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ABSTRACT

This study is a history of New Deal archaeology in the Southeastern United States from the Civil Works Administration (CWA) and the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) archaeological projects in the winter of 1933-1934 to the end of federal relief archaeology in 1942. The federal government selected archaeology as one of its relief programs to put to work some of the many unemployed Americans during the depression of the 1930s. This study focuses on the large Works Progress Administration (WPA) archaeological programs in Louisiana and Kentucky, the combined WPA and TVA programs in Alabama and Tennessee, and the WPA and National Park Service (NPS) program in Georgia. The CWA archaeological program in Florida and the National Park Service Natchez Trace Parkway project are briefly discussed. The WPA administration of its archaeological program lacked the strong national direction found in the other professional, white-collar programs such as the WPA art, writers, music, and theater projects. The WPA turned to the Smithsonian Institution...
and the Committee on Basic Needs in American Archaeology of the National Research Council for technical advice.

The role of federal archaeology in transforming archaeologist's knowledge of the prehistory of Alabama, Tennessee, Georgia, Kentucky, and Louisiana is analyzed. In addition to the state archaeological programs, archaeologists developed a broad regional interest in the prehistory of the Southeast. Young federal archaeologists organized the Southeastern Archaeological Conference and the Lower Mississippi Valley Survey to supplement and integrate the data produced by the state programs. After World War II the federal archaeologists became the senior generation of American archaeologists and greatly influenced the growth of their profession. They played a major role in the development of cultural resources management in the post-war period.
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Many Americans retain unpleasant memories of the depression even after more than fifty years since its beginning. Looking back on the 1930s they recall unemployment, hunger, and despair. Archaeologists, however, remember the 1930s as the golden age of their discipline. Some of the New Deal programs established to provide work relief to millions of unemployed Americans included huge archaeological projects. The experience of many young men and some young women in the 1930s supervising large archaeological crews for the Civil Works Administration (CWA), Works Progress Administration (WPA), Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), National Parks Service (NPS), and Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) decisively influenced their professional careers in archaeology and the development of the discipline. One prominent archaeologist who worked for the CWA, WPA, and TVA used to advise students to vote Republican to cause another depression and bring about another relief archaeological program.

The scope and impact of the federal government on
archaeology exceeded the wildest dreams of archaeologists of the 1920s. As Frank Setzler, then of the Smithsonian Institution, who perhaps knew New Deal archaeology better than anyone, put it in 1943, "one can safely assume that if a goal had been established in 1930, under the prevailing conditions at the time, for archaeological explorations within the subsequent 50 years, that this goal has been reached and in some areas surpassed during the last 6 or 7 years."1

The WPA organized large archaeological projects in many states throughout the nation, but those in the Southeast were the most significant. Contemporary archaeologists still recognize the Southeast as a distinguishable archaeological area. Archaeologists continue to gather each year at the meetings of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference which was created by New Deal archaeologists in the 1930s. My focus is on the five Southeastern states with major WPA archaeological programs: Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, and Louisiana. The CWA projects in Florida will be discussed as will the Natchez Trace Parkway project in Mississippi, but the WPA programs in these five states produced the most important contribution of the New Deal period to North American archaeology and will be the center of this history. James B. Griffin, closely
involved with federal archaeology in the 1930s but not employed by any federal agency, concluded that the best known publications from federal archaeology in this period were from the eight states of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, New Jersey, Tennessee, and Texas. Six of these states are in the Southeast and will be discussed in later chapters.

Evaluations of the archaeology of the New Deal period vary from favorable to very critical. Most archaeologists view New Deal archaeology as acceptable scientific archaeology given the constraints of the depression and the difficulties of working for federal agencies. However, a small number of archaeologists criticize it as unsatisfactory work which should never have been attempted.

Despite criticisms of the archaeology of the 1930s it led to many accomplishments. In 1976 Griffin summarized what he considered to be the fourteen major achievements of relief archaeology. The work greatly increased the number of known archaeological sites in the Eastern United States and changed the ideas of archaeologists about prehistoric Indian population density and distribution. It "provided many examples of cultural succession particularly in the Southeast, forcing an emphasis on the considerable time depth represented at
those sites." Archaeologists found many preceramic sites which provided a great contrast with sites occupied by Indians using pottery. Archaeologists became aware of regional development sequences which came to be called "traditions." Certain artifact and pottery types found over large areas of the Southeast were recognized as "horizon markers." Archaeologists discovered the Southeastern ceremonial complex. They traced interareal trade. Based on the data unearthed by the relief archaeologists, New Deal archaeologists James Ford, Gordon Willey, and William Haag published broad regional comparative studies. Griffin himself published in 1952 his massive study of the Archaeology of Eastern United States with chapters by many New Deal archaeologists based largely on their excavations in the 1930s. Many archaeologists who became the senior members of the archaeological profession after World War II gained field and laboratory experience on the federal archaeological projects. The relief programs led to the development of academic programs in archaeology at many colleges and universities. The relief work of the 1930s stimulated the development of the Smithsonian River Basin Salvage program and many other archaeological salvage projects after World War II. Data developed in the 1930s was used later in many published and unpublished...
archaeological studies. Archaeologist's understanding of the prehistory of the Eastern United States changed from a "timeless culture area approach" to a "chronological-developmental strategy." And last, they "built up a body of data which the 'Young Turks' of the last ten years could claim was not collected or analysed with techniques developed in the last ten years.\(^2\)

Southeastern archaeology in the 1930s was mainly prehistoric archaeology. Archaeologists were mainly interested in the study of the American Indian. There was some concern with historical archaeology which focused at that time on the interaction between Indians and early Europeans in America. While the archaeological study of the American Indian has a long history in the United States, historical archaeology developed in more recent times. During the 1930s some archaeologists excavated historical sites, most notably at Jamestown, but also in Cherokee areas in Tennessee, Ocmulgee in Georgia, and in Louisiana. However the WPA, TVA, and NPS archaeologists discussed in this study were mainly concerned with the prehistory of the American Indian.

The reader will look in vain in this study for the interaction between archaeology in the depression and its relationship with the intellectual and cultural
history of the 1930s. Historians have traced the emerging historical, regional, and ethnic consciousness in the 1930s, but such developments had little impact on New Deal archaeology. As the historian and philosopher of science Thomas Kuhn has written, historians of science, when they rarely turn to the study of scientific theories, "... seem invariably to give excessive emphasis to the role of the surrounding climate of extrascientific ideas." He warns against this approach to the history of science because "except in the rudimentary stages of the development of a field, the ambient intellectual milieu reacts on the theoretical structure of a science only to the extent that it can be made relevant to the concrete technical problems with which the practitioners of that field engage." Archaeology in the United States, other than classical archaeology, is part of the larger field of anthropology. While a relatively autonomous division of anthropology, it is this discipline which has been the primary influence on the development of professional archaeology from the 1930s to the present. While major currents of anthropological thought such as evolutionism, functionalism, and historical anthropology had some role in the development of archaeological thought in the 1930s, there is no evidence that currents of American thought, such as
Marxism, had any impact on the professional thinking of archaeologists. There is no attempt in this study to investigate amateur archaeology or the role of archaeology in the popular culture of the 1930s. This would be an interesting project based on newspapers and popular magazines and would add to the developing understanding of America's concern with its past. This study, however, focuses on New Deal archaeology as an episode in the history of science not cultural history.

This history of New Deal archaeology is based on the written record generated by professional archaeologists and federal administrators during the 1930s. Only a small amount of oral history was part of the research. One reason for this is that many of the principal senior figures died before the beginning of the research and others during it. Another reason is that too much emphasis could easily be placed on relying on the human memory for events that took place as many as fifty years ago. Over the years inaccuracies have multiplied in the oral testimony of New Deal archaeologists. The stories of the archaeologists are certainly entertaining, and some are true, but the preference of historians for the written record can lead to a more accurate history. The primary source has been the correspondence and reports of the archaeologists and federal program.
managers. The letters of the archaeologists who worked in the Southeastern states were a most valuable resource. This was supplemented by the correspondence of Smithsonian Institution, National Research Council, and WPA, TVA, and NPS administrators and archaeologists. The reports revealed the archaeologist's growing understanding of Southeastern prehistory throughout the 1930s and early 1940s.

New Deal archaeology continued to be important to the discipline of archaeology after World War II. It provided the foundation for the development of cultural resources management after World War II. This study of the origins of federal archaeology should be particularly timely today as cultural resources management adapts to a changing federal government.


Archaeology in the United States has a long history dating back to the excavation of Thomas Jefferson in 1784. But until the dramatic increase in federal support for archaeology beginning in 1933, archaeological projects were small excavations conducted in relatively short periods of time by few men. During the 1920s American archaeology became increasingly professionalized. This professionalization of archaeology can be seen in the increasing separation between amateur and professional archaeologists. Many of the students of American archaeology had always been amateurs, and even some of the professional archaeologists had limited training in scientific procedures, but the amateur problem grew rapidly during the 1920s. According to Carl Guthe, "that rapidly spreading conflagration which we professionals disdainfully labeled 'amateur archaeology' was getting out of hand." Individual pot hunters continued to be a problem, but many organizations were also interested in archaeology; sports groups, automobile touring clubs, chambers of commerce, women's and men's clubs, historical
societies, Boy Scouts, nature groups, and other associations. Some archaeologists believed that the economic hardships of the depression caused many amateurs to become commercial dealers who began to sell their collections. But other amateurs even before the depression were busy manufacturing fake artifacts. Neil Judd, an archaeologist at the Smithsonian Institution, observed in 1929 that "the widespread demand for curios and the ambitions of a few collectors of special forms have brought about the fabrication and sale, in ever increasing numbers, of spurious antiquities." Most of the fake artifacts came at that time from Kentucky, Tennessee, and Alabama.

Professional archaeologists fought the amateurs and attempted to control their activities. The members of the Committee on State Archaeological Surveys examined every action of the committee because some archaeologists feared encouraging amateurs. The committee considered publishing an atlas of archaeological sites, but opposition developed anticipating it would be a "guide book for amateurs and vandals." Despite vigorous efforts the professionals could not defeat amateurs fascinated with archaeology. As Neil Judd realized in 1929, "public interest in archaeology is deep and firmly rooted. No other subject surpasses archaeology in
popular appeal; none so quickly awakens the lay imagination." The few professionals trained by the seven universities that granted a doctorate in anthropology in the early 1930s—California, Chicago, Columbia, Harvard, Pennsylvania, Southern California—simply could not cope with the huge number of amateurs.7

Some archaeologists attempted to educate the general public about the nature of archaeological research through lectures and writing for popular publications. Archaeologists even participated in the brief effort of Science Service to support archaeologists trying to get to discoveries in the field early enough to recover the scientific data and accurately report on the discovery through the press. The National Research Council established a Committee on Accurate Publicity for Anthropology consisting of Roland B. Dixon, Harvard University, Alfred Kroeber, University of California, Leslie Spier, University of Washington, and Neil Judd of the Smithsonian Institution. The committee asked archaeologists and anthropologists in many states to be ready to visit sites on short notice. Both William D. Funkhouser and William S. Webb, who surveyed the state of Kentucky and conducted extensive excavations there in the 1920s and 1930s, were "Scientific Minutemen" in anthropology and archaeology while Henry B. Collins,
Neil Judd, Matthew W. Stirling, and Alexander Wetmore represented the Smithsonian Institution. Much of Southeastern archaeology of the 1920s was supported by non-Southeastern institutions such as the Smithsonian Institution, Peabody Museum, Phillips Academy, The American Museum of Natural History, and the Heye Foundation. The Smithsonian Institution provided the only federal funds for archaeology in the Southeast but its resources were very limited. Archaeologists at the Smithsonian recognized the importance of excavating sites threatened with destruction and supported some salvage archaeology during the 1920s. The Bureau of American Ethnology gave Gerald Fowke a small amount of money to salvage sites to be flooded by Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals. He excavated a kitchen midden and sand mound at Town Creek. William E. Myer with help from the Bureau of American Ethnology surveyed Tennessee for archaeological sites. The prehistory of Louisiana was largely unknown before the WPA excavations of the 1930s. Winslow Walker had excavated the Troyville Mounds, but little scientific archaeology had been attempted in the state.

Support for archaeology from Southern institutions was very limited in the 1920s and early 1930s. The University of Kentucky began a relatively large archae-
ological program for that time. William S. Webb, of the University of Kentucky began to study archaeology as an amateur and continued his work through the 1930s and 1940s and into the post war period. Webb was a professor of physics at the University. His interest in archaeology and Indians started with his service as secretary to the officer in charge of the Indian Territory that would become Oklahoma. He learned the Seminole language and began to study the history and ethnology of the North American Indian. In partnership with William D. Funkhouser, he would revolutionize the study of Kentucky prehistory. According to Douglas Schwartz in his history of Kentucky archaeology, 'all their work was based on a conception of the state's past which had taken more than two hundred years to evolve, and which they were to change completely in fewer than twenty.'

In 1927 the University of Kentucky created the Department of Anthropology and Archaeology with Webb as chairman in order to be able to receive a truck from the National Research Council (NRC). The first major archaeological publication of the team of Webb and Funkhouser was their Ancient Life in Kentucky published in 1928. They discussed the major archaeological cultures of Kentucky: Fort Ancient, Hopewell, Stone Grave,
Iroquois, Algonquin, Pre-Cherokee, and Western River. That pioneering study of the prehistory of a Southeastern state did not lead to a synthetic interpretation of Kentucky prehistory because of the great amount of data available to Webb and Funkhouser. They were overwhelmed to the extent that they never again attempted a synthesis. For in this first effort they saw enough gaps in the knowledge of the state's past to suggest that they should dedicate the next two decades to the collection of data.

The early archaeological work of Webb and Funkhouser was not based on any formal training in anthropology or archaeology. Schwartz characterized their early field techniques as "abominable." And even after the first season of Webb's work supervising the archaeological program of the Tennessee Valley Authority in 1934, Webb "was not a broadly experienced field archaeologist and had a great deal to learn." Despite this lack of experience his training as a scientist made him aware of the importance of detailed description and recording of data.

This emphasis on careful description and the importance of scientific publication led Webb and Funkhouser to publish numerous detailed studies on their field work from 1929 to 1933 including the Williams site,
the Page site, the Tolu site, and the Duncan site. In 1932 they published an archaeological survey of Kentucky listing more than one thousand sites. The survey had been completed by mailing requests for information about archaeological sites to individuals in the counties of Kentucky, but this approach was not totally accurate or complete. During the summer of 1931, Webb continued his archaeological survey of Kentucky by having his field crew travel three thousand miles and visit sixty-eight county seats to extend his knowledge of the archaeology of the state. So by the time Webb became involved in federal archaeology in 1933 he had a good knowledge of the archaeology of Kentucky which led him to select sites to excavate with significant potential for improving the knowledge of Kentucky prehistory.

This accumulation of knowledge about Kentucky prehistory was, unfortunately, not paralleled in other Southeastern states. Florida was not well known for its archaeology. In Florida in 1923-1924 the Smithsonian Institution supported an excavation at Tampa Bay by Matthew W. Stirling under the direction of Jesse W. Fewkes. This was the first professional archaeology in the state of Florida. Fewkes defined the type site for the Weeden Island culture as a result of this excavation.
This excavation began the long interest of Smithsonian archaeologists in Florida prehistory.25

In Alabama, the Alabama Anthropological Society had worked on a survey of the state to locate all archaeological sites.26 However, this organization of amateurs could not accurately survey the state because they lacked resources and trained archaeologists. The Alabama Museum of Natural History under the supervision of Walter B. Jones began an archaeological survey of the state on July 1, 1931. In order to avoid listing rumors of sites, they recorded only sites visited by the staff. Jones was a geologist with no formal training in anthropology and archaeology and his survey was not complete.27

The development of Southeastern archaeology before 1934 was influenced not only by excavations and surveys in the Southeastern states but by the archaeological program of the National Research Council (NRC). The NRC had organized the Division of Anthropology and Psychology in 1919. Among its early activities, the new Division proposed an archaeological survey of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, and Missouri, which had already resulted in increased interest in archaeology in Illinois and Indiana by the end of 1920.28 This concentration on state archaeological surveys led some archae-
ologists to fear that "emphasis upon state surveys may lead to 'States-rights' propaganda, restrictive legislation, and the exclusion of outside institutions which might wish to carry on scientific investigations." But emphasis on the archaeology of the state rather than the region or nation was not the creation of the NRC. Many amateur and professional archaeologists focused their attention on state prehistory before the creation of the Committee on State Archaeological Surveys. Even today archaeologists retain some elements of a state orientation as shown by the recent publication of books on the archaeology of Alabama and Florida.

The Division of Anthropology and Psychology created a subdivision to deal with archaeology, the Committee on State Archaeological Surveys. Even this committee found it difficult to develop government interest in Southeastern archaeology. Alfred V. Kidder felt that the reason for this lack of federal interest in the Southeast was that the archaeological sites in the Southeast were small and inconspicuous and that "contact with the Indians took place so long ago that historical interest in Indians and their remains is less than in the West."}

Beginning in the 1920s the National Research Council
sponsored three conferences designed to establish communication between archaeologists. The first on Mid-Western archaeology met in St. Louis from May 17th to May 18th, 1929. The Committee on State Archaeological Surveys had called for a conference on archaeological problems at a meeting on March 16, 1932. Both Guthe and Warren K. Moorehead suggested plans for a conference, but Guthe organized the meeting. To the organizers of the conference, it was important to avoid offending the feelings of archaeologists in the South. As Neil Judd reminded Guthe, "as you well know, the South is most conservative and sectional in its attitude; in general it resents northern advice and aid however altruistic." Many of the senior generation of archaeologists with an interest in the prehistory of the South attended this conference which was supported by a $2000 grant from the National Research Council.

The second NRC conference met in Birmingham in December of 1932 and focused on Southeastern prehistory. James Griffin characterized the work of this meeting as "essentially a Culture area approach, rather vague characterizations of an area, or of a single site, the identification of a few complexes as being the remains of historic sites, an emphasis on the direct historic approach by Stirling and Collins and the recognition by
Collins of the importance of developing a chronology.\textsuperscript{34}

The third conference met in Indianapolis in December, 1935.\textsuperscript{35} This meeting focused on the north central United States and was the smallest of the three conferences. These meetings allowed a useful exchange of information among many archaeologists who would play major roles in federal archaeology in the depression. Among the participants attending at least one of the conferences were: Fay-Cooper Cole, Henry B. Collins, Jr., Matthew W. Stirling, William C. McKern, William S. Webb, Carl E. Guthe, Walter B. Jones, Frank M. Setzler, John R. Swanton, and Winslow M. Walker.\textsuperscript{36}

In 1927, the NRC organized the Ceramic Repository for the Eastern United States at the Museum of Anthropology of the University of Michigan. Carl Guthe, the director of the Ceramic Repository, felt that developing an understanding of the culture history of the Eastern United States required a comparative knowledge of the distribution of artifacts. The purpose of the Ceramic Repository was to develop a library of pottery sherds and serve as a clearing house on the study of pottery in archaeology. The Repository concentrated on pottery rather than other specimens because of the nature of pottery. Even if broken the sherds can still provide much information from surface finish, techniques
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of decoration, and form. Guthe emphasized that the specimens submitted to the Ceramic Repository must be properly identified by specific location and association with surrounding features. He recommended "a strong discouragement of the efforts of individuals inadequately equipped to pursue such investigations." In much of the archaeology of the 1920s the emphasis was on beautiful objects for display in a museum. Guthe stressed that this was not the purpose of the Ceramic Repository. He urged that archaeologists send ordinary sherds that they might otherwise discard, not just the interesting or important pieces.

An important attempt to provide the basis for a new understanding of North American prehistory developed from the efforts of the National Research Council. A group of archaeologists at the 1932 conference sponsored by the NRC sketched the essentials of the Midwestern Taxonomic Method—also called the McKern classification because of William McKern's role in the development of this classification—and later revised it in 1935 at the NRC conference. The reason for the development and great influence of the Midwestern Taxonomic Method was the lack of sites in the Eastern United States deep enough to show stratigraphy. In addition, archaeologists wanted to be able to study the
large number of collections of artifacts in museums and in the hands of collectors that had been excavated at a time when little information was recorded about the specimens. The Midwestern Taxonomic System was able to use these specimens by focusing not on time or space, but on the characteristics of the artifacts, or typology. The lowest level of this classification was the component which was generally an entire site, or more rarely, a level of a site. Components that were very similar were placed in a focus. Other, higher level classifications were the aspect and the phase. The next classification was the pattern, which was very broad, for example, the Woodland pattern and the Mississippian pattern. Even more general than the pattern was the base, which distinguished between cultures that practiced horticulture and had pottery and those without these traits. Once this classification had developed, a basic understanding of prehistoric spatial and temporal dimensions could then be included. Despite the great influence of this system, not all archaeologists were happy with it, particularly those in the Southeast where the relief archaeologists of the 1930s were beginning to find deep sites with more clear stratigraphy and where the great emphasis on the construction of culture histories did not lend itself to this system. Gordon Willey, who was deeply involved in
the archaeology of the 1930s, later said that the settlement of this argument might have been anticipated: "as more became known about Eastern archaeology, especially from the standpoint of chronology, the debate over the merits and limitations of the Midwestern method began to recede. Gradually, taxonomic categories were given chronological dimension."^39

Observing American archaeology from his position at the Smithsonian Institution, Neil Judd described the state of the discipline in 1928. "Lacking Federal recognition as (being) of national concern," Judd wrote, "archaeology in the United States has been, and is still being, exploited by selfish or misinformed persons; it is being fettered by local emotions and further handicapped by obsolete conceptions as to the fundamental purpose of original field investigations."^40 At the end of the 1920s archaeology was still plagued with amateurs: "Witness the number of ancient sites mutilated each year by those not trained carefully to observe or to interpret their observations; witness the prevailing custom of designating as an 'archaeologist' any collector of curios, every dabbled in prehistory."^41 Archaeology was not yet a respectable discipline. "It does not command sufficient respect; it is too generally regarded as a mere game, an avocation, at which all may play with equal
promise of success." Judd was concerned that the historic Indians of the Colonial period were being ignored. He recognized that most American archaeologists would like to trace a tribe from its living culture in the present through its historic and prehistoric phases to its origin, but due to lack of information gathered by ethnologists about living Indians this was extremely difficult. Judd pointed out to his fellow archaeologists that "within a few hours' motor ride from Washington are village sites, occupied at known periods by Indian groups whose identity may be learned from early histories and books of travel." But trained archaeologists had studied few of these sites.

Frank Setzler's view of Southeastern archaeology before the New Deal was similar to Judd's. He believed that "the limited number of excavations in the southeast prior to 1930 gave us only a jumbled picture of certain exceptional sites which had produced unusual specimens. Nothing more than a guess gave us any indication of the relative chronology." Setzler would have a major role in the federal effort in the 1930s to correct this situation.

The general interpretation of Southeastern prehistory had changed from a nineteenth century concern with the mound builders. Archaeologists were beginning to
be interested in the possibility that Indians had lived in the New World for a very long time. In Florida artifacts had been found in association with Pleistocene mammals, and other evidence of the antiquity of man in the New World was beginning to be found in Texas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico. Judd predicted that the problem of early man in the New World would be an important problem in the 1930s.\(^4\) Archaeologists knew by the end of the 1920s that the numerous mounds found in the Eastern United States had been constructed by Indians. Setzler concluded that "the so-called Mound Builders were not a superior race, related to the Lost Tribes of Israel or to the mythical Atlanteans; neither were they a race of giants, later dispossessed by more aggressive tribes."\(^4\)

Archaeology became more professionalized during the 1920s, but institutional and economic constraints prevented a transformation of the discipline. Judd argued that archaeologists did not understand the prehistory of any area of the United States. Only the general outlines were known. "We have, he said, "prepared a general map but without topographic detail."\(^4\) The detail and a new framework for the interpretation of North American prehistory could come from the federally-sponsored archaeology of the 1930s and early 1940s.
Just as the crisis of the depression of the 1930s created the conditions which allowed the development of Big Government and Big Labor, the relief agencies of the New Deal provided the money, labor, and experience which transformed amateur archaeology into Big Archaeology.
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CHAPTER III: CWA ARCHAEOLOGY

The Great Depression, beginning in 1929 and continuing until the beginning of American participation in World War II in 1941, had a great impact on the history of archaeology in the United States. In order to cope with massive unemployment, the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt organized a number of relief agencies to deal with the economic disaster. Roosevelt created the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA) in 1933 as a first attempt to put the unemployed to work.

Archaeological work under the auspices of FERA showed skeptical archaeologists that large-scale archaeology was possible with the support of the federal government. Average archaeological expeditions prior to 1930 consisted of from ten to fifteen laborers working for three to four months and costing about $2500. After World War II the size of archaeological field projects would shrink again. "Nowadays we tell our students," wrote Gordon Willey in 1980, "that one archaeologist can effectively supervise up to twelve workmen. With a ratio of any more diggers than that a proper record cannot be
kept."² But these numbers would be greatly exceeded as the FERA established a major archaeological project at a site at Marksville, Louisiana. After the city of Marksville acquired the land containing the site, the city council and the local FERA requested that the Smithsonian Institution send a representative to supervise the work of excavation and restoration of the site. Frank M. Setzler, Assistant Curator of Archaeology at the United States National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution, arrived in late August of 1933 and remained until November, 1933. His assistant, James A. Ford, aided in the excavation while Setzler was at the site and took charge for the month of November after Setzler left. It was a new experience for both men to supervise a crew of over one-hundred men supplied by the FERA in the excavation of three mounds, a village, and an embankment which partly enclosed the site.

The scientific outcome of this work was a new awareness that the Hopewell culture extended into the Southeast. Hopewell is a Woodland culture centering in the Ohio Valley characterized by huge burial mounds and earthworks ranging from ten to hundreds of acres.³ Even Setzler at first resisted the idea that a variant of the Hopewell existed in the Southeast, but he finally admitted that "the data obtained give definite proof that
the prehistoric Indians who lived and built the mounds on this site were closely allied in their culture-phase to those known as the Hopewell in the northern Mississippi Valley.  

The FERA program was a necessary first step in federal relief efforts, but it was not enough to overcome the fears about the terrible impact of the winter of 1933-1934 on jobless Americans. In November the President created the Civil Works Administration (CWA) to get the country through the winter. Federal relief officials, familiar with the confusion caused by state administration of the FERA, concluded that a federally operated program would be necessary. As a result the CWA differed from the FERA in that it was a federal program, not merely a device to make grants.  

The Marksville project was important in the development of federal archaeology because Setzler gained experience in how to use relief labor on large-scale archaeological projects. By the time the Civil Works Administration was set up in November, the FERA's previous experience at Marksville had convinced the Smithsonian officials that under proper supervision, and with a sufficient number of trained men, worthwhile scientific results on a large scale could be obtained.  

Setzler passed on this information to the relief
bureaucracy when on his return to Washington he became the assistant to Alexander Wetmore, the Smithsonian's liaison officer with the CWA in the direction of archaeological projects in the Southeast and California. When a CWA official asked Setzler to organize an archaeological program, M. W. Stirling, William Duncan Strong, and Setzler submitted one to the CWA, which approved it on December 7, 1933, and the work began within two weeks.\(^7\)

The CWA archaeological projects, sponsored by the Smithsonian Institution, were federal rather than state projects. This gave the Smithsonian a higher degree of coordination and control than would be the case with later WPA archaeological projects. Despite this centralized control there was still a great amount of confusion about how long the CWA program would last. This did not help the efficiency of the work or the morale of the workers. Setzler believed that the CWA would last longer than February 15th, but he could not be sure due to lack of official notification.\(^8\) The Congress, fearing that the CWA would use relief funds for purposes not approved by Congress, in the Act of February 15, 1934, prohibited the creation of any new federal projects.\(^9\) The CWA finally ended on March 31, 1934. The federal relief effort then shifted back to the FERA which had continued to exist in low profile during the CWA period.
The Smithsonian Institution established CWA projects in states with mild climates and large numbers of unemployed workers—Georgia, Florida, North Carolina, Tennessee, and California—using the labor of approximately 1500 workers. In addition, the archaeological program of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) used CWA labor. The TVA program gave employment to over 1000 workers. Guthe, in evaluating the CWA archaeological program, concluded that "the spring months of 1934 will stand in history as a period of greatest field activity in eastern United States archeology."\(^{10}\)

The Smithsonian organized one of its archaeological projects at Macon, Georgia, to study two major groups of mounds: the Lamar group and the Macon group. The Macon group consisted of four major mounds and other smaller ones: the Great Temple Mound (Mound A) with dimensions of 300 by 270 feet and 40 feet high, the Lesser Temple Mound (Mound B) measuring 100 feet on each side, the Funeral Mound (Mound C) measuring 230 feet east-west, 100 feet north-south and 25 feet high, and the Cornfield Mound (Mound D) a round mound 150 feet in diameter and 8 feet high. The Lamar group included two large mounds and a village.\(^{11}\) Local interest in the preservation of sites in the vicinity of Macon developed as early as 1922, but only with M. W. Stirling's visit...
in 1929 in response to a local inquiry did organizational work begin. Dr. C. C. Harrold suggested the organization of a Macon historical society, but, despite plans of the Smithsonian Institution to work in the area, little was accomplished. In November, 1933, Dr. Harrold, General Walter A. Harris, and Linton M. Solomon asked the Macon Junior Chamber of Commerce to purchase the mounds to preserve them, and in December it bought Mound A and the Lamar Mounds.

