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1 Introduction

This thesis is an attempt to write a different history of archaeology to the ones we have, in effect to amplify those histories. I felt that the general histories of archaeology concentrated too much on the published works of archaeologists and too little on the archaeologists themselves. I wanted to get behind the written work, not to create a series of biographies, but to see if it was possible to write a history which placed archaeology in its social context, which looked at how archaeologists experienced their lives, at what they did to become archaeologists, and what that term meant to them.

I chose the inter-war period for a variety of reasons. This was the time, I felt, when archaeology was moving from being a hobby to a potential career. Obviously there were archaeologists employed before the 20s and 30s, and part-time or amateur archaeologists for many years afterwards, but by the inter-war period it was possible to study archaeology, to train as an archaeologist, and for a select few, to pursue archaeology as a career. When I was an undergraduate this period was portrayed almost as an heroic age, there was Collingwood, Childe, Wheeler, Clark, Piggott, and Hawkes, men whose thinking, I was told, transformed archaeology. Yet, when I read about this time in the histories I was disappointed, I wanted to know more about these figures, how and why they became archaeologists, what being an archaeologist had meant to them, what they thought archaeology was and should be. I also wanted to know where the women were, why in this list of heroes there were no women. In part this reflected the type of archaeology I had studied, my degree concentrated on British archaeology so Kathleen Kenyon and Dorothy Garrod were not mentioned. But, I wanted to know more about the people who were just names on reports and books, C.M. Piggott, A. Fox, and T.V. Wheeler, and why they were not included in that list of 'greats'.

I had other, less archaeology based, reasons for looking at inter-war life. I had studied the First and Second World Wars, I had read some of the war poets and writers (Blunden 1928; Brittain 1986; Graves 1960; Owen 1963 & Sassoon 1946), I wondered how archaeologists had coped with these conflicts, had they been involved and in what capacity? I was also interested in the suffrage movement and its post-vote aftermath. I
wanted to know what had happened to the women's movement in the 20s and 30s and why the pre-war feminists had seemingly failed to capitalise on winning the vote. I wondered how the campaign for equality in suffrage, education, and employment had moved to a construction of women that seemed so restrictively domestic when that representation had been so strongly refused before the First World War. I also wanted to look at class and colonialism. In the histories I had read in the 70s and 80s I had been repeatedly told that the Great War had emancipated women, but my later reading, particularly of feminist histories, suggested this was not the case. Those same histories asserted that the war had demolished class barriers and signalled the end of the British Empire. If understandings of gender during the inter-war period were more complicated than suggested by these books were their representations of class and colonialism also open to question? And, how did these questions relate to archaeology? Who had access to becoming an archaeologist? Was this access dependent on class, gender, or race? And, were these issues reflected in the past that inter-war archaeologists constructed?

These were the motives with which I started this study. Over time the parameters of this thesis have been modified. Originally I had intended to examine the periods before the First World War and after the Second World War, to compare archaeology and archaeologists from those periods and see how conceptions of archaeology had changed over time. I also wanted to look at archaeology beyond Britain, to talk about developments in Egyptology and Near Eastern archaeology, areas where British archaeologists were working developing techniques and methodologies. Again, I wanted to compare their work to those working in Britain and look at how overseas archaeologists related to the inhabitants of the countries where they worked. I soon realised that this was an impossible task, the quantity of information, while inspiring, meant I had to confine my writing to the inter-war period in Britain and British archaeology. Even then I was unable to fit in everything I wanted to say. As a consequence I decided to concentrate on those areas I felt were most interesting and had seen the least research: fieldwork; training; employment; social networks; class; gender; and colonialism. I felt that the general histories, particularly Trigger's, had already discussed the development of ideas of culture history and functionalism in more detail than I could attempt here. And, in the case of Trigger although I have critiqued his approach to history writing, I found his examination of what archaeologists were saying about the past in the 20s and 30s an excellent introduction to the written work of the
period. Therefore, I have concentrated on questioning how culture history reflected the dominant discourses of class, gender and colonialism. The published work of 20s and 30s archaeologists informs this discussion of the history of inter-war archaeology. The explanations offered through typologies, economic determinism, the identification of culture groups and culture history, and diffusion underlie my understanding of this period, but I felt there was so much new and different material to discuss that this thesis should concentrate on that new material and how it reflected ideas about the nature of archaeology.

The sources I have used combine published and unpublished material. In addition to the published archaeological material of the period I have incorporated information from the fieldwork manuals, archive material, autobiographies, biographies, and conversations I had with archaeologists. The use of biographical and autobiographical material and oral testimonies has been critically examined by other writers. Biographical and autobiographical writing is a particularly stylised genre, as Liz Stanley has remarked:

... autobiography provides readers with exemplary lives. Also, by effect if not intent, it inscribes what 'a life' looks like, the form in which (written and spoken) tales of lives should be told and actual lives should be lived. These lives are linear, chronological, progressive, cumulative and individualist, and follow highly particular narrative conventions. (Stanley 1995: 12)

Biography gives the impression of being more critical, the life has been weighed and considered, unlike autobiography faults are uncovered rather than elided, yet Liz Stanley again punctures this belief:

... 'the biographer' is a socially located person, one who is sexed, raced, classed, aged, to mention no more, and is so every bit as much as an autobiographer is ... any biographer's view is a socially located and necessarily partial one. (Stanley 1995: 7).

Oral testimonies are equally problematic sources of material (Perks 1995; Howarth 1999; Thompson 2000). Denise Riley (1983: 191) and Joan Scott (1988) concluded that personal testimony could not be used in the writing of history, the constructions and reconstructions of terms such as gender were worked and re-worked by powerful external discourses and it was they that should be studied rather than individual voices. However, as Penny Summerfield has argued oral testimonies can be used by post-modernist historians:
Personal narratives draw on the generalised subject available in discourse to construct the particular personal subject. It is thus necessary to encompass within oral history analysis and interpretation, not only the voice that speaks for itself, but also the voices that speak to it, the discursive formulations from which understandings are selected and within which accounts are made. (Summerfield 1998: 15).

I would also argue that the perceived problem of the interviewer predetermining the answers received is exactly the same inter-action that takes place in any form of historical investigation. The historian brings to the source, whatever it may be, preconceptions and understandings which shape the answers produced. In turn the narrative that is constructed further shapes the history that is written (see Chapter 3). I would argue that since I am not a trained interviewer the personal reminiscences I have incorporated in this work were conversations rather than interviews. Obviously my questions shaped the course of the conversation and the details I was told, but the archaeologists I spoke to told me when they thought I was asking the wrong question, focussing on the wrong people, misunderstanding the nature of inter-war archaeology. They were not passive interviewees but active constructors of their own history, telling me only what they chose to reveal. They were also insistent that in exchange for their information I told them my history, my story, these meetings were not interviews but conversations that wandered from the point, debated similarities and differences between then and now, and were not only illuminating but also enormously entertaining. I enjoyed these occasions and I am grateful to those archaeologists who shared their memories with me, even when I have questioned what they said. Their reminiscences have helped ground this study and contextualise my ideas about inter-war archaeology, and to give a more human face to that period. This does not mean I have uncovered the ‘truth’ about archaeology in the 20s and 30s, rather it means I have a different history to offer.

This was also my reason for looking through archive material. I wanted to see if I could use that material to put together a different sort of history, one that looked at how sites were dug and recorded, and in particular whether I could find any traces of the foremen and labourers who excavated those sites. In the process I was presented with a wealth of information, written and pictoral, about how archaeology was performed in the 20s and 30s and this has helped shape my understanding of the period. Again, this does not make my account any more truthful, I have interpreted and selected the material I have
presented here, it is channelled through my understanding as much as the understanding of archaeology in the 20s and 30s. None of the archives I examined were complete, to a modern archaeologist they are astonishingly incomplete, but even this negative evidence was useful in constructing an understanding of inter-war archaeology. It reinforced the distance between us and them, made me aware of how much archaeology has changed and the ways that change have shaped what we now understand by the term archaeology.

The arrangement of this thesis reflects these various strands and interests and is divided into four separate but inter-connected parts. The first looks at how the histories of archaeology have been written, what I think the standard histories have tried to do and why. I have also explained why I have found this approach disappointing because of the issues that have not been covered. In this part I have also discussed the nature of historiography and how it has been applied to the history of archaeology. I have then gone on to detail my own understanding of history and the theoretical standpoint of my work. The second component is a general history of Britain in the 20s and 30s which attempts to set the scene and discuss the society within which archaeology was situated. The third part constitutes my history of archaeology. In these chapters I have begun by discussing the nature of fieldwork, the ideal and the reality, and what the manuals, site-reports, and archives tell us about the way archaeology was performed and understood. Then I have looked at training and employment, how would-be archaeologists became actual archaeologists and the career options that were open to them once this authority had been attained. Chapter 7 looks in detail at identity; how archaeologists created their identity and how that identity was understood within the discipline and to those outside, the press and public. I have discussed what archaeologists were saying about their work to each other, and also to the public and the differences between the two. In turn I have looked at how the public chose to consume and re-interpret the archaeological information they were given.

Throughout these chapters I have incorporated ideas about class, race and gender and how these concepts informed the archaeology of the period, how they controlled who had access to the past, and what that past said about these issues. The final chapter summarises and concludes my ideas about inter-war archaeology and my understanding of history.
2 Histories of Archaeology

2.1 Introduction

The history of archaeology has been the subject of popular writers since at least the 1920s (see section 7.7.2 below), but it was not until the publication of Hawkes and Hawkes' *Prehistoric Britain* in 1943 that particular academic archaeologists investigated the origins of their discipline. It is still a largely under-researched area, receiving occasional attention at conferences and in the archaeological journals. This chapter concentrates on the few book-length histories which have been published by archaeologists, the books by Bahn (1996a & 1996b), Daniel (1950, 1967 & 1975), Malina and Vasicek (1990), Schnapp (1996), Stiebing (1994), and Trigger (1989). I intend to deal only in passing with those works which deal with particular areas such as Piggott's books on William Stukeley (1950 & 1985), or his more general work on antiquarians (1976 & 1988), the edited volume on the history of German archaeology (Harke 2000), or the investigation of women archaeologists (Díaz-Andreu & Sørensen 1998). I have also largely ignored the papers given at conferences and published in periodicals. This is not because I believe that they have the same failings as the standard histories of archaeology. On the contrary, they are essential for broadening our understanding of archaeology by introducing new figures and tackling the problems of writing history, and I have used such papers extensively in my attempt to create a different picture of archaeology in the 20s and 30s. My reasons for omitting them here are precisely because they don't have the same failings as the standard histories, and because the new perspectives they offer have not been incorporated into the standard histories.

In essence the standard histories constructed a linear view of archaeology, the early stages of archaeological understanding were presented as a time of misunderstanding and uncertainty about the past. Through the accumulation of knowledge and a supposedly more objective understanding of the world we progressed through the centuries with 'great men' providing the requisite knowledge until we arrive at the present day as finished 'scientific' archaeologists. Although what follows is an
extensive critique of the content and approach of these histories I am aware that these books reflect the constraint of providing a coherent history of the discipline. And, I am equally aware that it is much easier for me to criticise their attempts than to envisage and construct a whole new history of archaeology. These books have provided me with a place to begin my investigations. It is their omissions and exclusions which provoked my thinking about archaeology and archaeologists. Without these texts there would be no history of archaeology, and it is to their credit that these writers have begun a discussion of such a neglected area.

The standard texts have presented a largely uniform picture of the history of archaeology. Whether this history was given as part of the text of a non-history book such as Clarke's *Analytical Archaeology* (1968) or Hawkes and Hawkes' *Prehistoric Britain* (1943), or in a book devoted to the subject as with Daniel's *A Hundred and Fifty Years of Archaeology* (1975) or Trigger's *A History of Archaeological Thought* (1989) the events and people seen as innovators and originators in archaeology were endlessly recycled. The repetition sometimes extended to the point of using virtually the same language, so Daniel referred to John Aubrey as 'the most famous of the seventeenth-century antiquaries' (Daniel 1950: 19), while Trigger called Aubrey 'the most famous of the seventeenth-century English antiquaries' (Trigger 1989: 48). On the few occasions these texts disagreed on the relative importance of individuals, there was little explanation of why or consistency in their approach. Equally the reasons behind deciding which individuals should be singled out as representative of the discipline at different stages were not given.

Nor was it just the text that was the same, repeated pictures were used, Thomsen showing visitors around the museum (fig. 2.1), stern portraits of Petrie, Darwin and Pitt-Rivers, or photographs from Howard Carter's excavation of the tomb of Tutankhamun. All of which reinforces the idea that the people portrayed and discussed were 'proper' archaeologists, people with authority. In turn the repeated use of their photographs confers authority on the authors which then reinforces the idea that there is only one possible reading of the history of archaeology.

The history of archaeology was seen and presented as a logical, seamless, progression. Archaeology arose out of incremental additions of knowledge from key workers, or
‘fathers’ as they were frequently termed. While it is not my intention to dispute that men such as Thomsen, Worsaae, Lubbock, Darwin, and Lyell were important in the development of archaeology, one begins to wonder when faced with this uniformity if they were the only people of any influence. In this concentration on individuals were there no other people who affected the discipline? Are there no other voices to be heard in this history? Is the history of archaeology as these writers portrayed it? Is there really nothing new to say? I intend in this section to outline how these books have presented the history of archaeology, and then to look at who and what has been overlooked before suggesting how the history of archaeology’s development could be differently addressed.

2.1.1 Justifications

Before dealing with the history presented in these books I want to briefly examine the justification given by the various authors as to why they wrote their texts and for whom they were intended. Most stated that they were intended for ‘the serious student’ of archaeology (Daniel 1975: 10), and had been written because the author had been teaching the subject for a number of years and felt such a book was essential (Trigger 1989: xiii). This justification was then generally followed by an appeal to a wider audience:

*Uncovering the Past* is intended primarily for college students studying archaeology, anthropology or ancient history. But there are many general readers interested in these subjects as well. So I have tried to keep professional jargon to a minimum and to make the material as readable as I can. (Stiebing 1994 19).

I will discuss later how far this attempt at inclusiveness was successful, but I would question the selflessness here expressed. The mention of teaching the subject acts as a claim to being an expert, there is in this statement an implicit authoritative voice saying ‘after this number of years I know what the history of archaeology is and the correct way to teach it’. Yet, if all these books cover the same people and events, why would we need more than one text? Even those books which claimed to go back to the original sources such as Ceram’s *Gods Graves and Scholars* (1952) or Daniel’s *The Origins and Growth of Archaeology* (1967) followed the prototype set down by Hawkes and Hawkes’ *Prehistoric Britain*. This suggests right at the beginning of this examination that there was a preconceived idea of how the history of archaeology should look and read, which again reinforces the monumental nature of the history of archaeology, as
well as setting up the writer as someone who spoke with authority.

2.2 Content

2.2.1 Beginnings

All of these books started with a discussion of when archaeology began, an area on which there was some disparity, but essentially there were two basic camps: those that saw archaeology as originating from Greek, or earlier enquiries about the world (Stiebing, Trigger); and those that saw archaeology as a Renaissance affair (Clarke, Daniel, Bahn). The claim to longevity gives archaeology an enhanced status, the idea that there has been a longstanding interest in the past suggests that past has been thoroughly investigated. But this attitude also conferred authority on the writer of history, by laying claim to being part of a tradition that can look back over millennia the writers could be seen as speaking with the weight of that accumulated knowledge. The question that was almost never asked was why the Babylonians, Chinese or Greeks were interested in their past. Schnapp attempted an explanation when he suggested that for the Babylonian kings and Chinese emperors it was a way of taking on the mantle of authority of their predecessors, showing that they were worthy inheritors of their kingdoms (Schnapp 1996: 11-56 passim). Schnapp also suggested that for the Greeks an interest in the past was part of the cult of hero-worship and belief in a golden age from which contemporary Greeks had fallen. But, it was also Schnapp who voiced the belief implicit in every other history of archaeology:

As far back in time as we can go we find antiquaries comparing remains with texts, monuments with their associated literature, mythological cycles with landscapes. We cannot capture antiquarianism at its roots . . . We simply know that to deny them any curiosity about the past is just as absurd as to deny them a sense of the divine, or the practice of language. (Schnapp 1996: 317).

It is noticeable however, that it was only certain groups of people who were allowed an interest in the past, no-one ever cited the re-use of Neolithic monuments for Bronze Age cremations, or post-Roman use of Iron Age hillforts. Although instances of re-cycling and re-using artefacts are well known from prehistory (Bradley 2002) this was never seen as antiquarian interest. Bahn mentioned early modern African tribes collecting
ancient polished stone axes and he suggested this indicated 'that an interest in ancestors and relics from the past existed long before the arrival of Europeans' (Bahn 1996b: 13). A statement directly contradicting an earlier remark in the same volume where he wrote that while *The Cambridge Illustrated History* was Eurocentric 'We make no apologies for this. Archaeology was not created by non-western experience' (Bahn 1996b: xi). Nor was it, according to Bahn, created by the *hoi polloi*:

> While commoners may display curiosity about the past, it is the élites in any society who have a vested interest in establishing their origins. Information about ancestors and lineage helps bolster status and keep social inferiors at a distance. (Bahn 1996b: 13).

Only certain groups with particular understandings of the significance of the past were therefore allowed into this chronology of archaeological interest.

### 2.2.2 The Renaissance

Regardless of where these writers saw the history of archaeology beginning, they all agreed that the Renaissance was an important phase in the development of archaeology (Clarke 1978 2-6; Trigger 1989: 36). While still falling a long way short of proper archaeology by virtue of being treasure hunters (ibid) these renaissance scholars were claimed as our discipline's forefathers (Malina & Vasicek 1990: 12). The spread of Renaissance ideas was seen as having given rise to antiquarian interest in the rest of Europe. Camden, Leland, Lhwyd, Bure and Worm are claimed, often explicitly, as the precursors of modern topographical techniques (Schnapp 1996: 139 & 167; Daniel 1975: 35; & Bahn 1996b: 35). But why an Italian interest in ancient Roman life and culture should give rise to an interest in North European ancient monuments is not discussed. Instead of exploration the narrative moved on to the next generation of archaeological field workers exemplified by Thomas Browne and John Aubrey, who according to Daniel:

> ... blazed a trail which leads from Leland and Camden to Stukeley, Colt Hoare, Cunnington, and to the great field archaeologists of the last fifty years, such as Williams-Freeman, Crawford and Fox. (Daniel 1950: 19).

Not only written archaeology but also field work was thus given a linear and progressive history.

All the histories then discussed the formation of 'the learned societies'. These societies were portrayed as inclusive bodies, how one went about joining, and whether everyone was welcome or if anyone was actively excluded was not discussed. Yet an aristocratic
club such as the Dilettanti must surely have had some sort of entry restriction and how were their Aegean expeditions subsidised? Daniel did mention this problem:

...it was not everyone who could afford to travel widely in classical lands, and, for such, the study of British antiquities provided a cheap and interesting substitute near at hand. (Daniel 1950: 22).

The study of archaeology in the field may have been cheap, but how accessible was the London Society of Antiquaries? Initially it was a tavern society meeting at the Bear or the Young Devil in the Strand. Were working class men encouraged to join? It seems unlikely, the members we know of were entirely from the upper and professional classes. and what of women? Lord Melford 'declar'd he w'd not go to a tavern' (Malcome 1738 in Piggott 1985: 38), and no respectable woman would have visited such a place (Evans 1956: 147). I would suggest that the lack of analysis was because the writers of the standard histories were male and middle class, they didn’t think in terms of exclusion because they themselves were unlikely to have faced any such discrimination. To these writers male and privileged was the norm, female and/or working class was not, so an exclusion of these abnormal elements was unremarkable.

In these histories the founding of the Society of Antiquaries led to a discussion of William Stukeley (Schnapp 1996: 212). Stuart Piggott’s biography of Stukeley first published in 1950 and substantially re-written and re-published in 1985 has ensured that the life and work of Stukeley is well known, albeit channelled through Stuart Piggott’s eyes and voice. All of these historians followed Piggott in bemoaning Stukeley’s ‘lamentable lapse from scholarship’ (Piggott 1976: 21 and see Trigger 1989: 65). Whereas later scholars have suggested that Stukeley’s early and later conclusions were inextricably entwined, and that his belief in an ancient druidic religion had always informed his conclusions (Ucko et al 1991: Haycock 2002: Sweet 2004). As with so many new interpretations, this convincing analysis of Stukeley had not been incorporated or discussed in the histories of archaeology published since 1991.

Surprisingly the re-discovery of Pompeii and Herculaneum in the 1730s was given little space in the standard histories. The popular histories of archaeology (see section 7.7.2 below) reported these events as major occurrences in the history of archaeology. This would seem a reasonable supposition since Pompeii and Herculaneum provoked enormous interest in Classical remains and became a popular stop on the Grand Tour for Europe’s upper-classes, the very class from which the majority of contemporary
archaeologists or antiquarians were drawn. It was only Schnapp and Stiebing who dealt in detail with these discoveries (Schnapp 1996: 42-7; Stiebing 1994: 147-53). Bahn and Trigger simply outlined the succession of events, while Daniel made only passing reference to these discoveries. By saying so little about classical archaeology these histories reinforced the idea that it was only pre-historic archaeology that contributed to the development of the discipline (Whitley pers. comm).

2.2.3 The Enlightenment

The next event on the archaeological horizon, according to the standard histories, was the Enlightenment, and what Trigger called the end of Scientific Antiquarianism and the Beginning of Scientific Archaeology (Trigger 1989: 61-109). This period ended with the development of the Three Age System at which point most of these authors announced that archaeology 'has come of age'. It was only Trigger who explicitly discussed Enlightenment thinking (Trigger 1989: 55ff), and then his primary objective was to dispute Daniel's assertion that the Enlightenment had little to do with archaeological developments (Daniel 1975: 41):

On the contrary, their advocacy of an evolutionary view of human development from primitive beginnings encouraged a more holistic understanding of prehistoric times. (Trigger 1989: 59).

Trigger saw the development of belief in materialistic and evolutionary views of cultural development as directly related to Enlightenment thinking and of prime importance for archaeological explanations formulated in the eighteenth and nineteenth-centuries:

The development of prehistoric archaeology has long been ascribed to the influence of geological and biological evolution. It has been assumed that the stratigraphically derived chronologies of geological time constructed by geologists and palaeontologists provided a model for the development of archaeological chronologies of prehistory. Yet in Thomsen's pioneering work we see a seriational chronology of human prehistory inspired by social-evolutionary theories of the Enlightenment combining with the data collected by earlier antiquarians and with an implicit knowledge of stylistic change probably derived from the study of numismatics. (Trigger 1989: 84).

Daniel, Bahn, Stiebing and Schnapp preferred to talk of physical archaeology, so the Romantic movement also passed with barely a mention (Bahn 1996b: 56 & Daniel 1950: 22-4). It was only Piggott who suggests the Romantic Movement had any real impact on archaeology (Piggott 1976: 22), and discussed how this impact was manifested, but even he concluded:

... however much it may have quickened a general apprehension of ancient
monuments, hardly served to tighten the disciplines by which they were studied. It was not until the end of the nineteenth century that the reintroduction of the scientific approach to archaeology enabled it to build a secure foundation upon which the fabric of prehistory and protohistory could be constructed and, establishing its own techniques and authority, enabled it to take its place side by side with the older discipline of history itself. (Piggott 1976: 21).

The various histories then discussed Wincklemann in Rome, or Elgin in Greece, or the Grand Tour as a finishing school for young male European nobles. Again the exclusion of women was not seen as worthy of remark in this context. The histories then converged and in extremely similar language discussed Rasmus Nyerup and his complaint about the ‘thick fog’ shrouding prehistory (Daniel 1975: 38; Schnapp 1996: 285; Bibby 1959: 29; & Trigger 1989: 71). None of these authors discussed Nyerup in any detail, rather he was introduced to re-iterate the problems faced by early workers, problems which in these narratives were about to be solved. Nyerup therefore acts as an intermediary between the end of uncertainty and the beginning of modern archaeology. The first step towards this new understanding was the appointment of Christian Jürgensen Thomsen by the Danish Royal Commission for the Preservation and Collection of Antiquities as the cataloguer of their collections. This appointment gave Thomsen the opportunity to develop his ideas of archaeology into the Three Age System. His system was covered by these writers in more detail than any other event in the early history of archaeology, clearly signalling how important they considered Thomsen and his theory to be. In his creation of a workable typology Thomsen was seen as taking archaeology away from the church and Archbishop Ussher and ‘bringing order to chaos’ (Bahn 1996b: 90 and see Daniel 1950: 43; Malina & Vasicek 1990: 36; Schnapp 1996: 299-300). In these celebratory histories the lengthy interlude between Thomsen’s formulation of the theory and its adoption in Britain merited little discussion (Morse 1999). Equally there was little discussion of how the Three Age System has restricted, and continues to restrict the way we understand the past.

2.2.4 Deep time and archaeology

Deep time, the recognition of the great length of human history, was the next event highlighted by these authors. The Three Age System had given archaeologists a way of controlling the past through dividing up its artefacts, but this system could not answer the question of how long, how deep that past was. Throughout the early nineteenth
century, we are told, hints of this long timespan kept surfacing. But, as all these histories stressed, these suggestions of antiquity could always be explained away (Schnapp 1996: 293; Daniel 1975: 35; Trigger 1989: 90).

Instead of offering explanations for the various conflicts between the competing theories of nineteenth century geologists, these histories concentrated on events; in 1785 James Hutton published *Theory of the Earth*, in which he proposed an uniformitarian view of geological history (Trigger 1989: 92; Stiebing 1994: 37-8; Daniel 1975: 37). This publication was heralded by the histories of archaeology as the first step on the road to 'deep time', a road which took in William 'strata' Smith (Daniel 1975: 38; Trigger 1989: 92; & Bahn 1996b: 158), and culminated with Charles Lyell who between 1830 and 1835 published *The Principles of Geology*:

This work supported uniformitarianism and provided such a wealth of geological data to illustrate the principle that even its most unyielding opponents were impressed. (Stiebing 1994: 43). Historians of science have questioned this account of the development of deep time in geology (Gould 1990). But again, none of this work has been incorporated or discussed in archaeological histories. Instead, the tale continued with the Geological Society of London sponsorship of Pengelly's excavations at Brixham Cave in 1858. This work was 'carefully supervised by a committee of prestigious scientists, including Charles Lyell' (Trigger 1989: 93) all of whom saw the stone tools and fossil animal bones sealed beneath the deposits. Further evidence was supplied by Boucher de Perthes in the Somme gravels, the 1859 excavations were again attended by Charles Lyell who, with John Prestwich and John Evans, testified to the integrity of the discoveries. For these historians 1859 was the *annus mirabilis*

The mid-nineteenth century saw the final transition from an age of antiquarians to one of archaeologists. The key principle of stratigraphy was adopted from geology, and the period culminated in 1859 - arguably the most important year in archaeology's history - with the publication of Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* and a general acceptance of human antiquity. (Bahn 1996b: 80 and see Daniel 1975: 64-5; Stiebing 1994: 45; Trigger 1989: 94). However, none of these writers seemed aware that until Darwin published *The Descent of Man* in 1871, he himself made no reference to humanity evolving from apes. Nor was Darwin ever an advocate of Social Darwinism. With the exception of Trigger there was no recognition from these historians that it was Huxley and Tylor who had the main effect on archaeology by their application of Darwin's ideas to wider society (Trigger
1989: 113). And, although Trigger went some way to discussing the effect Social Darwinism had on nineteenth century beliefs, even he stopped short, only really dealing with the way Malthusian politics affected the working classes (ibid). Yet Social Darwinism was a key thread in the work of many archaeologists, particularly Pitt-Rivers and Lubbock. However, it is noticeable that these the histories barely discussed how evolutionary theory affected the way cultures and their artefacts were catalogued and described. They might include a very general discussion of Pitt-Rivers and Montelius arranging their collections of artefacts according to notions of advancement and progress, but, these discussions did not go as far as questioning the logic of the approach or any history of its development.

2.2.5 The East
Although European archaeology dominated these accounts of the nineteenth century, the Near East and Egypt were mentioned. However, it was the work of European archaeologists in these places that was seen as significant, and in all the histories the focus was on the wealth of archaeological material these countries produced. Investigators of these areas were labelled ‘heroes’ or ‘villains’ with Belzoni in particular qualifying as the worst ransacker and Layard given more sympathetic treatment. An analysis which perhaps had more to do with Belzoni being Italian and Layard British than with any real difference to their techniques. Aside from briefly mentioning the fabulous discoveries in Egypt and the Near East, these histories had little to say about the developments in archaeology away from Europe. There were specialist histories of these areas that could have been consulted Lloyd’s Foundations in the Dust (1947) or Silberman’s Digging for God and Country (1982). Perhaps the silence by the standard histories was a reaction against the popular histories of archaeology which concentrated on these discoveries at the expense of European and African prehistory. The result of largely ignoring these areas suggests again that only strictly prehistoric archaeology was seen as important in the maturation of the discipline.

2.2.6 The Nineteenth century and after
Having briefly dealt with the East the location moved back to Europe and particularly Britain for a description of the work of the nineteenth-century barrow diggers, beginning with the work of Cunnington and Colt Hoare before moving on to Canon Greenwell and J.R. Mortimer and then Pitt-Rivers. With the exception of Trigger there
was no discussion of the rise of the middle classes, even though the majority of barrow
diggers were from this leisured professional class (Trigger 1989: 85). Instead, these
nineteenth-century investigators were simply presented as the fore-runners of Pitt-
Rivers.

While Pitt-Rivers was heralded as the ‘father’ of archaeology, there was little
discussion of what it was that Pitt-Rivers did to revolutionise field practices. Instead
these writers asserted his importance and briefly mentioned his use of evolutionary
theory in the classification of artefacts (Daniel 1975: 170-2; Malina and Vasicek’s 1990:
49) before turning to Montelius and Petrie as the typologists of archaeology (ibid). From
typology the histories moved on to diffusion as the preferred explanation for
archaeological change. And, for once the importance of this work was explained.
Petrie’s recognition of Egyptian material at Knossos and how this led to a creation of a
chronology which could be extended to Europe was described in great detail.

The creation of a seemingly workable chronology gave rise, we are told, to ideas about
diffusion, the transmission of information and goods, and the concept of separate,
culturally defined groups. Trigger in particular considered the differences between
Childe, Montelius, and de Mortillet’s thinking on evolution, culture history, and
diffusion. However, he and the other writers were especially concerned with discussing
‘good’ and ‘bad’ diffusionists. Childe was a good diffusionist (Trigger 1989: 250-1 and
see Daniel 1975: 248) although ‘he did not wholly escape the racism’ that was inherent
in discussing culture history and tracing the Indo-Europeans (Trigger 1989: 173).
Grafton Elliot Smith and William Perry were criticised because of their
‘hyperdiffusionist excesses’ and their ‘unwillingness to face up to the mechanics of
prehistoric culture change’ (Daniel 1975: 179 & 247 and see Trigger 1989: 152-4). But
even these supposed dangers were translated into a narrative of progression, Trigger
comfortably concluded:

Yet, by the 1920s the archaeological record was sufficiently well known that
hyper-diffusionism had little appeal to archaeologists as an explanation of

Gustav Kossinna was singled out for particular condemnation (Daniel 1967: 121-3;
Bahn 1996b: 136-8), but he was also seen as a solitary aberration. Reading these
accounts one would think that only Kossinna had held such dangerous ideas and that it
was only with the rise of National Socialism that his ideas had become respectable in Germany. This simplistic understanding of inter-war German archaeology had been challenged by Bettina Arnold in *The Past as Propaganda* (1990). And, although *Archaeology, Ideology and Society: the German experience* (Härke 2000) was published after these standard histories, there has been a great deal of discussion at conferences of German inter-war archaeology, as well as the repercussions this had for the post-war world. However, this is a constant theme of these histories, they appear to only have consulted printed material and very rarely were new or challenging ideas incorporated into their work.

Only Trigger made any connection between Kossinna’s ideas and those held by other Europeans:

> ... in interpreting archaeological evidence in a way that encouraged Germans to regard Slavs and all other peoples as inferior to themselves and excused aggression against these peoples, Kossinna was not acting differently from the amateur and semi-professional archaeologists who in North America, Africa and Australia were portraying native peoples as inferior to Europeans. In different ways archaeology in each region reflected racist attitudes that had become widespread in Western civilization in the course of the twentieth century. (Trigger 1989: 164).

Despite the problems with Kossina’s work Trigger and Malina and Vasicek both identified positive aspects within his theoretical framework:

> His approach offered a means to account for the growing evidence of geographical as well as chronological variations in the archaeological record. He must therefore be recognized as an innovator whose work was of major importance for the development of archaeology. (Trigger 1989: 167 and see Malina & Vasicek 1990: 64).

Trigger’s account of the rise of culture history, culture groups and functionalism as the preferred method of explanation and organisation of archaeological material in the first half of the twentieth-century is extremely thorough. This section covers nearly 150 pages, and constitutes one third of his entire history, looking not only at Europe but the Americas as well. This part of Trigger’s history is fascinating, obviously the detailed analysis reflected his interest in Childe (Trigger 1978 & 1980), and it shows the difference between writing history because one feels certain things have to be covered, and writing history because the writer is engaged and interested in the subject. Reading Trigger I felt that I now had a better understanding of the inter-war archaeologists.
whose work I had been reading. Their explanations and the influences that led to those preferred explanations became much clearer, as did the drawbacks of this approach:

The most striking failure of culture-historical archaeologists was their refusal, following their repudiation of cultural evolutionism, to extend their concern with change to properties of cultural systems that either make innovation possible or lead to the acceptance of innovations coming from outside. Without such understanding, diffusion was doomed to remain a non-explanation. (Trigger 1989: 206).

I would argue that an underlying idea of evolution, of progress, still informed British archaeologists’ work and that the concept of diffusion tied in to colonialism and imperialism (see section 7.5). However, I would agree that the insistence on external influences, while it led to the idea of a European prehistory for Britain (Piggott 1989: 27), was a very narrow and constricting form of explanation.

Aside from Trigger, there was little discussion of the theoretical framework around which understandings of culture histories were constructed. Daniel documented the rise of this approach (Daniel 1975: 242-49) but, possibly because this was his own approach, fell short of explaining what was entailed:

... this is no place for an analysis of the concept of culture in prehistoric archaeology. We are here concerned only in chronicling how the idea of cultures entered prehistory. (Daniel 1975: 247).

The other writers appear to have believed that neither functionalism nor culture histories were philosophical stances, but were instead un-situated means of filling in the gaps of the prehistoric record. Unsurprisingly, given this view, there was no understanding that the use of functionalism and the culture history approach might have coloured interpretations of the archaeological record. These writers seem to have been unhappy when dealing with any subject that had an obvious suggestion of politics. Instead the twentieth-century, like the previous ones, was discussed in terms of individual archaeologists and sites. Changes and events in wider society were largely ignored. But with the political and social upheavals of the twentieth-century this approach became more difficult to sustain, especially when archaeologists began to develop more reflexive and openly theoretical forms of interpretation.

2.2.7 The Impact of the New Archaeology

The transformation in thinking brought about by the New Archaeology was an area where these histories diverged in their understandings of this philosophy and their
sympathy with its aims. Daniel was particularly antipathetic to the New Archaeology, despite saying there was ‘much to praise’ in this movement he found far more to denounce:

This new movement in America stems, of course, from the bareness of the pre-Columbian record of archaeology: for centuries nothing happened of general interest to the student of world history - no Stonehenge, no Maltese temples. American archaeologists, dismayed by their archaeological record, have sought refuge in theory and methodology and spend their time talking about ‘the elucidation of cultural process’ and the production of 'laws of cultural dynamics'. . . This new movement of the 1960s needs to be absorbed into standard thought and work: at the present moment it is, especially for non-American workers bedevilled by jargon and by people who, apparently unable to speak and write in clear English, use such phrases as 'the logico-deductive-evolutionary systems paradigm. (Daniel 1975: 371-2).

Daniel was particularly concerned with arguing that the New Archaeology was in fact, not new at all and stemmed in its entirety from Walter Taylor’s 1948 work A Study of Archaeology (ibid). A statement also supported by Trigger:

The scope of the New Archaeology does not appear to have expanded beyond that already embraced by the ecological and settlement-pattern approaches that developed in the 1950s. (Trigger 1989: 327).

Bahn seemed to be more undecided about the worth of these theories:

Forcefully argued and apparently with great potential, [Lewis Binford's] views attracted the adherence of many younger archaeologists in the two decades that followed, and processual archaeology became for a time a juggernaut that threatened to dominate subject entirely. (Bahn 1996b: 289). Initially this remark could be read as enthusiasm but the language used hinted at ambivalence ‘apparently with great potential’ and ‘threatened to dominate’ suggest Bahn was in fact largely opposed to processualism.

Malina and Vasicek, by contrast, were passionate processualists, and after a hundred pages of history their Archaeology Yesterday and Today developed almost into a eulogy to the new archaeology:

No-one corrected New Archaeology better and with more insistence than it did itself, and we should never forget this. (Malina & Vasicek 1990: 125). However, even Malina and Vasicek presented processualism as a seamless succession to that which had gone before. While it is undeniable that processualism came out of the work of White, Steward, and other anthropologists, its introduction into archaeology did represent a break with previous understandings. These histories of archaeology were written in such a style that they did not allow for discontinuities. Instead, the history of
archaeology was written as a smooth evolution from a state of ignorance to a state of knowing, each discovery building on the last which allowed little room for the disruptive effect of genuinely new ideas. If there were no disruptions then archaeology could be seen as entirely self-constructed without any external influences. This stance meant that only Trigger paid any attention to the social context in which this work was produced. Trigger linked processualism to the rise in economic stability and self-confidence amongst post-war middle class central and western Americans; there was:

... a readiness to believe both that there was a pattern to human history and that technological progress was the key to human betterment. (Trigger 1989: 289).

And, he argued, New Archaeology’s attraction was that it seemed to produce:

... objective, ethically neutral generalizations that were useful for the management of modern societies. (Trigger 1989: 313).

2.2.8 Post-processual approaches
Post-processualism was given very little attention by these writers. Daniel is obviously exempt from criticism on this score since Ian Hodder’s *Theoretical Archaeology: a reactionary view* was not published until 1982. However, the other writers either ignored this new philosophy entirely (Stiebing), or trivialised its significance by barely discussing its occurrence:

Post-processual archaeology is a summary term invented by I. Hodder for cognitive, contextual, critical, Marxist, structural and symbolic archaeology. Besides the relationship between the individual and the social norm, post-processual archaeology is concerned with structure, mind and meaning, and the historical approach. The best critiques of the post-processual orientation have been given by A. Gallay and S. Wolfram. (Malina and Vasiczek 1990: 132 and see Bahn 1996b: 293; Trigger 1989: 368-9).

This was Malina and Vasiczek’s entire entry for post-processualism. Bahn again seemed initially more sympathetic stating that Ian Hodder and Mark Leone:

... started to develop an explicitly political ‘post-processual’ archaeology that acknowledged the link between social mores and the practice of academic disciplines ... that a relationship between culture and sites ... can at least be considered by archaeologists, who need not to be limited simply to traditional studies of technology and subsistence. (Bahn 1996b: 293).

But, Bahn obviously disliked such an explicitly politically and socially situated understanding of archaeology since he then remarked of critical theory:

It argues no knowledge is politically innocent, and calls into question the objectivity of any archaeological statement. This has two potential repercussions. First, it denies the ability to rank claims about the past, rendering books proclaiming the extra-terrestrial origins of ancient civilisations just as valid as professional archaeologists' opinions. Second,
and more sinister, it permits the rewriting of history as pure fiction, allowing the historical fact of the Holocaust to be dismissed as Jewish propaganda, as it has by some anti-Semites. (Bahn 1996b: 293).

Both the belief in an inherent objectivity to knowledge and the use of such an extreme, and erroneous, example locate Bahn as opposed to post-processualism. Trigger was more reflexive in his writing but even he saw post-processualism beginning and ending with Ian Hodder, other writers were not included in his discussion (Trigger 1989: 348-50).

The dismissal of post-processualism by these writers is unsurprising, Bahn was the most outspoken in his belief that there was a way of writing objectively about the past. His criticism of ‘ivory tower intellectuals’ more concerned with ‘naval gazing’ than producing the ‘truth’ (Bahn 1996a: 9 & 1996b: 8), indicated where his sympathies lay. While the other writers were less explicit, this belief in the possibility of creating unsituated knowledge about the past underlay and informed their histories. I have argued in Chapter 3 below that this philosophy positions these writers within the empiricist school of historiography. As a post-modernist I would argue that all knowledge formation and constructions of history are informed by our understandings of the world, and cannot be divorced from our beliefs and society. And, as I have attempted to show here, and deal with in detail below, the interpretation of the history of archaeology that has been offered is neither objective, nor the only history that can be constructed.

2.2.9 Endings

Having brought archaeology up to the present day these writers then ended their histories on an upbeat note with grandiose claims for archaeology:

Archaeology, we can boast, has already provided partial answers to many fundamental questions about the development of our species. It is important to know why humans began to turn to agriculture 12,000 years ago or why cities developed 5,000 years ago. Archaeology is the only discipline that can shed light on human antiquity so far back in time. If it is true that the present is defined by the past, archaeology's role should be secure for all time. (Bahn 1996b: 373 see also Daniel 1975: 380-1; Trigger 1989: 410-11).

Or an assertion of archaeology’s continued relevance:

Through archaeology, we are in a position to improve our understanding of other cultures, to articulate more effectively our relationship with the natural world, to discover unsuspected possibilities and to pose unanswered questions . . . Arche teaches us to understand ourselves, to identify ourselves in other peoples, cultures, and in the past. (Malina & Vasicek 1990: 271).
Archaeology in these works had progressed from a state of uncertainty to one of certainty. This linearity was reinforced by the inclusion of a timeline as an end-piece to their histories. Bahn, Daniel and Stiebing all included a list of 'Major Events and Discoveries' in which year by year more pieces of information were added to our understanding of the past. The entirety of history could be reduced to a chronological calendar, a selective series of events which seemingly needed and received no analysis or interpretation. Again this suggestion of objectivity is obviously false but it strengthens the idea of a single history of archaeology, and adds to the authority of the author as one who has that history under their command.

2.3 Omissions and Exclusions

... history is not the prerogative of the historian ... It is rather, a social form of knowledge; the work, in any given instance, of a thousand different hands. (Samuel 1996: 8).

The history of archaeology has been constructed in diametrically opposed terms to those suggested by Samuel. This section examines who was not included in the standard histories of archaeology.

2.3.1 Introduction

The history of the discipline is, moreover, part of a larger social context: it consists of more than the activities of famous individuals. The social context in which knowledge was produced and the archaeological record shaped must be understood in order to comprehend the intellectual and physical framework that has been generated and within which we now work. (Sørensen 1998: 55).

The histories of archaeology discussed above are very difficult to classify in terms of modern historiographer’s definitions. They are not intellectual history; social history; cultural history; and certainly not feminist or post-feminist history. It could be argued that this avoidance of genre is therefore liberating, but I think it would be fair to say these writers are unaware of contemporary historiography. Insofar as they follow any style it is an old-fashioned history uninformed by any recent critical theory. They represent the attempt to tell history ‘how it was’ the ‘wie es eigentlich gwesen’ approach
established by Ranke (Ranke in Evans 2000: 17) and most recently advocated by George Elton (1967 & 1991), Arthur Marwick (2001) and Richard J. Evans (2000). However, unlike these historians whose work was based on a careful examination of the sources, the writers of archaeology’s history appeared to have done very little original research. There is little evidence that any of these writers consulted archives, read letters, diaries, or even the site note books of any archaeologists. So although these writers constructed empiricist, or ‘common-sense’ history, they were doing so outside the parameters of critical empiricist thinking. I will return to this understanding of history in the following chapter. Here I want to examine how history that has been produced by simply cataloguing events restricts our understanding of archaeology.

These histories have presented a narrow view of archaeology, one that looked only to internal events, and by the omission of different narratives have silenced alternative voices and readings of the past. Not only was the history in these standard texts one that had no connection with the society it inhabited, there was also no consideration of archaeologists as members of that society. In these narratives there was no discussion of politics, or war, of race, class, or gender tensions. Instead archaeology was presented as a small cohesive community of like-minded thinkers. This complacent picture ignored any questioning of how or why one joined such a community, who might have been excluded and on what grounds. Nor was there any questioning of what was meant by the term archaeology or archaeologist, what training such a person received, or what employment they could hope to gain. Not only was archaeology presented as unaffected by external events, within the smaller social group of archaeology questions and tensions were ignored.

2.3.2 ‘The intelligent layman’

The first exclusion to note are those to whom the books were supposedly directed, the interested member of the public:

So I have tried to keep professional jargon to a minimum and to make the material as readable as I can. (Stiebing 1994 19 and see Bahn 1996b: vii).

Despite such protestations these works were filled with jargon. An archaeologist with excavation experience would be aware of terms such as 'section', 'plan', 'stratigraphy', 'levelling' but as those of us who have ever tried to explain our work to the public are aware, our use of these terms is not the general or accepted one. Immediately any
'serious student' who had never dug, or any interested lay reader was excluded from the debate. Not only was jargon used but the history of their usage and meaning was unexamined. Nomenclature was another exclusionary area; the histories marked the first use of words such as ‘prehistory’, ‘Neolithic’ and ‘Palaeolithic’ (Daniel 1950: 85; Trigger 1989: 83, 94-5), but not the effect these names had. Who understood Daniel Wilson when he first referred to Pre-history, or Lubbock when he discussed the Neolithic? Trigger remarked that Lubbock’s use of this term was ‘merely formally labelling a distinction that was already obvious’ (Trigger 1989: 94). But when did these terms become part of popular language rather than the province of specialists? It is noticeable that in the popular archaeology books that were produced between the wars the authors were careful to use terms such as Old and New Stone Age and then go on to explain that Palaeolithic and Neolithic were archaeological terms (section 7.7.2).

Archaeology has long relied on the public for support and funding. This funding came from indirect taxation, by contributions to expeditions, and subscriptions to journals and archaeological societies. However, aside from mentioning the crowds that flocked to see the Elgin marbles at the new British Museum, or the public’s purchase of Layard’s books, this public interest was largely overlooked. There was no examination of how archaeology has interacted with the public and vice versa, and there was also no discussion of how archaeologists presented the past for public consumption. Those who wrote popular archaeology books were ignored by the histories:

This invisibility ... demonstrates how the histories of archaeology have been written with total disregard for the various structures through which archaeological knowledge is disseminated: they show no interest in how certain popular attitudes and images of the discipline were created, and they ignore the fact that there are degrees of formality and institutionalized acceptance of knowledge communication. (Diaz-Andreu & Sørensen 1998: 13).

Nor was there any discussion of how far the public followed archaeologists interpretations of the past or discarded them and constructed their own. Consequently, the general public were excluded from the histories on a variety of levels, the use of jargon excluded the uninitiated, and the public’s interest in and contribution to the development of archaeology was ignored.

2.3.3 Class

With the exception of Trigger there was no discussion of the class-based nature of
archaeology, and Trigger’s brief discussion was limited to the rise of the middle-classes in the wake of the Industrial Revolution (Trigger 1989: 15 & 117). As I said above those who are seen as influential in the early formation of archaeology were uniformly middle or upper class. What of the labourers who actually dug the sites? What of those men who dug for Colt Hoare, Cunnington, the Duchess of Berry and all the other Victorian barrow diggers? The hundreds of workers on the sites in Egypt, Iraq, Iran or India? Richard Bradley once suggested that the history of archaeology could be traced through the acknowledgements that appeared in site reports (*pers comm*), however the foremen who worked these sites were rarely mentioned and the labourers almost never (see below section 5.3). In the standard histories it was only the directors of excavations who were named and credited with the work. Occasionally the importance of the site foreman has been acknowledged, we even know the names of some of these men: Bill Wedlake who worked at Maiden Castle; Hamoudi who oversaw Woolley’s excavations at Ur; and W.E.V. Young. But we know their names from the biographies, autobiographies and incidental remarks of archaeologists, not from the history books (Wheeler 1961: 163). At the 2000 Rhind Lectures Graham Ritchie observed that the report on the Newsteads excavation could not have been written solely from James Curle’s notes, Curle was only occasionally present on site and kept minimal records. Ritchie suggested that the site foreman must also have kept a journal which was used in the final report. He also suggested that the role of the foreman as unacknowledged and unofficial archaeologists should receive more attention. However, when asked by Edwina Proudfoot whether any attempt had been made to recover the foreman’s journals, Ritchie replied that he was reliant on members of the public coming forward with information. This suggests that the role of the historian is to be reactive rather than proactive.

Labourers have not been given even this limited credit. The method of strip digging trenches has been attributed to the labourers who dug them (Lucas 2001: 20), but there has been little investigation of the way the labourers may have affected other fieldwork developments.

There were, however, probably no working class women (or men) involved in the early history of archaeology in capacities other than illicit robbing or paid diggers. (Sørensen 1998: 49). Within the histories labourers are reduced to an anonymous mass, were it not for their un-named existence in photographs we would have no physical evidence of their
archaeological presence (fig. 2.2).

2.3.4 Women

One of the most notable omissions in these standard histories was the participation of women archaeologists. Women were occasionally mentioned and their work briefly discussed (see for example Trigger 1989: 133). There was, however, no discussion of women’s access to archaeology. Again, this silence could be seen as empowering, if there was no distinction of sex, how could there be any discrimination? How could inequality and difference exist if all archaeologists were gender neutral? Yet, this supposition is false. By denying through silence that women’s access to and success within archaeology was any different to men’s experience we judge women’s results by male standards, and women automatically become underachievers by this line of reasoning (Sørensen 1998: 32). In The Origins and Growth of Archaeology Daniel (1967: 247-50) referred to J.P. Droop’s contention that men and women should work on separate excavations. However, by only referring to Droop, and locating him as a pre-First World War figure, Daniel suggested that he was the only one to have any objection to women archaeologists and that this opposition was already out of date by the 20s. Yet talking to women archaeologists and reading their autobiographies presents a very different picture (see sections 6.4.2 & 7.4.2 below). Nor was it only active archaeology that was seen as the province of men, the Societies of Antiquaries of both Scotland and London were reluctant to admit women as full members (Roberts 1995).

The standard histories suggest archaeology was an unproblematically accessible discipline for women, yet the archaeologists represented by the words and illustrations of these texts were predominantly male. Paul Bahn’s The Cambridge Illustrated History of Archaeology is lavishly illustrated, but there were only five pictures of women included amongst those represented. In addition the use of the cliché ‘father of’ was common in these texts; Petrie was described as the ‘father of Egyptology’, Pitt Rivers the ‘father of fieldwork’. The usage of this phrase was not confined to archaeological history and occurred in anthropology and geology. Western society places a premium on individuals particularly those who were the first to implement new techniques and ideas, or at least those seen to be implementing new ideas. The uncritical use of this term not only denied those whose work added to the pool of knowledge, it also denied that women could even be leaders in their field, since they could never be ‘fathers’. Yet,
there was never any discussion of how understandings and constructions of women might have limited their role in archaeology.

Bahn did include a section, though written by other authors, on women archaeologists in *The Cambridge Illustrated History of Archaeology*. However, this restriction of women to a special category suggested that every other reference to ‘the archaeologist’ was in reality only applicable to men. Nor did the writers of this section critically engage with the problems women archaeologists have had to face, instead they relied instead on upbeat rhetoric:

> Women have traditionally been at a disadvantage in archaeology, but the twentieth century has nonetheless brought them considerable achievements in a subject once dominated by the likes of Belzoni, Layard and Wheeler. (Kehoe and Levine in Bahn 1996b: 356).

And, wives of archaeologists who worked with their husbands, if mentioned at all, were assumed to be involved solely because of their husband’s interest rather than any interest of their own (Bahn 1996b: 63 & 247 and see Silberman 1982: 24-7). Trigger was equally responsible for presenting a masculist reading of the history of archaeology:


A statement which again suggested that archaeologists were invariably male and which overlooks women such as Dorothy Garrod, Winifred Lamb and Gertrude Bell who were or became archaeologists and served in the First World War.

In 1998 *Excavating Women* was published, the only history of archaeology published in Britain to discuss women’s involvement in archaeology. In view of women’s previous invisibility it is hardly remarkable that the editors felt the need to justify focussing entirely on women:

> The need to understand the disciplinary integration of women, to appreciate the varying socio-political contexts of their work, to reveal the unique tension between their roles as women and their academic lives, has become obvious and is strongly felt in many areas of the discipline. (Diaz-Andreu & Sørensen 1998: 1).

Or that they would approach this subject somewhat hesitantly:

> What do we want from women's historiographies, what are their purposes, their ramifications? Such questions are particularly germane when separating something out as a 'Historiography of Women in Archaeology', since this means that a particular group is singled out as having its own distinct history/historiography. (Sørensen 1998: 32).

Sørensen seemed particularly concerned that the discussion of archaeology and gender
might be seen as a temporary fashion and that the accusation of ‘trendiness’ would be used to undermine the volume’s worth (ibid). Again this anxiety reveals how restricted our understanding of the history of archaeology is. If we are concerned that different histories, multiple histories, feminist histories can be summarily dismissed on the grounds of fashion, this implies that the unreflective histories of Bahn, Daniel and the like are somehow the real history of archaeology.

Excavating Women raises other issues. I have a great deal of difficulty in critiquing this work, because I admire the contributors and because I am grateful that there is at least one book which deals with women archaeologists. However, although the editors stated that Europe was a convenient area for study (Díaz-Andreu & Sørensen 1998: 2-3) I would argue that this writes out the differences of these places, and assumes all European women archaeologists have the same experiences. The lack of coherence to the volume also runs the risk identified by Joan W Scott (1996: 152) who stated that in writing feminist history it is not enough to ‘simply add women and shake’. The concentration on the women archaeologists themselves while obviously important, runs the risk of removing their professional lives from the wider social context and of uncritically accepting what has been said about these broader issues:

The First World War acted as a watershed and in its aftermath the path breaking role played by a few was replaced by more easy access to the discipline. Henceforth, an increasing number of women from a wider set of classes and nations ... became involved in the profession. (Díaz-Andreu and Sørensen 1998: 15).

As I have argued below the First World War did liberate a select number of women, but for the majority life before and after the war was equally constrained (see section 3.3.3). The main problem I have with Excavating Women has nothing to do with the papers or the contributors. This book was obviously intended as a starting point for discussion, and yet there has been none. It is as if with this one book we assume that the history of women archaeologists has been done and needs no further examination. Again this reinforces the idea that the standard histories are enough to tell us about the history of archaeology.

2.3.5 Race

There was no discussion in the standard histories of archaeology of how race affected access to archaeology. Instead, there was an unexamined and overwhelming emphasis
on European archaeologists. Hormuzd Rassam who worked with, and then took over from, Layard at Nineveh was only mentioned by a few of the histories. The excuse given by Stiebing (1994: 104) for overlooking him was that Rassam was not the great writer that Layard had been. Layard’s books had sold popularly, Rassam’s did not. Yet nowhere else was public opinion cited as a reason for inclusion or exclusion. When Rassam was mentioned he is criticised as being more 'brutal' in his techniques than Layard (Bahn 1996b: 158-9). Yet Daniel pointed out that Layard was not renowned for his archaeological sensitivity (Daniel 1975: 158). Instead, I would argue that Rassam’s omission reflects the Eurocentric nature of these histories. Rassam was a Chaldean Christian and though born in Mosul a British citizen, he was educated at Oxford before entering the British Residency in Aden as an interpreter. After Layard returned to Britain and a life in politics the British Museum grudgingly appointed Rassam in his place. Here was a man as talented and educated as Layard, and in his home country Rassam was of a similar social standing. It seems likely that although Rassam was a British citizen his ‘otherness’ as a foreign born national has led to his eradication from the histories.

The racism that Trigger identified as inherent in the Enlightenment philosophy, in the use made of Darwin’s theories of evolution (1989: 111-18), and in the rise of culture history explanations (1989: 173-4), was not examined by other writers. It is to his credit that Trigger discussed these issues, as well as exploring how imperialism and colonialism affected archaeological interpretations. But there was no discussion beyond archaeological interpretation, no discussion of how race affected access. How those that worked on excavations in the East, in India, or in Egypt, were relegated to working as labourers or at best overseers. Nor was there any discussion of how European archaeology is still predominantly white and middle class. Although Trigger discussed the rise of nationalist archaeologies in Europe there was no similar discussion of how archaeology had been invoked elsewhere in the creation of an independent identity or used in the struggle for autonomy (Reid 2002: 287-97).

2.3.6 Creation of Identity
These histories not only excluded those whose race, class, or gender did not fit with the ideal of ‘the archaeologist’ but also excluded those who did not study a specific form of archaeology. These histories equated archaeology with prehistory and it was European
or African prehistory that dominated these accounts. As James Whitley has remarked this reading of archaeology as prehistory excludes many who call themselves archaeologists (Whitley pers. comm.). It also means the question of who an archaeologist was, and what such a person might study, becomes constructed in negatives. An archaeologist could not be working class, a woman, non-European, a member of the public, or interested in non-prehistoric archaeology. An archaeologist was male, middle-class, white, and studied only European or African prehistory.

Even within this limited understanding of who had access to archaeology and becoming an archaeologist the histories did not explain how one became an archaeologist. There was no discussion of what one needed to do, or to know in order to become a member of that community, and how these criteria changed over time. Instead there was the implication that all that was needed before the twentieth century was an interest in archaeological or antiquarian studies, or membership of one of the archaeological societies. Yet, the working classes and women were all excluded from the national societies until the twentieth century. And before and after that date prospective fellows could be blackballed The first time Elsie Clifford and Stuart Piggott were put up for election they were refused (Piggott in conversation, 1994). Rather than discussing any of these issues the histories moved on to the early twentieth century at which point, we are told, archaeology became a ‘mature’ discipline.

The age of the amateur digger had ended, and the day of the professional prehistorian had begun. (Stiebing 1994: 54). But how did this new professionalism manifest itself? What was the difference between amateur and professional archaeologists, how did one judge who was amateur and who professional? And, who did that judging? These questions were completely overlooked by the histories, which were, of course, written by archaeologists whose status within the discipline was secure.

The whole question of identity and belonging is an issue I find fascinating, and one that I discussed with archaeologists who worked in the 20s and 30s. Their conception of an archaeologist’s identity encompassed a variety of elements and techniques quite aside from the work undertaken. The tools that were used, whether one had to rely on paid work or a private income, the people one knew, the meetings attended, the clothes worn, even one’s personality affected whether one was identified as an archaeologist by one’s
peers. None of these points were mentioned by the standard histories, instead there was
the flat assertion that archaeology had come of age and archaeologists were now part of
an identifiable discipline and social group.

2.3.7 Archaeology and Society
Aside from excluding all those who did not match up to the writer's idealised picture of
an archaeologist, these histories excluded discussion of events in wider society. With
the exception of Trigger issues such as war, imperialism and colonialism and the rise of
nationalism were omitted from discussion. Even Trigger had little to say about the two
world wars. Many archaeologists took part in the wars, Daniel himself was in photo-
intelligence, yet his history, like the other histories, was virtually empty of any
references to any war. The stance taken by the authors in Excavating Women
exemplifies this silence:

... the possible effect of the First World War on the academic population
can at this point only be guessed at. (Sørensen 1998: 44).

Daniel did mention that the Crimean war halted excavations in Mesopotamia for twenty
years (Daniel 1975: 76), but the Boer war, and the First and Second World wars were
not even mentioned in his List of Events at the end of his histories. In the main body of
the text Daniel only referred to the First World War in conjunction with Crawford's use
Trigger did remark that Wheeler was one of the few to have survived the First World
War, but as noted above this brief statement merely served to construct all
archaeologists as male.

The Second World War included more archaeologists and yet received equally little
attention. Stiebing's sole comments were concerned with missing treasures. He recorded
that the original 'Peking Man' skull vanished when the Japanese occupied Peking
(Stiebing 1994: 216) and 'Priam's treasure' was discovered to be missing when the
Russians left Berlin (Stiebing 1994: 130). Trigger was equally unhelpful, he ascribed
the changes in archaeological thinking to the social changes in America after the Second
World War, but did not explain how the war brought about these events (Trigger 1989:
288 & 289). Daniel simply remarked that this war:
... locked up the energies of most archaeologists in military or semi-
 military pursuits and held up further discovery by excavation for some
while. (Daniel 1975: 317).

A brief and inaccurate remark since Grimes' *Excavations on Defence Sites* (1960),
Fox's work at Llyn Cerrig Bach, and Bersu's examination of Viking burials on the Isle
of Man were all conducted during wartime. Bahn limited his discussion of war and
archaeology to the German use of archaeology as propaganda before and during the
Second World War. In particular he focussed on the films produces such as *On the Trail
of the Eastern Germans* and *The Flames of Prehistory* (Bahn 1996b: 217). Bahn was
seemingly unaware that the Allies had made similar propaganda films or that many
British archaeologists had worked in propaganda (see section 7.8.2).

It was not the case that the wars were irrelevant to archaeologists, those I spoke to
mentioned the war and their war work. Biographies and auto-biographies discussed this
area of archaeologist's lives and the prefaces to Droop's *Archaeological Excavation
(1915) and Wheeler's report on the Maiden Castle excavations (1943) reveal a little of
how war was affecting these archaeologists. To many archaeologists the wars were
immensely important events which affected all aspects of their world including their
archaeological life. The silence by the standard histories suggest that when
archaeologists were not conducting archaeology they ceased to exist or have any
meaning, any excursion into wider society resulted in their invisibility.

There was a similar silence about the role archaeologists have played in the construction
of racial identity and justification of colonial rule. Only Trigger (1989: 110-47) gave
this subject any sensible consideration, the majority of writers ignored this topic
although Bahn did include a brief and somewhat simplistic discussion (Bahn 1996b:
358-65). Trigger made it clear that archaeology's past had been explicitly racist:

The Darwinian explanation of these racial differences that was popularised
by Lubbock reinforced the racist views inherent in colonial situations and
which had already influenced the interpretations of archaeological
evidence in the United States. The archaeology that developed wherever
European colonists were seeking to establish themselves in the midst of
native populations had much in common. Native societies were assumed
to be static and evidence of change in the archaeological record, when
noted, was attributed to migrations rather than to internal dynamism. The
racist views underlying specific interpretations were more often implicit
than explicit. Either way, colonialist archaeology served to denigrate the
native societies that European colonists were seeking to dominate or
replace by offering evidence that in prehistoric times they had lacked the initiative to develop on their own. ... This primitiveness was widely believed to justify Europeans seizing control of the territories of such peoples. (Trigger 1989: 145).

As mentioned above Trigger was also aware that the creation of culture histories equally reflected racist ideology (Trigger 1989: 173). Where I would disagree with Trigger is in his seeming conviction that this attitude did not survive the abandonment of an evolutionary approach to prehistory, and his apparent belief that racism is no longer an issue in contemporary archaeology. Equally there seems to have been no recognition by any of these writers that there was an ethical question behind the removal of archaeology from its country of origin:

Much of Belzoni's work has been praised by later workers, and it was certainly due to the unprincipled depredations of Belzoni, Drouetti and their kind that representations of Egyptian art appeared in London, Paris and Turin, just as many of the British Museum's Assyrian treasures owe their existence to the surprising methods of Rassam. (Daniel 1975: 157-8; and see Bahn 1996b 67-9; Silberman 1982: 121-2 & 170ff; Stiebing 1994: 57-8).

The treatment of Elgin's removals of the Parthenon marbles was equally sympathetic. It was enough for these writers that archaeology had been preserved even if by doubtful methods, morality had been assuaged because the artefacts survived. Yet questions of ownership and ethics complicate these issues. There is a worrying colonialism and racism behind the removal and continued retention of these artefacts which these writers simply ignore.

2.4 Conclusion

These histories are limited and limiting in their view of what constitutes the history of archaeology and who should be included in that history. Not only do they exclude discussions of race, class, and gender and how these concepts have affected access to archaeology, they exclude the public both from the history of archaeology and as potential readers. Prehistory is assumed to be the only form of archaeology worth studying. These writers singled out individuals and they were used to represent movement and development in archaeology. The history of archaeology was presented as a purposeful and seamless progression from a state of ignorance to one of knowledge. This version of the history of archaeology saw changes as the result of entirely internal
developments and represented archaeologists as divorced from their social surroundings, and untouched by contemporary social issues. I realise that my discussion may seem overly critical of these writers, but my intention has been to highlight the areas that I see as important, and that I intend to discuss in later chapters. I would re-iterate that without these works there would be no history of archaeology, nothing to question, to react against, and attempt to improve.

Before setting out my history of inter-war British archaeology I want to briefly discuss how these histories correspond to understandings of historiography, and how taking an alternative historiographical stance opens new areas for examination and discussion.
Notes.

1 Except for Bahn, who referred to him as 'an eccentric martinet unknown outside Britain' (Bahn 1996b: 131), however, Malina and Vasicek's (1990: 49-50) citation of his importance suggests that this was not the case.
3 What is history?

3.1 Introduction.

Stories are ways in which we not only make sense of the world from the vantage point of the present but also claim for ourselves a self-hood and subjectivity in which we are positioned as both subject and object of our own narration. (Giles 1995: 25).

I said in the previous chapter that the historians of archaeology seemed to have no understanding of historiography. But perhaps before I go any further I should attempt a definition of this tricky term. By *historiography* I mean the critical body of theory used by self-conscious and reflexive historians when writing about the past. I do not use it as a substitute for the term *history* but rather as a shorthand expression for how we write about the past, what we think that past was, to what degree we think we recreate or create that past, and the theoretical and philosophical guidelines we use in our constructions. Keith Jenkins has suggested that once we go beyond simply chronicling the events of the past then we have moved beyond history as such, we are creating not reporting that past. His suggestion is that because *all* writings on history are imaginative constructions we should use the term *historiography* whatever form of history writing is under discussion (Jenkins 1991: 6-7), so the histories of archaeology are in reality historiography. I agree with Jenkins but, for most writers the term historiography is the theory of writing history, and for the sake of clarity I will follow the conventional usage.

I would argue that the majority of those writing the history of archaeology have little or no knowledge of this connotation and if they use the term it is simply as an alternative for the word *history*. There is certainly no conception of the changes that have taken place in the discipline of historiography over the last century. I have a certain amount of sympathy with that ignorance, this is an involved and complex issue. However, despite my sympathy, these writers are still constructing a theory laden history. There is no un-positioned centre from which a 'true' history can be written. The writers of the standard histories of archaeology have written Whiggish, teleological history where humanity
has progressed from ignorance to enlightenment. At the beginning are the Babylonians, Chinese, Greeks, or sixteenth-century antiquarians, depending on the author. These ancient investigators are portrayed as simulacra of later workers who, by the late twentieth century, have progressed to knowledge, science and a recognised code of practice. These descriptions suffocate difference, are uninformative if not misleading about the nature of archaeology and what it meant to its varied practitioners. Although I have confessed to having sympathy with this uncritical approach to history, it is not an approach I can follow, I am too interested in the ways historiography has developed and the way post-modernist understandings step outside conventional historiography and give confidence to examining those traditionally overlooked by history, to hear other voices and record other experiences.

3.2 Archaeological History as Empiricism

3.2.1 Ranke and the Enlightenment

Insofar as the various standard histories of archaeology follow a particular philosophical and methodological approach it seems to be the empiricist model of history which stemmed from the teachings of Leopold Von Ranke. Ranke and the German Enlightenment empiricists built their historiography on the basis of the sixteenth and seventeenth-century scientific revolution, particularly the natural philosophy of Francis Bacon which stated that knowledge should be observed from the material world. Through observation and the use of documentary sources Ranke argued history could be raised from folk-lore or moral tales to an objective, scientific, value-free account of the past. Incorporated into Ranke’s view of history were some of the ideas of Immanuel Kant, Giambattista Vico and Johann Herder. From Kant came the belief that when the knowing subject struck the right balance between concept and fact then that subject would know the truth about reality (Munslow 2000: 4). Ranke took from Vico the view that to understand the past the historian had to get inside the minds of past people. However, Ranke disregarded Vico's conviction that language, historical imagination and narrative were of fundamental importance in shaping the history produced. Nor did Ranke follow Vico in abandoning Enlightenment philosophy in favour of the understanding of knowledge as being socially constructed (Munslow 2000: 223). Ideas
which have found more resonance with post-modern historians. From Herder, Ranke took the concept of literary humanism, whereby the sensuous and the intellectual were accepted as combined rather than belonging to discrete halves of the brain. Herder also argued that while cultures might be at different stages, have different strengths, they were all in the process of attaining the idea of humanity. Ranke meshed these ideas with his own belief that the study of history had an underlying purpose in revealing the hidden hand of God (Appleby et al. 1994: 74). Together these disparate, positioned, strands were woven into what we understand as empiricist, or common sense, or telling it as-it-was historiography. The idea of a history that can tell us truthfully about the past and faithfully reflect past lives (Evans 2000: 17).

This idea of history as a true reflection of past events is the underpinning of the majority of history writing. Ranke believed we could know the past, that we could see the past on its own terms, we could know what took place and what it meant to past peoples. Then, through our narratives we could faithfully reproduce and report that past. All of this could be done through the critical examination of original documents. By original documents Ranke meant searching out archives for eye-witness accounts, primary sources rather than hearsay, the second or third hand accounts that had previously been used in the construction of history. Ranke also warned against using the most readily available documents. The critical historian would search for hitherto unknown pieces of information, in this understanding not only was the archive elevated to a source of ultimate truth, but within that archive there was a hierarchy of truthfulness ascribed to the material. It was Ranke’s contention that if historical documents were subjected to philological techniques, were rigorously tested for internal consistency and their relationship to other documents, then historians would be in the position of accurately reconstructing the past (Evans 2000: 18). The Rankean idea of historiography became the method of creating history. Ranke gained authority as the official historian of the Prussian state at the time when Prussia was gaining ascendancy. And in turn, Ranke’s writing of nationalist history for the state reinforced its authority and his own (Appleby et al. 1994: 74). But Ranke’s authority went beyond Prussia, as a Professor at the University of Berlin he trained his students in his methods of critically examining the archival sources (Appleby et al. 1994: 73). In the half century that Ranke held the professorship he trained generations of students in his methods, and from Berlin these
students went on to universities in Europe and North America taking with them the Rankean methodology and passing it on in turn to their own students (*ibid*).

The Rankean model of history also incorporated the Enlightenment idea of progress. History was seen as going somewhere, it had direction and purpose, the ability to explain how we got from one stage to another and the stations in between:

The historian may well interest himself in the state of things, the condition of society, the principles underlying a system of government or a system of thought. But if he is to understand historically and practise historical writing, he will have to think of such analyses as steps in a chain of events, as matters explanatory of a sequence of happenings. He will have to concentrate on understanding change, which is the essential content of historical analysis and description. (Elton 1967: 10-11).

The idea of history as explanation through development and movement is exactly that seen in the histories of archaeology which present the history of archaeology as a linear progression of stages from antiquarian fantasies to modern understandings.

### 3.2.2 The Past as History

This reading of history as progress has gathered additional baggage for historians. Although Ranke stated:

To history has been assigned the office of judging the past, of instructing the present for the benefit of future ages. To such high offices this work does not aspire: it wants only to show what actually happened. (Ranke in Evans 2000: 17).

As was noted above Ranke had additional nationalist and religious agenda. Later empiricist and other historians have returned to the idea that history of itself is important, that it has lessons that can be learnt, or that it can give us strength when it is used for good but in the ‘wrong hands’ can be made to work evil (Elton 1991: 73; Geras 1995: 110; Callinicos 1995: 108-9; Appleby *et al.* 1994: 289-90). This belief that history is tangible, that it has an existence independent of the historian is an essential part of much historiography, particularly empiricist philosophy, and it underlies the standard histories of archaeology:

Scientific experiments ... are artificial; these things would not have happened but for a deliberate act of will on behalf of the experimenter; the matter studied may be taken from nature, but before it is studied it is transformed for the purposes of the investigation... The historian’s case is very different. True, he may select his problems to suit himself. He may ask the questions he likes or believes capable of being answered; he may, and probably will, include himself in the equation when he explains, interprets,
Even perhaps distorts. But he cannot invent his experiment: the subject of his investigation is outside his control. (Elton 1967: 52-3).

Written into the histories of archaeology is the understanding that the history of the past already exists, that it can be visited, the events noted and written down and that narrative will be the truth about the past. This understanding of the past-as-history assumes that the evidence of the past and history are one and the same, and that that history exists independently of the historian or archaeologist, what Jenkins refers to as the 'always already there facts' (Jenkins 1991: 33).

Also within the histories of archaeology is the belief voiced by Elton and Callinicos that the past was the same as the present. That what was considered to be common sense, or rational, or important to the twentieth-century mind has been the same throughout history. We can know the world of the past because we are its successors, we have inherited the views of those in the past, we can understand their beliefs, and through their words we can re-construct their society (Elton 1967: 77-80; Callinicos 1995: 86). This unproblematic view of accessing the past is inherent in the histories of archaeology which present the purpose of the ancient Greeks, Chinese, and sixteenth-century antiquarians in investigating the past as understandable and identifiable to the modern reader. Similarly the histories of archaeology take the line of those historians who argued that:

... there is inborn in almost every individual... a curiosity and sense of wonder about the past. ...The instinct is akin to that aroused in those autumnal days when there is wood smoke on the air and a strange disordered nostalgia pervades the mind; or to the emotions inspired by distant church bells on a calm Sunday morning. Whether he stresses the poetic or the functional element, the historian is ministering to a human need. (Marwick 1970: 14 and see for example Trigger 1989: 27).

