible through Foundation funding.

Viewed in the large, the Wenner-Gren contribution to Americanist prehistory has been enormous. From its inception in 1941 up until about 1960, the Foundation was by far – certainly in dollars expended and in the numbers of projects financed – the major donor to the New World archaeological field. After that time, United States governmental agencies, such as the National Science Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities, began to provide substantial sums for large-scale archaeological surveys and excavations, so that in total expenditures these probably exceeded, on an annual basis, the dollar amounts of Wenner-Gren grants and subsidies. But even then, Wenner-Gren still offered the greatest number of grants although they were smaller than the Federal awards. And this, I think, has been one of the great strengths of the Foundation. Wenner-Gren was always more willing to reach out and back the lone – and perhaps not well-known or established – investigator, the person with the odd idea that he or she wished to pursue. Often this was the kind of idea that the big funding agencies might have been less willing to support. True, many such ideas come to naught; but every now and then, one such idea opens up new and exciting vistas. There are advantages to both the small project and the large one. Both are needed – certainly, both are needed in New World archaeology – and it is a choice to be made. This and other choices will confront the Wenner-Gren Foundation as it looks toward what we hope will be its second highly successful half-century.

Gordon R. Willey is the Bowditch Professor Emeritus of Mexican and Central American Archaeology at Harvard University.