The purchase of the site coincided with the beginning of the CWA which approved a project for building a road to the site and improving and clearing the land. The Smithsonian, alarmed at the prospect of amateurs digging an important site, suggested cooperation. Stirling proposed a generous division of the artifacts with the Macon group which they could use as a nucleus for the museum they were organizing. The local interests agreed to this plan and the Smithsonian then took over full direction of the CWA archaeological project in Macon.

The Society for Georgia Archaeology cooperated with the Smithsonian in getting the project under way. Despite this good beginning, differences between the Smithsonian and the local amateurs organized into the Society for Georgia Archaeology continued through the
life of the project. The Smithsonian archaeologists were willing to consult with Harrold, President of the Society, and to cooperate with the Society, but required full authority over the project. The Smithsonian's first priority was to contribute to the archaeological knowledge of the area. They also desired proper protection of the artifacts recovered and at least a type collection for their own museum. The Society, on the other hand, intended to use the Macon CWA project for its own purposes: to establish a state museum at Macon.

The Smithsonian named Arthur R. Kelly as supervisor of the project beginning his lifelong interest in Georgia archaeology. Kelly had earned his Ph.D. in anthropology from Harvard University in 1929 with emphasis on physical anthropology rather than archaeology. After leaving the University of Illinois where he had been an assistant professor, he researched the anthropometry—measurements of the human body—of the Alibamu Indians in East Texas. James Ford, who had been Setzler's assistant at Marksville, took the job as Kelly's assistant and developed a good working relationship with him. "I like Kelly fine," Ford wrote to his friend and mentor Henry Collins, "he seems to have substantial ideas on the subject of archeology and not to be too much perverted by his Harvard training."
Kelly's task was not to be an easy one. By the end of the fourth week his crew numbered 157 men and by the middle of January totaled 243.\textsuperscript{19} Kelly at first feared his job would be in impossible one. "I must confess," he wrote to Wetmore, "that I was appalled in the beginning at the thought of trying to use so many people in doing a careful scientific job of archaeology in an important site."\textsuperscript{20} But to everyone's surprise they had no problems controlling the large crew of inexperienced workers.

Despite the initial problems, the project soon unearthed interesting archaeological data. Kelly and Ford found the site much larger and more complicated than they had anticipated. They discovered that "the pyramidal mounds on the heights above the Ocmulgee river plain seem to be enclosed by a rempart which may extend for a mile or more. In addition, there are terraces on the face of the escarpment." The village area encompassed small mounds that Kelly thought might be the remains of houses or burial areas. "Connecting with these are small square and oblong enclosures, whose purpose can as yet only be guessed at."\textsuperscript{21}

Kelly's method of operation at this large site took advantage of the skills of Ford. Kelly ran the work at Ocmulgee while Ford supervised an independent field crew.
at the Lamar site in a swamp three miles away. Kelly praised Ford's field techniques, commenting that, "his technique in exploring house sites is one of the finest examples of workmanship I have seen." The high standards of the work under difficult conditions gained support for the project by federal archaeologists.

Setzler of the Smithsonian was convinced that the site was of great importance and felt that of all of the Smithsonian CWA projects the Georgia work should be continued. Kelly also believed that additional work was needed at Macon. He planned a survey of sites within fifteen miles of Ocmulgee. By the end of January he had finished excavation of only a part of Mound C at Macon, and Mound D had not even been started. Kelly wanted to continue Ford's work at Lamar and argued that comparative work at numerous sites near Macon should be attempted.

Despite the efforts to have the project continued after February 15, 1934, the project was not approved and an effort was made to continue under state CWA auspices. The Georgia state CWA approved the project under the control of the Society for Georgia Archaeology with the city of Macon as sponsor. Kelly continued the project under the state CWA for approximately three months until it came again under FERA administration.

Due to the personal interest of Gay Shepperson, state
relief administrator, Kelly retained his trained work force of 100 laborers and 30 supervisors under FERA.26

The work of Kelly at Macon under the CWA and FERA eventually culminated in the creation of a national monument at the site. The interest in Macon as a prehistoric and historic site coincided with the increasing concern with historic preservation in the National Park Service (NPS). While a number of private interests pressured the federal government to develop a systematic program for historic preservation, the increasing number of historians in the NPS under the direction of Verne E. Chatelain, Chief of the Historical Division, worked to comprehensively evaluate historical sites with potential for federal development. But the work of the historians was less important than the role of members of Congress who could introduce legislation to establish national monuments. "The acquisition of new properties had become a question of effective lobbying by influential people in different sections of the country."27 As early as January, 1934, the NPS was preparing a report on the significance of the site at the request of Chatelain.28 In February of 1934 Representative Carl Vinson introduced a bill to establish Ocmulgee National Park.29 The bill passed with the name changed to Ocmulgee National Monument at the suggestion of the Department of
Interior. By June the NPS was attempting to gain necessary information about the area by communicating with Kelly. 30

The Ocmulgee site was too big a job to complete in limited time even with large numbers of workers. Only one of the mounds at Lamar was partially excavated and it showed a change in pottery types in the levels of the mound. At Macon Kelly directed excavation of all the major mounds. He approached Mound A by sinking a shaft from the top of the mound which was 45 feet high to the middle of the mound and cut a section into one side of Mound B. Mound C was the most carefully studied. Kelly found many burials and at least five construction levels in the mound. Excavation of Mound D revealed a circular council house, rectangular structures, and a cornfield. Surprisingly, the archaeologists found the corn planted in rows rather than the hills that they expected from their knowledge of other Indian cultures. 31

Stirling managed the general operation of all of the Florida CWA projects from the Smithsonian. Marshall Newman supervised the project at Perico Island in Manatee County near Bradenton. The site consisted of three shell mounds, the largest being 900 by 120 feet in size. Newman made a cross section of the smaller mound, and excavated the burial mound completely and part of a small
burial area. The burial mound contained 185 flexed burials. The artifacts in the smaller mound were mainly sand-tempered pottery and animal bones. The circular burial area contained 43 skeletons. The occupants of this site did not place any burial goods with their burials. Newman also directed the excavation of the Englewood Mound in Sarasota County which was a sand mound 110 feet in diameter and 13 feet high. The pottery was similar to that at Safety Harbor, and Stirling described it as being untempered muck and clay with incised and stamped decorations.

D. L. Reichard supervised the excavation of four mounds on the Little Manatee River in Manatee County. Mound 1 was small and constructed of sand. He found 27 burials in very poor condition. Pottery was of the Safety Harbor type of muck and sand-tempered ware. The abundant amounts of European artifacts included thousands of glass beads which convinced Stirling that the mound was constructed in the late historic period in the middle of the seventeenth century. Mound 2 was circular and measured 65 feet along a north-south line, 65 feet along an east-west line, and 6 feet high. Excavation of the mound revealed the remains of a mortuary temple containing over thirty burials, most of them cremated. European artifacts show the mound to be of the post-contact period.
Mound 3 was circular with a diameter of 68 feet and 7 feet high. The CWA crew discovered 212 burials, almost all secondary bundle burials. Pottery resembled the Weeden Island type. European artifacts showed the mound to be of the very early Spanish period. Mound 4 was 80 feet in diameter and 7 feet high. At least 89 burials were discovered. Stirling felt that the mound, with no European artifacts found, was the earliest of the four and possibly was constructed late in the fifteenth century.33

Gene M. Stirling managed the excavation of the Belle Glade site in Palm Beach County which consisted of a refuse mound and a burial mound. The careful excavation of the site enabled Stirling, from the bones he found, to determine the subsistence pattern. He concluded that "these remains indicate a diet of deer, alligators, turtles, raccoons, opossums, turkeys, water-fowl, fish, and shellfish, including many marine forms."34 Excavation of the burial mound showed six periods of use of the mound; three as a living site and three for burial. But finding little evidence of cultural change, Stirling concluded that the culture at the site was probably static. He felt that the site would be very important to understanding the culture history of Florida, arguing that "here, for the first time in Florida, there is a repre-
sentative collection of habitation shellmound artifacts, burial furniture, and skeletal material all from one site. 35

Marshall Newman directed the excavation of the Perico Island Site in Manatee County. The site consisted of three shell mounds, the largest being 900 feet by 120 feet wide. He discovered in a burial area 43 skeletons almost as hard as rock from the action of salt water. 36 Jesse D. Jennings managed the excavation at Ormond Beach in Volusia County. The Ormond Mound was a small sand mound sixty feet in diameter and six feet high built on an area of village site refuse. The layer between the village and the mound indicated that the village had been abandoned for a considerable time before the construction of the mound. Jennings found numerous burials in the mound. Stirling thought that it was possible that the occupants of the site had been one of the Timucua tribes, perhaps the Mayaca. 37

George Woodbury, assisted by Eric K. Reed, supervised the excavation of the two sites on Canaveral Peninsula in Brevard County. The Surruque or Curruque Indians had lived in this area at the time of Spanish contact. The sites were being destroyed for use in road building and the Smithsonian planned the excavation to add to the historical record. One site consisted of five small
sand mounds. The second site was a mound eighty feet in diameter and thirteen feet high. They found many burials but few artifacts, and Stirling concluded that "either the Surruque were limited in material possessions or they were not accustomed to bury many mortuary objects with their dead, for very little material was found in their burial mounds." 38

Complete studies of the Florida CWA excavations were not possible at the time. Unlike other Southeastern states, the Florida CWA work was not followed by a large WPA project to continue the work begun in 1934. This meant a substantial delay in publication until Gordon Willey studied the artifacts for use in his book, *Archeology of the Florida Gulf Coast*, published in 1949. 39

Outside of Florida the Smithsonian scientists selected the Peachtree Mound in western North Carolina near Murphy in the Hiwassee River Valley for excavation because John R. Swanton, a Smithsonian specialist in the ethnology of the North American Indians, thought that the site might be the location of the Cherokee town of Guasili visited by DeSoto in 1540. 40 Jesse Jennings supervised the excavation of the site and submitted a report, titled "The Significance of the Peachtree Site in Southeastern Prehistory," as his thesis for a degree
at the University of Chicago. Setzler analyzed the data along with Jennings and made the published report more descriptive than Jennings' original study had been.41

They began work on December 21, 1933, and finished by April 1, 1934. The mound measured 215 by 180 by 10 feet high. The CWA provided the Smithsonian with 104 men for the project. This large crew forced the archaeologists to use a different method of excavation from that they had normally used. "Approach is usually made along a single axis. In this case, however, approach trenches were put down on three sides. This three-way excavation proved extremely appropriate later, permitting as it did a simultaneous approach from three sides to feature 29, the central structure."42 Based on an incomplete study, they concluded that the mound was a truncated pyramid used for ceremonial purposes. The archaeologists found numerous artifacts in the mound and surrounding village: mortars, axes, projectile points, pipes, beads, and pendants. Pottery in the mound was grit tempered, decorated with stamped designs. Below the mound level the pottery differed. In general Setzler and Jennings thought the pottery was related to the north Georgia area sites of Etowah and Nacoochee.

Frank H. H. Roberts, Jr., an archaeologist at the
Bureau of American Ethnology, excavated a site at Shiloh National Military Park near Pittsburg Landing on the Tennessee River from December 21, 1933 to March 30, 1934. His assistant was Moreau B. Chambers. This site consisted of six large earth mounds used for living areas and one mound for burials, a number of house sites, and the remnants of a palisade. He sampled the site by testing a number of features. First Roberts dug trenches around the main mounds and found round houses sixteen feet in diameter. He excavated the burial mound where he found 30 burials in a flexed position, and the remains of what he called a temple. The midden material contained mussel shells, animal and fish bones, pottery, and stone artifacts. He also found evidence of the Civil War battle fought on the site: pieces of cannon balls, bayonets, canteens, and other artifacts which he gave to the Park museum. Roberts recovered evidence of the subsistence pattern from mussel shells, and animal and fish bones. He found stone and bone artifacts and shell ornaments. The pottery was grit tempered in the older strata and shell tempered in the later strata of the site. He tentatively concluded that this site served as a refuge for inhabitants of the numerous village sites nearby during floods and was also the ceremonial center of the region.
The only Smithsonian CWA project outside of the Southeast was in California at the site of the Tulamniu Mounds in Kern County. William Duncan Strong supervised a crew of 175 beginning work in the middle of December, 1933. Winslow M. Walker, Associate Anthropologist at the Bureau of American Ethnology was his assistant. One of the shell mounds at this site was 1000 feet long, 200 feet wide, and 8 feet high. Trenching of the mound showed that it was used as a living area for a long time. The excavation was very careful. The archaeologists screened a large area for small objects and found more than 3000 specimens including stone tools, flaked flint points, bone awls and needles, and shell beads and ornaments.

In 1933, Franklin D. Roosevelt proposed the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) to develop the natural and human resources of the Tennessee River Valley. Congress passed the Tennessee Valley Authority Act and Roosevelt signed it on May 18, 1933. Because TVA dams would inundate many archaeological sites, a number of professionals and amateurs interested in archaeology pressured the TVA as early as August, 1933, to begin a program of salvage archaeology. Edwin P. Powers, head of the Department of Zoology at the University of Tennessee, was active in these efforts as was Burnham
The Committee on State Archaeological Surveys of the National Research Council early became involved in dealing with the archaeological emergency in the Tennessee River Valley. A. T. Poffenberger met with Carl Guthe in Chicago to discuss the problem and was already at that time communicating with Colburn and Stirling and attempting to obtain maps of the areas to be flooded. After meeting with Guthe and other interested persons, Poffenberger presented a plan for archaeological salvage to Neil Judd of the United States National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution. Following discussions with a number of archaeologists, the National Research Council set up a Subcommittee on the Archaeology of the Tennessee Valley under its Committee on State Archaeological Surveys with Matthew E. Stirling of the Bureau of American Ethnology as chairman, and Neil Judd and Burnham Colburn as members.

The original plan called for one archaeologist from the Smithsonian Institution, using a $1600 grant from the Carnegie Corporation to the National Research Council, to make a four to six-month preliminary survey of the areas threatened by flooding as a prelude to possible extensive excavations at a later date. But this plan was never used because "work on the construction of dams
proceeded so much more rapidly than originally planned... that it became apparent at once that whatever material was to be saved must be discovered immediately. In December, 1933, representatives of the TVA, the University of Tennessee, and the University of Alabama met in Knoxville. Neil Judd attended as a consultant at the request of the TVA. The possibility of using CWA labor for this work made a major TVA archaeological project feasible. Judd believed it was urgent to begin the work as soon as possible because "the Tennessee River drainage was the home of diverse Indian tribes in historic and prehistoric times. Hence we might reasonably expect to find there solution of at least some of the puzzles which students of southeastern archeology have encountered. Not only Tennessee but the entire nation will be loser unless the data and material remains now threatened with destruction are scientifically recovered and preserved." Availability of CWA labor allowed Judd to design a large program of archaeological research in the Norris Basin in Tennessee and the Wheeler Basin in Alabama. Judd urged that a survey of the Norris Basin be completed similar to the one Dr. Walter B. Jones, the State Geologist of Alabama, had made of the Wheeler Basin in the summer of 1933 using National Research Council funds and resulting in a map of over three hundred sites. This was
to be followed by excavation of a few representative sites in each area, development of a complete photographic record of the sites, and collection of necessary data in the field. Judd intended to use CWA labor and tools. He recommended W. C. McKern of the Milwaukee Public Museum as the director of the project with an assistant in charge of each basin supervising the work of several field crews. Judd recognized that there would be a battle over which institution would control the artifacts. Already it had been suggested to him that the University of Tennessee have custody of the collections.56

The TVA had considerable trouble finding a director for the archaeological project. The TVA offered the job to McKern but he turned it down.57 William S. Webb of the Department of Physics of the University of Kentucky finally accepted the position as TVA archaeological consultant. Webb, although not trained as an archaeologist, was an experienced field technician. Just as important were his personal characteristics: "a man of boundless energy... (who) often observed, unnecessarily of course, that he could lick his weight in wildcats before breakfast."58 He, along with William Funkhouser, a zoologist at the University of Kentucky, had excavated a number of sites during the 1920s and with
Funkhouser had published *Ancient Life in Kentucky* in 1928. 58

The archaeologists began work on the Norris Basin project about January 8, 1934. Webb selected Thomas M. N. Lewis as supervisor of the work in the entire basin, beginning Lewis' lifelong concern with Tennessee archaeology. Lewis had some archaeological experience but his background included the practical experience needed for the job. "I had charge of a deck force for a year and a half during the war," he wrote to Walter Jones, "and as the result of handling that tough bunch of hoodlums I don't believe that I would encounter many difficulties with a bunch of college boys and unemployed." 59 But Lewis and his field supervisors, Robert Goslin, William G. Haag, H. M. Sullivan, A. P. Taylor, Wendell C. Walker, and Charles G. Wilder, did encounter many difficulties. They faced not only poor roads but snow and temperatures near zero in the winter, and rain and floods in the spring.

Webb developed a plan to transform the Norris project to Federal Emergency Relief Administration sponsorship after the end of the CWA. He was able to retain his supervisors at their current salaries and was glad to get rid of the positions of foreman, time keeper, and water boys which were useless to him and were paid more than
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his real workers. Because the remaining laborers would be permitted to work from three to five days per week instead of fifteen hours per week, the work could proceed more smoothly.

The archaeological survey of the Norris Basin found 23 sites. While in the Wheeler Basin only a sample of the sites were excavated, in Norris all were studied. The archaeologists excavated two stone mound sites, six cave sites, one cemetery site, three burial mound sites, and eleven earth mound and village sites. The archaeologists found twenty earth mounds, nine stone mounds, four villages, and seven caves on the twenty three sites.

After the end of the field work, the TVA gave the artifacts to the University of Tennessee where Webb studied them. He sent the skeletal material to the University of Kentucky and samples of the pottery to the Ceramic Repository at the University of Michigan. Webb retained the photographs, maps, and field notes which were stored at the University of Kentucky despite the attempts of the University of Tennessee to get them back.

James B. Griffin studied the pottery from the Norris Basin. Griffin had a Master of Arts degree from the University of Chicago and was a research fellow at the Museum of Anthropology at the University of Michigan.
Griffin received his Ph.D. from the University of Michigan in 1936 for a dissertation on Norris pottery. He treated the pottery in some detail in a one hundred page report published as part of Webb's Norris Basin report. Griffin saw a resemblance between Norris Basin pottery and "Cherokee" artifacts from the upper Tennessee River, but he was unwilling to generalize about the position of Norris Basin ceramics in Southeastern prehistory because of what he called his "... unfortunate lack of familiarity with that area." William D. Funkhouser, Webb's old digging partner in Kentucky in the 1920s, and Dean of the graduate school of the University of Kentucky, studied the skeletal material and published his study as part of Webb's Norris Basin report.

At one time, Webb felt that the most important contribution to archaeology of the project in the Norris Basin was the dendrochronological work of Florence M. Hawley. He argued that she showed that this method of archaeological dating by tree-ring analysis, first applied in the Southwest in the 1920s, could be used successfully on trees of the Southeast. In the spring of 1934, Fay-Cooper Cole of the University of Chicago and Hawley decided to test the application of dendrochronology in the East. Guthe sent out one of his
Committee on State Archaeological Surveys circulars asking for the help of archaeologists in locating the necessary trees and wood. Webb offered his assistance and Hawley worked in the Norris area for two weeks, then part time during the rest of 1934, and spent the summer as TVA dendrochronologist in Knoxville.

Hawley was confident that a reliable dating method could be achieved, though she estimated that several years of research would be necessary before the results would be conclusive. But this early Southeastern work in dendrochronology never lived up to expectations because of problems between the dendrochronologists and the field archaeologists and a feud between Hawley and another TVA employee, Lassiter. "The point is that dendro-chronology in the TVA got off to a rather bad start despite very generous subsidies from the Authority because Hawley and Lassiter got into personal conflict and subsequently muddied the waters in questioning the results of the work." But even without these personal conflicts, dendrochronology would not have been a success. Despite later research, dendrochronology has never proved to be a usable dating method in the Southeast.

Webb, always the scientist, separated his conclusions from what he called his "speculations" about the relationship between the prehistoric record and the historic
Indian groups known to have occupied the area. He attempted to clarify the relationship between the Norris Basin and the Over Hill Cherokee, known to have occupied the area around the Little Tennessee River only forty miles away from Norris. Webb summarized the early history of the Norris Basin based mainly on travellers' accounts among the Cherokee, Creek, and other tribes. He found that Cherokee town houses were universally round while those in the Norris Basin were rectangular. This led him to an important conclusion that "the difference in the shape of the structures required a different method of construction and clearly indicates that though the town houses in the Norris Basin were in Cherokee territory, yet they were not built by the Cherokee." Webb thought, although he could not prove it, that the Cherokee might have built their town houses on mounds already constructed by other people, "perhaps the same people who built the large-log town-house mounds in Norris Basin."

The other major area threatened by TVA dam construction was the Wheeler Basin in north central Alabama. TVA plans for the building of the General Joe Wheeler Dam were to result in flooding eighty miles of the Tennessee River. Fortunately for the TVA, Dr. Walter B. Jones, a geologist who was the director of the Alabama Museum of
Natural History, had begun an archaeological survey of the area in the summer of 1931. Jones continued his survey intermittently with support from the state of Alabama until the winter of 1933-1934. This survey located 237 archaeological sites.  

Webb selected David DeJarnette who was on the staff of the Alabama Museum of Natural History as the supervisor of the Wheeler Basin project. DeJarnette directed the work of twelve field party supervisors in the basin: Robert M. Adams, Eliot Davis, Kenneth B. Disher, James R. Foster, Bennett G. Gale, D. W. Lockard, Horace Miner, Robert D. Morrison, J. J. Renger, Alden B. Stevens, Sidney Thomas, and James W. White, Jr. These men excavated nineteen sites of the 237 known in the basin. They selected these sites based on criteria of importance in 1930s archaeology. This naturally created a bias in the types of sites excavated. As Futato observed in his recent reexamination of Wheeler Basin archaeology, "attention was given to those sites which might be considered 'richest' in materials, both qualitatively and quantitatively." And as Futato pointed out, this meant excavation of relatively large sites: Mississippian mounds, villages, and cemeteries, Copena burial mounds, and large shell middens. As a result, any evidence of pre-Archaic sites was missed. "Almost no data was re-
covered relative to occupation prior to establishment of the shell middens late in the middle Archaic because earlier sites would be limited to small lithic scatters in almost all instances."\(^{76}\)

The work started in the basin on January 6, 1934, and ended on July 15.\(^{77}\) By January 12th they had established a camp with sixty men and they expected 230 more in the near future. DeJarnette succinctly characterized the status of the project at that point, "it's a nightmare," he said.\(^{78}\) The archaeologists faced many problems during the project including the unusual and complex Alabama procedures governing relief. Archaeological field work during the winter was not easy. "The phenomenal rise of the Tennessee River in midwinter which covered many of the sites was another serious handicap."\(^{79}\) The CWA supplied labor until March, 1934, when the project came under the control of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. Webb and Jones had prepared for the transition to FEHA by developing a successful plan to continue the project after the end of the CWA.\(^{80}\) The project had to be concluded before completion of the work and only nineteen of the 237 sites were excavated.\(^{81}\)

Webb prepared the report on the Wheeler Basin as he had on Norris. He sent sample potsherds to Griffin at the University of Michigan and included Griffin's
Griffin found four distinct pottery types in the basin: shell tempered, fiber tempered, sand tempered, and grit, limestone and clay tempered. Webb shipped all the skeletal material to the University of Kentucky and Funkhouser published his study in the Wheeler report. Webb also included Jones' report on the geology of the Wheeler Basin in his publication. Webb considered both the Norris and Wheeler reports as preliminary summary studies and this led to problems for him. "I have been bitterly criticized for making this preliminary report on the Wheeler Basin," Webb said, "but I was forced by necessity to take what I had and use it then."

The archaeologists were fortunate to discover interesting features during the excavations. Webb noticed the stratification of sites such as LU086 where pottery, copper objects, and burials in the flesh overlay a level with no burials and no pottery. This pre-pottery culture was similar to the Green River shell mounds in Western Kentucky excavated later by Webb's WPA project in Kentucky and sites in New York, Florida, Georgia, and Louisiana, most discovered by WPA projects. James Ford and Gordon Willey, both WPA archaeologists, would later use this information in their discussion of an Eastern Archaic stage in their seminal article, "An
Interpretation of the Prehistory of the Eastern United States, published in 1941. The Archaic was then the oldest cultural horizon known in the East and was characterized by a hunting and gathering economy. Ford and Willey described the Archaic in negative terms. "The cultures of this period were," they wrote, "'archaic' in the true sense; horticulture was lacking, pottery is either lacking or makes its appearance late in the stage, and the abundance, variety and quality of artifacts do not compare with the more complex later developments." 88

Webb also discovered Mississippian sites in the Wheeler Basin. The Tick Island occupation is an example of a mature Mississippian phase. 89 But far more significant to Southeastern archaeology was the discovery of the Copena. 90 Webb described what he called a "copper-galena complex" in the basin characterized by native copper, galena funeral objects, ocean shells, woven fabrics, and ceremonial destruction of artifacts. The archaeologists took the name Copena from the first three letters of copper combined with the last three letters of galena. Webb felt that either the Copena was developing toward a specialized sedentary culture or had degenerated from a higher culture. 91 This chronology of the prehistory of the Wheeler Basin would be the basis for the work of the combined WPA-TVA archaeological proj-
ect organized in Ababama after the end of the Wheeler Basin excavation.

The archaeological projects of the CWA and TVA during the winter of 1933-1934 were the largest program of excavations in American archaeology to that time. The experience gained in these projects provided the foundation for the next stage in the development of federal archaeology, the WPA archaeological program.
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CHAPTER IV: THE STRUCTURE OF FEDERAL ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE DEPRESSION: WPA, TVA, NFS

After the end of the CWA, the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA) was again responsible for the relief efforts directed to the millions of unemployed Americans. Federal projects such as the CWA archaeological programs under the Smithsonian Institution ended, and the states took more control of public aid to the unemployed, using federal funds from the FERA. But because unemployment continued at a very high level despite the FERA, President Franklin D. Roosevelt proposed in January, 1935, a huge federal employment program. In April Congress passed the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 which gave the President the authority to set up a program to put the unemployed to work. Roosevelt established the Works Progress Administration (WPA) in August.¹

Archaeology was an ideal project for the WPA because it could use large numbers of unskilled men and women as well as professional people. Funds spent on archaeology went mainly for labor because very little equipment was
needed to do archaeology in the 1930s. WPA administrators considered archaeology to be a white collar, professional project, but they handled archaeology in a different manner from the most well known of the professional relief projects. The arts program, known as Federal One, and which provided jobs for artists, writers, actors, musicians, and historians, had a strong national organization which allowed WPA officials at the national level to avoid the problems of control by the state level of the WPA, at least until the decentralization of 1939. Archaeology never had this kind of a coordinated program, and the lack of centralized direction from Washington was an important reason for many of the problems archaeologists had with the WPA.²

Archaeology for most of the New Deal period was administered by the Women's and Professional Division (WPD) of the WPA.³ This division caused problems for the WPA out of all proportion to its size. Writers, artists, and other professionals were notoriously difficult to supervise. In an attempt to cope with some of the problems of running a relief program for professionals, the WPA reorganized the WPD in February, 1938 into the Division of Professional and Service Projects. This reorganization combined the Division of Women's and Professional Projects with Education, Recreation, Research, Statistical, and
Survey projects. As a result of the ERA Act of 1939 the twenty-five percent rule was imposed on the WPA requiring that the local or state sponsor contribute at least twenty-five percent of the total cost of the project. The WPA at that time also issued the eighteen month rule which required that relief workers on the WPA be removed from the rolls when they had been in the WPA for eighteen months, and then be eligible for reappointment only after a lapse of thirty days. Each of these rules caused many problems for archaeological projects. Many states had difficulty reaching the twenty-five percent level because their sponsors had limited funds during the depression. The eighteen months rule meant that experienced workers were lost to the projects and new workers had to be trained in the exacting tasks of excavation and laboratory work.

In August of 1936, WPA officials attempted to coordinate archaeological projects by issuing regulations governing excavation and restoration programs for archaeological and historical sites. These regulations required that the National Park Service (NPS) approve and provide technical supervision for WPA archaeological projects unless the NPS waived jurisdiction. Only state public agencies (for example, conservation commissions, park departments, or state universities) could sponsor these
projects unless the NPS allowed local public agencies to operate them. The archaeological programs were under the control of the WPA, but under "general consulting supervision" of the NPS. The regulations required the NPS not only to approve projects in the beginning, but also to clear changes in operating projects. The problem was that the NPS could not effectively implement these regulations, nor the provisions of the Historic Sites Act of 1935, due to limitations of personnel.

A. R. Kelly, who had a large role in attempting to enforce the rules, admitted that the problem with the NPS carrying out its responsibilities for WPA supervision was that the NPS personnel in Washington were not well informed about the personnel or activities of the individual projects. Because of NPS inability to provide enough assistance, WPA officials turned to the Smithsonian Institution for technical advice. Frank Setzler of the Smithsonian Institution was a regular source of advice to the WPA about their many archaeological projects. Setzler continued this role of advisor to the WPA throughout the life of the archaeological programs. He claimed that during the WPA period there was a "guiding force" working to improve WPA archaeological projects. Setzler was this guiding force. He may have approved each WPA archaeological project individually, and at the very least he saw...
every project application, and his advice was eagerly solicited by the WPA.