Throughout their narratives the histories of archaeology not only assumed that the past imagined by 'ancient civilisations' was a precursor to modern understandings of the past, but there is also the assumption that an interest in the past is a mark of being recognisable to us as human, of being civilised. In the same way that Carr, Callinicos or Marwick never stop to ask why people should be interested in history, so Bahn, Daniel or Stiebing never stop to question why ancient and modern people should be curious about the archaeological remains around them. And, nowhere in this understanding of history is there a corresponding understanding that history is a product of the European Enlightenment, of Western scientific thinking, and that other people, non-European people, with other priorities or other views of what the past might be or mean have
equally valid philosophies. This universalising of human experience and understanding through history is connected with the prioritising of Western thought over those seen to be other, lesser, different. And, these ‘others’ have to be spoken for rather than being allowed to speak for themselves, since by speaking for other people we can control them, we can create their identity how we wish and legitimate our interest in their lives (Jenkins 1991: 18-19). Alternatively there is the less cynical speaking for the ‘other’ in order to empower them, to ensure their history is heard, but even this suggests that such people not knowing the rules, not knowing that an interest in the past is a sign of civilised evolved behaviour, might not produce the ‘right’ history (Appleby et al. 1994: 289-90).

The distrust of philosophers and theoreticians shown in particular in Bahn’s remarks about ‘ivory tower intellectuals’ more concerned with ‘navel gazing’ than producing the ‘truth’ (Bahn 1996a: 9 & 1996b: 8) was another strand of empiricist, and indeed relativist and Marxist, historiography. Elton declared that logicians and philosophers could worry about objectivity and truth in historical reconstructions, historians who actually worked with the ‘relics of the past’ were immune to such concerns (Elton 1967: 100; and see Callinicos 1995: 3; Carr 1964: 26-7; Thompson 1993). Just as Bahn, Daniel and Stiebing believed they were faithfully reporting the history of archaeology as it had happened, so Elton declared it was possible for historians to ignore their own concerns and prejudices simply by concentrating on the material and letting it shape their history (Elton 1991: 67 and see Callinicos 1995: 94 & 187). Elton explicitly warned against theoretical approaches:

You quickly cease to be in control and become its’ slave. The theory directs the selection of evidence and infuses predestined meaning into it all. All questions are so formed as to produce support for the theory, and all answers are predetermined by it. (Elton 1991: 15).

Neither in Elton’s thinking nor the histories of archaeology was there any recognition that a belief in truth, in the correlation between word and world, in the independent uninterpreted existence of the past-as-history was as much a philosophy as the most explicit Marxist or post-modern philosophies.

3.2.3 History and the Archive

Where archaeology’s historians diverge from strict empiricist history is that they are less concerned with a critical analysis of the archives. As noted above the archive has
become the source of the historian’s magic. Tosh likened the would-be historian’s confrontation with the archive to a rite of passage, something which had to be endured by the neophyte in order to attain the status of the professional historian (Tosh 1991: 57 and see Appleby et al 1994: 349; Jordanova 2000: 186-7). For Elton, the archive was the entirety of history, if there were no documents then there could be no history ‘questions for whose answer no material exists are strictly non-questions’ (Elton 1967: 9). These empiricist historians would not have been content with relying, as the historians of archaeology have done, on an archaeologist’s published material. This archive would not have been seen as sufficiently rigorous, it was the easily accessible source warned against by Ranke. Strict empiricist historians would insist on examining letters, site notebooks and site reports ‘immersing’ themselves in that archive and completely ‘absorbing’ it in Elton’s terms (Elton 1967: 19 & 63-6).

This methodology does not mean that Elton would produce a history of archaeology that was any more true than Bahn or Schnapp’s account, nor does it mean that Daniel or Trigger are less constrained by ideas of what constitutes evidence or an underlying theory than Elton. It simply indicates that in the empiricist understanding within which the history of archaeology has been produced there is a divergence of opinion about the importance of primary documentation. For the historian of archaeology the published material is sufficient information to write the discipline’s history, for the empiricist historian this would not be the case. Had Bahn or Stiebing consulted the archive resources then their history might well have remained the same, because the history they produced was conditioned by their pre-conceived expectations and questions they asked. Similarly it is arguable that had Elton not consulted any archives for the sixteenth-century or Tosh archives for ideas of masculinity their histories would still have mirrored the ones they did write. The variety of histories written which have been based on the same sources show that it is not the archives which construct history. Historians construct history.

My point about the use of primary sources is not about the comparative truthfulness or accuracy of the narratives produced by empiricist historians and histories of archaeology, but rather to suggest that historians of archaeology wrote empiricist history without being aware of the importance of the archive in empiricist philosophy. Their empiricist histories fall short of the facticity and documentation demanded by Elton.
Not only are histories of archaeology constrictive because of their belief in empiricism, but an empiricist historian would dismiss their accounts as ‘amateur’ (Elton 1967: 18; Tosh 1991: 57).

The histories of archaeology have however taken part in empiricism’s totalising metanarrative of the modern world. By repetition of so-called key event and people an inflexible framework has been produced. As Jenkins remarked ‘We judge the ‘accuracy’ of historian’s accounts vis a vis other historians’ interpretations’ (Jenkins 1991: 11). So in order to produce a ‘proper’ history of archaeology it has to reflect what has gone before, to name check the same people, the same sites and this then becomes the accepted history of archaeology, the standard history. This builds up sedimented layers of tradition which in turn invoke validity and authority, if everyone says the same thing then it must be true. And, equally if this is the way it has always been done this then becomes the only way it can be done (Jenkins 1991: 52). This constraint obviously silences multiplicity. It is a predominantly male, white, middle-class past. If only certain voices are heard, only certain people are designated as archaeologists or archaeology’s ancestors and only they find a place in the histories then our histories will continue to duplicate each other. The history of archaeology privileges only certain people and designates only them as of interest to archaeology. These histories also privilege western ideas of science, reason, progress, fact and truth, they have reflected and endorsed the over-arching metanarrative that has shaped western society since the Enlightenment. They are constructed and constrained by that understanding of the world, and at the same time the re-create and re-inscribe this controlling narrative. Our histories reflect the belief that history is going somewhere, that progress is taking place and we are moving to a conclusion. These histories of archaeology construct a linear single track history beginning at the beginning and ending with the present when no more history can take place, they suggest that the past is now known, now controlled. By writing history in this style not only has archaeology progressed from a confused misunderstanding of the past to an objective scientific discipline, but by mapping out a course for the history of archaeology which subscribes to the metanarrative of western progressive idealism these writers have locked themselves into a restrictive understanding of the past.
3.3 Different Histories

3.3.1 Post-modernity

How then can this constrictive history be disrupted and different, more inclusive histories of archaeology be written? I would argue that the answer lies in postmodernism. Post-modernist theory has been reviled by empiricist, Marxist, commonsense historians as invention, mendacious representations of the past by those who wilfully refuse to acknowledge that the past is independent of the historian and its tale truthfully told (Callinicos 1995: 3 & 110-127; Elton 1967: 43; 1991: 27; Evans 2000: 89). Post-modernism is equally unpopular with relativists from whom one would expect more sympathy. Carr stated his relativist understanding of history as follows:

It used to be said that the facts speak for themselves. This is of course, untrue. The facts speak only when the historian calls on them; it is he who decides to which facts to give the floor, and in what order or context. It was, I think, one of Pirandello’s characters who said that a fact is like a sack – it won’t stand up till you’ve put something in it. The only reason why we are interested to know that the battle was fought at Hastings in 1066 is that historians regard it as a major historical event. (Carr 1964: 11).

But Carr also believed that history had a purpose and direction, and that objective recreation of the past was possible (Carr 1964: 122-32). He, like other relativists, was worried by Collingwood’s understanding of relativism:

[Collingwood’s] emphasis on the role of the historian in the making of history tends, if pressed to its logical conclusion, to rule out any objective history at all: history is what the historian makes... This amounts to total scepticism. (Carr 1964: 26-27).

This is exactly the point that post-modernists find exciting and invigorating:

Postmodernism is about how 'we' are defined within .. language, and within specific historical, social, cultural matrices. It's about race, class, gender, erotic identity and practice, nationality, age, ethnicity. It's about difference. It's about power and powerlessness, about empowerment, and about all the stages in between and beyond and unthought of... Postmodernism is about history. But not the kind of 'History' that lets us think we can know the past. History in the postmodern moment becomes histories and questions. It asks: Whose history gets told? In whose name? For what purpose? Postmodernism is about histories not told, retold, untold. History as it never was. Histories forgotten, hidden, invisible, considered unimportant, changed eradicated. It’s about the refusal to see history as linear, as leading straight up to today in some recognisable pattern - all set for us to make sense of. It’s about chance. It’s about power. It’s about information. And more information. And. And that's just a little bit about what postmodernism [is]. (Marshall 1992: 4).
What follows is my understanding of what historiography is and is not, and the concerns I have in constructing a history of archaeology.

3.3.2 Truth and Narrative

History is not out there waiting to be discovered, rather we go and search out traces of the past and then invest those traces with our interpretations and observations. History is not and cannot be a single truth about the past; we construct stories about that past based on the traces that remain, and call those stories history. I am not suggesting by this that the past did not exist, nor am I denying that there were indisputable events which took place in that past. Instead, I am following Jenkins (1991: 20) and other post-modern historians in asserting that these facts are nothing without interpretation. Knowing that Britain declared war on Germany on the 4th of August 1914 means nothing unless we can explain why Britain declared war on that day. And, it is the why which is pure interpretation, the why which locates our beliefs about historiography and our understandings of the world. The past occurred, traces of it remain, but history is the construction of historians using that past to make narratives which are then seen as evidence of truth (Jenkins 1991: 49).

There has been as noted above, the view that the sources, the archive, constrain what can be said about the past, and yet there have been a variety of histories constructed from exactly the same sources. The sources, traces, evidence, whatever one calls it remain the same, it is our histories that vary. The idea that the historian can get at the truth through the archive and let the past speak for itself is demonstrably false, the sources are mute, it is we who give them a voice and shape them into histories that please us, stories that resonate. If we accept with White (1987) that we interpret those sources, that our interpretation is as much about invention as it is observation then we are released from the belief that there is a real, identifiable, truthful version of the past out there. Instead we can see with Croce (1960) that history, because it does not exist until the historian gives it shape and purpose, is never neutral. History is always for someone. The function of history is to tell a story which explains the past, but the historian is imbued with contemporary concerns and interests which inevitably affects the history they produce. We cannot get into past minds and hearts, we are not them and they are not us. If we accept that we create rather than uncover history then we can accept with Barthes (1981) and Collingwood (1946) that there is no limit to the stories
that can be produced, only a limit on how plausible and resonant we find those stories (White 1987).

Not only can we dismiss the ideal of the archive which by its truthful representation of the past constrains our theories of history, we can also question what we mean by the archive and extend it from solely primary documents to encompass a variety of resources. For archaeology this means not only looking at site notebooks and letters pertaining to particular excavations, or notes and drafts of archaeological writings, but also looking at diaries, photographs, and news cuttings. We can extend our search beyond strictly archaeological sources, to magazines, adverts, films and novels. If we accept different forms of past traces for constructing our histories then we can look at those who have traditionally been overlooked because they left fewer, fainter traces. We can look at women, the working classes, we can try and write histories that incorporate different voices, that promote inclusivity not exclusivity. We can try and talk about constructions of gender and how this has affected archaeology and archaeologists. We can talk about ideas of class and the hierarchy of excavations reflecting an hierarchical society. We can broaden the view of archaeology set it within its context. In Rorty’s terms we can deconstruct the past we have been given by endless re-description, and through this re-description we will weave new vocabularies and new understandings (Rorty 1989). Rather than simply repeating received notions of the past we can search out new traces and write new, critically aware, grounded histories (Bennett 1981).

I would follow White (1978 & 1987) in arguing that it is the narratives that have constrained us, not the traces of the past. The language we use and the stories we tell shape our histories into certain forms, so the linearity of the histories of archaeology construct a narrative of progress, one which withholds space from all but those who fulfil a narrow definition of ‘archaeologist’. It is these narratives that we have to disrupt in order to construct new stories, and this can be done by looking at new sources and through re-description. But we can also disrupt these narratives by making our intentions clear in our stories, by stating and acknowledging our ‘conceptual apparatus’ and how this has affected our constructions (White 1978: 12). Again this doesn’t mean we will construct more accurate stories about the past, but we can construct more honest ones, more situated histories. By making our intentions, explanations and understandings explicit then we allow others to see the mechanism of the story. This
honesty in saying who our history is for challenges those who claim post-modernism is irresponsible because it lacks the rigour for principled judgements (Callinicos 1995: 66-8; Vaughn 1985: 8-10). Yet, these supposedly principled historians hide their intentions and present their histories as objective narratives of truth. Surely by accepting that history is an attempt to appropriate the world, to empower ourselves and others and by demonstrating the mechanism, then we are producing more principled, more courteous histories? And surely it is more rigorous and responsible to acknowledge that the past is neither good nor evil but that it is we who make it so by our constructions and ideas of morality? In essence, I would say that we cannot create the world, it exists independently of us, but we can try and appropriate it through our writing. Equally we cannot uncover the truth about the past but we can study the traces of that past and use them to try and tell resonant stories.

3.3.3 Tensions and Contradictions
I have unresolved concerns about the history of archaeology I am trying to create. I have discussed the idea of the archive as all-important to the historian and how it has been elevated as a source of truth. I have disputed this idea, but I have also criticised archaeology’s historians for not consulting any archives while constructing their histories. This may seem contradictory. However, my consultation of archaeological archives was not an attempt to find out the ‘truth’ about archaeology. Rather it was an attempt to see what traces remained, and whether these traces could be knitted together into new forms of history. I wanted to see if the absences and omissions of the histories of archaeology were reflected in the material remains of that time. Whether the issues which are now seen as dominating the inter-war period were the same concerns that archaeologists of the time saw as important.

My other difficulty is with the idea of speaking for those who have been silenced, particularly women and the working classes. This idea of history as empowering those designated as other is problematic. How do we speak for others and yet do so without at best being patronising and at worst taking over and colonising their space and voices? How can I speak for those whose minds I cannot read? Yet, at the same time I cannot accept the idea that we can ‘let the past speak for itself’ it cannot do so being mute and voiced through the present. Perhaps it would be most honest to say that what I have
attempted to do is use other people to speak for me. I have chosen the accounts and memoirs, I have edited and selected in order to construct my history of archaeology.

This then is the philosophy, the mechanism with which I have attempted to construct my history of 20s and 30s archaeology. As a socialist and feminist I have tried to write in understandings of gender and class, how they affected archaeology and were affected by archaeology. As someone who believes that archaeological explanations are created and shaped by the society in which archaeology is located I have attempted to explicitly link inter-war British society to inter-war archaeology. The history I have constructed is tentative and hesitant. I am aware it is no more accurate than that constructed by Daniel or Trigger, but I hope to make it more critically aware, more situated and more resonant. Despite my uncertainties I am conscious that on occasions I have written as if I had unproblematic access to the past, that I could hear and understand past archaeologists and share their concerns. This is obviously not the case, but my attempt to write a plausible and convincing story may suggest I have forgotten my own philosophy. However, throughout this account I have always been aware that I am constructing not reporting the history of archaeology in the 20s and 30s.
4 General History of the 20s and 30s

4.1 Introduction

The inter-war period in Britain is one of contradiction and ambivalence. The 20s and 30s have been hailed as decades of innovation and change, laissez faire liberalism was no longer acceptable, 'progressive Socialism' defined the Labour and initial National Government, resulting in unprecedented state intervention in people's lives. The war destroyed class, the war brought women out of the home, the war was to be followed by the construction of a fairer world. Slums were cleared, education became universal, there was universal suffrage, it was the beginning of the end of British Imperialism. With the General Strike and the hunger marches the whole tenor of Britain was transformed, moving perceptibly to the Left.

Alternatively it can be argued that fundamentally Britain was the same place it had been before the Great War. The male population had been decimated but Britain was still a masculist society and it was still the wealthy, the educated middle and upper classes who controlled and governed the masses. Maps of the world still showed reassuringly large areas of colonies, dominions, and protectorates full of loyal subjects who could be manipulated and exploited in the name of modernism and civilisation. The masses were still the masses, education, the dole, and housing relieved some of the inequalities, but a large part of the population lived in abject poverty. Class, race, and gender were still powerful tools of demarcation and destiny. While Europe divided into communism or fascism, Britain remained steadily conservative regardless of the colour of government or who was Prime Minister.

The choice of which version of interpretation one chooses to believe depends on personal preference, and how one measures change. While writers such as Marwick (1974) optimistically saw the inter-war era as a time of increasing democracy, Said (1994 & 1995) and Bourke (1996), amongst others, argued that for all the legal changes British underlying perceptions of the world remained static. That discourse rather than the judiciary shapes our understanding. And, if, as I suggested in Chapter 1,
archaeology reflects the discourse of the society in which it is situated, how were these issues embodied in the discipline and translated into interpretations of the past?

I should begin by stating that I favour the view that despite the personal upheavals caused by the First World War, there was little that was genuinely new and different about inter-war society. The surface changes are misleading. Understandings of gender, class, colonialism, and their filtration through archaeology, all stayed remarkably constant. When I originally conceived this thesis I had intended to discuss British archaeologists working within the British Empire. Constraints of time and length mean I have abandoned this particular ambition. Therefore I do not intend to discuss the rise of British imperialism or particular examples of colonialism performed by British archaeologists overseas. In the chapters that deal specifically with archaeology there are quotes and examples from these archaeologists, but my main focus is archaeology in the metropole. British imperialism and colonialism went beyond the simple fact of occupation and administration of non-western lands (Spivak 1987 & 1988). Colonialism has an effect on the colonisers and the metropole as well as the colony and colonised subject:

Colonialism, in the British example, was not simply a marginal activity on the edges of English civilization but fundamental in its own cultural self-representation. (Young 1990: 174).

Regardless of the moves towards self-rule by the colonies, for most people in Britain between the wars the Empire was a fact of life, an integral part of Britain’s identity at all levels of society. The way that Empire was portrayed and consumed by Britain inexorably fed back into a discourse which understood the world in terms of racial hierarchy, progress, evolution and social Darwinism. Both governmental and mainstream representations of Empire and imperialism silenced those who were colonised and spoke for subjected people.

But British inter-war society also created ‘others’ at home. Not just colonial subjects but the working classes and women were created and contested concepts whose construction came from without and was handed down to these groups in ways that constrained their abilities to move outside these definitions. I would follow Cixous and Spivak in linking this othering of women and the working classes to colonialism:

I saw how the white (French), superior, plutocratic, civilized world founded its power on the repression of populations who had suddenly become
‘invisible’, like proletarians, immigrant workers, minorities who are not the ‘right’ colour. Women. Invisible as humans... I saw that the great, noble, ‘advanced’ countries established themselves by expelling what was ‘strange’; excluding it but not dismissing it; enslaving it. (Cixous 1986: 70 and see Spivak 1987: 251).

I am aware that many, including Said (1994: 8 and see Viswanathan 2004: xii), would dispute this reading. Whether we call all these repressive otherings colonialism or split them into separate compartments such as Orientalism, class, gender, imperialism, it is, I would argue, part of the same process of Western discourse where those in power speak for those who are silenced, and in doing so the powerful can re-enact their interpretations upon this captive world. As Baudrillard (1983: 20-2) has asserted once the other has been spoken for, represented, then it can be appropriated and controlled.

Before looking in detail at these areas, I want to establish a chronicle of inter-war life, those events that indisputably took place although their cause and effect can be debated.

4.2 Chronicle

4.2.1 Politics and Economics
The Great War ended in 1918. In 1919 the Allies met in Paris to discuss the new world order that had been created. Unsurprisingly, but depressingly, the main aim of the peace talks was to punish the Central Powers, and especially the Germans, for their expansionist aims (Montgomery 1970: 15-16 and see Curle Section 7.8.2 below). Reparation terms were agreed in 1921. Payments were begun in 1921 but Germany had huge financial problems with spiralling inflation, and argued that further payments would result in too much hardship for the German people (Montgomery 1970: 87). In 1923 French and Belgian troops occupied the Ruhr, fighting broke out and Germany forbade those in the Ruhr to work for, or to help, the occupiers. However, Germany was in no real position to embark on an armed opposition and had to submit. The hardship Germany had suffered as a result of her resistance helped to change British and US opinion. American advisers were drafted in to advise the German economists and in 1925 with the signing of the Locarno pact Germany was back on an equal footing with the rest of Europe and began to recover prosperity.
Meanwhile the economic situation in Britain, while not as severe as Germany, was substantially worse than it had been before the war. While the empire still provided a captive market, their inability to obtain British goods during the Great War had led to them finding other sources. The national debt had risen from £620 million in 1914 to a staggering £7,810 million by 1920 and simply servicing this debt preoccupied the government economists (Thorpe 1992: 92-3). From full employment during the war unemployment rose sharply, by 1929 it had reached 10% and by 1932 23% of insured workers were unemployed. These figures were manipulated; unemployed married women for example were not included, and the actual figures were undoubtedly much higher. Nor do the numbers indicate regional trends and in areas such as South Wales and Lancashire the figures were much higher (Dewey 1997: 92-4). The 20s and 30s saw a succession of recessions of greater and lesser severity. However, at no time were the depressions of 1920-1, 1929-32, and 1937-8 universal, the country suffered disproportionately ensuring that although many endured severe hardship the overall standard of living appeared to be rising (Thorpe 1992: 92-3 & Dewey 1997: 147-8).

Lloyd George had announced with the cessation of hostilities the need to make Britain ‘a fit country for heroes’ (Montgomery 1970: 15). This was seen by historians such as Montgomery and Marwick as signalling the introduction of state intervention in the lives of British subjects. But, this understanding of events is somewhat disingenuous. It overlooks the Defence of the Realm Act of 1914 with its implementation of unlimited governmental powers, and the Military Service Act of 1916 which brought in conscription for men (Bell 1994: 137). These acts went far beyond any post-war intervention in people’s lives. It is also debatable how far state intervention went in the 20s and 30s given that Labour’s attempts to introduce better living standards were systematically blocked (Adamson 1994: 15) and the Second World War brought the same demand of homes and lives fit for heroes, an unnecessary requirement if state intervention had been so extensive (Adamson 1994: 17 & 118). On the outbreak of the Second World War the evacuation of children to the countryside brought home the full horror of the slums to everyone, Neville Chamberlain who had been Minister of Health from 1924-29 and should have therefore have been aware of the pitiful standards of slum housing wrote:

I never knew such conditions existed, and I feel ashamed of having been so ignorant of my neighbours. For the rest of my life I mean to try and make
amends by helping such people to live cleaner healthier lives. (Chamberlain 1939 in Adamson 1994: 71-2).

The Old Age Pensions Act of 1908 had provided means-tested, non-contributory payments of 5s per head ‘for respectable persons aged over 69 years’ (Dewey 1997: 10 my emphasis). In 1920 this pension was increased to 10s and in 1925 the system was overhauled and recast. Instead of being means tested pensions became contributory and the age of receipt was dropped to 65. The scheme covered everyone in the National Health Insurance Scheme and required an additional 9d a week for men and 4½d a week for women shared between employer and employed. This ensured a pension of 10s a week at 65 and was payable to both the insured person and his wife. Within the same act provision was made for widows and orphans. This was truly innovative as previously they had had to rely on the Poor Law but now widows received 10s and orphans 7s 6d (Dewey 1997: 150).

Another major development was The National Insurance Act of 1911, it provided health insurance in the form of sickness payment of 10s a week and free medical treatment from a doctor (Dewey 1997: 10). Part II of the act provided unemployment insurance to those in certain occupations that had fluctuating employment such as building, shipbuilding, mechanical engineering, and saw-milling. The weekly benefit was 7s payable for 15 weeks in any one year:

Both schemes were financed by contributions from the state, employer and employee. The use of the insurance principle meant that the schemes were devoid of the taint of private charity or public pauperism; benefit was available as of right to members of the schemes who had paid their subscriptions. (Dewey 1997: 11).

The unemployment insurance was extended in 1920 to cover all workers except domestic servants and agricultural workers, and in 1921 an allowance for dependants was added (Montgomery 1970: 40). However, hospital treatment had to wait for the implementation of the National Health Service in 1948, as did those excluded from the scheme. Problems arose when it was discovered that in certain areas the Poor Relief, which was regionally determined, was higher than the state payments, and neither payment was intended to provide real maintenance for workers, only to tide them over short periods of unemployment (Dewey 1997: 147-8). Providentially, for many workers unemployment in the 20s was only short-term and the insurance kept families from
starvation, although not malnutrition. Even when the amount of benefit paid was amended it was not a generous figure. In 1934 52% of men attending army recruitment offices were below the required physical standard, 20% of children were undernourished, and in 1939 it was estimated that malnutrition was responsible for the death of 3,200 women every year in childbirth (Thorpe 1992: 114).

The 30s brought more severe recessions, with unemployment increasing from 1.1 to 2.8 million, many more workers were on short time or not on the unemployment register. By mid-1931 the unemployment insurance fund was bankrupt, at the same time the trade balance collapsed. In 1928 there had been a £104 million surplus but by 1931 this had turned into a £114 million trade deficit (Thorpe 1992: 92). The gold standard was abandoned in 1931 but it took until 1932 for the economy to revive. Despite the economic situation there was a construction boom, new and service industries developed, and later in the decade rearmament eased the economic situation. The governments eased their consciences with unemployment benefit rather than more hands-on interventionist policies and the localised nature of the recessions meant that the National Government could ignore the situation, or force workers to move to areas where their skills were required (Thorpe 1992: 92-3).

Much of the housing occupied by the working class in Britain before the Great War was of an appallingly low quality (Dewey 1997: 165). The first real attempt to tackle the issue of sub-standard housing was the Housing and Town Planning Act of 1919. This provided an open-ended subsidy to local authorities to contract private builders to construct the houses. But the programme proved too expensive and was abandoned in 1923, by which time 213,821 houses had been built. In 1923 councils were offered £6 a year for 20 years for each new house that was built. However, houses could only be built if the councils could prove that private housing was not meeting the need, and it was intended to be a short-term measure that would end in 1925. In 1924 councils were offered subsidies to pay for the work at the rate of £9 a year for 40 years for each new house. The builders agreed to relax their apprenticeship rules which increased the number of workers that could be employed. The plan was to build 190,000 new council houses at modest rents by 1925 and that this figure would gradually increase until it reached 450,000 in 1934. The 1930 Act offered subsidies to councils for slum clearance and the construction of replacement housing, but this was terminated in 1933 by the
National Government who believed private enterprise should be responsible for housing. By 1938, however, one tenth of houses were owned by local authorities, and the new houses were of a far higher standard, they had gas, electricity, piped water and most had bathrooms.

This did not entirely abolish the problem, aware of the need to avoid rent arrears the councils tended to set high rates so that the houses were affordable only by the artisan class rather than the unskilled working class (Dewey 1997: 163). These higher rates meant some tenants moved back to their cheaper slum accommodation, or suffered dietary deficiency in an attempt to save money (Thorpe 1992: 99-100 and see section 4.3.4 below). And, at no time were enough houses built to house all those who needed accommodation.

There were other social reforms before 1914, dealing with hours of work and pay rates. Not all of these Acts were enforced, but a beginning had been made. Coal-mining was reduced to an eight-hour day in 1908, and in 1912 a regionally decided minimum wage was introduced. During war-time this regulation was ignored and post-war it led to confrontation between the pit owners and the employees resulting in the General Strike of 1926. For nine days the British were somewhat inconvenienced, but enthusiastic, predominantly middle and upper-class, volunteers stepped into key jobs. On the 12th of May a deputation of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress went to 10 Downing Street to discuss the situation, and the strike was called off. The Government refused to promise that they would not penalise returning workers, but the TUC still agreed to end the strike. Those seen as troublemakers were sacked and blacklisted, and those that were employed were forced to accept longer hours, lower wages and district agreement. In 1927 the British Government passed the Trade Union and Trade Disputes Act which overturned the gains made in the 1906 Trade Disputes Act. From having picketing restrictions eased and the unions given an official status, now all sympathetic strikes were illegal, the Civil Service unions were forbidden to affiliate with the TUC, and mass picketing became illegal.

Education was another area tackled before the Great War and extended in the 20s and 30s. Although the Education Act of 1902 led to a slow but continuous expansion of secondary education the situation wasn’t genuinely transformed until after 1945.
1918 the official leaving age was raised to 14 and all fees for elementary, but not secondary, education had been abolished. However, few ex-elementary pupils went into secondary schools, and fewer still went on to higher or further education. Instead most pupils simply stayed on in the highest class of the elementary school until they reached 14. At the beginning of the academic year 1919-20 it was estimated that 10,000 fee-paying applicants to secondary schools and a further 10,000 students who had qualified through scholastic achievement were denied places because of a lack of provision. In 1926 secondary education was organised into grammar schools, ‘modern’ schools, and technical schools, providing different types of education. Again economic slumps prevented these measures being fully implemented. The leaving age was raised to 15 in 1936 and was due to come into effect on the 1st of September 1939, unsurprisingly the deadline was ignored. It was only after the 1944 Education Act that all pupils were given a real opportunity for secondary education (Dewey 1997:150-153).

The numbers obtaining higher education slowly increased. Although some new university colleges were created between the wars, the only new university was the former Reading University College. It was still the old universities such as Oxford, London and St Andrews which were the principal destination of undergraduates. The number of students in higher education rose from 61,000 in 1924-5 to 69,000 in 1938-9 (Dewey 1997: 154). Undergraduates were predominantly from the upper and upper-middle classes, although those attending the non-Oxbridge colleges were generally from grammar schools. Women were allowed to become full members of Oxford University in 1919, but were still barred from full membership of Cambridge, and the provision for women students at other universities was still below that offered to men (see section 4.3.3. below).

The passing of the Matrimonial Causes Act in 1857 had made divorces a little easier to obtain. This act simplified and cheapened divorce by allowing the petitioner to sue for all stages of divorce in a specially established section of the High Court. In 1920 the Administration of Justice Act was passed which meant that assize courts were given the power to hear undefended impoverished cases, which lowered the cost to get divorced. The 1923 Matrimonial Causes Act gave wives the same rights as their husbands when it came to divorce and it is estimated that after this date the divorce rate increased by 25%. In 1937 the Herbert Act was passed, this extended the grounds of divorce to
include three years desertion, cruelty, prolonged incurable insanity, habitual drunkenness and imprisonment awaiting the death penalty. The expansion of grounds for divorce had a huge impact on the divorce rate which is estimated to have doubled between 1937 and 1938.

In 1918 Britain finally extended the franchise to all adult men and to a proportion of adult women. The extension of the franchise to women passed easily through parliament, but granting the vote to women on the same terms as men was rejected. Instead, suffrage was limited to women over the age of 30 who were householders, the wives of householders, occupiers of property with an annual rent of £5 or graduates of British universities. In 1918 women were given their first chance to vote in a General Election, several women from the suffrage societies stood, but the first woman MP to be elected was Constance Markiewicz. It was not until 1928 that women were given the vote on the same terms as men. The Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act of 1919 was again ambivalent about how far women were really perceived as equal. This act purportedly made it illegal to exclude women from employment because of their sex. In practice loopholes were often discovered, marriage bars operated in many of the professions, the act ignored the issue of equal pay, and women were still largely confined to ill-paid semi-skilled work since they were barred from the better paid apprenticeships (Thorpe 1992: 90; Dewey 1997: 56 and see section 4.3.3. below).

The election of 1918 returned a coalition Government with Lloyd George at the head. However, the Conservatives were the majority party and opposed Lloyd George's housing, health and education reforms, and after three years Lloyd George was replaced with the Conservative Bonar Law who in turn was replaced by Stanley Baldwin. In the election of 1923 the Liberals and Labour outnumbered the Conservatives and as the leading party of opposition Labour agreed to form a government under Ramsay MacDonald. Without overall control the Labour government lasted only 8 months, Montgomery suggests it fell because of their interference in the judicial process (Montgomery 1970: 77). This may have been the event that finally crushed the Government but with their reforms being blocked by the Liberals and a Cabinet that had little administrative experience it was only a matter of time before such a precarious edifice collapsed. In the subsequent election, aided by the fraudulent Zinoviev letter scandal the Conservatives gained 150 seats while Labour lost 40 and
their chance of forming a second government. The Conservatives were elected and Stanley Baldwin was once again Prime Minister.

The 1929 election resulted once more in a Labour Government, again this had a precarious existence. This government lasted until 1931, the recession grew stronger and unemployment rose from 1.1 million to 2.8 million. Following the rejection of Oswald Mosley’s Keynesian economic proposals, and with the budget in deficit, proposals to cut £56 million largely via wage cuts in public-sector salaries were agreed. This was felt to be insufficient. The Opposition leaders and the bankers objected wanting a cut in unemployment benefit, the cabinet voted for a 10% cut 11:9, but the minority was so strong and important, including Arthur Henderson and George Lansbury, that MacDonald was forced to tender the Government’s resignation. He, Snowden, and a few others, joined the Conservatives and Liberals in forming the National Government, and Henderson became leader of the Labour party. The Labour Party did very badly in the following election gaining just 46 seats (Thorpe 1992: 26-33).

In fact the key note of British politics in the 20s and 30s seems to have been the safety first approach adopted by the Conservatives, nothing too hasty or too excessive. And this was echoed by the electorate. The 20s and 30s in Germany, Italy and Russia were dominated by the rise of what have been termed extremist parties. But in Britain, although the Communist Party was formed in 1920, the British Fascisti in 1923, and the British Union of Fascists in 1932, none were particularly successful (Thorpe 1992: 47-57). The Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB) initially sought to work through the Labour Party but they were never allowed to affiliate with them, and by the mid 20s had become marginalised and expelled. Their main success was with the National Unemployed Workers’ Movement. This organisation advised the unemployed about their rights, gave them representation at tribunals and did much for the tenants struggles in London and Birmingham (Thorpe 1992: 47). By 1939 the CPGB could count 18,000 members and were seen as the opposition to fascism. The Left Book Club, begun in 1926 by Victor Gollancz was also a success it had 60,000 members by 1939 (Thorpe 1992: 49).
The fascists were variably successful, there were at least three fascist parties operating in Britain, of which the most successful was the British Union of Fascists (BUF) founded in 1932 by Oswald Mosley. At the height of its popularity the BUF had 50,000 members but this success was short-lived. The economic recovery, Hitler’s ‘Night of the Long Knives’, and Mosley’s increasingly violent tactics lost them support and by 1935 numbers had fallen to 5,000. The depth of Mosley’s anti-Semitism is difficult to fathom, it was not until 1934 Mosley banned Jews from the BUF, nor were they mentioned as an issue in *The Greater Britain* (1932), and it should be noted that Rothermere, Mosley’s main supporter, was himself Jewish. Thorpe (1992: 57) suggested that anti-Semitism had always been part of Mosley’s politics and had been played down out of respect for Rothermere. Anti-Semitism in Britain may have been lower keyed than in Germany but it was still there, and it was noted that the police dealt more harshly with the anti-fascist protesters than they did with the fascists (Branson 1975: 168). Branson argued that Mosley and the other fascist parties were seen as less dangerous than the pacifists and civil-rights campaigners (*ibid*). In 1940 the BUF was banned and 747 fascists, including Mosley and his wife Diana, were interned. Thorpe convincingly suggested this had less to do with their perceived threat and more because Churchill wanted an easy target to reassure the populace about 5th columnists (Thorpe 1992: 57).

The existence of the CPGB and the BUF, as well as the growing number of members within the trades unions do suggest that a small section of the British public were becoming increasingly politicised. As does the number of British men and women who in 1936 went to fight, on whichever side, in the Spanish Civil War. But, to many historians the lack of success of fringe political parties stands in stark contrast to other European countries. Branson suggested that there was a real risk, or politicians felt there was a real risk, of violent revolution in Britain in the 30s (Branson 1975: 6). The Government’s response to the General Strike does seem out of proportion to the actual threat, but British Governments have a long history of over-reacting to civil disobedience. This suggests either that successive British Governments have been alarmed by revolutionary fervour, or that the commonly held policy is to treat popular demonstrations with extremism in order to promote obedience through fear. Graves and Hodge suggested the failure of British revolutionaries was because they were shell-shock sufferers with ‘no capacity for concentrated thinking’ who suffered from
hallucinations which had ‘warped their critical sense’ (Graves & Hodge 1940: 27). This may seem an unlikely explanation but it was favoured by contemporary commentators (ibid). The majority of historians, however, argued that Britain avoided extremism by partial state intervention improving the lives of its citizens, and while areas of Britain suffered terrible economic hardship in the 30s this was offset in part by the move to rearmament, and, because the economic slump was regional at no time was all of Britain in recession, a situation that might have led to extremist parties gaining favour (Dewey 1997; Montgomery 1970; Thorpe 1992).

4.2.2 Innovations in Everyday Life
Life between the wars was not all acts of parliament and political parties. For the majority of people life was shaped by work and leisure and, recessions notwithstanding, most middle and upper class people now had more leisure and more forms of diversion.

Cinema had become a popular mass market entertainment. Weekly admissions were estimated at 23 million. New purpose built cinemas were being built, many in the art deco style which came to define so much of 20s and 30s design (Dewey 1997: 184 and see section 7.7.4 below). Partly this increase in popularity reflected the cheapness of visiting the picture houses, seats cost as little as 6d, and cinemas were open from midday to late at night. It was estimated that in Liverpool 40% of the population went to the cinema at least once a week (Dewey 1997: 185). But, the rise in numbers also reflected the growing democratisation of the cinema, it had previously been somewhat despised by the middle classes as a working class pursuit, lacking in intellectual rigour and akin to music halls. As the number of serious films increased, attending the cinema became a more acceptable pastime (Graves & Hodge 1940: 235). The majority of films shown were from the USA only Alexander Korda made universally popular British films. Despite protective legislation British films had a reputation for low quality and banal plots, and government interference in subject matter was notorious (Golby 1990: 215). However, British film makers also had a reputation for creating excellent documentaries which enabled the studios to survive and placed them in a prime position for the propaganda films produced in the Second World War (ibid).

Radio was another cross-class pastime which developed during the inter-war period. From 1922 licence fees had to be paid to the BBCo. for operating a radio receiver and
by the end of 1922 36,000 licences had been issued (Dewey 1997: 186). The BBC was in competition with foreign stations such as Radio Luxembourg and Radio Normandie. Sir John Reith the Director General of the BBC declared that radio should:

... carry into the greatest possible number of homes everything that is best in every department of human knowledge, endeavour and achievement.

(Reith in Golby 1990: 209).

Yet, according to Graves and Hodge, the early transmissions were lively and informal, with little homogeneity to the output (Graves & Hodge 1940: 88-90). Music predominated, largely dance music (Dewey 1997: 187). Duke Ellington, Louis Armstrong, Bing Crosby, and the Lindy Hop all became as well known in Britain as they were in the US (Graves and Hodge 1940: 386-7). Despite the music critics labelling jazz and jazz dancing as crude and vulgar dance halls embraced the sounds of the Big Bands and the new dances which crossed the Atlantic. The new phenomenon of night-clubs also helped to promote the new music. Undoubtedly, for the majority of the population visiting a night-club was something to be read about rather than experienced. While dance halls were common (Dewey 1997: 186), night-clubs were associated with Paris, New York and London, with black culture, seedy basements, slinky dresses, and illegal alcohol (fig. 4.1). The night-club became a way of signifying decadence, a literary plot device that could result in passion, white slavery, or simply a police raid (Christie 1929; Allingham 1938).

The BBC also reported on sporting events and in 1932 the first Christmas broadcast by a British monarch was made. The influence of Reith and his followers was seen in the quality and level of news coverage. Although these reports were not always impartial (Golby 1990: 209-11), the BBC was far from conservative, HG Wells was a frequent speaker, as was Maynard Keynes, the Webbs, George Bernard Shaw and William Beveridge. However, the stipulation that attendees be non-partisan and talk only in their personal capacity did mean party politics were avoided. With the outbreak of the Second World War the BBC became the main source of news and entertainment (Dewey 1997: 318).

The theatres continued to flourish although many of the music-halls were closed in the 20s and 30s (Graves & Hodge 1940: 191-201). J.M. Barrie, Noel Coward and George Bernard Shaw were all enormously popular in the 20s as was a revival of Cymbeline in
modern dress. But the two hits of the twenties were Miles Malleson’s *Fanatics*, and Michael Arlen’s *The Green Hat* (Graves and Hodge 1940: 146). Anita Loos’ *Gentlemen Prefer Blondes*, and Frederick Lonsdale’s *Spring Cleaning* were also very popular. The thirties saw a move towards social realism, deplored by Graves and Hodge (1940: 338-9), but exciting for such writers as Spender, Auden, and MacNeice whose plays were in tune with this development. Walter Greenwood’s *Love on the Dole* written in 1933, dramatised in 1934 and filmed in 1941 proved incredibly popular despite its grim depiction of life in Salford during the depression.

The cost of paper came down after the war, and in 1935 a publishing revolution took place when Allen Lane, of The Bodley Head publishers, brought out the first Penguin paperback, priced at 6d they were the same price as a packet of cigarettes or a cinema ticket. The books were sold at railway bookstalls, Woolworths, and department stores as well as bookshops and proved popular. Allen Lane was initially cautious, publishing books that had already done well such as Dorothy L Sayers, Agatha Christie, and Ernest Hemingway’s *Farewell to Arms*, but as Penguins continued to sell he branched out into biography, history, archaeology and philosophy. Public Libraries were prospering, by 1934-35 nearly everyone lived within reach of a public library. This was assisted by the Public Libraries Act 1919 which provided the local authorities with more money to spend on the libraries, and the power to develop library services (Dewey 1997: 192). Private subscription libraries were still being run by WH Smiths, Harrods and Boots. Newspapers, magazines, and comics were still popular. By 1939 sales of daily newspapers reached 19.5 million and Sundays/weeklies reached 23.4 million. Local newspapers suffered at the expense of the London based national papers. The *Illustrated London News* had pioneered lavishly illustrated articles and the first British photojournalist magazine *Picture Post* began in 1938, it was an instant success. Aggressive marketing was used with pens, tea-sets, clothes, kitchen equipment, bound sets of Dickens, and accident insurance as some of the incentives used to boost circulation Dewey (1997: 191). Magazines were enormously popular women were particularly well, or ill, served during the inter-war years with a range of magazines aimed at different classes of women (White 1970).

Increasing leisure time led to an increase in holidays. Again this was a pre-war phenomenon which extended after the war. By 1914 most middle-class families were
able to take an annual holiday, and post war many working class families could take a week at the seaside. Increasingly a week's paid holiday was being introduced by employers, the Ministry of Labour estimated that in 1925 1.5 million manual workers enjoyed paid holidays, this rose to 4 million by 1937. Destinations were largely governed by class, before and after the war the upper and upper middle classes went abroad (figs. 4.2 & 4.3). The working classes went to the seaside travelling on the special trains or by coach to their destinations. Cars were becoming cheaper, although still outside the range of manual workers, they became a middle class passion. By 1939 there were 1,798,000 private cars in use in Britain and 488,000 motor cycles (Dewey 1997: 183). For those who could afford the initial outlay cars became a form of recreation to go for a picnic, or to one of the new roadhouses for dinner and dancing or simply 'out for a spin'. O.G.S. Crawford cleverly cashed in on the automobile boom when he produced his period maps suitable for touring holidays (see section 7.6.2 below).

These are the indisputable events of the 20s and 30s, I have tried to indicate how far new events, ideas and laws were entirely novel, and how far they stemmed from earlier ideas of how society should be organised. By including cultural aspects of this period I have tried to indicate how life might be experienced by those living through the two decades. I now wish to examine how people saw and understood their world, how it was shaped by their experiences of class, gender and colonialism.

4.3. Others

4.3.1. Introduction

I have linked together colonialism, class, and gender in this section because I feel they are inter-related. They all involve the construction and delineation of groups of people as 'other'. They all involve an observer standing aside from the observed and making pronouncements about that subject. The observed is not invited into the discussion, there is no dialogue between observer and observed. They are represented, spoken for rather than being allowed to speak for themselves. The observer may believe that they are in sympathy with the subject, but it is still an external construction and the observed is contrasted to the speaker and found to be different, negative, inferior. This
construction is not an abstract intellectual delineation. It permeates all aspects of discourse. Marking people as other has repercussions that affects all aspects of that subject’s life; how they live their life, how they identify themselves, how they are seen by outsiders, and how that identity is valued, discussed and re-made to satisfy the desires of the observer.

Constructions of the other are not static, they can shift and encompass new meanings, take on new forms and definitions. The boundaries between observer and observed can be breached. By the 20s there were some women, working class and empire-born MPs, university lecturers, doctors, lawyers. But these few figures were never enough to challenge ideas about the groups to which they belonged. The distance that needed to be travelled from observed other to observer reinforced commonly held ideas rather than highlighting differences. Acceptance was precarious and could be withdrawn at any time, as Dorothy L. Sayers remarked in *Gaudy Night* (1935):

> Nothing is more prejudicial to the College in particular and to University women in general than spiteful and ill-informed gossip in the press. (Sayers 1987: 120).

This awareness was rare, or rarely expressed. Virginia Woolf’s examination of the fluidity of identity in *Orlando* (1928), and her realisation of her position as other while at the same time holding colonialist attitudes towards the working classes (1977), are rare examples. As I will argue in the next chapter women archaeologists were too busy attempting to consolidate their own unstable position within the discipline to be able to acknowledge their identity as other, and their creation of that identity for the people they studied. Even when these groups were aware that their identity was being created for them, this did not necessarily give them sympathy for those who were being similarly constructed. Women travelling and working in the colonies were no more sympathetic to colonised people than their male counterparts (Bell in Burgoyne 1958: 139; Blackman 1927 & Caton Thompson 1983: 119). Although Maud Pember Reeves (1913) and Margery Spring Rice (1939) did much to draw attention to the difficult lives of British working class women, they still made judgments about those women, still constructed those women and channelled their voices into particular narratives. The majority of Mosley’s support came from East End working class men. There is no evidence that these men objected to the idea of women being re-assigned traditional gender roles, nor any recognition that East End Jews and East End fascists might have more in common with each other than with a wealthy, middle class demagogue. But
this is the benefit of history, it is easy to stand at a distance and see patterns, suggest that these people were being silenced, created as others by external authorities. As I try and explain how inter-war British society denied sections of the population self-representation, shaped their understanding of the past and impeded their access to the past, I too am observing and making judgments, presenting my construction of these people and making their lives fit my narrative.

4.3.2 British Imperialism

It has been suggested that by the end of the Great War the British Empire was widely recognised by contemporaries as being under severe strain. Although the British Empire now extended over one fifth of the Earth's surface, Irish and Indian demands for autonomy, as well as the granting of independence to the Dominions in 1931 is cited as evidence of the inevitable disintegration of British control (Bowle 1977; Morris 1978; Thompson 2000). Similarly, it has been asserted that the British public were indifferent, if not hostile, to the existence of the Empire (MacKenzie 1986: 7-8: Richards 1986: 143-4).

Yet, there is a wealth of evidence to suggest that this reading of inter-war Britain is manifestly distorted, relying on hindsight and the belief that the alienation of writers such as Graves, Orwell and Forster have been seen as overly representative of the general view (MacKenzie 1984: 10 & 1986: 7-8). Instead, it can be demonstrated that Britain's victory in war confirmed Britain's status as an imperial power, and that the British government continued to behave as an active imperial power up to, and beyond, the Second World War (Cain & Hopkins 1993: 4-7). No major political party between the wars suggested the dissolution of the Empire (Richards 1986: 161). Instead, British colonialism, and their concomitant racial superiority, continued to be presented as the natural circumstance of the British public. This propagandist view dominated the discourse of British society, infiltrating education, economics, advertising, fiction, film, and radio (Mackenzie 1984 & 1986). Regardless of how little or how much attention was paid by the average British citizen to the concept of imperialism, their world was saturated in images and narratives of Empire.

It was not just the British whose understandings of the world were bounded and explained by imperialism. Those under British rule were even more deeply affected,
particularly if they lived in areas that had neither dominion status nor a degree of self-government. Lacking autonomy, such areas were externally controlled and that control was justified as an humanitarian attempt to enforce Western ideas of civilisation. However noble and sincere these sentiments may have been the colonised were still a subject people:

In the mother country the worker owes his condition to chance, not to his essence. Overseas the colonized are at the same time both a class and a race. In other words they are not people, citizens like the others. Sometimes ordinary language bears witness to this distinction. On one occasion a European was testifying in court. The judge asked: ‘Were other witnesses there?’ – ‘Yes, five, two men and three Arabs.’ Moreover they do not have names. In addition to being addressed as ‘tu’ or ‘toi’, the Arab was always called Mohamed, if a man, and Fatma, if a woman. (Ferro 1997: 124).

Which in turn corrodes the colonisers sense of self:

Colonised people do not simply suffer from their culture and labour being appropriated but within their souls a sense of inferiority is created. (Fanon: 1967: 18).

Imperialism was very much a middle and upper class concern. Those in the Foreign Office and colonial administration between the wars were the upper middle class ‘gentlemanly elite’ who were also in control in the City and political parties (Cain & Hopkins 1993: 25-7). These administrators emphatically did not share the pessimism of contemporary intellectuals about the empire but regarded it as an active and vital force in the world (Cain & Hopkins 1993: 178). These were the men who were in charge of British society, they were the class from which government was drawn, they dictated educational policy, wrote fiction and textbooks, made films, owned and controlled theatres and music halls, worked in advertising and propaganda, and organised the official imperial exhibitions. They were also the class from which archaeologists came.

The majority of what follows deals with the colonies rather than the Dominions, not because the Dominions were an un-contested area, but because they rarely figured in constructions of colonialism. Aside from portraying the inhabitants as ‘rough and ready’ folk, popular culture had little to say about these areas. Politically, however, there was a great deal to be said, despite the Dominions being legally of equal status with Britain ‘in many ways the notion of equality was no more than a polite fiction’ (Cain & Hopkins 1993: 109). The Dominions were reliant on Britain, not just for military protection but also economically through investment, debt re-payment and
trade. In the 30s both Australia and New Zealand tried to break away from Britain, but they and the Union of South Africa were too reliant on British controlled investments. In the aftermath of the Great War the political hold Britain exercised might have weakened, but the economic ties grew tighter and were reinforced with the outcome of the Ottawa conference and the creation of the sterling bloc (Cain & Hopkins 1993: 118-137). However, as white colonies the Dominions were seen as unproblematic in popular culture, they were presented as off-shoots of Britain, regardless of how the inhabitants might have felt.

_Institutional Imperialism_

Both formal and informal educational texts written for children reinforced the ideology of empire (Chancellor 1970). The longevity of school texts, many late Victorian and Edwardian text books continued in use with little revision through the inter-war years and into the 1950s and 60s, meant that the ideology of imperialism was still being taught when the Empire had been disbanded (Mangan 1986b: 118-121). It was this vision of imperial purpose that was taught to public school children the very class who would go on to govern that empire (Cain & Hopkins 1993: 299), or indeed to be responsible for writing the history of the colonised areas. It was not only the public schools that promulgated colonialism, the textbooks and lessons in all classes of school were equally imbued with imperialism. The formation of military cadet forces, the patriotic songs, prayers, school visits to museums and exhibitions, and juvenile fiction all promoted the discourse of colonialism.

In school texts the Whig interpretation of history was still in vogue. History was portrayed as providing lessons from the past as countries progressed from savagery to civilisation (see Chapter 3). Difficult periods and complex incidents were glossed over in favour of a simplified view of the development of the British Empire and later the Commonwealth (MacKenzie 1984: 179-181). In 1927 the H.M.S.O _Handbook for Teachers_ asserted that children should not be ‘harassed’ by complicated issues. In honing down the essentials of history and geography to a series of stark and simple methods about ‘development’, ‘progress’, and racial superiority, teaching methods ensured that those historical figures whose careers could best be portrayed as a consistent drive on the route towards the world of the late nineteenth century would be highlighted:
It was this same congruence of simple thought (at least perceived as such) and direct action which suffused all juvenile literature and stories of heroes of the period. (MacKenzie 1984: 178).

This similarity is hardly surprising given that one of the most widely used school history texts was co-written by Rudyard Kipling (Fletcher & Kipling 1911). And many educationalists recommended pupils should read 'books of heroes' such as those produced by G.A. Henty, Conan Doyle, and G.W. Steevens, popular writers whose imperialist and patriotic philosophy echoed that of the more official texts (MacKenzie 1984: 181).

Historical accounts of India reflected this reading. European histories of India only began with its discovery and recognition by the western world an attitude voiced by Marx in the mid-nineteenth century and continued through the twentieth century. British control was presented as disinterested and parental, the British benevolently took on responsibility for India's health, education, sanitation, education and irrigation. All moral dilemmas and complexities such as the Indian Mutiny were simplified and the Indians presented as being solely to blame (Castle 1996: 24-5). Colonial India dominated the history books. The other colonies were given less space and even less respect. When Africa was discussed the inhabitants were portrayed as idle, useless, and torpid and no mention was made of the ancient civilisations of Africa (Castle 1996: 71). None of the North African countries such as Egypt or Tunisia were ever considered to be part of Africa, which allowed the writer to ignore the undeniable civilisations of Carthage or Pharonic Egypt. Instead, African history was reduced to discussions of the slave trade. This was again an explicitly biased version of history, British involvement was exculpated with the Africans being represented as both passive victims and aggressors (Castle 1996: 67).

Geography text books took a similar stance. Geography had always been a more popular area of study for school teachers and school children. It was regarded as more stimulating for the pupils since it concentrated on voyages of exploration, adventure and the ubiquitous 'great men'. Into this mix was added ecological determinism and Social Darwinism:

In Nelson's _The World and its Peoples_ (c. 1907) the African was described as 'an overgrown child, vain, self-indulgent, and fond of idleness. Life is so easy to him in his native home that he has never developed the qualities of
industry, self-denial, and forethought’. But it was not just Africans who were denigrated. Asia was described as a continent of dying nations rapidly falling back in civilisation, while the Chinese were ‘cruel and vengeful’, a people of dubious and unpleasant appearance. (MacKenzie 1984: 184).

Social Darwinism appeared most obviously in the descriptions of hunter-gatherer societies, such as the ‘bushmen’ of Southern Africa (MacKenzie 1984: 185 & see Gould 1984). Incorporated into the geographical texts was a quasi-legal or moral justification for depriving indigenous peoples of their countries, so the Aboriginal Australians were described by A.J. Herbotson as:

... the most miserable of men. They roamed nearly naked, and were ignorant of everything except the chase. The explanation of their degraded condition lies in the arid climate of Australia.... Their great poverty led them to practise vices like cannibalism and the murder of the sick and helpless. (Herbotson 1902 in MacKenzie 1984: 185).

These ‘vices’ were taken as evidence of the Aboriginal Australian’s being incapable of self-government and offered as justification for British interference. The moral justification then became entwined with economic justification as only industrial societies had control of the civilising force of trade (MacKenzie 1984: 185-6). This portrayal of Britain’s civilising economic supremacy was then externally reinforced by the work of the Empire Marketing Board, events such as the Wembley Empire Exhibition, and the representations used in product illustrations and advertising (see below). This judgment of the colonies by their economic abilities was also a useful way of persuading the working class pupils of Britain that their own lives were comparatively fortunate. How could they feel otherwise when repeatedly told that Indians lived on only ‘a handful of rice a day’? (MacKenzie 1984: 188). However, the main argument of these books was that the Empire was a self-contained, interdependent, unit, that had been created by British superiority and had to be maintained, by force if necessary.

Aside from the formal colonialism offered by school texts, Empire maps and other imperial ephemera decorating classroom walls, there were more informal educational activities reinforcing the message of imperialism. Mangan (1986a; 1986b: 121) has suggested that it was believed that the ‘colonising genius ’ of the English was a product of racial superiority which in turn came from the experience of playing team sports. This uniting of athleticism and militarism recurred in many of the songs composed for public schoolboys to sing, and poems such as Sir Henry Newbolt’s *Vitai Lampada*
1897. Even when the songs were less militaristic they played heavily on the benefits of colonialism for the British. Kipling’s alarmist poem *Big Steamers*, published in his and Fletcher’s history text (Fletcher & Kipling 1911) and later set to music by Elgar, became a staple of school concerts.

During the early twentieth century as education became more accessible to a wider section of society, this interpretation of empire filtered down the social scale. State schools were taught the connection between athleticism, militarism and empire. They too participated in ostentatious displays of imperial ideology, the singing of patriotic songs, drilling and marching, and forming battalions of volunteers (Mangan 1986b: 127-8; MacKenzie 1984: 5-6 & Roberts 1971). The most famous of these cadet corps was Baden Powell’s Boy Scouts. The Empire figured strongly in *Scouting for Boys* (1908) (Warren 1986: 232-253). The Scouts quickly became an international organisation and overseas scout troops were encouraged. Baden-Powell visited India, Australia, South Africa and other colonial outposts to meet up with scout groups, he spelt out his own version of the imperial message:

... it stands for team work of free young British nations growing up in different parts of the world in friendly comradeship of goodwill and cooperation. (Baden-Powell in Warren 1986: 232).

Warren (1986: 239-243) has argued that Baden-Powell’s imperialism and racism was far less pronounced than those involved in other youth movements. However, despite preaching against colour and class prejudice (Warren 1986: 239), Baden-Powell’s ideas reflected the dominant ideology of corporatism in domestic and imperial politics; eugenics; the need to settle the Empire with British emigrants; and scaremongering about the threat from Germany, Russia and Japan, as well as promoting racist, if simplistic physiognomy (MacKenzie 1984: 244). His ideas about the role of Girl Guides were extremely limited, young women could not become scouts, instead they were to be trained in their role and duty as wives and mothers (Warren 1986: 244-6: Dyhouse 1989). As MacKenzie points out, even if the multi-nationalism of the scouting movement is accepted, the ideas exported were hardly multi-cultural being upper class, white, Anglo-Saxon, imperial ideals (MacKenzie 1986: 248).

The Empire Day Movement was the invention of Reginald Brabazon, the 12th Earl of Meath. He began his campaign in 1896 for a formal celebration of all things Empire related, and chose the date of the 24th of May to commemorate Victoria’s birthday. The
Dominions responded favourably, quickly instituting public holidays (MacKenzie 1984: 231-4 and see figs. 4.4 & 4.5), but the British government resisted marking the day as a formal holiday until 1916. Once instituted Empire Day swiftly became a popular event in the school calendar; in 1905 6,000 schools throughout the Empire were said to have participated in Empire Day, this figure had risen to 80,000 by 1922. Empire Day was a far from innocent celebration. The doctrine was to build an imperial race through self-denial, discipline, subscription to duty and fealty to the state (Mangan 1986a: 132). This message was delivered through a series of symbolic and concrete acts: hoisting and saluting the Union flag; readings from Kipling; singing the national anthem. There might also be an Empire service, the performance of an Empire related play or pageant, a film or slide show, or a school concert with patriotic songs. By the 1930s booklets were being produced for the occasion, along with song sheets, badges, records, and postcards detailing the Empire’s produce and industries (figs. 4.6 & 4.7). The celebrations grew beyond schools, there were special Empire Day supplements in the national newspapers, special promotions of Empire products in the shops (fig. 4.8), and the BBC devoted a considerable amount of air-time to the event (Mackenzie 1986: 169-180; Mangan 1986a: 135).

Empire Day was an annual event, but there were other intermittent reminders of the imperial message throughout the school year. The 1902 education act made provision for schoolchildren, accompanied by teachers, to count visits to museums as an integral part of the curriculum. Although exhibitions were generally more popular than museum displays, museums presented themselves as serious educational facilitators whose appeal transcended class barriers:

Heaven-born Cadets are not the only Englishmen who are placed in authority over native races... There are Engine Drivers, Inspectors of Police... Civil Engineers of various denominations... to mention only a few whose sole opportunity of imbibing scientific knowledge is from the local museum of the town or city in which they have been brought up. (Museums Journal 1909 in Coombes 1994: 127).

Coombes (1994:126-7) has argued that the overt and covert message of museums was to promote national unity through colonialism. However, underlying many of the displays was an eugenic and social imperialist view of the world that placed the working classes in an inferior position, even if their place in the hierarchy was higher than that of ‘foreigners’.
The main focus of museums was presentation of the far away, often colonial, other (McClintock 1995: 40). This presentation classified other races in stereotypes of hunters and gatherers, pastoralists, lost civilisations, or warriors. Their material remains were displayed both as trophies consisting of the conquered loot of defeated peoples, and a simplistic summary of the entirety of that society (figs. 4.9 & 4.10). Museums were leading exponents of the ideology of colonialism. Africa in particular was presented as static and changeless or moving backwards, away from civilisation. The sensation generated by Benin bronzes demonstrated these beliefs. The artefacts were reported in the press and displayed by the museums either as the product of external settlers from the more ‘advanced’ areas of Portugal or Egypt, or as evidence of that the Benin peoples were once civilised but had now degenerated to their present lowly standard. As Coombes (1994: 43-63) has argued the use of such terms as ‘degraded’, ‘decay’, ‘degenerate’, ‘deterioration’ are a significant part of colonialism, they are words which serve to undermine past achievements and negate any suggestion of European levels of civilisation.

The Benin artefacts were seen as desirable art, but the Benin evidence did little to challenge the stereotypes of Africans. Anthropologists and museum curators behaved as if all Negroes were essentially alike, and therefore the traits of one group could be used to discuss the behaviour of another. Africans were predominantly presented in terms of their physicality, they were talked of as ‘childlike’, ‘simple’, and having brute strength without intellectual capacity. Discussion of Africans often used their skulls as a starting point, and words such as ‘infantile’ ‘foetal’ and ‘paedomorphic’ were common. Dubow (1995) has stressed that these terms had evolutionist and moral connotations. Workers such as Raymond Dart used anatomical description to illustrate behaviour (Dubow 1995: 32). This conflation of corporality and intellect underlay the museum displays where photographs of indigenous people, their skeletons and skulls, or casts of their faces and bodies, were incorporated in display cases with examples of their material culture (Edwards 2001).

Such exhibits were likely to greet any visitor to any museum. There was a uniformity to these displays since there was extensive contact between the curatorial staff of the different museums both nationally and internationally. The exchanges may have been
framed competitively, especially the international ones, but they were also mutually supportive, which ensured a similarity of display and a reinforcement of the message through repetition (Coombes 1994: 110-111 and see Stocking 1985). The Pitt Rivers museum as one of the leading anthropological museum was recommended and used as a model for many other museums. Pitt Rivers had based the arrangement on that of the Natural History Museum, presenting an evolutionary 'Natural History and Phylogeny of the various arts and industries of mankind' (Balfour 1893 in Coombes 1994: 119). This evolutionary approach was praised as complimenting the displays and extensively copied (Edwards 2001: 65-6). And, as Coombes (1994: 118-119) has suggested at the same time this classificatory system reinforced imperial ideology.

By the Edwardian period this evolutionary approach was falling out of favour with academic anthropologists and ethnographers, but museum displays once arranged tended to remain unchanged for many years. And, as involved observers the public read meanings into the displays that had not necessarily been intended by the organisers (Coombes 1994: 120-11). It was not only the arrangement of ethnographic and archaeological displays which inculcated imperialism, their very existence reinforced colonialism. Coombes (1994: 193) has discussed how at the Franco-British exhibition held in London in 1908 the French presented themselves as the discovers and protectors of Tunisian heritage and history with their excavations at Carthage and other Roman sites. But, every British museum display of Greek, Egyptian, Moghul or Assyrian artefacts had the same effect. In each and every instance the implication was that archaeologists were rescuing the past, that without colonial rule such treasures would be lost. And, museum displays replicated the imperial act of exploration and discovery, as Pratt has pointed out the discovery has no existence of its own:

> It only gets 'made' for real after the traveler (or other survivor) returns home and brings it into being through texts: a name on a map, a report to the Royal Geographical Society, the Foreign Office, the London Mission Society, a diary, a lecture, a travel book. (Pratt 1992: 204).

Until a culture, tribe, or race have been defined through publication or a presentation of select pieces of their material culture they have no existence for the metropole. Whether these messages were made clear to the museum visitor, child or adult, made explicit by the curators and teachers is questionable. But, without doubt museums, as much as other media presented a coherent imperialist narrative that sanctioned, if not promoted colonialism.
Exhibitions

The 1851 Great Exhibition prompted a series of similar events in Europe and North America, which continued intermittently for the next century. While these exhibitions were instituted primarily as showcases of economic display, other imperialist messages were incorporated. Imperialism was portrayed as selflessness, these degenerate pitiful wretches were being rescued from a life of animal misery by their colonial conquerors (Greenhalgh 1988: 84; MacKenzie 1984: 116). Alternatively, and often simultaneously, the imperialism on display showed the wealth of the colonised nation which again could be viewed with national pride. Both elements of this justification were applied to the British annexation of India:

... we must realise, even if we have no more than a little imagination, how ceaselessly Britain has wrought for India, how much has been accomplished, how much remains yet to do... To understand the resources and variety of India as set out in the Pavilion, and to grasp the part Great Britain has played in developing one and unifying the other, is to understand why the title of King Emperor is the first of all titles throughout the world. (British Empire Exhibition 1924, Official Guide in Greenhalgh 1988: 61-2).

The first ‘human showcase’ went on display at the Paris Exposition Universelle in 1889 (Greenhalgh 1988: 88), and set the tone for the next fifty years. Groups of people from the colonies, usually Africa, Ceylon or Malaysia, were shipped over to Europe or North America to live in supposed replicas of their villages and re-create supposed replicas of their every-day lives. But, at the same time these displays illustrated contemporary and continuing ideas of social Darwinism and evolution. The western races were at the apex of progress and development, they were represented by pavilions full of manufactured items stressing civilisation and progress. Aborigines and Africans were at the bottom, and displayed for entertainment in ‘rude’ huts with few material objects. The Indo-Eurasians occupied the intervening levels, they had their goods displayed for them by their colonial masters and provided the exotic, but safe, element in these shows.

These tableau-vivant were enormously popular with the press and public who accepted that they were accurate representations of tribal life. Again like museum displays, one African could stand in for any other inhabitant of that continent, regardless of their actual lifestyle or geographical location (Coombes 1994: 90 & Greenhalgh 1988: 82-109). Zulus could be played by Senegalese or Matabeles and vice versa. Nor did the
exhibitors feel obliged to give full and accurate descriptions of the consequences of colonialism of those exhibited. The Coronation Exhibition of 1911 organised by Imre Kiralfy at White City included a Maori Village, the *Official Daily Programme* provided a history of the Maoris but said nothing about the genocide of those who resisted the imperial domination of their own country (Greenhalgh 1988: 93-4).

Misgivings were occasionally expressed by the press or public about these human exhibitions. Opposition to the *Savage South Africa* exhibition at Earl's Court in 1899 came from South African leaders, the London *Star*, the Aborigines Protection Society, as well as Joseph Chamberlain but the exhibition went ahead (Shephard 1986: 97). The reasons for their opposition ranged from the humanitarian to a fear of African sexuality (ibid & Greenhalgh 1988: 92) yet it was not until the Prince Lobengula furore that the general press turned against the show, and this was only a temporary revulsion, later exhibitions continued to display humanity as a product. However, the intensity of the reaction caused by the possibility of marriage between a black African and a white British woman revealed a deep fear of miscegenation (Shephard 1986:101-3; Coombes 1994: 91-3). Yet, even without the scandal of miscegenation the inhabitants of the human showcases were sexualised by the viewer. Physical prowess was seen as a naturalised precondition of blackness (Coombes 1994: 207). And, Black African men were talked about in sexually explicit terms prior to 1899, although after the Lobengula debacle sculptural analogy was used as ‘a safe way of maintaining the requisite distance between viewed and viewer’ (Coombes 1994: 205). Black women were constantly subject to lascivious interest masquerading as scholarship. The Benin bronzes again serve as an example, Coombes recorded that African women were displayed naked in the publicity which went with the reports about the artefacts. However much the articles might pretend to be scientific and objective the illustrations were both voyeuristic and reminiscent of the collector’s ‘trophy’ display (Coombes 1994: 12-13). This voyeurism was again noticeable in advertising and other ephemera (see below) and at the exhibitions it was the dancing girls, waitresses, and village women who elicited the most coverage by the male journalists (Greenhalgh 1988: 82-109).

The British Empire Exhibition at Wembley in 1924/5 continued the tradition of human showcases. The Gold Coast Pavilion featured ‘native’ drummers, and in the ‘Ashanti Court’ visitors could watch pots being made and diamonds being washed. The South
African pavilion also featured diamond processing with the De Beers Company display showing the washing, cutting, and polishing of gems. British Guiana shared a pavilion with the West Indies, here visitors could watch five live-in ‘native villagers’ as they went about their daily lives of weaving cotton and tending their animals (Knight & Sabey 1984: 116). The final pre-war empire exhibition took place at Glasgow in 1938. Pavilions were dedicated, as ever to technology and industry, but the armed forces pavilions indicated the awareness of the coming war, as did the presence of a Peace Pavilion. At Glasgow, as at the other British exhibitions, the major white dominions had their own pavilions and houses concentrating on trade and emigration. By contrast the non-white Colonies were grouped together in the Colonial Court:

First the ‘lesser’ territories were to be seen as a single concern, a grouped resource fused together as an economic unit with Britain as the common factor to link them. Despite their very different geographic locations and traditions, they were fused into the proverbial ‘over there’, with Britain at the centre of their world focus. Second, Britain was depicted as being in close physical proximity to its possessions in order to make them ‘feel’ British in popular consciousness. The message to the average British person visiting Colonial Court was clear, ‘this is yours, see how naturally it fits into your way of life.’ (Greenhalgh 1988: 63).

But, it was the ‘native’ showcases which again provided entertainment and voyeurism masquerading as instruction. This continuation of placing indigenous people on display, often to illustrate their ‘savagery’ their distance from civilised Britons, shows how entrenched colonialism and imperialism was between the wars. It might have been obvious to politicians by 1938 that the Empire could not continue, but the regular celebration of imperialism kept this fact from the general public.

*Juvenile literature.*

The Victorian and Edwardian era saw a boom in children’s literature, the increase in literacy allied to cheaper printing and paper costs created a whole new genre. Children’s fiction was seen as an ideal medium for transmitting imperial ideology and middle-class values palatably to the newly literate classes. Kipling was the prime expositor of fiction as training in imperialism (Bratton 1986: 81). In *Puck of Pook’s Hill* (1905) and *Rewards and Fairies* (1911) Kipling used the Roman and Norman governments of Britain to present a chivalric code of conduct for young empire builders and followers. His ideas presented the ‘idea of empire as an obligation of caste and a responsibility not just to country but to home’ (Bratton 1986: 81). Henty similarly
presented his message through historical novels, although his was a more violent doctrine. In *St George for England* (1885) the reader was told that 'fighting and bloodshed' with 'determination and enthusiasm' were essential virtues (Bratton 1986: 82). Throughout Kipling and Henty's work, and the work of other writers such as Charles Reade, J. G. Edgar, and Eleanor Bulley, the reader was shown an idyllic picture of rural England. It was for this rural idyll that the empire has been created, to spread these English values abroad, and to protect the pastoral haven of English life (Bratton 1986: 86-92). These books continued to be popular long after their original publication, Christopher Hawkes (1989: 47) remarked 'It was southern England's scenes, and reading Kipling on its past, that led me to history'. By stressing that it was possible to change one's personal circumstances by self-help, all the literate British classes could feel themselves to be included in this notion of Englishness and the attendant imperialism this nationalism included (Bratton 1986: 83-4). In stories which included colonial characters:

... the 'alien' played a key role in questions of identity and status, as the young Briton differentiated him- or herself from the wider world. Securing youth into the imperial ethos involved both positive identification with Britishness and a distancing from the undesirable 'other'. (Castle 1996: 8).

At the same time it was necessary to render the colonies and the colonised safe for British children, so the hero always won despite the odds, and colonial acolytes were isolated individuals owing their allegiance to the British rather than their native country.

Given that India dominated the history books the number of Indian characters in children's fiction was remarkably low. A stock character of boys school stories was the cricket playing Indian prince who spoke an ornate version of English. Occasionally the plot would feature an Indian villain or hero's assistant. The villainous Indian was regularly portrayed as an educated nationalist (Castle 1996: 55). The hero's native assistant could only be played by an Anglophile Indian who had entirely rejected his own culture and family to embrace Anglo-Saxon virtues. But even the 'good' Indian was never entirely accepted, and both 'good' and 'bad' Indians were represented as effeminate (Castle 1996: 47-8 & see Chubb 2001: 83 on Quftis). The only exceptions were the Sikhs or Gurkhas, who like the Zulus, were admired for their perceived war-like nature (see note v).
In contrast to the history books there were a great number of African characters in children’s books. But, again they were subjected to crude stereotyping. The ‘good’ African could be portrayed as dignified and knowledgeable, but only about esoteric bush lore, and only if he was demonstrably loyal to the British. The ‘bad’ African was always depicted as a cruel slaver (Castle 1996: 105-6). Africans could be of service to whites but they were always ultimately and demonstrably inferior (Castle 1996: 86). For Africans, like the other non-white peoples, racial characteristics were interchangeable with socially and culturally determined behaviour. The African was presented as ‘a specimen’ of the natural world, a dehumanising and alienating perspective’ (Castle 1996: 91). ‘Factual’ articles on Africa were equally iniquitous. The New Empire Annual begun in the 1930s included an article on Mysterious Zimbabwe dealing with the ruins. Despite the work done by Randall McIver in 1906 and Gertrude Caton-Thompson in 1929 which had demonstrated a mediaeval African provenance for the ruins, the author asserted the monument was 3,000 years old, could not have been built by black Africans preferring to link it’s construction to Rider Haggard’s fictional King Solomon’s Mines (1885) and She (1887) (MacKenzie 1984: 223).