Setzler was a very important behind the scenes figure in WPA archaeology in the Southeast. He knew the archaeology of the region and was intensely interested in Southeastern archaeology. He had worked at Marksville, Louisiana, in 1933 as well as later in North Carolina at the Peachtree Mound. Archaeologists knew that Setzler had a role in approving their projects but they did not know how much power he really had over their work.

Setzler and the Smithsonian Institution convinced the WPA to establish a standard application procedure for all archaeological projects and worked to disapprove unacceptable proposals. This gave Setzler a great deal of power which he defended to Webb: "as you must realize, many unqualified people request such projects (and) we are endeavoring to not only raise the standard, but at the same time eliminate those which you and I would consider a waste of time, money, and scientific results."

A number of the specific archaeological recommendations that were imposed on the state archaeological projects originated with Setzler and not with the WPA. For example, the restrictions placed on the Alabama project by Setzler in February of 1938 were passed on to the archaeologists as if they were a bureaucratic decision by the WPA.
The WPA gave no indication to Alabama that it was Setzler who was really imposing certain specific requirements on where the project could excavate and the personnel to be in charge.\textsuperscript{12}

Even the Smithsonian did not have the resources for the detailed supervision the archaeological projects required. The WPA national office appointed an anthropologist as consultant for archaeological projects, Vincenzo Petrullo, a Ph.D. from the University of Pennsylvania and a specialist in South American ethnology. He did not have an easy job representing the conflicting interests of the WPA and archaeologists. The WPA wanted carefully designed archaeological programs which would be easy to administer. Archaeologists desired money and labor with great flexibility in their use. Petrullo's major accomplishment was his effort to ensure that the projects met acceptable archaeological standards. He attempted to prevent WPA approval of archaeological projects which either did not have scientific supervision or properly store the materials excavated or publish adequate reports on their work.\textsuperscript{13}

In July, 1938, the WPA issued new regulations for archaeological and paleontological projects.\textsuperscript{14} These regulations were a major step toward more effective national control of federal archaeology because they
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allowed only a state university, museum or similar organization to sponsor a WPA archaeological project. The new regulations gave the NPS and the Smithsonian Institution responsibility to review all projects before approval by the WPA. Both agencies were to be available for assistance to the archaeological projects in the field and to the WPA in Washington for planning and advice in operating the projects. The WPA required the sponsor to prepare a scientific report on each project. All artifacts were to be deposited in a public or "quasi-public" institution with free public access to them. The WPA required quarterly progress reports for each project. These reports caused many headaches for the archaeologists because of the time they took to complete, but the WPA demanded them in order to keep the projects under control and so that the final publications of the projects, based on the preliminary reports, would be easier to prepare. Unfortunately, many of the archaeologists never completed final publications on the excavations they supervised since World War II interrupted the projects and they failed to complete their responsibility of publication after the war.

The regulations and the efforts of Setzler and Petrullo were effective in limiting the number of archaeological projects approved by the WPA. "When we took
over," Petrullo told a May, 1939, meeting of the Committee on Basic Needs in American Archaeology, "there were 83 projects. Today there are only 26, well controlled, sponsored by responsible institutions."\(^1\) Even with this decrease in the number of projects the WPA archaeological program was very large. In January, 1939, twenty-four projects were at work with federal funds of $2,078,000.\(^2\) Each institution sponsoring a WPA archaeological project (Louisiana State University, for example) had to supply funds and supervision to the projects. The sponsors contributed $281,000 for the fiscal year of 1939.

The large amount of funds invested by the WPA and the many archaeological projects in operation made some centralized direction by the WPA mandatory after the departure of Petrullo. Kelly, from his experience in the field, knew that "the conditions of field work, including personnel, change rapidly, and adjustments are not always made quickly or adequately enough under routine administrative setup to permit of maintenance of scientific standards."\(^3\) A consultant with some archaeological expertise had to be in a position to approve projects and changes in response to new situations in the states. The WPA, faced with the burning desire of many archaeologists to dig without ceasing, needed advice.
Archaeologists, then as now, enjoyed excavation. Field work was exciting, challenging, and the road to professional success. Some archaeologists were even willing to excavate without adequate laboratory work on the specimens taken from the ground, while many of the archaeologists were more interested in digging than in preparing publications on their work. Even today, nearly forty years after the end of the archaeological projects, reports on many sites excavated with WPA assistance remain to be published. Despite the reputation of the WPA as an agency that encouraged digging without laboratory work, the WPA supported large laboratories after 1938. Of course, by that time huge quantities of unstudied artifacts had accumulated in states such as Tennessee. After the early failure of the WPA to support laboratory study, Petrullo of the WPA suggested to Webb that he set up the Central Archaeological Laboratory in Birmingham which grew into a very large archaeological laboratory. The WPA finally established a laboratory in 1938 for the Tennessee project which by that time had "literally tons of material which had never been unpacked." \(^{19}\)

The WPA, contrary to its reputation today, tried to stop digging in some cases and worked for conservation of archaeological sites. The NPS and, to a lesser degree, the Smithsonian Institution, placed emphasis on
conservation rather than excavation. Kelly was correct when he remarked that "in the past both our Service and the Smithsonian have sought to put the emphasis on survey recording, description, and classification of sites, with a minimum of excavation, except in those cases where exploration is in the nature of salvage operations."20 The WPA put considerable pressure on the Alabama project to restrict digging and complete laboratory work and publication. The WPA tried to stop the Tennessee project from excavating so many sites until the laboratory could catch up with the field crews. Lewis of Tennessee was almost cut off from WPA support because of his long delay in preparing a publication on the excavations in the Chickamauga Basin. The Georgia statewide WPA project was primarily an archaeological survey with little excavation planned.

In January of 1940 the WPA issued a new Operating Procedure G-5. This established the procedures regulating the projects of the Professional and Service division including library, education, museum, and recreational work. The WPA at this time moved archaeology into the Research and Records subdivision.21 Petrullo by then had left the WPA, and Stella Leche Deignan, who had a Ph.D. from Tulane University and had been an assistant professor of anatomy there until taking a position with the WPA,
became assistant consultant responsible for archaeology.

To deal with continuing problems with the archaeological projects, in August, 1940, the WPA wrote a new set of regulations for archaeological and paleontological projects designed to replace Operating Procedure W-18 and sent them to the Smithsonian Institution and the NPS for review. The WPA based the rules on its policy of furnishing assistance to organizations doing archaeology. The Smithsonian Institution and the NPS would continue to review all projects before approval by the WPA. The types of work the WPA would support were survey or investigation of archaeological sites, restoration and preservation of archaeological objects, cataloguing and analysis of collections, and the preparation of a report. The regulations placed emphasis on proper planning. The WPA wanted to achieve a balance between excavation and laboratory work and required that projects be planned to complete work on one part of a long range project within the period of the project authorization. This idea, that archaeologists should finish work on one excavation before beginning another, proved burdensome to the Tennessee and Alabama projects. Planning would not prove easy for archaeologists who, while always ready to begin an excavation, found it more difficult to follow through to study and publish a
report on the excavation. The WPA required that the sponsor supply technical supervision, and allow the qualifications of the technical personnel to be reviewed by the NPS and the Smithsonian Institution. The rules directed the sponsoring institution to provide for storage of the artifacts to protect them from political pressures to divide the collections among many depositories in a state where they would not be properly cared for. The WPA required quarterly narrative reports funded by the sponsoring institution.  

The Smithsonian Institution and the NPS both approved the regulations.  

In addition to the WPA, the National Park Service played an important part in archaeology during the depression. This concern with archaeology departed from the previous policy of protection and conservation of sites under NPS jurisdiction. In the past the NPS conducted few excavations, but in the 1930s the NPS supported archaeological research at Ocmulgee National Monument in Georgia, Jamestown in Virginia, Moundville, Alabama, and other locations. The basis for this new policy of the NPS was the Historic Sites Act of 1935 which stated a national policy to preserve historic sites, buildings, and objects. The Historic Sites Act required the NPS to survey archaeological and historical
sites to develop information which could be used in their preservation.

To administer the new program the NPS established an Archaeological Sites Division as part of the Branch of Historic Sites. A. R. Kelly became chief of this division although he retained, at his request, the responsibility of close supervision of the Ocmulgee project. This new interest of the NPS in archaeological research aroused the opposition of the Smithsonian Institution which had always been the primary center of archaeology in the federal government. But Frank Setzler and other Smithsonian officials came to realize that the Smithsonian Institution could not stop the activities of the NPS and should cooperate with their archaeological efforts. Kelly and Setzler continued to cooperate closely throughout the 1930s despite the different purposes of their organizations.

Kelly tried to use his new position to influence archaeology throughout the Southeast. He asked, "since Federal funds are being used in geographically related parts of the Southeast, why should not the WPA require that all survey projects be coordinated and integrated by the NPS?" Kelly successfully developed some interest within the NPS in his plan for coordinated activity. He, along with Carl F. Russell, a Regional Director of
the NPS, explored a program for a unified archaeological program in the Southeast with William S. Webb and then with Walter Jones and David DeJarnette of the Alabama project in March, 1938. Kelly intended to call a general conference of Southeastern and Smithsonian archaeologists to discuss his general program. Despite initial favorable responses from Webb, Jones, and DeJarnette, Kelly did not achieve the desired coordination at this time. Later, in 1939, Kelly tried to make WPA archaeology conform to the NPS conception of conservation. He recommended a site survey leading to classification of archaeological sites with a decrease in the amount of excavation. Kelly concluded that a national program was necessary to improve the archaeological work of the WPA, and he suggested that the NPS might pay a consultant to work on a survey of historic and archaeological sites. He argued that a consultant would be more acceptable to archaeologists because he would be a scientist, rather than a WPA employee as had been the case in the past. Despite Kelly's persistent efforts, the NPS never was able to supervise successfully the many WPA archaeological projects.

As was the case with the NPS, interest of the TVA in archaeology continued after the creation of the WPA. After the CWA-TVA program in Norris and Wheeler basins
ended in 1934, archaeologists established state projects in Alabama and Tennessee. The TVA in the meantime planned to begin construction of three new dams—Chickamauga and Pickwick in Tennessee, and Guntersville in Alabama. Webb, as before, played an important role in the TVA archaeological program. The crucial problem for archaeology in the TVA was the authority's lack of a legal justification for doing archaeology. The law creating the TVA did not mention archaeological salvage and as a result archaeologists always had difficulty obtaining TVA funds. After the TVA failed to develop a program for salvage of archaeological remains in the three new basins, Webb brought the problem to the Committee on State Archaeological Surveys. The Committee recommended action to its parent body, the National Research Council, which then took the problem to the Science Advisory Board. As a result of this pressure, the TVA received orders to clear the basins of archaeological sites before inundation by water from the dams.  

Once the TVA decided to set up an archaeological program, the Authority appointed Webb as the archaeologist in charge of all three basins. In February, 1936, Webb began to plan a program of survey and excavation. Despite his official appointment, Webb's full time work
and salary did not start until June when he intended to set up a base in Chattanooga. In the meantime, Webb organized the program in his typically methodical fashion. His plan was for the Alabama Museum of Natural History and the University of Tennessee to organize state WPA archaeological projects. The TVA would provide supplies and central direction of the work through its Social and Economic Research Division which was part of the Department of Regional Planning Studies. Webb's immediate task was to divide the responsibility for the three basins among the Alabama and Tennessee projects. He opposed the efforts of Lewis to control the work in both the Chickamauga and Pickwick basins and suggested that Lewis concentrate his efforts in the Chickamauga Basin and let the Alabama project handle the work in Guntersville and Pickwick. As a result of Webb's recommendation the Alabama Museum of Natural History directed the excavations in both Pickwick and Guntersville basins, and the University of Tennessee supervised the work in the Chickamauga Basin.

Webb and Lewis almost immediately disagreed about how to spend the money available from the TVA. Webb wanted to spend slowly and conservatively while Lewis believed that "we are dealing with a 'sugar daddy' who had plenty of money in his jeans and if we smile sweetly
we can get a dollar as well as we can get a penny."
Lewis desperately needed equipment for the planned work and wanted to spend the money as fast as possible, "this laboratory of mine at the University is as bare as Mother Hubbard's cupboard and I would like to emerge from this orgy of governmental spending with some much needed equipment."

This early disagreement between Webb and Lewis would later intensify and lead to the elimination of effective central administration of TVA archaeology. The TVA asked Webb to submit plans for the salvage program in the Gilbertsville Dam area, later called the Kentucky Dam, on the Tennessee River in western Kentucky. The basin to be formed by the Kentucky Dam would flood parts of Kentucky and Tennessee, and Webb planned to work the basin as a whole, regardless of state boundaries, as he did with Norris, Wheeler, Pickwick, and Guntersville. He argued that prehistoric Indians did not know the location of state boundaries and it made sense to consider the basin as one area of prehistoric occupation. Lewis fought savagely to keep Webb out of Tennessee, and as a result the basin was excavated in two parts with no connection between the Kentucky and Tennessee WPA projects. World War II ended both projects prematurely and neither Webb nor Lewis ever pub-
lished a complete report on their work in the Kentucky Basin, although Webb published a study of one site on the Kentucky side of the Basin, Jonathan Creek, and Lewis and Kneberg published a monograph on the Eva site on the Tennessee side.\(^{37}\) It seems likely that if Webb had been permitted to control the excavation of the basin as a whole he would have published a complete report on the Kentucky Basin as he did on Norris, Wheeler, Pickwick, and Guntersville. The opposition of Lewis and the Tennessee project to Webb's plan made this impossible.

Lewis had achieved his goal of preventing a coordinated TVA program in the Kentucky Dam area under Webb, but this victory was only a part of the war. Since Webb had no official contact with Tennessee for some years, he recommended that the TVA protect itself against what he saw as the unethical behavior of Lewis and his inability to produce an acceptable report. The TVA did this by asking Neil Judd as the Smithsonian Institution to suggest another consultant to review the Chickamauga Basin manuscript.\(^{38}\) Eventually, when the Chickamauga Basin report was available in manuscript form, a number of prominent archaeologists reviewed it, but by then it was too late to matter because World War II made publication impossible.
Webb's position as TVA archaeological consultant finally ended when he answered Deignan's request for information about the qualifications of the Tennessee project. Webb criticized the Tennessee project in his usual understated manner which differed markedly from the shrill tone of the letters that Lewis and Kneberg wrote from Tennessee asking for the help of their many friends against Webb. But Webb's response was critical enough to embarrass the TVA which was still a co-sponsor of the Tennessee project. The TVA asked Webb to explain his actions and he defended himself by explaining that he was only acting as required by his position on the Committee on Basic Needs in American Archaeology which advised the WPA on its archaeological projects. Soon after this Webb resigned as TVA consultant giving as his reason his desire to be able to express freely his opinion on archaeological problems. Webb continued to receive TVA assistance in western Kentucky as before his resignation.

Webb's position on the Committee on Basic Needs gave him an opportunity to openly or covertly criticize the Tennessee WPA project. However, the main purpose of the Committee was to provide impartial advice to the WPA and the archaeological profession. Like its predecessor, the Committee on State Archaeological Surveys of the
National Research Council which also served as an advisory body to archaeology in the 1920s and 1930s, the purpose of the Committee on Basic Needs was to stimulate the growth of archaeology. In the 1930s the Committee on State Archaeological Surveys sponsored a conference at Indianapolis on technical problems in archaeology in the Upper Mississippi Valley and the Great Lakes area from December 6th to 8th, 1935. Guthe continued his visits to archaeological excavations including those of Lewis and Webb in April, 1935. Using a grant from the Carnegie Corporation, the Committee continued to send out publications to archaeologists and to handle its extensive correspondence between archaeologists and the chairman of the Committee.

A major accomplishment of the Committee on State Archaeological Surveys was the founding in December of 1934 of the Society for American Archaeology, today the major professional organization for North American archaeologists. The Committee developed the Society for American Archaeology in response to the need of archaeologists for the services of a professional organization, to provide publication outlets, and to deal with the growing challenge of amateur archaeologists. In 1933 Lewis suggested the formation of a national society for American archaeology. The Committee on State Archaeolog-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
ical Societies agreed to the idea. During a meeting of archaeologists at the December, 1933, meeting of the American Anthropological Association in Columbus, Ohio, they began actions leading to the sending of a prospectus for the Society for American Archaeology to almost two hundred archaeologists in April, 1934. The archaeologists formalized the organization of the Society in December, 1934, and created the journal of the Society, American Antiquity to serve as a major avenue of communication for archaeologists. Because the Society for American Archaeology was successful in taking over the functions of the Committee, the Committee on State Archaeological Surveys recommended that it be eliminated and the National Research Council did not reappoint the Committee.

Despite the best efforts of the Society for American Archaeology to meet the needs of archaeologists, both the WPA and the profession needed additional organizational support. The lack of coordination among the numerous archaeological projects in operation at the beginning of 1939 disturbed archaeologists and the WPA as well. In January, 1939, Florence Kerr, Assistant Administrator of the WPA, requested Ross G. Harrison, Chairman of the National Research Council, to organize a committee to investigate the state of archaeology in
the United States and to develop a research program in archaeology using the facilities of the WPA. She supported the recommendation of her national consultant on archaeology, Vincenzo Petrullo, that coordination of archaeological projects should be voluntary rather than through the administrative control of the WPA.  

Harrison turned over Kerr's proposal to Carl Guthe who organized the Committee on Basic Needs in American Archaeology as a part of the Division of Anthropology and Psychology of the National Research Council. Guthe set up a committee with broader goals than the original proposal. It was to gather information about the status of archaeology from many organizations, not just the WPA, and make recommendations to the entire profession of archaeology including, but not limited, to the WPA. The committee members included many of the leaders of American archaeology: William Duncan Strong was the chairman, and the members were Carl Guthe, Fay-Cooper Cole, William C. McKern, William S. Webb, Clark Wissler, J. O. Brew, and Alfred V. Kidder.

The committee first met on May 21, 1939, in the National Research Council building in Washington, D. C. The committee agreed at this meeting that it would focus on archaeological policy in general and not on the eval-
uation of specific projects, but this distinction proved difficult to maintain in practice. The committee would eventually become involved in individual projects as well as in the personal conflicts among archaeologists. At this meeting the archaeologists and the WPA clarified their common problems. Strong was most concerned with the issue of publication, "millions are being poured into archaeological work, with very little thought being given to the mechanisms for publication. It is as if a big factory were working... and not yet producing anything." Some members were concerned with the immediate difficulties of working with the relief programs, while others, such as Setzler, had a long range goal in mind to develop a program for archaeological research in future emergencies or lean years for archaeology.

A crucial issue was the relationship between the government agencies, the universities, and private individuals and organizations. Kelly, speaking for the National Park Service, stated that the NPS was actively looking for scientific advice on the value of certain sites for archaeology. Petrullo of the WPA thought the committee should be a continuing organization and not just one that would go out of business in a short time. He was particularly interested in the problems of publication, how to develop an appraisal of the proce-
dures of the WPA in order to improve its effectiveness in dealing with archaeological projects, and advice on how to deal with projects operating in an unsatisfactory manner, even including the elimination of some projects if necessary. Petrullo wanted action not talk from the committee. "We stand ready to submit to the committee definite problems, and we are anxious that they should get to work."\(^7\) Petrullo and the WPA had been under continual attack from archaeologists since the beginning of the WPA archaeological programs, and he took advantage of this forum to level an attack at archaeologists and their procedures. He forcefully criticized what he called the "academic prejudices" of archaeologists that prevented at least some of them from doing acceptable work using relief labor. Among these prejudices was the attempt of the archaeological "master mind" to do all of the work himself and not delegate tasks to others. Petrullo pointed out to the committee that, "Some academic people felt they were blocked from publishing because they never had enough data. Formerly they used a slice of one mound and published on just that, but now they must not only have the whole mound but a dozen mounds, or a hundred."\(^8\)

Many issues resulting from the experience of the archaeologists in the field came up at this meeting,
some of which were not amenable to solution by a committee of the National Research Council. Webb brought up the problem of what he conceived to be the low ethical standards of some archaeologists. "The one thing that has bothered me most is the lack of ethical standards among the young men who have come into the field. I had some sort of standards as a young man, and most of the young men I knew did as well, but the youngsters nowadays seem often to be intellectually dishonest." The committee had enough problems without dealing with the perennial criticism of the young by the old, but they did discuss ethical issues at future meetings.

At its next meeting on June 24th and 25th, in New York, the committee prepared a statement on the basic needs of American archaeology. They sent a copy to Kerr of the WPA and published a revised statement in Science on December 8, 1939. The committee sent the statement to many of the archaeologists in the United States. The report defined acceptable professional standards for archaeological projects. The committee recommended that any project that could not meet these minimum standards should not be started or approved for continuation. Archaeological projects were to be approved because of a need for conservation of archaeological sites, or to work toward the solution of some
clear archaeological problem. The sponsoring institution must guarantee satisfactory scientific supervision, resources for laboratory work and preservation, and publication. All archaeological projects using federal funds required approval by the Smithsonian.50

Other meetings of the committee followed. On September 15, 1939, Strong and Guthe met with WPA and NPS officials to discuss both coordinating and controlling federal archaeological programs. The committee met again in Philadelphia on December 31, 1940. By that time Stella L. Deignan was the WPA official responsible for archaeological projects. Strong told Deignan that the committee had not received additional requests for aid from the WPA. Deignan blamed this on changes in both the organization of the WPA and in personnel.51 She was interested at this time in the impact of defense work on the archaeological programs leading to a possible end of WPA archaeology. The committee reviewed and approved the new WPA operating procedures for archaeology. Deignan asked the committee for help in technical review of individual projects. The committee agreed to review certain specific projects but the members felt that the procedure for review of all projects should be left as it was and that the committee would not get involved in routine WPA matters. The
committee, pressuring for conservation rather than excavation, unanimously agreed that "... at the present, the necessity to analyze and study was far greater than the necessity to gather material for study."^{52}

Following up on the recent work by Deignan with the committee, Kerr requested that the Committee on Basic Needs continue to cooperate with the WPA by serving as a "National Advisory Committee" for the WPA archaeological program. The WPA hoped that the committee would become involved in routine reviews of projects and other administrative matters. Guthe replied to Kerr that the committee would continue to assist the WPA but that the members were busy men and their services would be limited.^{54} The committee could not become a part of the WPA bureaucracy,^{55} but it did deal with specific problems of some of the archaeological projects that needed the technical advice of the committee.^{56}

The attempts at coordination of WPA archaeological projects by the Committee on Basic Needs and the WPA came too late. The end of WPA archaeology as a result of American participation in World War II temporarily terminated the work of the committee. By that time the WPA had already closed many projects and there was little the committee could do to assist closing the others. But the committee was led to believe that it might have
a role in the post-war period. Government officials told Strong "... that a somewhat similar program will almost certainly be included among those now being planned for that crucial period of post war adjustment when the nation must change rapidly from a total war to a peace economy."^57

The main wartime activity of the committee was preventing relic hunting by troops in Alaska by working through the Ethnographic Board and the commanding general in the area.58 The committee met during the war in Washington on January 22, 1945, to plan action if proposed river valley authorities in the Columbia, Arkansas, and Missouri areas should be established. In May of 1944 Strong brought up the need for a smaller committee to inventory the records of the WPA archaeological projects as a representative of the Society for American Archaeology, and to prepare an index of their contents. This project was possible because Setzler, who claimed responsibility for the WPA requirement of quarterly reports for archaeological projects, had his secretary George McCoy analyze each quarterly report. The result was a 500 page summary of the quarterly reports.59 The president of the Society for American Archaeology, J. Alden Mason, appointed a Planning Committee with Frederick Johnson as chairman and Emil Haury and James B. Griffin
as members. Strong helped the Planning Committee to obtain $1500 for their work from the Viking Fund.  

The Planning Committee met first in Washington from January 8 to January 14, 1945. The committee members soon encountered bitter criticism from some archaeologists of the entire WPA archaeological program. To defend itself from being too closely associated with the WPA or the position of the WPA critics, it announced that it was concerned only with making the WPA archaeological material available to archaeologists and not with the quality of the data. As early as November, 1944, Griffin warned against making the Planning Committee "a punitive committee." Nevertheless, the Planning Committee could not avoid evaluating the quality of the WPA archaeological program. It concluded that "serious mistakes were made from the beginning to the end of the program. Political expediency seemed to be the rule and only rarely was it recognized that proper scientific results could only be obtained by insistence that the work be done properly." Their major criticism of the program was the lack of centralized direction of the archaeological projects.

The Planning Committee did more than review the WPA programs of the depression. It looked ahead to the future of archaeology in the post-war world. The Planning
Committee formed a new organization, The Committee for the Recovery of Archaeological Remains, to deal with the coming archaeological emergency, the threat of new river basin programs in the Ohio, Missouri, Columbia, and Savannah river valleys.  


3. There are some indications that archaeology was originally a part of the Engineering Section of the WPA. This may have been the reason for some of the early problems of the WPA archaeologists in obtaining supervision, transportation, supplies, and even labor. Webb to Jones, May 23, 1938, Alabama WPA Archaeological Records; See also Guthe to Lewis, June 6, 1938, Tennessee WPA Archaeological Records, and "Projects for Restoration of Sites and Structures of Historical or Archaeological Importance," Operating Procedure No. 0-4, August 26, 1936, Box 17, Setzler Papers.

4. Kerr to Regional Directors, March 7, 1939, Record Group 69, National Archives, 218. Hereafter records in the National Archives will be cited by record group and number. The reorganization of 1939 also changed the name of the WPA to the Work Projects Administration.

5. William F. McDonald, Federal Relief Administration and the Arts: The Origins and Administrative History of the Arts Projects of the Works Progress Administration (Columbus, 1969), 313.

6. "Projects for Restoration of Sites and Structures of Historical or Archaeological Importance," Box 17, Setzler Papers.

7. A. R. Kelly, "Archaeology in the National Park


9. Setzler to Kelly, November 30, 1936, Box 18, Setzler Papers.

10. Setzler to Frederick Johnson, October 5, 1944, Box 3, Setzler Papers.


12. Setzler, February 15, 1938, Box 17, Setzler Papers; Setzler to Webb, June 10, 1937, Roll 74, TVA Microfilm.


17. Petrullo to Kerr, February 9, 1939, RG 69/WPA General Files, 218.3.


21. Harvey Becknell to Research and Records Project Staff, February 2, 1940, RG 69/Professional and Service Division, Summary of Weekly Activities.
22. Guthe to Albert L. Barrows, October 9, 1940, Anthropology and Psychology Division Records.

23. Jay du Von to Alexander Wetmore, Assistant Secretary, U. S. National Museum, August 24, 1940, Box 17, Setzler Papers.


25. Ibid.

26. Wetmore to Jay du Von, September 16, 1940, Box 17, Setzler Papers; A. E. Demaray to Kerr, September 6, 1940, RG 69/215.


28. Setzler to Kelly, January 15, Box 18, Setzler Papers.

29. Kelly to Petrullo, March 15, 1938, Southeastern Archaeological Center Records.

30. Kelly to Setzler, September 8, 1939, Box 17, Setzler Papers.


32. Webb to Lewis, February 3, 1936, Box 2, Webb Papers.

33. Webb to Jones, February 3, 1936, Box 2, Webb Papers; Howard to Lewis, April 13, 1936, Roll 74, TVA Microfilm.

34. Webb to Lewis, February 3, 1936, Box 2, Webb Papers. Although the Pickwick Dam was in Tennessee, most of the basin was in the state of Alabama.

35. Lewis to Webb, February 10, 1936, Box 2, Webb Papers.


37. Thomas M. N. Lewis and Madeline Kneberg, Eva: An
Archaic Site (Knoxville, 1961); William S. Webb, *The Jonathan Creek Village, Site 4, Marshall County, Kentucky*, University of Kentucky Reports in Anthropology (1952).

38. Draper to Clapp, February 19, 1940, General Managers' Office File.

39. Webb to Durisch, November 5, 1941, General Managers' Office File.

40. Webb to Clapp, November 21, 1941, General Managers' Office File. Webb's resignation came as a surprise because his contract as TVA consultant was renewed for a year on October 4, 1941. A. Fletcher Percefull to George F. Gant, TVA Director of Personnel, October 8, 1941, General Managers' Office File.

41. Guthe to Webb, April 27, 1939, Box 5, Webb Papers.


44. Kerr to Ross G. Harrison, January 28, 1939, Anthropology and Psychology Division Records.

45. Committee on Basic Needs meeting May 21, 1939, Anthropology and Psychology Division Records.

46. Ibid., 2-3.

47. Ibid.

48. Ibid., 17.
49. Ibid., 20.


51. Minutes of meeting of Committee on Basic Needs, December 31, 1940, Box 17, Setzler Papers.

52. Deignan to Harvey Becknell, January 8, 1941, RG 69/215.


54. Guthe to Kerr, January 27, 1941, Strong Papers.

55. Guthe to Strong, February 5, 1941, Strong Papers.


59. This summary, George D. McCoy, "Summary of WPA Archaeological Projects, 1934-42," NAA catalog number 4844, Box 1, and the WPA Quarterly Reports are stored in the National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution.

60. Strong to Cole, January 31, 1945, Box 22, Cole Papers.


62. Griffin to Johnson, November 10, 1944, Box 3, Setzler Papers.


64. Ibid.

65. Ibid.
CHAPTER V: ALABAMA

Large-scale archaeology in Alabama began as a response to the crisis caused by the construction of Wheeler Dam by the TVA. This successful excavation program sponsored by the TVA, CWA, and the Alabama Museum of Natural History provided the basis for future federal relief archaeology in the state. William Webb directed the entire TVA program in 1934 and had established an organization which would be able to respond to the destruction of archaeological sites caused by the construction of two new TVA dams—Guntersville in the northeastern part of the state and Pickwick which would inundate sites in the northwestern area of the state. After the end of the Wheeler archaeological project, Webb retained his position as director of the entire TVA archaeological program and remained closely involved in all major decisions of the Alabama WPA project.

The director of the Alabama Museum of History, Walter B. Jones, sponsored the WPA archaeological project in Alabama, but David DeJarnette directly supervised all
of the work in the state. DeJarnette received his Bachelor of Science from the University of Alabama in 1929. He had been assistant curator at the Alabama Museum of Natural History from 1929 to 1931 and curator beginning in 1931. DeJarnette was a member of the famous University of Chicago field school in archaeology in 1932 where he received training in the most modern archaeological methods available at that time. He had been the district supervisor responsible for the CWA and TVA archaeological project in the Wheeler Basin in 1934. The other archaeologists working for the Alabama WPA archaeological project had a variety of different backgrounds. Field supervisors during the project included Harold V. Andersen who received his bachelor of arts degree in geology from the University of Alabama in 1931. H. Summerfield Day earned his bachelor of arts degree in anthropology in 1933 from the University of Illinois and had been a graduate student in anthropology at Harvard University, and an archaeologist with the National Park Service from 1935 to 1937. James R. Foster received his master of arts degree from the University of Kentucky in 1933. He had worked for the CWA-TVA Wheeler Basin project in 1934 and was a TVA junior archaeologist from 1936 to 1939. Theodore L. Johansen received his bachelor's degree in
biology and geology in 1937 and had worked for the Alabama Museum of Natural History and as an archaeologist for the TVA. Wayne W. Kraxberger received his bachelor of arts degree in 1937 from the University of Denver and had experience in the archaeology of the Western United States. Carl F. Miller earned his master of arts degree from the University of Arizona in 1929 and had archaeological experience in the West and had worked as a junior archaeologist for the National Park Service. Julie C. Adcock was a laboratory supervisor with a bachelor of arts degree from the University of Alabama and had worked for the Alabama Museum of Natural History from 1934 to 1937. Harold H. Dahms was the chief laboratory archaeologist. He received his master of arts degree from the University of Nebraska and had worked in Nebraska archaeology and as a TVA archaeologist in Alabama. Marion L. Dunlevy was another laboratory supervisor with her master of arts degree from the University of Nebraska, graduate work at the University of Chicago, and experience in Nebraska archaeology. The project had two physical anthropologists. Charles E. Snow received his doctorate in anthropology from Harvard University in 1938. Marshall T. Newman earned his master of arts from Harvard University in 1940 and had worked as a CWA archaeologist.
in Florida and a TVA physical anthropologist.¹

The relationship between the Alabama WPA archaeological project and the national WPA administration would never serve as a model for other WPA archaeological programs. When DeJarnette submitted an application for the Alabama archaeological project to the WPA in February, 1936, he optimistically asked the WPA for 1000 men and eighteen supervisors, each to have a field crew of sixty men. He planned to have eight field parties in the Pickwick Basin and ten parties in the Guntersville area, but he admitted that he would have been satisfied to receive one half or even a third of the proposed project.² DeJarnette faced immediate problems finding enough WPA laborers to do the work. The project was not yet organized on a statewide basis, and he had to deal with local WPA administrators to find the labor.³ The WPA supervisor in the Pickwick area was neither well educated nor sympathetic to archaeologists. "He said that he had too many 'worthwhile' projects without 'fooling around' with any Indian digging projects." DeJarnette could not persuade him of the value of archaeology and they met with another WPA official where they reached an unsatisfactory agreement for DeJarnette to receive only ten men in each of the two counties. DeJarnette was reduced to taking one
small crew himself in the Pickwick Basin and having Wilder supervise the other. He hoped to expand the size of the project later. He was not able to persuade the WPA officials to give him any labor at all in the Guntersville area and that project was delayed.  

Webb's experience working with federal and local officials in the CWA-TVA program in 1934 prepared him for the many problems he would face in Alabama in 1936. Webb told DeJarnette "this is just what I feared. Alabama seems always to have handled the labor situation in a different way from all the other states." Webb saw two ways out of this situation. One would be to have the project set up on a statewide basis so labor could be moved throughout the state. His other idea was to go to the TVA, explain his problem, and request the TVA to supply the labor because the WPA could not do it. Webb was to try his TVA strategy again and again in an attempt to get more support from the TVA. He was hopeful that he could persuade the TVA to supply men and supervision for archaeology in the two basins, but he knew that "of course they will not act as long as there is any hope of getting the work done otherwise."  

In April, 1936, Webb tried to persuade Howard of the TVA to allocate funds to pay for labor without using
the WPA. He complained about the Alabama WPA that "many of these administrators are so tied up with local politics that they will not consent to the distribution of labor to any other project than their own. It appears that state and Federal approvals mean nothing to these men when it comes down to actually getting the labor."6 Webb was able to convince the TVA to build up a small force of men to continue the excavation over a long period. Webb's failure to obtain all the assistance he wanted from the TVA was due not to lack of interest in archaeology by TVA officials, but to lack of explicit authorization for archaeology in the legislation creating the TVA.

DeJarnette submitted a proposal for a new WPA project in July and, surprisingly, in September the WPA approved the project. The WPA District Supervisor in North Alabama promised to assign every available man authorized to the work. The project authorization was for four 30 man crews--two field crews in the Guntersville area and two in Pickwick. Webb still was not hopeful that they would get all the men but he felt that this project would make possible a year's work in Pickwick and would finally allow excavation to begin in the Guntersville Basin. The WPA approved approximately $18000 for Pickwick and $16000 for Guntersville.7 Once
the program began to operate, the problems with the WPA lessened. The smooth operation of the WPA program allowed the TVA to transfer DeJarnette from its payroll to the staff of the University of Alabama. Jones was happy to have DeJarnette back and promised to keep him as supervisor of the TVA-WPA archaeological program. But despite the increasing efficiency of the WPA program, Webb still wanted the TVA to increase its support of the work. Until recently the TVA had generously supplied all transportation for the workers, salaries for the supervisors, supplies, tools, rental for laboratories, and money for crop damage. Without TVA assistance the Alabama archaeological program could not have operated as efficiently as it did, but Webb wanted more: archaeological apprentices on the TVA payroll.

Jones and DeJarnette objected to any outside supervision of their archaeological program. They tolerated Webb as the TVA representative but wanted the freedom to run the program in their own way. This independence was impossible to achieve within the complex structure of New Deal archaeology. The project was increasingly subject to close scrutiny in Washington as the WPA archaeological program became better organized. Both the Smithsonian and the National Park Service
worried about the standards of the work. When Setzler approved the Alabama WPA project in February, 1938, he imposed a number of conditions: the first priority of the project must be to continue the work in the Guntersville and Pickwick basins; field crews must be limited to 30 men each under the direction of a competent archaeological field technician; work of the project must be under the direction of David DeJarnette who was to submit for approval by the Smithsonian all new excavations in the state; and Webb was to continue to be an advisor to the project. WPA rules required that the NPS approve of the Alabama project, as all others, before it could be renewed. In March, Kelly told Petrullo of the WPA that he had discussed the conditions imposed by the Smithsonian with Setzler and he felt those conditions were the minimum standards they should expect of the project. Kelly was not impressed with the Alabama project and said, "I think it is impossible to deal with Jones as he has absolutely no conception of procedure either in the field or in the laboratory." He felt that the condition that DeJarnette direct all of the work was crucially important. He pointed out to Petrullo that "there can be no justification whatsoever for misuse of Federal funds in despoliation of valuable archaeological sites as
these people have been doing for many years with the funds provided by the state of Alabama," and continuing his criticism "the fact remains that there is absolutely no scientific personnel and that the methods and whole setting of elemental work is absolutely unacceptable to professional requirements elsewhere for furthering responsible scientific work." He recommended to the NPS that these conditions be enforced closely and that the NPS have the right to check all field and laboratory conditions.12 Kelly's hostile view of the Alabama project may have been influenced by the attempt of Jones in early 1938 to take control of the archaeology of the entire Chattahoochee Valley. Kelly regarded the whole state of Georgia as his personal archaeological territory and vowed "to stop Jones and DeJarnette dead in their tracks" because of this invasion of Georgia.13 Kelly's attempt to discredit Jones and the Alabama project may have been swayed by his desire to keep Jones out of Georgia, but his views were influential with the NPS and WPA. Fortunately for the Alabama project, Webb enthusiastically recommended continuation of the project.

Despite his opposition to any attempt of the Alabama project to work in Georgia, Kelly was willing to objectively evaluate the project and change his opinion of it. When Ronald Lee, the supervisor of the Branch of
Historic Sites, asked Kelly to give his opinion of the Alabama project before the NPS approved it, he inspected the project in September and was impressed with the standards of the project and its personnel. He told Lee that "they are thoroughly cognizant of the reservations made in regard to the former project and have lived up to those arrangements." Kelly reported to Setzler the improvements in the project and informed him that they were living up to the conditions imposed by the Smithsonian. But the improvements in the Alabama program did not cause the Smithsonian to relinquish its influence over the project through the Washington office of the WPA. In addition to its previously stated requirements, the Smithsonian continued to stress the importance of completing the work in the Pickwick and Guntersville basins. Then the project should begin a statewide survey to find all important archaeological sites. If any important sites outside of Pickwick and Guntersville were to be excavated, approval should be first obtained from the Smithsonian and NPS.

The WPA imposed these exact conditions on the Alabama project without indicating that the directive originated with the Smithsonian. Jones blamed Petrullo and the WPA for these restrictions on his freedom of action and complained to Webb that "we are having a good
deal of trouble with Dr. Petrullo, in that he appears to be taking too much interest in our archaeological project. I am afraid he is trying to dictate our policies, and I do not think that I as sponsor should be forced to do more than to listen to his advice and take only that part which appeared to me to be just and reasonable. 18 Archaeologists in Alabama and other states often blamed the WPA bureaucrats for constraints on their freedom of action that really resulted from the actions of the senior generation of archaeologists in the Smithsonian and associated with the National Research Council. Archaeologists such as Setzler feared that scientific standards were being ignored in a number of the Southeastern states and worked behind the scenes to prevent any deterioration in the quality of the archaeology.

In 1938 the WPA began encouraging the establishment of large central archaeological laboratories to expedite the processing of the thousands of artifacts discovered by the archaeological projects. Vincenzo Petrullo, the WPA consultant on scientific projects, found it difficult to convince some of the sponsors and state WPA organizations of the importance of central laboratories. He pressured the Alabama project to establish a central archaeological laboratory in Birmingham. Even Webb was
somewhat skeptical about the creation of a large laboratory in Birmingham, but soon became a supporter of the idea. The laboratory with a work force of sixty people was located in two large buildings of a former girl's reformatory in the suburbs of Birmingham. Once the archaeologists managed to overcome the initial problems, the Birmingham laboratory became a model for the laboratories the WPA established in other Southeastern states. Petrullo suggested to the directors of other archaeological projects that they send a representative to Birmingham to observe the operation of the laboratory before they set up a central laboratory in their own states. Petrullo considered this laboratory one of the most important accomplishments of the WPA archaeological program.

In order to organize the efforts of so many people without training in archaeology, the archaeologists developed a manual of operations for the laboratory and one for field work. The field manual included information about many problems that came up in the field, such as staking out the site as well as instructions about how to deal with a burial mound or cemetery. The manual pointed out to the reader that "the archaeologist advances by destroying and must read the story and pick up his clues as he proceeds. The slightest
discolorations, compactness, presence of limestone, relationship of one feature to another, etc.--all may have a meaning.23 The manual gave detailed instructions on how to excavate a burial using a probe, a grapefruit knife, and a brush. The procedures of the manual, when combined with the training provided by the archaeologists, gave the workers the skills to do laboratory analysis in an assembly line environment.

As Webb became more involved in Kentucky archaeology and less in Alabama archaeology the Washington archaeological establishment became more concerned about the Alabama WPA project. Instead of concentrating their efforts on laboratory study of the artifacts from the TVA excavations and archaeological surveys of the rest of the state, the Alabama archaeologists began to turn their attention to other areas of the state. Matthew Stirling of the Smithsonian recommended against excavation of additional sites not threatened with destruction. The project was already swamped with data and he supported laboratory work leading to publication of archaeological reports.24 Wetmore, officially speaking for the Smithsonian, recommended the continuation of a limited project to complete the laboratory work. He opposed any large scale statewide project which would delay the completion of the laboratory work.25 The WPA,
following the advice of the Smithsonian, opposed new excavations outside of the area of the Tennessee Valley. 26

The defense preparations prior to American entry into World War II began to limit the activities of the Alabama project. Jones took a leave of absence, several members of the staff went into the defense program, and others were subject to the draft. After her inspection of the project, Deignan of the WPA concluded that the project would need special guidance to prevent an increase in the backlog of unanalyzed specimens. She wanted the Alabama archaeologists to work more methodically, finishing sites before moving on to new ones and having a maximum of three field crews at one time. 27 The WPA recommended to DeJarnette that field work in the Tennessee Valley be the first priority of the project and that before excavation expanded outside the Valley a plan be submitted to the WPA. But DeJarnette ignored this condition for approval of the project. Setzler became increasingly concerned about the Alabama project fearing that it might become a "collectors heaven." 28 Finally DeJarnette submitted a plan of operation and the project continued. But by this time dissension had developed in the project and Jones felt there was an attempt "to scuttle the archaeological
Some of the staff members felt they were not getting full credit for their work, and there was some dissatisfaction with DeJarnette's management of the project. But the coming of World War II ended the project before the internal warfare did. By July the field crews were being closed and the operation of the laboratory reduced.

The Alabama WPA project expended much of its resources to salvage the archaeological sites to be flooded by the Pickwick Dam. The Pickwick Landing Dam in west Tennessee, approximately eight miles from the Tennessee-Mississippi border, was the third major dam built by the TVA. The TVA started construction in January, 1935. The Authority provided the archaeological supervisors: Harold V. Andersen, John L. Buckner, James R. Foster, William G. Haag, and Theodore Johansen. Archaeological field work began on May 4, 1936, and continued until the basin was flooded by the closing of the dam in February of 1938. Excavation continued at several marginal sites until the spring of 1939.

The two summer archaeological surveys of the Alabama Museum of Natural History had located a number of sites in Northern Alabama before the beginning of the Pickwick Basin project. Then R. D. Silver of the TVA searched
the more than 75 square miles of the Pickwick Basin for archaeological sites. At the end of this survey the archaeologists knew the location of 323 sites: 49 in Tennessee, 40 in Mississippi, 116 in Colbert County, Alabama, and 118 in Lauderdale County, Alabama. The topography of the area influenced the archaeological program in the Pickwick Basin. Hills surrounded the bottom land. The people in the area lived near the roads, not in the bottom lands, and it was difficult to bring workers to the sites. DeJarnette left Florence at six o'clock in the morning to pick up his WPA workers. He dropped them off near the site and they walked the rest of the way while he drove five miles to pick up more men and brought them to the site. In the winter it was impossible to reach many of the sites because of water and mud.

As early as 1936 Webb classified the sites in the Pickwick Basin into two types: earth mounds of the copper-galena or copena complex, and shell mound sites. He decided to focus on a careful excavation of twenty important sites rather than a partial excavation of many others. In their final report, Webb and DeJarnette discussed the five mound and two village sites in the earth mound and village Copena complex, and nine shell middens. They also discussed the three sites they
called domiciliary earth mounds and villages characterized by shell tempered pottery, and one cave site.

Webb first discovered Copena sites in the Wheeler Basin in Alabama in 1934. He extended his knowledge of them by the excavations in the Pickwick Basin. Webb selected the Wright sites for excavation because the appearance and location of a conical earth mound indicated that it might be a Copena site. When the archaeologists found burial pits, they dug down around them leaving a raised pedestal which they could later examine using trowel and brush. As was normal for Copena sites, all skeletal material was in poor condition. They found the copper artifacts they expected in a copper-galena site.

The second Wright mound was an earth mound which had been partially destroyed by cultivation and treasure hunters. Supervisors at this site were J. R. Foster, William Haag, and B. C. Refshauge. The mound was partially excavated in the spring of 1937 when high water in the Tennessee River made work at other sites impossible. When the water went down, the archaeologists returned to other sites until several weeks of excavation became possible in March, 1938, when rising waters from the early closing of the Pickwick Dam required abandoning other sites. They found 37 burials.
along with copper artifacts and galena balls. During the excavation of the mounds William Haag supervised the excavation of a small village site located 600 yards from the mounds. Normally the Wright village would have been ignored because of its small size, but because it was so close to the two Copena mounds, it was excavated in the hope that it would be the first certain Copena village site. Haag investigated an area 70 by 25 feet. He found a circular pattern of post molds. Pottery was sand tempered, limestone tempered, and clay-grit tempered. Webb and DeJarnette tentatively classified the site as a Copena village because it was so close to the two Copena mounds, but they could not be sure because the pottery found was not similar to that discovered at other Copena sites.

The Seven Mile Island site, excavated by Foster, was a Mississippian period site. Like all major islands in the Tennessee River it was occupied by Mississippian peoples because the island was a natural defense against enemies and was covered by rich soil annually replenished by floods. Work started in the fall of 1937 with the crews pulled across to the site in boats using steel cables. Under the mound was a large village which could not be completely excavated because a flood in March, 1938, pushed backwater into the excavation area.
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site had been occupied before the occupation of the site by the "shell-tempered pottery people." After living on the site for a long time they built the mound. This culture was characterized by truncated pyramidal mounds, rectangular post mold patterns, extended or partially flexed burials usually with artifacts, stone artifacts including greenstone celts, stone disks, and shell-tempered pottery. Webb and DeJarnette saw similarities between this site and C. B. Moore's excavation of Moundville, Alabama.  

Some sites presented an interpretative problem because they contained remains of two very different cultures. Webb and DeJarnette divided the occupation of the Koger's Island site into two complexes based on their observation that "the presence of a great preponderance of clay-grit-tempered sherds in the earth of the village in which only shell-tempered pottery was used with the burials definitely suggests the occupancy of this site by two distinctly different peoples." The first culture was similar to that of the shell mound type. Webb and DeJarnette concluded that a small number of people in a late stage of development of the shell mound culture briefly occupied the site using mainly clay-grit-tempered pottery. They placed very few artifacts in their graves. The later
occupation was by a much more advanced people with only shell-tempered pottery and more elaborate artifacts which they placed in graves. This culture reminded Webb and DeJarnette of the site at Moundville.

Webb and DeJarnette's study of the Pickwick Basin led to increased knowledge of the Copena Focus through excavation of the Wright Mounds and Village site, Colbert Creek, Boyd's Landing, and Fisher Mound and Village. They refined the trait list for the Copena focus, but were not able to place it accurately in the developing picture of Southeastern prehistory. They did conclude that the Copena focus was completely prehistoric and probably should be placed in the pottery era. They were not sure that the people of the Copena focus made or used pottery because the limestone-tempered pottery found could have been the result of later intrusions into the mounds. Webb and DeJarnette classified the Copena as the Southern part of the Hopewellian phase, but they could not definitely identity Copena with any historic Indian culture.  

Webb and DeJarnette were especially interested in the many shell mounds excavated in the Pickwick Basin: Smithsonia Landing, Perry, Bluff Creek, O'Neal, Meander Scar, Long Branch, Union Hollow, Mulberry Creek, and Georgetown. They represented the most common type of
site the CWA-TVA-WPA archaeologists found in the Alabama portion of the Tennessee Valley. In the 1930s and early 1940s, archaeologists thought them to be the oldest culture in the Tennessee Valley. Their way of life was governed by Tennessee River floods which forced the people away for a brief time and covered the sites with silt. New ideas led to new artifacts, but change was slow and Webb and DeJarnette did not see any drastic changes until the coming of the shell-tempered pottery people during the recent period. Skeletal material discovered remained the same. They saw no evidence of invasions of new people from outside the Tennessee Valley with a vastly different material culture or physical appearance. The shell mounds could be divided into pre-pottery and pottery stages, and Webb and DeJarnette concluded that "the use of pottery was acquired very late in the history of these middens, and also that pottery was unknown to the occupants for most of the period of the building of these shell mounds."^{43}

The construction of the Guntersville Dam by the TVA led to the other major salvage project in Alabama. The Alabama project began work in the Guntersville Basin on June 1, 1937. The archaeological supervisors were Carl F. Miller, Harold F. Dahms, Charles G. Wilder,
H. Summerfield Day, Theodore J. Johansen, and Steve Wimberly. The archaeologists finished most of their work by the time the basin was flooded by the TVA on January 16, 1939, but some work on the marginal sites continued to October 1, 1939.\textsuperscript{44} Webb had planned to begin work in this basin in 1936, but, despite federal and state approval of the project, a lack of unemployed men in the area delayed the start of the work.\textsuperscript{45} When the TVA began its construction of a dam, it put to work the unemployed laborers in the area, leaving none available to the WPA for archaeological projects.\textsuperscript{46} Webb had hoped to use only labor under the direct control of the TVA in this basin so he could "control it from top to bottom in every detail."\textsuperscript{74} He wanted to avoid using WPA labor so he would not have to coordinate his efforts with the Alabama relief program. He was optimistic that the work, once started under the complete control of the TVA, would move faster than in the other basins.\textsuperscript{48} But forced to use WPA labor, Webb's problems in finding adequate labor continued.\textsuperscript{49} Using a previous survey by the Alabama Museum of Natural History as a basis for their work, the archaeologists made a survey of archaeological sites in the fall of 1936 and found several hundred sites. Of these they decided to excavate only 23 sites.\textsuperscript{50} The decision to excavate was not
based on the archaeological importance of the sites but on the availability of WPA labor in the vicinity. 51 Webb's goal was only "to get a fair sample" of the prehistory of the Guntersville Basin. 52

After the archaeologists completed the excavation, Webb began to prepare a report on the basin as he did on the 1934 work in the Norris and Wheeler basins. The writing of the Guntersville Basin report did not go as smoothly as either of the previous reports. By October of 1941 the report was 95 percent complete, but Webb was in no hurry to finish it since the TVA, focusing on the national defense program, could not provide funds for its publication. 53 After the war the TVA tried twice to find funds to publish the report, but, because of a drive for economy in government, money was not available. Webb and Wilder finally published the report in an abbreviated form in 1951 with aid from the Haggin Foundation of the University of Kentucky.

The excavation of the Guntersville Basin illustrates the type of problems faced by New Deal archaeologists. It consisted of a domiciliary mound 180 by 210 feet and a large village area. The TVA did not obtain title to the site until five weeks before the closing of the Guntersville Dam. Webb and DeJarnette estimated that a careful excavation
of the mound would have taken from one or two years. Instead they had five weeks in the winter of 1938-1939 under conditions of extreme rainfall and high water. Since they did not have much time they decided not to excavate the mound and to concentrate on the village. But when the TVA had to construct a new river channel, the mound had to be removed. A few days before flooding the basin TVA crews began to remove the mound with five twelve-yard capacity Letourneau excavators and two bulldozers. During day and night under heavy rain archaeologists attempted to salvage what they could. They did not gain much information because "the method of excavation presented only a fleeting glimpse of any one portion of a floor before the next Letourneau cut deeper." They found layers of superimposed floors with fire-burned areas. The straight lines of post molds formed rectangular structures. One floor was composed of four inches of clay and had burned organic material on top of it. They could not find a post mold pattern on this floor because it was removed rapidly at night.

The study of the Guntersville Basin allowed Webb and Wilder to construct a chronology of five stages in the basin. Guntersville I is the pre-pottery period. The archaeologists found much less evidence of pre-
pottery cultures in the Guntersville Basin than they had in the Pickwick and Wheeler Basins. The levels without pottery included fire basins, fire-cracked rocks, hammerstones, and sandstone and steatite fragments. The Whitesburg Bridge site and the Flint River sites are good examples of this period.

Gunterlands II was characterized by the appearance of fiber-tempered pottery. Webb and Wilder thought that this type of pottery was not developed locally, but was the result of trade with other Indian cultures. The Gunterlands III period was marked by the introduction of limestone-tempered pottery. This pottery was made locally. They found a greater number of large middens in this period and consequently could define more traits for Gunterlands III. These sites were located on highly desirable land and as a result later Indians established camps and villages near or on them. The Gunterlands IV period people buried their dead in the Gunterlands III middens. This disturbed the sites and confused the stratigraphy. Evidence of Gunterlands III burials was not found. The Gunterlands IV period originated with the introduction of shell-tempered pottery, but the most noticeable characteristic of the period was the construction of large truncated pyramidal earth mounds with structures on top. New structures
were built when the old ones were destroyed, thus increasing the size of the mounds. The sites show similarities to Moundville, Koger Island in the Pickwick Basin, and Etowah in Georgia. Gunterlands V is the beginning of the historic period and was marked by the presence of European trade goods. Webb and Wilder placed three sites in this period. They thought that the trade goods showed contact with British traders in an early period of contact.

After the TVA closed the Guntersville Dam high water damaged several marginal sites. In order to prevent this loss of potentially valuable sites, M. Summerfield Day began survey and excavation of the Whitesburg Bridge site, a shell midden, on January 26, 1939. Day supervised the excavation until March, 1939, when Hugh Capps took over. After Capps resigned Day managed the excavation until its conclusion in April of 1940. Because a large number of black women were available for the work, a crew of black men and women excavated the site during the last seven months of the project. WPA rules regulating women's work required only slight modification in the working procedures. Day also supervised the excavation of the Flint River site beginning on June 13, 1938, and continuing to December 22, 1939. Dunlevy studied the more than 140,000 pottery
sherds found and determined that most of the pottery was limestone tempered. By the time of the publication of the study of the site in 1940, Webb and DeJarnette identified several periods of occupation, both Archaic and pottery stages.

After the completion of most of the work in the Tennessee Valley, the Alabama WPA archaeological project turned its attention to other areas of the state. The Alabama WPA project worked on the Moundville site and in South Alabama despite the attempts of the WPA to keep their attention on the needs of the salvage work in the Tennessee River Valley. An archaeological survey of Clarke County was completed and Steve Wimberly compiled a manuscript on nine sites including the Beckum Field site, the Rocky Ford village site, and the Porter site. The archaeologists surveying Clarke County excavated the McQuorquodale Mound from July 22, 1941, to August 22, 1941. This circular mound had a diameter of 60 feet. Wimberly and Tourtelot classified the site as a Hopewellian phase with similarities to the Copena in North Alabama and the Marksville stage in Louisiana.

The project excavated a number of sites in Baldwin County and Mobile County in the Gulf Coast region, and Wimberly prepared a manuscript on the work, "Aboriginal
Sites on the Gulf Coast in Alabama. The project also excavated the Bessemer site in Jefferson County. A major interest of the Alabama archaeologists was in the Moundville site. The Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) established a camp which excavated and worked toward restoration of the mounds. Walter Jones used special federal funds to begin construction of a museum. The CCC side camps ended their work in June, 1938, and the CCC assigned a full CCC camp to the park at that time, beginning the real progress of the park.

In January, 1941, Kelly wrote to Deignan to recommend that the Alabama project excavate the Coosa site in Coosa County because a large munitions plant was to be constructed near the site. He believed the site would be very important to archaeology. He had discussed Coosa, a Creek Indian occupation, with John R. Swanton, Chairman of the United States DeSoto commission, who told Kelly that this site "has the best chance of any of the DeSoto sites of being identified on the basis of historical, documentary, and archaeological investigations." DeJarnette, warning Kelly about a rumor that untrained individuals would destroy the site to obtain the old glass in the area, reminded him that "we all know that the material and the record
would be better preserved if left in the ground rather than be looted by private collectors. In February Kelly wrote to DeJarnette telling him that the WPA had granted an extension of his project to the Coosa site. But the approval to excavate Coosa was conditional in that work would be allowed in only one other area than Coosa, and this would mean closing down some other excavation in Alabama. DeJarnette felt that this condition was a violation of the project approval and planned to go to Washington to "have it out with them." "Why we cannot operate our project as the President approved it," he wrote to Andersen, "is beyond me." By April of 1941 DeJarnette was convinced that it was too late to excavate Coosa.

The large archaeological program in Alabama using WPA, TVA, and Alabama Museum of Natural History support contributed a great deal of data which would be useful in developing an understanding of Southeastern prehistory. The Alabama project excavated a large number of sites compared to some of the other Southeastern states: 84 mounds, 36 villages, 4 cave sites, and test excavations at other sites. The reports and data from this project continue to be important to Southeastern archaeologists. The survey of Alabama archaeology recently published by John Walthall relied very greatly
on the work of the 1930s and 1940s.
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CHAPTER VI: TENNESSEE

After the work in the Norris Basin ended in 1934, Webb recommended to the President of the University of Tennessee, James D. Hoskins, that the University develop a program of archaeological research in the state. Hoskins supported the proposal and, in September, 1934, established the Division of Anthropology as a section of the Department of History. He named Thomas M. N. Lewis director of the anthropology program. Lewis then organized a cooperative project between the university, the WPA, and the TVA beginning one of the largest archaeological projects during the depression.