Africa was seen as easier to mediate than India, there was no fear of mutiny, no underlying unease about Africans. They were seen as ‘simpler’ imperial inhabitants. The British in Africa had a moral imperative, the Africans were doomed barbarians who had to be sacrificed to the march of civilisation in the name of social Darwinism (Castle 1996: 113-4). Christianity, violence, paternalism and middle-class values were the key elements to stories about Africa and Africans. But such tales were also used to show British children that although ‘savagery’ might be appealing in a child, they would have to put aside such behaviour when they grew up and took their rightful place in the running of the empire. Something the African in their congenitally child-like state would be unable to do (Castle 1996: 114-5). Stories of Africa were therefore intended as lessons in imperialism and acceptable behaviour.

Literary and Popular Culture

As Said has demonstrated, so much of the revered literary output of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries enshrined colonial attitudes to the other. Orientalism, he argued, has a history, a tradition, it is more than an idea, it is a place, but it is a constructed arena
and it has a relationship with the Occident which is ‘a relationship of power, of domination, of varying degrees of complex hegemony’ (Said 1995: 5).

The Orient was Orientalized not only because it was discovered to be “Oriental” in all those ways considered commonplace by an average nineteenth-century European, but also because it could be – that is, submitted to being - made Oriental. There is very little consent to be found, for example, in the fact that Flaubert’s encounter with an Egyptian courtesan produced a widely influential model of the Oriental woman; she never spoke of herself, she never represented her emotions, presence, or history. He spoke for and represented her. He was foreign, comparatively wealthy, male, and these were historical facts of domination that allowed him not only to possess Kuchuk Hanem physically but to speak for her and tell his readers in what way she was “typically Oriental.” My argument is that Flaubert’s situation of strength in relation to Kuchuk Hanem was not an isolated instance. It fairly stands for the pattern of relative strength between East and West, and the discourse about the Orient that it enabled. (Said 1995: 5-6).

Away from high culture, popular culture reinforced the message of ownership, of speaking for the colonised:

For ordinary people, the Empire was the mythic landscape of romance and adventure. It was that quarter of the globe that was coloured red and included ‘Darkest Africa’ and ‘The Mysterious East’. It was in short ‘ours’... most people were not bothered about actual conditions in the Empire. It was the imagery they absorbed and endorsed and that imagery was romantic, adventurous and exotic. (Richards 1986: 143-4).

These elements of adventure and imperialism come through strongly in the films of the 20s and 30s. The propaganda possibilities of film had been explored before and during the Great War. ‘Factual’ anthropological films such as Fred Nottage’s from North Western Rhodesia (1913), and Major Shomburgh’s footage of West Africa in (1914) stressed the civilising mission of imperial rule. This style of film, often made by the GPO or the Empire Marketing Board and distributed to schools and clubs, continued to flourish during the inter-war years. But, it was the box office hits which provided the most popular portrayal of empire. Alexander Korda and Michael Balcon were the most noted producers of British adventure films with imperialist overtones. Korda’s trilogy Sanders of the River (1935), The Drum (1938), The Four Feathers (1939), and Balcon’s Rhodes of Africa (1936), The Great Barrier (1936), and King Solomon’s Mines (1937) replicated boys’ adventure stories. They reproduced the racial stereotypes, as well as themes of militarism, athleticism, and imperialism constructed as self-sacrifice, honour and duty (MacKenzie 1984: 89 & Richards 1986: 146-152). But, as Richards (1986: 150) has argued Hollywood films such as Clive of India (1935) and
Lives of a Bengal Lancer (1935) echoed this view of the British empire and presented 'British rule as timeless and eternal'. There was very little dissent from the image of empire produced in these films (Richards 1986: 151-2). The British Board of Film Censors followed a self-imposed code which prohibited films which criticised the British army, British colonial administration, or the 'white race' and ensured there would be no films that critically questioned British imperialism (Richards 1986: 153).

The areas so far discussed have all reflected the extent to which British society was imbued with imperialism, and justifications of empire, but they were all areas where the public had some choice as to whether or not they participated. There was no compulsion to visit the Glasgow or Wembley exhibitions, to read the books, and view the films, even education offered an element of choice. But the British were also bombarded with images of empire, images they couldn't avoid, since imperialism dominated advertising, product packaging and other ephemera.

Advertising, whether by the government sponsored Empire Marketing Board (EMB), or private companies, consistently used imperial imagery to sell their products. The EMB was established by the Department of Overseas Trade as part of the 'Buy British' campaign designed to combat the post-war economic slump. Launched with the slogan 'Buy Empire Goods from Home and Overseas' the board produced and distributed films, promoted research, promoted Empire goods through special offers, discounts, and events at the Empire Stores, and supplied schools with the materials to teach about empire trade and economy (Constantine 1984 and see fig. 4.8). The board also produced hundreds of advertising posters, and in each case the ideology of colonialism is inscribed in the art. The poster Jungles Today are Goldmines Tomorrow (fig. 4.11) is a particularly telling example as the slogans and image made clear, there were moral as well as material advantages to this exchange.

These posters, and others produced for the EMB (see figs. 4.12 & 4.13), would have competed successfully with those produced by private companies (fig. 4.14). The style was very similar, bright colours, simple figures and a clear message. The only difference was that in the majority of EMB posters the people were pictured at work, or holding the results of their labour, whereas those using white people featured decorative men and women at their leisure. The travel poster Tour South Africa (fig. 4.15) with the
black workers in the fields and the white people leisurely driving past made clear the idea that the colonies worked for the metropole, black worked for white, as well as inscribing the idea of primitive versus civilised, manual work versus advanced technology.

This relationship was acted out in a number of advertisements, or imperialism was evoked by the use of images of John Bull, Queen Victoria, the Union Jack, and the British lion. Soap advertising took a different approach. Pears and Gossages in particular played with the idea that soap could wash away blackness, here constructed as dirt, degradation and primitiveness, that cleanliness brought civilisation (figs 4.16 & 4.17). The irony, or hypocrisy, of this image is that the main ingredient of soap, palm oil, came from the tropics (McClintock 1995: 207-231). The colonies exported raw produce which was manufactured by the metropole into articles that were then used to further entrench colonialism and colonialist understandings (MacKenzie 1984: 16).

Companies also used ‘free’ gifts to sell their products, Lever Brothers, Lipton’s, Fry’s and Cadbury’s issued postcards that advertised their goods, but also showed the chain of production from raw colonial export to finished product, manufactured by the workers at Port Sunlight or Bournville (MacKenzie 1984: 22). Postcards, like cigarette cards, were issued as series, regiments, armaments, and naval ships were popular themes. Missionary societies produced picture postcards of ‘primitive’, ‘superstitious’ people to secure financial and moral support for their work (fig. 4.18), as did the Empire Marketing Board. Cigarette cards were given away, not just with tobacco but with confectionery, packets of tea, and in children’s magazines. They too reflected imperial themes, military heroes, ‘builders of empire’, empire transport, and flags of empire were frequent series motifs alongside cinema stars and famous cricketers. As well as these trifles and special packaging or printed tins, many firms gave away more substantial gifts, plates, vases, and pictures with imperial subjects that commemorated the Wembley exhibition, Empire Day or royal occasions (figs. 4.19 & 4.20). The cards, with their imperial stamps, the free gifts, the packaging, and other advertising ephemera were freely accepted into people’s homes, and all of these products embodied the discourse of imperialism.
3.3 Women

Introduction

In fighting for enfranchisement, suffragists sought no less than the total transformation of the lives of women. They set out to redefine and recreate, by political means, the sexual culture of Britain. (Kent 1990b: 3).

As several feminists have discussed, the category of ‘woman’ is not easy to define (Riley 1988: Scott 1986: Butler 1990: Purvis 1995), it is a fluid reading that is dependant on the social and historical context of those discussed and those doing the naming and describing. Of course this has not prevented dogmatic statements being made. There have always been competing prescriptive constructions of what women are, what they can do, and what they should do. A wide range of commentators including government administrators, medical practitioners, religious officials, poets, authors have all felt the need to contribute, often conflictingly, to the debate. Yet, even where consensus has been reached there are often internal inconsistencies in definitions of desirable womanhood that have further complicated the issue. Nor have these understandings been accepted by women themselves. Their voices are harder to hear but resistance through direct action, political lobbying and a multitude of re-writings have figured in the history of ‘women’ xii. All of which complicates any attempt to write about women in any particular time or place.

Yet these complications have been overlooked by many, male, historians who have argued that that the incremental gains women made over the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries resulted in the total emancipation of all women by the 20s and 30s. Looking at the legal changes to the status of women, their increased access to employment and education, historians have declared that:

... women's participation in the war effort brought considerable social, economic, and political gains ... the increased sense of their own capacity, increased self-confidence on the part of women themselves: and, on the other side, the total destruction of all the old arguments about women's proper place in the community ... Women also gained a measure of economic independence ... they had gained a new self reliance and new social freedoms. (Marwick 1974: 77).

But if we examine the ‘lived actuality’ of women’s lives a different picture emerges (Braybon 1981: 13-14). One that is less suggestive of constant progress, and instead suggests that women’s move to emancipation was neither smooth or steady and instead encompassed reversals and repeated fighting of the same battles. A more critical
reading would also suggest that despite new legislation removing legal barriers to women's education and employment, women as a category were still constructed in terms of domesticity, still understood as wives and mothers rather than autonomous individuals, and still only occasional participants rather than accepted co-inhabiters of the traditional male external public sphere.

The continuing designation of women solely as private, domestic, guardians of house and home is of interest to archaeology. It helps explain the position of women within the discipline and archaeological understandings of women in the past. In this section I want to demonstrate that although individual women might escape the externally enforced limitations of their gender this quasi-autonomy was not easily achieved, and even when women succeeded in their chosen field they were unable or unwilling to challenge gender stereotypes.

Women and the Consequences of War

If, as Marwick declared (1974: 74), the war revolutionised the position of women then one would expect to see a change in the pictorial representation of women on government posters during the First World War, or at least to see a significant difference between the images used in that war and those from the Second World War. Looking first at Great War iconography, the earliest government picture (fig. 4.21) showed British women in the archetypal feminine role of sending their menfolk to the front while they looked after the children and provided the inspiration for the soldiers to fight. They were passive figures, in need of protection, they had no active role, and when women did offer their services as doctors and ambulance drivers they were rebuffed by government officials (Tickner 1987: 230-4).

As the war continued and escalated the government realised they needed women workers in the hospitals and factories and recruitment posters appeared accordingly (figs. 4.22 & 4.23). Of itself this would appear to be a major reversal of thinking and one would expect some acknowledgement of the active role women could now play, especially when, after 1917, the military agreed to recruit women workers (figs. 4.24 & 4.25). Yet there is a marked similarity between these posters and figure 4.21, a similarity that does not suggest a changed perception in understandings of women. In all these posters the femininity of the subject was stressed. In the recruitment posters
the long, impractical, skirts, the averted gaze and the empty hands stressed the passivity of these women. Just as in figure 4.21 they were not threatening and, despite their very existence being an obvious reference to the war, there was nothing martial in their appearance no hint of the reality of these women's work.

If we assume that Marwick's point was that after the Great War the construction of women changed then the similarity of these pictures is understandable, but one would then expect a marked change by the time Second World War recruiting posters appeared (figs. 4.26 & 4.27). Superficially, there does appear to be a difference, but it was a change in fashion not understanding, despite the shorter skirts, fitted jackets and shorter hair these were still passive pictures of women. Even in figure 4.28 there was little to connect these women with the realities of war (fig. 4.29). Women could be life givers, they could care for children (fig. 4.30), but they could not be shown as in any way responsible for death and destruction. These Second World War women were more active inhibitors of their pictorial space but these were still disingenuous portrayals of women's war-time role, and they still stressed the femininity of women war workers. So, by either understanding of Marwick's assertion the pictorial evidence contradicts his statement.

Nor was this the only evidence that the war did little to change women's status, either for the duration of the war or in the post-war period. Marwick, following contemporary commentators such as Yates (1918) saw women's war-time work as novel and revolutionary. But, as Braybon (1981: 47-8) has demonstrated, 70% of women war-time workers had been employed in some form previous to the war, mainly as domestic servants or producing luxury items that were discontinued during war-time. Since the Industrial Revolution women had been employed in factory work, concentrated in areas demanding repetitive tasks to which they were seen as uniquely suited (Summerfield 1984: 10). The social stratifications in place before the war continued during the war and into the post-war period (Braybon & Summerfield 1987: 197-8). The difference was that in war-time women became visible, they were working in shops, banks, offices, taking over family businesses, working on public transport rather than in the invisible service industries (Braybon & Summerfield 1987: 34 and see Curle in section 7.8.2 below).
The public gratitude in response to women's war-time effort was equally ambivalent. The newspapers praised their work, but in a patronising style (Strachey 1928: 344 and see Braybon 1981: 154-168). Perhaps unsurprisingly in both wars there was hostility from the conscripted men who were being replaced by women. They were, after all, leaving relatively safe jobs for the uncertainties of life as a soldier. Vandalism of the machinery was a common occurrence, so too was the refusal to train the incoming women and the unions ignored complaints of harassment (Summerfield 1984: 155-179). But the opposition went deeper. The unions only agreed to accept women's dilution of the workforce on the understanding that the women would be sacked as soon as the men returned. Nor did the unions support women worker's campaigns for equal pay, rather they assisted in the re-designation of jobs so that a skilled male worker would be replaced by two or three women (Braybon 1981: 60-82). Even in death women were not deemed as valuable as men. As late as the Second World War it took a major campaign to pressurise the government into paying women the same rates of compensation (Braybon & Summerfield 1987: 183).

If the Great War revolutionised the way women were viewed one would expect the immediate mobilisation of women on the outbreak of the Second World War. Again, this did not happen. It took a cross-party committee of women MPs to force the introduction of conscription for women in 1941 (Summerfield 1984: 44; Braybon & Summerfield 1987: 159-62). In neither war was provision made for the double burden of home and work that women had to juggle (Summerfield 1984: 37-43). When absenteeism resulted employers blamed the women workers rather than the unsuccessful system. The reputation of women workers suffered, they were seen as selfish and unpatriotic (Summerfield 1984: 99-119), which in turn did little to help the status of women workers, and did much to ensure that these women lost their jobs when the men returned (Smith 1986: 221).

Similarly, if the Great War revolutionised women's status one would expect women to be employed in non-traditional areas in the post-war period. Again, this didn't happen. After the Great War the main area of employment for women was again domestic work (Beddoe 1989: 48-88). Many were unwilling to return to domestic service (Braybon 1981: 13-14), but by 1931 35% of all working women were in domestic service, in 1911 the figure had been 39% (fig. 4.31). Rather than there being new employment
opportunities for women in the post-war period the number of women working actually went down below pre-war levels in the 1920s and 30s (fig. 4.32). This slump was due to a combination of factors, the economic downturn in industry, the rise of pro-natalism and particularly the backlash against women workers encouraged, if not initiated, by the media:

Public opinion, less than a year after the war, was calling these women limpets, and urging, in a slightly mixed metaphor, that they should be combed out. (Cole 1939: 106). I would follow Grayzel (1999) and argue that the portrayal of women on war memorials and women’s role in remembrance also illustrated that the Great War did nothing to question gender stereotypes and in fact probably strengthened the construction of woman as wife and mother. The majority of war memorials were simple crosses or portrayed soldiers, but a significant number used figures of women and these women were portrayed as mothers (Grayzel 1999: 230-36 and see fig. 4.33). It was suggested that there should be special mourning dress for the mothers of combatants, and that mothers should be allowed to wear their dead son’s medals (Grayzel 1999: 228). This sanctification of women as mothers was reinforced in remembrance services, those chosen to unveil the statues were often women who had lost sons or husbands in the trenches (ibid). Women’s war-time contribution was therefore rendered solely as the sacrifice of their sons, their only value was as the producers of sons and their only role was to mourn their death. Again this denied women any active role in war-time and ignored the multitude of roles women actually fulfilled (Grayzel 1999: 230-36).

Marwick also identified post-war legal changes as increasing the status of women. Yet, if we look more closely at how this legislation affected women we see problems with his thesis. The Representation of the People Act of 1918 was a surprising concession, not from the government but from the Suffrage Societies. Prior to 1918 the Suffrage Societies had insisted that women should be enfranchised on the same terms as men, yet here they supported a bill which gave all adult men the vote, lowered the age of majority to 19 for men who had served in the war, yet extended the franchise only to women over the age of 30 who could fulfil certain requirements. Although this limited enfranchisement has been construed as a reward for women’s war-time service (Marwick 1974: 77; Murray 1963: 173) it was noted at the time, and subsequently, that the very women who had been most involved in the war were prevented from voting in
elections (Cole 1939: 103; Graves & Hodge 1963: 20-1). It seems likely this was a conscious decision to prevent the number of women voters outnumbering male ones (Kent 1993: 92) and to limit the franchise to women who were more likely to be wives and mothers (Pugh 1990: 160). It took another decade of campaigning before women were enfranchised on the same terms as men. And even with equal franchise no political party was prepared to whole-heartedly support women candidates for parliamentary seats (fig. 4.34). Women were technically equally enfranchised citizens but in actuality they were still inferior subjects.

The Sex Discrimination (Removal) Act of 1919 illustrates that laws do not necessarily change conditions. The Act theoretically made it illegal for women to be discriminated against on the grounds of their sex. This had the effect of forcing the Civil Service and the legal profession to end their exclusion of women candidates. Little else changed. The law did nothing to address the question of equal pay for equal work, in all areas women were paid at best two thirds of the wage men received and often were paid substantially less than this (Braybon 1981: 100-109 & Smith 1986: 217). Nor did entry to previously closed professions ensure that women could follow the same career paths as men (Summerfield 1984: 12; Graves & Hodge 1963: 46). The Act did have the effect of forcing previously closed societies to open their membership to women. This was not always done graciously, or whole-heartedly (Roberts 1995). The University of Oxford finally allowed women to graduate from the university in 1920 (Brittain 1960: 171-2). Other organisations, such as the University of Cambridge, argued they were outside the Act’s boundaries or that it was too unpopular to be enforced.

The post-war introduction of marriage bars on women in many of the professions, and particularly teaching, are an obvious example of sex discrimination, but as competition for work increased in the 20s challenges invoking the Act always failed (Dyhouse 1989: 77-79; Braybon & Summerfield 1987: 146). When Rhondda Urban District Council decided to dismiss their women teachers on marriage the women teachers took the council to court citing the Sex Discrimination Removal Act, only to be told that the act ensured that marriage didn’t disqualify women from employment, rather than saying married women were necessarily entitled to employment (Smith 1990: 52-3). And this interpretation of the law seems also to have been used by the Government in deciding benefit levels, women’s unemployment benefit was paid at lower level than
men's, it was reduced after three months unemployment and cut completely after six, or if women were offered but refused domestic work (Braybon & Summerfield 1987: 123-5). In 1922 the government ceased the dole for married women unless the entire family income came to less than 10s a week (Braybon & Summerfield 1987: 127). The Job creation schemes in the post-war economic slump were aimed at men, not women, it was expected that women could simply retire from the work force and be supported by their men-folk. And, in a final piece of manifest unfairness the press blamed women for the lack of jobs for men, rather than the economic situation (Braybon 1981 173-193). The trade unions provided little help and were more concerned with protecting the male workers and continuing to exclude women from ‘male’ tradesXIII (Pugh 1991: 100). In many cases rather than removing discrimination the 1919 law seems to have institutionalised it by providing a mechanism of exceptions. Had the act genuinely altered women’s subordinate status there would have been no need, or no opposition to, the failed Married Women’s Employment Bill of 1927 (Pugh 1991: 90-3) and the Equal Citizenship Bill of 1944 (Smith 1986: 224).

If we move away from war and legal changes and into the area of discourse then we see further refutation of Marwick’s thesis. Such ephemera as changing fashions have been used as evidence of women’s emancipation (Marwick 1974: 77). Post-war clothes for women were less restrictive and made of lighter fabrics, but at the same time that clothes became lighter the cosmetic industry boomed and women were expected to look pretty at all times (Kent 1990b: 225). Women’s ‘proper place’ in the 1920s and 30s was still seen as the home and family, and like her nineteenth-century counterpart, she was expected to look attractive for her husband, and to please him in any way she could. It is this construction of gender that was emphasised in all aspects of inter-war society. The post-war magazines all promoted domesticity and marriage as the best career for a woman (Pugh 1990: 151). Their entire stance was how to acquire and keep a husband. When the divorce reforms were discussed in Woman’s Own readers were urged not to divorce unfaithful husbands ‘a bad husband is better than no husband’ (Woman’s Own 1934 in Pugh 1990: 151).

A New Kind of Feminism

With the enfranchisement of women, the suffrage societies moved from equality feminism to celebrating domesticity. The National Union of Women’s Suffrage
Societies (NUWSS) had become the National Union of Societies for Equal Citizenship (NUSEC) in 1919, but the view of equal citizenship that was espoused had little to do with the equality feminism of pre-war days:

Not the rights of women, but the needs of women as mothers backed feminist appeals now'. (Kent 1993: 118).

In 1925 Eleanor Rathbone gave her NUSEC Presidential Address in which she talked of the need to change the social structure and relocate society’s resources to mothers (Banks 1981: 167). Despite opposition amongst NUSEC members this reading of all women as potential mothers in need of protective legislation became the understanding of women, supported by the Labour Party and the Women’s Trade Union. In 1927 Lady Rhondda and friends founded the Open Door Council promoting equal rights which was denounced by NUSEC and the Women’s Trades Union conference (Banks 1981: 170). In 1928 NUSEC divided into the Townswomen’s Guild, which prospered, and the National Council for Equal Rights, which did not. The Townswomen’s Guild’s aims, like those of the enormously successful Women’s Institute, were firmly centred on ‘women’s issues’ and they opposed any connection with the feminist organisations (Pugh 1990: 148). As Pugh (1990: 152) has pointed out, this caused problems for feminists, if they tried to lift women’s aspirations then they were accused of disparaging the housewife, if they concentrated on the housewife broader change was swallowed up in the ideology of domesticity. It was argued that if home-making was raised to an art-form, or a science, then women’s status as guardians of the home, possessors of that science, would also be raised. However, as motherhood became a science career women became more firmly trapped in the domestic role. They became less important as people and were completely subsumed in this idea of family (D’Cruze 1995: 76-7). And, women’s subordinate standing relied less on what she actually did than on her gender (Higonnet & Higonnet 1987: 5-6 & 35-6).

What women do is inevitably devalued to highlight men’s privileged position, the situation of women can change but the relationship does not. (Higonnet & Higonnet 1987: 5-6).

Riley (1988: 59) and Kent (1990b: 222) have suggested that as the European situation became increasingly unstable British feminists were ashamed to demand further concessions when other 'more important' issues were at stake. Political threats were represented in terms of gender, war equalled sexual disorder and therefore peace was shown by a return to ‘traditional’ gender relationships. Fascists and Nazis argued for a
return to ‘order’ which they understood in terms of gender. Anti-Semitism was also rendered in gender terms by the Nazis, the Aryans were strongly masculine, whereas the Jews were effeminate, homosexual, so feminisation was used as a way of excluding and marginalising peoples (Scott 1987: 27 and see Chubb 2001: 83). With these disturbing developments threatening all of Europe it is unsurprising that British equal rights feminists had their numbers eroded by other calls on their time from the League of Nations, the Peace Union and the need to offer a safe haven for refugees. The Peace Union also used the understanding of women as passive, peace-loving and life-giving, in their arguments against war. Men were constructed as war-mongers whose innate violence had to be contained (Kent 1993: 99-101 & 114). Even amongst equality feminists there was an understanding of women’s special nurturing qualities and previously equal rights feminists such as Maude Royden and Helena Swanwick, and to a degree Vera Brittain, began to argue for women’s role as natural peace keepers (Kent 1993: 126).

However, it is difficult to see where else inter-war feminism could have gone. Had the old-style equality feminists succeeding in recruiting new members it is possible that some headway might have been made, but their unpopularity and the lack of external support meant that as far as feminism survived into the 1930s it survived as new style feminism. It is undeniable that this reading of women found, or created, widespread appeal. Women’s magazines proliferated after the war, women were seen as a market to be exploited, and the majority of these magazines were not remotely feminist (Pugh 1991: 43). Whether aimed at the upper, middle or working classes magazines emphasised women’s role within the family, carrying articles on children’s health, beautifying tips for the home, and they all took the line marriage was ‘the best job of all’ (White 1970: 101-2: Giles 1995 & Tinkler 1995). And, within that marriage the ultimate intent was children. Obviously this celebration of domesticity was an ideal way of creating a market for the women’s magazines and for selling advertising space to the producers of domestic equipment, but the magazine editors complained that they lost sales if they wrote about social problems, the economy or European situation (Pugh 1990: 153). Whether this is true, and whether this justifies the blatant manipulation they employed, is debatable:

The tide of progress which leaves woman with the vote in her hand and scarcely any clothes upon her back is ebbing, and the sex is returning to the
deep, very deep sea of femininity from which her newly-acquired power can be more effectively wielded. (*Woman’s Life* 1920 in White 1970: 99).

All the mainstream political parties were happy to collude with this reading of women. The WSPU had discovered before the war that the Labour Party and Independent Labour Party were more interested in socialism and the rights of man rather than feminism (Rowbotham 1973: 87-92). The unions supported their male workers, not their female ones (Rowbotham 1973: 128), just as they supported a family wage rather than family allowances paid to mothers (Pugh 1990: 159). Labour women might have had a different agenda, but they made little progress (Pugh 1991: 115). Indeed the Labour Party felt it was more important to stress its interest in welfare reforms rather than equality politics even when their literature was aimed at women (Hannam 1995: 236-7). The Conservative party, while anxious to secure women’s votes had a very clear idea of the Conservative woman, she was constructed as responsible, hard-headed and dedicated to empire (Hannam 1995: 236). The Conservatives pointed out the:

> ... male culture of Labour and trade union politics in its attempts to appeal to the good sense of home-centred working-class women. (Hannam 1995: 236).

But despite this critique the Conservative party was equally sure that women’s sphere was the domestic one:

> We men value you for the soundness of the home ties which you maintain. Keep our homes for us. (Conservative candidate 1922 in Pugh 1991: 114).

And the Liberal party also followed this approach:

> Men make houses but Women make Homes. (Liberal candidate 1923 in Pugh 1991: 115).

No political party was prepared to back feminist candidates (Pugh 1991: 176-9). This has prompted a lack of understanding from male historians, Pugh maintains that women candidates were not opposed unless they were seen as feminists (Pugh 1991: 189-190). Yet he also identifies the misogyny of the political parties, the press and other MPs (Pugh 1991: 190-92), which would suggest that women were aware of this exclusion and took pains to hide their sympathies. But the political parties were not even prepared to back women candidates in safe seats, unless the woman in question was the wife or widow of the previous incumbent. Viscountess Astor, in 1919, was the first woman to take a seat in the House of Commons. Lady Astor maintained she was standing as a stop-gap candidate while her husband tried to divest himself of his title. She was, she maintained, merely doing her ‘duty’ to her husband and Plymouth rather than
campaigning for herself (Pugh 1991: 173). However, Lady Astor remained an MP for over twenty years. Margaret Bondfield, one of the few Labour women to have the support of the unions, became the Minister of Labour in 1929 and therefore the first woman cabinet minister. But, throughout her campaigns for election she canvassed on issues of capital and labour with virtually no mention of women (Hannam 1995: 237 & Pugh 1991: 179). Even Ellen Wilkinson, long time member of the NUWSS, looked at women’s issues from a class rather than an overtly feminist perspective. Whereas, Dorothy Jewson in Norwich did highlight the need for legislation specifically aimed at women (Hannam 1995: 237) and she polled less and less at each election as she became more vocal on women’s issues and birth control, and finally left the Labour Party for the ILP (Pugh 1991: 188).

Women MPs never reached a significant number within the House of Commons before the Second World War (fig. 4.34). However, in the 20s these few parliamentary women were prepared to form cross-party connections with each other in order to get legislation enacted (Pugh 1991: 172; 198). It is noticeable that these women were only successful if the bills they introduced focussed on women, children or welfare issues. The Duchess of Atholl, as Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education, successfully introduced bills concerning women and children. However, when she addressed the big masculine political questions such as the war in Spain she was unsuccessful (ibid). In the 1930s this inter-party camaraderie broke down as a result of pressure from the political parties, particularly the Labour party, who demanded loyalty from their members (Horn 1995: 142 & Pugh 1991: 197-8). It would seem women candidates had a clear choice, they could disseminate feminism and fail to be selected, or they could follow party lines and have a faint chance of success. If elected they would find themselves in a tiny minority and could either ‘betray’ their party by forging links with other women and by trying to ensure women’s issues figured in the legislation, or they could ignore their sex and hope their party and supporters would do the same.

Education

Women’s education could also be read as encouraging the view of women as potential wives and mothers. The 1902 Education Act suggested that girls should receive a different education to boys and in 1905 'housewifery' became compulsory for all girls.
The whole intention was to train girls to be wives or domestic servants depending on their class (Hunt 1987: xi). At best a girl’s education was directed at preparing them for ‘filler’ jobs that would be abandoned as soon as they married (Giles 1995: 5). Nor did the experience of women teachers suggest there was any alternative possibility. Not only were women teachers sacked if they married but unmarried women teachers also came under attack. The National Association of Schoolmasters vilified women teachers and headmistresses arguing it was dangerous and wrong for boys to be taught solely by women or to have women head-teachers (Hunt 1987: xi). Since teaching was an area that had traditionally attracted women the expulsion of married women again raised the question of why spend money to educate women if ‘all’ they were going to do was marry and raise children (Dyhouse 1995: 247)\textsuperscript{xxv}. Women teachers and lecturers were paid less than their male counterparts, which in turn meant their resultant pensions were much lower (Dyhouse 1995: 149-51). Interestingly, Dyhouse (1995: 150-51) used Margaret Murray as an example of the poverty faced by women lecturers. As a junior lecturer in 1898 Miss Murray was paid £40 per annum, she was an Assistant Professor by 1937 and paid £450 p.a. but her pension when she retired was only £115 p.a. raised to £290 in the 1950’s. In 1960 Miss Murray was given a cheque from the Samuel Sharpe Fund to alleviate her poverty. Admittedly Miss Murray began her career later than most male lecturers, but the comparison between her penury on retirement and the Petries’ comfort is stark.

However, these were not the only problems women in education faced\textsuperscript{xxvi}. The women’s colleges were substantially poorer than the men’s colleges with insufficient income to increase accommodation (Brittain 1960: 236-7 and Woolf 1928). And, although Oxford allowed women to graduate from 1920, in 1927 the Hebdomadal Council passed a resolution that women students should be limited to one sixth of the total student body, and that there would be a moratorium on building new women’s colleges (Brittain 1960: 171-2). There were also fewer scholarships available to women to attend university, less money involved in women’s scholarships and fewer fellowships for women once they finished, (Dyhouse 1995: 149-51). By 1931 there were 13 women professors in England and Wales compared to 829 men, and 585 women lecturers and demonstrators to 3,103 men\textsuperscript{xxvii} (Dyhouse 1995: 138). It is also noticeable that the focus of research for women had changed. The end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth-century had seen a wealth of material on women and
work (Atkinson 1914: Black 1915: Hutchins 1911: Davies 1915: Reeves 1913) and the
historical position of women (Abram 1909: Caird 1897: Clark 1919: Eckenstein 1896:
Stopes 1894). Obviously this was in part linked to the suffrage movement, a re-
examination of the contemporary and historical role of women might indicate how
women’s emancipation had once been accepted (Stopes 1894) or how their
contemporary role meant women now deserved emancipation (Black 1915). In the post-
war period such research tailed off and the only major examination of women’s history
adopted a conservative ideological framework of analysis in line with the pro-natalist,
maternalist discourse of the 20s and 30s (Dyhouse 1989: 66). Alice Clark’s 1919 study
*Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century* had discussed women’s loss
of authority and status with the move to industrialisation, whereas Ivy Pinchbeck’s
*Women Workers and the Industrial Revolution, 1750 – 1850* (1930) celebrated industry
for domesticating women:

Now that the home was no longer a workshop, many women were able, for
the first time in the history of the industrial classes, to devote their energies
to the business of home-making and the care of their children, who stood to
benefit greatly by the changed home conditions. (Pinchbeck 1930: 307).

However, as Eileen Power discovered, even when radical critiques of male-dominated
history were written, her work was edited and altered before publication (Power 1926
& 1975).

The majority of historical enquiries moved away from examinations of specifically
women’s history to the more mainstream, masculine, areas of political and economic
history, while at the same time avoiding controversial issues that ‘nice’ women were
not supposed to know about. E.M. Butler was treated as a social outcast in 1920s
Newnham after her book on the writer Puckler-Muskau revealed his astonishing private
life; and Enid Starkie, in 1933 had her book on Baudelaire refused because of her
discussion of his sexual problems (Dyhouse 1995: 147-8). Chaperonage of women
students had disappeared with the war, but women students were expected to behave
carefully and not draw any hostile attention to their presence (Williams 1987:
Summerfield 1987: Dyhouse 1987: Dyhouse 1995). Neither students nor lecturers were
given the same licence as their male counterparts whether in academic enquiries or
simply social settings (Dyhouse 1995). It was not just the Oxbridge colleges which
practiced discrimination. Women academics were frequently prevented from taking a
full part in university culture and deciding university policy. The most recurrent form
of discrimination was the exclusion of women lecturers from the senior common rooms, women could invite male lecturers to lunch in their room but not vice versa (Murray 1963: 160; Vicinus 1985: 135). This effectively distanced women from informal discussions which generally became formal decisions about university policy (Dyhouse 1995: 151-53).

There were simply too few women in universities, as students and academics, to change the dominant masculine culture. Dyhouse (1995: 6-8) argued, that where women form a minority they are seen as tokens rather than individuals, their position is characterised by conflict and difficulty, they fear visibility and their presence underlines rather than undermines the dominant culture. It was certainly the case that women were unsuccessful in challenging the male dominated sphere of academia either as students or as staff. There were always fewer women students, fewer women lecturers, and they faced implicit and explicit discrimination from governing bodies and from the student unions up until the 1970s and 1980s (Dyhouse 1995). Dyhouse (1995: 223-229) has also suggested that women became so used to their segregation, that it became a naturalised state of affairs. The universities gave women an oases of women’s culture, a space for learning and support, and just as with women MPs, and women in the professions, women academics were prepared to accept their gendered construction and subordinate status in exchange for this limited and liminal space (Vicinus 1985: 152-162).

*Women and Sexology*

The construction of woman as wife and mother was encouraged by the post-war popularity of sexology and psychology. While it is questionable how many people actually read Freud, his ideas soon spread into general awareness (Vicinus 1990: 228; Murray 1963: 98 & see Allingham 1938). And, Marie Stopes’ popularity is easily demonstrated by the large quantity of books she sold (Stopes 1918; & 1928). There was however a world of difference between Dr Stopes’, admittedly bourgeois, celebration of sexual relationships, and the repressive understandings offered by Freud, Edward Carpenter, and Havelock Ellis. It was now argued that the enjoyment of sex, within marriage, was essential to the happiness of both sexes, but that enjoyment was constructed in different ways, all of which viewed maternity as the desired outcome for women. Freud and his followers such as Cynthia Playne argued against the belief in the
sexlessness of women while reinforcing the idea of anatomy as destiny (Playne 1931: 126; Kent 1993: 102-113). Kent (1993: 41-2) has suggested that the psychoanalytical theory of aggressive masculinity was equally detrimental to feminism. Havelock Ellis echoed this division of men and women into opposing roles, his construction of sexual relations were rendered in terms of capture and surrender (Jeffreys 1995: 200). This reading of women as passive, men as aggressive implicitly condoned sexual and physical violence. Ellis was enormously influential (Cook 1979; Jeffreys 1995: Vicinus 1990), he also viewed separate, gendered, spheres as ‘natural’. Men and women were biologically different, with different needs, and to argue against these natural divisions was ‘unbalanced’ ‘pathetic’ and ‘absurd’. Men needed sexual enjoyment from marriage and women should be forced to give this, while the ultimate aim of marriage for women was maternity. (Ellis 1946 in Jeffreys 1995: 202).

The battle for equal rights, as constructed by sexologists, had nothing to do with parity and justice but was simply the result of women’s frigidity (Jeffreys 1995: 203 and see Carpenter 1914 and Gallichan 1929). If a woman completely surrendered to her husband, allowed herself to be conquered, then pleasure would follow, and since this sexual pleasure was seen as essential to a good marriage autonomy was a small price to pay. There seems to be a fear of any deviance from this masculine constructed norm running through these prescriptions for women’s sexual behaviour. This urge to impose external constraints on women’s sexuality is particularly noticeable in discussions of homosexuality and women in wartime. Feminist writers have observed that lesbianism, or the passionate friendship of women whether with or without genital contact, has been overlooked by male historians and writers (Cook 1979 & Hallett 1999). Lesbian identity has been and still is represented as infantilism or a ‘poor imitation’ of ‘natural’, male or heterosexual behaviour (Weeks 1977: 87).

Obviously lesbianism, and passionate but non-sexual friendship between women had existed prior to the twentieth-century, but inter-war lesbianism was regarded as a whole new sexual category, and like the ‘frigid’ woman, lesbianism was constructed as a pathological disease (Jivani 1997: 31). ‘Lesbian tendencies’ and ‘characteristics’ were identified, and sexologists constructed an entire identity for ‘the lesbian’. Jeffreys (1995: 212) argued that this lesbian identity still constructed women ‘around an ideal of eroticized masculine dominance and feminine subordination’ (and see Faderman 1981).
While Gertrude Stein, Alice B. Toklas and Radclyffe Hall, may have found this liberating, it limited lesbianism to this restrictive interpretation of a masculine and feminine partnership, which could then be dismissed as 'aping' heterosexuality. Cook has argued that this interpretation was not empowering and it was not relevant to women outside this construction of homosexuality (Cook 1979: 719).

Identification of lesbianism also meant that women's friendships took on a new and sinister significance, they were no longer seen as 'healthy or innocent' (Gould 1987: 121). One of the fears expressed about the WAAC was that their wearing of uniform would render them 'mannish', lesbians (Grayzel 1999: 199). Government officials were very keen to stress that the WAAC were not wearing military uniform (fig. 4.35), it was khaki, but not military and 'officers' in WAAC had purely courtesy titles and were not to be saluted (Grayzel 1999: 198). Kent has suggested this indicated an uneasiness about women in uniform, that their clothes were turning them into men, subverting traditional understandings, gaining employment and privileges while castrating men (Kent 1993: 35-9)\textsuperscript{exii}. All war workers wore a uniform of sorts, including the factory workers (Yates 1918: 19), but these clothes were seen as feminine and unthreatening (Yates 1918: 29). However, even these feminised workers were seen as potentially dangerous, fears were expressed about the dangers of women's unbridled sexuality (Grayzel 1999: 87). Welfare supervisors were brought in to factories to monitor the physical and moral health of workers. The welfare supervisors tended to be middle-class and had the power to go into workers homes and check that the workers were respectable and 'suitable' which obviously led to resentment and the feeling that the welfare supervisors were factory spies (Braybon 1981: 141 & Braybon & Summerfield 1987: 96). The patrolling of women extended beyond the factory women were subject to the attentions of women police volunteers who patrolled cinemas, parks, and other open spaces, checking for signs of immorality (Pugh 1991: 30-34). And throughout both wars myths circulated that the women who worked in the factories frittered their huge pay packets on jewellery and furs, they were careless, drunk, sabotaged their machines, were immoral and neglected their children (Braybon 1981: 167).

It was not only the factory workers who were subjected to external scrutiny. The 1914 Army memoranda \textit{Cessation of Separation Allowances and Allotments to the Unworthy} gave police the right to enter the homes of servicemen's wives, and if the women were
suspected of drinking, neglecting their children, or committing adultery their allowances would be stopped (Braybon & Summerfield 1987: 108. Grayzel 1999: 91). The public policing of women resulted in curfews and other restrictions being imposed upon women, so for example the wives of servicemen were banned from pubs in Hartlepool (Braybon & Summerfield 1987: 108). In the absence of the men the state felt obliged to take over paternal and spousal duties. But state interference went far beyond paternalist views of women. The Defence of the Realm Acts of 1914 further marked women's sexuality as an area of government concern. Within the various acts incorporated under DORA was the re-introduction of the Contagious Disease legislation which feminists had fought against in the nineteenth-century. This act subjected suspected prostitutes to curfew, arrest and medical examination to ensure they were not carriers of VD, and if found guilty the women would be subject to military law and court-martialled (Grayzel 1999: 129-31). The hysteria associated with VD escalated, women with VD were seen as preying on young men like vampires or harpies (Kent 1993: 39 and see fig. 4.36). In March 1918 it was made a military offence for any woman with VD to have sex with a member of her majesty's forces. Men were examined and treated for sexual diseases by military doctors and encouraged to use condoms, but women were still seen as delinquent if they had VD and were held responsible for the spread of sexual diseases (Grayzel 1999: 151) as they were in World War Two (fig. 4.37).

Women within the military, like the nurses posted to the field hospitals, were particularly liable to accusations of immorality. Women in the WAAC were the subject of endless gossip (Grayzel 1999: 199) to the extent that in 1918 there was a Government inquiry into these accusations (Marwick 1977: 124-6). The women were completely exonerated, but similar rumours spread about the ATS in the second World War (Braybon & Summerfield 1987: 165-6). Women in both wars complained that sexual harassment was recurrent, assaults on women transport workers were frequent, and women reported they were afraid to be alone in train carriages with servicemen (Braybon & Summerfield 1987: 205-9). Throughout the Great War, sexual terminology and imagery was used, by government and ordinary people. Belgium and France were represented as innocent women under attack, their territory invaded and despoiled. This metaphor of women as violated sacrificial victims in need of male rescue and protection again emphasises the passivity of the feminine (Grayzel 1999: 85). The terminology
became increasingly sexual as the war continued and propaganda was made out of the, often exaggerated, reports and rumours of rape and mutilation (Kent 1993: 23-5). This was then used as propaganda and a veiled threat to British women: if they didn’t send their men to defend them, then they too might suffer ‘atrocities’.

The discourse around women’s sexuality encompassed a variety of readings, women were sexless and their only sexual pleasure was child-rearing, women were dangerously sexual and if left unimpeded their sexuality would cause mayhem to society and the state, countries were women needing protection from harm, women war workers were vampires stealing men’s jobs and sending them to die at the front, women were shy heroines needing praise and encouragement to participate in the war-effort, women were the innocent victims of men’s ‘natural’ sexuality, and women were responsible for the spread of venereal disease. Yet throughout this confusion, this allocation of blame, women were still being externally constructed and the construction was primarily as wives and mothers. Motherhood was an essential part of the national identity and ‘was figured and reconfigured during the war to speak to every aspect of women’s lives by an enormous range of voices’ (Grayzel 1999: 245).

Women and Society 1919 to 1939

This endless construction of women in maternalist and pro-natalist terms helps to explain why there was so little change in women’s circumstances between the wars, and why the suffrage societies who had aimed to transform the foundations of British society were prepared to adopt the idea of domesticity as women’s only destiny. The suffrage societies, whether militant or constitutionalist, had made little advance before the war. In such circumstances it was hardly surprising that they took the limited franchise they were offered in 1917. At least this way some women were guaranteed parliamentary representation even if the majority had to continue the fight for equal enfranchisement.

Women of all political beliefs had come together to fight for the vote, once that was done political differences were re-established, and reinforced by the political parties who wanted to ensure they gained the ‘women’s vote’. Because women were given only limited access they were never a significant force in British government, and as a tiny minority they chose to fight along party lines rather than specifically feminist ones.
The changes in legislation enacted in the 20s and 30s did little to alter women’s perceived subordinate status. And even when the acts were intended to emancipate women they were executed in such a way that the original intention could not be achieved. In the face of political indifference and hostility it is unsurprising that equality feminism began to wither away. And, with overt opposition to women in government, in the professions, or any high profile role there could be few challenges to gender stereotyping. The more women were confined to a conservatively feminine role, the more embedded these stereotypes became. British inter-war society in all aspects from government legislation to women’s magazines understood women in terms of maternalism, consciously or unconsciously British feminists also arrived at this understanding and fought for public recognition of women’s role as housekeepers, wives and mothers (Pugh 1990: 160). Inter-war feminism is not my understanding of feminism, but that doesn’t make their struggle less important.

Rather than being a springboard to women’s emancipation the Great War brought little significant change for women (Humphries 1995: 89-90). If the war was constructed as abnormal, and women’s wartime work was enmeshed in this understanding, then a signifier of war’s end and a return to ‘normality’ would be the dismissal of women from work spaces. In this version of normality women were removed from the public sphere, they retreated to the private world of domesticity, caring for the home and family. And, as I will discuss below, this construction of women seems to have appealed to working-class women. For working class women with sufficient income the domestic sphere could be construed as a sign of success, of independence, giving them both the social space and identity as ‘good’ housewives (Giles 1995: 23-4 & 116-118).

When we look at archaeology we see a similar pattern. Women archaeologists confronted the same choices other professional women faced, they could remain single and pursue a career, or they could marry. There were no marriage bars in archaeology, but there were very few jobs and marriage usually entailed a loss of independence and identity, and the possibility of a career. Women archaeologists were as weighted and shaped as other British women. Archaeologists of either sex understood the past as it was channelled through socially constructed expectations. Women in the past were constructed in maternalist terms, men hunted, farmed, ruled, or went to war, they were
active, they lead changes in burial, tool and pottery styles; women were in the background, caring for the home, the family, needing protection, being passive, reacting slowly to change. Archaeologists in their lives and in their work reflected the discourse, beliefs, and prejudices of their own time and their own society.

4.3.4 Class

The British working classes were ruled, controlled and constructed by government, and interested observers. Despite the rise of the Labour movement and universal male suffrage in 1918, the working classes were still a silenced majority in the first half of the twentieth century. Lacking both autonomy and the arena for self-construction working class voices were largely channelled through a variety of contemporary writers and subsequent historians. These external observers have created a whole variety of working classes, positive or negative depending on the writer's personal sympathies. We have imperial, patriotic, subversive, radical, indifferent, and 'problem' working classes, but they are the discussed rather than the discussants\textsuperscript{coovi}. As a consequence of being the subject of debate and narration rather than pro-active creators, working class Britain has largely been homogenised and anthropologised (Savage & Miles 1994: 14). Individuals have been lost in the writing, and instead of seeing the working classes as disparate groups brought together through employment or income, we have a constructed collective entity manipulated to reflect the writer's beliefs. And this representation, this construction has been a predominantly middle class construction.

As the middle classes grew in strength and numbers during the nineteenth century they began to take control of the political, economic and social life of Britain. By the twentieth century it was the middle class who controlled parliament and decided policies. Asquith, in 1908, was the first Prime Minister to come from the middle classes, the first Prime Minister not to be a landowner\textsuperscript{coovi}. Not only did the middle classes move into government, but they also occupied positions of professional authority, they were the doctors, lawyers and lecturers. They wrote history, archaeology, sociology and anthropology, and it is their view of the past and present which we rely on to talk about race, class and gender in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.
The nineteenth century has been understood as the century where the middle classes rose to prominence, but it was also the time when the working classes were identified and problematised (May 1987: 46). As the industrial towns and cities grew, more and more workers came from the countryside to work in the new urban areas. The middle classes had only previously encountered the working classes as servants or employees, in situations they could control. With the expansion of the towns and cities a visible working class emerged living lives outside direct middle class jurisdiction. As previously ‘respectable’ areas became colonised by the working classes and moved down market the nearby middle classes became increasingly nervous. The slums came to represent a threat to middle class purity and hegemony. The slums were not the only cause of inter-class tension. The increasing militancy of the working classes was another cause of alarm. One response was for the middle classes to physically remove themselves from the towns, the improved transport links led to the rise in middle class suburbia. Another response was the increasing attempt to control and patrol the working classes (Savage & Miles 1994: 60-2).

Official and unofficial reports on the working classes proliferated during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Increased state intervention at a national and local level gave unprecedented access to working class lives at a time when independent sociologists and anthropologists were increasingly investigating working class conditions. Aside from Means’ melodramatic *The Bitter Cry of Outcast London* (1883) there was Henry Mayhew’s *London Labour and the London Poor* (1861-2), Edward Cadbury’s *Women’s Work and Wages: a phase in the life of the industrial city* (1908) and his examination into the sweated industries (1908), Seebohm Rowntree’s *Poverty: a study of town life* (1901), Charles Booth’s comprehensive exploration *Life and Labour of the People of London* (1891-1903), as well as the Report of the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes (1884-5). These were joined in the twentieth century by investigations which exclusively focussed on the lives of working class married women such as Maud Pember Reeves’ *Round About a Pound a Week* (1913), *Maternity* (1915) and *Life as We Have Known It* (1931) edited by Margaret Llewelyn Davies, and *Working Class Lives* (1939) compiled by Margery Spring Rice.

As noted above state intervention into people’s lives began before the twentieth century but became increasingly pronounced during the Boer War (Weeks 1989: 125 and see
below). While the state provisions of health care and education can be seen as much needed attempts at social reform, they can also be seen as an attempt to colonise and regulate the working classes. Equally the sociological investigations seem to be as much about a bid for authority by the groups and individuals doing the research as a genuine attempt to understand and alleviate working class suffering. This suspicion becomes particularly marked when considering some of the acts passed in the first part of the twentieth century. These acts defined the very nature of British citizenship and how this belonging could be granted or withheld depending on race, class, or gender. Harris (1995: 88) has suggested successive governments understood that to construct a controlled population that population had to be at least loosely united and this was best achieved by publicly excluding certain sections of society.

The Aliens Acts of 1905, 1914, and 1919, and the British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act of 1914 are the most obvious examples of controlling the number and definitions of British citizens. The 1914 Nationality act, the first to codify nationality, stated that those born in the British Empire were citizens of Britain, and the wives of such citizens were also British subjects regardless of their initial nationality. Conversely any British woman marrying an alien immediately lost her British nationality, regardless of whether or not she then acquired the nationality of her husband’s country. This inequality continued until 1933 despite agitation from women’s groups (fig. 4.38).

Those already resident in Britain and accepted as British nationals were also subjected to increased documentation and monitoring. With the introduction in 1907 of the Notification of Births Act it became compulsory for all live births to be registered within six weeks, the mother and child would then be inspected by a health visitor. Education and health acts allowed these children to then be regulated from birth to school leaving age. Their health was monitored by the introduction of medical inspections for school children in 1907, their careers guided or blighted by employers increasing reliance on school reports and the Juvenile Employment Bureaux (Savage & Miles 1994: 53 & 88). The supervision did not stop once the child reached adulthood, the Labour Exchange Act of 1909, the National Insurance Acts of 1911, 1920, and 1921, the move from poor relief provided by Poor Law Guardians to local authority provision in 1929, the means testing of the poor, the entry requirements and continued
monitoring of tenants in council housing, the various acts providing old age pensions, guaranteed that their subsequent lives, retirement, and deaths were also documented. Wartime registration cards, ration books, passports, driving licences and more informative census returns meant there was an unprecedented amount of information about each and every British citizen (Harris 1995; Savage & Miles 1994).

This surveillance went beyond the individual, the Emergency Powers Act of 1920 meant the government could claim a state of emergency if essential social services were interfered with, an effective way of discouraging strikes by those in the social sector. The General Strike of 1926 brought in further legislation, not only were 4,000 strikers prosecuted and 1,000 imprisoned, the Trade Disputes Act of 1927 made general strikes illegal. While the Disaffection Act (aka Sedition Act) of 1934 gave the police the power to search and remove the property of anyone suspected of treasonable offences.

Undeniably many of these acts were for the public good. State intervention into poverty, education, health, and housing went a little way to mitigating social inequality. The various midwives acts from 1902 to 1936 and the Mother and Child Welfare Act of 1918 (which enabled local authorities to fund and support maternity clinics if they chose) undoubtedly saved the lives of many women and children. But poverty, ill-health, illiteracy, and sub-standard housing all continued as Reeves' (1913) and Rice's (1939) investigations demonstrated. And, as said above, these acts allowed unprecedented access to people's private lives. That this access was political is equally undeniable. Increased monitoring led to increased information that could be used by politicians and interest groups as platforms to agitate for social change, but the information could also be used to define and anthropologise the poorest classes (Harris 1995: 90). In particular it was working class women and their domestic lives which attracted the attention of twentieth century investigators. But these investigations and reports were selectively interpreted. An Interdepartmental Committee was set up to examine the supposed physical deterioration of the race in the wake of the Boer War. The report, published in 1904, largely argued for environmental and conditional changes, but these were ignored in favour of hereditarian and pronatalist solutions which maintained that it was not poverty that was the problem, but the lack of training for motherhood that women received (Weeks 1989: 126). As argued above the construction of women shifted from the idea of woman as wife, to woman as mother,
and there was increasing emphasis from governments and voluntary bodies on providing the training mothers supposedly needed (Campbell 1939: vii). This emphasis on child rearing as a national duty to the British race and the Empire moved motherhood from a private to a public act and had an enormous impact on the working class mothers subjected to middle class monitoring (Weeks 1989: 127, Savage & Miles 1994: 88).

**External Commentators**

Unquestionably the investigators were concerned about the hardships Britain's poorest classes endured. However, there was an element of self-interest in the work of these observers. Charitable visits to the poor and needy had a long tradition amongst women of the middle and upper classes (D'Cruze 1995: 55-71; Hamman 1995: 221). In a world where even upper and middle class women were barred from interesting employment, visiting, publicising, and debating the lives of working class women could be constructed and represented as an extension of this acceptably feminine activity. Working class mothers were perhaps the least powerful, least autonomous, group in British society. Even if individuals exercised their limited independence by refusing to comply with the sociologists, as a category working class women could be observed, dissected, and constructed using the wealth of information from health visitors, schools, the means test inspections, and the Mother and Child Welfare clinics. It is these predominantly middle class sources which edit the information we have on working class women, channelling working class voices through middle class commentary. And, as Giles has noted, the gulf between the classes could not be eradicated by a common gender (Giles 1995: 18 & 25), a point made by Virginia Woolf who recognised that middle class women felt it was their role to lead rather than listen when she described:

... the contradictory and complex feelings which beset the middle-class visitor when forced to sit out a Congress of working women in silence. (Woolf 1977: xxxi).

Even when the investigators were sympathetic to working class domestic issues they failed to recognise that the working classes were people like themselves. Virginia Woolf mischievously identified the differences between the classes (Woolf 1977: xxiii). For middle class women all that was possible, she asserted, was 'fictitious sympathy' 'aesthetic sympathy' 'ladies' she remarked 'desire Mozart and Einstein – that is they desire things that are ends, not things that are means' (Woolf 1977: xxviii), culture rather than inside plumbing. Working class women were more acerbic:
I had attended Mother's Meetings, where ladies came and lectured on the domestic affairs in the workers' homes that it is impossible for them to understand. I have boiled over many times at some of the things I was obliged to listen to, without the chance of asking a question. In the Guild we always had a chance of discussing a subject. (Layton 1984: 40).

These inter-class tensions come through clearly in *Round About A Pound A Week* (1913) and *Working Class Wives* (1939), both of which are sympathetic studies and yet clearly show the lack of understanding between observer and observed.

Reeves' study exemplified middle class understandings of working class life, her intention was be supportive, but the approach characterised the working classes as unable to cope with their burden:

That the diet of the poorer London children is insufficient, unscientific, and utterly unsatisfactory is horribly true. But that the real cause of this state of things is the ignorance and indifference of their mothers is untrue. What person or body of people, however educated and expert could maintain a working man in physical efficiency and rear healthy children on the amount of money which is all these same mothers have to deal with? It would be an impossible problem if set to trained and expert people. How much more an impossible problem when set to the saddened, weakened, overburdened wives of London labourers? (Reeves 1979: 145).

The investigators chose an area of Lambeth which they knew to be 'respectable' but poor (Reeves 1979: 15). They based their definition of respectability on hospital records which demonstrated that the women to be studied were legally married. This checking by consulting external sources rather than believing the women who were to be studied epitomized the relationship between the middle and working classes. Even when the writer was sympathetic there was the belief that the information given by those observed had to be verified. This need for external confirmation could be read as an attempt at scientific objectivity or one can see it, as I do, as indicating a lack of trust.

This is not to say Reeves and her investigators were unsympathetic, 'If the poor were not improvident, they would hardly dare live their lives at all' (Reeves 1979: 14). And, in answer to the accusation that the poor are poor because they were extravagant she stated how could they be otherwise? They had neither the space or economic resources to practice 'forehandedness' (Reeves 1979: 22). The poverty of the area needed little external confirmation, it could easily be seen, but the investigators were surprised at what they found:
It was at first proposed to rule out disease, but pulmonary and respiratory

disease were found to be so common that to rule them out would be to
refuse about half the cases. It was therefore decided to regard such a
condition of health as normal, and to refuse only such cases of active or
malignant disease in the parents as might, in the doctor’s opinion,
completely wreck the child’s chance of a healthy life. (Reeves 1979: 9).

But this realisation did not prevent the investigators from pre-judging these families,

Reeves continues with:

Drink, on the other hand, the committee had expected to find a normal
condition, and had proposed the acceptance of moderate drinking.
Experience, however, went to prove that married men in full work who
keep their job on such a wage do not and cannot drink … Many of the men
were teetotallers, and some did not even smoke. (Reeves 1979: 9-10).

Nor did it prevent judging once the investigators and families were acquainted, and
giving patronising reproductions of the women’s reported speech. Throughout there are
instances of working class speech in inverted commas “boomer” for lie, “kidding” for
joking “eaved at it” for finding something repugnant (Reeves 1979: 189 & 57). It was
as if the working classes spoke a different language that had to be translated for the
middle class readers, as well as rendered humorous. The examples of supposedly
humorous working class spelling such as ‘leggerbeef’ and ‘dryaddick’ continue this
impression despite Reeves’ assertion:

... the spelling was sometimes beyond the sharpened wits of the most
experienced Fabian women to comprehend. Great care had to be taken not

to hurt their feelings as they sat anxiously watching the visitor wrestling

with the ungainly collection of words and figures. (Reeves 1979: 14-15).

However, this sensitivity did not preclude publishing such remarks or the women’s
budgets. Presumably there was no final report to the working class women involved in
the investigation, and no expectation that they could or would ever read the publication
in which they figured.

And all sensitivity broke down when it came to designating the women as ‘good’ or
‘bad’ managers and therefore ‘good’ or ‘bad’ mothers (Reeves 1979: 88; 113; 125; 161;
164 & 168). Working class men were seen as irrelevant to this study, they went out to
work and returned with their wages, their sole function was to provide the money for
their family. It was the women who were investigated and judged, the woman whose
ability to feed and keep their families on a pound a week was subjected to scrutiny.

Reeves and the other Fabians were socialists and social reformers, they intended their
work to illustrate that the state had to intervene and provide all children with ‘sufficient food, shelter, warmth and clothing’ (Reeves 1979: 215):

... to keep the children of the nation in health and strength is too important and vital a responsibility to be placed entirely on the shoulders of one section of the community ... It is a responsibility which should be taken by the only authority which is always equal to its complete fulfilment – the State. (Reeves 1979: 218).

Inevitably, having this underlying intention, the working class woman had to be represented as incapable of giving their children the care and sustenance these children needed. I am not denying that Reeves’ study did not accurately portray the poverty of these families, the menus and budgets alone make horrendous reading (Reeves 1979: 132-45) but the additional motive for this work should not be ignored. These working class women were being used to try and force state intervention into contraception and childcare. As a socialist I applaud the intention, and the selflessness of deciding to represent those without the power to change their own lives. But, I am very aware that the women observed had no chance to say how they viewed their lives and what they desired, they were not given a platform to speak for themselves.

Rice’s study was rather different. It was based on questionnaires filled in by the women themselves, but annotated by health visitors. The questions were entirely to do with the women’s health, although ‘health’ was taken to mean housing, diet and number of children. Coming twenty-six years after Reeves’ investigation it showed that little had materially changed for married working class women. And, that little had changed in the way these women were viewed by middle class observers. Working class women were portrayed as passive, they were ‘patient, courageous, inarticulate mothers’ who needed external education to live their lives properly (Campbell 1939: viii-ix). Those who were not seen as passive were condemned, they were seen as being ‘above themselves’ or refusing to listen to advice (Rice 1939: 36; 41; 82 & 84) or even ‘self-assertive and talkative’ (Rice 1939: 164). And in Rice’s study, as in Reeves’, there was surprise expressed when working class women refused and resisted their investigations (Reeves 1979: 168; Rice 1939: 20). Working class women were not seen as having the luxury of shutting out interrogators. As Giles (1995: 28-9 & 41) has noted one way of resisting investigation was to conform ‘keeping to yourself’ and being ‘a good manager’ was a way of escaping middle class attention and interference. And, it should be stressed, that for many working class women marriage and domesticity was a sign of
success. Their husbands earned enough money to release these women from the double burden of working outside and within the home (Giles 1995: 18-9). But, this was the only ambition working class women were allowed, any desire to educate themselves in ways other than motherhood were condemned as frivolous and irrelevant to their perceived role in life (Rice 1939: 135 & 203-4).

The similarities of these approaches reinforce the argument that the First World War which was credited with breaking down class barriers had done little to alter understandings. The Second World War was also credited with removing class barriers but as Braybon and Summerfield (1987: 197-8) have noted class divisions were observable in war-time work. In the factories shop floor women were working class, administrators were middle class. In the services the WRNS were predominantly middle and upper class, the ATS was more mixed, but in the WAAF cooks, spark plug testers and general duty hands were working class; orderlies, teleprinters and clerks were lower middle class, while administrative workers, radio operators and plotters were middle class or above. Nor did the Great War erase class divisions for men, as Bourke (1996: 146) has noted ‘The gulf between servicemen imposed by rank was unbridgeable’. For all that Marwick asserted:

... class structures are altered by participation of the war effort of formerly underprivileged social groups. (Marwick 1974: 10).

Bourke (1996: 146) pointed out that officers still had servants, and the officers censoring letters would jeer at the writer’s lack of education. Despite the legal and social changes before and after the First World War which made work and life a little easier for the working classes, the discourse which surrounded them remained constant. Workers could be moved around the country to provide labour wherever it was needed, regardless of the fact this meant they had to uproot themselves and their families. Even the trade unions were powerless to prevent this. Those that were re-located can be seen as the lucky ones, the Jarrow march attracted so much cross-party sympathy because the men and their families were starving, regardless of insurance and the dole. And, it should be noted that each time the unions challenged the Government, they lost. The railwaymen and police strikes of 1919, the General Strike, the smaller strikes by coal miners throughout the 20s and 30s were all lost by the strikers. For all the supposed changes in education most working class pupils received only an elementary education.
however long they stayed at school. For the majority of the working classes school was followed by dull, hard work with little to alleviate the struggle.

Some members of the working class managed to escape from this restrictive life. Either through scholarships or as adults through the co-operative movement and the unions managed to continue their education. Some went on to become writers like Robert Roberts and Richard Hoggard, or lecturers, doctors, lawyers, even Prime Ministers like Lloyd George and Ramsay MacDonald. Similarly there were upper and middle class women and high caste colonials who became ‘professionals’ able to represent and construct themselves. But, as I argued above these few were too few to change the dominant discourse, and for all their freedom the majority of the working classes, women, and non-British members of the Empire were constructed by external authorities. And, when we look at archaeology we see the same relationships played out in who had access to the past and how that past was constructed.
Notes.

i As a member of Sinn Fein she refused to swear allegiance to the King, or to take her seat in parliament.

ii However, in 1935 Rothermere withdrew his support and therefore the support of the Rothermere controlled press.

iii Because of the non-intervention agreement volunteers kept their intentions quiet, it’s estimated that 50,000 volunteers from Europe joined in the war, but with the secrecy actual numbers are hard to come by. The TUC puts the number of volunteers at 2,000 but this is the number of those fighting and doesn’t include those who volunteered as nurses, doctors and relief workers (Davis 2004).

iv I am aware that the violence of this imposed construction varied and was not experienced in the same way by all groups. Obviously in each case vocal and articulate individuals from these groups can be found and used to argue that if they were not silenced then nor was anyone else in that group. This is a disingenuous position, I am talking here about the majority not this fortunate minority. And, as I argue here such small minorities could not challenge the dominant discourse even if they chose to do so. Here I am concerned with what those in authority said about these constructed groups, individuals may have stepped outside these constructions, the majority could not.

v Colonial involvement in the First and Second World Wars did little to challenge attitudes. In the Great War Indian troops, particularly the Sikh regiments, were valued for their ‘martial prowess’ but they were still considered to be ‘savages’ (Bourke 1996: 149). Nor were non-white British soldiers recompensed at the same rate as white ones, the Maltese troops who served alongside British servicemen received significantly lower pensions (Bourke 1996: 69).

vi Much of what follows relates predominantly to boys. Not because I am following the custom of taking male experiences to be the norm, but because women are dealt with in a separate area of this chapter. Also, while boys’ education stressed their role as mini-imperialists in a wide variety of forms, girls education concentrated on their perceived destiny as wives and mothers (Hunt 1987) While gender and class affected how these ideologies were consumed and internalised the discourse of imperialism was a dominant factor in the education of all children.

vii Indian society has no History at all, at least no known history. What we call its history is but the history of its successive intruders who founded their empires on the passive basis of that unresisting and unchanging society ... England has to fulfil a double mission in India: one destructive, the other regenerating – the annihilation of old Asiatic society, and the laying of material foundations of western society in Asia. (Marx 1853 in Fernbach 1973: 320).

viii One of the activities of the Empire Day Movement, see below, was to equip British schools with Empire imagery, maps, export tables and other ephemera.

ix Prince Lobengula, the star of Savage South Africa became engaged to Miss Kitty Jewell, the daughter of a Cornish mining engineer who had emigrated to South Africa. The two had met in Bloemfontein and Miss Jewell had followed Lobengula to London.

x Castle stated the position as:

The contribution of the ‘expert’ in building the image of Africa is a particularly acute example of securing the rising generation into the ignorance of the old. The blend of entertainment with professional expertise produced a particular kind of information, selective, distorted and misleading. Under the guise of enlightening the audience, Africans were relegated to a position of cultural and social inferiority. Their culture was treated as laughable and its artefacts as grotesque manifestations of backwardness. African society became interesting only when bizarre, shocking or contemptible. The approach was closer to the experience of a ‘freak show’ than a studied exposition of African life. Juvenile periodicals were reflecting here a growing trend toward ‘experiencing’ the Empire which found peculiar expression in the colonial exhibitions of the era, where ‘science’ and entertainment merged in the spectacle of African life. They too treated material culture as a ‘curiosity’ or ‘trophy’ of the imperial connection, co-opting the authority of ‘scientific’ judgement to authenticate the mythologising of the ‘other’ (Castle 1996: 91-2).
The EMB was in existence from 1926 to 1933 (Constantine 1984 & 1986).

I am not suggesting that the category ‘man’ is necessarily any less problematic, colonialism, class, colour and sexuality are just a few of the complexities which defeat a simple definition of masculinity. However, for much of our history, masculinity, maleness, and man have been formulated by men themselves. The category may have limited application, referring essentially to upper and middle class, white, heterosexual, European men, but it has not been a definition entirely imposed from outside. Also, there has always been more latitude in the definitions of ‘man’ than there has been of ‘woman’.

Lack of space dictates that in this section individual women’s voices will only occasionally be heard, whereas in the following chapter I will be using the direct experience of individual archaeologists. I have already discussed in the chapters on histories of archaeology and historiography the way memories and experiences are shaped and channelled by the expectations of the speaker and listener. I do not intend to discuss these issues again here but I want to mark my awareness of another layer of complexity when attempting to discuss women and their lives. And, lack of space also dictates that this discussion has to be mainly confined to those aspects that are relevant to women archaeologists and ideas of women in past societies.

I am indebted to Angela Morelli for assistance with this section.

For example, when Elise Inglis approached the war office with her plan to send out VAD units and field hospitals she was told ‘My good lady, go home and sit still’ (Krippner 1980: 290).

The Personal Injuries (Emergency Provisions) Act of 1939 was amended in 1943 after women formed the Equal Compensation Campaign and pressured the government. Initially women received 7s less a week than men (Braybon & Summerfield 1987: 183).

This was obviously a frequent suggestion, Agatha Christie gave one of her heroines the same words to describe her post-war unemployment:
I clung to the office with the true limpet touch for many long months, but, alas, I was combed out at last. (Christie 1922 [1955]: 9).

Conscientious objectors however were punished by having their right to vote removed for 5 years. householders; wives of householders; occupants of property worth £5 annually; or graduates of British universities.

The Representation of the People Act 1918 gave the vote to adult men without restrictions other than prisoners, the insane, and conscientious objectors and enfranchised women over 30 who were: householders; wives of householders; occupants of property worth £5 annually; or graduates of British universities.

However, women over 21 who could not vote, could be elected to parliament (Holton 1986: 150).

When the possibility of admitting women as full members of the University of Cambridge was raised the male students rioted and vandalised the women’s colleges. These students were not prosecuted (McWilliams-Tulberg 1980).

Women were still seen as marginal to the Trade Unions, and their contribution overlooked, many of the women’s unions were not called out in the General Strike (Pugh 1991: 100).

For example the activities of the Playwrights, Editors, Essayists and Novelists Club, which became very active in the 30s under the chair of Storm Jameson in helping European intellectuals flee Nazi and fascist repression which is how Else Baumgärtel the Egyptologist came to Oxford. (Brittain 1986).

D’Cruze and Hamman note that the teaching and philanthropic work done by women reinforced the idea of women’s familial caring role.
Both sexes justified women’s philanthropic work with reference to their caring qualities, which had been developed in the home, and their duty to help the poor. It was thought that women’s special mission was to work towards a moral transformation and regeneration of society - a view that was shared by feminists.
and non-feminists alike. This line of argument was based on, and helped to reinforce, existing gender
divisions. (Hannam 1995: 221).
And, as D'Cruze points out, women's philanthropic work had less prestige than the same work done by men (D'Cruze 1995: 55-71).

xxv The majority of women went to university to study to become teachers, with Board of Education grants available this did supply women with some external funding, however women were given fewer and lower grants than male students. (Dyhouse 1995: 18: 30-31).

xxvi There were no official marriage bars for women in higher education, but many women discovered they were expected to resign if they married (Dyhouse 1995: 161-7)

xxvii The majority of these women were lecturers rather than demonstrators (Dyhouse 1995: 138).

xxviii Published in 1919 but written in the earlier part of the decade.

xxix For example, she suggested that dressing for dinner was the ideal time to insert a contraceptive-cap, advice that would have been of limited use to working-class wives.

xxx And, Kent argues war rhetoric became part of this understanding: ... the metaphors of war have come home: the return of the soldier has placed Britain, or at least the women of Britain under military occupation... The social bases of masculinity and femininity gave way to a biologically determined, innate male and female sexuality, which in turn suggested that women must act differently in order to protect themselves and society from the aggression unleashed by war. The rhetoric of separate spheres had become infected with the rhetoric of war. (Kent 1993: 139)

xxxi Although as Weeks has pointed out 'sexuality' has changed its meaning and employment (Weeks 1989: 1).

xxi Pugh, perhaps intentionally, makes a similar inference when he suggests that the uniformed Women Police Volunteers were seen as 'interfering frustrated spinsters intent on preventing innocent fun' (Pugh 1991: 30-34).

xxiii 'The psychologically brutalized, victimized, Belgianized women of Britain, symbolically occupied by an army of returning soldiers, may have found comfort and protection in the promises of 'new' feminism.' (Kent 1993: 142-3).

xxxiv Pugh's suggestion is that having gained the vote through this cult of domesticity, the cult of domesticity then trapped women into a restrictive domestic ideology (Pugh 1990: 160).

xxv Although as I will also argue below it is hard to establish working-class womens' desires because their voices were channelled through middle-class writings.

xxvi Obviously there are sources of information such as the reports of Union or Co-operative meetings. However, although such documents reveal the aspirations and demands of politicised working class there is both an absence of female voices, and such accounts are couched in obscure, standardised, bureaucratic language. There are very few personal accounts of working class lives, and, when they do occur they create new problems (see below).

xxvii Although his second wife Margot Tennant was from a large land-owning family.

xxviii In 1926 this act was amended to cover the registration of still births.

xxix Round About A Pound A Week was a study by the Fabian Women's Group of the daily budget and domestic lives of the working class in Lambeth. Investigators were sent to selected houses on a regular basis to monitor the effects of undernourishment on mothers and babies.
5 Inter-war Archaeology

5.1 Introduction

Having critiqued other writers’ efforts to construct a history of archaeology, the following chapters are my attempt at a different history of archaeology for the 20s and 30s. My history is tied to the cultural history of the period as outlined in the previous chapter, here I have tried to show how these themes affect archaeology and at the same time find answers to the series of questions that I find interesting. These are not necessarily the questions anyone else would find of overwhelming importance. Another history would have different emphases and conclusions, but as I have emphasised throughout this thesis this is my history of inter-war British archaeology.

This chapter will examine the development of fieldwork between the wars.