Many problems confronted Lewis during the life of the Tennessee project. One of the major continuing difficulties was the laboratory analysis of the artifacts. Originally there were no provisions for laboratory work in the budget. As a result, Lewis was four years behind the field work and had "literally tons of material which had never been unpacked" by the time the WPA established the laboratory in June, 1938. Even with the new laboratory, Vincenzo Petruollo of the WPA...
felt that the main problem with the Tennessee project was the inability of Lewis to coordinate the field work with the laboratory. He thought that if Lewis would speed up the laboratory work he could come up to the record of many of the other archaeological projects where specimens were processed within two weeks after they were received in the laboratory. The laboratory might not have been the most efficient in the Southeast, but its failure to process artifacts rapidly was not due to a lack of staff. In February, 1940, Lewis supervised a staff of 35 workers in the laboratory.

Tennessee state and local politics often influenced relief archaeology in the state. Politicians persuaded the WPA to appoint unqualified individuals to WPA projects, and archaeology was no exception. The WPA appointed an amateur, George Barnes, to the staff of supervisors in the Chickamauga Basin, along with a friend of his. When it became necessary for Lewis to dismiss Barnes' friend, Congressman Samuel D. McReynolds (Dem.-Tenn.) threatened to have the project terminated. Lewis appealed to Matthew Stirling of the Smithsonian to contact the Congressman and try to persuade him to refrain from political interference in archaeological projects. But it was never possible to remove WPA archaeology from political influence. One day the WPA
suddenly took away half of a 45 man crew because county politicians gave higher priority to a farm road and other public works projects than to archaeology.  

Both the TVA and the WPA were concerned about the administration of the Tennessee project. Its inefficient procedures, delays in publishing reports, and the controversy with Webb made both agencies nervous about their support of Lewis. The TVA worried about the problem of checking the scientific standards of the work of the University of Tennessee once Webb no longer controlled the work in the Tennessee basins. In addition, the Authority was looking for ways to reduce its expenditures for archaeology. The TVA wanted to use the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) for archaeology since it was only half the expense of WPA labor. Lehman of the TVA argued that the typical CCC camp had a budget of $25000 and included a complete supervisory staff, 65,000 man-days of labor each year, twelve trucks, and $1500 for supplies. Lehman planned to approach the CCC in Washington about setting up camps in the Kentucky and Fort Loudon basins. Lewis, fearing that he would lose control of archaeology in Tennessee, resisted the involvement of the CCC in his program.

The WPA officials were also increasingly disturbed
about the progress of the Tennessee project. Lewis seemed, to the WPA, more concerned about beginning new excavations than in completing a project and publishing a report on the work. When Lewis met with the WPA in Washington in the spring of 1940, the agency told him that he should focus on finishing some of the work which was already underway. The WPA claimed that Lewis had set the dates of July 1, 1940 for completion of the Chickamauga Basin report, August 1, 1940 for Watts Bar, and July, 1942, for the Kentucky Basin report. Despite years of effort, Lewis had failed to complete the work in any basin, and the Chickamauga report still remained to be written.

When Stella L. Deignan visited Tennessee for a conference, she imposed new conditions on the increasingly troublesome Tennessee WPA project. The meeting of Deignan with John Lehman of the TVA, J. P. Hess and Lewis of the University of Tennessee was an "uproar from start to finish." Lewis thought that her entire interest was in finishing the final report on the Chickamauga Basin, but Deignan had broader goals in mind. She certainly wanted the Chickamauga report finished as soon as possible, but she also desired to have the field and laboratory activities coordinated so that artifacts could be more rapidly processed in
the laboratory. She wanted Lewis to finish one basin at a time and then prepare the report rather than work in numerous reservoirs at the same time. She recommended that field crews be eliminated from the Kentucky Basin and that all attention focus on the Watts Bar area. Lehman countered with the suggestion that a small crew continue in the Kentucky area, but he agreed that a large program of excavation was not necessary in the basin at that time in view of the long period before flooding of the basin.\textsuperscript{11} Besides suggesting changes in project operations, Deignan recommended closing the Tennessee WPA archaeological project on April 1, 1941.\textsuperscript{12} Despite the feeling of the Tennessee personnel that they were being singled out for punitive action, WPA policy was to approve a new project only when work currently underway showed signs of reaching completion.\textsuperscript{13}

The WPA made severe cuts in the project, but Lewis still applied for a new project to work in the Kentucky Basin, the Fort Loudoun area, and the Little Tennessee region. He planned to have the archaeologists in the field write site reports to be published as separate bulletins by the University of Tennessee.\textsuperscript{14} The TVA recommended approval of the new project,\textsuperscript{15} but on October 1, 1941, the WPA disapproved the project.
application for $111,000 until laboratory analysis and publication were completed for all basins excavated to that date. The WPA informed Lewis that it would consider a project to continue the laboratory work and to provide for clerical assistance for preparation of the manuscript. After this disapproval Lewis frantically tried to get the decision reversed. He telephoned Guthe to ask for assistance and asked Cole, McKern, and Strong to write the WPA requesting a reconsideration of the decision. All of them in letters to the WPA, strongly advocated continuation of the project. These letters from supporters of the project led Deignan to seek support for her decision to close it down. She asked Webb for his opinion of the project. Deignan wondered if a system of sampling could be developed which would replace complete excavation and thus cut expenses. Webb, always consistent in his opinion of Lewis, replied with a strongly negative evaluation of the University of Tennessee's archaeological program.

Deignan used Webb's evaluation in support of her decision, but once the Chickamauga report was submitted to the WPA her rationale for terminating the project grew weaker. Lewis had submitted the Chickamauga Basin manuscript to the WPA, and Setzler and Strong recommended
that the project continue.\textsuperscript{19} The WPA reconsidered its
decision and approved the project in November for
$64,000, though with conditions. WPA assistance for
excavation would stop at the end of June, 1942; and
after this date the laboratory work and clerical support
for preparing other manuscripts might be continued.\textsuperscript{20}
The University officials did not regard this as a
final decision and hoped to submit additional applica­
tions after the expiration of this grant because of
the continued construction of dams in the state.\textsuperscript{21}
Work continued rapidly and by January, 1941, Lewis had
six field crews at work with a total of approximately
190 men.\textsuperscript{22}

The most important excavation program of the
Tennessee WPA archaeological project was in the
Chickamauga Basin north of Chattanooga. The work in
this basin started much more smoothly than it would
end. By June, 1936, Lewis had approximately 150 men
working on three sites, each a large mound surrounded
by extensive villages and a cemetery. Jesse Jennings
supervised the work in the basin and reported to Lewis.
The WPA provided the labor, some of them men of very
poor quality.\textsuperscript{23} Webb organized a survey of archae­
ological sites in the basin in August, and by September
Buckner of the TVA staff found approximately 70 sites.\textsuperscript{24}
Lewis wanted to use a boat for the survey, but Webb refused to use this method and the survey found 220 sites in a shorter period of time and with less expense than Lewis' method would have required.  

Webb's long and bitter feud with Lewis developed during the Chickamauga Basin project. Webb later explained why he ended his connection with the work in Chickamauga: "when a conference was held and a course of procedure agreed upon which apparently satisfied all parties I proceeded on the basis of the conference and the administration in Tennessee proceeded on some other basis." One major problem between Webb and Lewis was the authorship of the planned report on the Chickamauga Basin. Webb originally planned to write the report himself as he had with the other basins. He was under the impression that Lewis had agreed to this plan, though Lewis had really intended to write the report himself from the beginning and only then submit it to Webb. Lewis, claiming that the University had asked him to write the report himself, planned to list Webb as co-author, even though he intended to do 99% of the work himself.

Lewis wrote a short article on the Chickamauga Basin work for the University of Tennessee Bulletin. This infuriated Webb. Lewis used photographs that Webb...
thought could not be used again in the final report because of copyright problems. Webb concluded that Lewis was going to publish the report in a piecemeal manner, in violation of his understanding, "that I am in charge of the archaeological studies being made in all three Basins on the Tennessee river under the direction of the TVA, the Chickamauga Basin as well as the others." In addition to this very real disagreement, there were more personal reasons for the quarrel. Webb angrily wrote to Lewis that "it has come to me therefore with much surprise from many sources, that on many occasions, in private and public, in the state of Tennessee and out of it, you have by indirection, inuendo, sarcasm, ridicule, and sometimes by direct statement sought to belittle me and my work and my connection with the T.V.A."\textsuperscript{29} \textsuperscript{30}

Lewis and his project began to develop problems with the TVA by November. Webb worried about this because he envisioned a long period of cooperation with the TVA and did not want to have any difficulties with its administration. Howard of the TVA complained of a lack of progress reports so that he did not know what was happening in the Chickamauga Basin. He felt that supervision of the work was not close enough and that a representative of the University of Tennessee should
be in the basin all of the time. Howard did not like to rely on WPA employees who were not responsible to the TVA.\textsuperscript{31} Lewis in addition to working in the Chickamauga Basin started a project in the Cheatham County area. He intended to establish a wayside museum north of Nashville with the profits going to build up the archaeology program at the University of Tennessee. The WPA was willing to provide labor for excavation and construction of the museum. The TVA criticized Lewis for his frequent absences from Chickamauga to supervise the project in Cheatham County, but Lewis defended his absences, saying that they would result in the development of a stronger archaeology program in the state.\textsuperscript{32}

Planning was never a great strength of the Tennessee project, and by March, 1937, the project was in danger of running out of money. When the National Research Council proved unable to make a grant, Lewis applied to the American Philosophical Society for an emergency grant of $1000. Fortunately, in June he received the grant which allowed the work in the basin to continue.\textsuperscript{33}

Webb was not satisfied with the work that had been done in the Chickamauga Basin when Lewis closed the project. Lewis later wanted to do a survey specifically looking for what Webb called "a hypothetical early
culture." Webb objected to the survey because it would mean that the TVA was not satisfied with the survey made under his direction in 1936. Webb considered this to be a trick of Lewis. While the survey was underway for two months, Lewis would continue his work in the Kentucky Basin. Webb rightly suspected that Lewis did not intend to resume work in the Chickamauga Basin, despite the fact that many known sites remained unexcavated. 34

Lewis developed an ambitious plan for the publication of a report on the Chickamauga Basin. He had in mind a complete, exhaustive report which avoided what he considered the faults of Webb's publications on the Norris and Wheeler basins. 35 This plan created a real problem for Lewis. This type of report would take a long time to prepare and the WPA required prompt publication. William McKern tried to defend the Tennessee project from what he regarded as pressure to publish prematurely. He worried that Webb's reports were being held up as models for archaeological publications. Perhaps influenced by his total commitment to the Lewis side of the Webb-Lewis battle, McKern argued that "Webb's recent bulletins are good only if compared to the sort of thing we were getting out some eight or ten years ago." Defending Lewis to Fay-Cooper
Cole, McKern asked, "why should anyone interested in the welfare of American archaeology insist that similar publications be rushed to press by the workers on other projects?" 36

Deignan anticipated, as a result of a meeting with Lewis in Washington in the spring of 1940, that the Chickamauga manuscript would be completed by July 1, 1940, 37 but Lewis failed to complete the manuscript on time. Another meeting with Lewis, Kneberg, Hess, and State WPA officials in December, 1940, allowed Deignan to push for completion of the manuscript. She pointedly reminded Lewis that the $118,000 WPA appropriation for the project was approved by the WPA based on an agreement that the report would be complete by June 1, 1940. Not only was the manuscript not ready, but Lewis did not remember promising it by that date. She set a new deadline of April 1, 1941, for completion of the Chickamauga manuscript with the threat that if it was not complete on that date the project would be suspended until it was finished. She arranged for Lewis and Kneberg to be freed from many administrative duties to work on the report. 38

When the report was finally ready, Lewis estimated that the length of the book would be 750 pages. 39 They had prepared a nine pound manuscript, without the
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illustrations. But by this time the TVA refused to grant the publication funds because of the requirements of the defense emergency. The University of Tennessee officials assured Lewis that they accepted responsibility for eventually publishing the complete manuscript, but because of their lack of funds he chose to publish the first chapter of the report as an interim measure. The final report on the archaeology of the Chickamauga Basin was never published despite a large amount of money and time invested in the project. The Tennessee archaeologists had closely studied thirteen sites in the basin. Surface collections were made and test pits were dug at many more sites. Because of the nature of the sites, Lewis concentrated his time in intensive excavation of a small number of sites rather than many shorter and less complete excavations. Lewis and Kneberg did publish a study of one of the excavations in the basin, the Hiwassee Island site. According to James B. Griffin, the Hiwassee Island report is not an archaeological classic. Charles H. Nash, assisted by Wendell C. Walker and Charles H. Fairbanks, began excavation at the Hiwassee Island site in April, 1937, and ended in March, 1939. Their survey of the island found five types of sites: a large village, numerous shell middens, conoidal mounds, a large truncated sub-
structure mound and the remains of another one, and the remains of a lake caused by prehistoric activities.\textsuperscript{42}

The planning of the Gilbertsville or Kentucky Dam by the TVA aggravated the feud between Lewis and Webb. The dam was to be in Kentucky, but the basin to be flooded included parts of both Kentucky and Tennessee. Webb's interest in a program of excavation began in 1936, even before Congress authorized the construction of the dam,\textsuperscript{43} but it was not until late in 1938 that the TVA asked him to submit plans for an excavation program in the Kentucky Basin. Although the TVA did not plan to begin construction until July, 1940, Webb was anxious to develop a plan of exploration for archaeological sites. Word that enemy field parties from the University of Tennessee were to enter the basin increased his fear that Lewis would disturb his long-range plan of exploration in the Tennessee Valley.\textsuperscript{44}

Webb intended to begin an archaeological survey of the basin starting in January, 1939, with excavation beginning in July, 1940, when the TVA was to begin acquisition of land.\textsuperscript{45} He advanced his schedule because of the threatened activity of Lewis, and Foster finished his survey of the Gilbertsville Basin in May, finding 40 sites in Kentucky and 160 in Tennessee. Foster suggested that the TVA establish a CCC camp at Murray,
Kentucky, for the Kentucky side and a portion of the Tennessee side, and another camp at either Waverly, Tennessee, or Camden, Tennessee. 46 Webb stressed to Durisch of the TVA that the project should not include any cooperation between the University of Kentucky and the University of Tennessee. 47

But Lewis would not so easily give up the Kentucky Basin to Webb. He had already invested fourteen months of work in the area and claimed it as his own. Lewis had by this time developed a states rights conception of archaeology: Tennessee archaeology should be controlled by citizens of Tennessee. This notion, combined with his desire to personally control all archaeology in Tennessee, was bound to lead to trouble. Lewis regarded any attempt to reduce his control as a personal threat to his reputation in the profession of archaeology. He contended that the use of Civilian Conservation Corps labor, a plan favored by Webb, was absurd in an area where he said there were hundreds of unemployed men. He further argued that the University of Tennessee had a good basic knowledge of the area because of the fourteen months of work in the Kentucky Basin. Lewis feared that two reports based on conflicting methods and with diverse interpretations of the prehistory of the area would be published, and this would be an
unwelcome confusion in Southeastern prehistory. In August of 1938, Lewis estimated that it would take two years to investigate the sites in the Tennessee portion of the Kentucky Basin. He wanted to make a preliminary site survey in the fall. Lewis suggested that he be appointed state archaeologist and be given authority to prevent this situation from developing. He wanted to be freed once and for all from the "annoying interferences" of Webb. He suggested that H. A. Morgan of the TVA appoint a consultant such as Carl Guthe to help deal with these problems. He needed immediate action by the TVA because he was completing one of the two sites in the Kentucky Basin which he had been excavating.

Lewis contacted his friends in archaeology, including McKern, Cole, Guthe, and others, for support against Webb. Webb, as usual, did not call for outside help. Lewis letters stirred up action among his archaeological friends. Cole, worried about "the whole system of 'feuding' which has been developing in the Southeast," had visited the area in the spring in an unsuccessful attempt to clear up the differences between Lewis and Webb, and he still hoped that the Committee on Basic Needs in American Archaeology could replace conflict with cooperation in the Southeast. The TVA tried to
resolve the conflict by calling Lewis to a meeting with TVA officials where he was told that a TVA-CCC camp was to be established in the Kentucky Basin area. The TVA gave Webb the authority to direct the excavation of the entire basin. Lewis was told to work on two or three additional sites in the region for one year and to reduce the size of his operation in the Basin and begin to focus his activity in the Watta Bar Basin. 51

Lewis then turned to the President of the University of Tennessee to defend the state's rights by taking the problem to H. A. Morgan of the TVA Board. Morgan was a past president of the University of Tennessee, and he took the side of Tennessee in the controversy. 52 Lewis continued his criticism of Webb's publications on the Norris and Wheeler basins, calling them preliminary reports. And he claimed that his organization at the University of Tennessee was "far superior" to the one at the University of Kentucky. 53 At a meeting Morgan assured Lewis of the support of the TVA. Morgan suggested consideration of a mobile CCC camp to work in the three remaining basins in Tennessee. The TVA would continue to supply engineering services and other supplies. But Lewis feared that he would lose control of the excavations if the CCC entered the work in the Kentucky Basin. He wanted complete control over the
Morgan asked Lewis to go before the TVA Board to defend his position. Lewis and Hoskins appeared before the board on August 7, 1939, and presented the Tennessee case in a statement signed by Hoskins but written by Lewis. Hoskins informed the board that the University of Tennessee had a field operation in the Kentucky Basin of between 125 and 150 men. He argued that if the University had to end this work, the WPA would close the Knoxville laboratory because the field crews would be too small to support the large laboratory force. The University of Tennessee could not transfer its activities to the Watts Bar area because WPA labor was not available unless the sponsor provided transportation. He recommended continuing a smaller project in the Kentucky area which would eventually culminate in a publication which could be combined with a report by Webb on the Kentucky side of the basin. The University hoped to set up a CCC camp in the Watts Bar area if the TVA would increase funding to provide two additional archaeologists. This additional contribution by the TVA would increase the sponsor's contribution to the 25% level required by a new WPA rule. Webb felt that this was "... a very dastardly attack on my work with the TVA." After the board meeting, the University
of Tennessee representatives met with Durisch and agreed to temporarily continue the current plan. Lewis and Kneberg thought they had won the war and would be able to continue the work in the Kentucky Basin unimpeded by Webb and the TVA. But all that the TVA had really decided was to refer the problem back to the Department of Regional Studies for reconsideration. Draper of the TVA later complained that TVA officials did not know in advance of the appearance before the TVA Board and that they were previously unaware of some of the Tennessee complaints. He defended his actions, stressing that the projected five-year period of construction of the dam made it advisable to develop the archaeological program in the basin slowly and for Lewis to focus his attention on the Watts Bar Basin. He reiterated the TVA policy for a comprehensive report to be published on the archaeology of each basin as a unit and recommended that Lewis should complete the report on the Chickamauga Basin before shifting his attention to the Kentucky Basin.

Lewis and Kneberg never published a report on their Kentucky Basin excavations. They did publish a report on one site, Eva, in 1961. Douglas Osborne supervised this excavation from September 11, 1940, to November 23, 1940. They classified the site as
Archaic with three components. By the time they published the report the development of radiocarbon dating allowed them to give precise dates for the components. The earliest component belonged to the Eva phase of the early Middle Archaic characterized by "notched and stemmed projectile points, biface tools, and ground stone artifacts." They dated this component from 6000 B.C. to 4000 B.C. This was followed at about 4000 B.C. by the Three Mile component of the late Middle Archaic which lasted until approximately 2000 B.C. New cultural traits in this period included conoidal pestles, stemmed scrapers, antler weights, and turtle shell rattles. The Big Sandy component lasted from 2000 B.C. to 1000 or 500 B.C. This late Archaic period was in contact with Woodland cultures. New artifacts found were Ledbetter and Benton projectile points, green slate gorgets, and copper beads. Lewis and Kneberg analyzed the chipped stone artifacts in the Eva report. Writing 20 years after the excavation of the site, they realized that the methodology of archaeology in the 1930s was imperfect when dealing with this class of artifacts. "Twenty years ago when the Eva site was being excavated, American archaeologists tended to discard unretouched flakes as merely the by-product of flint chipping.
technology. Today this is no longer the case, and a much clearer picture of early flint working has emerged.62

To defend the University of Tennessee against Webb's attacks, President Hoskins wrote to Guthe and asked him to recommend an outside archaeological consultant to evaluate the Tennessee archaeological program. Guthe himself agreed to conduct the inspection. Lewis asked him only to appraise the competence of the project, and not serve as a peacemaker in the dispute between Lewis and Webb.63 Guthe inspected the Tennessee project between September 17th and 19th, and reported to Hoskins that he considered the work of the project to be up to the standards of professional archaeology in the United States: "its past accomplishments and present activities demonstrate the value of the substantial support given its program by the Tennessee Valley Authority, and of the facilities placed at its disposal by the Works Projects Administration." He approved the work of Lewis' staff of four field assistants and six laboratory assistants who supervised 192 WPA workers. He did not visit the field work but concentrated his attention on the laboratory. Guthe was particularly impressed with the restoration of broken human skulls. He believed that the procedures
for documentation used in the laboratory might be too elaborate, but he recommended that the experiment be continued because the results so far indicated that the laboratory procedures were acceptable. Guthe concluded that it was "entirely probable" that the manuscript completed by Lewis and his team would be satisfactory. 64 His report pleased the University of Tennessee since he had removed the reason for their problems with the TVA. 65 Even Webb was satisfied with the report. He did not believe that Lewis' archaeological or laboratory procedures were deficient. "My contempt for him is based entirely upon his lack of ethics, his unprofessional conduct and his evident belief that he can advance his own position by defaming others." 66

The TVA officials decided to restrict the activities of both Webb and Lewis in the Kentucky Basin. Draper instructed Lewis to complete the one site under excavation at that time and then concentrate his efforts in the Chickamauga area. 67 The University of Tennessee reluctantly agreed to this limitation but stressed that the end of the work in the Kentucky Basin was temporary and that the question would be reopened if a shortage of labor developed in the Watts Bar Basin. 68 The TVA indicated its willingness to consider further work in the area if lack of WPA labor in the Watts Bar
Basin meant that laboratory work on the Chickamauga Basin material might be endangered. Webb was happy with the decision of the TVA because it at least slowed, if it did not stop, the activities of Lewis in the Kentucky Basin. He was pleased that Lewis would not get additional funds to make a survey in the Chickamauga area and would be required to prepare a report on the work he had completed in the Chickamauga area. Webb supported the continuing TVA commitment to excavate the Kentucky basin as a unit. He anticipated being in charge of the basin but, if he was not, at least the basin would be studied as a unit—which was a high priority to Webb.

The planned construction of the Watts Bar Dam between Knoxville and Chattanooga north of the Chickamauga Dam created another archaeological emergency for Lewis. Lewis tried to get the assistance of the National Park Service for this project, but the TVA and WPA financed the work. Excavation in the Watts Bar Basin was delayed due to problems with the WPA eighteen-months ruling. Lewis requested that the TVA pay the salaries of two archaeologists to supervise the proposed CCC laborers. He planned to begin excavations in the basin on October 19, 1939, with at least 40 WPA laborers and more in November. The TVA contributed
$9,000 for fiscal year 1940 for trucks, rental of a laboratory, supplies, equipment, photography, and crop damage. The TVA expected Lewis to prepare a publication on the basin which would be submitted to the TVA for review by its consulting archaeologist. If he judged the report acceptable, the TVA would assist in publishing it in the Bureau of American Ethnology series. The TVA supported Lewis even what was required of it. Lewis supposedly was doing only salvage work in areas to be flooded. If fact, he wanted to excavate sites near the basin even though they were not to be inundated. These sites were closely related to the sites he had excavated, and he felt he had to excavate them for the light they would throw on the prehistory of the basin. The TVA agreed to this request to work sites beyond the taking line.

The TVA planned to dam the Little Tennessee River at its mouth, and for the water to flow into the Fort Loudoun Basin. A WPA project under Hobart S. Cooper, beginning in June, 1936, had started the excavation of Fort Loudoun, a British fort. The project was sponsored by the State Highway Department and had more than 50 men in the crew. Prior to this the Fort Loudoun Association had worked for several years to restore the fort. Lewis had a broader program in mind than just
the excavation of Port Loudoun. He considered this region the most important archaeological area in the state because of the presence of historically documented Cherokee sites. The TVA recognized the importance of archaeological in the Fort Loudoun Basin, but since the dam was a national defense project, funds were not available for archaeology. Although this work was left out of the budget of the TVA, Lewis wanted the question reopened since WPA support would not be available after June, 1942. Lewis felt that it was important to investigate at least the Little Tennessee part of the Fort Loudoun Basin. Lewis had loaned one University of Tennessee archaeologist to the TVA for work at Bean Station. He would complete his work by January 1, 1942, and Lewis wanted to send him to a WPA project on the Little Tennessee. Because not all the funds assigned to the work in the Kentucky Basin would be needed, $2,500 could be made available for use in the Little Tennessee area. The TVA finally agreed to transfer $2,000 to the Fort Loudoun project to support work for six months.

Lewis developed another project in the Shelby Negro State Park, fifteen miles south of Memphis. J. Charles Poe, Commissioner of the Tennessee Department of Conservation, informed Lewis of the archaeological artifacts...
uncovered in the area. CCC workers discovered the mounds while they were clearing the ground for the park. "The land between and around the mounds was literally ankle-deep in crumbling bones, bricks and ancient pottery." After the discovery was reported to Washington the CCC work was brought to a stop. Lewis went to the site and pronounced it of great importance. He planned to have George Lidberg and 20 WPA workers excavate the site in March, 1940. Kelly of the NPS was concerned that the wayside museum being discussed by Lewis and others might not be the best way to develop the area. The NPS proposed to make the park into a state archaeological park.

The WPA approved the continuation of the Tennessee project in May, 1940, subject to important conditions: WPA officials opposed the Tennessee project's policy of continuing to excavate numerous sites. They approved the project on condition that the planned work in Shelby County be shelved and that funds available for work in that area be shifted to the project in the Kentucky Basin. Lewis temporarily postponed the work in Shelby, and the Shelby project finally ended in April, 1940. Lewis had requested assistance for two other areas. The TVA approved Lewis' proposal to extend work from the Fort Loudoun and Watts Bar areas to
include the Douglas Reservoir, so long as the work did not interfere with the construction of the dam or require any additional funds. Unfortunately the owner of the Mound Bottom site on the Harpeth River had continual problems with amateur archaeologists. When Lewis first asked for permission to investigate the site the reaction of the owner was to reach for his gun to defend his property.

American entry into World War II in December, 1941, did not immediately end the Tennessee archaeological project. The WPA approved continuation until June, 1942, and agreed that laboratory work would continue even after that date. The immediate goal of the project was to salvage everything possible in the next six months leaving analysis and publication to a later time. Lewis, particularly worried about the Cherokee sites on the Little Tennessee, tried to use convict labor to work in that area. He estimated that one archaeologist and 30 convicts could finish the work in six months. But the Tennessee WPA archaeological project was rapidly coming to an end. In June all of Lewis' employees had left and he could do little on his own. He prepared for the resumption of the archaeological program after the war, though he was extremely pessimistic about the future.
But after the war Lewis continued his efforts in Tennessee archaeology. With Madeline Kneberg, he published a report on the Eva site from the Kentucky Basin project and one on the Hiwassee Island excavation in the Chickamauga Basin. He never published a full report on either basin. Lack of complete publication of archaeological reports on the majority of the excavations of the Tennessee project prevents a full assessment of its impact on archaeologist's understanding of Tennessee prehistory. The best summaries of relief archaeology in Tennessee are the three articles published by project archaeologists in James Griffin's *Archeology of Eastern United States* in 1952. Madeline Kneberg wrote a chapter on "The Tennessee Area" which she submitted to Griffin in December, 1947. She discussed the entire range of Tennessee archaeology relying mostly on New Deal excavations. The earliest period of human occupation in Tennessee was represented by the Folsom points found all over the state. The next period was the Woodland culture of the Upper Valley people. While the oldest in Eastern Tennessee, it was seldom found in the Western section of the state. The oldest Valley culture was that of the Watts Bar people who lived in circular houses in compact villages. Because the archaeologists
had found no evidence of corn or shell, and only a few animal bones, Kneberg could not determine their subsistence pattern. The Indians made quartzite or sand-tempered pottery until they began to use limestone as the tempering agent.

Kneberg defined a Middle Valley culture similar to Upper Valley, but with the addition of conical burial mounds. The archaeologists found evidence of much conflict among some of the Upper Valley cultures: many of the Hamilton burials had arrow points in them. "The contentious Hamiltonians," Kneberg concluded, "were too much concerned about fighting among themselves, and too complacent regarding any threat from outside. And so they were driven out of the fertile valley by a more united and powerful people, the early Mississippi invaders." The Middle Mississippian culture in Tennessee, characterized by large pyramidal mounds, developed from a migration of the Muskogeans into the area. The Shelby site at Memphis was an example of a Mississippian site as was the Hiwassee Island culture in Eastern Tennessee. The Hiwassee Island people lived in compact towns, built large mounds and plazas, and used shell-tempered pottery.