5.1.1 Excavation and fieldwork

In Critical Approaches to Fieldwork (2001) Gavin Lucas suggested that although there was a long tradition of scholars going out into the field to observe archaeology it was the artefacts, the ‘collection’ rather than the monuments which attracted British intellectuals before the twentieth-century (Lucas 2001: 3-4). Lucas saw a division between the fieldworkers and the intellectual elite which replicated the hierarchical nature of contemporary botany and anthropology, an explorer was commissioned to go into the field and gather information that was then collated by the gentleman scholar into a coherent, artefact based, narrative (Lucas 2001: 5-6). While I agree with Lucas that fieldwork was an essential part of archaeology by the early twentieth-century, I am not convinced that the division between those who excavated and those who collated had been as marked as he suggests, or indeed that the upsurge in fieldwork led to an archaeology that was less artefact based. And, I would argue that the archaeology practiced in the 20s and 30s was as gradated as it had been in the nineteenth-century, but the division had been and still was between those who were designated ‘staff’ and the labourers.
However, fieldwork had undoubtedly become the defining characteristic of archaeology in the 20s and 30s, and of all forms of fieldwork, excavation was seen as the most important. Mrs Chitty observed that it was ‘all important to be able to dig, and that was one’s measure’ as an archaeologist (Mary Chitty in conversation, 1994.). Archaeologists were judged on their excavational abilities. Added to which there was a reaction against those who were considered to be old-fashioned in their approaches to excavation. Archaeologists such as Wheeler*, Grahame Clark, and Keiller saw themselves as developing new forms of archaeology. Bushe-Fox and Harold St George Grey were seen to represent the old guard, Wheeler and Keiller the new. Clark’s interests, stimulated by the Fenland Research Committee resulted in his economically informed environmental explanations (Smith 1997). Excavation was both a measure of an archaeologist’s reputation and it provided materials to elucidate archaeological questions. Those we now tend to associate with written rather than practical archaeology, authors such as Hawkes, Daniel, Childe, and Crawford, were all actively involved in fieldwork.

Active archaeology was defined as fieldwork, a portmanteau term which covered a variety of forms. Most of the fieldwork manuals included museum work, mapping, and surveying as essential skills to be developed by the archaeologist (Atkinson 1946; Crawford 1953"; Kenyon 1952; Wheeler 1954). Atkinson devoted nearly a third of Field Archaeology to the matter of archaeological surveying (Atkinson 1946: 75-146). Crawford was particularly keen to promote landscape studies:

The surface of England is a palimpsest, a document that has been written on and erased over and over again; and it is the business of the field archaeologist to decipher it. (Crawford 1953: 51).

Atkinson (1946: 16) also promoted field surveys as the way archaeological novices could begin to understand the archaeological landscape. This sentiment was echoed by Kathleen Kenyon (1952: 155-161) although I feel her recommendation of such work had more to do with preserving archaeology:

...they are a form of archaeology in which a comparative beginner can do no damage, for he is not destroying anything. (Kenyon 1952: 159).

5.1.2 Manuals, archives and other sources

Regardless of the frequent assertions within the manuals that there was more to archaeology than excavation, it was, as stated above, excavation that was seen as the
fundamental occupation of archaeologists. The sources of information for excavation techniques consist of the fieldwork manuals, site-reports, and archive material where this still exists. With the exception of Woolley's *Digging up the Past* (1930), the fieldwork manuals lie outside the strict time limits of this study; Petrie published *Methods and Aims in Archaeology* in 1904, Droop's *Archaeological Excavation* is the closest to this period having been published in 1915 but it is also the least detailed, while Atkinson (1946), Kenyon (1952), Crawford (1953), and Wheeler (1954) all post-date the period. However, I would argue that they bracket the period involved and are sufficiently close to the time to allow their use. Also, the differences between Petrie and Droop's manuals, and the more comprehensive post-war handbooks suggest that the idea of what constituted archaeology and archaeologists had developed and became more complex.

I have studied Atkinson and Wheeler's excavation archives as a comparison to their public declarations of intention. It should be stressed however, that all the archives for this period have their limitations, none of them equate with the modern idea of an archive. They are generally aide memoirs for the excavator rather than a lucid document of the work undertaken. The amount of information archaeologists kept in their heads was tremendous, and the view was largely that once the report was written and in the public domain this was the only archive needed (Lesley Ferguson *pers. comm.*). The archives that do remain make fascinating reading, not just as archaeological documents. I was particularly taken by James Curle's Newsteads notebooks which I found largely illegible, but which have beautiful sketches of artefacts mingled with recipes for manure, and diagrams to show correct pruning methods (MS/28/289).

The other archives I consulted were far less eclectic, but still make for fascinating reading, as do the other sources of information. And it is possible to create a hierarchical order of these sources. The fieldwork manuals represent the platonic ideal of excavation. With these manuals a director could undertake every part of the perfect excavation. Everything would be properly recorded, annotated, drawn, and archived. Droop and Atkinson both stated that it should be possible to recreate an excavation from the records kept (Droop 1915: 7; Atkinson 1946: 146). The site reports, to continue the conceit, were still close to the shadow on the cave wall, they present the work undertaken in the best possible light, whereas the archives show the reality of what
actually took place. In *Field Archaeology* (1946) Atkinson explained how artefacts should always be recorded in three dimensions with reference to the site grid (Atkinson 1946: 150) but having examined Atkinson’s photographic archive from East Finnercy it is obvious Atkinson did not always follow his own advice (Leivers *et al* 2001). Nor did Wheeler, in *Archaeology in the Field* he declared ‘unrecorded excavation is the unforgivable destruction of evidence’ (Wheeler 1961: 209), yet work he did in Wales and Bedfordshire remained unpublished. Therefore, taken together the manuals, site reports, and archives demonstrate not only what the writers thought it should be, but also what archaeology was.

### 5.2 The Platonic Ideal

#### 5.2.1 The nature of archaeology

The fieldwork handbooks are something of an oddity. In all cases there was a similar declaration to Droop’s stated intention:

> This essay has been written with the idea chiefly of entertaining the many who by their interest and subscriptions have helped in the work of recovering the past, and partly in the hope that, if it makes even slightly for the accomplishment of better work in the future, it may not have been written in vain. (Droop 1915: x & see Petrie 1904: viii; Kenyon 1952: 9; & Crawford 1953: 15).

Despite the avowed purpose to educate the interested public, and provide some practical assistance for archaeologists in the field, as Lucas (2001: 28) noted, these texts are in fact Director’s manuals. Atkinson (1946: vi) and Kenyon (1952: 7) explicitly stated that their books were ‘primarily intended for beginners’ and Atkinson (1946: 38-9) gave such basic instructions as how to use a trowel. Yet, even these two manuals provided a level of detail that only a director would need to know (Atkinson 1946: 34-5; Kenyon 1952: 77 ff.).

But, the manuals were more than director’s guides, they were an attempt to establish an identity for archaeology and archaeologists, and they are revealing documents of cultural and social history. Lucas (2001: 7) remarked that Petrie’s *Methods and Aims* was as much a colonial administrator’s handbook as it was an excavation manual. Wheeler, who was part of the colonial administration when he was working in India,
was equally colonialist in his outlook (Wheeler 1961: 37, 172-77 and see Wheeler 1955). Moreover if Petrie’s manual was a colonial handbook, Wheeler’s was a manual for training the officer corps. The Director or General was given explicit instructions on his duties and how he should behave, and what he could expect from each member of staff down the ranks to the foreman, or sergeant-major, and the labourers or privates (Wheeler 1961: 153-177). Incorporated into this staff hierarchy, and extending beyond it, was Wheeler’s obsession with control. *Archaeology from the Earth* was overtly concerned with control, control of the site through stratigraphy and recording, control of the artefacts, and, most noticeably control of the workforce (Wheeler 1961: 29, 32, 154-5 &174-6).

*The definition of an archaeologist*

Interestingly, these writers felt it was necessary to define the archaeologist, to enumerate the skills and character needed to successfully pursue fieldwork. These included: dedication; knowledge of previous work\textsuperscript{iv}; the ability to train the workmen; to be observant; to have some drawing, surveying, and photographing ability, a practical understanding of conservation; and, if working abroad, knowledge of the ancient and modern language of the country, Droop and Petrie recommended that the archaeologist have a ‘rudimentary’ knowledge of civil engineering particularly ‘how to lay and run a light railway where its use is expedient’ (Droop 1915: 35). Petrie believed the archaeologist should look after all the details:

> And a general eye to the safety and condition of everything, both of work, antiquities, and stores is incessantly wanted if a camp is to be successful and prosperous. (Petrie 1904: 6).

This was not the end of Petrie’s list, he continued by stating:

> In the externals of the work an excavator should always be his own best workman. If he be the strongest on the place, so much the better; but at all events he should be the most able in all matters of skill and ability. Where anything is found it should be the hands of the master that clear it from the soil; the pick and the knife should be in his hands every day, and his readiness should be shown by the shortness of his finger-nails and the toughness of his skin... The man who cannot enjoy his work without regard to appearances, who will not strip and go into the water, or slither on slimy mud through unknown passages, had better not profess to excavate. (Petrie 1904: 7).

Wheeler supplemented this catalogue with the need for the director to have leadership qualities, and the suggestion that the most important archaeological ability was the ability to comprehend and interpret stratigraphy (Wheeler 1961: 158). While, somewhat
ironically, Atkinson (1946: 19-20) was the only writer to stress the importance of full and rapid publication.

This comprehensive encyclopaedia of demands could be dismissed as exaggerated. However, Mrs Chitty did not consider herself to be a real archaeologist because she had never felt she was sufficiently skilled to direct an excavation. Yet, she had organised the implementation and funding of digs for other people, as well as working on a variety of excavations (Chitty in conversation, 1994). It would seem, therefore, that even if the archaeologists writing the manuals did not actually possess all these skills themselves, the skills were still seen as desirable commodities, and without them practitioners were excluded, or made to feel unworthy. I will return below to this question of identity and the issue of the robustly masculine ideal implicit in many of these characterisations of the archaeologist.

The archaeological officer corps

Anyone following Wheeler, or Petrie, Droop or Kenyon’s recommendations would have to have, as Wheeler (1961: 160) suggested, personnel management skills. Only Atkinson's (1946: vi) manual was aimed at providing the information needed for a small-scale excavation. The other handbooks envisaged a large excavation with a hierarchy of staff. Wheeler had the most extensive list outlining the responsibilities each role entailed. Aside from the Director he assumed there would be a Deputy Director, who would also be a trained field archaeologist, who could deputise for the Director, would be a specialist in some branch of archaeology, would keep the accounts, and be responsible for the equipment, first aid and the organisation of supplies (Wheeler 1961: 160-2).

The other ‘staff’ employed on Wheeler’s excavations included supervisors. They were generally students with a season’s experience, and would be in charge of a trench or grid square and the control pits. The supervisors would also be in charge of the notebooks and site records for their area, and would be assisted by a junior student whom they would be training (Wheeler 1961: 162). On Wheeler’s excavation there would also be someone to record the small finds, to mark the artefacts, annotate the records, and keep everything in order:
Muddle means inaccuracy, delay, incompetence, and the destruction of evidence laboriously garnered. (Wheeler 1961: 164). Wheeler further pontificated that the unceasing ‘vigilance’ of the finds person ensured the ‘scientific value’ of the excavation (ibid). A field-chemist should also be on hand to conserve or at least consolidate ‘friable objects for removal and transportation’ (Wheeler 1961: 169). Ideally the finds assistant would be supported by a pottery-assistant. Like the finds assistant this individual would have a wide knowledge of previously recovered material, and was also responsible for ensuring the smooth-running of the excavation ‘He must be a strict disciplinarian and possess a clear and orderly mind’ (Wheeler 1961: 164). Throughout this catalogue of roles and duties, Wheeler stressed that every member of the team should be aware of their value to the project (Wheeler 1961: 158).

Other posts included that of the photographer who should be ‘technically dependable’, ‘quick and ingenious’ and most importantly:

Like a doctor, the photographer must be available at a moment’s notice and at all times. (Wheeler 1961: 166). Although the section drawings were to be done by the area supervisors, ‘under the eye of the director’ (Wheeler 1961: 166), there would also be a architecturally trained surveyor to conduct the surveys and the plans. This surveyor would, however, have to be informed, according to Wheeler, that although accuracy was important pedantry was not required (Wheeler 1961: 167). Separate from the surveyor would be the draughtsman. Their duties included tracing and lettering of maps and plans, drawing the artefacts including the pottery, which was to be drawn following the accepted conventions (Wheeler 1961: 170-2). Wheeler’s list of posts also included that of site foreman and the labourers, but I will deal with their expected roles in sections 5.3.2 and 5.3.3 below.

Although Wheeler’s list was more detailed than most, these divisions and roles were replicated throughout the other manuals, with the exception of Petrie, which raises the point that throughout these handbooks there were two separate ideals being propounded, often in the same book. The archaeologist could fulfil all these roles, or alternatively, was fulfilling one of many specialisms. Perhaps, though unvoiced by the other writers, Wheeler’s dictum was the accepted model, for Wheeler it was essential that the whoever was in charge:
... must be able to direct and check his expert ... and must know enough to impose his standards without question on his experts ... He is a leader ... a strategist as well as a tactician. (Wheeler 1961: 154-5).

The definition of archaeology

By laying claim to such a variety of skills archaeologists were in a position to elevate the discipline to a more complex level. Archaeologists were the custodians of the entire human past, both Petrie (1904: vii-viii) and Wheeler (1961: 17) began their manuals with introductory remarks on these topics (also see Droop 1915: x; Atkinson 1946: 16-20; Kenyon 1952: 9-15), and Wheeler in particular continued in this vein in his final chapter What Are We Digging Up, And Why?:

...archaeology is primarily a fact-finding discipline... [the archaeologist] is primarily a fact-finder, but his facts are the material records of human achievement; he is also, by that token, a humanist, and his secondary task is that of revivifying or humanizing his materials with a controlled imagination that inevitably partakes of the qualities of art and even philosophy ... The historian, and with him I group the archaeologist, must have a spark of the intuitive comprehension which inspires the painter or poet ... they make the past live because they are themselves alive and can integrate their reasoned facts with the illogicalities of life. Otherwise they were mere cataloguers, adding dust to dust and ashes to ashes. (Wheeler 1961 229-30).

While Crawford claimed archaeology would help modern society to understand itself and its changes, for 'the modern archaeologist looks at both past and present from the same view-point' (Crawford 1953: 18). Even when such lofty sentiments were not spelt out, these writers emphasised that archaeology was of paramount importance to understanding the past (Kenyon 1952: 9-10). Petrie took the argument into the area of mortality and morality:

To murder a man a week before his time we call a crime; what are we to call the murder of years of his labour? ... The work of the archaeologist is to save lives; to go to some senseless mound of earth, some hidden cemetery, and thence bring forth into the comradeship of man some portions of the lives of this sculptor, of that artist, of the other scribe; to make their labour familiar to us as a friend; to resuscitate them again, and make them live in the thoughts, the imaginations, the longing, of living men and women. (Petrie 1904: 177-8).

Justifying an ethical archaeology

Within this elevated definition of archaeology was the reassurance that archaeology had gone beyond simple treasure hunting to become a legitimate discipline:

To suppose that excavating – one of the affairs which needs the widest knowledge – can be taken up by persons who are ignorant of most or all of
the technical requirements, is a fatuity which has led, and still leads, to the
most miserable catastrophes. Far better let things lie a few centuries longer
under the ground, if they can be let alone, than repeat the vandalisms of past
ages without the excuse of being a barbarian. (Petrie 1904: 180).

Atkinson quoted Petrie in his own work and then reiterated the message:

The first principle of excavation is that it should never be undertaken except
by an experienced person ... excavation is not a simple matter. It does not
consist merely in digging things up. For the archaeologist digs not for
objects but for knowledge, knowledge, which can only be won if digging is
carried out systematically. (Atkinson 1946: 16).

And, every manual contained some variant on Wheeler's (1961: 17) assertion that an
archaeologist should be aware they were not digging up 'things but people'. But, their
justifications of archaeology went beyond this simple defence and discussed the very
ethics of archaeology. The writers were primarily concerned with the morality of
restoring sites or artefacts to an approximation of their supposed original condition:

... if it helps the imagination it's a good thing, whether it's a building or a
pot, as long as it is clear to the expert what is real and what is restored.
(Droop 1915: 54-5).

Wheeler in particular argued that the archaeologist had a cardinal duty to present results
in a way that the public could understand and appreciate:

There may yet linger in remote cloisters a few pedants of the old school who
will have none of this vulgarisation, but their mortality-rate is happily high.
The modern scientist recognizes the public as his partners. (Wheeler 1961:
220).

What I found most surprising was that it was the earlier writers, Petrie and Droop, who
discussed the ethics of excavation itself:

The destruction which is needful to attain knowledge is justified if the
fullest knowledge is obtained by it, and if that is so safely recorded that it
will not again be lost. The only test of right is the procuring the greatest
amount of knowledge now and in future. (Petrie 1904: 175, see also Droop
1915: 52).

Later archaeologists contented themselves with remarking that while excavation was
destruction it was a necessary destruction undertaken altruistically for historical

The published reports of excavation do tend to include a reassurance about why that
particular site was chosen. The justification was either that in some way the material
was under threat:

The ruined buildings at Skara Brae were discovered in 1850 and have at
various times been excavated and the results recorded in the Proceedings of
the Society. Little, however, was done in the way of preserving the buildings, with the result that they were rapidly being destroyed by exposure and the action of the sea. (Childe & Patterson 1929: 15 & see Wheeler Verulamium archive).

Or, the site itself was believed to be of importance to a more general understanding of the past. Maud Cunnington's introduction to the report of her work at Oliver's Camp stated such reasons for their excavations\textsuperscript{vi} (Cunnington 1908b: 419 & see Callander et al 1927: 171; J. Curle 1913: 384; A. O. Curle 1939: 71). However, these explanations can also be read as part of archaeologists' assumption that they spoke with authority about the past rather than as justifications for their work. That the later writers of the manuals felt no real need to defend their destruction of sites through excavation suggests that archaeology, at least by the mid nineteen-forties, had been recognised as a legitimate source of information about the past.

5.2.2 Excavation techniques

The site reports gave little information about the mechanics of excavation except to detail where the trenches were placed. Again it was the manuals that gave the ideal of execution, and the archives that indicated how far these procedures were actually followed.

Discovery

Looking first at how potential sites were identified, there seems to have been little in the way of an agreed agenda for searching, locating and excavating the types of sites that should be investigated (Mike Hamilton pers. comm.). Decisions on where to excavate were largely personal decisions based on what the excavator decided they wanted to excavate. And, in those pre-trust, pre-county archaeologist days, there was no recognised body to call upon to ‘rescue’ threatened sites unless the Ancient Monuments Department was notified and intervened. Rescue archaeology was, as speakers at the 1943 *Future of Archaeology Conference* noted, still a somewhat haphazard affair (Fox 1944: 51; Myres 1944: 54-6; Grimes 1944: 65-9).

The major change between Petrie and Atkinson or Kenyon was the advent of aerial photography (Atkinson 1946: 28 & see Kenyon 1952: 160-1; Crawford 1953: 45-50). However, as these writers conceded, despite the publication of *Wessex from the Air* (1928)\textsuperscript{vii}, most of the available air photographs were not taken for archaeological
purposes so their use was variable (Kenyon 1952: 61), or they were taken once the site was under excavation (figs. 5.1 & 5.2). While it should be noted that both Woodhenge and Little Woodbury were amongst the sites discovered by aerial photography, the more usual approach was still largely surface observation. Petrie, Atkinson, Crawford and Wheeler all recommended asking the locals, physically examining the area, noting any surface pot sherds or stone chips, any differences in vegetation, or noting the patterns made by light and shade which might highlight banks, ditches, or walls (Petrie 1904: 9-19; Atkinson 1946: 21-33; Kenyon 1952: 155-61; Crawford 1953: throughout; Wheeler 1961: 135-49). Both Petrie and Atkinson advocated listening to the noise a site made:

Prehistoric camp sites are noticed by the difference of tone of the ground in walking over them; the ashes holding so much air that the reverberation to the foot-step is quite different to that on ordinary desert. (Petrie 1904: 13). Whereas Atkinson recommended ‘bosing’ (Atkinson 1946: 32). This technique had been favoured by Pitt Rivers and was recommended by Crawford (1953: 134-5) but sounds unreliable despite the technical language Atkinson used to describe the procedure

Trenches and walls

Once a site had been discovered, the next step was to decide how it should be excavated. Petrie was highly critical of the ‘cursory method’ ‘favoured by French excavators’ of digging trial pits in various spots; which he argued were unlikely to hit anything of importance and if they did would in all likelihood damage it, and certainly destroy its connection with other things (Petrie 1904: 41). Insofar as I understand how Petrie excavated, and his photographs do little to elucidate his methods (fig. 5.3), his suggestion was that potential sites should be explored by parallel trenches, the method he also advocated for the actual excavation of the site. This method, he argued, had the advantage of lessening the material to be moved since the previous trench was filled with the current one’s soil:

If a town is cleared, then it is done chamber by chamber, each being emptied over the wall into the previous chamber. The corners of the chambers can just be left visible for making a plan afterwards. (Petrie 1904: 44).

Should there be any doubt as to where to begin excavating, Petrie’s advice was:

In case of tracing a building, trenches cut along the lines of the walls are a good beginning; and then if more is wanted, the plan is clear and the rooms can be emptied with foresight. (Petrie 1904: 41 & see 46-7).
Although Droop argued against strip trenches, he did remark:

If there are walls showing or stones that look like parts of walls it is a natural, and strange to say quite proper, method of beginning trials to dig trenches along them to see how deep they go. (Droop 1915: 21).

This system of investigation while acceptable until after the first world war in Britain, and later in the Near East according to Wheeler (1961: 32-4), was denounced by the later writers who complained that features would be easily missed:

This system has nothing to recommend it, as only a very narrow strip of the site is exposed at one time. (Atkinson 1946: 43 and see Kenyon 1952: 90).

Wheeler also criticised this style of work and included an illustration (fig. 5.4) to show:

... the unhappy consequence of the wholesale clearance of the wall along its two faces. The relationship of the wall with the adjacent strata has been lost beyond recall ... Excavation has devolved into destruction. (Wheeler 1961: 93-5; and see 81-2 and 91).

Yet in the same volume Wheeler praised James Curle’s Newstead report as a ‘shining’ example of how reports should be written (Wheeler 1961: 216), omitting to mention that the site was excavated by wall following with strip trenches. This is yet another example of Wheeler’s selective presentation of information.

In contrast to Petrie, Atkinson’s instructions for excavating buildings were detailed both in the methodology and the possible discoveries. Atkinson suggested that before buildings were excavated a test pit should be dug to check the depth of stratification, and only when this had been established should the rooms then be cleared:

... layer by layer, leaving a baulk not less than 2 feet wide running right across the room and two opposite walls. The remaining walls should also be bridged by baulks which extend right up to the surface. The purpose of these bridges is to make quite certain which layers run right across the remains of a building, and therefore post-date its destruction, and which are confined within its walls, and therefore contemporary with its use. (Atkinson 1946: 56).

Once all the layers had been removed and the sections drawn:

Finally, one wall should be breached and a cutting dug through its footings to expose the method of building the foundations. Needless to say, the walls and floors should only be breached when the building as a whole is destined for destruction; in other cases it may be desirable to leave the structural parts of the building intact for preservation. (Atkinson 1946: 57).

Although Kenyon advocated a more complex approach with a greater number of sections (figs. 5.5 & 5.6), the method was principally the same. Wheeler had little to say in *Archaeology from the Earth* about the excavation of individual buildings, but the photographs and notebooks from the Verulamium archive demonstrate that he too was following this system, at least in the 1920s (figs. 5.7 & 5.8).
The Wheeler/Kenyon method

Although Atkinson appeared to be recommending that sites be investigated through a modified version of the Wheeler/Kenyon box system (Atkinson 1946: 41, and see fig. 5.9), at no point did he credit either archaeologist with inventing the approach. unsurprisingly, both Kenyon and Wheeler gave a much fuller account of the system, but it should be noted that neither advocated this approach to the exclusion of all other methods. In Archaeology from the Earth Wheeler stated that trial trenches were acceptable when ‘the preliminary problem is solely and simply to search for a superficially invisible structure’ (Wheeler 1961: 82). He did, however, argue that before beginning an ‘area-excavation’ certain prerequisites had to be fulfilled:

Only one type of layout normally supplies all these needs; namely, a layout based upon a square. A series of squares, a grid, dug so that a balk is left between each pair of adjacent squares until the extreme end of the work ... The individual square is a clearly defined sub-unit for record and supervision; supplementary squares can be added in any direction in accordance with developing needs, without affecting any previous datum; the supervisor retains in each square (until the end of the work) a complete section on all four sides of him, together with such additional sections or part sections as he may care to add within the compass of the square; the stratification of adjacent squares, and therefore accumulatively of the whole site, can easily be correlated and recorded along a number of arterial lines, so that ultimately the barriers between the squares can be removed without loss of vertical evidence and the whole plan laid bare, level by level ... and the squares, unlike most trenches, are sufficiently spacious to let in ample light and to provide elbow-room for interpretation and record. (Wheeler 1961: 82).

This method, Wheeler argued, had the overwhelming advantage of localising:

... both control and record. The supervisor’s responsibilities are clearly defined, and the area covered by his field note-book is precise. (Wheeler 1961: 85).

A further check was the provision of a ‘control pit’, which Wheeler felt should be used on all sites regardless of excavation style:

This is the supervisor’s own special charge, and upon it the accuracy of the general digging in large measure depends. It is a small cutting ... cut ... to a depth of 1½ - 2 feet lower than the average level of the work. Its purpose is to enable the supervisor, with a minimum disturbance of the strata, to anticipate the nature and probable vertical extent of the layers which are being cleared by his main gang. It is a glimpse into the future of his stratigraphical work. (Wheeler 1961: 84 & fig. 5.10).

Wheeler’s concern with control is as I have said a constant motif of Archaeology from the Earth, Kenyon was less dogmatic in her promotion of the grid system, simply
stating it to be ‘the most satisfactory method’ (Kenyon 1952: 95), before outlining a simple account of the method.

_Earthworks and barrows_

For sites such as barrows or earthworks, all three writers recommended similar approaches, and in fact all three authors used the same illustration, the excavation of the ditch at Maiden Castle (fig. 5.11). To investigate banks or ditches, it was suggested that a trench be put in at right angles to the line of the feature, long enough to extend beyond the earthwork for investigation of its construction (Atkinson 1946: 51; Kenyon 1952: 110-111; Wheeler 1961: 86-7). Atkinson and Wheeler (Wheeler 1961: 101) urged that great care should be taken to search for phases of construction and any remains of postholes that might indicate a palisade or fence:

Great attention should also be paid to the excavation of the old turf line beneath the bank, which may contain valuable evidence for the date of its construction. (Atkinson 1946: 51).

In excavating ditches, Atkinson cautioned that regardless of their depth, the fill should still be removed layer by layer (Atkinson 1946: 51). Atkinson’s directions revealed not only a concern for the correct excavation methodology, but also gave information about what the excavator could expect to find (ibid). Archaeology was no longer an unknown quantity, the characteristics of different kinds of prehistoric sites had become familiar enough to be predictable.

This agreement on techniques extended to the correct way to excavate pits and post holes (Atkinson 1946: 52-4; Kenyon 1952: 97), graves with skeletons or cremations (Atkinson 1946: 54-6; Kenyon 1952: 114) and, in particular the method of excavating round barrows. Two approaches were suggested by these authors. In the first method the mound was to be excavated in a series of parallel strips with the sections of each strip drawn as it was revealed (Atkinson 1946: 58; Kenyon 1952: 112). This was how Cyril Fox had excavated Yscefiog (fig. 5.12) and the same approach Wheeler had used at Dunstable Downs (Wheeler 1961: 115). The alternate method, the quadrant or segment method, was the one Kenyon preferred since it gave sections of both axis of the mound (Kenyon 1952: 112). Here the mound was divided into quarters, alternate quarters were excavated in turn with the baulks left standing to expose the sections (figs. 5.13 & 5.14 Atkinson 1946: 59; Kenyon 1952: 113; Wheeler 1961: Plate 14). All three authors warned that such sites should be excavated with caution:
The excavator of a barrow should always be on the look-out for traces of more than one period of construction, for secondary inhumations or cremations, for turf work or revetting in stone or wood, and for timber structures in the body of the mound. The latter in particular are easy to miss without constant observation; and nothing is more mortifying than to realize, on discovering the ground-plan of a stake or timber structure, that one has unwittingly dug away the most important part. (Atkinson 1946: 60).

While Kenyon declared:

No one should attempt to excavate a tumulus without first reading reports of recent excavations and the material they have produced. (Kenyon 1952: 112).

Although Field Archaeology predated his excavations at West Kennet or Wayland’s Smithy I was surprised that Atkinson, who spent so much time detailing the minutiae of excavation, had nothing to say about the excavation of long barrows, chambered tombs or cairns. Kenyon simply noted that such sites could be excavated in a similar fashion to round barrows:

... except that the length requires a number of cross-sections to be left in addition to a longitudinal one, and it should in fact be excavated in a number of bays. (Kenyon 1952: 112).

Her reticence is perhaps explained by her final sentence on these monuments:

In the great majority of cases, the primary burials in the central chamber have been disturbed. (ibid).

Without material culture there was little point in excavating, it was the artefacts which gave the site importance. For Wheeler long barrow excavation techniques gave him the chance to yet again refer to Pitt Rivers:

The first long barrow scientifically excavated – and one of the few – was the famous Wor Barrow on Handley Down, Dorset, excavated by Pitt Rivers in 1893. The published photograph of the finished work, in which ‘the figure standing at attention in the middle distance marks the site of the central interment’, is itself a monument of the General’s scientific discipline ... It is no detraction from the outstanding merit of this classic excavation to suggest improvements of method. (Wheeler 1961: 121).

These improvements, with reference to C.W. Phillips’ Skendleby excavations\(^x\), were that a contour survey of the monument should be made before excavation, that longitudinal sections with sections across the axis should be made, that there be ‘firmly fixed datum-lines’, and that the site should be excavated in two halves (Wheeler 1961: 122). All of which sounds like an entirely different approach rather than simply ‘improvements'.
Recording Practices

All of the manuals repeatedly asserted that excavation was destruction and that therefore adequate records must be kept (Droop 1915: 7). However, when it came to the details of how this ideal should be attained, Droop had little to say other than to stress the need to record stratigraphic information (Droop 1915: 9, 71-3 & 75-7) and that the excavator should keep notes:

It is impossible to give directions for such notes, but they should err in the direction of fullness rather than of concision, and it is well to remember that rough sketches and plans are often worth more than a good many words. (Droop 1915: 27).

Petrie gave a little more detail of his method, including an example of what the notes should record:

Town Plan. - Survey of every wall of each house; thickness of each wall (easily neglected); reveals of doorways; doorsills if of stone; sizes of bricks; levels of top and base of each wall if any rebuilt or superimposed; contents of each chamber, note if on floor or in filling; objects buried in floors; special note of position of exactly dated objects; copies of frescoes or decoration. (Petrie 1904: 52).

In the later manuals it was suggested that notebooks should be used to record the work taking place, Atkinson suggested that on any excavation there should be four record books, the trench book for listing ‘all the trenches and cuttings excavated, with a record of the structures, stratification, and finds revealed in each one’ (Atkinson 1946: 155). The bag list which recorded all the artefacts, except the small finds, from a given context (ibid); the small finds list, and, most importantly, the day book:

For the excavator who makes no written records other than mere lists of finds, and trusts to his memory for the rest, will have at the end but the bare bones of his site; it is the small observations, the hypotheses, the casual ideas which when later sorted and studied will most often clothe those bare bones in flesh and blood. (Atkinson 1946: 155-6).

It seems extremely unlikely that Atkinson always followed his own advice since the surviving records for some of his unpublished excavations are extremely scanty (Cleal et al. 1995: 16; Leivers et al. 2001).

Wheeler recommended a similar system, each box in the grid should have a separate notebook kept by the supervisor in charge of that area, and into this was recorded the sketches of sections and plans, and the small finds (Wheeler 1961: 85-6 & 162; Kenyon 1952: 122). The Maiden Castle archive shows that at least on this site Wheeler was following this method (Mike Hamilton pers comm).
Despite Wheeler’s disparaging remarks about Petrie’s recording system (Wheeler 1961: 29-30 & 68) Petrie was also keen to stress the necessity of keeping adequate records:

Recording is the absolute dividing line between plundering and scientific work, between a dealer and a scholar ... The unpardonable crime in archaeology is destroying evidence which can never be recovered; and every discovery does destroy evidence unless it is intelligently recorded. (Petrie 1904: 48, and see 52).

But, by Wheeler’s advocated standards his criticisms were valid, where he (1961: 28), Atkinson (1946: 173-4), and Kenyon (1952: 115), stated, quoting Pitt Rivers, that everything should be recorded, Petrie (1904: 49) argued that there had to be a method to recording, the intelligent excavator should know what to record and what to discard. And, although Petrie obviously kept written records (1904: 50) he also argued the excavator had to rely on memory:

Everything seen should be mentally grasped, and its meaning and bearings comprehended at the moment of discovery, so clearly that definitive statement can be made, which shall be as certain and as absolute as anything can be which depends on human senses ... It is as well to work slowly over all the petty details of an important discovery, perhaps for half an hour, while considering all the facts and their meaning, before finally removing the main evidences of position. All this needs practice, and a full knowledge of what is important and what is trivial. (ibid).

**Standardising excavation**

The high level of agreement between the later authors about techniques and methods appropriate to each type of excavation suggests that by the late 1940s there was an established procedure for excavation and recording, and one that had been in place for a considerable time. All of these writers speak with a weighty authority about what should be done, how, and the expected results. The archives, however, present a very different picture. Childe’s excavations at Kindrochet in 1929 and Castlelaw in 1932 show exactly the sort of untidy narrow trenches that Atkinson, Kenyon and Wheeler warned against (figs. 5.15 & 5.16; and see Atkinson 1946: 46; Kenyon 1952: 77, Wheeler 1961: 83 & plate 11). Wheeler’s own excavations at Verulamium show large trenches with excavation taking place at different levels all over the site (fig. 5.7), and despite his criticisms of those who did not write up their excavations, Wheeler also dug sites and failed to write the reports. Alexander Curle’s site notebook from the 1938 excavations at Freswick suggest wall following was still being practiced with little attention being paid to stratigraphy. It could be argued that this simply represents the inter-war diversity of approach which was later abandoned for agreed methods and principles. However, it
seems more likely, as Atkinson's own work at East Finnercy suggests, that the manuals depict an ideal that was not always followed even by the those advocating these approaches.

5.3 Class and Employment

5.3.1 On site supervision
The level of on site supervision required by the director of an excavation was something of an obsession for the writers of these manuals. They were all keen to stress that the days were long gone when archaeology was undertaken by absentee gentleman scholars who only appeared at the end of the day, or week, or dig, to examine the artefacts recovered:

The workmen should of course be trained to report at once any change in the soil that they may notice, as they would any thrilling find, but as workmen are not to be trusted to pay attention to such trifles, which being beyond their understanding they treat as mere whims of their employer, the employer's eye should never be far off. It follows that no excavation should ever be left without some capable man in charge, and work should never be carried on over an area wider than can be supervised properly. For given the chance any site will develop enough spiteful intelligence to produce its best finds just in the absence of the observing eye, and even among the best trained workmen there are few with self-restraint enough to wait for its return. (Droop 1915: 18-19).

Petrie's remarks about the need for the director to get involved in all aspects of the work regardless of how hard or dirty that work might be (Petrie 1904: 7) suggested that he too rarely left his workmen alone on site. Yet, as Wheeler noted, Petrie also included recommendations for long-distance surveillance, and explicitly stated, to Wheeler's horror:

In detached small sites men may even be left unvisited for two or three days, merely reporting each evening how far they have worked. In one case some lads were left to work at a great sarcophagus for weeks unwatched, and came some miles to report progress, and say when further attention was wanted. (Petrie 1904: 29).

Other archaeologists incurred Wheeler's wrath for their lack of awareness of the requirements of 'scientific' excavation:
There is still no real understanding of the primary principle of all excavation, that no shovelful of earth shall be cut save under direct and skilled supervision. (Wheeler 1961: 32).

There are a few points I wish to raise here, the first was that Wheeler was overstating Petrie’s carelessness. Petrie had trained his labourers in his preferred methods, they were not Wheeler’s methods, but that does not mean that Petrie was negligent. Petrie had an ambiguous relationship with his workmen (see sections 5.3.2 & 5.3.3), on the one hand they needed constant surveillance, but he also remarked of his ‘well-trained men’:

... their observations and knowledge should always be listened to, and will often determine events. The freshman from England is their inferior in everything except recording; and at least a season’s digging is needed before anyone can afford to disregard the judgement of a well-trained digger. (Petrie 1904: 22).

I think the real point here is that Wheeler was concerned that on Petrie’s sites there were no other gentleman, or junior officers to carry on the work in the Director/General’s absence. Wheeler himself was not always in attendance on site (Hawkes 1982: 90-1), and the photographs from Verulamium and Maiden Castle show he did not personally examine every shovelful of earth (figs. 5.17 & 5.18). Likewise, Wheeler’s hero Pitt Rivers was not always present at every stage of the excavations (fig. 5.19):

The work of superintending the digging – though I never allowed it to be carried on in my absence, always visiting the excavations at least three times a day and arranging to be sent for whenever anything of importance was found ... I had by ample experience been taught that no excavation ought ever to be permitted except under the immediate eye of a responsible and trustworthy superintendent. (Pitt Rivers 1887: xviii).

Petrie also used site supervisors even if they are not mentioned in Methods and Aims (Murray 1963: 118; Seton-Williams 1988: 34), but he was using far more labourers than Wheeler or Pitt Rivers, and of necessity he relied on his workmen to a degree incomprehensible to Wheeler, who could not see his preferred hierarchy of command on Petrie’s excavations.

5.3.2 The Foreman

The idea of a hierarchy of labour on excavations was an unquestioned facet of archaeology in the first half of the twentieth century. The manuals and archives reinforce the view from the previous chapter that Britain in the 1920s and 30s was still
sharply divided across lines of class and race. As can be seen from Wheeler’s ‘staff’ list there was a clear division of roles, and within this division an explicit hierarchy. The Foreman of an excavation occupied a liminal role, he was, in Wheeler’s tedious military metaphor, the sergeant-major of an excavation, the conduit between the officers and the troops, the trained staff and the manual workers:

He has proved himself as a digger and should be the best workman on the site. He may assist in the uncovering of especially fragile or important objects. But he must above all things, be by nature capable of controlling his men with firmness and scrupulous fairness. (Wheeler 1961: 162).

It was expected that the foreman would be interested in the archaeology:

The best foremen are also enthusiasts. In England, William Wedlake my foreman and colleague at Maiden Castle and in France, Thomas Hepple, who assisted Mr J.P. Gibson and Mr Gerald Simpson on Hadrian’s Wall, and W.E.V. Young, Mr Keiller’s foreman at Avebury, are three most outstanding examples of the foreman-archaeologist and friend. In India, I had one such, a Punjab peasant, whose mind was constantly on his work whether he was on duty or off... Such friendships are amongst the highest reward that a director can desire. They bridge the class-room and help to link inferred fact with basic earthy knowledge. (Wheeler 1961: 163; and see Droop 1915: 35).

Although Wheeler talked here about ‘friendship’ it is noticeable that the foremen he named are not given the gentlemanly prefix ‘Mr’, and in the case of his Indian foreman, not even named. Wheeler may have been trying to argue that class was irrelevant to archaeological enthusiasm, but his wording, in fact, reinforced class and colour boundaries. Petrie, whose ambiguous attitude to his ‘native’ staff ran through Methods and Aims, opposed the widespread practice of employing overseers:

The more friction they save, the less the master knows of his men, and the less influence he has. The more they profess to drive the men, the more hollow the fraud is, until the overseer merely serves to give notice when the master is coming, the more indispensable they seem, the less desirable is it to have so to trust a native... Moreover, there is nothing so demoralising to a native as wandering about, without hard work... Even good men soon lose their character in such conditions, and it is needful to have some definite allotted manual work for even a leading man. (Petrie 1904: 24-5).

Alexander Curle described his foreman Simon Bremner as ‘an old friend and an admirable foreman as he is an antiquary and unusually intelligent’ (Curle diary 21st September 1947 and see Curle 1939: 109). I would like to read this as Bremner being ‘unusually intelligent’ for an antiquary/archaeologist, but it seems more likely Curle meant for a man of his class. Curle did allow Bremner some measure of autonomy:
Bremner was working away all day clearing up to the east of 6. I think on a wrong scent, and late in the afternoon I called him off to concentrate on what I am sure is the complete foundation. (Curie MS/28/461 (3) 28th June 1938).

Curle also recorded Bremner’s suggestions about their discoveries in his site notebook, the following entry was a typical example:

The exploration of the mysterious structure to the east side progresses. Bremner is convinced it has some connection with a clay floor we met last season in an area bounded by a foundation, or row of boulders set in an arch, just to the north, and that it has something to do with a water system. Personally I cannot, at present, accept this idea. It suggests to me a building with an arrangement for draining a floor. (Curle MS/28/461 (3): 24th June 1938).

Given that Bremner’s ideas were here mediated through Curle and the final decision about the results was presented in the site reports as solely Curle’s work it is impossible to state with confidence how Bremner viewed the work. But, these entries do suggest that Curle listened to his foreman, even if eventually he dismissed the suggestions. However, listening to advice does not indicate Curle in any way saw Bremner as an equal, Curle was in no doubt that he was the expert in charge and Bremner the employee to be directed and overseen. Curle might not always be present at the excavations but he was the one who made the decisions.

The foreman was expected to be nearly equal to the directors in skill, as Captain Cunnington noted of the Cunnington’s excavations:

Neither actually dug unless to take out some ticklish object needing special care. … When anything of special importance appeared, W.E.V. Young, the foreman digger … who was very skillful and experienced, was called upon to take over with the trowel. (Cunnington, R. H. 1933, 229-30 and see also Cunnington 1908a, 2).

The foreman was also in required to run the excavations when the director was absent. As Dr Graham Ritchie has noted, given James Curle’s own uninformative notes and his frequent absences from the site, James Curle must have been relying on his foreman’s notebooks of the excavation in order to write the Newstead report (Curle 1911: vii). Likewise, Alexander Curle although formally in charge of the Traprain Law excavations, was only present once a week, he recorded in his diary for the 20th May 1914:

We have now commenced work on Dumpden Law [Traprain Law] and are finding many objects of interest. We began our 6 month visit and [James] Cree is giving personal and daily supervision for this month. In June Mr J.G.A. Baird takes control, and in July Mr Craw and young Murray … By
this arrangement we shall always have someone on the spot to direct the
workmen. (Curle diary 20th May 1914)\textsuperscript{xvii}.

All foreman occupied a liminal position on an excavation but James Cree was in a
particularly odd position in the Scottish excavational hierarchy, being neither the
foreman nor the overall director of excavations at Traprain Law or the investigations
carried out at the Inchnadamph caves. Cree was not employed to supervise these
excavations, in that he does not appear to have been paid, although his expenses were
covered (Ritchie to Cree 8th July 1926), but neither was he credited with control of the
excavations. Traprain Law was published under Curle’s name, even though Cree and
Pringle essentially ran the excavations. Similarly the report for Inchnadamph was
authored by Callander, Ritchie, and Cree, and both Callander and Ritchie appear to have
been trying to control the excavations from a distance even though it was Cree who was
in charge of the daily running of the excavations with only occasional visits from
Callander and Ritchie\textsuperscript{xviii}. The ambiguity of Cree’s position in archaeology may have
been due to his uncertain social status, he was the son of a Scottish brewer who
relocated to New Mexico with his family and set up a ranch which James Cree inherited
(Lesley Ferguson \textit{pers. comm.}). Cree was evidently quite well-off, but being referred to
as ‘Cree’ rather than Mr Cree indicates he was not perceived to be part of the same
social strata as Alexander Curle.

I have argued elsewhere that Stuart Piggott was in a similarly ambiguous position when
he was employed as Keiller’s private archaeologist and that this led to difficulties in his
relations with other Wiltshire archaeologists (Roberts 2002: 57). Problems which were
not encountered by W.E.V. Young, who worked for Keiller and others, because
Young’s position was less imprecise, he was the site foreman, a labourer who had later
become interested in archaeology, but nonetheless a member of the working classes
who was clearly an employee (\textit{ibid}).

\textbf{5.3.3 The labourers}

\textit{Class as character}

This is not to say that the employment of labourers on archaeological sites was
straightforward. In Wheeler’s hierarchical list of staff the labourers were the last entry,
and it is hard not to conclude that they were also at the bottom of the on-site hierarchy.
A drawback to the kind of labour that usually comes to the field-archaeologist to-day in Great Britain is that it ... consists of unemployed or unemployable invalids, garage hands, drapers' assistants, university students and the like, to whom picks and shovels are encumbrances rather than instruments ... And indeed, to be just, the university student, if he be of the right sort, can usually be trained without undue delay to a fair measure of competence; only he could usually be better employed in more detailed and specialized work and is largely wasted in the basic task of digging. (Wheeler 1961:173).

Wheeler offered no explanation as to why drapers' assistants or garage hands, or indeed British labourers could not also be trained in the 'detailed and specialized work'. The obvious conclusion to draw is that their class was seen to prevent them from taking an intelligent interest, a particularly contradictory belief when he had already praised Young and Wedlake, presumably, they were seen as exceptional. Throughout Wheeler's discussion of workmen class determined character:

... noise amongst British workmen is a bad sign. Almost every gang of them contains at least one addle-pated gossip, who must be isolated and extinguished at once, or the good men will rapidly deteriorate. (Wheeler 1961:174).

Wheeler was certainly not alone in his assumptions, Atkinson was equally patronising about the working classes:

It may be said at once that ... the navvy is to be preferred for actual digging to all but the most skilled and conscientious amateur. In the writer's opinion the ideal labour force for the small excavation consists of a few navvies with previous experience of archaeological digging, under a good foreman, and one or two experienced amateurs to help with the recording, surveying, and photography, and to do the more delicate digging. (Atkinson 1946: 64, original emphasis).

There was the belief that labourers could only labour, for careful work or work that required intelligence they were overlooked, it was their brute strength that was required. The labourer was seen as an earth-moving machine, to be turned on or off as required:

The major part of most excavations consists of pick-and-shovel work, at which the navvy excels; though unused to archaeological work, the navvy will yet achieve the necessary standard of neatness and efficiency in digging more often than the majority even of experienced amateurs; and finally, the navvy is used to carrying out definite instructions, and if he is troublesome or inefficient he can be paid off: the approach to the amateur unpaid helper cannot be either so direct or so effective. (Atkinson 1946: 65 and see Kenyon 1952: 77).
I have a certain amount of sympathy with Atkinson, who had obviously been plagued by enthusiastic and inefficient amateurs, however, running through his discussion of navvys was a judgment of the working classes as innately stupid and dishonest (Atkinson 1946: 65-66).

*Mistrust*

Wheeler was equally concerned with the possibility of theft from his excavations, although his reading placed a racial as well as class interpretation on honesty:

> There can be no doubt that in the past much has been salved for science in the East by the baksheesh system. Even in Great Britain, objects, notably coins, have probably been saved in similar fashion from disposal at the local public house. (Wheeler 1961: 176, my emphasis and see Petrie 1904: 35-9 for explanation of his baksheesh system).

His solution was not to trust his workers, or indeed to pay adequate wages, but to constantly monitor them:

> On a properly supervised excavation, nearly all the diggers are constantly under the eye of the site-supervisor, and theft in any event would be difficult. (Wheeler 1961: 176).

These writers were not only concerned with the presumed dishonesty of their workers, they also suspected that given the chance the workers would take advantage of them. Wheeler warned that while the workmen should be given a ‘reasonable’ amount of comfort:

> An over-solicitous attention to ‘welfare’ may easily result in dissatisfaction... the charitably minded director suddenly finds that he is being exploited, and, if remedy be not immediately and tactfully applied, the path to hell has been well and truly paved. (Wheeler 1961:175).

Atkinson was similarly concerned about the possibility that an excavator would be imposed upon:

> ... the rate paid should be the local one for this type of work, which can be ascertained from the local Labour Exchange ... The practice of ‘subbing’, that is, of advancing a portion of wages not yet due, is not to be encouraged. (Atkinson 1946: 66).

While Petrie believed that only constant monitoring kept labourers working:

> An air of vigilant surprises has to be kept up. A sunk approach to the work behind higher ground is essential, and if possible an access to a commanding view without being seen going to and fro. A telescope is very useful to watch if distant work is regular. (Petrie 1904: 28)
This fear and mistrust of the working classes was noted in the previous chapter, and its presence here amongst writers who worked extensively with working class labourers shows how deeply ingrained these beliefs were.

*Working conditions*

Atkinson detailed when the workmen could be expected to work and when they should be given breaks and overtime. He suggested obtaining workers from the local Exchange, and that the local rates of pay should be checked with the labour exchange, rather than asking the men themselves (Atkinson 1946: 66). The men were expected to put in a nine hour day with an hour for lunch and a ‘short’ morning break (*ibid*). A. O. Curle engaged a foreman who was then responsible for hiring a crew (MS/28/461 (2): 6th January 1937). Curle’s men were employed on similar terms to Atkinson’s, although from Curle’s accounts and diary entries his workmen appear to have worked Saturdays as well (fig. 5.20; and MS/28/461 (3) 18th June 1938). It was expected that the workmen would provide their own tools (Petrie 1904: 33), Atkinson noted that:

If a workman breaks his own tools during working hours they should be replaced for him free of charge. (Atkinson 1946: 66).

I will return in section 5.3.4 to the way tools defined role and status.

From Cree’s accounts of the wages for the Inchnadamp excavations in 1926 (fig. 5.21) and Curle’s notes from Freswick in 1939 (fig. 5.20) it can be seen that British workmen were paid around two pounds a week for their work, with Bremner’s wages being slightly higher as befitted his superior status as foreman. This was a pittance, the usual pittance for a workman, but a pittance nonetheless, as was seen in the previous chapter with Reeves’ investigations into those living on a pound a week before the first world war. I am not certain whether the employer was obligated to provide extra insurance for the workers while they were on site, figure 5.22 is the insurance document for the McLeod’s work at Inchnadamp. However, this is the only such document I have seen, so I am unsure whether this was the usual practice, or if this being a cave site additional insurance was needed.

Employers were also responsible for making sure the National Insurance Stamps of their workers were up-to-date. Atkinson noted cards should be stamped every Monday (Atkinson 1946: 66), and Cree’s expenses included payments for unemployment and
health insurance. Curie however deducted these from his worker's wages, removing a no doubt much needed shilling, a rare and petty deduction. Curie recorded that when, in 1916, he was appointed Director the Royal Scottish Museum in addition to his original post at the National Museum his pay was £650 rising to £750 a year (Curie diary 13th April 1916). In the unlikely event of a labourer managing to find work for every week of the year, having no time off through sickness, unemployment, or holidays he would still have only earned just over a hundred pounds in 1939. And, Curie was one of many who complained bitterly about the working classes being overpaid during the first world war (Curie diary 13th January 1918 and see section 7.8.2). As well as fear and mistrust there was also resentment by the middle classes, allied to a lack of understanding of the hardships faced by the working classes.

Given that archaeology operated within Britain's sharply stratified society it is unsurprising that it should reflect these elements. When Curie travelled around Skye with Callander surveying the monuments he commented on the inhabitants and their lifestyle as much as the archaeology (Curie Diary 3rd June 1914). He observed them from a distance, mental if not physical, remarking on their houses, the layout and usage as if they were archaeological sites descending only into corporeality to remark that the houses didn't smell too bad 'considering' (ibid). This deliberate distancing underlay Curie's reason for only visiting Traprain Law on Saturdays during the excavations. He wrote that he had tried to find suitable accommodation for overnight visits, but after once staying with a ploughman and his wife had concluded that it was all too primitive, the sheets were clean but the plumbing was non-existent and 'The working man's meals are not as ours' (Curie Diary: 29th June 1919). Curie was particularly class conscious, I have already mentioned his views on the working classes during wartime, but he also recorded the following when his son Sandy, Colonel Curie, joined the 3rd Battalion of the Gordon Highlanders at the end of the war:

He is quartered in the Botanic Gardens and his fellow officers are obviously a good example of the 'temporary gentleman' class. Sandy reports that some of them sleep in their day shirts, they take no baths, and because he speaks with an Aberdeen accent they considered he must be an Englishman! (Curie Diary: 23rd February 1919).
Race as character

It was not just class that determined intellect and character, in the previous chapter I discussed how race was seen to determine character, and this understanding was visible in archaeology. Wheeler’s remarks about the lassitude and indolence he discovered amongst his staff at the Archaeological Survey of India could come straight from Kipling (Wheeler 1955: 186-209). The inhabitants of the different regions of India were also given distinct racial characteristics ‘little round-faced talkative Bengalis, quick-witted Madrasis’ (Wheeler 1955: 197) ‘the tall, regal Punjabi Musulman’ and ‘the tiny, volatile Madrassi’ (Wheeler 1961:173). There was also a generalised interpretation of the nature of ‘Orientals’. In arguing against having too many men at work in one trench Wheeler asserted that aside from anything else the site became too noisy:

Noise on an excavation generally implies inefficiency; always with the proviso that the Oriental is a born chatterer and is unhappy without a considerable measure of noise about him. (Wheeler 1961: 174).

Wheeler’s conflation of ‘Orientals’ was a common theme of his work:

With Arabs I have never worked, although I have often enough watched them with a critical eye upon archaeological excavations. They do not appear to be a very different problem from the north Indian Muslims. (Wheeler 1961: 173).

Wheeler was not alone in his colonialism and racism, Petrie remarked:

The better class of these workers are one’s personal friends, and are regarded much as old servants are in a good household. (Petrie 1904: 22). Which is both an example of the conflation of class and race whereby ‘natives’ are all presumed to be of the working classes, and an odd reflection on the nature of friendship, one that regularly recurred in Petrie’s work (Petrie 1904: 5). Workers could be friends, but they were not social equals. I commented above that Petrie had an equivocal relationship with his workers, on the one hand he stated that their ‘knowledge should always be listened to, and will often determine events’ (Petrie 1904: 22). But at the same time he denied his workers any real self-control or autonomy (Petrie 1904: 22). Petrie was at best paternalist in his dealings with his workmen, in his description of the ideal archaeologist he wrote:

Alongside of his men he must live, in work hours and out; every workman should come to him at all times for help and advice. His courtyard must be the pay office and the court of appeal for every one; and continual attention should be freely given to the many little troubles of those who are to be kept properly in hand. (Petrie 1904: 7, my emphasis).

At his worst, Petrie was racist:
A Coptic village is clean and well swept, the women sitting at work in doorways and chatting across the street. It is on the level of a civilised Mediterranean land, and not like the filthy confusion of a Mohammedan village. The same difference is seen in Cairo; the Coptic main road the Fagallah, is well repaired, planted and watered. The great Mohammedan boulevard Mahomet Aly has the pavements broken and full of holes, and dust and filth heaped up in all corners. Egypt will never be a civilised land till it is ruled by the Copts — if ever. (Petrie 1931: 207-8).

Just as could be seen with Wheeler, there was the belief that race determined character:

The Egyptian is good at steady work, but the Syrian is very different, and it took some weeks at Tell Hesy to educate men into continuous regular digging. They would jump out of their holes every few minutes and squat on the edge for a talk with the next man... In Greece such difficulties are even greater, and rational regular hard work cannot be reckoned upon, as in Egypt. (Petrie 1904: 20).

This belief in race determining ability was shared, although inverted, by Droop who believed that while Greek and Italian workmen were generally honest and industrious, Egyptians were dishonest thieves (Droop 1915: 73). Droop also referred, in the style of the juvenile fiction writers of the previous chapter to ‘Oriental subtlety’ (Droop 1915: 73) and the ‘laxer notions of the East’(Droop 1915: 74).

The masses

Whatever nationality the worker belonged to, they seem to have been treated as a nameless interchangeable mass. In Curle’s notebook for Freswick he referred regularly to Bremner, but rarely mentioned the labourers by name, they were simply ‘the men’:

The men are removing the ... sand and making excellent progress. They produce planks from their own homes and bring them down on a motor lorry belonging to one of their number. (Curle MS/28/461(2): Monday 7th June 1937).

It is hard not to get the impression that Curle was either uncertain of their names or simply didn’t distinguish between his workmen, even though at one point he was only employing three labourers. When the workers were named it was usually because they had irritated him:

I have again changed William Cormack’s job and set him and his ‘pal’ to clean up the interval between Ho.5 and the west end of Ho. 2. (MS/28/461(3): 18th June 1938).

Curle was not alone in this, Wheeler referred to his anonymous ‘Punjab peasant’ foreman (Wheeler 1961: 163), and Cree rarely mentioned the McLeod’s by name in his notebook or letters to Callander and Ritchie, again they were simply ‘the men’ (MS/28/632: 21) unless they were troublesome:
John and Alex McLeod – the same two men we had last year are again working and I am glad to tell you that I think they are keeping better time! So far I have really not had cause to complain. (letter Cree to Ritchie 19/6/27).

Nor were the labourers mentioned in the site reports, at the end of the Freswick report Curle simply said:

My excellent team of local workmen, under Mr Simon Bremner, tackled their job with such zeal and interest beyond the mere terms of their employment as to deserve special recognition. (Curle 1939: 109 and see Childe 1931a: 72 for a similar appreciation of his anonymous staff).

Even this level of acknowledgement was rare, and Childe’s thanking of the workmen by name at the end of the Rousay report (Childe 1938: 31) was exceptional. Photographs of excavations reinforced this message of anonymity, the navvys from the Caerleon and Verulamium excavations were nameless, bundled together as ‘workmen’ (fig. 5.23). It could be argued that this is in part our fault. Little attempt has been made to trace these archaeological labourers. When talking about the Curles’ excavations at the Rhind lectures in 2000, Dr Graham Ritchie said that he hoped that the diary of James Curle’s foreman at Newstead would turn up, but admitted he had done nothing to initiate a search. Nor does it help that the Employment Bureau destroyed many of their records before historians had the chance to intervene. However, the original fault certainly lies with the directors and photographers of these excavations, it was their decision to withhold the labourers names, which has made these people anonymous (fig. 5.24).

Not only were workmen deemed anonymous, they were also rendered invisible, Droop remarked:

It is to be hoped that the days are over when extensive digs were carried on by one or two men. (Droop 1915: 4).

But in actuality he meant one or two supervisors in charge of ‘large gangs’ of workmen (Droop 1915: 4). Curle noted in his private diary ‘Young Stevenson joined me this morning I shall be glad of his company’ (Curle Diary: 1st July 1938), yet Curle was hardly alone, he was working with Bremner and the ‘three others’. This image of the lone archaeologist in the field is a common thread in our mythology. I was repeatedly told that in 1926 Tessa Wheeler had excavated the Caerleon amphitheatre ‘alone’, and indeed this was how it was reported in the Daily Mail who subsidised the work (Wheeler 1955: 75-6), it was only when I saw a photograph of the light railway for removing spoil that I realised far from being alone Tessa Wheeler was in charge of a large crew of workmen (figs. 5.25).
5.3.4 Tools as status

The tools used on an excavation also reflect the hierarchical nature of archaeology, Wheeler's list of tools clearly shows the differing status conferred:

(a) Equipment of the Directing Staff:

1. Theodolite or simplified equivalent.
2. Plane Table.
3. Reinforced measuring tapes 100 feet (or metric equivalent) long.
4. 2-foot and 5-foot folding rules, or their metric equivalent.
5. Prismatic oil-compass.
6. Drawing boards, including several light boards of 3-ply wood for work on the site.
7. Plumb-bobs.
8. Bubble levels.
9. Drawing paper, some of it squared (e.g. in 1-inch squares with eight subdivisions).
10. Architectural scales.
11. Good pencils and soft erasers.
12. Broad-bladed knives (blade about 7 inches long) and / or pointed masons’ trowels.
13. Good string.
15. Circular celluloid protractors.
16. Large celluloid set-squares.
17. T-squares.
18. Good drawing-pins.
20. Small pay-envelopes (for coins, &c.).
22. Notebooks.
23. 3-inch and 6-inch nails.
24. Scales of various kinds for photography, &c.

(b) The Labourers’ Equipment

1. Picks.
2. Small picks or trenching-tools.
3. Large shovels.
4. Small shovels or scoops.
5. Spade.
6. Turf-cutter or trimmer or edging knife.
7. Baskets or pans (in the East, for the removal of soil).
8. Wheel-barrows (in the West).
9. Knives or trowels.
12. Sledge-hammer (particularly for driving in fencing-posts).

Reinforcing this division Wheeler included photographs of the tools used on an Indian excavation (fig. 5.26), the top photograph was largely of labourers tools; basket, shovel, and picks, the exceptions being the 2-foot scale and the 'supervisor's knife', which he regarded as 'almost a badge of rank' (Wheeler 1961: 181). The second photograph was of the tools 'staff' would use, brushes, measuring tape and a notebook.

Tools obviously defined status and role, the workman was defined by his self-supplied shovel, spade or pick (fig. 5.27), the supervisor by his 'scientific' paraphernalia (figs. 5.28 & 5.29). The labourer supplied the unthinking work of soil removal, the supervisor took over when archaeology was unearthed. It should be noted that there are photographs from Childe's excavations which show labourers trowelling (fig 5.30) however, Childe's excavations appear to have been less stratified affairs. The representation of labourers as interchangeable with their tools went a stage further when the workmen were either removed from the picture entirely but their tools left behind to signify their presence (figs. 5.31 & 5.32), or they were used as archaeological markers, as scales for sections or to mark features (figs. 5.33 & 5.34 and see Wheeler 1961: 79). I would argue this definition went deeper than tools simply reflecting status, the workmen almost become part of the archaeological scenery to the photographer. It is, as Mark Knight has suggested (pers comm), almost as if the hierarchical sections that we construct in excavation spill over into the way we write about our history, at the top we have the directors, then the site assistants, and beneath them - the natural? - we have the labourers (fig. 5.35). There is an inhumanity to this, it reinforces the idea that to the archaeologist the labourers were just nameless dehumanised tools to be employed, regardless of the manual writers recommending listening and heeding the workers advice.

5.4 The Manuals vs. the Archives

5.4.1 Recording

It was not only the supervisor's knife or trowel that was a sign of status. For Wheeler, and Atkinson, the site or area notebook also denoted the supervisor (Atkinson 1946: 155; Wheeler 1961: 162), and it is noticeable that where there is an archive to consult
the records were kept by the senior members of staff. This does not mean that the foreman or other workers did not keep records. There are two different styles of handwriting in the Skara Brae notebooks and it is unclear who apart from Childe was writing them, it may have been Mr Firth of the Office of Works, or Mr Moor the foreman. W.E.V. Young kept his own excavation diaries which are now held in the Devizes Museum. As previously noted Dr Graham Ritchie has argued the Newstead report could only have been written if James Curle had access to an additional source of information, presumably the records kept by his foreman. It does suggest, however, that records other than those compiled by the director of the excavation were not seen as worth keeping beyond the writing of the final report, or not included in the material that was then archived.

5.4.2 Layers, Contexts, and Stratigraphy

The Ideal

It was only the later manuals, those by Atkinson, Kenyon and Wheeler that gave any real details as to what should be recorded and how these recordings should be made. Looking first at context recording, Atkinson advocated giving every layer of soil a number. These numbers were to be marked on the sections with labels. Atkinson also thought that layer numbers across the site should be correlated where possible and the same numbers given to equivalent layers (Atkinson 1946: 154-5 and see Wheeler 1961: 72-4 & 87-90). Kenyon disagreed with the attempt to correlate layers between trenches and squares. She held the view that so many layers would be unique to each square that it was better to have a set of numbers for each box. The phasing over the whole site could then be established and equivalences noted while preserving the individual square numbers (Kenyon 1952: 128-9). In this passage Kenyon appeared to suggest that the whole purpose of recording the layers was to give meaning to the artefacts recovered, a similar impression is gained from the other manuals and from the site notebooks.

Stratigraphy on site

In his excavation notebooks, A. O. Curle rarely recorded any detailed information about the layers removed, despite noting their archaeological significance:

Commenced excavations at Freswick on what I believe to be the site of a considerable settlement of the early Norse or Viking period. Over an area of several acres facing the foreshore of the bay are evidences of kitchen

Layers and structures were measured, although the high incidence of round numbers suggests that these measurements were approximate, but Curle had little to say about the soil, being far more concerned with their contents:

We were busy clearing the east section to east of the cross wall. There was much debris and stones, which at a higher level appeared to be placed turned out to have merely tumbled from the wall.

Crossing the east end we found a heap of peat ash close to the wall where there had been a fire and before it a short line of placed boulders suggests a platform of some sort.

In the south east angle, slightly below the floor level and 3 foot from the south wall and 4ft. 6ins. from the south lay the upper stones of a rotary quern (FS 55) not circular, as is the usual shape, but oval. It is almost complete except for a flake off one end. On lifting it I realised that it was in a hollow, and by probing discovered a post hole, which had a depth of 18 inches from the floor, dia. 9ins. and distance from east and south walls 43ins. in each case. There were stones around the mouth of the hole on one side as well as a packing of clay, and we recovered a piece of carbonised wood from the bottom of the hole. (MS/28/461(3): 20th June 1938).

I had wondered if Curie was recording more information about the layers in another notebook subsequently lost, since several were used for Freswick\textsuperscript{xxiii}, but the site report similarly dismissed contexts as irrelevant unless they contained artefacts or structures:

The floor of this house was covered deep in midden refuse, and no feature came to light in the course of its clearance. (Curle 1939: 80).

And:

On the north side of the hearth, and at the east end, a flue had been formed, rather over 1 foot in width, with two flat stones set on edge parallel to the kerb. When discovered, this had been used as a fireplace, and was filled with kitchen-midden refuse. At its inner end it had been blocked with a number of thin flat stones standing on edge, which, when the true nature of the construction was realised, were found to be the original covers of the flue, and were replaced. The flue terminated in a slope of hard compacted peat-ash. While no food refuse lay upon the hearth, such material covered the area at the east end of the chamber. (Curle 1939: 82).

Although Cree gave far more information about the soil structure and the depths of the layers, the style of recording was still verbal description, and like Curle, Cree placed a similar emphasis on the contents. Cree's description of the excavation of Cave Number 2 at Inchnadamph, the 'Reindeer' Cave read:

Commencing work at the end of June a datum line 10' 0" in length was placed due east and west at the mouth of the cave. Close to this 4 or 5 stones of moderate size, and occupying a space of about 5' 0", were observed set on
edge. These were placed in a diagonal line from west to east, at the entrance to the cave, but their purpose was not evident.

The removal of the deposits was next undertaken. The top deposit which, at this point was of red cave-earth, was only a few inches in thickness, but as we progressed inwards it increased considerably. A cross-section was made at 5' 0" from DL [datum line] and the cave earth was all removed and carefully examined. Near the entrance, at the east side a bone awl was removed. It was formed from an irregularly shaped splinter of bone about 5" in length and had been much in use. The point was broken off and the edges of the bone were rounded and smoothed through wear, while the flat surface was highly polished. ...

Below the cave-earth a deposit of coarse weather-rolled subangular gravel was found, and this was found to contain antlers and bones of reindeer and bones of other mammals and birds etc. ...

At 8' 0" from DL another cross-section was made – the breadth of the cave here being 11' 0". The deposits now became considerably thicker – a total of 4' 10" being measured. The various characters and thickness of the layers were as follows, reading from the top downwards.

1. Red cave-earth about 10" thick
2. Gravel containing antlers and bones etc. 20" in thickness.
4. Grey clay containing quartzite blocks about 10" thick.
5. Greyish yellow clay about 16" thick.

(Cree MS/28/632 (2) 7-9).

The only report of these excavations was in a preliminary form after the first season and nothing was published after the 1927 season. Nevertheless it is worth noting that even the limited contextual information recorded by Cree was omitted from this report:

In Cave No. 2, or the Reindeer Cave, two bone-bearing deposits were discovered – the cave-earth and an underlying slightly rolled gravel. Beneath this, over part of the cave, lay a barren gravel of much more rolled appearance. (Callander et al. 1927: 170).

Amateurs vs. professionals

I think that I had unconsciously divided these archaeologists into ‘amateurs’ and ‘professionals’ with Cree and Curle as the amateurs and Wheeler and Childe as the professionals. They were, after all, the ones that I had heard about during my undergraduate degree. I had expected there to be marked differences between Cree and Curle’s on-site recording styles, and those of Childe and Wheeler. But despite the practices suggested in Archaeology from the Earth there are more similarities than differences between these archaeologists’ notebooks. Childe’s notebooks consisted of references and quotes from relevant articles, with sketches of the plans, sections, and artefacts recovered. Occasionally there would then follow a description of the
structures, layers and the work undertaken but, often there would simply be a list of the artefacts recovered from these contexts:

Pass B [Passage B]
Top of midden 10.5"
Trench 2. Through midden as in I
Level II T (9.69) = -9¼"
   46. One hammerstone.
   51. Tusk knotched near either end.
(9.08 = -7¼"
II. 52. One tooth cut for making beads.
   Level 6.81.
   The midden here reached immediately to the collapsed roof of passage 6 lying at a depth of 3' 8" in front and descending to a depth of [not recorded] from entrance in the midden at these levels were found.
   53. One tooth cut for making beads.
   54-5. Bone needles 54 55.
   56. Piece of horn (? Antler.
   57. Burnt bone ? worked.
   58-9. 2 round stones.
   60. Rim of pot blackened.
(Childe Skara Brae notebook 1929).

What is puzzling about these records is that the reports Childe wrote about Skara Brae were remarkably full and detailed. Even with the sketched plans and sections these notebooks contain, and the photographic record, Childe must have had an additional source of information, or a phenomenal memory. The interim report for 1927 said of passage B:

At its entry passage B was nearly 3 feet wide, but here the north-west wall looked like a secondary construction making a raceband joint with its continuation about 3 feet 6 inches from the mouth. Hereafter the passage is barely 2 feet wide and sometimes considerably less, perhaps owing to the deformation of the eastern wall under the pressure of accumulations in “Chamber 6”. The passage is partially paved with slate flags. Its floor just beyond the threshold is 18 inches below the floor of passage A. the passage, as originally discovered, was roofed over throughout its entire length, the roofing slabs being on an average 3 feet 9 inches above the floor. Unfortunately many of the slabs proved to be rotten, and had to be raised to make it safe to traverse the passage.

When discovered, the entry to passage B was filled from the floor up to the level of the threshold of the door with limpet shells. This deposit extended inwards for a distance of several feet, effectively blocking the passage. It thus seems that B was no longer used as a throughfare during the last phases of the occupation of the system of huts opening on to passage A. (Childe & Patterson: 1929: 247).
On other occasions Childe recorded far more additional information in the site notebook, his description of “Chamber 6”, for example, went beyond simply cataloguing the finds:

Chamber 6, see fig opp p.8. On removing the upper courses of the collapsed wall M no clear floor level had come to light but between its corner & passage B Mr Firth [of HM Office of Works] unearthed an empty slate cist like the “limpet boxes” in other chambers, whose bottom lay 4' 5" below the level of the inner lintel at L. This was then presumably sunk in the floor of the main Chamber 6 (from which too perhaps came the decorated pot sherds found in & under M). At a lower level more loose stones & midden came to light while an extension of wall Q set forward from the base line reached in 1928 was found running probably right up to the wall of passage A east of L. A section below Wall M (which seems to rest on the floor of the main chamber 6 below came midden 8" then a layer of midden & shells and more midden down to -1' 2" then 3 bands of sand alternating with this midden & then -1' 6" a thick layer of red & black hearth clay below it 1' of sand broken by a band of blue clay about -2' and then at 2' 9" blue clay which we took for virgin soil till to our astonishment lintel slabs appeared 4" down! These appear to be the roof of a narrow drain passing under floor in direction of passage B & under Wall Q towards inner wall of 5. Beneath the weight of Q the drain roof had collapsed producing a [unclear] sag in Q at the front, the drain was half full of sand & thereunder of blue clay mingle with bones & ashes. To pick up the drain in 5 a trench was dug there from the hearth through the right hand pen [?] On its floor were

64 pin A1
65 round scraper of black flint well but deeply worked [unclear].

[The entry then continues on July 25th in a different hand].

(Childe Skara Brae notebook 1929).

The differences in the two styles of recording are perhaps explained by the different structures being dealt with, the passage between the houses was seen as less important than the houses themselves. The passage was important for the artefacts it contained which could be used for dating and discussing the culture group they indicated, the houses were significant in that they revealed the social details of the inhabitants (Rick Peterson pers. comm.).

I have quoted this excerpt in full because I feel it illustrates a number of points about Childe’s approach to excavation. It has been an accepted truism that Childe was not a good field-archaeologist, and this was certainly the attitude taken by those archaeologists of his generation that I spoke to (Piggott in conversation, 1994; Fox in conversation, 1994; Chitty in conversation, 1994). However, I think this section reveals that while he was certainly not a gifted field worker, he was certainly no worse than other practitioners. And, I hadn’t expected such engaging enthusiasm, or indeed the
ingenuousness revealed by the discovery of the flag-stones in what had been assumed to be the natural. But, I also wanted to compare this excerpt with the published report. Throughout his reports on Skara Brae Childe freely acknowledged the assistance he had been given, not just by Mr Firth of the Office of Works, but also Mr Houston of the Office of Works who did the surveying, Mr Moor the site foreman, Mr Richardson the Inspector of Ancient Monuments, and Mr Patterson Architect-in-Charge of Ancient Monuments (Childe 1930a: 158 & 159, 162 etc.). Childe wrote the report, he was present on site, took part in the excavations, recorded the artefacts and structures, but he presented himself almost as an assistant to the staff from H. M. Office of Works:

Once again I was afforded facilities for observing and recording the archaeological remains that might incidentally come to light. The actual work was again under the charge of the Department's contractor, Mr J. Firth, and we were fortunate in having the same foremen and labourers as previously. (Childe 1930a: 158).

Throughout this report, and indeed the reports dealing with sites not under the care of the Office of Works, Childe used 'we' when discussing the work done (Childe 1931b), unlike Wheeler, Curle and Callander who used 'I' or an impersonal form of expression. Childe's famous synthetic studies of European prehistory, however inclusive the writing style, were definitely an individual exercise. In contrast, he seems to have viewed excavation as a collective activity rather than a means of self-aggrandisement.

Verulamium

To return to the actual practice of excavation, the Verulamium notebooks were far closer to the modern idea of an excavational record than those kept by Childe, Cree or Curle. But despite the emphasis on figurative representation they still fall far short of Wheeler's suggested ideal (fig 5.36). The emphasis was again on the recovery of artefacts, but with far more contextual information recorded:

SITE A  HOUSE I  ROOM ?
31.7.30 Trial through floors S of Trench I.
LEVEL O = pebble surface, 2½ inches deep (containing piece of glass and rim of coarse black pot) going over whole area: no sign of wall.
LEVEL 1 = yellow cement. 8 inches deep, containing piece of rd tile and coarse red pot.
LEVEL 2 = brown pebble thickness, very hard, 8 inches deep, containing 2 pieces of red tile.
LEVEL 3 = darker and less hard pebble thickness, [?] inches deep, contains many fragments of tile, fragments of iron nail, and very small piece of samian.
The ‘house –debris’ of p.64 continues up this trench as far as a good post-hole some 8ft. north. To the north of this there is a greeny soil 34 on same level. Depth at 2.9.30 not ascertained.
The flint wall of p. 24 returns N. for a short distance only enclosed new hearth. The house debris surrounds it and is not, 2.9.30, scratched away to determine plank lines.
4.9.30 Further W. of N. of Room I. The pre-bdg. 2 level becomes a burnt green-yellow earth and equates in level with p. 65. 2. The house debris does not appear here. MARKED A. Bdg 2. P65. 2A. [A later note reads The trench has been widened by 5 feet by Room I as in Rooms 1 + 2 pottery].

SEE p. 18 + 88 + 88 continued on 92.
2 feet E. of datum a whole circular pila brick appear 11” down but now appears only founded on sand no importance.
5.9.30 2 coins both Domitian found below gravel + below packing of gravel in burntish clay N. of ? post hole. This is formed of broken bricks and may be accidental fall.
White chalk under p. 72. 1 equates with white chalk p. 88. above clay wad 2.
16.9.30
T.H. by sinkage of N wall
1 = Top levelling above Hadrian coin
2 = second levelling under Hadrian coin
3 = heavy gravel running under footing
4 = yellow clay – under footing.
5 = green burnt debris with cordoned pot
17.9.30
6 = greyish yellow below that + above clay floor wh[ich] breaks away from 7 = gritty burnt green.
Domitian coins are pre-house in p.72.4
Oven roughly contemp. with 1st phase of house [later addition reads ‘no pre’]
Sealed by Hadrian.
Post sinkage was sealed [unclear].
(Notebook 6, Site A, 1930).

This particular site notebook was for the area excavated by Tessa Wheeler (David Thorold pers. comm.), however this book, and the others, show entries written in a variety of hands which suggest that like Childe’s notebooks they were written up by all the members of staff. Regardless of who was doing the actual recording, all the entries followed the same methodology arguing that there was an agreed on-site formula. The other immediately noticeable point was the checking and re-checking of the recorded information, and many of the entries have later additions, such as the remark about
widening the trench or the dating of the oven. What is also noticeable was the inter-linking of the areas excavated, exactly as Atkinson suggested should be done (Atkinson 1946: 154-5), although Wheeler said nothing of this. The notebook also revealed that although each layer in an excavated area was numbered, the numbers were not global context numbers, it was the area number that was unique rather than the layer number.

The Verulamium notebooks gave a little information about who was doing what on the site, the entry for 6/930 reads ‘Two coins found in upper part of rammed material over sinkage of brick floor 3 feet N of the section. One by Miss Clements & one by T.V.W.’ 8/9/30 reads ‘White is taking down 1 = top gravel and bedding running to Bdg 2 top flint wall’ (Notebook 6, Site A, 1930), and 10/9/30 has an entry for Building 1 Room 1 ‘Cutting being widened by Michael to E.’ (ibid). One of the sketched plans is annotated with ‘Dixon’s deep trench’ and an area marked ‘Catlin’ while the notes read:

This was dug by Catlin and is a cut in the S. E. corner in same area but not yet connected up with Dixon’s earlier cut S. of actual wall of cellar. (ibid and see fig. 5.37).

None of the above names were mentioned in the Introduction to the report where the Wheelers thanked their staff and supporters (Wheeler & Wheeler 1936: 3-5) and this doesn’t really tell us how far the Wheelers were running an hierarchical excavation. Nor was there much information in the notebooks about how the site was excavated. The reference above to scratching away the house debris to determine plank lines and to widening trenches (Notebook 6, Site A, 1930) was as much material as these notebooks gave. However, for Verulamium there was an extensive photographic record which revealed the means and style of excavation.

5.4.3 Sections and Stratigraphy

The ideal

For it is not until after excavation has disclosed fully what may be called the geological nature of the site, the original contours of the virgin soil, and the source and order of the subsequent accumulations, that reasoned conclusions can be formed as to the history of the objects found. (Droop 1915: 7).

In his 1927 address History by Excavation Wheeler (1927: 817) declared that the stratification of a site lay ‘at the basis of all archaeological excavation’. While, in Archaeology from the Earth, many pages were given over to the meaning of
stratigraphy and the importance of recording stratigraphic evidence (Wheeler 1927: 812-35; 1961: 44-6; 56-79; & 93-7 and see fig. 5.4):

From the outset, the strata are carefully observed, distinguished, and labelled as the work proceeds. It is, of course, as the work proceeds that 'finds' are isolated and recorded, and their record is necessarily integral with that of the strata from which they are derived. The supervisor must therefore make up his mind clearly from moment to moment as to the limits and nomenclature of his strata; and his decisions, whether ultimately approved or modified, must be susceptible to accurate delineation, if only for the subsequent correlation of his 'finds'. (Wheeler 1961: 71-2).

Once again excavation was rendered in terms of the 'finds' recovered, they gave meaning to the stratigraphy, just as the stratigraphy gave them meaning.

The manuals often struck me as idiosyncratic, and this was especially so on the subject of stratigraphy. Atkinson made a novel suggestion for establishing the sequence of layers in a section:

In such cases it is often helpful to look at the section upside-down (standing that is, with the back to the section and bending down to look through the legs); from this unaccustomed position it is frequently possible to notice details not apparent to the normal view. (Atkinson 1946: 130).

Wheeler, while equally singular in his approach to excavation in Archaeology from the Earth became ever more doctrinaire about details. For section drawing he described the equipment needed down to the last detail:

String of the best quality should be used; inferior string breaks or, worse still, stretches and sags. In any case, the string should be supported on carefully levelled pegs at horizontal intervals often feet. Moreover, to avoid errors from stretching or other causes, the level of the string should be checked once or twice during the day. (Wheeler 1961: 74).

These personal eccentricities apart, by the 1940s a standardised set of scales had developed for archaeological drawing. Sections were to be drawn at half an inch to the foot (1:24) or 5 cm to the metre (1:20) for large sections, an inch to the foot (1:12) or 10 cm to the metre (1:10) for smaller sections or when more detail was needed. Atkinson suggested an inch to five feet (1:60) for detailed plans and again an inch to two feet, or half an inch to the foot, for sections (Atkinson 1946: 133 and see Kenyon 1952: 119).

Atkinson’s other instructions were, unlike Wheeler’s, succinct:

When the drawing and figures are complete, the following information should be added to both records:
1. Name of the site.
2. Exact position of the section (e.g. E side, Trial Trench A2).
3. The layer numbers. Each number should be written in a circle in its proper layer.
4. A short description of each layer.
5. The scale of the section.
6. The reference numbers (i.e. pottery bag numbers and small find numbers of the finds of the cutting of which the section forms one side.
7. The date, and the names of the people responsible for measuring and drawing the section.

(Atkinson 1946: 133).

There was no matching standardisation of conventions for soil representation for section drawings. In *Archaeology from the Earth* Wheeler included a chart of possible conventions in an attempt to rationalise and codify the style and substance of these illustrations (fig. 5.38). He included as warning against over or under-emphasising features or layers and the impressionistic sections drawn by Bersu (Evans 1989; Lucas 2001: 43-4). Wheeler (1961: 78) argued that such a style 'lends itself to nebulousness, to a blurring of detail and a lack of precision in diagnosis'. Accuracy he stated was more important than beauty (*ibid*) and yet his own style of drawing was very beautiful, echoing Heywood Sumner in its art nouveau, arts and crafts derivation (figs. 5.39 & 5.40; and see Piggott 1965; Bradley 1987):

An intelligently drawn section is far more than a diagram; it is, as I say, a picture, representing not merely the skeleton but also something of the vital flesh and blood of its subject. ... It must be confessed that a well-drawn, i.e. intelligently recorded, section is relatively a rarity. But it is nevertheless a basic necessity of modern field-work. The published sections are the readiest index of the value of an excavation-report. (Wheeler 1961: 76).

**Sections in the archives**

Unsurprisingly, given the lack of contextual information recorded by A. O. Curle, there were plans in his notebooks, but no sections. This indifference to stratigraphy was echoed in the report on the Freswick excavations (fig. 5.41), where the sections merely noted the architecture of the Viking houses. However, compared with his brother, James Curle, A. O. Curle’s sections were remarkably detailed (fig. 5.42). Between 1911 and 1939 there had obviously been some recognition that vertical stratigraphy should be recorded. Cree’s records for the Inchnadamph caves, and the letters between him and Ritchie reflect this more stratigraphic approach. It was, however, largely a verbal record of the contexts, with sketches of the sections, which as Cree himself said were ‘very free’ representations (Cree to Ritchie 24th July 1926 and MS/28/632 (1)) or the uninformative, geological, section included in Ritchie’s notes for the preliminary
Ritchie and Cree did discuss the need for a geologist to come and examine the deposits in 1927 (Ritchie to Cree: 12th July 1927), but there was no published account of this season's work and no confirmation in the records that this visit took place. There seems to have been more concern with ensuring that the caves were adequately planned and surveyed (Ritchie to Cree 12th July 1927).

Within Childe's site notebooks plans and drawings of artefacts dominated, and the majority of the sections were oddly schematic sketches although there were a few non-schematic ones too (figs. 5.44 & 5.45), again suggesting that more than one person wrote up the site notebook. Those in the published reports, although few in number, were more conventional and appear to have been drawn by Mr J Houston, the surveyor with the Office of Works (fig. 5.46). The recording of the pits, however, was oddly done, there were no illustrations but instead a tabulated list of the layers (fig. 5.47). This seems odd when a simple scaled section drawing would have conveyed the information, and Childe did not use this convention elsewhere.

The Verulamium notebooks did affirm the weight that was given, on-site, to recording the contextual sequence (fig. 5.48). And, this importance was confirmed by Mrs Chitty who spent time at Verulamium. Being aware of the increasing significance that archaeology was giving to recording stratigraphy, and knowing that it was the Wheelers who were promoting this approach, Mrs Chitty had wanted to see how the Wheelers excavated (Chitty in conversation, 1994 and see Fox 2000: 56). However, using Wheeler's own dictum that 'The published sections are the readiest index of the value of an excavation-report.' (Wheeler 1961: 76) the Verulamium and Maiden Castle reports fell short. Plans and artefact drawings dominated, the sections, although beautifully drawn and easily understood, were comparatively few in number (figs. 5.49 & 5.40). This is particularly surprising for Maiden Castle where I would have expected the section of each 'box' to be illustrated in the report. Instead the sections were amalgamated, and only the pits, Neolithic 'long mound' and the rampart earthworks were included as section drawings. The houses and the majority of the structures were represented by plans. This is a rare instance of the site notebooks rather than the site report being closer to the ideal of excavation as portrayed in the manuals. The other point of interest is that the slightly different styles of section drawing demonstrate that there was leeway in the agreed style of representation, although all the examples
followed Wheeler's 'compromise' style rather than the more impressionistic style favoured by Bersu. On the other hand, plans were far more uniform.

5.4.4 Plans

As Lucas (2001: 44) has suggested Wheeler was 'almost on a mission to raise awareness of stratigraphic relations and the importance of the section', but not as a replacement of the plan:

Wheeler's concern for stratigraphy meant that the section was raised in value, not that the plan was devalued. (Lucas 2001: 44).

Plans had been the main form of representing archaeological remains, from Colt Hoare (Robinson 2003: 122-4) through to Petrie (1904: 51-9), the emphasis had been on the plan view (Piggott 1965). When Gertrude Caton-Thompson was preparing to go to Egypt to work with Guy Brunton on the pre-Dynastic sites, as part of her training Petrie sent her off to the School of Mines at UCL to learn the principles of surveying (Caton-Thompson 1983: 82). Indeed, despite Atkinson being keen to stress the importance of stratigraphic recording, the majority of *Field Archaeology* was devoted to discussing surveying and planning methods. It is noticeable that Wheeler, Petrie and Kenyon were only concerned with surveying and planning in connection with actual excavation:

The requirements of an archaeological survey are to put the site on the map, to make a plan of the site and its structures, and to show the area excavated. (Kenyon 1952: 115; and see; Petrie 1904: 51-9; Wheeler 1961: 166-8).

Whereas Atkinson and Crawford were additionally looking at sites within the landscape and detailing how that landscape should be surveyed and the sites within it plotted (Atkinson 1946: 75-146; Crawford 1953).

Atkinson's guide was essentially a simplified version of the methods used in construction work and by geographers, (Rick Peterson pers. comm.). Unlike Keiller who had trained as an engineer and was very keen on surveying accuracy, using his own idiosyncratic methodology, (Murray 1999: 67) Atkinson was attempting to take the mystique out of survey work:

Every archaeologist should be able to make clear and accurate plans of the sites which he investigates. To do this requires no special ability, for surveying is not the complicated and abstruse business it is commonly supposed to be; nor does it require expensive and delicate instruments, nor more than a schoolboy's knowledge of mathematics. What it does require is a sound knowledge of a few elementary principles and plenty of common sense. (Atkinson 1946: 75).
Atkinson outlined the basic methods of surveying then moved on to ‘field geometry’, chain surveying, the traverse survey, compass triangulation, plane tabling and every other technique the archaeological surveyor was likely to need, before giving, in exhaustive detail, a list of the equipment that was needed (figs. 5.50-5.52). This wealth of detail must have been a useful introduction for any archaeologist in the field, as long as they had that ‘schoolboy’s knowledge of mathematics’. Kenyon had, as noted above, a different agenda, and was also working on the assumption that anyone who was interested would consult one of the manuals of surveying that she listed in the bibliography (Kenyon 1952: 115). On Kenyon’s excavations, as on Wheeler’s and Bushe-Fox’s (Fox 2000: 67), it was expected that a ‘professional’ would do the actual surveying.

This was also the procedure followed on Scottish sites, the RCAHMS have a folio of the beautiful plans and sections drawn in the 1900s by Mungo Buchanan, who was a professional architect and amateur excavator (MS/28/289). Curle and Childe both referred, in their site reports to the surveyor who came and drew their sites once the excavations were complete (Childe & Patterson 1929: 279; 1930: 72; 1938: 31 & Curle 1948: 285). The correspondence between Cree and Ritchie showed a similar preoccupation with having a professional survey done of the Inchnadamph caves:

Here is a matter of vital importance. I've been pressing Mr McKelchan of H. M. Office of Works to take in hand the planning and surveying of the caves. He would not fix a date when I last saw him, although he said he would be willing to go for the sake of the honour of being associated with the investigation. Last week I wrote saying that a definite date could no longer be delayed, and I have just had a reply saying that his wife is so seriously ill that he could not possibly leave her for a considerable time to come. ... BUT WHAT ARE WE TO DO? Could you approach the surveyor you made the acquaintance of at Inchnadamph last season or would you send me his name and I’ll call upon him and explain the need for careful and accurate work such as he only could give. Perhaps best if we unite the methods: you write him, and I’ll strike while the iron is hot. What do you think? (Ritchie to Cree 12th July 1927)

This concern with accurate, professional, plans and surveys perhaps reflects the development of excavation as part of an archaeological identity and the development of an agreed code of practice. Plans had always been important in archaeology and were done by professional surveyors to an agreed model (Piggott 1965). Sections, however, were more idiosyncratic, done by archaeologists during excavation, in an individual
manner. As stratigraphy became more important then archaeologists such as Wheeler were concerned to similarly codify the recording of sections.

5.4.5 Photography

Wheeler (1961: 166) and Kenyon (1952: 59-60) assumed that there would be a specialist photographer as part of the excavation staff, whereas Atkinson (1946: 156-164) and Petrie (1904: 73-84) believed the archaeologist would also be an able photographer. However, all these authors dealt in considerable detail with the technique of site and object photography (Petrie 1904: 73-81; Atkinson 1946: 162-4; Kenyon 1952: 135-144; Wheeler 1961: 200-208). I was surprised at both the number of photographs included in the published reports of the 20s and 30s, and the variability of quality and style. Petrie’s photographs in Methods and Aims varied between beautiful professional shots of artefacts and the disorganised mess of his site photographs (figs. 5.3 & 5.53). This emphasis on the importance of photographing artefacts was all part of Petrie’s stated attitude to excavation:

The two objects of excavations are (1) to obtain plans and topographical information, and (2) to obtain portable antiquities. (Petrie 1904: 33).

And Petrie was not alone in his inclusion of unusable photographs as a means of recording, Curle’s photographs from the Freswick excavations were of very poor quality except for those dealing with the artefacts (figs. 5.54 & 5.55).

Childe’s photographs from the Kindrochet and Castlelaw excavations, and many of those in the archive for Rousay and Skara Brae, were of the level of holiday snaps rather than the clean, cleared and emptied archaeological photograph as we have come to know it (Lesley McFadyen pers. comm; figs. 5.56 & 5.57). They are enormously useful for demonstrating how the sites were excavated, but relatively useless as a means of recording the archaeology unearthed. Childe’s excavation photographs reveal narrow, untidy trenches, sloping sections, tools scattered about and un-cleaned surfaces, a complete contrast to the published Verulamium and Maiden Castle photographs. However, Childe’s photographs also show that on his excavations the demarcation of tools and status was not as immutable as on other excavations, there were pictures of labourers trowelling, as well as pictures of the staff with shovels (figs. 5.58 & 5.59). There was, moreover, if I am not reading too much into these photographs, a comparatively ‘holiday’ air about the proceedings, particularly on those excavations.
conducted at the weekend with the Edinburgh League of Prehistorians. Here we see the labourers relaxed and smiling, at least while being photographed, they appear to be enjoying the work as do the ‘staff’, and there was a marked absence of hierarchy, of separate spaces and tasks.

The photographs from the Wheelers’ excavations, were very different. Wheeler stated in *Archaeology from the Earth* that a professional photographer was indispensable (Wheeler 1961: 166), and his regular employment of M. B. Cookson (Cookson 1954: 5 and see fig. 5.60) of the Institute of Archaeology to take his photographs show that Wheeler took archaeological photography extremely seriously. The photographs published in the excavation reports of Maiden Castle and Verulamium were extremely modern in appearance. They show cleaned and cleared spaces, the archaeology is distinct and ready to be interpreted, they match the requirements stated in *Archaeology from the Earth*:

- Clean, sharp angles cut between the divergent planes of a section, carefully cut with trowel, knife, or edging-tool, are essential if the section is to tell its story with the minimum of confusion. Furthermore, a spotlessly clean trench is no mere ‘eye-wash’, if only because it gives the spectator a justifiable trust in the orderliness and accuracy of the work. Even the top edges of a trench should be neatly trimmed and the grass cut and swept along them; a stray blade of grass in the foreground of the picture may be overlooked by the eye but may loom embarrassingly in the lens. Strata readily distinguishable in nature may merge in the black-and-white of the plate and may, on occasion, have to be emphasized by careful spraying or by additional smoothing or even deliberate roughening, though such aids should be used only where all other methods (e.g. the use of a filter) fail. (Wheeler 1961: 200-201).

The photographs were not completely modern in appearance, in that there were still figures included, the diggers have not been shunted out of the frame in order to focus on the archaeology. Wheeler explained that this was a deliberate decision:

- Every archaeological photograph should include a scale, either in the form of a graduated rule or rod or in that of a human figure ... the scale should not monopolize the attention of the spectator ... Where the scale is a human being, as is often desirable in large subjects, the individual thus honoured must remember that he is a mere accessory, just so many feet of bone and muscle. ... the figure shall not look at the camera but shall be ostensibly employed in as an impersonal a manner as possible. (Wheeler 1961: 201-202).

And the photographs included in the Maiden Castle report do show this rather callous use of people as scales (fig. 5.61). I am aware that my distaste for this practice would have been incomprehensible to Wheeler. I can see that his inclusion of human figures
might be intended to humanise the archaeology, to demonstrate that these monumental ditches and banks were the work of human endeavour, and perhaps Wheeler wanted to make an explicit link between the past and the present. Nevertheless, to me this use of human scales places the people below the archaeology in importance, it makes people interchangeable with scaled rods, things to indicate the archaeology, not living, breathing, thinking people. I would find it less distasteful, perhaps, if the figures used were not invariably the workmen. The use of labourers seems to argue, again, for a hierarchy of value, just as Pitt Rivers placed the labourers on a level with the natural, at the bottom of the trench and at the bottom of his view of evolution, so here in figure 5.61 the labourer was at the base of the ditch, the member of staff at the top. These photographs also repeat the idea that labourers were interchangeable with their tools, a spade could be used as a scale, or the wielder of that spade, there was no perceived difference. And, I would argue, this practice was reminiscent of anthropological photographs, there may not be the voyeuristic view of 'native' nakedness of so many of those photographs, but there was still the element of display. The idea that the accoutrements was important but the figure was no more than a model to display the objects, was repeated in the way these workers were used as inanimate markers of the archaeology.

The working shots from Verulamium reinforced the idea of the hierarchical excavation. Not only were the labourers and staff using different tools, but the physical separation of the labourers from the 'staff' working on the site was particularly marked (fig. 5.62). The two groups inhabited separate spaces only coming together for the site photograph (fig. 5.63). The photograph which could be read as going against this trend is the picture of Wheeler and the workmen at the well (fig. 5.64) but here we see again that there was a hierarchy, two of the labourers were busy sieving the other was showing a pot to Wheeler. The clothes of this group make the difference in class apparent, the workmen in flat caps, collarless shirts, braces and shirtsleeves contrast to Wheeler in his jacket and plus fours, his tie, with his handkerchief showing the regulation amount in his breast pocket. Aside from the clothes it was obvious who was in charge by the stance of the workman – the foreman? - he was offering the pot to Wheeler, Wheeler was explaining the pot to the workman and supervisor:

... the archaeologist has to remember that the requirements of science involve a complete change of values on the part of the peasant ... When the
workman begins to realize that what is to him a mere fragile crock or a fragment of carved bone and nothing more may, to his supervisor, be an historical ‘document’ of high importance ... he is on the way to a mental readjustment which may ultimately turn him into more than a mere dirt-shifter ... For example, a workman finds an old horse-shoe; he is told that it was made 2,000 years ago. He in turn remarks upon its general similarity to the horse-shoes which his uncle, the local blacksmith, makes, but proceeds to observe minor differences. The brief discussion — it must not be protracted, or all work about ceases — leads to other historical or archaeological points, and the man becomes intelligently interested in his work. (Wheeler 1961: 176-7).

This photograph represents a brief meeting of the two disparate groups, Wheeler will return to directing operations, the workmen will return to labouring at the well under the watchful eye of the supervisor. Whether these photographs reflect the reality of work at Verulamium is unclear, but in all the hundreds of archive ‘working’ shots stored at the Verulamium museum this disconnection of the workforce was repeated time and again.

The quantity of photographs in the Verulamium archive was exceptional, and it suggests that it was a deliberate decision by the Wheelers to document their excavation. Again this may have been a reflection of having a photographer of the calibre of Cookson on site, or it may be, as it looks, that Verulamium was dug throughout with photography in mind. By this I mean the site appears to have been dug from photo to photo, an area was excavated, cleaned up, photographed, then the features dug further, then cleaned up, photographed and so on. The archive almost makes a photo-history of the excavation. But, and this may reflect the public nature of the Verulamium excavations, the archive also revealed the public face of archaeology. There were photographs of the site tours and lectures (figs. 5.65 & 5.66), there were photographs of excavation taking place in front of an audience, (fig. 5.67) pot washing while spectators stood behind the fence observing the proceedings. Equally, it is noticeable that there was a marked difference in the clothing worn by the women staff in these public photos and in the more private ones (figs. 5.68 & 5.69 and see section 7.4.2).
5.5 The Artefact Based Nature of Archaeology

‘...the archaeologist is digging up, not things, but people’ (Wheeler 1961: 13).

But it was the things, the artefacts, which were important. As indicators of the history of the site artefacts were used to give a chronology, to give the ‘time in hard figures’ that Wheeler (1961: 38) felt was so all-important. And, as Lucas (2001: 107-104) has suggested, artefacts were indicators of culture groups, they enabled archaeologists to talk with authority about past societies:

... without an absolute chronology cultures of different regions cannot accurately be compared, their inter-relationship cannot be assessed: in other words, the vital causative factors of human ‘progress’ cannot be authoritatively reconstructed, and may be widely misunderstood. (Wheeler 1961: 39).

Unsurprisingly, given this artefact driven nature of archaeology there were extensive sections within the manuals dealing with the recovery and recording of artefacts. And, the site notebooks from the 20s and 30s also reflected this emphasis on the recovery of material remains.

5.5.1 The manuals

... it should be possible, at least in theory, to reconstruct the site with every find in its original position. (Atkinson 1946: 146).

The whole emphasis of archaeology in the 20s and 30s was the recovery of artefacts, and this affected the manner in which sites were dug and recorded. Almost every section of the manuals referred in some fashion to the uncovering, recording and preservation of artefacts. Droop, Atkinson, Kenyon and Wheeler all stated that not only should the sides of the trenches be vertical to enable the reading of the stratigraphy but also:

Whatever method is used trenches must have vertical sides, for the reasons stated ad nauseum, it is not only ‘untidy’ it is ‘unscientific’, as it may confuse the recording of finds thus displaced. (Atkinson 1946: 46 see also Droop 1915: 13-15; Kenyon 1952: 77-8 & 107; Wheeler 1961: 174).

And, when talking about photography, Petrie assumed that the main part of the photographic record would be the artefacts:

The preparation of the object is a very important point. Any sunk carving or inscription of small size should generally be filled in with whiting or charcoal dust, according as the material is dark or light, so as to give a strong contrast. (Petrie 1904: 76).
Recovery

Discovering artefacts in their entirety was therefore a major preoccupation of these writers. Petrie and Droop both suggested how to ensure the workmen dug carefully:

> When giving bakshish on a broken thing, it is well to say how much more would have been given had it been perfect. And if fragments are missing, a large deduction should be made, and the balance promised if the pieces can be found. ... In another case I kept a lad sifting earth for three weeks, to find a minute head which he had lost. Nothing can ensure care better than paying for it; while any bad carelessness or disobedience to orders is met by degrading a man to unprofitable work, or dismissing him. (Petrie 1904: 34-5).

Droop (1915: 16) also advocated reducing the amount of bakshish paid, but unlike Petrie he suggested that punishing or even severely reprimanding the workman was nonsensical since the workman would then hide the evidence ‘a far worse evil’ (ibid).

Although the system of tips was occasionally used on British excavations, here the emphasis was more on the method of careful excavation:

> The fork is the chief tool used by the excavator for routine digging... In use, the prongs of the fork should be gently worked, not jabbed, into the ground, and the soil levered up in front, and, if necessary, broken up fine; in this way there is the least danger of breaking or damaging finds. (Atkinson 1946: 37).

It was also expected that as soon as something exciting was unearthed the director or supervisor would take over the actual excavation:

> ... the extraction of delicate objects from the earth demands the highest skill, patience, and knowledge available, and is not lightly delegated. (Wheeler 1961: 125; and see Atkinson 1946: 45-6; Kenyon 1952: 129-32).

Therefore the experienced excavator included in their personal tool kit brushes, bellows, a pen knife, and for very delicate work, a needle which as Droop pointed out had the added advantage that:

> ... it will generally be present in the excavator’s personal outfit, unless he wishes his socks to be permanently in holes and all his buttons missing. (Droop 1915: 42-3; and see Atkinson 1946: 40).

Recording in situ

Not only did Wheeler include a section on the small finds and/or pottery specialist, and another section on their specific duties, he also explained how small finds should be recorded in situ (fig. 5.36). The system he suggested was identical to that suggested by Atkinson and similar to Kenyon’s which suggests that here too there was a standard procedure by the mid 1940s. The find was given a number, enclosed in a triangle to differentiate it from context numbers which were enclosed by circles (Wheeler 1961:
The find was then three-dimensionally recorded, both Atkinson and Wheeler took great pains to explain exactly what this entailed. Having marked out the trench with pegs along the line of the site grid (figs. 5.70 & 5.71), the supervisor, armed with a measuring triangle (fig. 5.72), bubble/spirit levels, tapes and a plumb bob could step in to do the recording:

(A) **Longitudinal measurement.** The point at which a line at right-angles from the main datum-string to the object cuts the former is measured along the line from the last preceding peg. The point in question is obtained by means of the angle-measure, with such extension of the outward arm as may be required and with the assistance of the plumb-bob. Thus if the point be 10 feet 4 inches from the zero peg, it will actually be measured from peg III (9 feet) and will be recorded as III 1' 4".

(B) **Outward measurement.** The distance outwards, at right-angles to the datum-string, to a point vertically (by plumb-bob) above the object is measured with the angle measure, levelled by its bubble-level and extended by means of a 5-foot rule if necessary. Note that the measurement is recorded from the datum-string, not from the actual side of the trench. Thus, if the measurement is 2 feet 5 inches, the distance of the object from the side of the trench will be about 1 foot 5 inches. The recorded measurement is affixed to the longitudinal measurement with a multiplication sign: thus in the present example the measurements so far will be III 1' 4" x 1' 5".

(C) **Downward measurement.** This represents the vertical depth of the object below the level of the datum-string at the intersection established under (A) above. It is obtained by tape (or rule) and plumb bob from the levelled arm of the angle-measure, and it is added to the record with a minus sign. If the depth is 6 feet 2 inches, the total record will now read III 1' 4" x 1' 5" - 6' 2". (Wheeler 1961: 89).

Kenyon’s instructions were equally confusing, although her inclusion of a plate showing recording taking place may have helped the amateur to understand her directions. Atkinson was little better:

To measure the position of a find in the trench the triangle is held level, with the side $AB$ resting on the nearest of the line of pegs and in line with them, and the side $BC$ vertically above the find. A measuring tape with a plumb-bob at the zero end is then held against the side $BC$ at $X$ and lowered onto the find. The co-ordinates of the find with reference to the nearest peg are then given by the distance $P$ (peg) - $B$, $B - X$, and $X - F$ (find). Suppose that these distances are respectively 2 feet 6 inches, 3 feet 8 inches, and 4 feet 7 inches, and that the peg $P$ is 35 feet from the end of the line and 6 feet 10 inches above the datum. Then the co-ordinates of the find to be recorded will be: 37 feet 6 inches; 3 feet 8 inches; 2 feet 3 inches. (Atkinson 1946: 152-3).

Given that three-dimensional recording was something far more easily demonstrated than explained on the page, these instructions demonstrate both the importance of artefacts to archaeology, and that the manuals were intended to be used as a substitute.
for training. They were, as Lucas has suggested, manuals for directors, armed with these books someone with little or no experience could go into the field and begin an excavation. Therefore, no matter how confusing the directions, the would-be archaeologist had to have all possible eventualities within the book, and since the recovery of finds was the primary function of archaeology, this too had to be covered.

In each manual the would-be archaeologist was reminded to keep the finds from each layer separate (Atkinson 1946: 148; Kenyon 1952: 129; Wheeler 1961: 185), either in separate trays or tins, or if small finds then in boxes, envelopes, or bags, all of which would be labelled outside and in. Droop suggested that rather than the luggage label advocated by Atkinson a wooden label should be used, being both insect and damp proof and re-usable with the application of sand paper:

Workmen who are finding objects should be trained to look upon a label duly written and issued by authority as their most crying need, and to think that to be found content without a label is a crime only surpassed by confounding the belongings of two separate labels. (Droop 1915: 29).

Labels appear to have been something of an obsession. Wheeler (1961: 186) was particularly inflexible on the need for keeping material and their labels together at all times, particularly once the material had gone into the 'pottery shed'. He also suggested that all small finds should be entered into the accession-register and onto two separate record cards (Wheeler 1961: 189-190). The cards were prepared in duplicate, one to be filed under category, the other by site, the 'object' card had the object type printed across the top, an accession number, provenance, and either a sketch or photograph, while the 'site' card listed the site first and then repeated the information recorded for the ‘object’ card (Wheeler 1961: 190; fig. 5.73).

Cleaning and conservation

All of the manuals gave detailed instructions for the cleaning and conservation of finds. There was a marked similarity between the practices advocated by Petrie and by Atkinson suggesting that, at least on site, little had changed in the conservation and preservation of material over half a century. On the subject of cleaning, Wheeler (1961: 186) advocated hard brushing for wheel turned well baked pottery, but not for samian or painted pottery, Atkinson (1946: 214) took a much gentler approach, no hot water, abrasives or soap should be used with pottery. Petrie (1904: 88-9) suggested long soaking to remove the salt from glazed pottery, and then coating with paraffin wax.
Droop (1915: 42) argued that acid should be used for cleaning pottery and terracotta as this would be gentler than scrubbing at it with water and a brush (and see Wheeler 1961: 186). Fragile sherds were to be dipped into a cellulose solution and allowed to dry before being washed, and having been cleaned they should once more be allowed to dry ‘preferably in a low-temperature oven’ (Atkinson 1946: 214).

The cleaned pottery was then marked, or rather rims, bases and decorated sherds were marked unostentatiously with the site code and location. Wheeler, ever one to give unnecessary details, remarked:

Mapping pens are used, and if they are kept clean by wiping, washing, or scraping after use, will write more legibly and will last longer. (Wheeler 1961: 187).

Once this had been done then an attempt could be made to reconstruct the whole pot, and cement it together:

Missing portions of a restored pot may be filled up with plaster-of-paris. A piece of plasticine is moulded to the curve of the outside of the pot, at the same level as the gap, and is moved around to cover it. Plaster is then poured in from the inside and the excess trimmed off before it sets. The plaster should be coloured to match the pot when it is mixed; this gives a better finish than painting with water colours when the plaster has set. Plaster repairs in thin-walled pots may be strengthened by painting with celluloid solution when dry; large repairs should be reinforced with strips of cloth, canvas, tow, or galvanized iron wire. (Atkinson 1946: 215 original emphasis).

Petrie warned that:

Not more than half-an-hour or one hour at a time can usefully be given to such sorting, as the eye and attention become much too fatigued to observe the fits. When finished, all the fragments belonging to one bowl are to be wrapped together, and a number given to the parcel; and the odd pieces can be thrown away unless worth having singly. (Petrie 1904: 104).

This somewhat relaxed attitude to objects may come as a surprise after I have argued that 20s and 30s archaeology was artefact based. However, it was only indicative artefacts, diagnostic pieces which placed the site within a culture or phase, that were deemed important. Wheeler regarded the selling of undiagnostic artefacts from Maiden Castle as a legitimate source of excavation funding (Wheeler 1943: 3).

The treatment of bones, wood and metals were all dealt with by these writers:

Animal and human bones should be washed carefully with water and a soft brush. When thoroughly dry they may be painted with a hot solution of size, which to some extent restores their original gelatine content, and makes them less brittle. Breaks should be mended with gelatine glue, using wooden
pegs in the cavity of the bone where necessary, and great care should be taken not to damage the delicate spongy (cancellous) tissue which forms at the centre of the thicker bones. It need hardly be added that correct and rapid repair, especially of skulls, requires some knowledge of skeletal anatomy. (Atkinson 1946: 215).

This recommendation of caution was one of Atkinson’s themes, throughout the section on finds he repeatedly suggested consulting museum specialists, and ended the section reiterating the warning:

So far as possible all cleaning, apart from the removal of superficial dirt, and all restoration, including that of pottery, should be left to a competent museum worker. The above details are given for use when this course is not possible. (Atkinson 1946: 216).

Wheeler and Petrie although working on larger excavations with a more extensive staff to call upon, appear to have expected more knowledge from their directors, Petrie ominously began with:

Some familiarity with chemistry and physics and properties of materials is one of the first requisites for an excavator. (Petrie 1904: 85).

Both Wheeler and Petrie stressed that their instructions were only for simple field preservation, ‘first aid’ (Wheeler 1961: 197), rather than specialised work:

It is particularly important that the field-chemist shall be able to treat coins in any metal with a minimum of delay, since their evidence will be required at once by the director. For the rest, the chemist’s main functions are (a) to prevent further decay, and (b) to consolidate friable objects sufficiently for removal and transportation. (Wheeler 1961: 168-9).

Yet, the level of information they provided was phenomenal: how to soak textiles to get rid of salt; how to conserve ivory and bone by soaking in gelatine or paraffin wax; how to treat metals, including gold, silver, copper, bronze lead and iron (Petrie 1904: 88-102). And, Wheeler was equally thorough in his coverage, (Wheeler 1961: 195-99) xxxii.

5.5.2 The archives and artefacts.

Curle’s notebooks were essentially a list of material excavated, whether it was Viking houses, or the Traprain Law silver. A typical entry from Curle’s second notebook xxxiii of the Freswick excavations reads:

A very boisterous day with showers of sand almost continuously sweeping over us and filling up the corners of our excavated buildings. We have at last got to the promising and distinctive occupation level of Ho.5. It lies nearly 3 feet below the highest point of the wall on the south, though on the north and other sides the walls have been reduced almost to foundation level. The north corner for a few feet has been almost entirely removed, possibly when the interior was used as a midden for it is too narrow for an entrance, besides the position across the end of the east gable is impossible for such a
purpose. In the soil trampled in before the gap, lay a number of pieces of pot. (Curie MS/28/461(3): 20th June 1938).
The structures excavated seem to have been considered less important than the artefacts, in the notebook Curle seems to have been using on site, this emphasis was even more marked:

F.S. 54. A narrow bladed iron knife complete with tang much corroded. Found between Ho. 5 and Ho. 2 near S. end of area ca 1½ ft below wall head of 5 at that spot. [A sketch accompanied this entry].

F.S. 55. A flat oval upper stone of a rotary quern almost complete lying some 18” below wall head of south wall of Ho. VI at 4’ 6” from east wall and 5 from south, being used to cover a posthole. The quern measures 16½" x 13" and lay slightly below the lowest level. (Curle MS/28/461(2): 20th June 1938).

Curle was obviously using the architecture as a means of location rather than using a measuring system independent of the house walls, but the finds were carefully recorded and numbered. It was the artefacts which mattered rather than the architecture, Curle’s on site plans were rather perfunctory, as they were in the final publication (figs. 5.74 & 5.75). However, the sketches of artefacts in Curle’s notebooks were carefully observed (fig. 5.76). Curle’s focus on the artefacts was a deliberate policy, he said of the book he produced about the Trapin Law silver hoard:

Of such a work fortunately the illustrations are the most important and as these will reproduce practically every detail of ornament, as well as actual vessels and fragments, so that scholars may form their own opinions, my descriptions and conclusions do not matter very much. (Curle Diary: 1922).

Despite this emphasis it was only with the Jarlshof excavations that Curle kept a separate finds book, or at least only the Jarlshof finds book was archived at the RCAHMS, possibly because on this project Curle was the absentee director and the foreman was largely in charge of the day to day excavation (MS 165/6). Curle’s artefact based mentality may well have been, in part, because of his museum work. Artefacts were important indicators of material culture, they also attracted museum visitors, and throughout Curle’s diary there were references to accessions and acquisitions; some he bought from dealers (Curle Diary 13th October 1914), others he was given by members of the public, sometimes after protracted negotiations:

A Mr Bell at Torbeck Hill tantalised me all summer with a rather well preserved Viking sword found while a quarry was being opened on his property. I was first told of it, I should say, in April, when a man reported its existence at the museum and said he thought Mr Bell would give it to us if I asked him. This I did but received no reply to my letter. A month or two later a minister from Bathgate called with a sword for my opinion. As I
knew there could not be two swords of the type knocking about I at once declared the sword must come from Dumfriesshire. The minister was somewhat taken aback but admitted it, and suggested that I should return the sword to Mr Bell and tell him its interest. This letter eventually brought a reply to the effect that if I would visit [illegible] near [illegible] I might possibly be given the sword [to take] away with me! Eventually I arranged for a visit in September before I returned to Edinburgh, and accompanied by Sandy, I duly reached the place, up in the hills, some 8 or 10 miles from Arran. We were very hospitably entertained to lunch and tea, and returned to Rockcliffe with 'Excalibur'. (Curie Diary: 3rd November 1913).

Elsewhere in this diary Curie detailed his plans for the exhibits he already had:

I have arranged to have the gold objects displayed to proper advantage in dust-proof boxes, covered with biscuit coloured linen, instead of open trays lined with faded crimson baise, in which they have been exposed to the dust in the strong room nightly for over 20 years till they are filthy. (Curie Diary: 6th August 1913).

And:

Some weeks ago I had a jeweller in to wash the filth from the gold exhibits, using only soap and water – the result was marvellous. (Curie Diary: 3rd November 1913).

Yet, Cree was similarly preoccupied with artefacts. As noted above Cree recorded the stratigraphy and layers, but spent more time discussing the material remains. Despite the absence of material from Inchnadamph Cree still saw the site in terms of the artefacts recovered:

Close to the entrance on the right hand side (north) a fairly large accumulation of the bones of mammals was found, but these seemed to be comparatively recent ... Among these bones was found a fine knife handle made of deer horn. This was fluted from near the point in the butt end. Two small holes had apparently been drilled close together near the point and the intervening bony structure had been removed thus forming an ovoid hole. The hole was obviously intended for suspension. The handle had apparently never been used, and the suggestion may be made that it slipped down from the surface layer of the outer cave and been irrecoverable. (Cree MS 28/632(2)).

Cree not only noted the artefacts and bones recovered from the caves, he also recorded what he then did with these items ‘All the relics, bones etc. from this and above layers were put in separate boxes or bags and carefully labelled’ (Cree MS/28/632 (2)). The artefacts were then sent to Ritchie at the Royal Scottish Museum for examination, he in turn then wrote to Cree with recommendations:

I'm sending on some boxes of various sizes to-day. Could you send down the femur from No.1, or all the femora? It would help to decide whether
No. 1 is worth making a special effort to complete the excavation of the back section of the cave. (Ritchie to Cree: 8th July 1926).

And:

I heard from Callander that you would rather I did not brush or clean the horns etc. and accordingly you will find most of them untouched. Your reason for wanting them left with the dirt on viz. that you desired to examine the stuff for seeds etc. is pretty thin. The real reason probably being that you wanted to get the honour and glory of finding some wonderful figurine of an animal incised on the horn! (Cree to Ritchie: 24th July 1926).

At Skara Brae Childe, like Curle, used the structures as a means of finds location, rather than having established a co-ordinate or peg system. The site notebook listed the finds recovered, their location and any parallels discovered:

Hut 8

150. Flint flakes, chips & scrapers, principally N & W of hearth A. Such chips as well as broken bones were found in great numbers also under the slates that were here and there paved portions of the floor of 8, but especially near the upright slabs N. Immediately in front of these lay 7 nuckle [sic] bones of ox & 2 in cupboard F. (Childe Skara Brae Notebook 1929).

At Verulamium the site notebooks were similarly dominated by finds recording. There appears to have been a site grid and artefacts were measured in relation to this:

3.9.30. Datum established from top N. corner of brick to wall.
Hadrian (D) Coin 1 was 4/9 from X, 4/5 long to W and 1/- down.
Coin 2 was 4/9 from X, 3/6 long to W and 11 inches down immediately on round brick. (Verulamium Notebook 6 Site A, 1930).

Somewhat strangely the grid was only used for finds locations. Architectural details were generally recorded by measuring the dimensions of walls and structures, ‘12/9 from NW angle of Bdg 1’, for example. The artefacts were also recorded on record cards, although not exactly as Wheeler had recommended in *Archaeology from the Earth*, each card did relate to a separate artefact, recording the location, description, measurements of the artefact and giving an accompanying sketch (fig. 5.77).

### 5.5.3 The Site reports and artefacts.

Lucas (2001: 65ff) discussed how finds and features became segregated within site reports, and how within this division finds were increasingly separated into different types of material, this in turn led to the rise of the finds specialist. Lucas (2001: 62) traced this trend back to Pitt Rivers and earlier archaeologists/antiquarians attempting to construct evolutionary typological sequences. With the rise of culture history the trend
became more pronounced although the underlying purpose had changed. Material
culture was seen as the physical manifestation of different groups of peoples (Childe
1935a: 3). The understanding that artefacts equated with people was apparent in the site
reports relating to the excavations dealt with above. In the Verulamium report there was
a separate category for the finds which came after sections dealing with the history of
the site and its structural remains, even though the discussion of the dates and lives of
the occupants of Belgic and Roman Verulamium were determined by the material
culture (Wheeler & Wheeler 1936: 12). Of the ‘Second Roman Verulamium’ the
Wheelers’ stated:

In the second century A.D., Verulamium was drastically re-modelled. No
relevant inscription has yet appeared to confirm explicitly the date of this
event, but a multiplicity in the form of coins and pottery enables us to
ascribe it to the second quarter of the second century A.D. The period was
one of consolidation and ambitious civic development throughout the
Empire... It is not surprising that, at Verulamium, the evidence combines to
associate with this period the re-designing of the city and the construction or
reconstruction of a majority of its buildings ... Thus was Verulamium in the
hey-day of its prosperity, a city fully Romanized in all the details of its
craftsmanship. Even its pottery retained only in a few modified and
Romanzied forms some reminiscence of a Belgic ancestry. (Wheeler &
Wheeler 1936: 26-8 & see 30ff for Verulamium’s decline).

Turning to the Finds section at the back of the volume there was a marked lack of
discussion, the finds were listed, described, and illustrated (Wheeler & Wheeler 1936:
149-239). The only ‘specialist’ report was B. H. St. J. O’Neil’s discussion of the Roman
coins (Wheeler & Wheeler 1936: 227-239). All the other sections were presumably
written by the Wheelers, or by un-credited members of the excavation team.

Childe’s site reports followed a similar pattern, the report for Castlelaw Fort discussed
the site, structures, and finds in separate sections, and again the artefacts were the means
of dating the site and discussing the occupants:

Nos. 2, 9, 17, 19, 320, 21, 22, 38, and 48 attest contact between the
inhabitants of the Earth-house and the Romans or Romanised Britons. The
Samian fragments are unfortunately all small and undecorated so that they
give no exact indication of date ... The Roman imports prove an occupation
of the Earth-house during the second century, as in the case of five similar
refuges in Angus ... As such structures [the Earth-house] are exceptional
south of the Forth but common in Aberdeen and Angus, the new idea and its
embodiment on the Pentlands were probably due to an infiltration of people
from the north-eastern counties, similar to but later than that which planted
three brochs in the Lowlands. (Childe 1933: 385-87).
The reports for Skara Brae (Childe & Patterson 1929: Childe 1930: 1931), Rinyo (Childe 1938: 1947), Freswick (Curle 1939), Jarlshof (Curle 1934), All Cannings Cross (Cunnington 1923), and Woodhenge (Cunnington 1929) all followed the same pattern. This was the template for archaeological reports and adherence to this model was part of affirming an archaeologists' identity and professionalism.

The Maiden Castle report demonstrated Lucas' (2001: 65-90) contention that finds reporting became an increasingly specialised task. This report had sections written by noted authorities such as Stuart Piggott discussing the Neolithic pottery and J. Wilfred Jackson the animal bones. Maiden Castle was a prestigious and well funded excavation with complicated and diverse archaeology which may explain the number of different specialists employed to write reports. However, in contrast to Lucas' (2001: 68) assertion that by the 30s the finds bias had lessened and the site and artefacts were given equal space, this volume was noticeably finds dominated. The section on artefacts constituted nearly two thirds of the report. This imbalance may reflect the publication of the report in war-time, Wheeler stated in his dedication of the book to the late Tessa Wheeler that the report was incomplete and that it was only:

... the main facts and the more immediate inferences are here in some fashion inscribed... The wreckage of the present has in these days been more instant to my mind than the wreckage of the past, and inter arma I have no heart for studentship. The following pages are less a report than the salvage of the report that should have been. (Wheeler 1943: xviii).

Nevertheless, as it stands the Maiden Castle report has an overwhelming bias in favour of the material culture, and, in the *Epilogue* the connection between artefacts and culture history was made explicit:

Here ends the catalogue. From it certain factors have emerged which may be held to justify, in conclusion, a brief discussion of the economic and historical position of Maiden Castle amongst the Iron Age cultures of Western Britain as a whole... The Wessex Iron Age A culture was, then, pre-eminently an iron-using culture, and therein exhibited both its poverty and provincialism. That provincialism found a further expression, however modest, in the development of local forms: La Tene I brooches with long, flat, or even concave bows (p. 256), ring-headed pins with the variant 'involute' stems (p. 270). These things represent the insignificant enterprise of a peasant community working in isolation; but they scarcely relieve the tedium of a culture whose essential inertia is signified by an ever-devolving ceramic of pitifully low grade. (Wheeler 1943: 381-2).

Not only were artefacts indicative of people, their lives, society, beliefs and economy, they were also the means by which past people were judged. As will be discussed in
section 7.5 below, archaeologists made value judgements about the past in the same way that anthropologists, sociologists, and colonial officials made similar, often negative, judgements about racial groups.

Conventions for drawing artefacts

Like plan views of the sites, drawing conventions for artefacts appear to have converged by the 1940s. Again, like plans, this undoubtedly reflected the long standing importance of artefacts in archaeological thinking. In particular, pottery drawing was given a lengthy history. Wheeler traced the convention of representing vessels wholly or partly in section back to John Evans' 1852 report Roman Remains found at Box Moor, Herts. (Wheeler 1961: 212). Whereas Atkinson merely noted that ‘certain methods ... have become almost standardized among archaeologists’ (Atkinson 1946: 198), before going into the specifics of the conventions. The method, as now, was that single sherds should be drawn with a section inked in black on the left hand of the illustration. The sherd itself was drawn with ‘stippling’ or ‘hatching’ to show the details of shape, texture and decoration (Atkinson 1946: 198-9 fig. 5.78). Undecorated sherds of Roman pottery were only shown in section, since there were published corpus that could be consulted to determine details (Wheeler 1961: 211-2). For decorated Roman pottery, the decoration was delineated through line-drawings (fig. 5.78). Whole, or reconstructed pots, were drawn in section, with any decoration on the inside of the pot on the left of a vertical central line, and on the right a profile of the outside of the pot with any external decoration:

Restored portions of a section or a decorative pattern should be indicated by broken lines; care should of course be taken that no restoration is shown unless it is the only one possible. (Atkinson 1946: 199).

This was the style followed in the majority of site reports by the 1920s. The pottery drawings from Verulamium and Maiden Castle followed these conventions in entirety (see figs. 5.80-5.82). There were occasional variations, Curle and Childe, in particular, favoured using photographs of the pottery they recovered, but even in these cases they included a section drawing of the vessel alongside their photographs (figs. 5.83 & 5.84).

Other artefact drawings show a similar agreement on conventions of representation, flint drawing (figs. 5.85 & 5.86), metalwork (5.87 & 5.88), and bone (5.89 & 5.90) all appear to have been drawn to the same formula. Frustratingly, I have been unable to trace
where this agreement came from, or how it was transmitted from one archaeologist to
another. Atkinson only discussed the conventions of drawing pottery, and neither Stuart
Piggott’s 1965 paper *Archaeological Draughtsmanship,* nor D. B. Harden’s (1944: 44-
6) paper *Training in Interpretation and Presentation* at the 1943 *Future of Archaeology
Conference* discussed the conventions of drawing artefacts.

5.6. The funding of fieldwork

In view of the mass of detail the manuals offered on every aspect of archaeological
fieldwork, it is somewhat surprising that they said nothing about how to fund that
fieldwork. Petrie (1904: 29) and Atkinson (1946: 64) discussed the payment of
labourers, Petrie (1904: 120) also discussed the costs of publishing reports, but none of
these writers mentioned where the money was to be found to pay for fieldwork.

The archives and site reports do give a little more information and suggest a diverse
range of funding sources. The Society of Antiquaries of London and Scotland, were the
main sources of grant allocations, and also paid for the cost of publishing the final and
interim site reports in their journals. The Verulamium excavations were funded by an
appeal launched by the Society of Antiquaries of London (Wheeler & Wheeler 1936: 3),
as were the Maiden Castle excavations and the publication of the final report (Wheeler
1943: 3). Wheeler managed to broker a deal with the *Daily Mail* to pay for the expenses
of the Caerleon excavations (Wheeler 1955: 75). The Society of Antiquaries of Scotland
funded James Curle’s excavations at Newstead while the report was paid for and
published by Glasgow University Press (Curle 1911). Alexander Curle’s work at the
'Wag' of Forse and at Freswick was another Society of Antiquaries of Scotland funded
project (Curle 1939: 110; 1947: 25; 1948: 285). Edinburgh University gave Childe a
grant for the excavations at Kindrochat and the Edinburgh League of Prehistorians
supplied their time and labour, as they did at Castlelaw Fort (Childe 1931b: 293; 1933:
388). The work at Skara Brae seems to have been funded and equipped by H. M. Office
of Works (1929: 279; 1931: 72). Although it was not mentioned in the preliminary
report the investigation of the caves at Inchnadamph were paid for by a grant from the
Royal Society of London (fig. 5.91). Keiller paid for the excavations he undertook at
Avebury and Windmill Hill as well as the work he and Crawford did for *Wessex from the Air*. Similarly the Cunningtons’ the Curwens’ and countless other ‘county’ archaeologists paid for their own private investigations. Work outside Britain had more complex funding solutions, the Egypt Exploration Society and Palestine Exploration Fund were principal sources of income, raising money by subscription and appeal to pay for excavations abroad. The various British Schools, which were Government aided, were also a source of funding and personnel.

Archaeologists were rarely paid for their work on excavations, instead it constituted fieldwork in pursuit of other research. The work at Kindrochat was ‘supplementary to the researches embodied in Professor Childe’s Munro Lectures for 1929-30’ (Childe 1931b: 293). Wheeler’s excavations at Maiden Castle were primarily training excavations for students at the Institute and elsewhere. Stuart Piggott, Peggy Guido, Charles Philips and W.F. Grimes volunteered their services at Sutton Hoo. Although Stuart Piggott was paid when he became Keiller’s assistant, and Howard Carter was paid by Lord Caernarvon during their association, these are rare examples. The labourers and foremen were paid, the ‘staff’ were largely volunteers. And this remained the case after the second world war:

> Both senior assistants and those in charge of excavations may expect to receive some pay, though it will rarely be more than a subsistence allowance to cover their out-of-pocket expenses. (Kenyon 1952: 67 and see section 6.4.4 below).

Excavation was not a cheap undertaking, the accounts from Inchnadamph (fig. 5.92) show that even without the expense of paying for staff other than labourers, the costs soon mounted. Wheeler’s *Introduction* to the Maiden Castle report demonstrated how expensive a large excavation could be. The Society of Antiquaries of London paid for all the costs of printing the report, but even without this expenditure Wheeler (1943: 3) calculated that the excavation had cost £5,363 of which the Society of Antiquaries of London had paid £790, £3,307 had been raised by circulating an appeal for funds, and the remaining £1,266 had been given by members of the public visiting the excavations. Perhaps the reason none of the manual writers included sections on the funding of excavations was simply because there was no straightforward way of doing so:

> Subscriptions from colleges, national societies and institutions, corporations, small local societies and other bodies help to swell the list of
individual donations. Frequently, perhaps one or sometimes half-a-dozen individuals, are specially interested and contribute accordingly. Other means of raising funds vary according to the district or the nature or relative importance of the work. Sometimes an admission fee is charged when the area in question is enclosed; collection boxes are also used, money is also derived from ... common duplicate specimens from the excavations, and occasionally from models of objects discovered, or from objects formed from materials found on the site. (St George Grey 1944: 58).

5.7. Gender and Archaeology

Lucas (2001: 7) remarked that there was ‘much opposition to women “going into the field”’ although he noted that there were women who overcame this opposition, and that the exclusion did not apply to the wives of archaeologists (ibid). But, for Lucas the ‘rejection of ‘feminine’ characteristics’ used by Petrie and Wheeler to identify an archaeologist reinforced this exclusion of women from fieldwork (ibid). I am not convinced that there was anything distinctively gendered about fieldwork. Archaeology was a masculist discourse, archaeologists did not always accept women as equal partners or appreciate their contribution, but, I think fieldwork was the least gendered aspect of archaeology.

5.7.1 Robust masculinity.

Undeniably these writers framed a masculine characterisation of an excavator:

... one might as well try to play the violin in a pair of gloves as profess to excavate with clean fingers and a pretty skin. In clothing it need hardly be said that clothing must correspond to the work; and there must never be a thought about clothes when one kneels in wet mud, scrapes through narrow passages, or sits waist deep in dust. (Petrie 1904: 7).

Wheeler (1961:13) similarly characterised his excavation manual as ‘an earthy book, inapt for clerkly hands’. Later in Archaeology from the Earth Wheeler’s tone became reminiscent of nineteenth and early twentieth century juvenile literature, mixing colonialism with romanticism as he urged archaeologists to go adventuring as was their British heritage:

I am firmly of the opinion that our young men and women will lose nothing by a little real adventuring, and their search as archaeologists for the footsteps of civilized man in Asia or African tracks will add an incidental stimulus of a kind which is otherwise increasingly hard to find ... until a very few years ago the young Briton was still enticed into the paths of
adventure by the worldly prospects of governing a tract of Asia many times
the size of England, or of trafficking with tribesmen on the roof of the
world... Much of the potential adventure overseas has gone out of our life,
and, with it, that sharpening and shaping of the character which is a by­
product of it... I am commending first-hand adventure as a necessary
medicine to the character of the young, and archaeology of the kind which I
have been trailing before the reader is fraught with the right sort of
adventure. ... It will serve ultimately to enhance his proper patriotism.

This framing of archaeology as a ‘boy’s own adventure’ was not unique to Wheeler,
Crawford also took up the theme in *Archaeology in the Field*:

> There is only one pastime that is more exciting than fieldwork on the ground
> and that is observation of the same kind from an aeroplane, to which is
> added, in the mountainous parts of Scotland, just that spice of risk that is
> needed to bring out the full flavour. (Crawford 1953: 59).

This robust masculinity did exclude ‘feminine’ characteristics, Wheeler, Crawford and
Petrie took pains to represent archaeology as macho, but I think they were excluding
effete ‘unmanly’ men rather than women. I think they were arguing that archaeology
was a ‘proper’ job for men. Surely this says more about an underlying fear that
archaeology was not a sufficiently virile discipline than it does about the need to
exclude women? We cannot take the constant framing of the archaeologist as ‘he’ as an
indication that this excludes ‘she’, it was, and still is, grammatically acceptable to
render neuter as male. A point raised by Kathleen Kenyon in *Beginning in Archaeology*:

> In particular, for he throughout the book should be read he or she, for there
> are just as many openings for women as for men. (Kenyon 1952: 163).

There were a few occasions where women were specifically referred to, Wheeler (1961:
160) in his staff list suggested the Deputy Director would often be a woman, and Petrie
(1904: 23) talked of employing women as basket carriers. But we cannot take this to
mean that every other post on Wheeler or Petrie’s excavations would be exclusively
male since both of these archaeologists regularly employed women on their excavations.
In the context of early twentieth-century British society this omission of women as a
specific group would not have seemed remarkable. British society was a masculine
society, as I argued in the previous chapter, despite various campaigns women were
largely invisible. By addressing their expected reader as ‘he’ these manual writers were
simply following this convention rather than specifically disregarding women. Although
there was no specific inclusion of women, this does not mean that women were
specifically excluded. I realise a similar argument might be made about race and class,
however, whereas Petrie and Wheeler’s remarks about race and class reflected their
actions, their inclusion of women on their excavations suggests that regardless of what they said or didn’t say, they considered women to be potential archaeologists.

Droop on ‘Mixed Excavations’.

Droop is an obvious exception here. In his ‘infamous epilogue’ (Lucas 2001: 7 and see Daniel 1967: 82; 1969: 2) Droop (1915: 63-4) stated that ‘mixed excavations’ were a bad idea. Much has been made of these two pages, and I am not about to defend Droop’s chauvinism, however, it should be remembered that at no point did Droop argue that women could not be archaeologists or that they should be entirely excluded from fieldwork. His argument was that they should have separate excavations, his personal reasons were that women distracted men and that men would be inhibited from behaving naturally on an excavation where women were present (Droop 1915: 64). By this I take him to mean that men could not swear freely in front of women. As I said I have no intention of defending Droop, but again, in the context of early twentieth-century British society his remarks are understandable. Droop was writing in 1915, at a time when the sexes were largely kept apart, at a time when upper and middle class women were still subject to chaperonage. Unless a man of Droop’s class had sisters, his knowledge of women would be minuscule, he would go from a male school to a male university and then into exclusively male employment. Droop’s attitude was ridiculous, but understandable in this world. His other point was I feel, a reasonable one, but overlooked because of these fatuous remarks. Droop maintained that a mixed excavation offended the proprieties:

I have never had a very reverent care for these abstractions, but I think it is not everywhere sufficiently realised that the proprieties that have to be considered are not only those that rule in England or America, but those of the land where it is proposed to dig; the view to be considered is the view of the inhabitants, Greek, Turk, or Egyptian. (Droop 1915: 63).

I am sure that Droop’s motivation was less altruistic than these words imply, but he was the only one of these writers to consider, however superficially, the conventions of these countries.

5.7.2. The manuals vs. actuality.

We need to look beyond what these writers were saying and look at how they acted. Wheeler and Petrie as I mentioned above were the main employers of women on excavations. Both expected their wives to be their excavational companions (figs. 5.28
& 5.93), but both went a stage further in that they positively supported women in archaeology. Petrie encouraged Margaret Murray to write her first Egyptology article, and to become an assistant lecturer despite her lack of formal qualifications (Murray 1963: 94-5). Indeed, the terms of Amelia Edwards' bequest which gave Petrie his chair at UCL ensured that women would be accepted and promoted as Egyptologists, and Petrie followed this decree taking women on his Egyptian excavations long before he married Hilda and she became his second-in-command (Drower 1985: 214; 218; 231-45). Wheeler did likewise, the photographs of his excavations at Verulamium and Maiden Castle show a preponderance of female staff (figs. 5.7). His casting of the 'Deputy Director' as female, may well have been because his deputy directors were generally women (Wheeler 1943: 2).

However, this is not to suggest that women had an easy or equal access to archaeology. As I will argue in the next section, the past archaeologists created was an exclusively male place. Nor was it the case that women had unchallenged access to training and degrees, parental or familial opposition was a frequent problem, quite aside from the opposition of educational establishments and individual lecturers. And, when it came to employment, very few women attained paid jobs within archaeology (see section 6.4.2). However, going into the field and working, particularly fieldwork in Britain, was relatively accessible for middle and upper-class women.

5.8 Conclusion

On the basis of the information from the manuals, archives, and site reports it is possible to argue that archaeology was in the process of developing a distinct identity by the 1940s. It was an identity that was bound up with excavation. The definition of an archaeologist incorporated excavational ability, and excavation was a recognised as part of archaeological practice. Within this definition however there was leeway for a variety of approaches to fieldwork. Site location, trenches, and on-site recording techniques were all matters of personal choice. Despite Wheeler's attempts to codify section drawings, these were still personal and eclectic representations. Planning views, site reports, especially the treatment of artefacts, showed far more concurrence.
Nonetheless, despite these divergences, excavation was an accepted part of what was becoming the discipline of archaeology. The manuals show the attempts being made to define a code of practice and agreed upon techniques, even if the site reports and especially the archives suggest that the authors of the manuals were not always following their own advice. All the sources demonstrate the prominence that was given to the recovery of artefacts, and that excavation was still largely about the extraction of material remains, even if they were now used to establish a coherent narrative of past cultures rather than as indicators of social evolution. But there was far more to archaeology and excavation than simply digging for the past.

The sources also reveal the politics of excavation and the excavators. By politics I mean the underlying beliefs and ideology that governed excavation practices rather than simply which political parties the archaeologists favoured. Although I think on the basis of their writings it could be argued that Curie and Wheeler were conservative, at least with a small C, and that Childe’s fieldwork photographs show a non-hierarchical approach to excavation, demonstrating his socialist principles in action. What I have said, and would re-iterate, is that excavation was a hierarchical performance, one where class and race defined status, with few opportunities to change that status or move out of the accepted role. Colonialism was part of this political understanding. There was an underlying racism to much that was said by these writers about undertaking archaeology in Egypt, Africa, Greece and India. Incorporated into this racism was an unthinking belief in the supremacy of the West. Archaeologists were very much a part and product of British inter-war society and reflected the dominant discourses on race and class. Control was clearly a subject of concern, and one which was a feature of British social life from the Industrial Revolution through to the 1950s. There was a repeatedly articulated belief that ‘foreigners’ and the working classes had to be controlled and patrolled, either for their own good because they were seen as incapable of self-control, or for the good of wider society. Petrie attempted control through covert surveillance, whereas Wheeler advocated overt surveillance and vigilance. Running through the manuals and archives was a mistrust of the working classes, a fear of being ridiculed or abused as a soft employer. At the same time there was almost a dislike of the working classes allied to an anxiety about the possibility of the working classes becoming powerful and autonomous, this was particularly manifest in Curle’s war-time writings with his remark about ‘temporary officers’ (and see section 7.8.2 below).
Simultaneously those of a different class or race to the archaeologists were rendered anonymous or even invisible in the records. With the exception of Childe, workers were treated as an homogeneous mass, conflated with the tools of their trade, de-humanised and treated as earth-moving machines. When they were noticed they were patronised, their class or race presumed to inhibit their intelligence and to identify their character and personality.

I have suggested that fieldwork was not a particularly gendered area of archaeology, I feel that much of the gendering of archaeology came from ideas prevalent outside the discipline, and I will return to this issue in the section on identity. Despite the manuals characterising the archaeologist as robustly masculine, many women were involved in excavations during the 20s and 30s and many were trained by those writers responsible for this masculine representation of archaeology.

Publicity and the public were becoming increasingly important to archaeologists. They were solicited for funds at Maiden Castle and other prestigious excavations, and through such public bodies as the Egypt Exploration Society they helped fund excavations around the world. In return for their money archaeologists had to incorporate the public into their work through open days, news-stories, films, lectures and site tours of the excavations, as well as providing material for later museum exhibitions. The 1943 Future of Archaeology Conference discussed the need for extending knowledge of archaeology into schools and further education, and from Wheeler’s figures for the number of Maiden Castle visitors it would seem that there was a desire from the public for this information. This external interest helped to make archaeology a recognisably distinct discipline, the high profile excavations of Tutankhamun, Verulamium, Maiden Castle, Ur and Avebury ensured the public were aware of what archaeologists did. And the public perception of archaeology and archaeologist’s courting of the public will be dealt with in section 7.6 below.

This chapter has raised some of the issues about what an inter-war archaeologist was and did, who was included and excluded by these renditions, and the next two chapters extend this discussion into the areas of training, employment, archaeology and society, and the creation of an explicit identity for archaeologists.
Notes.

1 In this and the following chapters Wheeler refers to R.E.M. Wheeler, Tessa Wheeler is referred to as Tessa Wheeler or Tessa Verney Wheeler and Kim Collingwood is referred to as Kim Collingwood or Lady Wheeler.

2 I am aware that Crawford’s *Archaeology in the Field* was sharply criticised for its inaccuracy and ignorance of fieldwork developments (Daniel 1986: 233), with this in mind I have only sparingly used it as a source. However I have used it occasionally because Crawford was an important figure in 20s and 30s archaeology, and even if his fieldwork methods were considered out-dated by the 1950s he was at the forefront of inter-war archaeology.

3 This book was based on a series of talks Woolley did for the BBC and was a popular introduction to archaeology rather than a manual for fieldworkers and is dealt with in section 7.6.2.

4 Although practical experience was seen as of more importance than ‘book-work’ (Petrie 1904: 3.)

5 And, even he assumed that the director of a small excavation would still be employing labourers (Atkinson 1946: 63-6).

6 I have discussed elsewhere how Maud Cunnington developed a particular research strategy of excavating earthwork enclosures, at that time a relatively neglected and poorly understood group of sites (Roberts 2002: 52).

7 Even *Wessex from the Air* should only be regarded as a qualified success. The flying was done when weather conditions prevented any crop-marks being visible and equipment problems meant that relatively few flights were made. (Crawford 1955: 172).

8 Atkinson’s recommendation of bosing is a wonderful mixture of enthusiasm and faux science, particularly his description of how to construct a boser:

This method … consists in percussing the surface of the ground with a weighted rammer, and listening to the sound thus produced. Over undisturbed ground the sound is dull; over a filled-up ditch or pit it changes to a more resonant note; the two sounds may well be represented as ‘thud, thud’, and ‘thoomp, thoomp’. The sound is best observed by a helper stationed a short distance from the rammer, and, when necessary, out of the wind. The best instrument for bosing is a cylindrical tin, about 3 inches in diameter, filled with lead, in which is embedded a short length of iron pipe, to form a socket for a stout wooden handle about 5 feet long. The foot of the instrument should be slightly convex. (Atkinson 1946: 32).

9 Alexander Curle, however, greatly favoured digging trial pits, his notebook for the Freswick excavations frequently refer to setting the labourers to dig a small trench (MS/28/461 (3) 18th June 1938, 24th June 1938, 6th July 1938).

10 Wheeler’s criteria were that the area-excavation be:
(a) conveniently and clearly subdivisible for record and control;
(b) capable of easy, progressive expansion in any direction without breaking down or impairing the preliminary datum-lines;
(c) capable for preserving for constant reference at a maximum number of points complete vertical sections until the last phase of the excavation;
(d) capable, ultimately, of easy integration into a continuously exposed regional excavation.
(e) readily accessible to all points for the removal of soil, without hindrance from intervening cuttings or traffic across excavated surfaces; and
(f) sufficiently open to the sky to ensure the easy inspection of well-lighted sections at all required depths. (Wheeler 1961: 82).

11 It is noticeable that Philips did not receive the same accolades as Pitt Rivers, his excavation was described as ‘very successful’ (Wheeler 1961: 122) while having ‘an element of opportunism’ (Wheeler 1961: 123). Yet again, Wheeler could not bring himself to unconditionally compliment any of his contemporaries bar Fox, who had retired, and Tessa who was dead, by the time *Archaeology in the*...
Field was first published, instead Wheeler saved his praise for those long gone (see sections 6.1 and 7.3.3 below).

xii At Ho.7 we are following the wall and digging down through a deep kitchen midden’ (Curle MS/28/461 (3): 28th June 1938).

xiii Mary Chubb also used military terminology to describe the hierarchy of excavation at Amarna. John Pendlebury was in charge, she and the other non-Arab personnel were ‘junior officers’ (2001:37), while the ‘Gufts’, who came from Petrie’s excavations and therefore had experience were the ‘NCOs’ (2001: 53)

xiv By the time of the ‘Wag’ of Forse excavations Bremner had joined the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland as a corresponding member (Curle 1947: 5)

xv Curle later concluded that this structure was a Viking bath house (Curle 1939: 77).

xvi Dr Graham Ritchie made this point during his lecture on the Curies at the Rhind Lectures in 2001, and James Curle himself wrote: ‘During these periods of work my residence within a mile of the site enabled me to make frequent, and often daily, visits to follow the progress of the digging’ (Curle 1911: vii my emphasis).

xvi Curle was also absent when the silver hoard was found at Traprain Law he was phoned by the site manager Pringle and went over the following afternoon (Curle Diary: 14th May 1919).

xvii The letters record discussion about pursuing work in the cave behind the reindeer cave with Callander and Ritchie arguing that this was imperative: It is all very well you and Callander saying that the work should be continued – but how? I am up against an impossible proposition and this you and he do not seem to realise. ... One of the geologists who visited the caves 10 days ago, told me that it was highly dangerous and that “even the jar of a pick” might bring some of the roof down. I therefore refuse to accept responsibility of ordering the men to continue clearing out the cavern at the back of No. 1. (Cree to Ritchie: 4 August 1926)

xx ‘The principle that the holder gets the bakshish must even be extended to cases where one man has taken things from another man’s hole; the man who has lost the thing is merely told that he should have taken better care of his work’. (Petrie 1904: 35). Which gives a peculiar slant on the ‘honesty’ here being promoted.

xxi Petrie did extend this telescope supervision to his European site assistants (Seton-Williams 1988, 36).

xxii The Indemnity Policy ran from the 17th of June 1927, perhaps Cree’s misgivings about the safety of the caves during the 1926 season (see below) led Ritchie to make certain of extra insurance for the labourers.

xxiii Always bearing in mind Lesley Ferguson’s proviso that there was the view that once the report was written then the information was in the public domain and additional records were superfluous.

xxiv Curle’s notebooks overlap and have slightly different information recorded within them, this, and the following remark suggest that one notebook (MS/28/461(2)) was used on site and the other (MS/28/461(3)) kept back at the hotel and brought up to date every evening: I am writing at 10.30 in broad daylight at the window. (MS/28/461(3): 4th July 1938).

xxv Presumably Michael Wheeler.

xxvi A geologist, Phemister, had visited the excavations in the first season but all three men in charge had been unhappy with his conclusions (Ritchie to Cree: 9th September 1926).

xxvi ‘I spoke to the Scottish Director of the Geological Survey about a careful examination of the deposits, and Haldane is the man detailed for the job. He was unable to get away, as he was something to do with
the pageant in honour of the Majesties, at Craigmillar. I thought that I’d like to be on the spot when the
geologist is there and I can’t fix a date at the moment’. (Ritchie to Cree: 12th July 1927).

xxxvi Petrie was remarkably uninformative about the actuality of planning, while at the same time assuming
it was part of an excavator’s repertoire. This is a continual feature of Methods and Aims but in this
instance Petrie was undoubtedly concerned with saving money by not taking a professional surveyor on
his excavations, another constant refrain of his manual.

xxxviii Although when Childe excavated with the Edinburgh League of Prehistorians, as at Kindrochet and
Castelaw, one of the party appears to have done the plans of the site (Childe 1931b & 1933).

xxxviii Curle made no reference to a surveyor in the published Freswick report, but the site diary entry for the
5th of July 1938 reads ‘Mr Calder arrived last night to do my plan and together this morning we went over
the excavation. He was very helpful and cleared up one or two points.’ (Curle MS/28/461(3)).

xxx The surveyor in question, Mr Williams agreed (Cree to Ritchie 19th of July 1927) but there is no record
in the RCAHMS archives of the plans, and no published report for the 1927 season.

xxx I am indebted to Mark Knight for sharing his ideas with me and making me re-think my ideas about
excavation photographs. Having had conversations (both real and imaginary) with Mark about this
subject I am no longer certain which ideas were originally his, and which mine, but I do know that
without him I would have continued to accept these photographs as an unproblematic source of
information.

xxx Whether an inexperienced archaeologist could have followed these instructions seems doubtful, if not
actually dangerous, and surely if someone had experience they would not need these instructions? This
was another example of the confused nature of these manuals. They contain considerable detail about the
various processes but with little idea of the needs of any potential reader. While they were essentially
manuals for archaeologists to use for directing an excavation, they also appear to represent the
outpourings of everything a particular writer knew about every aspect of field archaeology.

xxxiii As I mentioned above, I believe MS/28/461 (3) to have been the notebook Curle used to write up the
day’s business, while MS/28/461 (2) was the notebook he used on site.
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6 Employment and Training

6.1 Introduction

This chapter looks at training and employment. What education or training processes did a would-be archaeologist have to go through to become an actual archaeologist? Did class or gender affect who could become an archaeologist? Once that training was complete were they then considered to be an archaeologist or was this identity dependent on employment, and who was employing archaeologists? Were these posts open to everyone and what qualifications were needed? How much were archaeologists paid and what were they expected to do?