Despite the many problems of the Tennessee WPA archaeological project, Lewis developed a very impor-
tant program which provided a great deal of data to Southeastern archaeologists. The Tennessee archaeologists discovered 736 sites in the reservoir areas and excavated 73.93
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CHAPTER VII: GEORGIA

The Civil Works Administration project at Macon proved more successful than anyone had anticipated—so successful that the end of the CWA did not stop the Macon project. The elimination of the CWA concentrated federal relief efforts again in the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA). Kelly had feared that he would lose all his trained supervisors under FERA, but his fears were unfounded.\(^1\) When the FERA approved his project, Gay Shepperson, Georgia state FERA director, bent the rules to get Kelly 100 laborers and 30 trained supervisors from his old work force.\(^2\) These experienced workers enabled Kelly to begin efficient work quickly.

Kelly realized that his excavation at Macon lacked comparative information from the rest of the state that would allow him to place the chronology he was building at Macon in the perspective of Georgia prehistory. He unsuccessfully attempted to establish an archaeological survey of Georgia under the national FERA. Kelly would persistently work toward a survey of the state until
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the creation of the University of Georgia-WPA state-
wide archaeological survey in 1938.

The work of Kelly at Macon under the CWA and FERA
led to the creation of a national monument at the site.
Continuing the long efforts to have a park made at
Macon, a committee of 100 made up of members of civic
organizations began to raise the money to purchase
the site. In June President Roosevelt signed a bill
creating the Ocmulgee National Monument. Almost
immediately the NPS, which would have the responsibility
of managing the monument, began to gather information
about the area through discussions with Swanton,
Setzler, and Kelly. The development of this national
monument was a complicated process of integrating
local and archaeological interests. The local amateur
archaeologists provided the land for the monument.
The Macon Junior Chamber of Commerce gave some land to
the United States government, and other Macon citizens
purchased land through the Macon Historical Society
and donated it to the government.

Influential Macon citizens interested in archae-
ology who had been instrumental in the creation of the
monument wanted to have a continuing voice in the plan-
ning and administration of Ocmulgee National Monument.
Dr. Charles Harrold, while not lacking an appreciation
of the needs of the archaeologists, preferred to begin
the work of restoration of the site in preparation
for the expected influx of tourists. He recognized
that Kelly needed to finish the archaeological inves­
tigations before beginning restoration, but Harrold
did not think that Kelly would finish the work before
he died and "the property looks like shell ridden
Flanders." The local amateurs had a great interest
in the educational and public relations future of
Ocmulgee National Monument. Harrold wanted to put on
a show to interest the school child and the tourist.
He realized that the archaeologists were not inter­
ested in "circus like exhibitions," but the interests
of the city of Macon had to come first. Kelly would
have many battles with the amateurs during his years
at Ocmulgee. His ability to accomplish so much was
due to the support of the Smithsonian Institution.
Setzler hoped that Kelly would dominate Georgia archae­
ology and coordinate all the federal programs to develop
a comprehensive understanding of Georgia prehistory.

The creation of the WPA gave Kelly a new source
of labor for his project. When combined with Civilian
Conservation Corps (CCC) labor and the assistance of
the NPS, Kelly had the foundation for a large and
efficient archaeological project. Kelly was puzzled
about how he became the superintendent of the new CCC camp as he had nothing to do with the project application. This additional job for Kelly caused much resentment among the local amateurs and some unsuccessful attempts to prevent losing control of the project at Ocmulgee to outside federal institutions. Kelly was to be the supervisor with his salary paid by the NPS and authority to spend more than $155,000 which was available from the WPA. He continued to complain about his low salary as he had ever since he came to Macon. Because he was a CCC superintendent he could not receive an additional salary for directing the WPA project, and he objected to doing the work of two men. But despite his complaints, Kelly was pleased at this division of responsibility between the CCC and WPA. The CCC project would work on park construction while the WPA crew would do the archaeology. He was happy with the restoration and construction work of the CCC, but not their efforts at archaeology. He anticipated that his new WPA project which would give him 63 laborers and 16 trained men would allow him to work in mounds A and B which had been delayed since the end of the previous WPA project.

Kelly had many difficulties managing a project
with WPA, NPS, and CCC sponsors. Applications for new projects and extensions slowed down the progress of the excavation. "WPA went out like a light May 7th," Kelly complained to Setzler, "quiescent until now with intermittent rumblings of an 'extension'." The WPA finally approved Kelly's application for a new project with the condition that he submit a comprehensive report within one month, and that plans be finalized for publication of a final report at the end of the project. Eventually Kelly would have 700 workers at Ocmulgee with many difficulties in controlling and coordinating their activities. Some were engineers while others were educated enough to serve as clerical workers. But the laborers divided into categories of "burial men," "trowel-men," "profile-trimmers," and "shovel-men" were directed by very few archaeologists. Their control ultimately rested on the existence of "two other large WPA projects in the county, the 'paving project' and the more ominously named 'malarial drainage project'." Willey remembered years later that "discipline, when needed, could be maintained with threats of transference to one of these, particularly the 'malarial drainage' enterprise which had a local reputation as a kind of WPA Siberia."
Kelly concentrated the attention of the new WPA project on the large mound and surrounding areas on Macon Plateau. Kelly intended to use his force of 80 men to complete the investigation of the Plateau before any restoration work could be started. He thought it advisable to delay work in the Lamar area because of water problems. He used WPA labor to peel off the layers of the seven superimposed house sites between the two large mounds. Kelly believed that this was the most difficult archaeological problem he had ever worked on and he told Hooton it was about to drive him "distracted." While Kelly worked at Ocmulgee, Gordon Willey, the senior archaeological foreman using a CCC motorized unit of 25 boys, surveyed the area within 40 miles of Macon. Willey, later to become the Bowditch Professor of archaeology at Harvard University, came to Macon as a Laboratory of Anthropology Field Fellow under Kelly in the summer of 1936. He had been a student of A. E. Douglass at the University of Arizona, and was especially qualified in the use of dendrochronological techniques used in dating trees.

Kelly, in addition, to directing the excavation, tried again unsuccessfully to establish a statewide WPA archaeological survey with four or five archae-
ologists and 100 laborers sponsored by the Georgia State Park Commission. In addition, he also worked to develop a broad base of community participation in the development of the Monument. There was a feeling in Macon that despite the almost $30,000 spent by the city of Macon and local individuals for purchase of land, the project was just a hobby for a few influential men. Kelly attempted to involve more people in the project, and the Chamber of Commerce formed a commission to create increased support for the Monument. 21

Kelly continued to expand his area of archaeological interest beyond the Ocmulgee National Monument. While Willey dug stratigraphic test pits at Lamar and James Ford worked on the restoration of the Council Chamber at Ocmulgee, Kelly tried to organize a survey and excavation program in the Chattahoochee Valley. The WPA encouraged his plans and Kelly hoped to excavate a village site and cemetery at Bull Creek near Columbus. He also wanted to do some historic archaeology at two historic Creek villages, particularly near Cashita 22 at Fort Benning. The Ocmulgee archaeologists were also involved in the excavation of the Kolomoki site near Blakely in Southwest Georgia. The CCC had established a camp to preserve the mounds, but Fairbanks
complained to the NPS about their preservation activities. "So far," he wrote, "this protection has consisted of constructing a road over a known archaeological area, and the destruction of two aboriginal mounds. If this sort of protection continues, it is obvious that little or nothing of the site will remain in a few more years." To prevent further destruction Fairbanks with a crew of more than 20 men excavated the mounds in March, 1941.23

While he tried to expand his influence over Georgia archaeology, Kelly came under attack for his administration at Ocmulgee. Petrullo, the WPA archaeological consultant, was concerned that the Ocmulgee project, which had become the largest WPA archaeological project, was being delayed by the lack of white collar workers in the laboratory. In addition, WPA officials disapproved of the publicity about the project. The WPA had spent approximately a quarter of a million dollars at Ocmulgee while the NPS had claimed most of the credit for the accomplishments.24

The lack of workers in the laboratory did not prevent Kelly and his associates from finishing a number of archaeological reports. Charles H. Fairbanks, senior archaeological foreman, wrote "The Macon Earthlodge" which was submitted to the NPS as the final report
on the WPA excavation and restoration of the earth-lodge. The archaeologists completed other reports on the Lawson Field, Bussey Plantation, Abercrombie Mound, Turnbull Mound, and the Ennis site.25

In 1938 Kelly published "A Preliminary Report on Archeological Explorations at Macon, Georgia," as a 70-page monograph in the distinguished Bulletin series of the Bureau of American Ethnology.26 This preliminary report, never to be followed by a final and comprehensive report on Ocmulgee, summarized what Kelly had learned during four years of federal archaeology in central Georgia. Excavation uncovered evidence of a pre-pottery flint industry on the Macon Plateau. The archaeologists found thousands of worked flints. The deterioration of the flint showed the flint industry to be very old with its heaviest concentration in the pre-pottery levels. After the pre-pottery period was a pottery-agricultural period in Ocmulgee Fields followed by a mound building period. Kelly argued that the mounds on the Macon Plateau represented a late period of Georgia prehistory.

Kelly and his associates investigated a number of other sites in central Georgia. The McDougald Mound was not excavated until late in 1936. Road contractors had removed more than three-fifths of the mound while
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building a highway. Kelly suggested that the mound was built over an especially important house site. Pottery was plain red or orange, and coarse tempered with prepared grit. The Brown's Mount site, six miles from Macon, was excavated in 1936 following surface collecting the previous year. The pottery found was grit-tempered. Gordon Willey excavated the Stubbs Mound site eleven miles from Macon. James Ford first worked at the Lamar mounds and village site in 1933-1934 with CWA labor. In August of 1937 Willey dug 20 stratified pits into the village. The One Mile Track site was excavated by sinking pits into the site. The archaeologists found 1,500 Swift Creek sherds.

The other major publication resulting from the excavations at Ocmulgee was a report on Mound C. In 1956 Fairbanks published a monograph on the excavation of the Funeral Mound during the 1930s. By that time he was able to summarize the prehistory of central Georgia based on the 1930s excavations and later advances. The Paleo-Indian culture was represented by a Clovis fluted point, scrapers, and flint. The remains of the Archaic period were not found in central Georgia probably because they were buried by silt. Dunlap Fabric Impressed pottery characterized the early Wood-
land. The middle Woodland period, called Swift Creek, was marked by two pottery types: Swift Creek and Napier. After Swift Creek came the appearance of the Macon Plateau focus which Fairbanks believed is early Mississippian with temple mounds, earth lodges, and plain grit or shell-tempered pottery. Central Georgia was unoccupied during the Savannah period until the Lamar culture developed as a combination of traits including paired mounds, open courts, and some elements of the Southern Cult. Spanish and English explorers observed the Lamar culture which was clearly Lower Creek. 

Excavation of the Macon Trading Post was one of the few examples of historical archaeology during the 1930s. The archaeologists followed an old trail for a mile until they found the Trading Post. The structure was five sided with one side 140 feet long, two sides 30 feet long, and two other sides 100 feet long. They dated the Trading Post to the period between 1680 and 1718 using historical artifacts including a Spanish coin and a brass scale pan weight with the date 1712 stamped on it. Traders from Carolina may have built the Trading Post, and it may have been destroyed about the time of the Yamasee Wars of 1715.

The archaeological project at Ocmulgee National
Monument was not the only one in Georgia sponsored by federal agencies. The construction of a runway for the St. Simons airport uprooted a tree and exposed human bones. Frank Setzler was convinced of the importance of the site after he spent two days removing five skeletons. Kelly and Dr. Harrold both worked to establish a WPA archaeological project for Glynn County. Harrold wanted the project supervised by an amateur archaeologist, but a decision made during a meeting with the Georgia division of the National Resources Board gave the Smithsonian the final choice of the project supervisor. Setzler first recommended Gene Stirling for the project archaeologist, but he was not available. Setzler and Matthew Stirling then recommended Preston Holder who was working under the indirect supervision of the Smithsonian Institution in Florida. Holder had supervised CWA archaeological projects in Florida during 1934. Later he managed the excavation of two mounds in Florida: the Thomas Mound in late 1935 and early 1936 and the Cockroach Key site from February to April of 1936. The delay in receiving WPA support for the project made the Smithsonian fear that unsupervised and untrained individuals would begin to destroy the site, but fortunately the Sea Island Company and the Brunswick Board of Trade
assisted Holder before the WPA acted.35

Holder started work on the Airport site on May 4, 1936 with two laborers, one technical assistant, and occasional WPA workers. He also worked on a small mound on the north end of Sea Island.36 The assistance of the Sea Island Company ended on May 31, but the Society for Georgia Archaeology paid Holder's salary temporarily. By June 13 the Society for Georgia Archaeology had exhausted its resources, and all funds for the project stopped.37 Holder was running low on money and was ready to leave when the WPA approved the Glynn County archaeological project. Holder began excavation on July 22 with two laborers and excavated the Airport site, the Charlie King Mound, Cannon's Point, the Sea Island Mound, and Sullivan's Fish Camp.38 During the excavation Holder experienced some of the same problems with untrained WPA workers that would be reported by archaeologists all over the Southeast. "While this work was in progress," Holder wrote to Kelly, "an attempt was made to train several of the laborers in the technique of exposing burials. Unluckily, the most complex part of the burial area was encountered immediately after this plan went into effect, and little success has resulted."39 As would be the case with numerous other WPA archaeological proj-
ects, a comprehensive report on this work was never published. 40

The WPA established a separate archaeological project on the Georgia coast sponsored by the Chatham County Commissioners and the Savannah Chamber of Commerce. The Smithsonian continued to take an active interest in Georgia archaeology and the success of this new project. Setzler wanted James Ford to take the job as archaeologist, but Holder became the supervisor after he finished with the St. Simons project. 41 Setzler instructed Holder to work closely with Kelly. He stressed that "Kelly, of course, as you realize, is in a rather peculiar situation in that we look upon him more or less as having the responsibility of eventually working out some definite prehistoric chronology for the state of Georgia." 42

The WPA, as it became better organized, exerted more control on locally sponsored projects such as this one. Petrullo visited the site for the WPA in August, 1937, and recommended that Holder have two assistants, one in the laboratory and one in the field. 43 Like the other WPA projects in the South this project was racially segregated. Holder supervised a crew of 80 black women. 44 When Holder left the project Setzler and Kelly had difficulty replacing him. They had to
consider the local conditions in making their recommendation to the WPA. The job required a mature archaeologist with impeccable credentials and the ability to deal with temperamental and wealthy amateurs. Setzler felt that the archaeologist's personality and administrative ability were more important to the position than archaeological training because the archaeologist in charge had to be acceptable to the Savannah Chamber of Commerce, the Colonial Dames, the Society for Georgia Archaeology, and other interests. They considered Joseph Caldwell a good student but not mature enough to manage the project. They finally selected Vladimir J. Fewkes as the supervisor. Fewkes had received his doctorate in anthropology from the University of Pennsylvania. He was born in Czechoslovakia and spent most of his time from 1927 to 1937 working in Central European archaeology. Fewkes did not fit into Setzler's plan for Kelly to dominate Georgia archaeology because he refused to acknowledge Kelly's authority. Fewkes lasted only until August, 1938, when he returned to the University of Pennsylvania Museum. Claude E. Schaeffer became the next supervisor and, following Schaeffer, Joseph R. Caldwell took the position.

This project focused on the excavation of the
Irene Mound site from September, 1937, to January, 1940. The large mound was circular with a diameter of 160 feet and 15 feet high composed of eight superimposed mounds. The small mound was only 55 feet in diameter. During the excavation of the mound an unusual problem came up. The Rae family used the Irene Mound for burials for over 100 years after their arrival in 1740. After two years of work the archaeologists decided to peel the mound like an onion.

"Work was well begun on the last mantle when there was an embarassing complication. The Rae family began to pop up." They found about 15 or 16 skeletons. A conference between McIntire of the WPA, Schaeffer, and Waring led to a solution. Fearing that the excavation would be delayed if this news leaked, they decided to secretly package the bones and rebury them nearby.

Caldwell and McCann concluded that the site was a ceremonial center for the population of a large area. They divided the history of the site into two periods based on pottery types: the Savannah and the later Irene period. They found 13 types of pottery: Irene Filpot Stamped, Incised and Plain, Savannah Fine Cordmarked, Check Stamped, Burnished Plain, Complicated Stamped, Wilmington Heavy Cordmarked, Deptford Linear Check Stamped, Bold Check Stamped, and Simple Stamped...
and St. Simons Incised and Punctated, and St. Simons Plain. While this project concentrated on the Irene site, other sites were excavated including the Deptford site, the Bilbo site, the Oemler site, the Dotson site, the Walthour site, and the Cedar Grove site.

The work in and around Macon gave archaeologists some understanding of the prehistory of Georgia, but little was known about the rest of the state. An archaeological survey was necessary to locate sites throughout Georgia. Kelly had been trying unsuccessfully to establish an archaeological survey of the state since 1934. Some members of the Society for Georgia Archaeology wanted to organize a department of archaeology at the University of Georgia at Athens to develop the study of archaeology in Georgia. In September, 1935, Harrold tried to get President Caldwell of the University of Georgia to a meeting with Swanton, Webb, and Lewis. He hoped to have Webb "hypnotize" Caldwell and convince him of the desirability of an archaeology department. He had grandiose plans for the University to acquire and preserve such important archaeological sites as Kolomoki, Neisler, and even Etowah. However it took a long time to get action from the University of Georgia as Isabel Patterson, an amateur who tried to persuade the University to
develop a program in field archaeology in 1937, knew. She had a project ready for approval in August, 1935, when Swanton, informing her that Kelly already had plans for a state-wide archaeological survey, told her to stop her projected survey in the Chattahoochee region. She halted the project application, and because Kelly was not able to organize a survey, no progress was made. 52

Kelly did not want a possible state archaeological survey to escape from his control. When Harrold contacted him about a survey based at the University of Georgia, Kelly suggested that the survey should focus on major river basins such as the Chattahoochee Valley and the Savannah Basin. He stressed to Harrold that the survey should cooperate closely with the National Park Service so that a program of conservation of archaeological sites could be developed with the NPS, Georgia state park service, and other institutions. 53 Finally, fear of encroachment into Georgia by Alabama archaeologists led to the formation of the University of Georgia State-Wide Archaeological Survey. Kelly was working on his plan to have the University of Georgia establish an anthropology department and do a survey of the Chattahoochee Valley with WPA assistance. When Walter Jones of the Alabama
Museum of Natural History heard of this plan, he wrote to the WPA stating that he already had a WPA project which was going to do a survey of the entire Chattahoochee Valley in both Alabama and Georgia. Kelly was furious and intended "to stop Jones and DeJarnette dead in their tracks." But in the meantime, Patterson and the state WPA office acted. Patterson was in the Georgia state capitol when Boggs hurried over from the WPA with Jones letter. Shepperson and Boggs then decided "that a state-wide project for an archaeological survey of Georgia was most expedient." Shepperson immediately wrote the project application and made the University of Georgia the sponsor with the cooperation of the State Department of Natural Resources.

Patterson and others recommended Fewkes to be the supervisor of the project. But Fewkes would not cooperate with Kelly, and Kelly visited President Caldwell and recommended that Fewkes not be given the job. Robert Wauchope then became the director of the archaeological survey. After a year of graduate work at Harvard University, Wauchope had participated in the 1932 field trip to Uaxactun, Guatemala, and another trip to the Maya area in 1934 and in 1935-1936. From 1936 to 1938 he continued his studies at Harvard. He did not receive his Ph.D. until 1943, but he was an
experienced archaeologist by 1938 when he became assistant professor at the University of Georgia and director of the archaeological survey.57

The University of Georgia did not operate smoothly. Wauchope had continual problems with WPA paperwork including the submission of quarterly reports and the quality of the reports.58 In 1966 when he published his final report on the project, Wauchope remembered answering numerous meaningless questions on WPA reports: "How many artifacts excavated during the period? How many linear feet of trenches excavated? How many cubic feet of dirt removed? How many post molds identified?" He remembered submitting reports on purchases, balance sheet, petty cash, report of sponsor contributions, laboratory and field party time sheets, laboratory and field party cost analysis, travel expense sheets, mileage records, equipment inventories, and many others.59 Finally Wauchope, after pressure by the WPA, submitted a report "Certain Aboriginal Culture Elements in Chatham County, Georgia," to the Washington office of the WPA. The officials were still not satisfied and asked Wauchope to put out mimeographed releases on the work of the project.60

When Wauchope left the project in August of 1940 for the University of North Carolina, the University of
Georgia ended its sponsorship of the survey. He had left without notifying the WPA which then closed the project. Several conferences were then held between WPA officials and others interested in the project. The participants reached an agreement to store the archaeological collections from the project at Ocmulgee National Monument. Because Wauchope wanted to publish a report on the project, Deginan of the WPA agreed to allow him to have access to the specimens on loan. Wauchope believed that the publication would take several years to prepare. He seriously underestimated the time to prepare the report and the final publication did not appear until 1966.

Georgia archaeology in the depression seems to have been more disorganized than that in some of the other Southeastern states. This may be because of the four separate federal archaeological projects in Georgia: Chatham County, Glynn County, Ocmulgee National Monument, and the University of Georgia Statewide Archaeological Survey. These projects were not effectively coordinated either by the WPA in Washington, the Smithsonian, or the National Park Service. Archaeologists such as Setzler always hoped that Kelly would integrate these projects into a synthesis of Georgia prehistory, but despite Kelly's
return to the University of Georgia after he left the National Park Service, he never published this synthesis.

There is no comprehensive study of Georgia prehistory; in fact, only two of the four projects ever published a complete report on their work. A final study was never completed on the years of excavation at Ocmulgee National Monument, although Fairbanks' report on the Funeral Mound analyzes one of the major excavations of the project. The project at St. Simons Island lacks not only a complete report, but even a preliminary analysis. Caldwell and McCann were more successful. They published a major site report on the Irene Mound in 1941. Wauchope finally published his outstanding report on the University of Georgia. Archaeologists have complained for years about state control of archaeology in the depression and the lack of centralized, national coordination of the relief archaeological projects. But if state control was bad, local control was worse. The example of Georgia demonstrates that state archaeological projects such as in Louisiana, Tennessee, Alabama, and Kentucky were far superior to local projects.
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CHAPTER VIII: KENTUCKY

William Webb's position as chief archaeologist for the TVA in Alabama and Tennessee enlarged his archaeological interests beyond his home state of Kentucky. For several years the focus of his archaeological attention was outside of Kentucky. In 1934 he used labor supplied by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration for the excavation of the Ricketts site in Kentucky, but so much of his time went to Alabama and Tennessee that it was not until the summer of 1937 that Webb organized a major federal archaeological program in Kentucky.¹

Webb had learned from his experience with federal agencies in Alabama and Tennessee to be flexible in developing his program in Kentucky. He intended to excavate sites wherever labor was available in the state. If labor could be found in Eastern Kentucky, he planned to excavate rock shelters, while in the Central part of the state large earth mounds would be selected. If enough unemployed workers could be found in Western
Kentucky he wanted to focus on the area of Kentucky Basin to be created by the TVA's construction of the Gilberstville or Kentucky Dam. Webb feared most the inundation of archaeological sites in the Kentucky Basin and hoped to have six or seven field archaeologists concentrating their attention there at first.

Webb asked William Haag to be in charge of the whole Kentucky program with a salary of at least $175 per month. Haag received his masters degree in August, 1933, and had a year of graduate work in vertebrate paleontology at the University of Michigan. He had worked for Webb on the TVA projects for three years and Webb thought him to be "an exceptionally well trained and brilliant student." Webb proposed to have Haag first select an area for excavation and then begin the excavation. Once the project was functioning satisfactorily, another supervisor would take charge and Haag would then organize another area. The supervisors would be on the WPA payroll and the University of Kentucky would supply engineering and photographic equipment, supervision, storage of the artifacts, and publication of the reports. The WPA approved the project in August of 1937 despite some questions of how much time Webb could devote to the project while running the large TVA archaeological program at the same time.
Frank Setzler of the Smithsonian Institution successfully defended Webb's proposal at the WPA by arguing that Webb would have capable students directing the work. By September, 1937, Webb received approval for work on a mound in Montgomery County and a shell mound in the Green River area.

As in all the other Southeastern states, the Kentucky WPA project had problems with the WPA. The WPA attempted to impose uniform rules on all archaeological programs despite vast differences between the states. Vincenzo Petrullo, archaeological consultant for the WPA, wanted the Kentucky project to expand its laboratory to the size of other Southeastern states. But while in Georgia, Alabama, and Tennessee thousands of artifacts were found, in Kentucky far fewer were discovered because of the nature of the sites, and the project did not need a large laboratory. Webb was running the TVA archaeological program and had years of archaeological experience and did not feel that he needed the advice of less experienced WPA officials. Webb had to try to educate the WPA about the unique features of Kentucky prehistory in order to be able to operate the program as he wanted.

The Kentucky WPA program excavated four major types of archaeological sites: Archaic sites in Western Kentucky, Adena sites, Fort Ancient sites, and Missis-
slippian sites. Webb focused a large amount of the resources of the Kentucky WPA program on the Archaic sites in the Green River area of Western Kentucky. These sites include: Indian Knoll, the Carlson Annis Mound, the Read Shell Midden, Chiggerville, the Cypress Creek Villages, and Archaic sites in McLean County. Webb had excavated sites of the Archaic stage, which lacked pottery and horticulture, in 1934 in the Wheeler Basin and was interested in extending his knowledge of this early culture.

The Read site was a shell midden on the bank of the Green River. The owners and others in the area had dug pits in the mound for shell for their chickens for years, but the mound was still in good condition for the excavation which started on December 28, 1937, and ended on January 31, 1939, with a three week break in work in October, 1938. Albert C. Spaulding was the archaeologist in charge from December, 1937, to September, 1938, when he resigned and was replaced by Ralph D. Brown. Webb concluded that the site was a single component of the Archaic. The discovery of atlatl or spear thrower weights showed that the site was occupied into the late Archaic. The location of the site on a high bluff and away from the bank of the river made it less attractive to later Indians and it was unoccupied.
by the subsequent Woodland and Mississippian cultures.

The Carlson Annis Mound was a shell midden measuring 350 feet long by 300 feet wide and 6 feet high. Ralph Brown managed the excavation from its beginning in the fall of 1939 until he became state supervisor of the Kentucky WPA archaeological project. James R. Greenacre then took over supervision of the site. The Indians used the site as a living area and for gathering shell fish. The archaeologists found 390 burials on the site. Webb concluded that this site was a typical Archaic shell midden which was occupied for a long time from the early Archaic into the late Archaic. In addition, the discovery of two fluted points on the site showed that early hunters had camped on the site. The archaeologists found a brief occupation by Woodland people demonstrated by 24 grit and clay-grit tempered sherds, and the later Middle Mississippian represented by 41 shell-tempered sherds.12

Webb and Haag reported on the excavation of four Archaic sites in McLean County. Elliott supervised the excavation of one-third of the Barrett site from November of 1938 to July 9, 1939. Seven feet of flood water over the site prevented work from February to March. Elliott also excavated the Smith site, a small rock shelter, which had been disturbed by gold hunters and the rooting
of hogs. The Butterfield site was an Archaic shell heap excavated from March, 1939, to April, 1939, when high water forced the crew away from another site. The archaeologist found 153 burials. The Reynerson site, excavated in February and March, 1939, was occupied for a short time as a camp site and yielded four artifacts. The lack of depth of the sites made the stratigraphy difficult to understand. The Archaic occupants lacked pottery and agriculture as expected. In addition to the Archaic occupation, some pottery was found. Lack of evidence prevented Webb and Haag from deciding whether the grit-tempered pottery was used by the shell heap people of the late Archaic or left by later occupants of the site.

One of the most important Green River Archaic sites was Indian Knoll. As was the case with other shell mounds in the area, the mound was used to protect later American residents from high water. But the house on the mound could not withstand the great flood of 1937 which destroyed it and allowed excavation in 1939 by Marion H. Baugh who was trained as a geologist. C. B. Moore had excavated Indian Knoll in 1915, removing 298 skeletons and reporting the lack of pottery at the site. The WPA archaeologists planned to excavate the site to expand the knowledge of the Archaic that had been devel-
oped in Alabama by the TVA archaeological program. Baugh found the site to be much larger than anticipated and only slightly disturbed by Moore. The excavation recovered more than 55,000 artifacts and 880 burials in two years. The report on the Indian Knoll site remains of such importance to Southeastern prehistory that the University of Tennessee reprinted the report in 1974.16

The archaeologists decided to excavate the Ward and Kirkland sites because they might be similar to Indian Knoll and provide a useful comparison to it. The Ward site was so large that it could not have been excavated without the use of WPA labor which allowed a complete study of the midden rather than a random sample.17 Elliott supervised the work at the Ward site beginning in February, 1938, and followed this with the excavation of the Kirkland site from September to November. Webb and Haag concluded from a study of the artifacts including heavy flint and stone, bone artifacts used for fishing and hunting, and the atlatl that the occupants of these villages had a relatively simple culture. The artifacts showed that the Indians were root and berry gatherers. The lack of house sites also indicated a simple culture.18

The work of Webb and other WPA archaeologists on
the Archaic remains important to contemporary archaeologists. According to Douglas Schwartz, "perhaps of all the scientific monuments Webb left for posterity, his descriptive work on the Kentucky Archaic will last the longest." However Schwartz also pointed out that the weaknesses of this work were apparent at an early date. "As should also be expected," Schwartz argued, "in his struggles as a scientific pioneer, Webb left many problems untouched: internal change within Archaic sites was only hinted at; regional variation was not understood; perhaps more seriously, his rather limited conceptual framework resulted in a poorly developed understanding of and a limited interest in the relationship of the Archaic material and other temporally contiguous cultures."\(^{19}\)

The Kentucky WPA archaeologists were intensely interested in the Adena sites in Kentucky. Although they excavated other complex sites of the Fort Ancient and Mississippian cultures, Haag remembered that they "never captured our interest as did the spectacular Adena culture."\(^{20}\) The Kentucky archaeologists knew about the Adena sites in Ohio, but in 1932 the Kentucky Adena was virtually unknown. It is not difficult to understand why the archaeologists were fascinated with the Adena. Adena sites centered around large conical burial
mounds containing log tombs built on high elevations as memorials to the dead. Adena artifacts included tubular pipes, engraved tablets, and copper artifacts.  

The first of the Adena sites excavated in Kentucky was the Ricketts site, a conical mound that was originally 12 feet high and 100 feet in diameter. In 1924 Webb and Funkhouser conducted limited excavations at this site.  

In the summer of 1934 using Federal Emergency Relief Administration labor, Webb excavated part of the mound using 60 men. In 1939 a crew supervised by John Buckner returned to the site to excavate undisturbed sections. Webb and Funkhouser in 1940 argued that the Ricketts Mound was definitely a component of the Adena aspect. They believed that the Adena culture "probably practiced agriculture" but still were hunters. They compared the Adena complex with the Copena and the Hopewell of the Ohio Valley and concluded that "while probably no one, in the present status of knowledge would wish to regard these three great complexes as identical, the fact remains that as knowledge increases the distinctions between them seem to be growing fewer and the line of demarcation less distinct."  

The Wright Mounds were a group of three or four mounds, one of which was 30 feet high and 200 feet in diameter. The archaeologists selected the site because
they thought it might be an Adena mound which would definitely prove the existence of the Adena in Kentucky. John L. Buckner and Claude Johnston supervised the work of 40 men who removed 13,166 cubic yards of earth in 19 months beginning in the fall of 1937. Eventually the archaeologists found part of an Adena village under the mound. They discovered large circular house patterns with paired postmolds. By that time, "there was no doubt," Haag later wrote, "that the numerous mounds that dotted the area of central Kentucky must all be part and parcel of this great Adena culture." Early Adena excavations had not discovered very much pottery. The excavation in 1939 of the C & O Mounds by J. C. Greenacre expanded the knowledge of Adena ceramics. By the time of Webb's publication of the C & O site report in 1942 he was more willing to speculate and draw a broader conclusion than he had in his earlier publications, some of which had conclusions of one paragraph in length. He saw these mounds as a single component of the Adena built on top of one of their villages. Excavation of the burial mound recorded additional information about the Adena in Kentucky, but the real importance of this site was the village excavation. Few Adena villages had been found before this, and this village provided a greater range of information
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about the life of the average Indian than the burial mounds alone could. Construction of the burial mounds required a large population and only the remains of a few important individuals had been found in the mounds. Excavation of the village provided the answer to the question of the location of the other Adena burials. The circular postmold patterns showed the location of houses containing circular fire basins. Under one of the mounds the archaeologists found 22 cremated burials. These burials were much less elaborate than the burials in the mounds. Webb suggested that the small amount of midden found resulted from a large population that lived in house groups separated by hundreds of feet within an area of occupation of several square miles. The dispersed population could not accumulate large amounts of midden even if they lived in a village for a long time.  

In the spring of 1939 Claude Johnston excavated the small Morgan Stone Mound.  

This mound, which was not made of stone but named after the owner of the property, was important because it had been constructed to cover a single burial in a round house which had been burned in a burial ceremony. Two large pots were found which helped to understand Adena pottery. "Thus," as Haag later remembered, "by 1939 we were increasingly
convincing that Adena was a burial cult or a burial complex, at least.\textsuperscript{32}

On August 7, 1939, Claude Johnston began excavation of the Mount Horeb Earthworks. Because Johnston excavated the site during dry weather in the summer and fall, location of postmolds was very difficult.\textsuperscript{33} Webb concluded from the excavation that this "sacred circle" was made by the Adena culture as a stockade. Haag later argued that since the paired postmold pattern was not broken by an entry, it probably was a sacred enclosure.\textsuperscript{34} Claude Johnston also excavated the Drake Mound from December 8, 1939, to the early spring of 1940. Faced with difficult winter weather— a large amount of snow, low temperature, wind, and rain— he ingeniously protected the excavation by canvas covered with straw.\textsuperscript{35} This mound was constructed around a cremated burial of an important person and was performed with some ceremony.\textsuperscript{35}

In order to obtain more information about the Ricketts site Funkhouser completed additional excavations there in the summer of 1939 with John Buckner as the field supervisor. The most impressive discovery was the bone artifacts. The increasing information about the Adena allowed the archaeologists to see more clearly the relationship between Adena and other surrounding
cultures. According to Haag, "the rather large number of artifacts that were included as burial furniture enabled a clear realization for the first time that the artifact correlation among Adena, Hopewell, and Copena was indeed very low."\(^{36}\)

By the summer of 1940 when the WPA program was shrinking, the WPA archaeological supervisors in Kentucky planned their schedule so they could have two weeks to excavate a site together. The archaeologists selected an Adena rock shelter which they called Hooton Hollow in honor of Earnest Hooton, a Harvard physical anthropologist. The crew consisted of John L. Cotter, James Greenacre, John D. Elliott, Ralph Brown, Ed Hertzberg, Henry Carey, Claude Johnston, Richard Von Schlicten, George Jackson, and William Haag. Funkhouser was present at his last archaeological expedition. They found Adena burials, pottery, and a dog burial in a wooden pit. The archaeologists kept detailed field notes which unfortunately were borrowed by a graduate student during the war and disappeared.\(^{37}\)

In addition to excavations of Archaic and Adena sites, the Kentucky project excavated several Fort Ancient sites but reports were never published on any of these sites. Schwartz speculated that the reason Webb did not publish on Fort Ancient was his lack of
desire to study pottery. He suggested that Webb not only did not use the pottery type concept, but avoided pottery in his Adena publications, and even "resented its presence in Adena sites." Schwartz also argued that Griffin's developing dominance of the study of the Fort Ancient prevented Webb from publishing on this culture.\textsuperscript{38}

The fourth major area of WPA archaeological activities in Kentucky was the Kentucky Lake area of Western Kentucky. Following the decision by the TVA to build Kentucky Dam near Gilbertsville, the Authority supported an archaeological survey by J. R. Foster, TVA junior archaeologist, from March 22, 1939, to April 29, 1939. Foster found 164 sites in Tennessee and 47 in Kentucky. In 1940 the Civilian Conservation Service (CCC) established a camp at Benton, Kentucky, under the archaeologist Charles Wilder for archaeological salvage. From February to May of 1941 Carl F. Miller the CCC archaeological foreman surveyed areas near and east of the Kentucky Basin and found more sites. Working quickly to prevent flooding of the sites, Webb established six field crews and a central archaeological laboratory at Benton. His archaeologists were working on several sites when the entry of the United States into World War II brought the work to an early end. The archaeologists
closed the smaller sites and focused their attention on the Jonathan Creek site until the work ended on March 20, 1942 before the completion of the excavation. The supervisors were James R. Foster, G. E. Martin, Harold F. Dahms, and Joseph Spears. The site was large and very complex. The archaeologists found a large village with superimposed post mold patterns of houses and stockades. According to Webb, "it was not, therefore, a simple stockaded village, once built, peacefully occupied and finally left to be later discovered by archaeological investigators." The occupants destroyed many structures to build new buildings. "Everywhere there was evidence of action, changes in position of houses and stockades, and changes in the methods of construction, their repair, and destruction during occupancy." 39

The archaeologists found two separate occupations of the site. The first was by people who built trench wall houses surrounded by stockades. The second group built rectangular houses surrounded by stockades with small bastions. They found no historic artifacts so the site was very likely prehistoric. Webb speculated that the first occupants might be Chickasaw and the second Natchez. Schwartz later classified this site as Mississippian although Webb did not use this concept, nor
did Webb use the greater body of information about the Mississippian that had become available since the site was excavated. Webb's approach to the study of pottery had not developed and Schwartz concluded that "the ceramic analysis continued more in the simplistic tradition Webb had established some twenty years earlier." 40

John Greensacre excavated the Roach site in the Kentucky Lake area from October, 1941, to March, 1942. Martha Bolingson and Douglas Schwartz catalogued and studied the artifacts in 1961 for their study of Late Paleo-Indian and Early Archaic Manifestations in Western Kentucky. They used the field records stored at the Museum of Anthropology of the University of Kentucky including maps, field specimen forms, feature data forms, stake elevations, profiles, and photographs. Their discussion was not as detailed as they would have liked because of the lack of daily logs, site survey cards, and a general summary of the work. 41 They found three occupations: Paleo-Indian, Archaic with some Woodland additions, and a Mississippian farming community. They concluded that the Mississippian occupation was closely related to the Jonathan Creek site. George Jackson supervised the excavation of the Morris site in the Tradewater River basin from July, 1940, to March,
1941. The artifacts were not studied until 1961 by Bolingson and Schwartz. They complained about the quality and brevity of the notes which made study of the site difficult. The site had two Archaic and two Mississippian occupations.

Any evaluation of the Kentucky WPA archaeological project becomes of necessity an evaluation of the work of William S. Webb. Webb was clearly the driving force behind Kentucky WPA archaeology and it is difficult to separate his work from that of his archaeological associates who very likely deserve more credit than they are usually given.  

The Kentucky project did not find much evidence of Paleo-Indian or Lithic sites. Discovery of fluted points at the Parrish Village site led to the excavation of the site beginning in December, 1939. C. T. R. Bohannan supervised the excavation in December and was followed by George A. Jackson who managed the excavation until its end on July 21, 1940. By the time Webb published the site report in 1951 he concluded that the fluted points, points with ripple flaking, gravers, knives, and scrapers were part of an early hunting culture which occurred before the Archaic.

The contributions to the understanding of the Archaic were more substantial. A huge amount of data on Archaic
shell middens was found and, according to Winters in his introduction to the new edition of Webb's Indian Knoll site report, Webb's writings on the Archaic are still "the largest and most comprehensive corpus of excavation derived data on Archaic sites in all of eastern North America." His experience with the Kentucky WPA excavations allowed William Haag to synthesize the data on the Archaic in his 1942 article, "Early Horizons in the Southeast." Schwartz, in evaluating this article, concluded that Haag's attempt to understand the patterns of early prehistory over all of North America shows "a more sophisticated awareness of the overall pattern of prehistoric cultural development in the East than is revealed in Webb's writings." Haag was only one of many of Webb's students who learned a great deal of archaeology while working on Webb's TVA and WPA projects.

The work of Webb and his colleagues on the Adena culture was one of the most important accomplishments of the Kentucky WPA project. According to Schwartz, "at the time of Webb's retirement, one of the best documented prehistoric cultures in Kentucky, and perhaps in the East, was the Adena." Considering the absence of knowledge about Adena in 1932 this is an outstanding achievement of federal archaeology in the Southeast.

The contributions of the Kentucky WPA project to the
archaeologist's conception of the Mississippian was less important than to the Archaic or the Adena. The major Mississippian excavations in the Kentucky Lake area were very late in the WPA period and were interrupted by World War II. Webb was never able to publish a major report on this basin as he had on the Norris, Wheeler, Pickwick, and Guntersville basins, and this work on the Mississippian had much less impact on Southeastern archaeology than his Archaic or Adena publications.

Whatever the evaluation of Webb's work in Kentucky by later archaeologists, it remains of fundamental importance to contemporary interpretations of Eastern archaeology. Don W. Dragoo in his 1975 article, "Some Aspects of Eastern North American Prehistory: A Review 1975," notes that most of the knowledge of the Central Riverine Archaic comes from the TVA and WPA work supervised by Webb. He pointed out that "although large collections of artifacts, skeletal remains, and data were made at many sites, only a fraction of this material has ever been adequately studied and reported."49 Archaeologists such as Dragoo have been critical of the excavations that have remained unpublished for such a long time, but despite the problems in using the publications and collections from Webb's work, it provides the data base of much of Southeastern archaeology.
1. This discussion of WPA archaeology in Kentucky is based on the many site reports prepared by Webb and his associates, the article on "The Adena Culture" by William G. Haag who participated in much of this work, and Douglas Schwartz, Conceptions of Kentucky Prehistory. The papers of William Webb at the University of Kentucky Archives contain very little information about the Kentucky project as compared to the great amount of data on the TVA projects in Alabama and Tennessee. William Haag speculated that there are two reasons for this gap in the records: the Kentucky archaeologists met frequently and did not write as many intra-project memos as other WPA archaeological projects, and there was a fire at the University of Kentucky which might have destroyed some of the records. Personal communication from William Haag.
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CHAPTER IX: LOUISIANA

The WPA archaeological program in Louisiana was one of the most significant in the Southeast. The project produced a much improved understanding of Louisiana prehistory. Even before the WPA James Ford had developed a basic chronological arrangement of the archaeological cultures in the Lower Mississippi Valley. The WPA project in Louisiana clarified this preliminary culture history and added the Tchefuncte culture as the oldest stage. In addition, many young archaeologists worked on the project, and the experience these men gained under the WPA program was important in the development of their careers, and the relationships between them continued to influence the growth of Southeastern archaeology after World War II and into the 1960s and 1970s.¹

After James Ford finished the Smithsonian Institution archaeological project at Marksville, Louisiana, late in 1934, he went to work on the CWA project at Macon, Georgia, but his interest in Louisiana archaeology remained strong. In January, Fred Kniffen, a geographer at Louisiana State University (LSU), suggested to Ford...
that they organize a CWA project in Louisiana.\textsuperscript{2} Ford thought that the work in Louisiana would be more important than in Georgia, but Setzler recommended strongly that he remain at Macon until the project was completed, and a CWA project was not organized in Louisiana.\textsuperscript{3} After he finished the project with Arthur R. Kelly at Macon in April, 1934, Ford worked for the Georgia Park Service excavating a site near Brunswick, Georgia. He followed this project with a non-archaeological but very educational experience of working for the American Indian Exposition in Atlanta where "he managed the exposition, fed, housed, nursed, and bailed out of jail the 40 Cherokees, 30 Seminoles, and 30 assorted southeastern Indians provided by the Bureau of Indian Affairs."\textsuperscript{4} Ford entered Louisiana State University in the fall of 1934 and received his A.B. in 1936. He began graduate study at the University of Michigan in the fall of 1937 and received his Master of Arts degree in 1938.

Ford planned a WPA archaeological project for Louisiana while he was at the University of Michigan in the spring of 1938. He then spent the summer working out the details of the project.\textsuperscript{5} During this period Ford convinced skeptical Louisiana state WPA officials that an archaeological project was possible and necessary.\textsuperscript{6}
He corresponded with Gordon Willey about his plans, and Willey indicated as early as July that he would join Ford in Louisiana, but final approval of the project was not received until September. When finally approved the project budget was $112,000 in federal funds and $12,852 in funds from the sponsor, Louisiana State University with the total number of employees to be approximately two hundred. Despite the delay Ford had selected his staff of archaeologists: Willey, Mulloy, Neitzel, King, and Doran. Whenever possible, Ford selected archaeologists with extensive field and laboratory experience. Ford himself had a great deal of field experience beginning with his three summers of excavation and collection for the Mississippi Department of Archives and History. He had spent a summer working in the Arctic under Henry B. Collins of the Smithsonian Institution and later eighteen months there beginning in the summer of 1931. In 1933 Ford received a grant from the National Research Council to extend his archaeological survey from Mississippi into Louisiana. He based his work in Louisiana on his increasing knowledge of archaeological theory and Southeastern prehistory. His interest at the time was in determining chronological relationships in prehistory. He focused on pottery sherds as a key to culture history. Ford intended to
obtain the sherds by surface collecting rather than by excavation. He justified his strategy of surface collection by arguing that his intensive survey obtained a sample of all pottery types in the area. He felt that even representative sherds from buried strata would be found on the surface because of cultivation and erosion.  

Ford's job as assistant to Frank Setzler at the Smithsonian Institution's excavation at Marksville, Louisiana in 1933, gave him experience in directing a large crew of relief laborers. His position working for Arthur R. Kelly at the large federal project at Ocmulgee National Monument in Georgia in the summer of 1937 was particularly important to his development as an archaeologist because he met regularly with Gordon Willey, Preston Holder, and other men actively working in Southeastern archaeology including Antonio Waring, Jesse Jennings, and Charles Fairbanks. "During this climatic summer the Southeastern Conference, the binomial system of pottery nomenclature, the Southern Cult, and area-wide relationships of previously isolated culture sequences were discussed by this group." Ford's contact with these and other archaeologists enabled him to select men with significant archaeological experience for the Louisiana WPA archaeological project. Gordon R.
Willey, the supervisor of the laboratory in New Orleans, earned his Bachelor of Arts and Master of Arts in anthropology from the University of Arizona with special knowledge of dendrochronology. In the summer of 1936 he had been a Laboratory of Anthropology Field Fellow under Arthur Kelly at Macon. Willey also worked for the National Park Service on a stratigraphic and surface survey in Georgia. He had gained a wide knowledge of Southeastern pottery types by contacts with Ford in Louisiana, Preston Holder on the Georgia coast, and other archaeologists in the region.  

Robert S. Neitzel, supervisor of the Avoyelles Unit, received a bachelors degree in anthropology from the University of Nebraska and completed one year of graduate work at the University of Nebraska and two years at the University of Chicago. He had one summer of field work at Nebraska and two summers at Chicago. For over two years Neitzel had been a field archaeologist for the University of Tennessee in the Tennessee River basin. The assistant supervisor of the Avoyelles Unit was Edwin B. Doran, Jr. He earned his bachelor of arts degree from LSU with a major in geology and a minor in anthropology, and had experience on a number of field trips. Doran was a good engineer and draftsman, and Ford planned to use him mainly for those jobs.
William T. Mulloy supervised the LaSalle Unit. He lacked only four units to achieve a bachelor's degree in anthropology from the University of Utah, but his experience included six months of work on the Utah volume of the WPA American Guide Series, and two summers at the University of New Mexico archaeological field session. Arden King, the assistant supervisor of the LaSalle Unit, received his A.B. degree in anthropology from the University of Utah. He had been student curator at the University museum for two winters and spent two summers in archaeological field work in Utah.\(^{14}\)

The policy of hiring experienced archaeologists continued in the later phases of the project. George I. Quimby had earned his Masters degree from the University of Michigan and had experience in Arctic archaeology when he replaced Willey as State Supervisor in September of 1939.\(^{15}\) Quimby's area of responsibility was very broad. He was in charge of the laboratory, and while Ford was gone from the spring of 1940 to the end of the project in July, 1941, he managed the three field units, and directed the processing of the collections coming into the laboratory from the Lower Mississippi Valley Archaeological Survey.\(^{16}\) Between the date Willey left, September 1st, and the arrival of Quimby from the Arctic, Preston Holder, who had been a graduate student in
anthropology at Columbia University, ran the laboratory. 17

The experience of these men aided them in meeting
the scientific and practical problems which came up in
their work. However, despite their extensive back­
ground and training, they were not prepared to deal with
all the problems they would face. The paperwork and
bureaucratic procedures of the WPA were particularly
troublesome for some of the archaeologists. Neitzel
had more than his share of problems with the paperwork.
"Guess there are some things in this world more compli­
cated than archaeology," he wrote to Willey. "I've
never seen so much standardized and apparently socially
sanctioned drivel in one piece and at the same time
before.... If I have to rastle(sic) with these travel
vouchers every time I take a trip, I see where you're
going to have to move the lab up here if you want me to
see it." 18

Although administrative problems persisted through
the life of the project, it was well organized from the
beginning largely due to the experience and organization­
al ability of Ford, 19 who created three major units of
the project to operate through the winter of 1938-1939:
a central laboratory, a field unit in Avoyelles Parish,
and one in LaSalle Parish.

The Laboratory Unit of the project, located in New
Orleans because of low rent and the availability of skilled labor for the project, occupied space provided by Louisiana State University on a floor of the Department of Conservation building at 336 Chartres Street. A large room sixty feet square was used for the laboratory and an adjoining room was a carpenter's shop.\textsuperscript{20}

The Laboratory, which started operation in October, 1938, consisted of a number of divisions and sections: Catalog Division, Preparing Division, Analysis Division, Statistical Section, Engineering Division, Photography, Archives and Records, Dendrochronology, and carpentry, secretarial, and administrative sections.

The Catalog Division first handled the excavated material as it came in from the field. All material was cleaned and marked with a catalog number which was also recorded in the catalog ledger and on a catalog index card. Special procedures were sometimes established to handle the problems of particular artifacts; for example, specific memos were issued for handling artifacts from sites LA-2 and AV-2. The size of the operation of this division is illustrated by the estimate that from the beginning of the project to December 12, 1938, the division cleaned and cataloged approximately 127,750 specimens, ranging from broken pieces of pottery to animal bones, bone tools, broken ornaments, stone
artifacts, and human skeletons. If the artifacts could be restored they were sent to the Preparing Division where workers cemented together the broken pieces and filled in the missing parts with plaster of paris. This division also cleaned and preserved skeletal material.

After the cataloging operation was completed, the specimens were sent to the Analysis Division where pottery was classified along with stone and other miscellaneous material. Workers entered the most important characteristics of the specimens on cards which were then sent to the Statistical Section of the Analysis Division. At this time the number and percentages of the types in the collection were calculated, and comparative charts and summary graphs of typological trends were constructed. The Engineering Division was responsible for drawing in final form profile drawings, contour maps, and floor plans sent in from the field. This division also produced graphs and drawings of type materials. The photographer in the laboratory developed the negatives sent in from the field and took photographs of type specimens in the laboratory.

Ford set up the Archives and Records Division to gather information on the Indians of Louisiana, partic-
ularly from the earliest written sources. But just as archaeological research cannot really be limited by state boundaries, neither could the ethnohistorical research of this division, and its research activities extended over the entire Southeast. This work was under the direction of Andrew C. Albrecht, the project ethnohistorian, who had received a Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of California in 1931 and his doctorate from the University of Vienna. He established a procedure for the workers to read publications on Southeastern archaeology and ethnology including early travelers and missionary accounts, studies of early historians, original deeds and treaties, early legis­lative records, narratives of Indian captives, traditions and legends, and contemporary studies of living Indians, and place the relevant information on 5x8 cards. The archaeologists used the data gathered by Albrecht in a number of manuscripts.23

The Avoyelles Unit of the project, under the direc­tion of Neitzel and Doran, started work at the Greenhouse site. The three main mounds at this site, A, E, and G, formed a triangle. Mound A was 120 feet square at the base and twelve feet high with a flat top about eighty feet square. Mound E was approximately the same size but only ten feet high with a less level top, and despite
cultivation was the only one that remained in a pyramidal shape. Between these mounds were a number of smaller mounds. The archaeologists selected this site for excavation because a surface collection of pottery showed ceramics different from the nearby Marksville site. The archaeologists began field activities at the Greenhouse site with a surveying operation on September 26, 1938, and continued working for one year. A simple system designed for the flat Louisiana terrain was used for the survey grid which served to control excavation and to pinpoint the location of discoveries. The archaeologists selected a permanent bench mark and ran lines north-south and east-west with stakes set up at one hundred foot intervals. Within the primary area of the site, they set stakes at ten foot intervals, and in certain important areas at five foot marks.

By October 18, 1938, a larger crew of approximately forty-five men had nearly completed the preliminary work of road building and surveying, and excavation was to begin shortly. They began excavation by digging two east-west trenches across the site. These five foot wide trenches were excavated in three-inch levels and required a great amount of work as the first was 680 feet long. They carefully excavated those spots where they found significant cultural evidence. For example, they
uncovered an area of 25 by 30 feet square because of evidence there of a house floor. They cut three other trenches through the site because the method proved so successful. They next excavated the mounds. From his knowledge of the archaeology of the Mississippi Valley, Ford expected to find that the rectangular mounds would be built in stages with some evidence of a structure at the top of each stage. The plan of excavation was to "peel" the mound by removing one level after the other. The archaeologists excavated the other mounds on the site using similar techniques.

As in all of Ford's work in Louisiana, he placed great emphasis on ceramic analysis. C. H. Hopkins, a professional bookkeeper, classified the pottery. His work showed that WPA relief workers could sometimes do an excellent job. Ford was very pleased with the work of this non-archaeologist. In fact, Ford felt that once the pottery classification system was established a non-archaeologist could often do a better job of classification than an archaeologist. "He has," Ford argued, "no preconceived ideas, no theories to prove, and he is less likely to let the classificatory categories 'creep'." Hopkins "achieved an almost machine-like precision in his separation of pottery into type groups." To test him, Ford had Hopkins reclassify the sherds again.
without his knowledge up to three months later and the reclassification was usually exactly the same. 27

By December, Neitzel felt that the stratification of the site was becoming clear and that Coles Creek material was found in the upper levels and Marksville in the lower levels. He was willing to state a hypothesis about the relationship of the site to North American prehistory: the Marksville complex on the bluff was very early and was followed by a Coles Creek complex. To Neitzel, "the two complexes tie in with the manifestations at other sites in the state, and the Marksville material bears a distinct relationship to the Ohio Hopewell, so far as the pottery is concerned." 28

Willey and Ford almost completed a draft for a report on the Greenhouse site in 1938, but sections had to be revised and finally Ford alone wrote the report, publishing it in 1951. Ford's analysis showed the site to be a multicomponent site including Troyville and Coles Creek components. 29 The time between the excavation of the site and the publication of the final report allowed him to place the site more accurately in the culture history of the Southeast by making comparisons with work completed after the termination of the WPA program. Ford was thus able to conclude that the
site was not unique and could be compared to sites throughout the Southeast. He compared the site to the Peck site near Sicily Island, Louisiana, that he had excavated, and the Troyville site at Jonesville, Louisiana, excavated by Winslow Walker. Ford also saw similarities between Greenhouse and the West Florida sequence described by Gordon Willey in 1949.

Because Greenhouse was located less than two miles from the Marksville site excavated by Setzler and Ford in 1933, the project did some work at the Marksville site to determine the relationship between the Marksville period at the Marksville site and the Troyville period at the Greenhouse site. Flooding at the Greenhouse site forced Neitzel to transfer his entire crew to Marksville. Neitzel ended the test trenches and village excavations at Marksville in April, 1939. In addition to the excavations at the Greenhouse and Marksville sites, Neitzel surveyed Avoyelles Parish for archaeological sites. His field trips allowed him to make surface collections adding to the information about the archaeology of the parish.

The field unit which excavated the Crooks Mound in LaSalle Parish from October 2, 1938, to April 20, 1939, consisted of three clerks who recorded the location of the materials, exposed burials and packed the specimens
for shipment to the laboratory, two foremen, a time-keeper, approximately 35 laborers, and two supervisors, William T. Mulloy and Arden King. This site near Catahoula Lake included a conical mound eighty feet in diameter and eighteen feet high and a smaller mound fifty feet in diameter and only two feet high. The archaeologists chose this site for study in order to fill in the picture of the prehistory of Louisiana. Since surface collections indicated that the site was probably from the Marksville period, they wanted to develop a better understanding of its relationship to other cultures and particularly Coles Creek.34

Setzler always intended to publish a major report on the original Marksville excavation of 1933, but he never finished it. Eventually Ford had to work on the problem of the Marksville period despite his recognition that Setzler was the "grandfather of Marksville" and claimed the right to publish on the Marksville site. Setzler had published articles on the Hopewell in Louisiana, but Ford felt that the failure to publish on the 1933 excavation at Marksville was delaying the development of Southeastern archaeology. He told Setzler that "it is not going to be possible to keep the traits of the Marksville period secret much longer."35 Setzler had feared that this situation would develop
when he wrote to Ford that "it will naturally be a blow to me if you find it necessary to make a detailed report on the original Marksville site." Despite his respect for Setzler, Ford went ahead and excavated and eventually published a report on the Crooks site of the Marksville period.

The field unit began excavation of the Crooks site by establishing an engineering grid. The two mounds were marked with stakes at five-foot intervals. Trees had to be removed from the large mound and then the crew cut a trench 10 by 140 feet long into the mound. The archaeologists had many problems in the central area of the mound because of the large number of burials. They followed a simplified procedure in the excavation of the small mound which contained a few burials that could not be saved. The archaeologists tested the area around the mounds for human occupation by digging two trenches, but found no cultural material. They discovered more than 53,000 specimens and more than 900 burials.

Ford and Willey concluded that the mounds were constructed for the purpose of burial. Finding no evidence of a living area at the site, they argued that the population which built the structures was scattered through the region and that the mounds served as a common burial ground for the entire area. Without direct evi-
dence, they concluded that the builders of the mounds had an economy productive enough to achieve a stable occupation of the area. They found evidence of extensive trade with conch shells from the Gulf of Mexico, copper possibly from the Lake Superior region, and quartz from the Arkansas mountains.