Before the 1950s there was little in the way of formal instruction for prospective archaeologists, and even fewer employment possibilities. As late as 1943 conference delegates meeting to discuss the *Future of Archaeology* complained about both these issues (Corder 1944; Kenyon 1944; Robertson 1944; Wade Gery 1944). Biographies, autobiographies, and obituaries of archaeologists regularly refer to the individual being 'self-taught' or 'self-trained' a 'pioneer' in archaeology (see for example Fox 2000) this was also mentioned by the archaeologists I talked to, even when those involved had begun their careers in the 1930s and attended the first formal University courses. Inter-war archaeologists felt that despite the modicum of training they had received, self tuition had been equally important.

There are several points that should be raised here. The first is that autobiographies tend to be written towards the end of a full life. Similarly, the archaeologists I spoke to were retired, mostly in their seventies or eighties. This is not to suggest that their memories are unreliable, but rather to highlight that there may be minutiae of details and dates missing from their accounts. Obviously they remembered what was important to them but it would be unreasonable to expect total recall of the courses and training they experienced fifty or sixty years previously. Also memories are not static, they have been remade over the years, modified as different aspects seemed important at different times. In addition, the questions I asked directed the answers given. Although these
points were raised during conversation rather than in a formal interview (see Appendix A) I am aware that my interest helped shape the areas we covered, just as my narrative has shaped these answers into the particular form given here. Nor should it be forgotten that the assumption of pioneering status can have an additional agenda. It may sound cynical but presenting themselves as self-taught can be part of an archaeologist creating their own personal mythology, a way of justifying the life that has been led. The most obvious examples of self-aggrandisement were Pitt Rivers and Wheeler. Pitt Rivers (1887: xvi-xvii) presented himself as attempting a new style of archaeology. This self-portrait was adopted by subsequent archaeologists who have claimed him as the creator of modern fieldwork, a pioneer genius who stood alone in his abilities (Wheeler 1961: 25-9; Piggott 1966: 44-5). Yet Pitt Rivers was Greenwell’s protégé as he himself, albeit quietly, stated (Pitt Rivers 1887: xix) and, regardless of Wheeler’s effusive praise, Pitt Rivers was refining previous techniques and explanations rather than creating markedly new and different ones (Barrett et al. 1991: 13; Bowden 1991: 94 and 154-56; Bradley 1983: 3-4; Lucas 2001: 19-26).

One of the ways Wheeler created his own legend of greatness was by ignoring his peers and linking himself with ‘the General’ by constant repetition and invocation of Pitt Rivers’ name, rather than giving credit to his actual mentor Bushe-Fox (Wheeler 1961: 13; 25; 210; 218-9). However, as Lucas has demonstrated, Pitt Rivers was as much Bush-Fox’s mentor as he was Wheeler’s (Lucas 2001: 36-7). Although Wheeler said that Bushe-Fox:

... had produced a rational sequence of cultures and a number of penetrating ideas, though his recording never, then or later, approached the standard of Pitt Rivers. (Wheeler 1955: 67).

Lucas (2001: 37) disputed this suggesting Bushe-Fox’s work was never of a lower quality than Pitt Rivers’ and as regards plans and sections he was ‘way ahead of anything Pitt Rivers did’. However, the illustrations that accompanied Bushe-Fox’s reports were not particularly informative (fig. 6.1), especially since they were done by a professional surveyor from the Office of Works (Fox 2000: 67). Had Wheeler complained of this aspect of Bushe-Fox’s work his criticisms would have been justifiable. It is Lucas’ (2001: 36-7) contention, and it seems convincing, that despite Wheeler’s citation of Pitt Rivers’ influence over his work, it was the training from Bushe-Fox which provided Wheeler with the basis from which he developed his fieldwork techniques. Bushe-Fox was written out of Wheeler’s personal history in order
for Wheeler to strengthen the idea of himself as self-taught and self-created, and of being entirely responsible for a completely new approach to fieldwork. Pitt Rivers could be claimed because he was sufficiently distant, Bushe-Fox was still alive and working (and see section 7.3.3 below).

This approach also serves our purposes, by talking of archaeologists as self-made men, ahead of their time, seeing more clearly than their predecessors and contemporaries we gain heroes, 'great men' of archaeology. Strictly speaking, these descriptions may be inaccurate, but they make for more exciting history and more exciting reading. Mythology, story-telling is, as I argue in section 7.2.2 below, one of the ways we create and reinforce an identity. However, I would emphasise again that archaeologists were not divorced from each other and their interaction, discussions, and exchanges of information helped to transmit ideas about working practices as much as ideas about culture history and economic or environmental determinism.

Taking these points into consideration, it is still undeniable that aside from Classical Archaeology and Egyptology, there was little formal education in archaeology before the Second World War. The archaeology of Britain, where it was studied at all, existed only as a subsidiary subject at university. Most archaeologists had degrees, but they came to archaeology after studying other subjects, and it is noticeable that before the 1930s the majority of those we would term 'professional' archaeologists (fig. 6.2 and see Appendix B) were almost exclusively arts graduates. O.G.S. Crawford with his degree in geography, stands out as an exception. History and Classics were the usual degree subjects. Those with degrees, as well as those without, received most of their field archaeology training on site. This training was, to a modern archaeologist, remarkably slight. During Aileen Fox's second season at Richborough she was put in charge of a highly complex area consisting of burnt wooden structures and wattle and daub buildings, she had no idea what 'wattle and daub' meant, nor any experience of excavating wooden buildings (Fox 2000: 54-5).

Another motif, is that this training, such as it was, was open to both men and women. Higher education was still a rarity for women. Yet when we look at women archaeologists a surprising number of them had a degree or had followed degree courses (fig. 6.3 and see Appendix B). The women who became archaeologists were
overwhelmingly middle and upper class, the majority of them had private incomes, and these women came from homes where they were encouraged by at least one parent to seek further education (Seton-Williams 1988; Fox in conversation, 1994; Chitty in conversation, 1994). Education was largely a matter of parental generosity, employment was outside parental control, and it is noticeable that far fewer women than men were employed as archaeologists, and far fewer women than men were directors of excavations. This may seem to contradict what I said above about there being no gender bias in fieldwork, but it ties in with the wider social dimensions of archaeology. Individual male archaeologists were not necessarily sexist, but the society in which they lived and worked was a gendered one, women could train as archaeologists but they were largely overlooked when it came to appointing paid staff. Women archaeologists, just like other British women, were denied equal access to employment, were sacked or expected to resign on marriage, and were expected to put their family, whether their children, husband, or parents, before their career. This gendering of employment and expectation inevitably affected the way archaeologists constructed the past. It is one of the contradictions and complexities of archaeology that women were encouraged to work within the discipline, but at the same time were prevented from shaping archaeology since they were denied access to positions of power in museums, universities or fieldwork. Even when Dorothy Garrod was elected to the Disney Professorship the same contradictions made this post extremely difficult for her (see section 6.4.3 below).

Similarly there was an absence of working class archaeologists other than as paid labourers. The majority of 20s and 30s archaeologists working in Britain were from middle class backgrounds with the upper classes and working classes markedly absent. Alexander Keiller and W.E.V. Young were the exceptions to this pattern. Those of the working classes who attended university on scholarships followed courses more likely to result in employment. The majority studied to become teachers which virtually guaranteed employment and a reasonable income (Dyhouse 1995; Savage & Miles 1994). Archaeology, which offered only uncertain career possibilities would not have been appealing. W.E.V. Young was the only working class archaeologist in Britain that I have come across who moved from being a foreman to an accepted archaeologist, and this was entirely through Keiller’s patronage. Keiller employed Young on his excavations, as did his sister-in-law Dorothy Liddell and Maud Cunnington, but it was
Young's appointment to Keiller's Avebury Museum which transformed him from foreman to archaeologist. Simon Bremner does not seem to have made that transition, without a wealthy patron he remained a foreman who was interested in archaeology rather than becoming an archaeologist. It is noticeable how very middle class archaeology was, those who were lower-middle class such as Stuart Piggott, John Starkey and Lancaster Harding were again exceptions, and Piggott went into paid employment at 17 while Starkey and Harding continued to work outside Egyptology as they trained to become archaeologists (see section 7.6.1 below).

6.2 Education

6.2.1 Oxford

The University of Oxford had taught Classical archaeology since the end of the nineteenth century, Sir John Evans' third wife, Maria Lathbury, had studied Classical archaeology there (Evans 1964: 73). With the appointment of Arthur Evans as Keeper of the Ashmolean in 1884 there was a brief opportunity for students to hear lectures about other aspects of archaeology (Evans 1943: 268, 270-2 and 280). However, as late as the Second World War the only formal qualifications available were the diplomas in anthropology or archaeology offered to post-graduates or as part of a pass degree. Joan Evans followed the archaeology diploma, alongside Gordon Childe:

... my tutor and chief teacher was Professor Percy Gardner ... He began his first lecture by saying: "I have given this course of lectures for twenty-six years, and I always begin by saying ...". I had my mother's notes of the same lectures as they had originally been given, and could testify that but for the addition of a few more recent discoveries they continued to be exactly the same. (Evans 1964: 72).

The emphasis was on the classical sources with additional study of inscriptions, sculptures and vase painting. Childe recalled that:

My Oxford training was in the classical tradition to which bronzes, terracottas and pottery (at least if painted) were respectable while stone and bone tools were banausic. (Childe 1989: 12).

Joan Evans (1964: 74) described her classes with J. D. Beazley where they were shown painted sherds and had to identify the painter simply by the drawing style. This was the sum total of their 'field-work'. Wade Gery complained in 1943 the diploma and other places where archaeology had attained 'precarious footings' in Oxford still concentrated
on object observation rather than a more active archaeology. Archaeology was relegated to the role of 'handmaid' to history (Wade Gery 1944: 86-7).

The anthropology diploma was perhaps more useful to those desiring a career outside the confines of Classical archaeology. Taught by R.R. Marrett, it attracted students who went on to become famous in archaeological circles. T. D. Kendrick, Francis Turville-Petre and Dorothy Garrod all followed the diploma (Caton Thompson 1969: 342 and Clark 1989: 11). However, prehistory was only a minor part of the degree, and Dorothy Garrod followed this introduction to archaeology by spending two years at the Institut de Paléontologie Humane as a student under the Abbé Breuil, and working on a variety of prehistoric French sites (Caton Thompson 1969: 342-3; Clark 1989: 11).

6.2.2 Cambridge

The University of Cambridge was equally ambivalent in its approach to archaeology, the emphasis was again largely on Classical Archaeology which was taught in the second part of the Classical Tripos (Robertson 1944: 88-90). Non-Classical archaeology had been a minor part of the Board of Anthropology, and any teaching was entirely reliant on the interest of the occupant of the badly paid, part-time Disney Chair, the only official post in archaeology in Cambridge (Clark 1989: 26).

This is not to say that it was impossible to study archaeology at Cambridge. Mary Kitson Clark (later Mrs Chitty) went up to Cambridge in 1923 with a history scholarship for Girton. Having completed the course she was then awarded a one year Bursary which she used to study archaeology. She already had an interest in the subject, her father, Edwin Kitson Clark was a leading member of the Yorkshire Archaeological Society and the Leeds Archaeological Society. Mrs Chitty accompanied him on his visits to sites and excavations, and shared his involvement with the Thoresby excavations. The course Mrs Chitty followed had been especially designed for her, and involved lectures from Miles Burkitt on the Palaeolithic, Maureen O'Reilly teaching Anglo-Saxon and other periods, as well as lectures on palaeography. Mrs Chitty felt that her year's study had given her many opportunities, perhaps even too many. She finished her studies in 1927 then worked with Miss O'Reilly on the material from the Saxon cemetery at Mitchum, a site that had been dug by Mrs Chitty's uncle. She also met and worked with Ian Richmond who was directing the excavations at Cawthorne Camps at
Ilkley. And, Miles Burkitt invited her to go out as the representative of Cambridge University to Dorothy Garrod's excavations at Mount Carmel in 1928. With so many different opportunities Mrs Chitty felt overwhelmed, but also that the year of lectures at Cambridge had extended her archaeological world beyond measure (Chitty in conversation, 1994).

At the same time as Mrs Chitty’s individual study, archaeology at Cambridge was gaining a less tentative footing in academia. In 1920 a new Board of Archaeology and Anthropology was formed but the Disney Chair was not put on the same footing as others in the university until 1927 and the appointment of E.H Minns (Clark 1989: 27 and 32). In 1926 the Board became the Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology, this was more than a simple change in nomenclature; Miles Burkitt who had previously been lecturing, unpaid, on prehistory was formally appointed as a paid University Lecturer (Clark 1989: 30 and 34). The schedule for the tripos offered by the new Faculty in 1927 was:

1 Principles, including physical anthropology.
2 Social anthropology.
3 Archaeology (restricted to the Stone and early metal ages of Europe and the Mediterranean) and technology (or material culture). (Clark 1989: 34).

This was a one year course, intended to be taken by second year students, and ‘well-designed for beginners’ (Daniel 1986: 62). Many of those who followed the course were going into the Colonial Service (Fell in conversation, 1994 and Phillips 1989: 35). Professor T. C. Hodson, formerly Colonel Hodson of the Indian Civil service, was the head of anthropology, and the inter-connectedness of archaeology and colonialism is demonstrated by Bernard Fagg who followed the course in the 30s and went out to Nigeria initially as a colonial administrator and then joined the Archaeology Service in 1947 (Clark 1989: 106). In 1927 ‘Section B’ was added by the transference of Professor H. M. Chadwick from the Faculty of English to the Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology. Section B was largely concerned with Celtic, Anglo-Saxon, and Norse writings but Chadwick brought with him J. M. (Toty) de Navarro who lectured on the Bronze and Early Iron Ages of Europe. By following both Sections A and B it was possible to obtain an honours degree with some relevance to non-Classical archaeology.

The Cambridge Archaeology and Anthropology Tripos were followed by a considerable number of students who went on to have careers in British and overseas archaeology in
the 20s and 30s. Cyril Fox, Glyn Daniel, Clare Fell, Grahame Clark, Thurstan Shaw and J. Desmond Clark were amongst those who sat the Section A exams. While Glyn Daniel emphasised the quality and inspiring nature of Miles Burkitt and Toty de Navarro’s lectures, it was the emphasis on the artefacts that Clare Fell remembered:

You were made to handle objects, you could get to know the objects in a way that I don’t know if they do now. (Fell in conversation, 1994).

Despite these artefact handling sessions it was a largely non-practical course where the importance of recognising artefacts was stressed rather than studying the contexts from which they came. Aside from a week long field trip to central Wales to look at churches and hill forts (Daniel 1986: 65), there was no officially organised provision for fieldwork:

It was extraordinarily light-hearted, there was none of this amazing detail, carbon-dating had not appeared, nor were we taught all the techniques of excavation, you were sent out with a plane table to see if you could do a survey of some area of Cambridge, but that was about all you did. (Fell in conversation, 1994).

Those who were interested could assist on T. C. Lethbridge’s excavations for the Cambridge Antiquarian Society (Clark 1989: 41), and Clare Fell remembered spending many weekends on these excavations around Cambridge (Fell in conversation, 1994). Another possibility for fieldwork training was the Fenland Research Committee, formed in 1932 with Grahame Clark and C. W. Phillips as founder members (Clark 1989: 53-6; Phillips 1989: 37-8; Smith 1996: 11-30). Clark ran excavations at Mildenhall Fen from 1935 using Cambridge students, but the students attended on a purely voluntarily basis (Smith 1996: 21). Clark (1989: 45) felt that this lack of provision for fieldwork training was one of the weaknesses of the course, but, he suggested, the students would have been inspired by the ‘off-stage activities’ of Louis Leakey, Dorothy Garrod, and Gertrude Caton Thompson. However, it is noticeable that after the Second World War under Dorothy Garrod and Grahame Clark fieldwork became an important part of the course (Clark 1989: 66-7; Daniel 1986: 211).

Not all students who followed Section A went on to read Section B (Clark 1989: 52). This section of the course was a very different proposition requiring, as Glyn Daniel (1986: 82) observed, ‘real scholarship’. Under H. M Chadwick the course dealt with Northern European prehistoric and proto-historic societies from the Neolithic to the Norman Conquests. Students were expected to be able to read Anglo-Saxon English, Old Norse, Old Welsh, Latin, French and German (Daniel 1986: 82 and Fell in
conversation, 1994). Although Chadwick was interested in archaeology, reading and including excavation reports in his lectures, as well as visiting monuments and excavations, his was a linguistic rather than artefactual approach to archaeology, and again there was no provision for fieldwork training (Daniel 1986: 84-85).

**Other Universities.**
Outside Oxbridge there was a similar pattern. Archaeology, when it was taught at all, was largely Classical Archaeology or Egyptology. Non-Classical archaeology only existed as a subsidiary subject. At Cardiff, for example, archaeology ran as a joint degree with other subjects and the teaching was one of the responsibilities of the Curator of Archaeology at the National Museum. In Liverpool the Institute of Archaeology had been established in 1904 with Professorships of Classical Archaeology and Egyptology. Again social anthropology was one of the subjects covered, alongside medieval archaeology and methods and practice of archaeology. There were lecturers in Assyriology, Central European archaeology, geology and numismatics, but according to Clark the main aim of the Institute was to sponsor excavation in Greece and the East (Clark 1989: 12). Despite this promising start by 1943 W. J. Varley, who lectured in Geography at Liverpool University, was complaining that the Institute had done more to further the careers of the staff than provide training for students and that there was an inadequate provision of archaeology courses for those who were interested (Varley 1944: 91-3).

**6.2.3 London**
Under Petrie's forceful guidance the Egyptology Diploma at University College was a popular choice for study. The diploma concentrated on language and artefacts and, as at Cambridge, there was only a modicum of fieldwork training. Margaret Drower recalled surveying the car park (Drower in conversation, 1994). Students were, however, encouraged to join excavations in Britain as well as Egypt. Lesley McNair Scott (later Mrs Murray Thriepland), one of Petrie's students, worked with the Wheelers at Verulamium and Maiden Castle (Seton-Williams 1988: 21). Margaret Drower enrolled for the diploma but switched to the Archaeology and Egyptology degree when it was inaugurated in 1935. Ms Drower also excavated at Saint Albans and Maiden Castle before going out to Tell el-Amarna with John Pendlebury and then to excavate the Armant Temples with Oliver Myers (Drower in conversation, 1994).
When R.E.M. Wheeler transferred from the National Museum of Wales to the London Museum in 1926 one of his expressed reasons for doing so was the intention to set up an institute of archaeology which would ‘emphasize the technical needs of archaeology’ (Wheeler 1966: 113). It took another ten years for this to become a reality. In the intervening period with the support of the museum authorities and University College (Evans 1985: 2), Wheeler began informally lecturing to undergraduate students at the museum, and:

... every evening two or three research students could be found at work to a late hour in a room or workshop partially allotted for that purpose; we became the working home, too, for the inspector of London excavations appointed about this time by the Society of Antiquaries. (Wheeler 1955: 87).

In 1929 University College made Wheeler a part-time lecturer and the post-graduate diploma in prehistoric archaeology was launched (Evans 1985: 6). Stuart Piggott, Margaret Preston (later Mrs Piggott, then Peggy Guido), Molly Cotton, Kim Collingridge (later Lady Wheeler) and Veronica Seton Williams and many other would-be archaeologists followed the course. Neither Stuart Piggott nor Peggy Guido recollected much other than having attended lectures at Lancaster House, although Professor Piggott did remark that he had been one of the very few people to have ever heard Wheeler lecture on the Palaeolithic (Piggott in conversation, 1994). It was Wheeler’s personality that Stuart Piggott remembered most:

One used to hear the screech of the brakes of his arrival in a very sporty Lancia car and he’d leap out and lecture. (Piggott in conversation, 1994).

Peggy Guido, who had considerably less tolerance of Wheeler’s affectations, recalled only that the course concentrated on Western Europe rather than any details of its substance. She did remember that the main problem faced by the students was the lack of reading material, there were only about six books on the reading list, of which she remembered Leakey’s *Adam’s Ancestors* (1934), Curwen’s *Prehistoric Sussex* (1929), Burkitt’s *The Old Stone Age* (1933), Crawford’s *Man and His Past* (1921), and Kendrick and Hawkes’ *Archaeology in England and Wales 1914 to 1931* (1932) (Guido in conversation, 1994).

Dr Seton-Williams, possibly because of her continued connection with University College and the Institute, had a better recollection of the course. She was a contemporary of both Peggy Guido and Stuart Piggott, and began the diploma in 1934. Dr Seton-Williams had originally intended to follow the Egyptology diploma under Margaret Murray, but the Wheelers’ persuaded her to switch to prehistory. Their
argument was that as a woman she would never get a job in Egyptology, but that if she changed over to prehistory ‘they would see that I got something’ (Seton-Williams 1988: 23). The diploma seems to have had some similarities with Section A of the Cambridge Tripos, there was a social anthropology course, a general outline of British prehistory, as well as some lectures in geology and anatomy. Where this course differed is that Wheeler also lectured on ‘Methods and Aims’ of archaeology and the students were taught surveying with a theodolite and plane table:

In our spare time, if we had any, we were supposed to get up to the top of the London Museum and help Delia Parker and Ione Geddye with mending the Maiden Castle material. (Seton-Williams 1988: 24).

This was a far more practical course than those offered by Cambridge and Oxford, but still a long way from Wheeler’s vision of a technical Institute, and although students were encouraged to go on the Wheelers’ digs, this was not an essential part of the diploma.

As Peggy Guido had remarked the main problem for the students was a lack of books, there was no library at Lancaster House, Wheeler’s students were given the key to University College’s Yates Classical Library but this was of limited use to prehistorians. The students were encouraged to join the Royal Archaeological Institute which gave them the use of the Society of Antiquaries library (Guido in conversation, 1994 and Seton-Williams 1988: 23-4). There were other advantages noted by Dr Seton-Williams:

Working with the Wheelers one was in the centre of the British archaeological world, and by attending meetings at the Society of Antiquaries I gradually met all the leading figures in British archaeology. (Seton-Williams 1988: 25).

6.2.4 Individual Learning

These were the formal ways of studying archaeology, there were other less structured approaches possible too. I mentioned above Mrs Chitty’s year of study at Cambridge, Aileen Fox and Gertrude Caton Thompson also followed personalised routes. Aileen Fox had studied English at Newnham and came to archaeology almost by accident (Fox in conversation, 1994). After working for J.P. Bushe-Fox at Richborough Lady Fox went to the British School at Rome for six months to study Roman sites and monuments in readiness for her second season at Richborough. After this second season she was encouraged to learn German, since so many excavation reports dealing with Romano-Gaulish sites were written in German. Lady Fox had been given an allowance of £250 a
year by her parents, and so without the necessity to earn a living, her solution was to go and live in Germany until she was fluent in the language (Fox in conversation, 1994).

Gertrude Caton Thompson also had a private income, but no formal education. Before the First World War she had attended a series of lectures at the British Museum by a Miss Sarah Patterson on the Myceneans, Minoans and early Greeks, but it was when she visited the prehistoric excavations at Villa Foucher de Careil in Mentone in 1916 that her real archaeological interest began. Acting on the advice of Flinders Petrie in 1921 Gertrude Caton Thompson attended courses at University College in surveying, Arabic and geology (Caton Thompson 1983: 82). She then accompanied Petrie’s expedition to Abydos where she investigated the high plateau away from the main work of the expedition. The season was successful, Ms Caton Thompson discovered palaeolithic flint implements and the same year she went to work with Margaret Murray on Malta. However, these two expeditions convinced Ms Caton Thompson that she needed to know more before undertaking further work. Her solution was to go to Cambridge for a year as a self-funded research fellow at Newnham and study zoology, palaeontology, geology, surveying, prehistory and anthropology (Caton Thompson 1983: 87-90). This research paid off, Ms Caton Thompson went out to Egypt again for the 1924-5 season and with Guy Brunton identified the previously unknown predynastic settlement near Badari (Caton-Thompson and Brunton 1928). This was the beginning of a career which spanned work in Egypt, the Yemen and Zimbabwe. As well as her excavational work Ms Caton Thompson became a research fellow at Newnham, and was on the board of governors there as well as at Bedford College and the School of Oriental and African Studies (Caton-Thompson 1983: 210-32).

6.3 Training

6.3.1 Introduction

This section deals with fieldwork training rather than training for museum or academic work, simply because for the latter there was no such training. Christopher Hawkes, like Leonard Woolley twenty years previously, went straight from Oxford to a museum post. Pottery reconstruction was undertaken by archaeologists with no formal training, but
more specialist work was done by those who were qualified in chemistry or environmental science, rather than archaeologists. Fieldwork training, although minimal, was the only form of training available to would-be archaeologists aside from following university courses.

The lack of fieldwork training was raised at the 1943 *Future of Archaeology Conference*. Kathleen Kenyon argued that excavation was often approached in a 'light hearted' way by those who were reputable workers in the theoretical aspects of archaeology but ill-equipped in the practicalities of excavation (Kenyon 1944: 41 and see Atkinson 1946: v). Ms Kenyon argued, as she would in *Beginning in Archaeology* (1952), that since excavation equated with destruction:

> ... it is far more important that archaeological field workers should be trained than any other specialists who contribute to the elucidating the history of an archaeological site. The errors made by epigraphers, numismatists, and so on, can be corrected, while once a site has been badly dug or badly recorded its potential evidence is lost for ever. (Kenyon 1944 39).

Kathleen Kenyon suggested that training should cover stratification, recording, uncovering and handling artefacts (Kenyon 1944: 40). As was seen in the previous section only artefact handling and planning seem to have been covered at university. Another indication, like the fieldwork manuals and excavation reports, that it was the artefacts not contexts that were seen as important, and that the section was subordinate to the plan.

Most archaeologists received their sole fieldwork training on site. Again, what was immediately noticeable from the autobiographies and the conversations I had with archaeologists was how few details of their training they recollected, or felt were worthy of comment. These archaeologists had spent a large part of their careers in the field, refining and developing their initial training, it would be absurd to expect them to remember details from half a century ago. Another problem is that to most archaeologists who excavate it is self-evident what one does in the field and why one does it. Beyond deciding what is good or bad practice the process is rarely reflexive. What tends to be remembered is the site itself and what was uncovered, or the excitement of being with other archaeologists the friends and enemies made, not the minutiae of digging.
6.3.2 The content of the training

What archaeologists were trained to do, therefore, has to be surmised from site notebooks, reports, the manuals and any existing archives. These suggest that it was archaeologists who were responsible for any ‘delicate’ work in digging up artefacts, it was they who photographed, recorded, measured and surveyed. The details of this training are obscure. Lady Fox (in conversation, 1994 and 2000: 47-8) gave one of the fullest accounts of her training, but even so there are enormous gaps. Her first excavation was at Richborough under J.P. Bushe-Fox and Dr Donald Atkinson. She was initially shown how to clean the bronzes and mend pottery, and then, seemingly without any additional training was transferred to supervising the workmen. Between the two seasons at Richborough Lady Fox assisted Bushe-Fox with the post-exploration work, visited Italian Roman sites, and spent a week at the British Museum in preparation for initiating and running the Richborough site museum. For the second season Lady Fox was promoted to site assistant in charge of her own area, but all she recorded of this season, aside from the fiasco with the wattle and daub buildings (Fox 2000: 54-5) was:

There were many discussions with Bushe-Fox and Donald Atkinson about the interpretations of our findings. We were pioneering a new technique using area clearance instead of trenching, and scraping instead of digging. Our discoveries illuminated a whole new phase of Roman military activity in first-century Britain. (Fox 2000: 55).

Although it is interesting to know that ‘area clearance’ was being applied at Richborough this statement is hardly revealing of how the areas were cleared, or what exactly she meant by ‘scraping instead of digging’.

Other hints about field training come through in Aileen Fox’s account. She remarked that there was an element of competition between Verulamium and Richborough, and although she never regretted being in the Bushe-Fox rather than the Wheeler camp (Fox in conversation, 1994) she knew that the Verulamium excavations:

... provided technical training and interpretation far in advance of elsewhere
... I doubt if St Albans would have suited me, though I might have been better equipped professionally as a result. (Fox 2000: 56).

And, in order to become more technically competent Lady Fox joined Dorothy Liddell’s excavations at Hembury since she had heard that Ms Liddell did her own recording, whereas at Richborough this was done by a surveyor from the Office of Works (Fox 2000: 67). Even with these details and hints fieldwork training remains largely obscure.
6.3.3 Mentoring

The details of what archaeologists were taught may be unknown, how they were taught is less so. Without a formalised structure for fieldwork training archaeology appears to have relied largely on individual mentoring for the induction of new recruits. This tradition dates back at least as far as Pitt Rivers and his training of site assistants, and the system continued through the 20s and 30s. Seton Lloyd (1989: 82) for example acknowledged Henri [Hans] Frankfort as 'my mentor'. Would-be archaeologists attached themselves either as a volunteer or as paid assistants to those who already had experience. This was the path followed by Wheeler who began his career as an assistant at the Ministry of Works under Bushe-Fox at Wroxeter (Lucas 2001: 36-7). However, the majority of these experienced directors were amateurs, in that they conducted excavations unpaid and in their spare time, but as Grahame Clark stressed:

... there was usually a choice of ones of a high level of technical excellence. In my own case I learned the basic skills of excavation on the chalk downs of Sussex under Dr E.C. Curwen ... who applied methods perfected by the legendary Pitt Rivers. (Clark 1989: 50).

Clark was not the only trainee initiated by Curwen, C.W. Phillips and Stuart Piggott also began their excavational careers on Curwen’s dig at the Trundle (Phillips 1989: 36 and Piggott 1989: 23). Stuart Piggott was exceptional in the number of different mentors he acknowledged as influential to his work. Curwen was the first of Piggott’s influences (Piggott 1989: 23) however, between seasons at The Trundle Piggott visited Alexander Keiller’s excavations at Windmill Hill and was impressed by Keiller’s style:

Technique at The Trundle in 1928 was rather primitive, with the turf roughly hacked off the approximate area of excavation, but in 1930 I laid out a rectilinear cutting in the Windmill Hill manner. Reginald Smith emerged from the British Museum to visit us... and sizing up the situation commented briefly ‘very marmaladish’. (Piggott 1989: 23).

Piggott’s association with Keiller continued and they worked together on the long barrows at Thickthorn Down in 1933, at the end of which Keiller suggested Piggott leave the Royal Commission and work instead for him. Together they excavated Avebury which Piggott recollected as being ‘enormous fun’ before it descended into ‘landscape gardening’ (Piggott in conversation, 1994). Piggott was also involved with the Fenland Research Committee and the Prehistoric Society of East Anglia, which strengthened his ties with Grahame Clark and C.W. Phillips, and reinforced his alienation from Keiller’s brand of archaeology (Guido in conversation, 1994 and Piggott
1989: 26). Although Piggott had directed his own excavations at Holdenhurst, Ram’s Hill, and Crichel Down in the late 30s, he remarked that:

My most valuable experience was excavating Little Woodbury with Gerhard Bersu, from whom I learnt much. (Piggott 1989: 27 and see Evans 1989: 436-50).

Veronica Seton-Williams was another archaeologist whose training took place under a number of different, acknowledged, authorities. Her first experience of fieldwork was at Maiden Castle:

The actual direction of the excavation was initially under the supervision of Mrs Tessa Wheeler with Dr Wheeler in charge of the overall strategy... I worked for three seasons at Maiden Castle starting as a student in 1934 knowing nothing. At the end of the first year I had become a partial supervisor and for the next two years was in charge of one of the areas as a Field Supervisor. (Seton-Williams 1988: 22).

Again details of actual training were left out of this account. We are told that in-between seasons at Maiden Castle Dr Seton-Williams went to work at Sinai with the Petries, and that the telescope mentioned in Methods and Aims (Petrie 1904: 28) was in constant use for checking on the staff as well as the workmen (Seton-Williams 1988: 36). Although anecdotes of Petrie’s eccentricities are always amusing they do little to further our understanding of archaeological techniques. Dr Seton-Williams noted that the complexities of the Sheikh Zuweyed site:

...was very good training for a student, anxious to learn stratification. Perhaps I was lucky, too, in that I had to learn the hard way by understanding a buried site with many superimposed layers, pits, granaries, and all the other complications that this entailed. (Seton-Williams 1988: 43).

But we are left wondering how did she learn? What did she learn? How was the information recorded?

From Sinai Veronica Seton-Williams went to work with Professor John Garstang at Jericho, and here a little more information was given. In the context of discussing how Garstang had been criticised for his record keeping she remarked:

When I worked with him, his records were meticulously kept. Room cards were made for each room or area excavated with a note of the dimensions of the walls, material and state of the floors, or any constructions, and a list of the main contents of each room. Then each type of pot was entered on its own special card after having been drawn and photographed. (Seton-Williams 1988: 50).

Presumably she too became trained in this form of recording, and John Pendlebury used a similar system at Tell el-Amarna (Chubb 2001: 77-79). However, in her
autobiography Veronica Seton-Williams was more interested in detailing the sites on which she worked and the people with whom she worked. From working with Alan Rowe and Professor Garstang she went back to Maiden Castle, then on to Turkey as a supervisor on another of Garstang’s excavations. Dr Seton-Williams also worked on Cyprus, in Ireland and Palestine. It was not until 1939 that Dr Seton-Williams worked independently, surveying sites in Northern Syria with John Waechter, and running an excavation in Cyprus with Joan du Plat Taylor and John Waechter. With the hiatus caused by the Second World War it was not until 1949 that Veronica Seton-Williams again directed excavations in Cyprus and Turkey (Seton-Williams 1988: 50-101). This lengthy apprenticeship was rare even in eastern archaeology, perhaps reflecting that the Wheelers had been right to suggest Dr Seton-Williams would have had more success if she concentrated on British archaeology. The problems she faced were with those who were in charge of the excavations rather than the area studied or the attitudes of the Arab workmen (Seton-Williams 1988: 121).

Although Curwen has appeared repeatedly in this section, it was the Wheelers who provided the majority of inter-war fieldwork training. Curwen may have trained five or ten archaeologists, the Wheelers trained hundreds (Wheeler 1961: 153; Seton-Williams 1988: 55). From the tiny beginnings at Brecon Gaer where Nowell Myres and Christopher Hawkes were volunteers, via Verulamium with students in the tens and twenties, to the multitude at Maiden Castle took a decade, and it might seem that with such large numbers that by Maiden Castle personal mentoring was no longer in use. However, the site notebooks at Verulamium with their variety of handwriting suggest that the volunteers were being trained in the site conventions and recording techniques. At Maiden Castle, as Dr Seton-Williams remarked (1988: 22), Tessa Wheeler was in charge of supervising the volunteers. Mortimer Wheeler described how this mentoring system worked on site; students with a season or more of training were appointed as site assistants in charge of an area, and:

... wherever feasible, they are each assisted by a junior student whom they help to train. (Wheeler 1961: 162).

Again the details of this training are lacking, but it seems a reasonable assumption that Archaeology from the Earth reflected an idealised form of the training given to the Wheeler volunteers.
6.3.4 Inexperience

What is certain is that archaeologists were considered capable of independent work far sooner than would now be the case. Petrie’s excavation at Tanis in 1884 for the Egypt Exploration Fund was the first excavation he had ever been connected with and yet he was the director (Drower 1985: 70). David Hogarth and Leonard Woolley were similarly inexperienced. After graduation Woolley worked at the Ashmolean Museum and was placed in charge of the excavations at Corbridge in 1906 and 1907 under the nominal supervision of Professor F.J Haverfield:

I had never so much as seen an excavation, I had never studied archaeological methods even from books ... I was very anxious to learn, and it was a disappointment to me that Haverfield only looked in at the excavations one day a week and then was only concerned to know what I had found – I don’t think he ever criticized or corrected anything ... I had beginner’s luck, which pleased everyone, and we were all, I think, happily unconscious of the low standard of our performance. (Woolley 1953: 14-15).

Woolley’s next excavation was in Nubia with David Randall Maclver who had worked with Petrie and:

... was a first class archaeologist and I felt that now for the first time I could learn the techniques of field work under a competent instructor. (Woolley 1953: 23).

This instruction however, only lasted a fortnight then Woolley was put in control of a hundred Egyptian workmen, whose language he didn't speak, and a cemetery site which turned out to consist of over eight-hundred graves. Even when Randall-Maclver learned of the site’s complexities he left Woolley in charge, a decision Woolley felt the need to defend:

During the fortnight’s work together at Areka he had put me on the right lines, and with the modicum of experience and with the hard work and ordinary care which he knew I would not shirk, there was no likelihood of the dig being improperly done. (Woolley 1953: 25).

Later archaeologists had considerably more experience than this before undertaking their own excavations. However, it was still surprisingly little by modern standards, and in view of the swiftness with which archaeologists were considered qualified, Mrs Chitty’s lack of confidence in her ability to direct an excavation seems reasonable by modern standards. When John Pendlebury became the director of excavations at Amarna he had spent one previous season there as an assistant to Frankfort. He and his ‘staff’ were incredibly young, Pendlebury was 26, the architect Hilary Waddington was the oldest at 28, and the other members were in their early 20s with little or no
experience of archaeology (Chubb 2001: 25). C.W. Phillips excavated Ty Newydd on Anglesey and the Skendleby long barrow after two seasons working with Curwen (Phillips 1989: 37). Grahame Clark began his Fenland excavations also after two seasons with Curwen at The Trundle. Christopher Hawkes was in charge of the Alchester excavations after a couple of seasons excavating on other people’s excavations (Hawkes 1989: 48-9). Of them all Kathleen Kenyon seems to have been the best prepared for independent excavation having worked with Gertrude Caton Thompson for a season at Great Zimbabwe, and then spending four seasons with the Wheelers, before directing the Verulamium theatre excavations. Wheeler himself had minimal experience before undertaking the Segontium excavations in 1921. He had worked at Wroxeter and Colchester, and surveyed Roman sites in Essex, but had never directed a large, complex excavation alone. There are many other examples that could be used, Peggy Guido, Dorothy Garrod, Alexander Keiller, and O.G.S. Crawford, none of them had what would now be seen as enough experience at the point in their careers when they began to run independent excavations.

In view of the high level of responsibility archaeologists were expected to take after the minimum of preparation it is perhaps unsurprising that they should have forgotten the details of their introduction to fieldwork. They saw themselves as pioneers because they were very largely self-trained. Nor is it surprising that fieldwork training was given such a low priority since an archaeologist was considered qualified to run their own excavations after a few months experience. And, equally unsurprising was the conviction of archaeologists such as Kathleen Kenyon and Mortimer Wheeler who felt the need for would-be archaeologists to be given far more practical instruction before being sent out into the field.

6.4 Employment

6.4.1 Introduction

When Petrie complained that archaeology was ‘only fit for bachelor life’ his complaint was obviously that archaeology paid too badly for a man to be an archaeologist and support his family. But his words, perhaps unwittingly, also revealed the gendered
nature of employment in Britain and in archaeology, a gendering that continued through the inter-war years. It should be stressed that without Petrie and the Wheelers, training and education in archaeology would have been far more gender dependent too. As previously noted, both Petrie and Wheeler encouraged women to attend their courses and to work on their excavations (Janssen 1992: 6-10). Peggy Guido stressed that there were at least equal numbers of male and female volunteers working on Wheeler's excavations at Verulamium and Maiden Castle, an assertion which is supported by the photographic archive (figs. 6.4 & 6.5). Ms Guido also stated that when she attended Wheeler's diploma course there were the same number of female students as male ones (Guido in conversation, 1994). However, neither Petrie nor Wheeler were in any position to offer many of their proteges paid employment, they could, and did, help though recommendations (Murray 1963: 153 and Seton-Williams 1988: 23), but the constant refrain of conversations and autobiographies was the rarity of paid employment in archaeology. As late as 1952 Kathleen Kenyon warned:

Many people in whom an interest in archaeology is aroused will want to make it their profession, and the question then arises as to the possibility of making a living in it. The answer has to be given with some caution ... there are now a number of full-time jobs in archaeology. But this number is still restricted in comparison to those in many professions. ... Therefore, anyone who is completely dependent on his earnings must consider the matter seriously and decide whether he is prepared to take the risk. (Kenyon 1952: 56 and see Daniel 1986: 212).

She also warned that there were no full time excavation posts (Kenyon 1952: 58), but as well as this gloomy prognosis Kenyon did have some encouraging words for would-be archaeologists:

... it is fairly safe to say that anyone who shows real ability will in due course get a suitable job, though there may be a difficult period at first. (Kenyon 1952: 56).

This forecast may seem accurate when only men are considered, Desmond Clark related how after graduating from Cambridge in 1937 he struggled to find work and eventually went to Northern Rhodesia having been offered the joint post of Secretary at the Institute for Social Anthropology and Curator of the David Livingstone Memorial Museum (Clark 1989: 139-40). Nowell Myres remarked:

When I was an undergraduate more than fifty years ago, persons who could be properly described as professional archaeologists were very rare birds indeed. ... the total number of scholars who could be properly described as professional archaeologists at that time was probably no more than twenty-five or thirty at the outside. When I inquired, on taking my degree, about the prospects of archaeology as a career, I was firmly warned off by my
mentors, for all practical purposes, I was told, there was no career in archaeology, and if one had to earn a living, as I had, one must find some other way of doing it. (Myres 1975: 5).

Grahame Clark told Pamela Smith a very similar story (Smith 1997: 14). However, both Clark and Myres did find full-time work, admittedly Myres became Bodley’s Librarian rather than a lecturer in archaeology, but this was still a paid position with possibilities for research. We have no idea how many other students listened to their mentors and abandoned archaeology. And, Desmond Clark, Grahame Clark, and Nowell Myres all had the advantage of being men. Kenyon may have remarked in *Beginning in Archaeology* that ‘for he throughout this book should be read as he or she, for there are just as many openings for women as men’ (Kenyon 1952: 162). This was simply not the case before the Second World War.

### 6.4.2 Women’s Employment

Women’s experience of archaeology after education and employment was markedly different to that of their male contemporaries. All archaeologists were faced with limited employment prospects but women archaeologists, like other professional women in the 20s and 30s, had to contend with external ideas of femininity as well as an extremely restricted job market.

A surprisingly high number of women archaeologists had studied to degree level, especially when considering the number of women students as a whole in the inter-war period. In the *Women at Oxford* Vera Brittain gave the figures for women students in Britain in 1936 as 12,232 out of a total student body of 50,638 or one woman to every three men, at Oxford the proportion went up to 1: 5 and at Cambridge rose to 1: 10 (Brittain 1960: 182). Women archaeologists with degrees show a higher percentage than this national average (fig. 6.3 & 6.6 and see Appendix B) which again reflects the middle class nature of archaeology. Women students came largely from the middle and upper classes. Women archaeologists with a university education had to come from wealthy backgrounds. And, after university they still needed parental support. Women had to have parental approval to become archaeologists, as Gertrude Caton Thompson remarked, archaeology was not the most obvious course for a well brought up young lady and parental suspicions had to be allayed:

> By now [1928] it had been realised by my mother that my archaeology was not a passing hobby but a time absorbing pursuit whether at home or abroad
... She knew that two presentable young women with nice homes – Winifred Lamb and Dorothy Garrod – were similarly dedicated. (Caton Thompson 1983: 110).

The number of women who graduated and trained in archaeology in the 20s and 30s did not translate into a similar number of employed women archaeologists. Of all the women studied only Joan du Plat Taylor, Kathleen Kenyon, Margaret Murray and Dorothy Garrod were employed in full-time, official, posts (fig. 6.7 and see Appendix B). Joan du Plat Taylor became the Assistant Director of the Cyprus Museum, Kathleen Kenyon was appointed Secretary to the Institute of Archaeology in 1935 and, in an unpaid capacity, became the lecturer on Palestinian archaeology and the curator of the Petrie Collection, Margaret Murray lectured on Egyptology at University College, and Dorothy Garrod was successively a research student at Newnham, an adviser of students at Newnham, and the Disney Professor. It is noticeable that these four were all single women, a point I will return to below. It is also noticeable that Dr Murray and Dr Garrod were the only, official, lecturers which reflects the wider scarcity of women academics in Britain. Between 1912 and 1951 the number of women academics rose from 5% to 12%, with a sharp increase after the Second World War (Bradley 1989: 25).

Aside from these women there was a handful of women who were not employed on a full-time basis, but worked for the majority of the year on different projects. Veronica Seton-Williams’ year involved working on excavations in the Middle East, then on to Cyprus to work in the museum, and then back to excavating (Seton-Williams 1988). Mrs Chitty was an active member of the Yorkshire Archaeological Society, the Leeds Archaeological Society, and the Roman section of these societies, she organised funding for excavations and the publication of the results, however, her only paid work was as a part time adult education lecturer in archaeology. Winifred Lamb and Gertrude Caton Thompson were in charge of high profile excavations, for which only their expenses would have been paid (Kenyon 1952: 58), and were self-funded research fellows. Ione Geddye and Delia Parker, amongst others, worked extensively on the Wheeler excavations and preparing the post-extraction material, for which it is unlikely they were paid. Aileen Fox fulfilled a similar role for Bushe-Fox (Fox 2000: 58).

Another section of the archaeological population were the wives of archaeologists, the 20s and 30s are dominated by these husband and wife archaeological partnerships. Stuart Piggott (Piggott 1989: 31), Mortimer Wheeler (Wheeler 1955: 84), and
Christopher Hawkes (Hawkes 1989: 51) all paid tribute to the help they had received from their wives, and Desmond Clark echoed these sentiments:

Betty and I were married in 1938. What I have been able to do in archaeology has been essentially a team effort by the two of us and, if it had not been for her input, it would not have been possible to do half of what we have managed to do between us. (Clark 1989: 141).

Marrying an archaeologist was a way into archaeology, although it is unlikely that any of the women archaeologists chose marriage to archaeologists as a way of furthering their careers. Not only is this an overly cynical view of marriage, it should be remembered that the people archaeologists were most likely to meet and date were archaeologists (see section 7.3.2 below), and marriages between archaeologists resulted in the wives relinquishing their careers. However, there were women who married archaeologists and subsequently developed an interest in the subject, Maud Cunnington, Lady Petrie, Tessa Verney Wheeler, Hilda Pendlebury, and Lady Woolley all became recognised archaeologists after their marriages. The only one of these women who demonstrably showed an interest in archaeology prior to her marriage was Katherine Keeling (later Mrs Woolley), and her involvement was the subject of concerned letters between George Byron Gordon, the Director of the Philadelphia University Museum, who co-sponsored the Ur excavations, and Leonard Woolley who was directing the excavations. Gordon wrote to Woolley in 1926 to say that Katherine Keeling’s presence on the excavations had ‘begun to give rise to some slight and inconsequential comment’ by those visiting the excavations (Gordon 1926 in Dyson 1977: 19). Woolley’s response was that Mrs Keeling had consulted friends before volunteering at Ur and that she:

... is nearly 40 and has been a widow for over seven years and, as all her friends recognize, has no intention of remarrying! (Woolley 1926 in Dyson 1977: 22).

In reply to this letter Gordon conceded that Woolley was in charge of the excavation and that the University of Philadelphia did not make a practice of disqualifying women whether they were ‘married or single’(Gordon 1926 in Dyson 1977: 23). However, not all of Gordon’s worries seem to have been allayed since he added the rider as long as such women were ‘properly qualified’ (ibid). In 1927 Leonard Woolley and Katherine Keeling married and continued to work together at Ur, but by marrying Woolley Katherine was neutralised, she was no longer seen as a potential ‘risk’. Gordon’s fears were not unique, Droop made the case for single sexed excavations in 1915 but W.F. Albright was similarly concerned with the ‘conventions’ in a book that was first published in 1949 and continued to be reprinted without revision until 1960:
Women often make the best archaeologists, as is attested by a growing list of eminent women archaeologists. However, it is often wise to separate the sexes in excavating ... Some of the finest archaeological expeditions in the Near and Middle East have been all women enterprises: excellent examples are provided by much of the work of Dorothy Garrod, Gertrude Caton Thompson, and Hetty Goldman. Where expeditions are mixed it is highly desirable to have the director’s wife present both to provide a feminine social arbiter and to avert scandal – which has brought not a few expeditions to grief. Lady Petrie and Mrs Garstang were invaluable members of their husbands’ expeditions. (Albright 1960: 13).

It could be argued that men like Albright, who was a devout Christian, were overreacting to the potential for gossip and immorality on excavations. Had their advice been followed it would have prevented unmarried women from taking an equal role in excavations, since the majority of digs in the East, as in Europe, had male directors. Thankfully, their advice was not followed and many excavations included women members (Chubb 1957 and 2001; Seton-Williams 1988).

This reading of wives as sexless neutralised women, whose role was to assist their husband’s endeavours is a very Ruskin-esque concept of a wife’s ‘duty’ and it would be interesting to know how far Tessa Wheeler and Lady Petrie had wanted to be involved in their husband’s archaeology. Unfortunately neither their husbands nor their husbands’ biographers recorded this information and neither of these women wrote autobiographies. Of Hilda Pendlebury a little more is known, Mary Chubb wrote:

Hilda was the right wife for an archaeologist, for as well as running the domestic side of the dig, she was a classical scholar in her own right, and after marrying John had gone on to extend her work to Cretan and Egyptian archaeology. (Chubb 2001: 68).

These being the areas that interested John Pendlebury. Miss Chubb also recorded that Hilda was in charge of doctoring the workmen (Chubb 2001: 67-8), and lifting delicate artefacts (Chubb 2001: 83). In the epilogue of Nefertiti Lived Here Mary Chubb detailed the subsequent careers of those who had been at Tell el-Amarna, but all she said of Hilda Pendlebury was that she brought up the children after John was shot (Chubb 2001: 180).

Where we do have information about wives the difference of experience makes it impossible to generalise. Maud Cunnington was initially interested in ecclesiastical history (Cunnington 1899), but she soon became involved in her husband’s work as honorary curator of the Devizes museum and together they began excavating Wiltshire
sites. Her descendants ascribed her involvement in archaeology as a desire to be of help to her husband (Cunnington 1954: 288), but by the 1920s Mrs Cunnington was a recognised archaeological authority in her own right, she spoke at the International Congress on Prehistoric and Proto-historic Sciences in 1932 (Grinsell 1989: 52), and her synthesis of Wiltshire archaeology was received with acclaim (Wheeler 1934: 203). Mrs Cunnington's marriage to Ben Cunnington, and her son's interest in archaeology may have given rise to her own involvement, but she went far beyond her husband and became the leader not follower in their archaeological enterprises (Roberts 2002: 46-62). Agatha Christie presented a very different picture. She became involved in Max Mallowan's excavations after their marriage in 1930, especially when he began directing his own excavations in Iraq. Although she was an internationally famous author, as Jacquetta Hawkes noted, Ms Christie not only accompanied Mallowan on his excavations but ran the camp, was also involved in the excavations, and took charge of the site photography (Hawkes 1985: 11-12), including filming the excavations. She enjoyed her archaeological work and wrote *Come Tell Me How You Live* to explain what archaeologists did and because 'it was a very happy way to live' (Christie Mallowan 1985: 191). Despite this enjoyment Ms Christie felt no need to branch out on her own in archaeology, her solo projects were the crime books which used the location of a dig, or where the characters were archaeologists (see section 7.7.1 below). Archaeology was her winter occupation and her involvement was entirely bound up with her husband's interest.

Many women in the 1920s and 30s faced the prospect of losing their jobs if they married. The post-1922 economic depressions affected women's employment, the introduction of marriage bars in many professions such as teaching, made it impossible for women to marry and continue their careers (Smith 1990: 52-3). While I have not found any instances of women archaeologists losing their jobs on marriage, nor have I found any instances where married women archaeologists were employed as archaeologists during the inter-war period. Peggy Guido informed me that she would have 'loved' a lecturing post, but there were very few and she had married after doing her diploma, she remarked that while marriage didn't affect excavation work, it did affect 'that sort of job' (Guido in conversation, 1994). There were married women archaeologists who were involved in archaeology, but always in an unofficial capacity, and they were on the fringes of archaeology, assisting their husbands in their work.

209
Tessa Wheeler fits into this category. Her entire archaeological life was bound up with Mortimer Wheeler's, she assisted on his excavations, she helped with the London Museum, she assisted in his teaching and in the training of his students. Her only solo excavation was the Caerleon Amphitheatre which Wheeler had been due to dig before he took the London Museum appointment. Peggy Guido and Stuart Piggott both told me that when Stuart Piggott was appointed to the Abercromby Chair they decided to divide Scotland's prehistory between them in order to tackle the work that needed to be done. Although Aileen Fox was ostensibly not involved in Cyril Fox's museum work, she admitted that he did discuss this work with her (Fox in conversation, 1994). Together they worked on excavations and again much that Fox managed to do in Wales was a team effort, and Lady Fox remarked that he was happy for her to share in his work. However, she did mention that he was astonished at her eagerness when he mentioned it had been suggested she take over Nash Williams' teaching post at Cardiff University during the war. Cyril Fox's surprise at Aileen Fox's desire for independent work shows that even the most considerate of husbands did not necessarily appreciate how much autonomy their wives had given up for the sake of their marriage ix.

For later writers the difficulty in studying women in these archaeological partnerships is in disentangling individual work within that partnership. We can say with some certainty how Maud Cunnington and Ben Cunnington divided their work (Roberts 2002), but with the Wheelers it is virtually impossible to distinguish Tessa Wheeler's work. We know that it was Tessa Wheeler who was largely responsible for training the students (Seton-Williams 1988: 22; Peggy Guido in conversation, 1994), but was it Mortimer Wheeler who developed the theory of training and Tessa Wheeler who put it into practice? This would seem to be suggested from Mortimer Wheeler having written a fieldwork manual, but equally Archaeology from the Earth could have been based on noting Tessa Wheeler's training techniques. Similarly Wheeler's almost evangelical emphasis on fieldwork would seem to have been an essential part of his archaeology, but in an article about Kathleen Kenyon, who frequently worked with the Wheelers, we are told:

In print Kenyon always acknowledged Mortimer Wheeler as her 'constant inspiration towards improved methods'. In private conversation it was to Tessa that she paid equal, if not greater, tribute for what she had learned of dig management and field technique, notably the detailed control of

These remarks were echoed by both Peggy Guido and Veronica Seton-Williams (Guido in conversation, 1994 and Seton-Williams 1988: 22). All of these women were enormously fond of Tessa Wheeler and Peggy Guido in particular was candid about her distaste and contempt for Mortimer Wheeler. How far these archaeologists were motivated by a genuine admiration of Tessa Wheeler's archaeological abilities and how far their remarks reflect their dislike for her husband is impossible to establish at this distance. The one person who knew how far Tessa Wheeler assisted her husband was Mortimer Wheeler, but he simply recorded her help (Wheeler 1955: 84) and mentioned her practicality in solving archaeological problems (Wheeler 1961: 132). We might not be able to be exact about who did what in the Wheeler partnership but the assistance Mortimer Wheeler received from Tessa Wheeler cannot be over-estimated. Not only did she help to run the excavations, train the students, organise the financial backing for the Institute, she also seems to have shared in Wheeler’s curatorial and academic duties (Hawkes 1982: 116-123). The National Museum, the London Museum, and University College paid for one Wheeler but in effect they got both for the price, just as when Piggott was appointed to the Abercromby Chair at Edinburgh in 1946 Scottish archaeology gained two investigators (Piggott and Guido in conversation, 1994). Tessa and Mortimer Wheeler are perhaps an extreme example since they still invoke emotional responses³, but the inter-connectedness of their work indicates how hard it is to separate out individuals, particularly when the partnerships consist of married couples. The Wheelers also serve to remind us that memory and admiration are emotive not objective matters.

Not only were married women expected to hold their husband’s careers as more important than their own, they were also expected to put their families first. Obviously this limited the involvement of married women archaeologists who also had children, especially if their husband’s worked abroad. Lady Petrie remained in Britain while pregnant with John and Ann, and while the children were small she stayed at home when Petrie went out to dig in Egypt. When the children were older they often accompanied their parents on excavations, Michael Wheeler worked at the Verulamium and Maiden Castle excavations, as well as being present at the earlier digs. Many archaeologists took their children with them when they worked abroad, Mary Chubb
related how Hans and Yettie Frankfort took their son Jon with them when they excavated at Tell Asmar in Iraq. But, even with nursemaids the majority of child care on an excavation fell to wives, not husbands. Mary Chubb (1957: 70) noted that Yettie Frankfort, who was also an archaeologist, was frustrated that she spent most of her time running the camp and looking after Jon. This irritation was not confined to those digging abroad. Aileen Fox also mentioned her frustration that any fieldwork she undertook had to be local so that she could travel there and back within the day, and had to take place outside the school holidays, so when Sir Cyril Fox was digging at Llyn Cerig, Lady Fox remained in Cardiff with the children (Fox in conversation, 1994). Lady Fox also remarked that she had been fortunate, she was sufficiently wealthy to employ a cook and nanny without whom even this limited research would have been impossible. Peggy Guido’s archaeology work was suspended during the war, as was most archaeology work, but unlike Stuart Piggott and other archaeological husbands who used their skills in the war effort her contribution was limited by her child care duties. Ms Guido became the guardian of her niece which meant her war effort was confined to working with evacuees (see section 7.8.2 below).

It would seem that women archaeologists, like other professional women, had a choice between a career or a family. However, it was not that simple for women in inter-war Britain. Leaving aside the manifest unfairness of having to make such a decision, there were other problems single women had to overcome. The first was the disinclination to employ women noted in section 4.3.3 above (Pugh 1990: 148 and see Smith 1990). It is, as I said above, marked that the majority of women archaeologists relied on their private incomes rather than paid employment while working in archaeology. Kathleen Kenyon and Dorothy Garrod would seem to be the exceptions, both of these women secured high profile posts. But Kenyon’s appointment to the British School in Jerusalem came after the Second World War, and as Pamela Smith (2000) has suggested Dorothy Garrod’s time as Disney Professor was troubled and uncomfortable. And, it is noticeable that these two women were considerably older than their male contemporaries when they achieved these posts. Another obstacle women had to deal with was that women were paid less than men, equal pay for women was an unresolved issue until the 1960s. Archaeology paid badly, but it paid women even less. Kathleen Kenyon noted the inequality of pay in Beginning in Archaeology when talking about civil service archaeology posts (Kenyon 1952: 184) but did not give details. The usual
rate of women’s pay was one third less than men in the same posts were paid (Braybon 1981: 100-109 and Smith 1986: 217).

Nor did single women escape from family duties. Single women might not have children to care for, but they were expected to care for their parents. Clare Fell and Mrs Chitty remarked that Dorothy Garrod took care of her parents, and when she became a lecturer at Cambridge her widowed mother moved in with her. Clare Fell herself gave up her post at the Cambridge university museum to care for her parents, as she remarked:

I wasn’t there [the museum] all that long, because I had elderly parents and in those days you didn’t bundle them into a home or a hospital, you looked after them if you happened to be an unmarried person. (Fell in conversation, 1994).

Gertrude Caton Thompson’s career was similarly interrupted by looking after her mother who had heart problems. She missed the 1931-32 season at Kharga Oasis because of her mother’s illness (Caton Thompson 1983: 159-62). Gertrude Caton Thompson had already turned down the suggestion in 1930 that she spend a further six months investigating the Zimbabwe ruins because her brother had been institutionalised in her absence (Caton Thompson 1983: 115). Then, after her mother’s death in 1934, Miss Caton Thompson had to ensure that her brother was visited by someone he knew and trusted. In 1938 this family friend also died and confronted with the need to increasingly look after her brother and her own indifferent health Ms Caton Thompson decided to give up overseas archaeology (Caton Thompson 1983: 198). Margaret Murray, while giving no details, remarked in her autobiography that ‘From 1904 till the winter of 1913 family affairs kept me in England’ (Murray 1963: 103). There are no such remarks in any male archaeologist’s autobiography.

6.4.3 Full-time posts in archaeology

The Civil Service

Archaeologists were employed by universities, private employers\textsuperscript{xi}, and the Civil Service. The latter covered the Ordnance Survey, the Royal Commissions on Ancient Monuments, the Ministry of Works and the national museums\textsuperscript{xiii}. Figure 6.8 shows that before 1939 the majority of archaeologists were employed by the Civil Service (and see Appendix B), although the balance changed in the post-war era with the expansion of the universities (fig. 6.9).
Obviously different posts entailed different responsibilities, however, with the exception of those employed on the longer termed overseas expeditions, there was remarkably little fieldwork involved in any of these appointments. One of the suggested reasons for Christopher Hawkes' breakdown was his frustration with the hidebound nature of the British and Medieval Antiquities Department at the British Museum (Jill Cook, pers. comm.). Hawkes' curatorial duties involved cataloguing and organising the collections, but excavation had to take place during holiday leaves\textsuperscript{xiv} (Hawkes 1989: 49 and Webster 1991: 177).

This conflict of interest likewise caused trouble for Piggott when his excavations at Thickthorn Down in 1933 threatened to over-run (Piggott in conversation, 1994). Piggott asked Hemp, his superior, for an extension of leave to finish the excavation but this was refused. When Alexander Keiller stepped in with the offer of employment as his private archaeologist Piggott took the post despite the misgivings of his parents (Keiller archive Avebury Museum). Similarly Boon (1990: 84) suggested that W.F. Grimes left the National Museum of Wales because of the administrative workload.

Crawford also recorded his frustration at the limits imposed on his fieldwork by the Ordnance Survey and there were several disputes over what constituted his proper work for the department (Crawford 1955: 166). Crawford managed to persuade the Director General that fieldwork should be part of his responsibilities, and his Cotswold investigations became an Ordnance Survey 1:250000 distribution map. Yet, there was trouble when it was discovered that Crawford had been working on a map of Roman Britain during office hours (Crawford 1955: 162-3). As Crawford was anxious to point out, this map proved to be enormously successful, it sold out within a few days of printing and led the way for similar maps covering \textit{Seventeenth-Century England, Britain in the Dark Ages,} and \textit{Neolithic Wessex.} But, despite these concessions throughout his time at the O.S. Crawford felt archaeology was considered to be a 'luxury' rather than an essential part of O.S. policy (Crawford 1955: 230). And, even though he was given authorisation to work on the fieldwork and publication of \textit{Wessex from the Air} during office hours, Crawford suspected this permission was given because no-one 'really cared how I spent my time, provided I kept quiet and didn't worry them with new ideas' (Crawford 1955: 171).
C.W. Phillips, who succeeded Crawford as the O.S. Archaeology Officer, dismissed these problems as part of Crawford’s ‘difficult nature’ (Phillips 1989: 39), but Crawford’s complaints do seem to have been valid. Despite the success of *Wessex from the Air* when Crawford attempted to organise aerial photographs in Scotland he ran up against O.S. administration. Geoffrey Allington, a friend of Crawford’s and a pilot, had offered to fly Crawford over the areas charging only for the petrol used, as Crawford stressed this was official work for the Ordnance Survey but when he applied for approval:

... my application caused a flutter of apprehension in the bureaucratic dovecotes, and the usual lengthy exchange of minutes, though I had been using a-p’s for the purpose of O.S. archaeology for 16 years, no-one in the office seemed to have realised it and the advantages the overhead view provided. (Crawford 1955: 270).

According to Crawford it was assumed he was doing the fly-over for fun, and he was asked how much a taxi to his destinations would cost. Eventually Crawford was given permission for the work on the understanding that approval for Allington’s costs were withheld until the work was finished and the report was done, this didn’t happen and Crawford ended up paying Allington’s expenses himself (Crawford 1955: 270).

Although the archaeologists complained that they had to use their leave if they wished to engage in fieldwork, it should be noted that they did have sufficient holiday leave to be able to contemplate excavation and surveys. The working classes were fortunate if they had a week’s paid leave a year, Crawford by comparison had forty-five days a year (Crawford 1955: 212). With such lengthy holiday entitlement archaeologists were able to visit and volunteer on each other’s excavations and to contemplate foreign travel. The majority of the British working classes only went abroad when sent there during wartime. As was noted in section 4.2.2 the middle classes regularly took foreign holidays. Looking through the biographies and autobiographies of archaeologists I was surprised at how often holidays were referred to (Seton-Williams 1988: 25-9; 72; 82 & 83-4), Crawford in particular was immensely well-travelled (1955: 184 & 207-213) and even the impoverished Margaret Murray managed a holiday to Russia (1963: 98-100) and a lecture tour to Northern Europe. These visits and lecture tours not only enabled British archaeologists to visit a variety of sites and monuments, but it also enabled them to meet other archaeologists, to compare ideas about the past, and increase their awareness of other areas and periods (Crawford 1955: 194 & 207).
Of all the archaeologists employed by the Civil Service Mortimer Wheeler seems to have been in the best position to combine fieldwork with his museum duties. Or, at least this is how he presented his life in his autobiography. Wheeler went to work at the National Museum of Wales in 1920, his main administrative role was to organise the collections, and convince the rest of Wales that Cardiff was the right location for a national museum. When he became the Director in 1924 he also became responsible for getting the museum buildings finished, equipped, and open to the public (Wheeler 1955: 68-70). As well as these duties he was also ‘to secure for archaeology a recognized place in the curriculum of the Welsh University’ (Wheeler 1955: 69) by lecturing in archaeology at Cardiff. At the same time Wheeler wanted to continue his investigation of Roman Britain, in 1921 he was asked to take over the excavations at Segontium and worked two seasons there (Wheeler 1955: 71-2). In 1924 and 1925 the Wheelers excavated Brecon Gaer, despite Wheeler’s promotion to director and his replacement as Keeper by Cyril Fox. The Caerleon amphitheatre was the next site designated for investigation, but when Wheeler accepted the post of Director of the London Museum Tessa Wheeler and others were drafted in to run the excavations (Wheeler & Wheeler 1928). Despite taking charge of the chaotic London Museum with its accumulated ‘piles of irrelevant junk’, issuing guides and catalogues, lecturing to students and schoolchildren, Wheeler still managed to find time for fieldwork (Wheeler 1955: 86 & 95-109). In 1928 and 1929 the Wheelers excavated at Lydney (Wheeler & Wheeler 1932), 1930 to 1933 was spent digging Verulamium (Wheeler & Wheeler 1936), from 1934 to 1938 Maiden Castle was excavated (Wheeler 1943), and Wheeler still found time for surveying and excavating of French earthworks and hill-forts between 1936 to 1939 (Wheeler & Richardson 1959).

The Inspectorate of Ancient Monuments and the Ministry of Works had a few posts and those badly paid (see section 6.4.4 below). Despite Piggott’s (1989: 25) complaint of having to suffer W.J. Hemp’s ‘genteel antiquarianism in a dead atmosphere of dim mediocrity’, this post gave Piggott the opportunity of surveying Anglesey and learning archaeological draughtsmanship from Leonard Monroe (Piggott in conversation, 1994 and 1989: 26). W.J Hemp and J.P Bushe-Fox were able to combine being inspectors with excavation work, their record while not overly prolific was certainly respectable. As was mentioned above Desmond Clark went out to Northern Rhodesia to work ‘since there was nothing else in the offing’ (Clark 1989: 139). Thurstan Shaw went to Ghana
to be the Curator of the Anthropology Museum at Achimota, Joan du Plat Taylor became the Assistant Director of the Cyprus Museum, Peter Shinnie became Assistant Commissioner for archaeology for the Sudanese government in 1946, Barbara Parker became the Secretary and General Manager of the British School in Iraq, Bernard Fagg went out to Nigeria as a Colonial Administrator but spent all his leaves on archaeology fieldwork and was finally transferred to the Antiquities Service in 1947, and as noted above Veronica Seton-Williams managed to find enough fieldwork to support herself until she was offered a teaching post. So, there were some possibilities of a career in archaeology as long as the would-be archaeologist was prepared to take any position offered.

University Posts

Those who worked in universities were better placed to conduct active research, but the numbers employed in universities before the Second World war were very low. Childe had the Abercromby chair from its inauguration in 1926 until 1946 and Minns was the Disney professor until he retired in 1938 and was replaced by Dorothy Garrod. There were other posts in Classical archaeology and Egyptology but Edinburgh and Cambridge remained the two professorial posts for prehistorians throughout the 20s and 30s. As regards research Childe was in the best position, the terms of the Abercromby chair were for a part-time professorship which left the summer free for personal interests. It is regularly written that Childe had only the one honours graduate in twenty years (see for example Clark 1989: 13), and one research student – Margaret Stewart – it should be mentioned that Childe had no additional staff and he did develop a BSc in archaeology (Piggott 1989: 30). He may have had only one honours graduate but this does not mean he only lectured to one student. Childe used his time in Scotland to dig Skara Brae, Rounsay, Kindrochat and other sites which transformed the understandings of Scottish prehistory. These were also the years in which Childe wrote some of his most influential books *The Dawn of European Prehistory* (2nd edition 1927), *The Most Ancient East* (1928), *The Danube in Prehistory* (1929) *The Bronze Age* (1930), *New Light on the Most Ancient East* (1934); *The Prehistory of Scotland* (1935b); *Scotland Before the Scots* (1946), as well as the popular archaeology books *Man Makes Himself* (1936) and *What Happened in History?* (1942).
At Cambridge Professor Minns and then Professor Garrod were considerably less prolific. They had more administration, more courses to organise, more students and lecturers to motivate, and Dorothy Garrod also had the added distraction of holding the chair during the Second World War when she herself was on National Service. Pamela Smith (2000) has discussed how uncomfortable Dorothy Garrod found her role as Disney Professor. Her appointment was a cause for excitement and joy amongst the women scholars since she was only the second woman professor at Cambridge (Brittain 1960: 182 and Smith 2000: 134). But for Professor Garrod the formality and frustration of dealing with the General Board caused so much misery that she retired ‘as soon as her sense of duty allowed’ (Smith 2000: 136). And, it is noticeable that her publication record before and after her appointment was much higher than when she was Disney Professor, even allowing for the hiatus of the Second World War (Davies & Charles 1999: 277-82). It can’t have helped Professor Garrod that until 1948 women were not allowed to be full members of the university, so although she held one of the most senior positions in the Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology and was Head of the Department of Archaeology, her gender made her a non-person in Cambridge university terms.