As in the other excavations of the Louisiana WPA project, the archaeologists planned to make extensive comparisons with other sites throughout the Mississippi Valley. This was not possible at that time, but they saw similarities with the Tchefuncte sites they were excavating in Louisiana. They had found some Tchefuncte Incised pottery sherds at the site, and other points of similarity included conical burial mounds with flexed burials, the small amount of grave goods with the burials, lack of evidence of human occupation near the burial mounds, hafted stone projectile points, turtle-back scrapers, chipped-flint drills, boatstones, hematite plummetets, worked stone slabs, water-worn pebbles, ulna awls, tubular pipes, fired clay objects, and other similarities in artifacts. They concluded that the Marksville culture was a remarkably powerful influence on later and contemporary cultures in the Eastern United States. "It can now be demonstrated," they wrote, "that in the Lower Mississippi Valley the
later cultural stages, Troyville, Coles Creek, Caddoan, and the west coast of Florida developments, Weeden Island, and Safety Harbor, derived mainly from the cultural base provided by the Marksville stage. These researches provided a preliminary conclusion that the Hopewell influence developed first in the Lower Mississippi Valley and then moved north up the Mississippi Valley.

The excavation of the Tchefuncte sites was the next stage of the project. The Louisiana WPA project was not the first to work with materials we now call Tchefuncte. A Civil Works Administration project worked for six months in the shell deposits near Little Woods on the shore of Lake Pontchartrain. But the results of this project were not satisfactory because of a lack of careful recording and marking techniques. This created a major problem for the WPA project because the previous excavation had disturbed the site.

Before the Louisiana WPA project archaeologists thought that the Marksville period was the oldest in Louisiana. But soon the archaeologists discovered evidence of an earlier period that they believed might be related to the early horizon discovered by the TVA-WPA project in the Pickwick Basin in Alabama. "Although the pottery is not fibre-tempered," Willey wrote,
"it shows shape and decoration similarities to the Stalling's Island and Tennessee Shell Heap fibre-tampered wares." When the archaeologists recognized that the Tchefuncte materials they had collected formed a previously unrecognized complex in the Louisiana area they decided to take another look at the Little Woods site. Preston Holder began work in July, 1939, with a crew of thirty-five men. Doran, the assistant supervisor, directed most of the excavation because Holder worked in the laboratory. The crew excavated parts of the midden which had been least disturbed by the previous excavation. Work at this site ended in October, 1939.

Doran directed ten workers in the excavation of the Big Oak Island site for two weeks beginning in September, 1939. He could only finish part of the site because the crew had to wade to the site or travel in a canoe. The excessive heat and mosquitoes increased his difficulties. Doran and thirty-five workers excavated the Tchefuncte site in the Tchefuncte State Park near Mandeville in January and February of 1941. The site consisted of a shell midden 150 by 100 feet and a second midden 250 by 100 feet. Clarence L. Johnson, a historian working for the Civilian Conservation Corps unit at the park, first dug this site and turned his collection and
notes over to the WPA archaeological project. The project received other collections of Tchefuncte artifacts for use in preparing the report. The United States National Museum loaned the collections made by Henry Collins to the LSU project, and Collins provided his notes and photographs. The archaeologists dug to the bottom of the site despite its location below sea level by working on days when a north wind and low tide lowered the water level. 47

The discovery of the Tchefuncte period was a major accomplishment of the Louisiana WPA archaeological project. Tchefuncte is an early Woodland culture distinguished from the Archaic by the trait of pottery. Based on the work completed, Ford and Quimby concluded that "it appears probable that this culture was the product of a rather simple hunting and gathering economy to which a simple agriculture may have been added." The Tchefuncte period Indians hunted with the atlatl and dart, but shellfish were the main source of food. 48

The final stage of the project consisted of excavations in the area around Baton Rouge: the Medora site and the Bayou Goula site. Doran excavated the Medora site in West Baton Rouge Parish from November of 1939 to April, 1940. The site consisted of a truncated pyramid 10 feet high and 125 feet on each side at the
base, and a smaller mound 100 feet in diameter and less than two feet high. The archaeologists selected Medora because it could supply information about the period between Coles Creek and the Natchezan and also because of the availability of WPA labor in the area and accessibility of the site. Doran's method of excavation combined vertical slicing and peeling. He excavated the entire large mound and approximately one third of the small mound. Doran found more than 18,000 pottery sherds and seven stone artifacts. Quimby used this ratio in his report as an answer to complaints that archaeologists in the Lower Mississippi Valley placed too much emphasis on pottery. "Under the circumstances," he wrote, "it is difficult to see how one can shift the emphasis." He identified more than twenty pottery types and described eleven: Addis Plain, Plaquemine Brushed, Manchac Incised, Hardy Incised, Medora Incised, Harrison Bayou Incised, Evangeline Interior Incised, Australia Interior Incised, L'Eau Noire Incised, Dupree Incised, and Lulu Linear Punctated. Most of the pottery was from the Plaquemine culture which Quimby defined as agricultural despite the lack of direct evidence of agriculture at Medora. Quimby thought the Plaquemine culture could be characterized by plazas, truncated pyramid mounds, with or without stepped ramps,
First Doran and later Carlyle S. Smith supervised the excavation of the Bayou Goula site in Iberville Parish in 1940-1941. Ford and Quimby prepared the preliminary report, but Quimby alone published the final report in 1957. The archaeologists chose this site for excavation because the Louisiana project had achieved a fairly good understanding of Marksville, Troyville, and Coles Creek, and "the Tchefuncte and Plaquemine cultures, though still in the process of formulation, were nevertheless clearly recognizable." Because the project had not excavated a historic site they began to look for one in 1940. In order to find a suitable site Albrecht combed the seventeenth century sources, including Iberville's Journal, the logbook of the frigate Le Marin, and the diary of Father du Bu, and found an area where historic tribes had lived. Then Doran searched the area and found a site which showed that a Plaquemine level was under a historic occupation of the Natchezan type.

Like the other Southeastern archaeological projects, the Louisiana WPA archaeological project was not without fault from the standpoint of postwar archaeology. The strong bias of Ford and his associates was on the study of pottery as a key to Louisiana prehistory. This meant
that other aspects of the culture were neglected and, according to another WPA archaeologist, Jesse Jennings, "no thorough analysis, with equal emphasis upon all phases of Indian life, is at hand for any period." 

Despite this and other failings, this project clarified the understanding of Louisiana prehistory that Ford had presented in 1936. At that time he had divided Louisiana prehistory into three periods: Marksville, Coles Creek, and Natchez with Marksville the oldest and Natchez the most recent. Ford was aware that these "gross divisions of a changing cultural continuum" would have to be revised as further research allowed better understanding of Louisiana prehistory. The activities of the WPA project enabled Ford to revise the chronology in 1951 when he published the report on the Greenhouse site. Ford then subdivided the previous classification into: Tchefuncte, Marksville, Troyville, Coles Creek, Plaquemine, and Natchez-Bayougoula. Ford realized that this change in the chronology had confused archaeologists working in the Mississippi Valley who complained that Ford had reclassified Coles Creek pottery types into the Troyville period. Ford defended his action by arguing that the periods were really arbitrarily defined by the investigator and not natural divisions discovered by the archaeologist.
Postwar criticism of Ford's work in Louisiana has not reduced his large reputation among American archaeologists. The work of Ford during the period of federal archaeology in Louisiana produced what Willey and Phillips have called one of the firmest regional sequences in North American archaeology. Willey and Phillips concluded that "the unusual rigor of the 'Lower Valley' sequence is manifested by a tendency to dominate in correlations with other sequences in neighboring regions." The success of Ford and his associates is at least partially due to their record of publishing outstanding reports on so many of their WPA excavations.
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CHAPTER X: THE IMPACT
OF NEW DEAL ARCHAEOLOGY

The New Deal relief programs assisted archaeologists in developing an improved understanding of the prehistory of Alabama, Tennessee, Georgia, Kentucky, and Louisiana. Although archaeology has changed a great deal since the 1930s and early 1940s, archaeologists are still concerned with the prehistory of individual states. Recent books published on the prehistory of Florida by Jerald T. Milanich and Charles H. Fairbanks, a New Deal archaeologist, and the prehistory of Alabama by John Walthall indicate that the state has not ceased to be a relevant unit for archaeological study. But even in the 1930s archaeologists recognized that a regional perspective was necessary to understand the prehistory of the Southeastern states. Prehistoric Indians did not know the location of the state boundaries of the United States, so it is unlikely that their evolution could be understood completely by confining archaeological studies within modern administrative boundaries.

Despite the numerous WPA, TVA, and NPS archaeological projects in the Southeast, important areas of archae-
ological interest were untouched. Archaeologists suspected that answers to some interesting archaeological problems might be found in the unsurveyed areas, and organized several surveys to fill in the gaps between the WPA state archaeological programs. The National Park Service and the WPA organized a small archaeological survey of the Natchez Trace Parkway which was planned to be a kind of elongated park running from Natchez, Mississippi to Nashville, Tennessee commemorating a road laid out in that area in the early nineteenth century. The NPS needed to identify and study the historic sites such as taverns, Indian boundary lines, and treaty grounds along the road in order to develop a program to educate the public.  

Jesse Jennings, the project director, tried to persuade Gordon Willey to be the state supervisor of the WPA-Natchez Trace Parkway project with a salary of $175 per month and $25 in expenses. When Willey did not accept the position, Albert C. Spaulding became the state supervisor of the WPA project which lasted from August, 1940, to February, 1941. Jennings first surveyed the Parkway and found in the Southern area a sequence of Tchefuncte, Marksville, Troyville, Middle Mississippi, Coles Creek, and Natchez. In the Central Mississippi area he discovered Baytown (which archaeolog-
ists had first called Deasonville), Coles Creek, early and late Middle Mississippi, and Choctaw. In Northeastern Mississippi he found pre-Chickasaw and remains of the historical Chickasawas. Based on this survey Jennings decided to use Spaulding's WPA labor to excavate sites in the Chickasaw Old Fields near Tupelo in the Lee County area of Northeastern Mississippi.

The project excavated three sites and sampled four. Jennings was then able to describe the outlines of Chickasaw material culture in the early eighteenth century. Most of the house patterns were round. Burials were flexed and placed inside the houses. Jennings found that almost all of the artifacts were European: guns, beads, knives, bells, and iron nails. Chickasaw pottery was Middle Mississippi tempered with oyster shell. Jennings described three periods of pre-Chickasaw occupation, Miller I to III. Plain fiber-tempered pottery characterized the oldest culture, Miller I. Miller II pottery was sand tempered and decorated with cord markings. Miller III pottery was cord marked but with a different paste. In addition to prehistoric archaeology Spaulding did some historical excavation as part of the project. He attempted to discover the size and position of the original buildings on Mound Plantation and also looked for slave cabins and
Another unsurveyed area of archaeological interest was the Mississippi River valley from the mouth of the Ohio River to Vicksburg, Mississippi. James Ford had developed a broad interest in Southeastern prehistory beginning in the early 1930s. His work in the Louisiana WPA archaeological project filled in one piece in the puzzle of Southeastern prehistory. Ford thought that a survey of the area north of the Louisiana border might help archaeologists to understand what they called Middle Mississippian. Archaeologists had a general idea of the characteristics of Middle Mississippian, but specific information was sparse. Ford designed the Lower Mississippi Valley Survey to fill in this picture. In the fall of 1939 he corresponded with James B. Griffin, of the University of Michigan, Philip Phillips, Curator of Southeastern archaeology at the Peabody Museum of Harvard University, and A. R. Kelly of the National Park Service about his idea. Gordon Willey, at the time a graduate student in anthropology at Columbia University, also hoped to take part in the survey, but William Duncan Strong, his professor at Columbia, feared that cooperation between so many institutions would not work and Columbia never joined the survey. Ford wrote the proposal for the project, a
Plan for an Archaeological Survey of the Central Mississippi Valley.\textsuperscript{10} When Kelly approved of the survey the NFS provided some support.

Ford, Griffin and Phillips had a regional perspective on archaeological problems and were interested in the entire Southeast. However this perspective was far from universal at a time when many archaeologists and amateurs were primarily concerned with the archaeology of their own states. S. C. Dellinger controlled the archaeology of Arkansas. His attitude was that "Arkansas is for Arkansans."\textsuperscript{11} As happened in the case of the WPA-TVA project in Tennessee, his opposition to outside archaeologists, especially the Lower Mississippi Valley Survey, would eventually involve archaeology in politics. Ford, Griffin, Phillips, and Fisher Motz, a graduate student in anthropology at Harvard University, started field work in the spring of 1940. From February 1st to the middle of April, the archaeologists collected specimens from the surface of 121 sites.\textsuperscript{12} They sent their collections to the Louisiana WPA archaeological laboratory in Baton Rouge and the archaeologists worked on the collections there for a week in May.\textsuperscript{13} Their success in the field brought on a vigorous attack by Dellinger who began to resist their attack on his state. He wrote letters to landowners warning them against the
outsiders, but this did not prevent the survey from obtaining access to the sites.\textsuperscript{14} Dellinger complained to politicians about the involvement of the NPS and WPA in the survey.\textsuperscript{15} His complaints reached the WPA and caused trouble for Ford's Louisiana WPA project because the project was not authorized to process archaeological material collected outside of the state of Louisiana. As had been the case in other political conflicts in federal archaeology, Frank Setzler and Carl Guthe were drawn into the problem. Setzler regretted that one archaeologist could cause unnecessary difficulties for the Louisiana WPA project with a states rights approach which did not belong in science. He told Setzler that "it is too bad that some method could not be found whereby this thorn could not be removed from our archaeological programs in the Southeast."\textsuperscript{16} Finally they decided that Griffin should study artifacts from his survey at the University of Michigan and Phillips analyze his collections at Harvard. Phillips continued the survey in the fall of 1940 when Griffin joined him along with Mott Davis and Chester Chard. The outbreak of the war interrupted the survey's work; it resumed in 1946 when the archaeologists began short trips and continued them into the spring of 1947.\textsuperscript{17}

The archaeological programs in the Southeastern
May 16th to 18th, 1938. Archaeologists attending included John L. Buckner, William G. Haag, and Claude Johnston of the University of Kentucky, Joffre Coe of the University of North Carolina, David DeJarnette from the Alabama Museum of Natural History, Charles H. Fairbanks and T. M. N. Lewis from the University of Tennessee, Vladimir J. Fewkes, J. Joe Pinklestein of the University of Oklahoma, Arthur R. Kelly, Robert Neitzel, Charles G. Wilder, Frederick Matson, George I. Quimby, James Ford, and James Griffin. Willey and Holder did not attend this meeting.21

The development of a pottery typology was not a simple task. The archaeologists were experienced field technicians, but few had completed their professional training in anthropology. Each had a detailed knowledge of a small part of Southeastern prehistory, but none of them understood the archaeology of the entire Southeast. In order to develop a synthesis of Southeastern pottery types, Ford proposed the creation of a control board to select and name pottery types with a "czar" in charge, but this aroused opposition among archaeologists who feared dictatorial control of their work.22 They agreed on publication of pottery types which began to appear in the first bulletin of the Southeastern conference published in 1939. The "Outline
states developed large amounts of archaeological data. According to Stephen Williams, "the large W.P.A. projects in Louisiana, Tennessee, Alabama and Georgia especially were turning out more archaeological finds during every six-month period than had been uncovered in the several previous decades." Archaeologists soon began to attempt to synthesize this data into a prehistory of the Southeast. Ford had a broad regional perspective on the entire Southeast developed during his early work in Louisiana and a number of other archaeologists had a similar point of view. During the fall of 1937 Ford and James B. Griffin discussed Eastern pottery types and decided it was time to have a conference of archaeologists to discuss pottery typology. Correspondence with archaeologists including Arthur R. Kelly, Preston Holder, William G. Haag, and Gordon Willey helped to clarify the scope of the conference. Ford and Griffin sent out a six page proposal for the meeting, a "Conference on Pottery Nomenclature for the Southeastern United States," which advanced the idea of using a trinomial pottery classification in the Southeast. From this beginning "arose the many-header monster that is Southeastern pottery typology."

The archaeologists met in Griffin's office at the Ceramic Repository at the University of Michigan from
for Description of Types" in the "Report of the Conference on Southeastern Pottery Typology" based on the work of Carl Guthe served as a guide to prepare the descriptions. The archaeologists were to send type samples to William Haag at the University of Kentucky, David DeJarnette at the Alabama Museum of Natural History, Joffre Coe at the University of North Carolina, A. R. Kelly, and James Ford at Louisiana State University. A Board of Review consisting of Ford, Griffin, and Willey was to examine the type descriptions before publication, but this board did not work and it was soon dropped. This group of young founders of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference rapidly became dominant in Southeastern archaeology. The fast acceptance of the methodology discussed at the meeting was due to "a sort of 'Young Turks' movement which caught fire and took over the Southeast." The senior generation of archaeologists encouraged the Southeastern conferences but generally did not attend the meetings. Griffin was later puzzled by this and thought that "it is a curious fact that W. S. Webb did not attend any of the Southeast Conference Meetings." But it is not unusual for the senior generation of scientists to avoid meetings of a "Young Turks" movement designed to overthrow their life's work. William McKern of the Milwaukee
Public Museum, who had played a major part in the development of the Midwestern Taxonomic Method in the 1930s, also felt uneasy about the young archaeologists. He told Lewis and Kneberg that "I seem to be so far behind some of these speed-burning students of Mississippi Valley archaeology, such as Griffin and Phillips, that I never expect to catch up." He was unwilling to "gracefully retire from the field," and hoped to weather the storm created by the Young Turks. From his perspective "what we have on our hands now is a grand publicity carnival with everyone trying to go one better than the next fellow." He hoped that "after the tumult and the shouting die, as sooner or later they must--since bubbles will eventually bust, perhaps we can settle down again to do some real, careful, critical work at analyzing facts toward determining fact-supported postulates relating to detailed, local problems, preparatory to hypothesizing on the great sweeping problems. But there was to be no return to the good old days. The Young Turks would dominate archaeology after World War II.

In the early days of the Southeastern conference Ford was primarily interested in concentrating on the study of pottery. He had a powerful personality that strongly influenced the Southeastern conference. "One remembers," Willey wrote thirty years later, "the spare,
6-ft. 4-in., Lincolnesque frame, the deep-set, intense eyes. Clearly, there was a quality of the messianic about him—as there may be in all innovators. Not all the archaeologists reacted well to his personality. "One tended to be either drawn up and swept along in his enthusiasm or somewhat hostile toward and suspicious of it, and contemporaries in the early Southeastern Archaeological Conference meetings reacted in both ways. ... The arguments were hot and electrifying."^28

The second Southeastern conference met in Birmingham from November 4th to 6th, 1938, at the Central Archaeological Laboratory. The archaeologists represented widely different areas of the Southeast, and conflicts developed among them as soon as they had to reach decisions on pottery classification. This meant, in Kneberg's words, that the Birmingham meeting was not all "sweetness and light." She feared that too much preoccupation with the minutiae of pottery typology could retard the development of Southeastern archaeology. Kneberg told Guthe that "procedures were in danger of becoming fixed and arbitrary while still in an adolescent stage—a sort of intellectual Nazism—without regard to whether the system could be effectually applied to the whole Mississippi Valley."^29 But Ford was becoming less interested in an exclusive emphasis on pottery because his WPA
excavations in Louisiana had taught him to be more concerned with other aspects of archaeological investigation and helped him to place pottery in its proper perspective. The change of name from Southeastern pottery conference to Southeastern archaeological conference reflected this evolution in Ford's views.\textsuperscript{30} But even with Ford's increasing openness to other considerations than pottery typology, his continuing focus on pottery caused "some pretty open arguments and disagreements" at the Birmingham conference. These arguments appeared in the report of the meeting which Ford was to publish. Ford believed that the report did not represent fairly the action of the conference and he delayed the release of the report.\textsuperscript{31} Jesse Jennings felt strongly that the proceedings of the conference should be published and told Wilder that "I don't think we ought to let Ford scare us out of this thing, because there are still several people who question the advisability of the pottery approach and this letter would have a tendency to show the pottery approach is not as strong as they feel."\textsuperscript{32} Eventually a broader perspective would come to prevail as archaeologists became increasingly interested in settlement and subsistence patterns.

Archaeologists greatly improved their knowledge of Southeastern prehistory due to the CWA, WPA, TVA, and NPS
archaeological programs. By the early 1940s archaeologists had established a chronology of Southeastern prehistory which would exert great influence on the archaeology of the 1940s and 1950s, and even the "new" archaeology of the 1960s and after. Ford and Willey published in 1941 the first archaeological synthesis based primarily on the WPA, TVA, and NPS projects. The basis of their article, "An Interpretation of the Prehistory of the Eastern United States," was their division of Eastern prehistory into a series of stages: Archaic, Burial Mound I, Burial Mound II, Temple Mound I, and Temple Mound II. 33

The New Deal archaeologists in the Southeast found few indications of the earliest Indian cultures in the region. Archaeologists discovered evidence of early man in the 1930s and 1940s, but at the Lindenmeier site in Colorado, Sandia Cave and the Clovis-Portales sites in New Mexico, Signal Butte in Nebraska, and other sites in the West rather than in the Southeast.

Knowledge of the next stage, the Archaic cultures, developed immensely as a result of relief archaeology. Ford and Willey called the earliest known cultural horizon in the Eastern United States the Archaic stage. They saw this as the foundation cultural pattern which served as the basis for later cultural stages. The
Archaic was characterized by a lack of horticulture and pottery and a smaller number, variety, and quality of artifacts than would be found in later stages. They placed the Green River sites in Western Kentucky, the lower levels of some of the shell mounds in the Wheeler Basin in Alabama, Savannah River sites in Eastern Georgia including the Bilbo site, and the lower levels of the Tchefuncte sites in Southern Louisiana in the Archaic stage. The Archaic economy was based on simple hunting and gathering. Burials were often flexed. Artifacts found include bone and antler projectile points, stemmed flint points, awls, canine teeth, shell beads, grinding stones, and fire-cracked stones and clay balls.

Cone-shaped burial mounds characterized the Burial Mound I stage. Ford and Willey did not know the origin of this stage, but they saw the culture moving up the Mississippi Valley at a "giss date" of 900 A.D. Artifacts from this stage included tubular clay pipes, quartz crystals, circular shell gorgets, and polished stone celts. Archaic artifacts such as boatstones, hematite and galena plummets, conch shell containers, and stemmed projectile points continued to be used as they had in the Archaic. Pottery, mostly undecorated, appeared at the end of the Archaic. Ford and Willey
postulated that horticulture began with this stage, basing their judgement not on any physical evidence, but on their observation that the sites were located in a region suitable for agriculture rather than near areas with large supplies of shellfish. Evidence of this cultures' rapid spread north was found in Indiana, Ohio, and at the Ricketts site excavated by the Kentucky WPA project where the Burial Mound I stage provided the foundation for the Adena culture. Pottery was limestone tempered and undecorated. Ford and Willey classified the Copena culture discovered by the CWA-TVA project in the Wheeler Basin of Northern Alabama as Burial Mound I. They believed that Copena moved up the Tennessee River from the mouth of the Ohio River.

The Burial Mound II stage was primarily the time of the Marksville and Hopewell cultures. This stage was marked by the transition from the Tchefuncte to the Marksville culture in the Louisiana area. The Marksville period showed increased emphasis on burial customs with secondary burial, cremation, and log tombs. Archaeologists still could not prove the use of agriculture, but indirect evidence was stronger. Deptford check stamped pottery developed in this period. Swift Creek pottery, marked by curvilinear, and rectilinear stamped pottery developed about the same time as Marksville and
replaced Deptford. Cordmarked pottery moved into the Southeast from the north at the end of the Marksville period and became popular in the Troyville in Louisiana. What Ford and Willey called the Woodland Cultural Pattern combined many of the traits of the Burial Mound stage with remnants of the Archaic.

The construction of rectangular flat temple mounds around a central court marked the beginning of the Temple Mound I stage. Ford and Willey believed that these mounds had been built by practitioners of a new religious cult who were very concerned with treatment of the dead, practiced cremation, and lived in rectangular houses. Artifacts found included clay elbow pipes, clay figurines, and cordmarked pottery, the primary marker of this period. In the Lower Mississippi Valley this period is represented by Troyville and Coles Creek while north of this area in Eastern Arkansas and Western Mississippi it is represented by the Baytown period. The late Baytown was of the same age as the Coles Creek in Louisiana. Middle Mississippi followed the Coles Creek and Baytown periods in Eastern Arkansas and Western Mississippi. Ford and Willey recognized that the concept of the Middle Mississippian period characterized by shell-tempered pottery dated back to the work of William H. Holmes.
early in the twentieth century, but the archaeology of the 1930s added information to his original definition of the term. Because many of the Mississippian sites were large and easily located, archaeologists and amateurs had "excavated" these sites early in the twentieth century and into the 1920s. The Middle Mississippian mounds were square, not round as had been the case in earlier periods. Because of the great size of some of the mounds Ford and Willey concluded that "political unification was being effected and that these were the ceremonial centers of large communities." But they could say little about the life of these Indians because archaeologists had found little evidence of villages near the mounds.

Ford and Willey thought that about 1400 A.D. this Mississippian culture began to move out of the Mississippi River Valley and up the Tennessee River. They based this conclusion on the evidence found in the top levels of many of the shell middens excavated by the CWA-TVA survey of the Wheeler Basin in Alabama and the Norris Basin in Tennessee. The Indians continued to move into Georgia where much information had been obtained from the CWA-WPA-NPS excavations in Central Georgia. The archaeologists had found rectangular temple mounds and houses. Earth wall fortifications
surrounded two of the largest sites. Ford and Willey were able to use the historical research of John R. Swanton of the Smithsonian Institution and other ethnologists to add to the data uncovered by federal excavations.\textsuperscript{39} DeSoto's expedition through the Southeast from 1540 to 1542 provided information about Indians in Georgia, Tennessee, and Alabama in the early stage of the development of the Middle Mississippian culture.

Despite all the work completed on Archaic sites by the relief archaeologists of the 1930s, the Temple Mound II stage was still the best known in the Southeastern United States because archaeologists had found so many burial goods in the many large cemeteries near the village sites. The Norris Basin project discovered sites which Webb classified as a Large Post Townhouse complex. The Lamar period in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia is part of this stage. The Moundville site, partially excavated by C. B. Moore and further excavated by the Alabama WPA archaeological project, is Temple Mound II. This late Middle Mississippian period was a time when the Indians living along rivers and large streams moved back into the area of small streams and hills. Almost every village was fortified with a stockade. There was a great decline in population
at the end of the period. According to Ford and Willey, "in areas where sites of the early and late Middle Mississippian cultures must have numbered in the thousands, not an Indian was to be found in the latter part of the seventeenth century when the French and English explorers entered the region." They thought that epidemic diseases brought by the Europeans might have been responsible for the depopulation.

Setzler considered historical archaeology to be one of the most important contributions to archaeology in the period from 1930 to 1942. He defined historical archaeology as a means of verifying and supplementing the documentary record normally used by historians. The project at Jamestown, Virginia, was one of the major historical archaeological projects in the United States during the depression. In the summer of 1936, Jean C. Harrington replaced the previous archaeologist at Jamestown. He was an architect with graduate training in archaeology. He began a period of great progress in historical archaeology at Jamestown. Harrington developed the museum and effectively managed the archaeological project.

Archaeologists excavated some historical sites to identify areas of interest to the National Park Service. For example, the NPS was interested in locating the
Confederate fortifications at Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park at Marietta, Georgia. Excavation revealed the location of the fortifications and a few bullets. Other archaeologists worked with historical material at the Bayou Goula site in Louisiana, Cherokee sites in Tennessee, and Ocmulgee National Monument, Georgia, but the number of historical excavations was very small when compared to the prehistoric excavations. There was a reason for this lack of concern with historical archaeology. As Charles Hosmer, the historian of the historic preservation movement, has noted, "if historians who deserted the universities during the depression were considered second-class citizens in their professional groups, archaeologists who sifted the debris from colonial American historic sites were heretics. Their pioneer efforts did not really achieve any respectability until well after World War II."

The chronology established by Ford and Willey based on New Deal archaeology would eventually come under attack by a new generation of archaeologists with new problems, methods, and theories. This happened during the 1960s with the assault of the "new" archaeologists on the old archaeology of the depression. One might ask if New Deal archaeology represented a scientific revolution in archaeology during the 1930s and 1940s. The "new"
archaeologists of the 1960s and their followers felt the need to proclaim their own generation as the creators of a scientific revolution in archaeology. As a consequence the archaeology of the 1930s and 1940s was frequently attacked in tones ranging from mildly critical to vicious. Even today archaeologists can be found who believe that archaeology would be better off if the federal government had never supported archaeological research during the depression. Some archaeologists now practicing cultural resources management feel that the salvage work of the 1930s gave all emergency archaeology a bad name.

David J. Meltzer, in a recent article reviewing the changes in archaeology since the early 1960s, stated that "as a whole, archaeologists agree that some fundamental changes have occurred in the discipline since the early 1960s. Many have called the changes revolutionary." But he concluded that, "there has been no revolution in archaeology."45 If this is a correct interpretation of postwar American archaeology, there is a direct link between the archaeology of today and that of the 1930s and early 1940s. New Deal archaeology is not separated from contemporary archaeology by the wide gulf of a scientific revolution.

New Deal archaeology still lives on in the contem-
porary archaeology of the Southeast. The Southeastern Archaeological Conference held its 38th annual meeting in 1981. These meetings still deal with many of the problems of the original founding generation of WPA, TVA, and NPS archaeologists. The successes and the mistakes of the archaeology of the 1930s are the basis of a great deal of contemporary archaeology in the Southeast. Archaeologists in recent years have studied collections from sites excavated during the depression while others have excavated undisturbed portions of sites excavated in the 1930s to pose new questions and solve new problems. New Deal archaeology will continue to be important to the archaeologists of the 1980s and beyond.
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