Professorships aside there were a few other academic posts in archaeology, Toty de Navarro and Miles Burkitt were lecturers at Cambridge, and in 1935 Grahame Clark became an assistant lecturer there too (Clark 1989: 56-8). Aside from lecturing Clark used the time to investigate fenland sites with the assistance of the Fenland Research Committee (Smith 1997). By 1938 Glyn Daniel and Charles McBurney were elected fellows at Cambridge which gave Daniel the opportunity to supervise students and to test his lecturing skills as well as giving him the freedom for fieldwork and research (Daniel 1986: 94-7). As junior members of staff with all the resources of a wealthy university behind them, and few of the responsibilities, these would appear to have been the best possible posts for would-be archaeologists. Wheeler had to combine lecturing with museum work, as he had done at Cardiff, and as Cyril Fox and Nash Williams did when they took over the position of Keeper of Archaeology at the National Museum. Aileen Fox held the lecturing post during the Second World War, combining teaching with pregnancy and raising a family. By comparison Clark’s complaints about the frustrations of Cambridge academia seem insignificant, and Glyn Daniel’s joy seems more appropriate (Clark 1989: 58; 61; passim; Daniel 1986: 94; 197; passim).
6.4.4 Bachelor Life

Despite complaints by many archaeologists about the low rates of pay and the need for a private income (Kenyon 1952: 56; Clark 1989: 139) there are very few figures for how much archaeologists were paid in the 20s and 30s. Stuart Piggott cheerfully recalled that his wages were 10s a week when he worked as an assistant to W.A. Swallcombe at the Reading Museum. This was in 1927 when Stuart Piggott was seventeen and with the help of parents and family friends he was able to take the post (Piggott in conversation, 1994) In 1928 he joined the Royal Commission on Ancient Monuments, his job title was ‘typist’ though in reality he was an assistant to W.J. Hemp. Unfortunately Piggott had no memory of how much he was paid while he worked there or when he became Keiller’s private archaeologist, although he did recall it was for the same wages (ibid). In Beginning in Archaeology Kathleen Kenyon included a list of Civil Service posts and salaries (Appendix C) but these figures were for 1951 rather than the 20s. Crawford’s initial salary at the Ordnance Survey was £250 a year (Crawford 1955: 157) and by the time he retired in 1946 after 26 years of service he must have been close to the £1,050 quoted by Kathleen Kenyon, although Crawford complained ‘It was open to me to go on until I was 65, but the additional five years would not increase my meagre pension’ (Crawford 1955: 277). When the question of an assistant was raised Crawford gave no details of the wage offered simply stating that he had ridiculed the idea because it was unreasonable to expect university graduate to take a post on less salary ‘than that of the lowest paid labourer’ employed by the O.S. (Crawford 1955: 230). The next time the possibility of an assistant was raised the wages, according to Crawford, were still too low and ‘no-one applied’ (ibid.) yet other O.S. departments were increasing their staff ‘by many hundreds of persons yearly’ (ibid). C.W. Phillips, who followed Crawford at the O.S. suggested a somewhat different scenario in that the ‘drastic post-1922 economies restricted the activity of the Department’ (Phillips 1989: 39). Whatever the reality of the situation Crawford remained the sole archaeologist until Grimes was appointed as an assistant in 1938 (Crawford 1955: 230) presumably on a proportion of the salary given by Kenyon.

Wheeler began his archaeological career with the Franks Scholarship which, with the generosity of Arthur Evans, paid £100 a year. The only other salary noted by Wheeler was that at the end of the First World War his army pay was in excess of £800 a year (Wheeler 1955: 63). As Director of the National Museum of Wales he must have been
on a considerable salary, Curle was paid £650 rising to £750 a year for his directorships of two museums during the First World War (Curle Diary 13th April 1916). Whatever Wheeler’s income in Wales, the move to the London Museum brought about a ‘tremendous fall in living standards’ (Hawkes 1982: 107). The Wheelers’ gave up their spacious house in Cardiff for a semi-basement flat in Victoria. Wheeler’s starting salary at the London Museum was £600, with London living and school fees for Michael there was little money for frivolity (ibid). J Desmond Clark applied for museum posts when he finished his degree in 1937, but complained that the average stipend was £125 a year, and in order to take such a post he would have needed a private income (Clark 1989: 139). At the end of 1937 he was offered a position in Northern Rhodesia, this carried a salary of £400 a year, a furnished house and home leave every three years (Clark 1989: 139-40).

University wages varied considerably, particularly at University College which followed the old-fashioned system of students fees going directly to their teachers. Petrie’s salary for the part time Edwards’ Chair as Professor of Egyptology was £140 from Amelia Edwards’ bequest, and the income from his students, out of this he would then pay for any extra teachers he needed for his courses (Janssen 1992: 7). Until the 1920s the students paid £2 12s 6d for a full session of lectures or a guinea a term (Janssen 1992: 6). From this Petrie paid F. Ll. Griffith only £20 a year for his teaching of Egyptian hieroglyphs. When Margaret Murray took over the teaching on the diploma course she was paid £200 a year, which she made up to £300 by additional external lecturing (Janssen 1992: 22). It was not until 1922, when she was fifty-eight or fifty-nine, that her salary was raised to £300 and she gave up her extra mural teaching (ibid). Even then her students had to club together to raise the money to pay for her gown when she was an awarded an honorary doctorate in 1931 (Janssen 1992: 10; Drower 1985: 394). In 1935 Kathleen Kenyon was appointed as Secretary to the Institute of Archaeology for which she was paid £200 a year, in addition, and without pay, she took on the teaching of Palestinian archaeology and curating the Petrie Collection (Moorey 1992: 97).

As a comparison of wages, the accounts from excavations show that labourers were paid one or two pounds a week, Veronica Seton-Williams was paid £3 a week as site assistant at Maiden Castle, whereas Aileen Fox remembered being paid £7 a week as a
supervisor at Richborough. Meanwhile, until 1947 the top pay for London teachers was £250 a year, a Primary School Head was paid between £200 and £400 depending on location and Assistant Temporary Lecturers in provincial universities were paid £300 a year in 1957 (Mary Roberts, pers. comm.). These figures refer to men’s wages, women were paid less.

6.4.5 Amateurs and Professionals

In the introduction to this thesis I stated that one of the areas I wanted to examine was whether there was a difference between amateur and professional archaeologists. I still don’t know the answer. There were many archaeologists working in the 20s and 30s who were part-time or unpaid, the majority of writers for the county archaeology journals, and the national ones, were strictly speaking amateurs. If, as Myres suggested there were only twenty five or thirty paid archaeologists (Myres 1975: 5) then the overwhelming majority of archaeologists in Britain were amateurs. One would therefore expect there to be little opposition to those who were interested but not working in archaeology on a full-time basis. But the situation is unclear.

On the one hand there seems to have been no perceptible differentiation between those who were employed as archaeologists, and those who volunteered their services. On the other Elsie Clifford was blackballed by the Society of Antiquaries and I was variously told that this was because of personal enmity by Joan Evans (Fell in conversation, 1994) or because Charles Phillips was trying to make the Antiquaries ‘more professional’ (Reece in conversation, 1994). Grimes had told Richard Reece he had been approached by Charles Phillips about blackballing Mrs Clifford on the grounds of her amateur status. The first time he was approached Grimes had agreed, the second time Mrs Clifford applied he refused. But, as Richard Reece pointed out, Charles Phillips was also a very good friend of the O’Neils and Helen O’Neil and Elsie Clifford were competitors over who had control of Gloucestershire archaeology, so it is possible it was personal enmity rather than a genuine criticism of her work which provoked Phillips’ actions. Clare Fell did say that the Antiquaries blocked those they considered to be insufficiently serious about archaeology (Fell in conversation, 1994; Piggott in conversation, 1994). But other ‘amateurs’ such as Curwen were freely admitted to the Society of Antiquaries, and there is no evidence that Mrs Clifford was considered to be
less serious in her work than Curwen. Reece said of Mrs Clifford’s excavations and site recording that they were as good as most ‘professionals’ (Reece in conversation, 1994).

Nor am I certain that it was Basil Brown’s amateurism that led him to be replaced by Charles Phillips at Sutton Hoo, rather Brown himself seems to have realised the site was beyond his capabilities (Webster 1991: 227). After Phillips had taken over the work Brown remained on the excavation team (Phillips 1989: 39), which suggests Brown had no difficulty with the new situation. Both in her paper for the *Future of Archaeology Conference* and in *Beginning in Archaeology* Kathleen Kenyon remarked that archaeology would always need part-time archaeologists, ‘amateurs’ gave valuable volunteer labour and archaeology would:

... always be largely dependent on them. It is most unlikely, and most undesirable, that there will ever be enough full time archaeologists to do all the work. (Kenyon 1952: 55 and see Kenyon 1944: 39).

Given the number of part-time, occasional, and unpaid archaeologists working in the 20s and 30s it would seem that there was no strict division between what we would term ‘amateurs’ and ‘professionals’. Yet, at the same time the archaeologists I spoke to used the word ‘amateur’ as an insult for those they personally disliked, as perhaps was the case with Phillips and Mrs Clifford. It would seem therefore that amateurism itself was not an issue work was judged on its own merits rather than the status of the practitioner, and it was only when personal enmity was involved that amateurism became an insult (and see section 7.3.3).

### 6.5 Conclusion

There was no recognised career path to becoming an archaeologist. Would-be archaeologists came from a variety of disciplines, although the majority were arts graduates. They also came from comfortable if not wealthy backgrounds. Training was largely a matter of attaching one-self to an established archaeologist and learning the methods from that mentor. This informal approach began to change at the end of the 1930s as Wheeler’s ideas about an Institute of Archaeology became a reality, and his training excavations grew from the induction of a handful of students on his small scale Welsh excavations, to the hundreds who attended each season at Maiden Castle.
Archaeology began to take on a recognisably modern form of fieldwork techniques. While there were still very few jobs available, archaeologists could aspire to employment in museums, the Civil Service and university departments. Archaeologists were increasingly specialising in particular periods, or monuments, or artefacts.

However, there were still aspects of inter-war archaeology unfamiliar to modern practitioners. As was noted with the fieldwork manuals, the same excavation techniques were held to be universal and transferable from site to site regardless of the period or structure being excavated. Navvies did the majority of the heavy work with the ‘staff’ providing the skilled labour. This hierarchy of tasks reflected the class based nature of British society, higher education and interesting work was confined to the middle and upper classes who could afford to send their children to school and university. While Piggott worked for Keiller his social status was seen as ambiguous to those in Wiltshire archaeology who believed that paid posts in field archaeology were the province of foremen and therefore the working classes. A few men did rise from the rank of foreman to accepted archaeologist. W.E.V. Young shifted from being a hired hand to being considered an archaeologist in his own right. For working class women there was not even this unlikely possibility since women were not employed as labourers or foremen in Britain. Participation in active archaeology was exclusively confined to middle and upper class women. And, although training and education were open to women whose families were prepared to allow their daughters access to these resources, employment possibilities were so rare that the majority of women archaeologists were dependent on their private incomes to fund their work. Married women had the chance to work alongside their husbands, however, this meant subsuming their own interests to those of their husband. Unmarried women were just as likely to specialise as their male contemporaries, married women tended to work in whatever capacity they could. Aileen Fox was most interested in Roman Britain but worked on Bronze Age Barrows with Cyril Fox, Peggy Guido concentrated on the later prehistory when she moved to Scotland giving Piggott the freedom to concentrate on the Neolithic. And, all women whether married or unmarried were expected to put their families before their careers.

Training and education excluded the working classes from involvement in archaeology other than as labourers, or as consumers of museum displays and news stories. Inter-war employment practices and the limited number of posts excluded women from full
participation. Women may have been accepted as fellow archaeologists but that acceptance rarely translated into paid employment. This class and gender bias which echoed wider British society was in turn reflected in the archaeology that was written, and goes some way to explaining why this style of archaeology went unchallenged by those it overlooked.
Notes.

1 Glyn Daniel had originally intended to study Geography at Cambridge and had completed his Part I in this before transferring for a year to 'Section A' of the Archaeology and Anthropology Tripos. His original plan was to return to Geography for his third and final year (Daniel 1986: 59 and 81).

2 Stuart Piggott's father was an assistant schoolmaster in Petersfield which would make him of the respectable lower middle classes, educated but with little money, as he stressed he always had to earn a living (Piggott in conversation, 1994). It is noticeable that he only stopped working for Keiller when he married Peggy Guido who had a private income (Guido in conversation, 1994). Wheeler and Petrie were an earlier generation and are more difficult to classify, Wheeler's father was a journalist which cannot have paid well but Wheeler was obviously prepared to take a chance and risk the precariousness of archaeology (Wheeler 1955: 34). Petrie came from a family which while not wealthy saw employment as a matter of choice. His mother had a small private income which the family seem to have lived off (Drower 1985: 14-15), and Petrie had two trust funds bringing in £110 a year when he came of age (Drower 1985: 21).

3 Although Veronica Seton-Williams did note that in the season when she was supervising the excavation of the rampart area it was the students who dug out the ditches 'for, as the Director pointed out, we were only volunteers and if the sides slipped in and we were injured it would cost less than the workmen' (Seton-Williams 1988: 55).

4 The only instance I have come across where someone's qualification to excavate was questioned was with Keiller's excavations of Windmill Hill (Murray 1999: 39).

5 Obviously if the labourers are added to the equation then the number of men rises correspondingly and excavations can be seen as male dominated, but this says more about the gendered nature of labouring and British society as a whole, than it does about archaeology.

6 Chippendale, in the Introduction to Postmasters didn't even put it that highly 'When a professional institute for archaeologists was contemplated in Britain about 1980, the number of people employed in the subject was estimated at under a thousand – but that was towards a hundredfold increase on the number in 1930.' (Chippendale 1989: 8).

7 It should also be noted that although Oxford admitted women to degrees in 1919 they only allowed the women's colleges 'society' status rather than them being full colleges and it was not until 1959 that this statute was changed (Brittain 1960: 258). Also, statutes were passed in 1927 to officially limit the number of women students to one sixth of the total Oxford student population, and to prevent any new women's colleges being built (Brittain 1960: 171-2).

8 Male students, although generally from the middle classes, showed more diversity of background especially with the assisted degrees for servicemen. Stuart Piggott maintained it was his inability to pass mathematics and science which prevented him going to university (Piggott 1989: 21), but it is likely that money was also an issue, when Aileen Fox attended Newnham in 1926 the fees were £52 a term (Fox2000: 39). This did not cover examination fees, books, clothes, spending money etc, and although University College London was cheaper, it was still a costly business sending a child to university.

9 This lack of independence may well have placed a strain on some archaeological partnerships. Obviously I did not discuss their divorces with the archaeologists concerned but they did come up in conversation with other archaeologists. Peggy Guido and Jaquetta Hawkes' marriages collapsed, not necessarily because of archaeology, but it was suggested that this had been part of the reason, especially for Jaquetta Hawkes' split from Christopher Hawkes.

x The plaque at the Verulamium Museum is part of this confusion. If someone who knew nothing about the Wheelers relied entirely on this plaque for their information they would believe that Tessa Wheeler was the driving force in the Verulamium excavations. However, at the same time there is a film shown in the gallery which has Mortimer Wheeler explaining the excavations and it is obvious from the film that he was in charge. If one talks to the staff at the Verulamium Museum this confusion is explained, there they...
believe that everything good about the excavations was the result of Tessa’s involvement and that Mortimer Wheeler had minimum input.

xi The 25 years difference in age between Aileen and Cyril Fox, she felt, enabled her to have such a full career since her career began when Cyril Fox retired. However, although she played it down in her autobiography she did say that Cyril Fox’s last years were very difficult and this again limited what she was able to do in archaeology.

xii This was rare in Britain: Piggott and WEV Young are the only instances I have come across, but in Egypt for example hiring an archaeologist such as Howard Carter to excavate their concessions was common practice amongst wealthy amateurs.

xiii Kathleen Kenyon wrote :Appointments to the National Museums are made by the Civil Service Commissioners in the same way as to other archaeological posts in the Civil Service... Other museums are run by local authorities, universities and archaeological societies. (Kenyon 1952: 190 and see Appendix C).

xiv Although one of the ways Christopher Hawkes recuperated was by going and digging on excavations (Hawkes 1989: 51).

xv Peter Shinnie was born in 1915 and worked at Maiden Castle with Wheeler, although his archaeological career didn’t really begin until this post, he finished his MA in Egyptology just in time to join the RAF for the duration of the 2nd World War, and so arguably counts as an inter-war archaeologist.

xvi Admittedly Piggott referred to this as an ‘unworkable’ BSc.

xvii Although in Pastmasters Piggott said it was for more money (Piggott 1989: 25).

xviii I am suspicious of this figure because it seems so high, this would be an annual salary of £364, yet in 1951 an Assistant with the Ancient Monuments Inspectorate received £350 per annum (Kenyon 1952: 184).
Identity, Interaction and the Public

7.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter I discussed training and employment. There were so few posts available to archaeologists that there was a much higher number of trained archaeologists than there were employment possibilities. An archaeologist’s identity therefore cannot have rested on being employed in archaeology. It was the practice of archaeology and the judgement of one’s peers which conferred identity. How then did archaeologists interact with their peers, what formal and social opportunities were there for interaction? And, once conferred, could this identity be removed? Was it fixed or fluid? Did archaeologists differentiate themselves from the rest of society? Were an archaeologist’s skills seen as relevant to that society in capacities other than archaeology? This question is particularly pertinent to the inter-war generation of archaeologists. The two world wars affected British society at all levels, how did they affect archaeology and archaeologists? How far were archaeologists concerned with the problems that concerned other Britons in the 20s and 30s? Was the rise of political extremism important to British archaeologists? How did they react to the increasingly nationalistic discourse emanating from Germany and Italy? Then there is the converse question of how this wider society saw archaeology. Was there any understanding of what archaeologists did or were trying to do? Was there any interest in archaeology? How far did archaeologists see it as necessary that the public should be involved in their work? All these questions and hopefully their answers go some way to seeing what it meant to be an archaeologist in Britain between the wars.

7.2 Social Networks

7.2.1 Societies and Journals

The London and Scottish Societies of Antiquaries, Section H of the British Association of the Advancement of Science, the Royal Archaeological Institute and the county societies provided archaeologists and would-be archaeologists with opportunities to
meet and hear new research. The Society of Antiquaries of London in the 20s and 30s was not the most welcoming of associations. Piggott remarked that the senior members were uninterested in new research (Piggott 1989: 23-4). Although Aileen Fox referred to the ‘high powered and often critical discussion’ that took place at these meetings (Fox 2000:60), she also remarked that she was intimidated by the formality and rituals:

I was never wholly at my ease at the Antiquaries until I became a Fellow in 1944. It was then [1930s] still very much a man’s preserve and youth was also frowned upon. (Fox 2000: 58).

The masculinity of the society was preserved until the passing of the Sex Discrimination [Removal] Act when the society reluctantly allowed women to become Fellows, and from 1927 women were proposed and either elected or refused in exactly the same fashion as men (Roberts 1995). Stuart Piggott was initially blackballed, he assumed this was because he had been proposed by Keiller, but in 1937 he was safely elected (Piggott in conversation, 1994). As discussed above, Mrs Elsie Clifford was also initially turned down. As Clare Fell remarked:

They really blackballed anybody who wasn’t considered either totally involved in the archaeological world, or very eminent in their own area. It was a very snobbish society in many ways. (Fell in conversation, 1994).

The Society of Antiquaries of Scotland was less openly misogynistic (Roberts 1995), but going on Curle’s diary it was still a very masculine and staid society.

Young archaeologists preferred the Royal Archaeological Institute (RAI), membership of this society was much easier to achieve and members were allowed to use the Society of Antiquaries library, ‘the only useful part of the society’ (Piggott in conversation, 1994). The annual meetings of the RAI took place in various locations around Britain introducing archaeologists to the different sites and monuments (Seton-Williams 1988: 21). There was also the Royal Anthropological Institution and Section H (Anthropology) meetings which despite the names concentrated on creating national archaeological catalogues and mapping artefact distribution (Piggott 1989: 24). Again these were London based societies attracting members from all over the country. These societies also offered the possibility of publication in their journals which was another reason for joining. Membership didn’t ensure publication but it did guarantee a copy of the annual journal. In fact the non-society based journals such as the *Archaeological Journal* and *Antiquity* offered better chances of publication for young archaeologists still to make their names in the discipline. Looking through the contents pages of these two magazines I was struck by how many recently established and soon to be famous
archaeologists were submitting papers to these journals, and how their contributions looked so much more interesting and modern than those in the contemporary volumes of *Archaeologia, The Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland,* and *The Antiquaries Journal.* This was a deliberate choice by the editors of the *Archaeological Journal* and *Antiquity:*

At the end of 1925 I conceived the idea of starting a quarterly journal which would serve as an organ of the very live and active group of archaeologists then working in England. We needed such a journal and ... there was an intelligent public anxious to be enlightened. (Crawford 1955: 175).

For the price of a 'good dinner' this desire could be satisfied, potential subscribers were contacted and Antiquity was launched in 1927:

In starting *Antiquity* one of my chief ambitions was to make it possible for educated people to acquire some smattering of this knowledge [of archaeology], or at least to become aware of its existence. (Crawford 1955: 178).

It helped that Crawford was extremely good at recognising the interesting story. In his appreciation of Crawford, Wheeler related how they had spent an evening together in Oxford:

There Lord Cherwell, who had just come back from America, had told us for the first time of the new radiocarbon (C14) method of dating ancient organic substances – probably the first occasion upon which this tremendous discovery was mentioned in this country, at any rate to an archaeologist. I remember how Crawford’s eyes lighted up as the conversation proceeded, and how under his breath he whispered to me 'It’s a scoop!'. And so it was. It made the next editorial in Antiquity and opened up a new era. (Wheeler 1958: 4).

Crawford himself related how he came to ‘scoop’ an article about Ur. Crawford saw the ‘journalistic potential’ to Ur before the discovery of the Royal Tombs (Crawford 1955: 187), and through *Antiquity* launched an appeal for funds for Woolley’s work (Crawford 1955: 257-8):

The appeal was successful, nearly three hundred pounds were raised... It was during the next season’s work that the richest and most sensational finds were made. The discovery of hidden treasure has an irresistible appeal, and all the papers had long accounts of it. I got into touch with Woolley and extracted from him a short article summarizing the results; this was the first account to be published, apart from the newspaper reports. (Crawford 1955: 187).

This exclusive led to a rebuke from Sir Frederic Kenyon Director of the British Museum and President of the Society of Antiquaries, he felt as official sponsors of Woolley’s work they should have had first refusal on publication. Crawford was still unrepentant thirty years on:
When the discovery of the Royal Tombs was announced later, the editorial committee of the *Antiquaries Journal* could have asked for an article and published it in their April number. They missed their opportunity and then rebuked me for seizing it. (Crawford 1955: 188).

Crawford not only published the momentous news stories. Every archaeologist I spoke to emphasised how important *Antiquity* had been in bringing them news of archaeological ideas and discoveries, but they also stressed how helpful Crawford had been to them personally (Piggott in conversation, 1994). Crawford’s ‘ferrets’ who were sent free O.S. maps in exchange for up-to-date information about the antiquities of that area included some of the most important archaeologists of the time, Charles Phillips (1989: 37), Stuart Piggott (in conversation, 1994), and Christopher Hawkes (1989: 48) were all ‘ferrets’. Once *Antiquity* was launched it soon became the chosen forum for up and coming archaeologists (J. Hawkes 1951: 171-2 & C. Hawkes 1989: 49) and many archaeologists remarked they had their first papers published by Crawford (Daniel 1986: 216). Although *Antiquity* did not provide a physical meeting place for archaeologists it, and Crawford, connected up archaeologists around the country.

The county societies were often the first point of contact for would-be archaeologists, although many became exasperated by their parochial insularity (Guido in conversation, 1994). The exception was the Prehistoric Society of East Anglia. Piggott’s dramatic account of ‘the coup’ (Piggott 1989: 26 & Phillips 1987: 48) has been shown to be largely a myth (Smith 1999). The reality is perhaps more interesting if less exciting. Rather than Stuart Piggott’s tale of ‘Young Turks’ in fast cars overthrowing the establishment and forcing a provincial society to become a national one, other sources:...

... suggest that there was no need for a take-over. They reveal that for years the membership of the PSEA had discussed the possibility of changing its name. Years before 1935 the Society had already been recognised as a national organisation, critically important to the development of prehistoric studies for Britain. (Smith 1999: 466).

As Smith suggested the significance of the non-existent revolution was that the older members of the society’s Council retired and the younger, more active archaeologists took over. Under Clark’s editorship the *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* became an exciting journal which:

... published several landmark papers that set the frame of study for the next generation and became some of the most cited articles in modern British archaeology. (Smith 1999: 467).
Stuart Piggott on the ‘Wessex Culture’, Bersu’s paper on Little Woodbury, Dorothy Garrod discussing the Upper Palaeolithic and Crawford on air photography were just some of these articles. Like *Antiquity*, the *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* provided a forum for young archaeologists to publish their ideas, and as Smith noted while other societies lost members in the economic depression of the 30s, the Prehistoric Society’s membership doubled between 1934 and 1938:

Piggott’s coup is metonymical for a more radical change ... Although there was no abrupt take-over dramatic intellectual and institutional developments were emerging. This is why Piggott’s light-hearted vision lives so vividly. It reveals the joie de vivre and excitement of young men and women in positions of power who published innovative thoughts on new subjects. (Smith 1999: 469).

7.2.2 Mythology
Myths and anecdotes are how we form a sense of history, of tradition. The tales we tell about ourselves reinforce the idea of a separate identity, we are archaeologists and these are our stories. I was told the tale of the East Anglian ‘coup’ (Piggott in conversation, 1994; Guido in conversation, 1994) by archaeologists who must have known that Smith and Clark’s version of events was much closer to reality. Yet it was Stuart Piggott’s version that Charles Phillips referred to in his autobiography (Phillips 1987: 48). Piggott and Phillips’ account is a better story than Smith’s. As she noted, these archaeologists were young and confident and Stuart Piggott’s version *could* have happened. In a sense it *did* happen. Professor Piggott and others told this story and it became the accepted version of events, part of our archaeological history. It was popular because it resonated; young men, fast cars, revolutionaries seeing off the old guard, it was an exciting and plausible tale. Who knows how many more cherished stories are in fact myths? Did Piggott really answer when asked by a local man at Sutton Hoo if he had found any gold:

‘Yes, weighed down with it’, I answered, covertly grasping in my pocket the box containing the great belt-buckle, over 400 grammes (16 ounces) of solid metal. ‘Ha! Ha! Jolly good. have a drink?’ I accepted, knowing the truth would not be believed. (Piggott 1989: 27).

It doesn’t matter if this tale is true or not, it evokes the amazing discoveries made at Sutton Hoo, the unexpectedness of the wealth and the hasty excavation of the treasures.

Myths give us a history. Pitt Rivers was claimed as a ‘professional’ archaeologist, not only by Wheeler but by Clark (1989: 3), Piggott (in conversation, 1994) and Kenyon
Again Pitt Rivers' legendary status has been questioned (section 6.1) and again the reality is irrelevant. He was used to mark the beginning of 'proper' archaeological fieldwork and he was claimed as an ancestor to modern archaeology, Wheeler and the like were presenting themselves as Pitt Rivers' worthy successors. He was invoked for the authority and sense of identity he conferred on the discipline.

7.2.3 Conferences
To return to social networks, other formalised meeting places were the committees and conferences that took place in the 20s and 30s. While working for the British Museum Christopher Hawkes regularly travelled to Europe for meetings with other museum keepers (Hawkes 1989: 50-1), and Crawford related how his involvement with the Roman Empire Map Committee took him abroad and led to introductions to a variety of archaeologists and interested individuals (Crawford 1955: 201). The Map Committee decided to begin their work with Rome, as the centre of the Roman Empire. Unsurprisingly their work came to the attention of Mussolini, who in 1932 invited the Committee to a reception (Crawford 1955: 203). Despite Mussolini's encouragement and further European meetings, the attempt at mapping the Roman Empire failed, international politics and the Second World War intervened and prevented its completion (Crawford 1955: 206). The meetings did however, enable Crawford to visit European sites such as Pompeii and Herculaneum (Crawford 1955: 203) and to meet European archaeologists including Bersu:

This meeting was the beginning of a friendship ... which was for me the best result of the whole scheme. (Crawford 1955: 202 and see section 6.4.3).

Another international forum, this time open to all archaeologists was the International Congress of Prehistoric and Proto-historic Sciences. Inaugurated in 1931 from a schism within the International Congress of Anthropologists and Prehistoric Archaeologists, this new body aimed to promote international prehistory (De Laet 1989: 131). The first Congress was held at King's College London in August of 1932 with Sir Charles Peers as President. Reginald Smith, Sir Arthur Evans, Sir Flinders Petrie, and Sir George Macdonald were amongst the Vice-Presidents, Gordon Childe, Christopher Hawkes, H.S. Kingsford and C.A. Ralegh Radford were secretaries (Hawkes 1989: 50 & Webster 1991: 186). The Congress was attended by several hundred archaeologists and papers were read by a variety of luminaries including Evans, Cyril Fox, and Bersu. Even more
sociable than the Congress itself were the organised excursions to Oxford, Cambridge, Wiltshire and Ireland. Christopher Hawkes showed visitors around St Catherine’s Hill (Webster 1991: 191) and figure 7.1, a photo taken by Hawkes showing Childe, Keiller, and Maria Bersu at Avebury, demonstrates the international camaraderie of the Congress. The 1936 Congress held in Oslo, with excursions to Stockholm and Bergen, was equally well attended (Caton Thompson 1983: 169-70 & Webster 1991: 214). But, for Hawkes the meeting was marred by Bersu’s enforced resignation from the Council:

... and the eventual acceptance after an anxious and rather mismanaged discussion, of the worthless and wicked Nazi proposed by the German government in his stead. (Hawkes 1936 in Webster 1991: 214).

Bersu had already been removed from his post as director of the Romisch-Germanisch Kommission of the German Archaeological Institute, and eventually left Germany for Britain (Evans 1989). The next Congress was planned to take place in 1940 in Budapest but was postponed until 1950 and re-located to Switzerland (fig. 7.2) (De Laet 1989: 132).

Other conferences and meetings may not have had the same international flavour or importance, but they still attracted many influential archaeologists. The Pan-African Congress of Prehistory, founded in 1937 by Louis Leakey (Clark 1989: 102-3), the British Association for the Advancement of Science Congresses (Caton Thompson 1983: 130-6) and the Conferences held at the Institute during the Second World War (Peers 1944a & 1944b) were all well-attended (see figs. 7.3 & 7.4). Aileen Fox remarked of the 1943 *Future of Archaeology Conference*:

Over 280 people attended; Cyril and I both went, I to represent University College, Cardiff, he, a speaker, the National Museum of Wales. It was the first occasion for four years that so many archaeologists had been able to get together and the atmosphere was exhilarating. I left inspired by a sense of missionary zeal and a feeling that there were good times ahead ... After the conference there was a new mood and sense of purpose; everyone realised there was a need for a central body representative of all branches of British Archaeology which could speak with authority when the time came for planning the rebuilding of the bombed cities, and which could ensure that the need for excavations was not overlooked. (Fox 2000: 100-101).

This central body, The Council for British Archaeology was created and the first meeting held in March 1944 (Fox 2000: 101). At a local, national and inter-national level there were a variety of new and established organisations where archaeologists and would-be archaeologists could meet, exchange ideas, and develop their understandings of the past.
There were also more informal gatherings. In 1917 A.O. Curle was presented by Sir George Macdonald with a silver salver to mark fifteen years service as Secretary of the Society of Antiquaries Club:

[In] the winter of 1900 the idea occurred to my brother Jim that it would be a pleasant thing to have a small social dining club connected with the Society of Antiquaries. Accordingly he invited a number of the Fellows who took the most interest in the Society's affairs to a dinner at the University Club before one of the Society's evening meetings, in order to discuss his proposal. The idea met with unanimous approval: we had an excellent dinner ... this dinner was followed in turn by one or two others at the houses of other fellows, while the idea was being worked out. At last I was asked to be Secretary, and a small committee was appointed to approach 40 members of the Society to induce them to join, and to draw up rules. (Curle 15th January 1917).

They met on the nights of evening meetings with a special banquet on St Andrew's Night (*ibid*).

Excavations were a particular means for archaeologists, and not just students, to get together. All of the autobiographies, biographies and memoirs refer to archaeologists visiting each other's excavations (Webster 1991: 179). Cyril Fox, Sir Charles Peers, Bryan O'Neil, Reginald Smith, Ralegh Radford, Thurlow Leeds and other 'personalities of the archaeological establishment' visited the Richborough excavations (Fox 2000: 55). Piggott visited Keiller at Windmill Hill, and, as noted above, was impressed by his technical expertise (Piggott 1989: 23). Harold St George Gray visited Piggott's excavations at Thickthorn Down (fig. 7.5) and Crawford seems to have spent all his free time visiting various digs (Piggott 1989: 23). The photographs from Sutton Hoo show that the dig was visited by a host of eminent archaeologists many of whom helped out in the trenches (fig. 7.6). This sociability was not confined to British excavations, Veronica Seton-Williams visited Garstang's excavations at Jericho (Seton-Williams 1988: 41), and went over to Cyprus to visit Joan du Plat Taylor (Seton-Williams 1988: 64). Seton Lloyd talked of the interaction between excavations in Egypt and the Near East (Lloyd 1986), and Mary Chubb's envious description of the American dig house at Luxor suggested a familiarity with this accommodation (Chubb 2001: 122-24). Just as fellow archaeologists had turned up to help out at Sutton Hoo, so the discovery of Tutankhamun's tomb led to a super-group of Egyptologists and artefact specialists volunteering to work with Carter and Callender from 1922 onwards (Frayling 1992: 100-42).
Archaeologists met when they were studying, they worked together on excavations, they volunteered on each other’s excavations, and they visited each other’s sites. Through local and national society meetings, conferences, and congresses, archaeologists met and interacted. Contacts were made, information was shared and friendships were made, at the same time an archaeological identity was being reinforced. At meetings and on site it was obvious that these people were archaeologists, they talked archaeology, they performed archaeology, and in these ways their archaeological identity was re-worked and re-emphasized. They were a select few who knew each other and identified each other as archaeologists and in turn were so identified. Aileen Fox remarked how, after the 1943 *Future of Archaeology Conference* ‘I felt secure and accepted by the professionals, and no longer considered as Cyril’s shadow’ (Fox 2000: 101).

### 7.3 Friends and Enemies

Archaeologists of the 20s and 30s seem to have socialised extensively with each other. Stuart Piggott recalled how small a world it had been, how the same people had cropped up time and again at meetings and on digs. This had been an essential part of the fun of archaeology in the 20s and 30s, everyone knew everyone else ‘we were all friends or enemies’ (Piggott in conversation, 1994).

#### 7.3.1 Friendship

The university courses offered students the ideal opportunity to get to know each other. Having arrived in Britain only knowing Nancy de Crespigny, Veronica Seton-Williams was relieved by the intimacy of British archaeology. Only eleven other people studied with her on Wheeler’s diploma course so friendships were easily made. That winter she, Peggy Guido, and Peggy’s sister Pamela went to Germany to visit the museums (Seton-Williams 1988: 25). Clare Fell recalled how she and Elsie Clifford were the only archaeologists studying for Section A of the Archaeology and Anthropology Tripos, all the other students were trainee colonial administrators. Despite the difference in their ages they soon became friends, and Clare Fell was one of the many archaeologists who assisted Mrs Clifford with her excavations (Fell in conversation, 1994). Other
friendships were formed on excavations, Grahame Clark and C.W. Phillips met on Curwen's excavations at The Trundle and, insofar as either of these two difficult men could be said to have friends, they became friends, or at least allies (Phillips 1989: 36-8 & Clark 1989: 56). It was also at The Trundle that Stuart Piggott got to know Clark and Phillips, and through this association Stuart Piggott was asked to join the Fenland Research Committee (Piggott 1989: 23). This Cambridge connection led to Glyn Daniel and Stuart Piggott meeting and becoming life-long friends (Daniel 1986: 135 & Piggott 1989: 28). Piggott was staying with Glyn Daniel at Cambridge when Peggy Guido sent him a telegram confirming his appointment to the Abercromby Chair (Piggott in conversation, 1994).

Mrs Chitty met Kathleen Kenyon when they were both excavating for the Wheelers at St Albans, they ended up sharing a room together:

I was very naughty, I used to tease Kathleen a lot. She was ever so prim and proper, she liked to go to bed early and get up early, and liked everything to be proper and was like a head girl ought to be. I wasn't like that, I didn't mind if I went to bed late. I used to lie in bed and read ... and I discovered, which was very naughty of me, that I could embarrass Kathleen, she was perfectly defenceless ... I used to ask her very indiscreet questions. Poor Kathleen had not the slightest idea how to fend them off, and for some reason that cemented our friendship. (Chitty in conversation, 1994).

Mrs Chitty also met Peggy Guido at Verulamium and they too became life-long friends. Peggy Guido likewise met Margaret Drower on the excavations and they decided to share a flat together while they did their different diplomas (Drower in conversation, 1994). It was on the Verulamium excavations that Peggy Guido met Tessa Wheeler for the first time and they became friends. In spite of her position of authority Tessa Wheeler seems to have befriended all the students she trained, looking after them when they were in emotional or financial difficulties (Seton-Williams 1998: 30).

Aside from individual friendships there were archaeologists whom everyone seems to have liked. These were not always the best known or those who were seen as the most technically or intellectually advanced, although Ian Richmond and Gordon Childe were amongst them. These were the archaeologists other archaeologists enjoyed being around. Tessa Wheeler, Cyril Fox and O.G.S. Crawford were the names which came up regularly in conversations with archaeologists or in autobiographies and biographies. Mrs Elsie Clifford was another such figure. Notwithstanding her feuds with Joan Evans and Helen Donovan (later Mrs O'Neil) over who should control Gloucester archaeology, Mrs Clifford inspired a great deal of affection.
Dear old Elsie ... everyone had an affection for her you see this was the different thing about her, she was a very unusual and quaint person in her way, but very delightful and very serious about it all, and I think everybody was prepared to help ... in the early days Glyn [Daniel], Eleanor [Hardy], and I and various others of the younger element of Cambridge used to go and scratch away at her barrows for her ... I think she just had this ability to put everyone to contribute, knowing she probably couldn't manage to do it all by herself. You see, now they shelve off bits of reports into specialisms, but in the days of the 1930s you had to write up everything yourself, whether you knew about it or not, you had to get down to it and do it. (Fell in conversation, 1994).

Some of the most famous names in archaeology helped out on Mrs Clifford's excavations or visited her digs, Mortimer Wheeler, Sir Arthur Keith, Crawford, Gertrude Caton Thompson, Stuart Piggott, Glyn Daniel and Molly Cotton were all friends (Piggott in conversation, 1994; Caton Thompson 1983: 169 & 296-7; Daniel 1986: 340-1). Richard Reece, who began helping Mrs Clifford while he was still at school, was dazzled by these famous archaeologists (Reece 1984: 22). Every year Mrs Clifford sent Mortimer Wheeler a bottle of sloe gin, and when it failed to arrive one year Richard Reece was sent from London to Gloucester to fetch Wheeler another (Reece pers comm.). Childe would visit her excavations and take Mrs Clifford out for lunch, something of a mixed pleasure as she remarked to Richard Reece ‘I do wish he’d let me drive, he really is dangerous’ (Reece 1984: 23).

Tales of Childe’s driving were usually the staring point for affectionate reminiscences about his vagueness, kindness, and generosity (Daniel 1986: 216 & 414). Stuart Piggott had a particularly fine tale:

[Childe] was frightfully kind. He was very kind to me when I was writing a Neolithic pot paper, he said “You must come and see the Scottish material, I’ll drive you up. Come on, be my guest.” ... So I thanked him very much and duly arranged to meet him. He used to drive large, but not very expensive, fast cars ... after we drove a short distance ... he said blandly to me “Oh, by the way Stuart, I forgot to tell you I’m colour blind, can you tell me when the lights change?” ... So I had to say, you know “Red, red, red, amber, GREEN!” ... [it] was pretty hair raising. (Piggott in conversation, 1994).

Mrs Chitty similarly remarked ‘He was very charming, very nice, and extremely ugly, but he was very, very nice’ (Chitty in conversation, 1994). Max Mallowan called him ‘a good companion and the kindliest of men’ (Mallowan 1977: 284). As Glyn Daniel remarked many archaeologists could not believe Childe had committed suicide, and the
realisation of his sadness and loneliness was a shock to those who had so enjoyed his company (Chitty in conversation, 1994; Mallowan 1977: 234-5; Daniel 1986: 416-421).

Crawford was equally well loved, Mrs Chitty remarked that he was a ‘difficult man to know’ and ‘a very shy man’ who was enormously fond of cats and ‘didn’t turn a hair’ when one of Mrs Chitty’s cats planted a dirty paw right in the middle of his dinner shirt (Chitty in conversation, 1994). Daniel, Hawkes and even Phillips paid tribute to Crawford’s kindness and enthusiasm (Daniel 1986: 216; Hawkes 1989: 37; Phillips 1989: 48), while he seems to have become a careers adviser to Piggott as well as a friend of the family (Piggott 1989: 21-5).

Friendships begun on excavations continued for years afterwards. Kathleen Kenyon attended Mrs Chitty’s wedding, and despite Mrs Chitty moving slightly out of archaeological circles after her marriage she continued to keep in touch with Kathleen Kenyon and Peggy Guido. Veronica Seton-Williams met Joan du Plat Taylor when they both worked at Maiden Castle, later they shared a house together on Cyprus, worked together at the Ministry of Information, and lived near each other until Joan du Plat Taylor’s death in 1983 (Seton-Williams 1988: 142). There was little sexual dimorphism to these friendships. Gertrude Caton Thompson listed Dorothy Garrod, Winifred Lamb, Crawford, Childe, Breuil and Leakey as regular lunch companions (Caton Thompson 1983: 159-62). Aileen Fox recalled the ‘unsophisticated’ parties she had gone to at Christopher Hawkes’ flat where they played ‘Murder’ (Fox 2000: 61). It all sounds very innocent, however many of these friendships led to love affairs and marriage.

7.3.2 Marriages and sexual relationships

The marriages make this period distinct. The 20s and 30s were the time of husband and wife archaeological partnerships, initially there were the Petries and the Wheelers, to be followed by Cyril and Aileen Fox, Christopher and Jacquetta Hawkes, Peter and Lesley Murray Thriepland, Thalassa Cruso and Hugh Hencken, Peggy Guido and Stuart Piggott and many others. Given that archaeology was such a close knit community with so few members it is unsurprising that archaeologists should end up marrying each other. ‘We were so pleased to find someone else who was interested’ (Piggott in conversation, 1994). Many of these archaeologists were young, they were sociable and who else were they meeting?
The biographies and autobiographies of these archaeologists suggest they were a very chaste group. Aileen Fox remarked on her set's unsophistication and her portrayal of her relationship with Christopher Hawkes suggests it was spiritual rather than physical (Fox 2000: 65-6). Hawkes' relationship with Jacquetta Hopkins was equally virginal until their marriage (Webster 1991: 195). But, as Veronica Seton-Williams remarked:

People now talk about the permissive society but it was pretty permissive in the 1930s if you wanted it to be. (Seton-Williams 1988:23). And, it seems likely from Jacquetta Hawkes' biography of Wheeler that Tessa was already pregnant when they married (Hawkes 1982 52-3). Wheeler's later affairs may not have always involved sex but his reputation was such that everyone assumed that they did:

I was brought up in Cambridge by Chadwick, de Navarro, Burkitt, Grahame Clark and C.W. Phillips to regard him as a shit and a bounder. They all sneered at and raged against the hideous monster who made his excavations prove his theories and went to bed with all the girls who, delightedly worked for him. We were all advised not to go and dig with him at Maiden Castle. (Daniel 1986: 407-8).

Peggy Guido remarked that she and Peggy Drower had become such firm friends because they were the only two women at Maiden Castle who hadn't slept with Wheeler (Guido in conversation, 1994). This was undoubtedly an exaggeration of Wheeler's sexual prowess, but it does suggest that personal relationships formed an important part of archaeological networking. Both Sara Champion and Jill Cook suggested to me that women and in particular those who worked with Wheeler were attracted to archaeology because they were attracted to individual archaeologists. Such an old-fashioned suggestion is offensive since it undermines women archaeologists by questioning their commitment to archaeology and easily disproved if one examines the post-Wheeler work of these women. However, the freedom offered by excavation must have been attractive to both men and women in the 20s and 30s. At Maiden Castle many of the students camped on site, sharing tents and meals, in a way that we would take for granted but which was still a novelty in such a rigidly divided society. There were sexual liaisons, Louis and Mary Leakey are an obvious example but as noted above reminiscences are generally discreet on this score. And as Weeks has suggested we cannot assume we know how sex was understood to those in the 20s and 30s:

... it is by no means clear what we mean when we raise the prospect of 'a history of sexuality'. The usual assumption is that sex is a definable and universal experience, like the desire for food, with the minority or unorthodox forms filtering off into distributaries, which may, or more usually may not, be navigated by the conscientious explorer... it is the
centrality given to this concept of sexuality that constitutes a problem for historians, for it ignores the great variety of cultural patterns that history reveals, and the very different meanings given to what we blithely label as ‘sexual activity’. (Weeks 1989: 1).

When we look at homosexual affairs this becomes even more of a problem. Male homosexuality was illegal in this country until 1967 and those performing homosexual acts were unlikely to broadcast their sexual preferences unless they could be certain of discretion. Lesbianism, despite the work of various MP’s, was not illegal but it was still a taboo subject. Virginia Woolf, Vita Sackville West and Radclyffe Hall may have been open about their relationships, but outside Bloomsbury many gays and lesbians believed that they were alone in their sexual preferences (Jivani 1997: 40). There is also the additional problem of how homosexuality is defined, and whether we understand as homosexual behaviour would be perceived in the same way as in the 20s and 30s (Weeks 1989: 10). When looking at the lives of some of the women archaeologists particularly Veronica Seton-Williams, Dorothy Garrod and Joan du Plat Taylor there seems the possibility that these women were lesbians. They were women who worked, socialised, and lived with other women, but we cannot be certain that constitutes homosexuality (Vicinus 1990; Cook 1979; Jeffreys 1995; Faderman 1981). All we can definitely say is that these women enjoyed deep relationships with each other which gave them emotional support and support in their work.

Linda Murray’s (1999: 82) examination of the Avebury archive suggested that Alexander Keiller was bisexual and had a sexual relationship with W.E.V. Young, his foreman. What is uncertain is how Stuart Piggott fitted into this situation. Shakespeare’s book about Bruce Chatwin suggested that Stuart Piggott was in love with Chatwin but whether this was reciprocated or that they had any more than a friendly student / tutor relationship is unclear (Shakespeare 2000: 213). Nor can we be more certain about Piggott and Keiller’s relationship. In the Avebury Museum there is a copy of a letter from Keiller to Piggott’s mother in which Keiller appeared to be trying to reassure Mrs Piggott that working with him would not damage her son’s reputation. However, it is unclear whether Mrs Piggott was concerned about Keiller’s sexuality, or just his ‘fast’ lifestyle.
But the possibility of homosexual affairs does add an extra layer to friendships and relationships between archaeologists. And, the latitude extended to Keiller by the archaeological world suggests a surprising tolerance of sexual diversity. This view is reinforced by the demise of Turville-Petre’s career. Francis Turville Petre was well-known as a Palaeolithic specialist and worked with Dorothy Garrod at Mount Carmel (fig. 7.7). He was also a friend of Christopher Isherwood’s and equally well known for his homosexuality. This aspect of his life seems not to have troubled Garrod, it was his absences from site probably due to his recurring syphilis and drinking, which led to her making it clear to the funding body that she could no longer work with him (Bar-Yousef & Callander 1997: 13-4). Jacquetta Hawkes, as well as being involved in CND, was a founder member of the Homosexual Law Reform Society and The Albany Trust which fought for the decriminalisation of homosexuality (David 1997: 188-93). Archaeology would seem to have been one of the few places in inter-war and post-war Britain where homophobia was not the norm.

7.3.3 Enemies

Enemies were just as important as friends, and feuds begun by archaeologists in the 20s and 30s seem to have continued until both participants were dead. Archaeology was as faction ridden as any other discipline and criticisms of work were as likely to be the result of personal animosity as much as a genuine disagreement over the evidence. It is no secret that Wheeler provoked strong emotions even after his death. Archaeologists were divided over whether they liked or loathed him, approved or disapproved of his showmanship (Daniel 1986: 407-8). Stuart Piggott remarked that initially he had hated him but then came to appreciate his ‘dreadful energy’ (Piggott in conversation, 1994). Even when he came to appreciate Wheeler Piggott was certain he didn’t want to work with him (Piggott 1989: 29). Glyn Daniel was more ambivalent, he referred to Wheeler as ‘one of my closest friends/foes one of my dearest enemies’ (Daniel 1986: 407), and also called him ‘unkind, insincere, duplicitous and inhuman’ (Daniel 1986: 409). Daniel felt that Wheeler was jealous of what he perceived to be Daniel’s easy life:

The day after I had been elected to the Disney Chair of Archaeology in Cambridge, Brian Hope Taylor was lunching with him and told him the news. His face darkened: ‘What’, he said ‘that jumped up schoolmaster journalist to be Disney Professor? What is Cambridge coming to?’ Then he went back to his office that afternoon and dictated a letter of warm and fulsome congratulations concluding: ‘Cambridge is honouring itself by
elected you." I do not forget that he was an unsuccessful candidate for the Disney Chair when Minns was appointed in 1927. (Daniel 1986: 409-10). Wheeler (1968a: 149-50) was similarly rude about his friend Ian Richmond when reviewing the posthumous publication of Hod Hill. The reaction (Fox et al 1968: 292-3), however, does seem to have been out of proportion to the offence but suggests how well liked Richmond was compared with Wheeler.

Those who were close to Tessa Wheeler were particularly critical of Mortimer Wheeler. Peggy Guido questioned his technical ability, his scholarship, even whether he had any part in writing the excavation reports that came out under his name, and suggested that in all these areas he passed off Tessa’s work as his own (Guido in conversation, 1994). But Ms Guido also said that she was biased and could see no good in Wheeler because of his treatment of Tessa Wheeler. Veronica Seton-Williams was equally fond of Tessa and said that without her the ‘magic’ of Maiden Castle vanished:

Rik Wheeler was in many ways a perfectionist with drive and ambition but with no patience with the minutiae of the day-to-day running of things. He was a difficult man to work with and one of the reasons I did not do the last season with him was because of a disagreement we had about the rampart stratification I was excavating. (Seton-Williams 1988: 55). They later overcame this disagreement, but obviously for Seton-Williams the relationship had changed and had to be re-negotiated without Tessa.

Those who were outside Wheeler’s direct sphere of influence were equally ambivalent. Gertrude Caton Thompson, who knew Wheeler as a peer rather than a person in authority, likened him to Louis Leakey, another archaeologist whose personality became inextricably entangled with his work (Caton Thompson 1983: 220-22). Max Mallowan, who seems to have admired Wheeler rather than liked him, referred to him as ‘an over-engined dynamo’ (Mallowan 1977: 237) disliked for his self-promotion and nicknamed ‘flash Alf’ for his perceived vulgarity (Mallowan 1977: 238). Cyril and Aileen Fox who had been friendly with both Tessa and Mortimer Wheeler continued the relationship after Tessa’s death, but Lady Fox resented Wheeler’s refusal to visit after Cyril Fox developed Alzheimer’s. However, even those who disliked Wheeler admired his energy and promotion of archaeology:

He wasn’t my kind of person but that doesn’t mean one can’t admire his abilities, but I would never have been on good friendly terms, he was just not my type. (Fell in conversation, 1994).
How Wheeler felt about his reputation, or indeed those that disliked him is unrecorded, his autobiography was more concerned with self-promotion than self-examination. Wheeler, throughout his autobiography and other writings, rarely praised his contemporaries. It was not just Richmond, but others of his peers were damned with faint praise, I mentioned in Chapter 5 that he referred to Phillips’ ‘improvements’ on Pitt Rivers’ excavation techniques, yet Phillips appeared to be taking a distinct and new approach to the excavation of long barrows (see section 5.2.2, footnote 12). It was part of Wheeler’s puzzling self-aggrandisement that only Cyril Fox, Tessa Wheeler and Pitt Rivers were ever unconditionally praised by him. Wheeler’s mentor, Bushe-Fox, was barely acknowledged, except to illustrate how archaeology should not be done (Wheeler 1955: 67). I find Wheeler puzzling, because he seems to have been unable to stop himself from being rude about his contemporaries, not just about their work but also the way they lived their lives. The story of his reaction to Daniel’s promotion is just one of many. In his autobiography Wheeler (1955: 130) included a letter that he had sent to Cyril Fox during the Second World War where he had complained about ‘the younger members of our craft’ avoiding active service and taking ‘upon themselves gentle jobs at no great discomfort’. ‘How’ he asked could they ‘face themselves at the shaving mirror or go quietly to their beds at night?’ I found it very strange that Wheeler decided to publish this section, it would have been obvious to those concerned that he was referring to them and surely they would have been insulted? Also Wheeler’s own personal life was hardly above reproach, and despite his promotion of ‘active’ service, he left the army in 1943 in order to become the Director General of the Archaeological Survey of India. I asked Stuart Piggott about this incident and whether he and Glyn Daniel had been offended by Wheeler’s remarks and subsequent actions and his reply was that Wheeler was a difficult and complex man, always playing a different role, and that one was never certain how sincere Wheeler was in his remarks (Piggott in conversation, 1994).

Grahame Clark was another archaeologist whose work and personality caused conflicting feelings. Clare Fell remarked ‘I think his work is much more lasting than most people of that period, it’s very good.’ But, immediately followed this with ‘He hadn’t the warmth of personality of some of the others’ (Fell in conversation, 1994). Piggott was similarly unenthusiastic about Clark’s personality while praising his work (Piggott in conversation, 1994). Glyn Daniel, perhaps because of spending years in the
same department, was much more outspoken. He recalled that Dorothy Garrod had been an easy head of department to get along with:

She was a generous, loveable, outgoing person who was interested in people. Grahame Clark, great scholar though he was and a man who brought great distinction to Cambridge during his two decades as Professor, was not interested in people and did not get on easily with colleagues or pupils. (Daniel 1986: 211).

Daniel’s main complaint was that during his time as Disney Professor Clark made everyone feel he considered them to be ‘second rate’ (1986: 212). What was even more galling was that he had held this opinion since being a junior lecturer:

Clark and Phillips were driving Terence Powell and me to a meeting of the Prehistoric Society in London in the mid-thirties: they spent the time denigrating every archaeologist we had ever heard of until Terrence, with undergraduate innocence asked ‘Are there no good archaeologists?’ There was a silence. Then Phillips said ‘You don’t have to look very far.’ (Daniel 1986: 211).

Alexander Keiller’s dislike of the Wiltshire archaeologists is much easier to understand and explain. Keiller saw himself as promoting a new form of archaeology, with rigorous recording and surveying, yet to the Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Society Keiller was an inexperienced excavator who needed assistance. Lynda Murray (1999: 39) has discussed how Keiller was only allowed to dig Windmill Hill if he accepted Harold St George Grey as his site director. The two men clashed regularly (Murray 1999: 36; 39; 41; 43; 49 & 52) and one can understand Keiller’s frustration at having someone he disliked, and believed to be incompetent, placed in authority above him. Keiller’s clashes with the Cunningtons and particularly Maud Cunnington were again partly due to this frustration. Keiller was inexperienced, but then by modern standards so was everyone else who was excavating. However, Murray (1999: 108) revealed that Young felt Keiller’s dislike of Mrs Cunnington had become a ‘mania’ bordering on ‘insanity’. And, it should be remembered that although Keiller saw himself as being a different sort of investigator, to the established Wiltshire archaeologists he was a newcomer, a louche man-about-town, with questionable sexual tastes, who failed to publish his excavations (Roberts 2002).

Just as there were archaeologists everyone liked, so there were ones that a number of their peers disliked. Aside from Clark, Phillips and Wheeler, Kathleen Kenyon, W.J. Hemp, Aileen Fox and Jacquetta Hawkes all had their opponents. This antagonism was
usually framed in terms of questioning their scholarship or dedication, but seems to have had more to do with personal dislike than a genuine belief that these people were incompetent. Personalities affected relationships. Daniel (1986: 342-3) described W.J. Hemp as a lazy dilettante but his reasoning was less to do with work differences and more to do with Hemp having once been rude to him and unpleasant to Piggott. It could be argued that the Verulamium museum’s elevation of Tessa Wheeler has been done by overlooking Mortimer Wheeler’s contribution, and this disregard stems from the ambivalence with which he is viewed in British archaeology. I have argued elsewhere that these personal likes and dislikes are important for the history of archaeology because they affect the way we remember and evaluate archaeologists (Roberts 2002). It may be unsettling to know that admired archaeologists talked up their friends and rubbished their enemies, but it is a reminder that archaeologists are human and subject to the same vagaries as everyone else. If we refuse to acknowledge that personalities and personal interactions matter then we run the risk of accepting such statements as objective valuations.

7.3.4 Summary
Another reason for devoting so much space to discussing friends, lovers and enemies is to demonstrate how small a world archaeology was in the 20s and 30s. And, how much archaeologists relied on their social networks. This inter-connectedness of archaeology was important in the transmission of ideas. Stuart Piggott (in conversation, 1994) remarked that his understanding of archaeology came as much through discussion with other archaeologists over ‘a meal or a drink’ as reading their books. With so much taking place off camera intellectual history seems largely irrelevant. All we can say is that archaeologists discussed their work in books and journals, but also at society meetings, while working together, visiting each other’s excavations, and socialising.

The picture that we have of inter-war friendships reinforces the understandings of class and gender. Men and women were friends, and women were accepted as fellow archaeologists:

We didn’t think anything, you know, odd about it. We were just very glad to find someone who was an archaeologist. (Piggott in conversation, 1994).

But the friendships that mattered and endured tended to be with archaeologists of the same sex. This was particularly so for women archaeologists attempting to participate in
a discipline where their work was welcomed but not recompensed. Even more noticeable is that there were few cross-class or cross-race friendships aside from Young’s friendship with Keiller, Piggott and Peggy Guido. Good foremen and workmen, as was noted in sections 5.3 and 6.5, were appreciated but not befriended (Mallowan 1977: 43). If there were cross-racial friendships and affairs, as has been suggested for Turville-Petre and Howard Carter these have been kept very quiet. Workmen and foremen were the ‘NCO’s’ (Chubb 2001: 53 & Wheeler 1961: 162) of an excavation or the relied upon servants (Petrie 1904: 22), not friends.

7.4 Fashion

7.4.1 Clothing
Fashion as a means of communication has a long history. From the Sans Culottes to the Taleban clothing has expressed political, religious, and social beliefs (Parkins et al 2002). Clothing asserts identity, a sense of community and belonging within a group. This was just as true for inter-war archaeologists as it was for flappers or aviators (figs. 7.8 & 7.9). An archaeologist’s clothing marked them as different, they belonged to a select group within society and their fashion indicated membership of this group. With archaeology it was a particular allegiance within a group. Young archaeologists, go-getting, active archaeologists in the 20s and 30s dressed differently to established and establishment archaeologists. Compare the picture (fig. 7.6) of the excavations at Sutton Hoo with Piggott’s (1989: 23) description of Reginald Smith visiting The Trundle while wearing ‘bowler hat, pince-nez glasses, dark suit with rose in button-hole’. Or Crawford’s encounter in 1919 with his employers:

The members of the Cambrian Association in those days were a motley crew of amateurs who had inflated ideas of their own importance, a survival of Victorian times. They paid a formal visit en masse ... I was living on the spot in a tent and my usual dress was shorts and a sweater, and it never occurred to me that any more formal attire would be thought necessary to receive them ... Long afterwards I heard there had been disapproving comments on my informal dress; that a man of thirty-two should wear shorts on so solemn an occasion seemed rather shocking. But good old Boyd Dawkins defended me stoutly I had ‘had a hard time as a prisoner of war and perhaps had not yet completely recovered my balance’. (Crawford 1955: 150).
These archaeologists, not always the younger generation, but the ones who believed in hands-on archaeology, made much of an archaeologist wearing suitable clothing. Petrie was as decided on the subject of clothing as he was on all other archaeological matters:

In clothing it need hardly be said that clothing must correspond to the work; and there must never be a thought about clothes when one kneels in wet mud, scrapes through narrow passages, or sits waist deep in dust... The man who cannot enjoy his work without regard to appearances, who will not strip and go into the water, or slither on slimy mud through unknown passages, had better not profess to excavate. (Petrie 1904: 7).

Fifty years later Kathleen Kenyon was stressing the same point:

The equipment with which a volunteer who is going to dig should arrive on site is simple. The principal requisite is old clothes which can be allowed to get dirty without a qualm. Strong shoes are necessary in most seasons, though in fine weather sandals or plimsolls may be all right. Gum-boots are a great help ... An old mackintosh is essential ... Beginners are strongly advised to provide themselves with a pair of old leather gloves, unless they are already pretty horny-handed, as working with a trowel can easily produce blisters at first. (Kenyon 1952: 66).

The first time Mary Chubb (2001: 51) went to Egypt in 1930 to work with Pendlebury at Amarna she was surprised and amused ‘to see how the men had reacted to the question of Correct Wear for Excavation.’ Again, the ‘staff’ wore casual clothing, bright shirts, flannel ‘bags’ or shorts, very different to their normal attire (ibid). However, as Peggy Guido remarked archaeologists wore these clothes not just because they were suitable for excavation but also so they could be recognised as archaeologists. Many of the younger archaeologists, she stated, would wear digging clothes to attend meetings at Burlington House, scruffy, dirty, shabby clothes which clearly stated they were active archaeologists. Peggy Guido dismissed this fashion as ‘mere posing’ which it undoubtedly was, but imagine the contrast between these archaeologists and the rest of the public in central London (figs 7.10 & 7.11). Peggy Guido also remarked that she had been criticised for wearing smart clothing during the filming of the Sutton Hoo excavations. It was felt that she should have worn something more befitting to her role as an archaeologist, whereas she was determined not to appear in newsreels in disreputable clothes. So, not only was there a fashion amongst archaeologists to always look like they’d just stepped off a dig, there was also a counter-fashion reacting against this. Away from the public and cameras Peggy Guido and her set wore digging clothes to dig in, away from excavations and secure in her identity as an archaeologist she dressed like other members of her social class.
7.4.2 Fashion and Gender

For women clothing on excavation raised a variety of issues. Men wore shorts, flannels or 'country clothes' breeches, tweed jackets; this was work-wear but significantly different to that worn by the labourers. Many women also adopted country clothes, Tessa Verney Wheeler in her tweed suit and boots became a well-known figure in St Albans (fig. 7.12) and Aileen Fox wore a similar outfit. Lady Petrie on the other hand wore breeches (fig 7.13) as did Lady Woolley and Mrs Chitty (Chitty in conversation, 1994), Dorothy Garrod at Mount Carmel wore 'slacks' (fig. 7.7) as did many of the women at Maiden Castle (fig. 7.14). But wearing trousers was still very daring for women. The women apprentices at Kew (fig. 7.15) had worn breeches as early as 1896 which gave rise to a great deal of talk (Penn 1993: 79). Some women workers in the First World War had worn trousers (fig. 7.16) but only for heavy and dirty work. It was the Second World War that made the wearing of trousers and overalls more acceptable (fig. 7.17) and even then my paternal grandmother who was born in 1912 never wore trousers. Lady Petrie who began wearing 'bloomers' (fig. 7.18) in 1896 on her honeymoon working with Petrie at Denderah, had very decided theories about correct attire in the East:

... although she wore riding breeches [she] considered it unladylike to wear one's shirt tucked into the waistband ... She also had a theory that it was unladylike to go into Gaza in trousers. But she did not start from the camp in her town outfit, she stopped the car on the outskirts of Gaza and in the Muslim cemetery, a most unsuitable venue, she put over her head a black embroidered dress from Bethlehem. As she was wearing a shirt that stuck out of the top and breeches and socks that came out underneath, the total effect was rather strange. (Seton-Williams 1988: 39-41).

It wasn’t just Lady Petrie and Peggy Guido who believed different clothes were suitable to different locations. Veronica Seton-Williams (1988: 39) wore trousers or breeches at Maiden Castle and in Sinai, but on the Garstangs' excavation at Jericho she was photographed wearing a skirt (fig. 7.19). This may have been because Mrs Garstang, also pictured, wore dresses on site, or, as seems more likely, because Jericho was more populous than where Seton-Williams had previously been working she was being careful to abide by the social customs. Women do seem to have modified their clothes depending on where they worked. The photographic archive from the Wheelers' excavation at St Albans suggests that women archaeologists were careful to be seen to be retaining their femininity, to be unthreatening while tackling excavations. When I
looked at the photographs from Verulamium I was struck by the difference between the photos from the various open days and the photos of the staff relaxing around the site hut (figs. 5.68 & 7.10). I would suggest that the open day photographs are posed images, not just in the sense of posing while the camera takes the shot, but that the women were presenting themselves for the audience as unthreatening, ladylike, feminine. Around the site hut the women were clearly wearing working clothes, slacks and shirts, but when the public were invited to view the excavations the women were wearing fashionable frocks, sandals rather than shoes or boots (fig. 7.20). These women are so ostentatiously feminine that there is an element of caricature, of the mimicry defined by Irigary (1985) by parodying the feminine, by providing the customary ‘specular reflection’, the women were miming being women, miming being themselves.

Away from excavations women were equally careful about the messages given by their clothes. Peggy Guido remarked that most of the women archaeologists ‘aped’ men, in their clothes and their mannerisms, the particular example she gave was Kathleen Kenyon and other ‘butch people’ (Guido in conversation, 1994). I think here she was referring to the clothes such women wore when they were lecturing. Kathleen Kenyon, Veronica Seton-Williams, and Dorothy Garrod wore skirt suits with ties (fig. 7.21). Photographs from Verulamium show Tessa Wheeler excavating in a similar suit (fig. 7.12). These were clothes that again signified a particular task, they were the clothes professional women wore (fig. 7.22). They were masculine and no doubt some women like Radclyffe Hall wore them to be masculine (fig. 7.23), but they were also a feminised form of masculine professional clothing and by wearing them women could assume a similar authority and status. They were as much a of a uniform as the actual uniform worn by those in the services (fig. 7.24). They indicated seriousness, the wearer was a professional uninterested in fripperies and so should be taken seriously. This was a self-image many women were trying to present in the 20s and 30s, it is unsurprising that women lecturers adopted the style.

7.4.3 Fashion and Class

In archive photographs it is generally easy to distinguish the ‘staff’ from the workers. In part this is because of the difference in tools used. The hierarchy of equipment reflected the hierarchy of authority on site (see section 5.3.4). Clothes were equally illustrative of class. In Egypt and the Middle East the staff wore trousers and shorts, the Arab workers
galabayas and kafiyas (fig. 7.25). On Wheeler’s Indian excavations in the 1940s the Indian staff wore European clothes and topees, the workers wore minimal clothing. In Britain the contrast was equally marked, the male supervisory staff wore ‘country clothes’ shirts, breeches or shorts. Some of the men wore ties (fig. 7.26) and most wore jackets. The labourers wore trousers, never shorts or breeches, their shirts were collarless, their trousers held up by braces, they wore waistcoats but rarely jackets and they nearly always wore caps (fig. 7.27). The staff wore shoes, the workmen wore boots, (fig. 7.6). They were clothes for manual work. And, again this was, in effect, a uniform for both sides. Comparing Wheeler and the workmen at the well in St Albans the difference in clothing and identity is particularly marked. At Sutton Hoo the difference is again obvious, while Basil Brown the foreman wore a waistcoat and a flat cap the ‘staff’ wore jackets and homburgs. To an onlooker in the 20s and 30s the identity of each side was clear and ‘workers’ would be easily distinguishable from the ‘staff’.

7.5 Specialist Publications

...archaeology is no longer merely a hobby but a branch of science with techniques of its own ... the pursuit of archaeology requires study and training, it has become a skilled profession. (Crawford 1940: 113). The 20s and 30s were marked as much by the quantity of written information as they were by the number of excavations. The increasing number of archaeologists, many of whom were excavating and recovering yet more material culture, led to the development of area and period specialisms (Lucas 2001: 107). Archaeology was becoming increasingly systematised and defined; Dorothy Garrod (1926) had investigated and documented the Upper Palaeolithic in Britain, Grahame Clark (1932 & 1936) had described the Mesolithic; E.T. Leeds (1927) and Stuart Piggott (1932) had identified Neolithic pottery. The county archaeologies (Curwen 1937; Jessup 1930; Dobson 1931; Peake 1931) provided a prehistoric and historic picture of England, and Wheeler had produced a similar volume for Wales (1925). In 1932 Kendrick and Hawkes published *Archaeology in England and Wales 1914-1931* which summarised the state of archaeological knowledge at that date. The move away from an understanding of past peoples in terms of evolution to the culture history approach which dominated this period divided the past into smaller more easily defined groups.
Conferring names and characteristics on past societies gave the impression that the past was becoming better understood.

This view that archaeologists were in control of the past, could name and define past societies comes through very clearly in their work:

Thanks to excavation, thousands of years of human history are now familiar which a hundred years ago were a total blank. (Woolley 1930: 22).

Whereas the nineteenth century workers were largely content to outline the results of their excavations and leave the broader discussions of human societies to synthesisers such as Lubbock (1865), and Wilson (1862), the 20s and 30s showed a distinct intellectual change. Archaeologists no longer felt it was enough to simply describe the sites, monuments, and artefacts of the past, now the past had to be explained. This shift away from individual sites into broader syntheses is particularly marked during the 20s and 30s. While this intellectual shift has been noted by historians of archaeology, particularly Trigger (1989: 250-70), what these historians have not remarked upon was that these syntheses were predominantly written by men. Women were excavating, producing site reports, and contributing to the debates, but they were not writing the syntheses. Dorothy Garrod’s *The Upper Palaeolithic Age in Britain* (1926) was more a gazetteer of sites than a syntheses of societies. This may reflect women’s lack of access to academic posts. It is noticeable that the less specialist county syntheses were written by both men and women, although there were fewer women authors. Not only did the past archaeologists produced reflect contemporary understandings of society, but those who had access to write of that past were constrained by their gender.

As I noted above written archaeology has been extensively investigated by the historians of archaeology (Trigger 1989; Lucas 2001). Individuals and their writings have been re-assessed (Smith 1997: Smith 2000; Whitley 1997), as have the sites they excavated and used in their explanations (Bradley 1994; Evans 1989; Sharples 1991). In view of the amount of work already produced here I intend to only highlight those areas that I feel relate to the questions raised in this thesis, the ways in which archaeologists constructed an archaeology which reproduced the dominant discourse of inter-war British society.

Late nineteenth century archaeological explanations came largely from outside the discipline from investigators who were not strictly archaeologists. These explanations
were dependent on understandings of social Darwinism and evolution, both of people and their attendant material culture. Ethnography and anthropology were seen to provide modern examples of past societies. In 1863 T.H. Huxley had suggested that the newly discovered Neanderthal skulls were similar to those of modern Australian Aborigines, and argued that this supposed physical affinity suggested a similarity of cultural mores (Trigger 1989: 113 and see section 4.3.2 museum displays). Likewise, Lubbock in *Pre-historic Times* (1865) made explicit his belief that past societies were paralleled by 'modern savages'. Natural selection was invoked as the reason for the present elevation of Europeans, and particularly the British, they 'possessed superior intelligence and greater self-control' (Trigger 1989: 113), while 'primitive' peoples owed their position to their 'lack of restraint' and 'child-like intellect'. Their 'savagery' was evidenced by their squalid living conditions and simple societies (Trigger 1989: 116-7). This understanding of the world and the past reflected British Imperialism and colonialism, there was a hierarchy of people and the British being the most culturally evolved were in a position of natural authority over other groups. The archaeological record was believed to contain the evidence of the shift from 'savagery' to 'civilization', the cultural evolution of Europe (Trigger 1989: 114).

This understanding of the world and the later rise of culture history explanations were both informed by the concept of diffusion. The idea that change came from without, new ideas, new materials, civilization, came from external sources and were brought to new areas by invasion or migration, or simply through contact with other more 'advanced' peoples. British understandings of diffusion were shaped by W.H.R. Rivers and Grafton Elliot Smith, and developed into hyper-diffusionism by Smith, William Perry and Lord Raglan:

> ... communities in any part of the world which have advanced beyond the food-gathering stage of culture and practice any of the fundamental arts and crafts, owe their cultural capital to some other community. (Perry 1937: 14).

It is worth noting that within this framework Perry, Smith and Lord Raglan were still using the contemporary world as part of their explanation. Trigger (1989: 153) remarked that despite the differences between these men they all agreed that 'savages' could not invent anything, and, echoing other middle-class constructions of the working-classes they believed:

> ... most human beings are naturally primitive and will always revert to a stage of savagery if not stopped from doing so by the ruling classes. (*ibid*).
And, although Trigger (1989: 153-4) asserted that most archaeologists ignored the excesses of hyper-diffusionism, as late as the 3rd edition of *The Dawn of Civilization* Childe (1939: 301-2) repeated Smith’s thesis that megalithic tombs were debased pyramids brought to the West by Egyptian missionaries.

Whether archaeologists believed in migration, invasion, or contact through trade, their understandings of change in the material record were shaped by the belief that ideas were not internally developed. Change and progress came from without. I would argue that this understanding still stemmed from ideas about imperialism (Dennell 1990). The belief that there were centres of progression and civilisation ‘advanced’ cultures who brought new materials and ideas to more primitive societies is markedly reminiscent of the justifications of imperialism and colonialism seen in section 4.3.2 above.

By comparison with strict evolutionism the rise of culture histories as the preferred method of explanation would seem to herald a more inclusive understanding of the past. This is how Lucas presented the change in thinking and its attendant change in excavation techniques:

... for Petrie there was only History one story of Progress, and the details of when this happened and at what rate were merely incidental. For Wheeler, on the other hand, history was multiple, civilisation had many faces ... The rise of the culture group, of a pluralist conception of culture, created the necessity for an absolute framework within which to arrange that pluralism – space and time ... locating a stratigraphic layer on a site in both plan and section is a direct correlate of the need to fix a culture group in prehistory in time and space. (Lucas 2001: 45-6).

But, for all the recognition of the plurality of civilisation, culture history was still informed by an understanding of the world which was racist if not imperialist, and which still rested on evolutionary explanations.

Culture history came from nineteenth-century European understandings of the term ‘culture’, Gustav Kossinna was one of the first to apply this term to the archaeological record in 1911. In Britain the term took longer to be adopted, but in 1921 Crawford published *Man and His Past* in which he defined a culture as a bounded entity located in a particular time and space with specific cultural characteristics (Crawford 1921: 79). Fox also adopted the term and used it in *The Archaeology of the Cambridge Region* (1923). However, it was Childe who was most responsible for developing and
promoting the culture history approach. Childe had used the term in previous works, but in his Presidential address to the Prehistoric Society in 1935 he took the opportunity to define his understanding of the term:

The culture is not an *a priori* category elaborated in the studies of philosophers and then imposed from outside upon working archaeologists. Cultures are observed facts. The field-worker does find specific types of tools, weapons, and ornaments repeatedly associated together in graves and habitations of one kind and contrasted with the artefacts found in graves and settlements of another kind. The interpretation of the observed phenomenon is supplied by ethnography. The traits of a culture are thus presented together to the archaeologists because they are the creations of a single person, adjustments to its environment approved by collective experience; they thus express the individuality of a human group united by common social traditions. With this idea prehistory vindicates its character as a human, in contrast to a natural, science. (Childe 1935a: 3).

Culture history was intended to identify previously nameless prehistoric groups, to trace their 'origin, movements, and interaction' (Trigger 1989: 172) and to discuss that group's economy, social and political organisations, and religious beliefs (Clark 1940: v), in essence, to describe how people lived in the past. The problem with attempting this Rankean view of history was that although cultures could be identified by their traits, and new cultures could be mapped when they arrived in new areas, there was no explanation of how people lived in the past. How these societies worked and how the different elements related to each other. Borrowing from the social anthropology of Radcliffe-Brown and Malinowski archaeologists adopted Functionalism, the belief that human behaviour could be understood through the interdependent elements which together formed social systems. Childe adopted this scheme which he combined with ideas about diffusion. It was Childe's contention that diagnostic elements such as home-made pottery, ornaments and burial rites were most indicative of local tastes, and therefore most resistant to change. It was these traits which could then be used to identify specific groups and with Functionalism the way these societies operated could then be discussed (Childe 1929: viii).

Inter-twined with Functionalist explanations was the geographical/environmental determinism adopted by Crawford, Fox and Clark, and the economic determinism developed by Childe. However, these deterministic understandings were not exclusive and many archaeologists used a combination of approaches. Myres, Crawford and Fleure all adopted a view of prehistory where the geographical environment exercised
influence upon the inhabitants. Fox was the main proponent of this approach, begun in *The Archaeology of the Cambridge Region* and developed in the *Personality of Britain* (1932), where he used artefact distribution in terms of landscape in order to write more detailed culture histories. Fox's division of Britain into Highlands and Lowlands reflected their susceptibility to cultural change. The lowlands were more open to migrations, diffusions, and invasions from continental Europe, and therefore were more open to new ideas and materials. The highlands were more sheltered from disruption 'the highlander lives a harder life and is less easily conquered, still less easily displaced, than the lowlander' (Fox 1923: 27) and the highlander was therefore more selective about the new ideas adopted. Clark (1940: 5) also argued that Britain, despite the location on the edge of Europe, was as susceptible to the migration and invasion of cultures as the rest of Europe. Clark mixed environmental and economic determinism in his work (Clark 1933; 1935; 1954), seeing both as influencing the development and movement of cultures. Childe's vision of prehistory was more heavily influenced by economics, although he too welcomed Fox's highland/lowland division (Childe 1930c: 225). *The Most Ancient East* (1928), *The Bronze Age* (1930), and *New Light on the Most Ancient East* (1934) all presented major innovations such as agriculture and metal working as stemming from the Near East and spreading westwards through Europe via the migration of surplus populations and the trade of manufactured goods for raw materials.

Inter-war archaeologists were not only reacting against the evolutionism of the nineteenth century, they also saw their work as more humanly orientated. It was not only Wheeler (1961: 17) who was concerned that archaeologists should remember that they were digging up people not things, other archaeologists were equally keen to distance themselves from what they saw to be the overly artefact-based understanding of the past practiced by nineteenth century workers. Archaeologists in the 20s and 30s stressed that they were interested in the makers of artefacts rather than the object itself. They were concerned with uncovering a *living* past 'Man as a human being and not man as a fossil is the true subject of the prehistorian' (Garrod 1946: 11 and see Childe 1940: 3; Clark 1940: v). However, as was noted in Chapter 5, these archaeologists were equally obsessed with artefacts. Material remains were the measure of a culture. The artefacts were evidence of the culture and used to name and construct attributes of that culture and to judge its advanced or primitive nature. It was the artefacts that indicated
change and development in the past. The artefacts which explained the contexts. Similarly it was the artefacts that were displayed in museums. The explanations they used the artefacts for might have changed, but they were still operating within the same understanding that the artefacts were diagnostic of culture, and excavation was primarily for the recovery of material culture.

And, despite their reactions to earlier conceptions of the past these archaeologists were still creating a past that was ‘other’, still squalid, primitive, and alien. This comes through clearly in Curwen’s description of Whitehawk Camp (1937: 75-6), and in Clark inclusion of this description of Neanderthals in *From Savagery to Civilization*:

His short, thick-set, and coarsely built body was carried in a half-stooping slouch upon short, powerful half flexed legs of peculiarly ungraceful form ... the picture of unattractiveness ... The arms were relatively short and the exceptionally large hands lacked the delicacy and the nicely balanced co-operation of thumb and finger which is regarded as one of the most distinctive of human characteristics. (Clark 1940: 16-7).

And Childe used equally pejorative terms about the Scottish Iron Age:

... the finer arts and industries of higher civilization could find no place. Actually, barbarian squalor reigns everywhere, superficially relieved by a few imports from the peaceful Province. Only in the south in immediate contact with the Romanized provincials are a genuine art and a more sophisticated industry traceable. But even there objects of aesthetic value are rare, and the potter’s wheel was not adopted before the end of the fourth century A.D. (Childe 1935b: 236).

The past, like the colonial present was constructed in opposition to the British present. Occupants of that past were just as far removed from civilisation as modern-day ‘savages’, they were just as ‘other’ as those whose race, class, or gender prevented them from full participation in British society.

In addition, I would argue that for all these archaeologists had supposedly renounced evolutionism and social Darwinism these ideas still underlay their explanations. The idea of successive cultures invoked ideas of progress and competition which still echoed Huxley’s model of evolution. Cultures were seen as competing with each other, those that survived – through natural selection – were stronger, more progressive than those that succumbed (Clark 1940: 5). But, at the same time these cultures could become marginalised as other cultures rose up and took over. This was Childe’s understanding of the demise of the Near East civilisations (1934), and Gertrude Caton Thompson and
Eleanor Gardner (1934: 2) used a similar explanation when discussing the occupation changes in the Fayum:

It is as though a lingering Mesolithic group, some unprogressive tribe, parasitic perhaps in the first place on the more advanced Neolithic group ... degraded the higher culture to its own miserable status. (ibid).

Nor were these archaeologists divorced from ideas of imperialism and colonialism. The past was understood in terms of centres of civilisation, and, from these centres people spread out and colonised new areas, took over new lands imposing their culture and ideas on those indigenous populations (Piggott 1938: 94). This understanding of the past in terms of a hierarchy of cultures where primitive were colonised by advanced repeated those justifications of imperialism that were current in nineteenth and twentieth-century. School texts informed children that 'the African' was irredeemably 'child-like' with an 'affinity' to nature, in From Savagery to Civilization Clark used the same language:

Psychologically the savage is a true child of nature. Like a child he fails to discriminate between the inner life of the soul and the external environment and feels himself at one with nature, animate and even inanimate. (Clark 1940: 30 and see Quennell & Quennell 1922: viii).

And, Childe’s understanding of trade seems to have been as much informed by the economics of British Imperialism as his Marxism. Although Childe stressed that trade had to be closely and carefully defined in each instance (Childe 1928: 221), his model which involved the exchange of manufactured goods for raw materials was based, according to Trigger, on the model of relations between modern industrial countries and the Third World (Trigger 1989: 252). Or, looked at in terms of inter-war Britain Childe’s model reflected the forms of trade with the colonies as promoted by the British government through the Empire Marketing Board.

However, it should be stressed that although these archaeologists’ explanations were rooted in their own contemporary society in understandings of colonialism and imperialism, they were not parochial, nor were they attempting to discover a proto-British Empire. The past they imagined and the cultures they saw occupying that past were not divorced from Europe. Lucas (2001: 108) has suggested that the focus of early twentieth century archaeology became narrower, concentrating on ‘local groups as evolutionism lost favour’. Childe was the only archaeologist he allowed had a broader view of the past (Lucas 2001: 107). But British archaeologists were very outward facing, they saw change coming from the continent and beyond. Hawkes and Dunning’s
Belgic invasions (1930), Piggott’s Wessex Culture (1938), Childe’s traders and smiths (1934) all demonstrate Stuart Piggott’s contention that:

... we saw our insular archaeology as a part, if perhaps too derivative a part, of that of continental Europe and the Old World at large, and knowledge of the one was dependent on knowledge of the other. (Piggott 1989: 27).

British archaeologists saw themselves as part of a wider archaeological community, the conferences and meetings reinforced this belief, and the nationalistic archaeology of Germany, Italy and Central Europe seems to have had little place in British archaeological thinking.

An understanding of the past that stemmed, at least in part, from living in an imperial society would not be surprising. Archaeologists were part of British society and, as was noted in section 4.3.2, that society was saturated in images of empire. Archaeologists were educated in those same schools that promoted imperialism and colonialism, as Hawkes (1989: 47) remarked it was reading Kipling which provoked his interest in history and archaeology. Woolley who referred frequently to Kipling in his work (see for example Woolley 1930: 95), dedicated Abraham to him with the words:

We discussed this book together while it was in the making. Now it is done, and I dedicate it in gratitude and affection to you whom archaeologists and historians owe so much. (Woolley 1936: 3).

There were other aspects of that wider society to be found in archaeology, Clark (1940: 87-9) drew on very contemporary society when he linked the unfinished nature of many hill-forts to a process of hurried rearmament. Admittedly the inter-war constructions of the past offered little information about class, and concepts of gender were only infrequently invoked. However, what was said reflected those understandings current in contemporary society. Hyper-diffusionists saw the masses as needing control, while Piggott saw the Wessex culture as:

... a dominant and intrusive aristocracy who for some centuries at least lorded it over the native element. (Piggott 1938: 94).

Similarly the inter-war discourse which promoted a construction of women as passive and domestic was equally in vogue amongst archaeologists:

... woman – the traditional conservative being, secluded from contact with the outer-stirring world – has from time immemorial fashioned the pots, may we not guess that man – the traditionally more progressive being, in touch with the innovations of a wider world – has made the flint tools and weapons. (Caton Thompson & Brunton 1928: 80-1; and see Childe 1948: 93; Quennell & Quennell 1922: 26).
Archaeological fieldwork, employment, and training reflected contemporary British society, it is unsurprising that archaeologists understandings of the past were equally derived from their society.

7.6 Archaeology and the Public

Archaeology has always had strong ties with the general public and has long relied on the public for funding. Equally longstanding is the recognition that in return for their money the public had to be welcomed and entertained. Belzoni’s fabulous recreation of Seti I’s’ tomb in the Egyptian Hall at Piccadilly in 1821 was a masterpiece of showmanship, but the same understanding of the need for public interest underlay the museum displays, site tours and popular publications of the 20s and 30s.

7.6.1 Museum Displays

As was noted in section 4.3.2 these displays presented the past in evolutionary terms, and mixed artefacts with corporeal remains, suggesting that physical characteristics determined culture groups and levels of civilisation. The permanent and temporary museum displays at the British Museum and county museums were, and are, for the edification of the public as much as serious researchers, and in return the public paid through taxes and admissions fees to be entertained and educated. When the Library and Museum Committee of St Albans were discussing the new Verulamium museum which would be entirely devoted to the Roman discoveries, they suggested that the public be charged 6d for entry. This was a small but still significant sum, the same price as a packet of cigarettes or a cinema ticket and the authorities must have felt confident that the public would be prepared to pay. At the Future of Archaeology Conference in 1943 both C.F.C Hawkes (1944: 77-9) and Dr F.S. Wallis (1944: 79-82) (of the Bristol Museum and editor of the Museum’s Journal) complained that museums were not doing enough to attract visitors. They argued the governing bodies of the museums had forgotten that their main aim should be to display artefacts interestingly for visitors. Curle was also concerned about presentation:

Someday I hope to have efficient guide attendants in each gallery, and my latest dream is of models of prehistoric structures in the window recesses of
the stairs and a reconstructed model of the Roman fort at Newstead. (Curle diary 11th July 1913)

The excavations at Ur were part-funded by the British Museum and in return the British Museum were apportioned some of the material for display. The public, who had already funded the excavations through taxes and voluntary contributions (Crawford 1955: 187), flocked to visit the exhibition and undoubtedly some will have made further voluntary contributions (Bacon 1976: 237). The discovery of Ur and Tutankhamun stirred the public’s imagination:

In 1923 the tomb of Tutankhamun had been discovered, and things were never the same again. Excavations in Egypt became front-page news ... Everyone was familiar with the somehow pathetic relics appearing in every illustrated paper – the gauntlets, the walking sticks, the hunting gear. (Chubb 2001: 8-9).

The numbers subscribing to the Egypt Exploration Society shot up after Carter and Carnarvon’s discovery but, it wasn’t just the headline grabbing exhibitions that attracted funding and visitors. Even in the years before and after the uncovering of Tutankhamun the public subscriptions to the EES were substantial, and in return for their money subscribers were sent a report and could visit the annual exhibition (Chubb 2001: 8-10).

Petrie adopted a similar scheme, each year he would organise an exhibition of that season’s work, the public came to admire the artefacts their money had unearthed, and in some cases these visitors decided to become Egyptologists themselves. Margaret Drower (1985: 393) reported that although Petrie liked well-off students who could contribute to the excavation expenses, he also encouraged the poorer ones too. At the annual exhibitions the assistants, students and ex-students, would work as Petrie’s talent scouts, anyone showing a particular interest in the exhibits would be invited to an interview with Petrie. This is how John Starkey and Lancaster Harding began their archaeological careers. Lady Burton (Irene Donne), who had accompanied Petrie to Qau, brought them to Petrie’s attention. Harding a clerk, had little education and a widowed mother to support, while Starkey said that without Petrie’s assistance he would have remained a pawnbroker’s assistant (ibid). Petrie gave such promising students coaching after hours, and Margaret Murray ran evening classes. As noted in section 6.1 Starkey and Harding, like Piggott and Young, were exceptions, the majority of archaeologists were from wealthy or secure middle class backgrounds and could attend university on a full-time basis without needing to worry about earning money in the meantime.
After the excavations at St Albans Wheeler continued to be involved in the plans for the site. It was Wheeler's suggestion that Verulamium be used for running small scale training excavations for students (Wheeler 1939: Verulamium archive). And, in the Verulamium museum archives are letters to and from Wheeler about the campaign for the museum, and how to attract a 'suitable' curator (figs. 7.28 & 7.29). The intention was to engage a university graduate looking for their first post and this was reflected in the salary of £250 (see section 6.4.4). Wheeler suggested that the post be advertised before the end of May:

This would best fit with normal University arrangements and would help enlarge the field candidature. If the advertisements are deferred until June, we shall of course miss the University term. (Wheeler Verulamium Archive 23rd April 1938 and see fig. 7.29).

In the event Philip Corder who had been a schoolmaster for twenty years and an amateur archaeologist was appointed (Corder 1944: 85-6).

Museums and exhibitions were therefore seen as an important part of disseminating archaeological information. The whole debate in the fieldwork manuals about the morality of reconstructing artefacts was based on whether this helped the public understand their work (Atkinson 1946: 214-6; Droop 1915: 52-5; Petrie 1904: 169-88). This was why Evans' reconstruction of Knossos was seen as a good idea. It vividly explained the site, even though it was already suspected that it displayed Evans' own imagination as much as the Minoan one (Wheeler 1961: 243-4):

The historian, and with him I group the archaeologist, must have a spark of the intuitive comprehension which inspires the painter or poet ... they make the past live because they are themselves alive and can integrate their reasoned facts with the illogicalities of life. Otherwise they were mere cataloguers, adding dust to dust and ashes to ashes. (Wheeler 1961 229-30).

In the same spirit the trenches at Windmill Hill were not backfilled after excavation so that the visitors could see and understand the layout of the site as it had been in antiquity (Mike Hamilton pers. comm.). But, aside from these occasional site based presentations the majority of archaeology on display consisted of the artefacts recovered. Again this reflects the artefact based nature of inter-war archaeology.

7.6.2 Popular Publications

Although the majority of archaeological publications were site reports and texts aimed at a specialist audience, archaeologists relied on the public to buy their more general publications\textsuperscript{x}. Wheeler (1961: 220) was particularly keen to stress that archaeologists
had a duty to present their results to the public, in a way that the public could understand and appreciate. It was one of Wheeler's complaints that the increasingly jargon-ridden nature of archaeological writing was alienating the interested public:

It is the duty of the archaeologists, as of the scientist, to reach and impress the public, and to mould his words in the common clay of its forthright understanding. (Wheeler 1961: 224).

The county societies could not have survived without a membership of non-archaeologists paying their subscriptions and receiving their annual report. It is quite possible that the majority of members were subscribing because of an interest in the county, or because it was the 'done thing' to support county endeavours, rather than them having any real interest in archaeology (W.M. Manning pers. comm.). But, some of the members will have read the articles and reports even if their county's history was their only active interest in archaeology. And, those in charge of the county society meetings ensured they had a variety of interesting speakers, both Glyn Daniel and Wheeler visited the Cumberland and Westmoreland Archaeology Society while Clare Fell was in charge (Fell in conversation, 1994). Similarly not everyone who subscribed to Antiquity was an archaeologist, it was never Crawford’s intention to produce a magazine that was only for specialist consumption (Crawford 1955: 175). The County Archaeology Series that was produced in the 20s and 30s, and included Curwen’s The Archaeology of Sussex (1937) and Jessup’s The Archaeology of Kent (1930), were intended for a dual audience. Jessup’s Preface made it clear whom he thought would be interested in his county history and what form this interest would take:

Most readers will already possess their own maps; those that I have found most useful are the O.S. four miles to an inch coloured and layered (especially for motoring), and the O.S. one inch to a mile Popular Edition. A small map is provided for those who make use of the railway in their archaeological rambles. (Jessup 1930: vi).

Archaeology was a leisure pursuit for the middle classes. In the now affordable cars, by train, or the newly popular pastime of rambling the middle classes were using their increased leisure to visit the countryside and archaeology imbued this leisure with a sense of purpose. The massive popularity of Crawford’s Period Maps was a reflection of this interest, as were the hundreds of visitors who went to see the Maiden Castle excavations. This interest in archaeology may have been limited and intermittent, but it was present and archaeologists capitalised on it by producing accessible volumes.
These county archaeologies, and Wheeler's *Prehistoric and Roman Wales* (1925) covered much the same ground. Beginning with the Old Stone Age they continued in chronological order down to the Romans or Anglo-Saxons depending on the county (Curwen 1954: v). Mrs Cunnington's complete dismissal of any age or artefact which was not represented in Wiltshire was an extreme example of this style of writing (Cunnington 1933) but all the authors were very clear on the geographical limits of their interest:

The Old Stone Age in Kent ends with the culture of Aurignac. It is possible that there are a few implements which might be referred to a later industry, but the next important phase in the pre-history of the County falls in the New Stone Age. (Jessup 1930: 35).

This is not to say that they were completely insular in their approach. The discussions of the Mesolithic and Neolithic ranged to France, India, Africa, and the Near East, but the main focus of interest was the evidence from their county. The explanations relied heavily on the material evidence, particularly artefacts. As has been noted it was the artefacts rather than their contexts which were seen as important for dating and discussing the past. The main artefact types of each period were illustrated (fig. 7.30) as well as described, to give the reader the means to identify any material they might come across on their 'archaeological rambles'. Again, like the specialist texts, the past was constructed in terms of culture history with successive groups of traders or settlers arriving and colonising the area by means of their more 'advanced' physique:

The first appearance of bronze in this country seems to have coincided with the arrival of a new race of people of different physical features from those of the Neolithic natives, and with different habits and possessions. These people are usually known as the 'beaker-folk', from the name given to the characteristic pottery vessel which they introduced. Their average height was several inches taller than that of the Neolithic folk, and they were more robustly built, with broad, short heads and rugged faces which contrasted with the long, narrow heads and rather weak faces of the people they found in possession. (Curwen 1954: 145-6).

Or ideas were transmitted via the diffusion of knowledge, Jessup followed this thesis while at the same time acknowledging the limits of current archaeological information:

It has been found that the megaliths are part of a huge family of more or less similar structures distributed according to certain geographical conditions throughout the Old World from Sweden to Japan. The distinguishing feature of the family is, as it's name implies, the use of large stones; and this, coupled with the peculiar distribution of the monuments, at once suggested the convenient hypothesis of a common origin, but their subsequent spread and diffusion was involved and gave rise to interactions which further mask the issue. Egypt, Syria, Scandinavia and the Iberian peninsula have all been suggested as likely centres from which the megalith idea spread. The very
fact of their being so many conflicting opinions emphasized the difficulties of the problem. (Jessup 1930: 63).

Although these volumes were intended for the general public they mirrored contemporary archaeological thought and explanations. The explanations might be simplified for an uninitiated audience, they were still the explanations favoured by archaeologists. And, just as the accounts written by archaeologists for archaeologists overlooked the role of women in the past, so too did these more popular works present a phallocentric view of history. The past they envisaged was also an hierarchical one, the further back one went the more squalid and primitive the society:

Life at Whitehawk Camp must have been at a very low level. We have spoken of the Neolithic folk as enjoying the elements of material civilization, but this does not imply that they were in the least degree civilized in their manners... in the filling of the third ditch disclosed some sordid secrets... someone had squatted for a sufficient length of time to leave a good deal of litter. He had made a fire at which he cooked his food... But among the animal bones we found parts of the brain pans of two human skulls, three small fragments of which had been charred in the fire... What were these children’s skulls doing round this domestic hearth unless the occupant of this phase of the ditch was a cannibal? Not content, however, with living amid this filthy litter he must needs bury his young wife and her infant at the end of his little ditch, within 20 feet of his hearth... we came across the skeleton of another young woman... flung into the ditch with the other refuse... with no sort of prepared grave or any token of care or esteem. (Curwen 1954: 75-6).

Other writers may have used less emotive language but they were working within the same parameters. Peake and Fleure’s *The Corridors of Time* (1927 - 1956) was a far more wide-ranging study encompassing world archaeology rather than just a county. Again they were purportedly written for the general reader as much as the specialist. They too concentrated on a past explicable through the migration of particular racial types (fig. 7.31), their artefacts (fig. 7.32) and their monuments. There was a market for these books, the ten volume *Corridors of Time* was published by the Oxford University Press and *The County Archaeologies* by Methuen, both major publishing houses and neither of whom would have embarked on a series of books unless they expected them to sell.

The popular books written by Childe *Man Makes Himself* (1936) and *Progress and Archaeology* (1944) were published by the small company The Thinkers Library but *What Happened in History* (1942) was published by Penguin. Childe’s normally dense
prose style was further complicated in these volumes by the number of his objectives. Childe was writing a history of prehistory, but he was also valorising ‘objective’ science (Childe 1948: 2) and tackling the questions of progress and evolution. Concepts which he felt had been uncritically accepted by the Victorians:

Trade was expanding, the productivity of industry was increasing, wealth was accumulating. Scientific discoveries promised a boundless advance in men’s control over Nature and consequently unlimited possibilities of further production. Growing prosperity and deepening knowledge inspired an atmosphere of unprecedented optimism throughout the western world. (Childe 1948: 1).

As Julian Huxley had done with evolution, Childe was attempting to critically theorise these ideas of evolution and progress in regard to prehistory (Peterson 2003: 10-12). And, Childe was attempting to do all of this within the conventions of an explicit Marxist ‘realist’ history:

This sort of history can naturally be linked up with what is termed prehistory. The archaeologist collects, classifies, and compares the tools and weapons of our ancestors and forerunners, examines the houses they built, the fields they tilled, the food they ate (or rather discarded). These are the tools and instruments of production, characteristic of economic systems that no written document describes. Like any modern machine or construction, these ancient relics and monuments are applications of contemporary knowledge or science existing when they were fashioned. (Childe 1948: 6).

Weighted down with so many different agendas it is unsurprising that Man Makes Himself and Progress and Archaeology are not the easiest books to read or the most convincing exposition of any of these theories. The simplification of his arguments which Childe referred to in the Preface of Man Makes Himself (1948: vii) was most obvious in his equation of progress as an increase in an individual’s chance of survival (1948: 12). While the insistence on Marxist explanations often seemed, as Mrs Chitty (in conversation, 1994) complained, to be ‘clumsily tacked on’. Childe made many references social systems and economic organisations being defined by the ‘tools of production’:

the stone axe ... is the home made product that could be fashioned and used by anybody in a self-contained group of hunters or peasants. It implies neither specialization of labour nor trade beyond the group. The bronze axe which replaces it is not only a superior instrument, it also presupposes a more complex economic and social structure. The casting of bronze ... is a specialist’s job and these specialists must rely for such primary necessities as food upon a surplus produced by other specialists ... One or both of the constituents will ... have to be imported. Such importation is possible only if some sort of communications and trade have been established, and if there is a surplus of some local product to barter for metals. (Childe 1948: 8 and see 35-6).
Childe’s attempt at scientific objectivity was even less successful, in his discussion of pottery he reproduced contemporary understandings of gender:

Fancy cannot work in a vacuum. What it creates must be like something already known. Moreover, pots were generally made by women and for women and women are particularly suspicious of radical innovations. (Childe 1948: 93).

Nor can it be said that Childe’s past was markedly different from those produced by his non-Marxist contemporaries. The insistence on economic revolutions equating with new materials was still acceptable within conventional parameters since Childe argued these innovations arrived through diffusion (Childe 1944: 56-73), or invasion (1948: 73-7). Again the emphasis was on the identification of different culture groups through their material remains, although Childe was less concerned with describing typologies of artefacts and more concerned with detailing the major innovations. Whether these books appealed to those desiring information about archaeology is debatable. The only evidence I have of their popularity is anecdotal and comes from my father who said he and his friends, who were all Marxists or Trotskyites, bought these books because they knew they were written by a Marxist, rather than because of a wish to know about prehistory.

In 1935 a publishing revolution took place. Allen Lane, the Director of The Bodley Head publishers launched Penguin books. In 1937 Pelican books were introduced ‘to cover serious contemporary issues’ particularly history. Lane explained his vision in very similar words to those used by Crawford of Antiquity:

There are many who despair at what they regard as the low level of people’s intelligence. We, however, believed in the existence in this country of a vast reading public for intelligent books and at a low price. (Lane 1938).

Archaeology became part of this project, and although the majority of archaeology books were published by Pelican after the Second World War, the few pre-war publications marked something of a departure for archaeological studies. Woolley’s Digging up the Past was reprinted by Pelican in 1937, and his Ur of the Chaldees in 1938.

Digging up the Past was originally a series of six talks by Woolley broadcast by the BBC. It followed much the same course as the popular books discussed in section 7.7.2 below. Woolley began with the assertion that there was more to archaeology than ‘mere
romance’ (Woolley 1930: 11), rather than treasure it was the ‘pots and pans, these beads and weapons’ (1930: 13) that were significant:

The importance of our archaeological material is that it throws light on the history of men very like ourselves, on a civilisation that is bound up with that of to-day. (ibid).

Despite this assertion the majority of the book was concerned with the romantic and the exceptional Ur, the ‘Antioch chalice’, Tutankhamun, and Egyptian temples were all discussed. There was the usual justification of the emphasis on artefacts. Woolley explained that expeditions were generally funded by institutions such as museums and were therefore anxious to attain material for display:

... a perfectly good motive, because an appeal to the eye is the best way of awakening an interest in a new form of knowledge “seeing is believing” and museums are a big factor in education. (Woolley 1930: 38).

Where this book differed from the popular approaches was that Woolley attempted to describe how an archaeologist went about choosing and then excavating a site:

In a dry summer the grass withers more quickly where the soil lies thin over the buried tops of stone walls, and I have seen the entire plan of a Roman villa spread out before me where no spade has ever dug; darker lines in a field of growing corn or, in the very early morning, a difference in tone given by the dew on the blades, will show where buildings run underground. (Woolley 1930: 31-2).

Woolley discussed how archaeologists laid out their trenches and the use of plans to reconstruct a site, but his main emphasis was on the recovery and preservation of the artefacts, with particular reference to his work at Ur (see for example 1930: 115-122). And, for all Woolley celebrated the field archaeologist as opening ‘new chapters in the history of civilised man’ (1930: 142), the past he constructed reflected the understandings of the present in terms of gender and race. Men were active, while women were passive (Woolley 1930: 98). Race defined character, so Arabs were ‘unaccustomed’ to the ‘routine of work’ and innate gamblers (Woolley 1930: 47). Ethiopians were presented as part of the unchanging, undeveloped Africa seen in section 4.3.2. Their psychology stemmed from their race, since ancient times they had, like other Africans, a ‘love of foreign novelty’ and, had suffered from ‘African inconstancy’ (Woolley 1930: 127).

Ur of the Chaldees (1929) marked a new departure in popular archaeology writing. Where other authors confined themselves to brief biographies of famous authors or famous sites, or gave an outline of the history of ‘mankind’ from antiquity to the
present, *Ur of the Chaldees* was a popular account of the excavation of one site. Woolley explained the decision to publish such a book:

> The annual reports are not accessible to everyone and are often too detailed for general readers, and newspaper accounts dealing with successive phases of the work are ephemeral and even in the mass give no connected picture. (Woolley 1950: 9).

Graves and Hodge (see section 7.7.4 below) remarked that Woolley had explicitly connected Ur with Abraham and the Flood, as indeed he did (Woolley 1950: 23ff), but Woolley was writing the entire history of Ur as it was then known. The book outlined Ur’s foundation as a simple settlement of ‘Semitic speaking Akkadians’ (1950: 16) similar to the occupants of al’Ubaid nearby, through Ur’s development into an immensely important Sumerian city site with complex buildings and temples, and then detailed Ur’s decline:

> The splendour of the Third Dynasty of Ur went out in shame and disaster. The sturdy mountaineers of Persia swept over the river-valley, the Sumerian forces were beaten in the field, the king of Ur was carried away captive, and when the Elamites returned to their hills they left behind them a wasted land with its temples overthrown and its cities in ruins. (Woolley 1950: 111).

Although the description of the Royal Tombs dominated this account (1950: 27-67), Woolley was attempting to explain how archaeologists understood the past through the surviving material remains:

> ... the ruins which we had previously excavated at Ur cover a period of more than two thousand years, and at every age when there was much building activity the type of brick employed shows some modification; the standards of measure, the relative proportions of the bricks, change, often different clays are used, and one can generally recognize at a glance and nearly always confirm with a metre scale the date of any wall or isolated brick. (Woolley 1950: 21-2).

And, even when discussing the richness of the Royal Tombs Woolley detailed how the artefacts had been stabilised, removed, and restored (1950: 61-66), and their importance for archaeology, as well as describing the wealth and craftsmanship these items indicated.

*Ur of the Chaldees* was an unusual popular book. The many reprints and re-publication by Penguin demonstrates that a factual account of an excavation was read with interest. Obviously it helped that Ur revealed some of the richest burials and outstanding artefacts ever seen. It must also have helped that the excavations had received extensive
newspaper coverage but even so, this book's popularity confirms the popular interest and appeal of archaeology between the wars.

7.6.3 Other media
Books were not the only media used by archaeologists to reach the public. I will talk below about how archaeology was reported by the press (see section 7.7.3), but this newspaper coverage worked both ways. Journalists reported on exciting discoveries, archaeologists could use the papers to disseminate their work. Wheeler was particularly adept at manipulating the media. Whether he was approached by the Daily Mail over the Caerleon amphitheatre excavations (Wheeler 1955: 75-6), or whether he deliberately set out to attract them (Hawkes 1982: 96) the end result was that the Daily Mail agreed to pay for the excavation expenses in exchange for a dig diary. As it turned out Wheeler took no part in the excavations and the diary was supplied by Tessa Wheeler and this was even better copy, a ‘lone archaeologist’ (fig. 7.33) excavating an important Roman site (Collingwood 1929: 255). Wheeler then went on to make headlines with the Lydney excavations. The discovery of a coin hoard was published under the by-line of ‘King Arthur’s Small Change’ (Wheeler 1955: 98). Verulamium received press attention and Maiden Castle was seen as equally newsworthy, particularly since Wheeler ensured that exciting discoveries were relayed to the press. As he recorded in the Maiden Castle report, subscriptions from the public raised £3,307 and visitors to the excavations donated £1,266:

So large a contribution speaks eloquently for the increasing interest of the general public in archaeological discovery – an interest stimulated by many factors, amongst which the local and national newspaper press deserves special praise. The press is not always accurate and does not always emphasize those aspects of an excavation which are scientifically the most important, but sympathetic help from the directors of excavation is the best corrective of these failings, and may be regarded as a scientific no less than social duty on the part of the modern archaeologist. (Wheeler 1943: 3).

Carter and Caernarvon were similarly concerned to control press coverage of the Tutankhamun discoveries, to the extent that Caernarvon made a deal with The Times that they should have exclusive reporting rights. This later became one of the points of contention with the Egyptian Antiquities Service (Simson 1999). Newspaper coverage was not the only media exploited, Caernarvon held talks with Goldwyn Picture Co. Ltd. to make a film of the discoveries (Frayling 1992: 6-8). This was to be a proper motion
picture (see below section 7.7.4), rather than the 'high quality home movies' (Beale & Healey 1975: 890) that typified American films of archaeology in the 20s or 30s, or the British Movietone news reels\textsuperscript{wii}, or even the Ministry of Education film \textit{The Beginning of History} (Hawkes 1946: 78-82).

### 7.6.4 Site Tours and Visits

The most obvious way of attracting the public and informing them about archaeology was through site visits (figs. 7.34 & 7.35). Site tours organised by local societies, stray visitors driving or rambling past, open days, all of these were opportunities to educate the public, and in return the public would hopefully contribute to the site's finances. Once again Wheeler was the master of promotion, the majority of the money needed to excavate Maiden Castle had been obtained through public appeals:

Under conditions of unobtrusive discipline, the general public were deliberately encouraged to visit the site. Notices directed the visitor's approach from the nearest main road. He was told (by notices) where to park his car and where to apply for information. Throughout the excavations it was the duty of an official guide-lecturer either to explain the work to visitors or to organize reliefs of student-lecturers who, for regulated periods, undertook this task... The public was not charged for these services, but was invited to contribute to the cost of the work... And, finally a well-stocked post-card stall is as popular as it is profitable... (Approximately 64,000 postcards and 16,000 interim reports were sold at Maiden Castle.) And trivial oddments such as beach-pebble slingstones, fragments of Roman tile, Roman oyster-shells, scraps of surface-pottery, all marked in Indian ink with the name of the site, sell readily for a few pence each, and, under proper control, are an entirely justifiable source of income. (Wheeler 1943: 3).

This public involvement with field archaeology could be drawn upon when sites were threatened by development. The campaign to buy the land around Stonehenge and present it to the nation via the National Trust, initiated by Crawford and Keiller, was in response to the RAF's hangars left at the monument after the war:

It is now nine years since Sir Cecil Chubb made the nation the magnificent present of the Stonehenge circle itself, and the great stones are safely in the charge of the Commissioners of Works. The land of the Plain around them, however, is still private property. So long as it remains in private hands, there is an obvious danger that the setting of Stonehenge may be ruined and the stones dwarfed by the erection of unsightly buildings on the Plain. Any visitor to Stonehenge may at this moment form a notion as to what, if steps are not at once taken, may happen to the Stonehenge section of the Plain. During the war the military authorities found it necessary to erect an aerodrome and rows of huts very near the circle. These have reverted to the
owner of the land, but they are still standing. In recent months an enterprising restaurateur has built a bungalow, the Stonehenge Cafe, within hail of the stones, though happily just out of sight of them. The conditions of modern transport make it extremely likely that this structure, if no preventative measures be adopted, will be the first of many, and that the monoliths will in time be surrounded by all the accessories of a popular holiday resort. The Stonehenge ring, as every British child has learnt to picture it from his earliest years, will no longer exist.

The solitude of Stonehenge should be restored, and precautions taken to ensure that our posterity will see it against the sky in the lonely majesty before which our ancestors have stood in awe throughout all our recorded history. (Baldwin et al 1927).

Archaeology was under threat from a number of causes during the inter-war period. The expansion of the suburbs in the 1920s, the increase in the number of cars, which in turn led to an increase in the number of roads revealed many previously unknown archaeological sites. The Wheeler archives at the Verulamium Museum reveal how the excavation plans for that site were disrupted and re-cast by external events:

The excavation of Verulamium in the years 1930-1934 originated in a coincidence of archaeological need and local opportunity. The former, at this late date, needs no elaboration; the latter, it may be recalled, lay in the acquisition, by the Borough of St. Albans, of the southern half of the walled site, now known to have taken shape in the 2nd century A. D. A central area within the new Corporation property accordingly remained for three years the main focus of the excavations, supplemented by an intensive examination of the town defences ... At the end of that period a halt was called, not because the work of excavation had reached completion but because of the imminence of a new and dominating factor - the proposed building of a 100-foot arterial by-pass road right through the Belgic and Roman sites ... Every subsequent modification of the road-plan included some part of the early Roman site in its compass ... Now at last, thanks largely to the determined agitation of Lord Verulam, the new road has been moved lock, stock and barrel out of the Verulamium landscape ... If all goes as it should, for some time to come small-scale digs may profitably proceed in the Verulamium complex year by year, supplying alike a convenient training-ground for the young and a means of filling in the archaeological and historical outlines established in the earlier excavations. (Wheeler 1939: Verulamium archive).

7.6.5 Summary

Archaeology needed public interest and funding, and archaeologists were aware of this need. Through exhibitions, site tours and publications they attempted to control the image and identity of archaeology. Archaeologists portrayed themselves as the
custodians of the undocumented and documented past, the only people who could elucidate these mysteries. And, this identity was constructed through negatives as well as positives, as the custodians and explicators they were the archaeologists, which meant everyone else was not. But, at the same time it would be wrong to take too cynical a view of this control, archaeologists wanted to spread their knowledge. The debate about archaeology and education at the *Future of Archaeology Conference* (Dobson 1944; Corder 1944; Wade Gery 1944; Robertson 1944; Varley 1944 and Chitty 1944), the Ministry of Information film (Hawkes 1946), the newspaper reports and news reels, the books, exhibitions and site visits were about spreading the word of archaeology, attracting more amateurs and professionals into the discipline and promoting a knowledge and interest in archaeology.

### 7.7 The Public and Archaeology

The public interest in archaeology was not confined to the material released by archaeologists. While archaeologists had control over museum exhibitions, the presentation of their sites, and a modicum of authority over the newspaper accounts of archaeological discoveries, they had no control over the way the public chose to use this information. Nor did archaeology have any control over the way archaeological imagery was used in advertisements or by architects. Howard Carter became embroiled in a controversy with Wembley Amusements Ltd over their reproduction of Tutankhamun’s Tomb at the 1924/5 Empire Exhibition (Frayling 1992: 36). Equally annoying for Carter was that he and Caernarvon were unable to entirely control the press in the Valley of the Kings. Newspapers might rely on archaeologists for information about their discoveries, but as Wheeler noted (1943: 3) journalists did not always accurately report what they were told, they wanted the interesting story and when the fabulous wealth of Tutankhamun’s burial became commonplace stories of ‘the curse’ dominated the papers. Popular histories and popular archaeology books written by non-archaeologists did not always follow the dominant discourse and preferred explanations. Most followed the traditional interpretation of archaeologists as heroes and villains, but at the time when archaeology was trying to portray itself as an objective scientific study, popular writers were more concerned with presenting archaeology as treasure hunting.
7.7.1 Popular writers

There were few representations of archaeologists in inter-war fiction, and very few references to archaeology. In Jan Struther's *Mrs Miniver* Woolley's work was mentioned in connection with digging trenches for war-time protection:

> Woolley and the rest of 'em dig to uncover past civilisations. We dig to bury our own. (Struther 1939: 67-8)

When archaeologists and archaeology did appear in fiction it was often in the context of crime novels, written either by archaeologists or those close to archaeology. In somewhat poor taste Stanley Casson's *Murder by Burial* (1938) used the events of the 1931 season at Colchester when the section collapsed on Christopher Hawkes and J.P. Bushe-Fox as the murder method. Glyn Daniel, under the pen name Dilwyn Rees wrote *The Cambridge Murders* (1945, published by Penguin in 1952) while on active service in Delhi, his detective Sir Richard Carrington was a Professor of Prehistory and Vice-President of a Cambridge college. Agatha Christie incorporated archaeology and archaeologists in three of her books: *The Man in the Brown Suit* (1924), *Murder in Mesopotamia* (1936) and *They Came to Baghdad* (1951). *The Man in the Brown Suit* preceded Ms Christie's marriage to Max Mallowan and involvement in archaeology and this novel rendered archaeology as physical anthropology with the solution to the mystery resting on the difference in skull shapes. *Murder in Mesopotamia* was a thinly disguised account of the Woolleys' excavations at Ur, however, despite the murder weapon being a quern, there was little archaeological information. *They Came to Baghdad* included not only a wonderful portrayal of Max Mallowan as the absent-minded archaeologist Dr Pauncefoot Jones and an equally fine caricature of Mortimer Wheeler as Sir Rupert Crofton Lee, but was also far more descriptive of what took place on a Near Eastern excavation. Agatha Christie also wrote *Come tell me how you live* which although it was published in 1946 was written and based on her experiences with Mallowan in Iraq and Syria during the 30s. But this book was written to amuse, rather than educate the public, so although we are told about the preparations:

> ... buying of stores; engaging of a chauffeur and a cook; visits to the *Service des Antiquités*; a delightful lunch with M. Seyrig the Director ... we also have long and complicated dealings with the Bank. (Christie Mallowan 1985: 31)

About the examination of possible sites:

> All the Tells in this region have possibilities, unlike the ones further south. Sherds of pottery of the 2nd and 3rd millennium are frequent and Roman remains are scanty. There is early prehistoric painted hand-made pottery as well. (Christie Mallowan 1985: 51).
And the process of excavation:

The system is a simple one. The men are organised in gangs. Men with any previous experience of digging, and men who seem intelligent and quick to learn, are chosen as pickmen ... When his square of ground has been traced out to him, he starts upon it with a pick. After him comes the spademan. With his spade he shovels the earth into baskets, which three or four ‘basket boys’ then carry away ... When a group of pots in position, or the bones of a burial, or traces of mud-brick walls are found, then the foreman calls for Max, and things proceed with due care. (Christie Mallowan 1985: 77-8).

We are not really told what Max Mallowan was looking for and whether he found it.

The primary intention was always to amuse:

My sister says tearfully she has a feeling that she will never see me again. I am not very much impressed, because she has felt this every time I go to the East. And what, she asks, is she to do if Rosalind gets appendicitis? ... all I can think of to reply is: ‘Don’t operate on her yourself!’ For my sister has a great reputation for hasty action with her scissors, attacking impartially boils, haircutting and dressmaking – usually, I must admit with great success. (Christie Mallowan 1985: 22).

Popular presentations from those outside the discipline were more concerned with producing supposedly factual accounts of the ‘big’ archaeological discoveries, or like the Quennell’s Everyday Life Series aimed at providing a history of Britain for schoolchildren.

7.7.2 The Romance of the Spade

The majority of popular histories of archaeology dealt with discoveries from Egypt, the Near East, Italy and Greece rather than the more mundane area of European prehistory. Just as with the later standard histories, the popular accounts used individuals and their discoveries to illustrate the various periods of archaeological discovery. Casson (1940: 12) echoing Macaulay announced ‘History ... is made by individuals’:

... some acute mind appears, some man of vision and brilliance, who by his contributions advances the study to a new and more developed condition ... I have emphasised the work done by certain particular men, and have necessarily omitted mention of the work of hundreds of other minor men whose contributions in the aggregate are important, but whose individual work has not necessarily advanced the subject. (Casson 1940, 11).

The emphasis was on adventure, heroics and the big discoveries. Belzoni, Layard, Schliemann, Egypt, Nineveh and Troy. Although the same figures were used over and over with much the same narrative the quality of writing, and more importantly the understanding of archaeology varied considerably. Masters’ The Romance of
Archaeology (1923) which was published by the reputable firm of The Bodley Head was startlingly inaccurate on a variety of subjects. My favourite combined a misunderstanding of the mechanics of evolution and Petrie’s (1904: 7) statement about archaeologists having calloused hands:

... in a week or two he [Petrie] was having a personal lesson in evolution. Soft hands were useless to him in such a task. So nature quickly realigned itself to the different circumstances and evolved hard hands for him, toughened the skin of the palms and back and tempered the finger-nails until he could rummage about all day in the sand with absolute impunity. (Masters 1923: 28).

Baikie by contrast in The Glamour of Near Eastern Excavations (1924) provided a readable accurate account placing his heroes in their cultural context and discussed the effects on archaeology of the Grand Tour (1924: 37), Napoleon’s expedition to Egypt (1924: 6-8) and made the point that:

... questions of archaeology were continually complicated by questions of national pride and prestige, so that the early story of Egyptian exploration is not the story of pure research, conducted for the love of truth and of antiquity, but very often merely the story of how the representative of France strove with the representative of Britain or Italy for the possession of some ancient monument whose capture might bring glory to his nation, or profit to his own purse. (Baikie 1924: 8).

The majority of these books added interesting snippets of biographical information ignored by the more scholarly histories of archaeology. Boulton (1930: 213) in The Romance of Archaeology suggested that contrary to the accepted story Schliemann had trained in archaeology spending two years studying in France between 1863 and 1865. Michaelis (1908: 25) in A Century of Archaeological Discoveries discussed the inauguration of the Musée Napoléon set up to house the material removed from Italy and the other areas conquered by the French republicans. This Parisian museum offered free admission to the public, but when Napoleon was incarcerated on St Helena it closed down and was not replaced.

Generally however, the details of actual archaeology were scanty. What archaeologists did and why was largely ignored or covered by vague statements such as:

These are the men who are writing history. They are doing it not with a pen, but with a spade and pick. (Masters 1923: 14).

Or Magoffin and Davis (1930: 39) who informed the reader ‘Scientific archaeology does not dig at random, however fortuitous its finds may be’ but failed to provide any details on how ‘scientific’ archaeologists chose their sites. Boulton (1930: 65-6; 114;
122) went a stage further and completely ignored the mechanics of archaeology by employing the useful catch-phrase ‘There is no need to record the details ...’:

No point would be gained by enumerating the various discoveries that were made either at Kauyunjik or Nimroud ... Generally speaking, it was a continuation of the same kind of work and finds; galleries were dug, corridors were cleared, chambers opened, bas-reliefs, colossal human-headed bulls and inscriptions were disinterred, exactly as before. (Boulton 1930: 136).

And, although most of these writers discussed the discovery of Tutankhamun’s tomb, they all seem to have been defeated by describing Carter’s excavation techniques:

Excitement and admiration of the beautiful objects had to be curbed; the position of each object had to be noted exactly before it was touched, because like the position of revolvers or bloodstains in a detective story, this was an important clue to what actually happened in the first place, and thus added to the knowledge of Egyptian beliefs and burial customs ... Preservation and transport of the objects involved much experiment and exercise of ingenuity, and many feats of engineering. (Harrison 1937: 49-50 and see Boulton 1930: 69: Magoffin and Davies 1930: 60-66).

Instead of discussing how archaeologists operated their work was shrouded in mystery and described in superlatives; Champollion was ‘incredible’ his achievements ‘almost a miracle’ (Masters 1923: 10). Petrie ‘brought about a revolution in Egypt’ Masters (1923: 22) wrote, although the details were left vague, Petrie was also endowed with almost supernatural powers:

A brilliant scientist like Professor Petrie is able to deduce the most amazing things from a piece of pottery, even if it be but a fragment. To him the fragment serves the purpose of a calendar. It was as though he was picking up a modern calendar on which the year stood boldly out. (Masters 1923: 19).

These criticisms may seem unfair given that these books were simply intended to be entertaining accounts of adventure, but the authors had stated that their work was intended to educate the public about archaeology and its connection with modern life:

Archaeology is undoubtedly succeeding in giving the human touch to inanimate things of long ago, and thereby quickening the dead past with a vitality that makes our inheritance of the ages a living possession of priceless worth. (Magoffin and Davies, 1930, 19).

Archaeology was presented as a corrective to history:

Chaos, in scientific hands, soon came to order, History rewrote itself as its facts were served up on the archaeologists spade. (Magoffin and Davies, 1930, 52).

But, these phrases amount to empty rhetoric when no detail was given as to how archaeology changed history.
These books not only echoed contemporary archaeology texts by their emphasis on the material culture recovered, they also followed them in viewing the past as a degraded form of the present (Masters 1923: 15; Harrison 1937: 14 & 19). Equally, they echoed the biases of British inter-war society, there were no women archaeologists, or assistants, or foremen or labourers in these accounts. Nor were ‘foreigners’ well represented. The German duo Robert Koldewey and Hermann Helprecht who excavated Babylon and Nippur were dismissed as irrelevant (Boulton 1930: 165-6), Belzoni was heavily criticised as a ‘mere’ treasure seeker whereas Layard was given far more sympathetic treatment (Masters 1923 33 & 67). Schliemann by contrast appears to have transcended his nationality because of his use of Homer (Magoffin & Davis 1930: 63). And, Lord Elgin’s removal of the Parthenon marbles was presented as having saved the cultural heritage of ancient Greece not only from the Turks but also the ‘degraded’ Greeks who were ‘unworthy’ of their own great heritage (Boulton 1930: 225-6; Michaelis 1908: 31). This understanding of history went beyond simply celebrating British exploits and into overt racism:

When the Turk finally succeeded to supremacy of the land [Iran] any chance of a revival passed away, for the Turk is a destroyer and a desolator. (Boulton 1930: 101 and see also Harrison 1937: 66; Baikie 1924: 26).

While Masters was more concerned with celebrating British imperialism:

On the map of the world, Great Britain is small, that men should go forth from this little island and win their way in so many distant lands, that this island people should wield such power over the earth, that they should venture into the unknown places and bring vast areas under the dominion of England, seems incredible. (Masters 1923, 193).

Aside from this reflection of inter-war discourse these books, regardless of their statements to the contrary, rendered archaeology as treasure hunting. Concentrating mainly on detailing the spectacular discoveries they revealed little about how an archaeologist went about their work. However, archaeologists were not unhappy with this representation, reviewing Baikie’s *Century of Excavation in the Land of the Pharaohs* (1927), Clay (1927a: 116) remarked ‘he champions the cause of true scientific research’. Obviously the understanding of archaeology offered by these texts was acceptable to archaeologists.

The *Everyday Life* series by the Quennells intended for children of ‘public school age’ (Quennell & Quennell 1922: vi), were similarly socially situated. These books told the
tale of Britain from the Old Stone Age through to the Normans based on archaeological, documentary, and ethnographic sources:

Here we must be careful that our models are real primitives, and not degraded races, and there is all the difference in the world. The real savage is very frequently a person with unexpected virtues and cleverness, and a moral and spiritual code which is found to be admirably suited to his surroundings. These people are quite different from those tribes who, often by contact with the worst side of our civilization, have become hangers-on, and so have fallen from high estate. (Quennell & Quennell 1922: viii).

The books were frequently patronising, ‘real savages’ might have ‘unexpected cleverness’ but were still unable to comprehend civilisation:

The elaborate organization of a city: the details of its water supply, and sanitation, and its maintenance, were entirely beyond the comprehension of the Saxons; it was then, just as if to-day, a stranded aeroplane were found by a party of Australian black men; they would play with it, and steal the gadgets, and then tire of it and go away. This is what the Saxons did at Silchester. (Quennell & Quennell 1926: 4).

Occasionally condescension moved into racism, the illustration of the ‘trader’ has worryingly caricatured Semitic features (fig. 7.36). There were many similarities to the school texts discussed in section 4.3.2, the Quennells also celebrated the diversity and ‘virility’ of the races that came to Britain, albeit with a warning:

England has welcomed many men. The Piltdown Man of the Old Stone Age, and the Mediterranean men of the New Stone Age; the Goidels or Gaels; the Brythons or Britons, and the Belgae. Rome and her legionaries brought blood from all over Europe. Then came the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes; the Vikings and Normans; the Angevins, Flemmings, Huguenots, and all the other oddments who have drifted in. Age after age the soil of our island has attracted men; here they have lived, and dying, their bones or ashes have been turned into the soil of England. Each in their turn have made their contribution to the common stock, and the genius of the race, and the Viking, Norseman, or Norman, was not the least of these men. It may well be that England will go forward just so long as their courage and love of adventure are not allowed to be swamped by the vulgar chaffering of the market place. (Quennell & Quennell 1926: 112).

Reflecting the more scholarly works, the Quennells presented history as a linear progression to the present and change was brought through invasion by different races or diffusion. In the Old Stone Age ‘man’ was content to hunt and gather whatever ‘he’ could, ‘It must have been the pleasant loafing life of the beach comber’ (Quennell & Quennell 1922: 2). With the arrival of Iberian immigrants bringing the idea of agriculture from the East life changed, increasingly complex forms of government and society were invented and reflected in the monuments and settlements (1922: 7-8). The
Iberians were followed by a second immigration who brought megalithic monuments, and they in turn were followed by eastern Mediterranean Bronze Age and Beaker folk. The Bronze Age was seen as the time of the individual:

... if a man was harder working than his fellows or more far-seeing, cleverer or more frugal, he could become a man of property, and, founding a family, become a chieftain. The tribe was gradually forged into a nation, and the chieftain became a petty king... We shall not be far wrong if we picture the Bronze Age people as living, like the Homeric Greeks, under kings and nobles, yet given some share in the framing of the law. (Quennell & Quennell 1922: 81).

But, the Bronze Age folk were still ‘superstitious’ and criticised for believing in magic rather than science (1922: 77). With the arrival of the different bands of Celts the Bronze Age people were enslaved and dominated by the influx of Aryans:

The diffusion of the Aryan language coincided with great changes and migrations of the European peoples. The old Neolithic civilization had carried men forward as a tribe, and in a state which did not offer much opportunity to the individual. While the pioneer work was being done, the adventurous men had plenty to occupy them, and then may have become restless as conditions became more settled, and have seized power, not necessarily from a selfish point of view, but to satisfy wider ambitions and to obtain more movement and colour in life. We come to the Age of Heroes. The chieftain, or patriarch of the tribe, has to give way to the hero, who welds it into a nation and becomes a king. Again it may have been the work of a great prophet with some new message for the souls of men and this view is borne out by the pregnant fact that man now begins to burn his dead instead of burying them. (Quennell & Quennell 1922: 13-14).

And, so it went on through the ages and the coming of the Romans, Saxons, Vikings and Normans, each age brought new skills and new elements to the British character.

Where these books differed is that they included women and children. Women were constructed entirely through the domestic (figs. 7.37 & 7.38), but without the passivity of the official government posters seen in Chapter 4. She ‘looked after the home, while her husband was hunter and herdsman’ (Quennell & Quennell 1922: 26), although there was an attempt to make this interpretation significant:

She probably did far more than just cook and mend; we must think of her as an inventor. With pottery the long train was started which has led up to the modern saucepan; before then, meat could only be roasted over a fire, or baked in a cooking-pit, but with a stout earthen pot that could be placed in the ashes the Neolithic equivalent of Irish stew was possible. Water could be heated, and milk and grain stored. (ibid).

Since these were children’s books the Quennells’ knew it was necessary to engage children’s interest by including them in the portrayal of the past (see figs. 7.39 & 7.40).
Obviously, this was not a revolutionary concept for children’s history books, but it is noticeable here because in neither the popular or scholarly works about the past were children mentioned. Equally noticeable was that although the Quennells relied on ideas of progress through the ‘evolution’ of social systems and artefacts (fig. 7.41) they also pictured the artefacts in use (figs. 7.42 & 7.43). Not only must these books have appealed to children, but they were appreciated by archaeologists as providing a starting point for those interested in the subject (Clay 1927b: 127).

7.7.3 Newspapers

British newspapers regularly carried stories about archaeological discoveries. *The Times* and *The Illustrated London News* in particular covered archaeological excavations, and local newspapers often devoted space to digs and archaeologists. Ludovic Mann, the amateur Scottish archaeologist, was regularly featured in the *Glasgow Herald*, the *Evening Times* and the *Morning Post* and his dispute over the dating of crannogs enlivened many of the letters pages (Mann archive RCHAMS). The Wiltshire Gazette covered the annual speech of the President of the Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Society. And, as mentioned above the *Daily Mail* covered the Caerleon Amphitheatre excavations. It was the newspaper editors who decided what was a major discovery rather than the archaeologists, so only Ur and Tutankhamun gained extensive coverage during the 20s and 30s. The discovery of Tutankhamun’s tomb grabbed and retained the headlines for months. Having signed an exclusive with Carnarvon *The Times* was then obligated to keep the Tutankhamun story running for as long as possible. The quantity of gold artefacts and the death of Carnarvon initially made this an easily fulfilled duty. The quality and quantity of coverage by the press varied considerably between papers, newspapers such as *The Morning Post* and *The Daily Express* which had reported the initial discovery then turned to their ‘usual material of divorce, murder and rape’, were delighted with ‘the curse’ story as a means of selling papers (Frayling 1992: 46-55 and see below).

As a periodical rather than a daily paper *The Illustrated London News* had more time and space to devote to archaeological discoveries. They were not always the first with news of an exciting discovery, but they provided first hand or at least informed reporting often by the archaeologists themselves. In its pages Arthur Evans discussed Knossos, Hogarth reported on Crete and Carchemish, Bulleid on Glastonbury, Petrie on
various sites in Egypt. In particular there were reports about Ur by Woolley and Hall and detailed reports on Tutankhamun by Carter and Carnarvon since *The I L N* shared the exclusive contract. Bacon, the archaeological editor of *The I L N* for thirty years, recorded that between 1922 and 1931 there were twenty-two major features on Tutankhamun all with colour or black and white photographs (fig. 7.44). Bacon argued that the discovery:

... opened the eyes of a vast public to the fascination and glamour of the past. It sensitised them, so to speak, to the other less spectacular but archaeologically more important discoveries being made in this period. (Bacon 1976: 13).

This may have been the case, but it is noticeable that the sites covered in the periodical were rarely British ones, and were always rich in photogenic artefacts. Whether any of the readers took from the newspapers an image of archaeology that was anything other than glorified treasure hunting seems unlikely. It was the spectacle of archaeology that was consumed by the popular press and public, rather than the idea that archaeologists were trying to promote that of archaeology as a science.

**7.7.4 The Consumption of Archaeology**

The discovery of Tutankhamun’s tomb sparked off a ‘craze’ in 20s Britain, France and the US. In a completely unprecedented reaction to an archaeological excavation the media, fashion designers, architects, interior designers and advertising firms all turned to Egypt for inspiration. Frayling (1992: 22-3) in *The Face of Tutankhamun* attempted to explain why *this* discovery rather than say the royal burials at Ur were so appealing to the inter-war generation. His suggestion, following Graves and Hodge (1940) was that by explicitly linking Ur with Abraham, Woolley and Ur represented Victorianism. Ur was biblical and the Bible was no longer fashionable. Whereas Tutankhamun represented modernism, rebellion (against the beliefs of Akhenaten), and Tutankhamun being a youth struck down in his prime resonated with the post-war generation. It helped that there was also gold in unparalleled quantities. It also helped that Carnarvon was extremely good at PR and, unlike Woolley he was an aristocrat with media connections, a film buff who dined with movie moguls (Frayling 1992: 6). But, the discovery of Tutankhamun shows how little control archaeologists had over their discoveries once they became public property. Tutankhamun was relatively insignificant in archaeological terms, he marked the shift back to mainstream ancient Egyptian belief, and the move away from Amarna back to Thebes, but this was already known before
Carter found his tomb. The quantity and quality of material in Tutankhamun’s tomb was unprecedented for a modern discovery but again added little to archaeological knowledge. The general public didn’t care about these aspects, to them this was the most exciting archaeological discovery ever made, and never before or since has archaeology been so popular.

There was little that was intrinsically new to Tutmania. The use of Egyptian motifs in architecture and design had been a popular style since Napoleon’s invasion and the publication of the *Description de l’Egypte* between 1809 and 1828. The Egyptian Hall in Piccadilly, completed in 1812, was part of this revival and throughout the nineteenth-century there were upsurges of interest (Curl 1994). Nor was it only Egyptian motifs that were rediscovered, Classical architecture flourished throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with Greek and Roman statuary influencing fashion. Verdi’s *Aida* which premiered in 1871 was instantly popular. Even the supposed curse of Tutankhamun had its antecedents in mystery fiction of the nineteenth-century (Frayling 1992: 42-3). What was new in the 20s was the level of consumption. In popular music there was the ‘Tutankhamun Rag’ played by the orchestra at the Luxor Winter Palace, in entertainment the Folies Bergère offshoot ‘Tutankhamen’s Follies’. Egyptian motifs featured in architecture, furniture, fashion design, interior design, and accessories. Egypt dominated the fashion shows of 1923, with drapes, pleats, headbands, decoration included pyramid and scarab patterns (figs. 7.45 & 7.46). When Elizabeth Bowes-Lyon married the Duke of York in 1923 included in her honeymoon trousseau was a ‘Tutankhamun-inspired’ outfit embroidered with Egyptian motifs (Frayling 1992: 11). There were Egyptian influenced ceramic ranges by Clarice Cliff, jewellery ranges by Cartier, Van Cleef, and Arples, cosmetics, perfumes, even hats were linked with King Tutankhamun (figs. 7.47 & 7.48). The architecture of cinemas, factories and shops copied ancient Egyptian themes (Curl 1994: 147-220 and see figs 7.49 & 7.50). And, the woodcraft organisation the Kibbo Kift used aspects of Egyptology mixed with Native American imagery in their iconography (fig. 7.51 & 7.52 and Kibbo Kift Foundation 2004).

Not only was this level of consumption unprecedented it was mass marketed in a way that had never been done before, crossing class boundaries. Bakelite and plastic were used to produce ashtrays and jewellery, ephemera such as biscuit tins, cigarette packets
and cigarette cards reproduced Egyptian imagery (figs. 7.53 & 7.54), while the ‘sand-
dance’ became a highlight of the music halls (Frayling 1992: 20). Egyptologists became
celebrities solicited for their opinion on the treasures of Tutankhamun. Petrie lectured to
a huge audience of ‘society ladies’ in Mayfair in March 1923 (Frayling 1992: 26).
Arthur Weigall who had been an Inspector of Antiquities in Egypt was taken on as a
special correspondent by the Daily Mail. Weigall was also responsible for supervising
the construction of Tutankhamun’s tomb in the Amusement Park of the Wembley
Empire Exhibition (fig. 7.55 and Frayling 1992: 35).

With the story of the ‘Curse of Tutankhamun’ this interest moved on to a new level.
Carnarvon died on the 5th of April 1923 just as the excitement generated by the tomb
was moving off the front pages of the newspapers. All the papers, even The Times,
printed stories of the supposed curse. These articles drew on a tradition of occult tales of
ancient Egypt where items of magical power wrought havoc upon their new owners, or
doomed archaeologists inadvertently wakened the dead (Hornung 2001). Carnarvon’s
death resonated with these tales and invoked themes of mystery, the propriety of
disturbing the dead, and the occult since Carnarvon had supposedly ignored warnings
from clairvoyants. Egyptologists and museum curators joined Carter in ridiculing these
tales, but the press preferred to listen to Conan Doyle and Weigall (Frayling 1992: 42-
50) who warned of ‘evil elementals’.

The enormous popularity of the Tutankhamun excavations is inexplicable. However, it
is marked that it was the material remains and the mystery which appealed rather than
the accounts of the painstaking stabilising and removal of the artefacts. Carnarvon’s
proposed film outline covered the history of excavation at Thebes, the opening of
Tutankhamun’s tomb and the unwrapping of Tutankhamun’s mummy. The Goldwyn
Pictures’ treatment suggested adding footage of the sphinx and pyramids with a ‘re-
suggested both archaeologists and public were Orientalising Tutankhamun. The
archaeologists and the French and British governments controlled the past and present
of Egypt, while the public consumed a popularised form of Egypt’s exotic otherness.
This may not have been what the archaeologists intended, but the press and the public
took what they wanted from archaeological discoveries and used that information for
their own purposes xvii. Archaeologists needed the public to fund expeditions and
excavations, but once that material had been uncovered and displayed, archaeologists were powerless to dictate how it should be consumed and understood.

7.8 Archaeology as the Public

7.8.1 Politics
Looking at archaeologists as members of the British public presents difficulties. There is very little concrete information, the majority of biographies and autobiographies were more interested in detailing sites dug, books published and plaudits received. This is after all how and why reminiscences are written, to justify the subject’s life (Blunt & Rose 1994: 5; Smith & Watson 1996: Stanley 1995: 6-7). We have hints of external interests but only occasionally are those hints expanded into details. Pitt Rivers’ connection with Liberal politics (Bowden 1991), Arthur Evans’ involvement with Balkan independence movements (Evans 1943: 182-258), and Petrie’s commitment to right-wing anti-socialism (Drower 1985: 342-3) are examples of how archaeologists connected with the wider world and social issues. In the inter-war period we have far less information, Childe’s connection with Marxism being a rare example. Childe, despite suggestions to the contrary (Daniel 1986: 414), was wholly committed to Marxism, his popular books and scholarly work on the economic foundations of prehistory reflected his political beliefs. Talking to other archaeologists I discovered Childe’s political philosophy went beyond intellectualism; when he was visiting Mrs Chitty and her family in Yorkshire he went over to Leeds for a meeting. Mrs Chitty could not remember the name of the group Childe went to see, but said that when her father mentioned the meeting to his trade union friends ‘they were shocked, they said he [Childe] was so far on the left as to be invisible to them’ (Chitty in conversation, 1994).

Other archaeologists were less explicit about their affiliations but this does not mean they were uninterested in political or social affairs. Crawford explained that he had been initially attracted by Stalin’s communism but became disillusioned (Crawford 1955: 231). Both Margaret Murray and Gertrude Caton Thompson were connected with the suffrage movement. Margaret Murray was an early convert and walked in the ‘mud march’ of 1907 (Murray 1963: 167). She was also a member of the Society of
University Women and detailed the struggle for parity undergone by women lecturers at University College London (Murray 1963: 100 & 151-66). Gertrude Caton Thompson worked for the Conservative Women's Franchise League and became the Berkshire representative (Caton Thompson 1983: 52). Unlike Childe this commitment to feminism did not come through in their work, although their very presence as women in archaeology could be perceived as their feminist philosophy in action. Working out in Egypt and the Near East Veronica Seton-Williams saw British colonialism and the Jewish settlement of Palestine at first hand. While she was working at Acre in 1936 rioting broke out in Palestine because of the increased Jewish immigration. Dr Seton-Williams remarked 'I like most of the British who worked in Palestine was strongly pro-Arab' (Seton-Williams 1988: 52). Elsewhere (1988: 34) she referred to the 1935 riots in Egypt as being the result of Sir Samuel Hoare, the British Foreign Secretary, 'riding rough-shod over Egyptian susceptibilities'. And it is noticeable that unlike Petrie or Chubb amongst others, Dr Seton-Williams never alluded to her Arab workforce in disparaging colonialist terms (Petrie 1904: 20; 24; 25 & Chubb 1957: 83). Jacquetta Hawkes post-war political sympathies were well known, her involvement in CND was as famous as her archaeological work, but perhaps less well known was her involvement in the campaign to legalise homosexuality (see section 7.3.2 above). Alexander Curle's diary reveals that he was involved in Edinburgh's middle class social life, he was a keen gardener and member of the Scottish Rock Garden Club amongst other organisations, and he must have been involved in local politics since he became a provost (Curle diary 1939).

7.8.2 War

Aside from these hints information about archaeologists and wider society are largely lacking. Archaeologists had social networks outside archaeology, Mortimer Wheeler was connected with Augustus John's set, Glyn Daniel through his work at the BBC popularising archaeology had many friends outside Cambridge academia and archaeology, and Stuart Piggott talked of his friendship with Lord David Cecil (Piggott in conversation, 1994). However, these archaeologists and the others for whom we have biographical information seem to have been uninterested in the social issues of the inter-war period. It was only with the two world wars that we can see archaeologists as interested and integrated members of the public. Wheeler's war record is well known; in the First World War he was commissioned into the Royal Artillery (Territorial Force) as
an instructor and remained in Britain until 1917 when he was sent to the Western Front (Wheeler 1955: 37). This part of Wheeler’s autobiography (1955: 38-61) reads very lightly, a deliberately casual account of the war but, at the very end Wheeler dropped the affectation of indifference:

One morning, after a particularly heavy bout of enemy shelling, I walked back four or five hundred yards to the flattened spot known optimistically on the map as Golden Cross, where a battery of 60-pounder guns was deployed. I arrived to find four of the great guns knocked to all points of the compass, whilst two teams of heavy-draught horses, a steaming mass of pulped flesh save where a stiffening leg projected with idiotic integrity, bespattered the site. Amidst it all, lone survivor, the battery major was walking up and down aimlessly with tears streaming down his face. Twice within a few hours I had seen men weeping; the sight shocked and embarrassed me, and I turned upon my heel . . . That night...I flashed my torch to circumvent a shell-hole; the thin light lit up an arm and half-clenched hand, thrust from the mud as though to clasp my ankle, and the macabre memory has not faded. I was suddenly and violently sick. (Wheeler 1955: 61).

This more reflective mood continued in the next chapter where he remarked:

At Wroxeter under J.P. Bushe-Fox we had been groping towards something a little more adequate, inspired, as each generation fortunately is, by a filial contempt for our elders. But then the First German War had blotted us out... we had been blotted out... of five university students who worked together in the Wroxeter excavations of 1913, one only survived the war. It so happened that survivor was myself. (Wheeler 1955: 66).

Much has been written about how the First World War signalled the end of innocence for British middle and upper-class men. Sassoon’s many poems and memoirs, Graves’ *Goodbye to All That* (1929), Blunden’s *Undertones of War* (1928) and Brittain’s *Testament of Youth* (1933) all detailed how their lives had been torn apart by the war. These two passages from Wheeler also give a tiny flavour of how the war affected this generation. Crawford’s narrative of his war-time experiences was less emotionally evocative but it re-iterated the dislocation the war caused. Crawford remarked that when war was declared:

I had regarded as ultimately inevitable a struggle for power between the British Empire and Germany, but only in a remote and detached way. If it happened I expected it to be fought between professional armies and navies, and the last thing I thought of was that I should take part in it myself... Consequently when Mrs Peake hinted to me about enlistment I was taken completely by surprise. Such a thing had never entered my head! (Crawford 1955: 109).

Crawford enlisted on the 1st of September and was sent to the trenches in France; shelling he declared to be ‘exquisitely uncomfortable’ (Crawford 1955: 112). By pulling
strings Crawford left the trenches and by 1917 was in the RFC. He was shot down and hospitalised, on his return he qualified as an observer, was shot down again in 1918 and this time captured (Crawford 1955: 134). He attempted to escape (fig. 7.56) but was recaptured and placed in solitary confinement before being sent to Holzmindeminden where he remained for the rest of the war. Again, this dispassionate account broke at the end when he talked of being liberated:

> It was a queer feeling to walk out and see things one had looked at for so long from a new angle. During my seven months there I had only once been outside, on a parole walk, I never went for another because I found this mirage of freedom too tantalising. (Crawford 1955: 145).

On the train back the ex-prisoners marked when:

> ...we were out of Germany and free at last. it was another great moment; we were all quite overcome, and even at that distance of half a lifetime I cannot recall it without emotion. (Crawford 1955: 146).

Those archaeologists who were not on the front line still experienced the disruption of war. Gertrude Bell initially worked for the Red Cross before transferring to Baghdad to use her Arabic in the Intelligence Service. Woolley, Lawrence, and Hogarth, all of whom were Arabic speakers and had combined archaeology with spying immediately prior to the war (Silberman 1982: 191-5) also worked in intelligence. Winifred Lamb after finishing her Classics degree at Cambridge in 1917 joined Naval Intelligence (Gill 2004). Gertrude Caton Thompson initially volunteered for the Women’s Emergency Corps ‘I used to envy the fighting men and those with worthwhile jobs’ (Caton Thompson: 1983: 65). In 1917 she began work at the Ministry of Shipping and became secretary to Arthur Salter, Director of Ship Requisition. In 1919 she went to the peace conference in Paris where she met Gertrude Bell and T.E. Lawrence (1983: 78). Dorothy Garrod first worked for the Ministry of Munitions then joined the Catholic Women’s League who were working in France and the Rhineland (Caton Thompson 1969: 340). While this work may not have had the drama of Crawford or Wheeler’s experiences they were still subject to the trauma of war-time, and although they were physically safe they all lost male friends and relatives to the war. In her obituary of Dorothy Garrod, Gertrude Caton Thompson (1969: 341) recorded that all three of Garrod’s brothers died in the war. The youngest died in the flu epidemic of 1919 just before his mobilisation:

> The tragedy left a permanent imprint on their sister for they were a devoted and integrated family. She once told me that she resolved, at that dreadful
time, to try to compensate her parents, as far as lay in her power, by achieving a life they could feel worthy of the family tradition. (ibid).

Alexander Curie’s diary, which covered the First World War in detail, is a fascinating account of an archaeologist on the home-front dealing with the disruption of war. The physicality of war did not come particularly close. But the material facts of the war, the propaganda, food shortages, and need to feel involved did affect Curie. In many ways, and particularly with hindsight, it is an infuriating account. Curie appears to have uncritically accepted all that he was told by the newspapers and ‘authorities’. At the same time his politics, particularly his dislike of the working classes, make his diary very difficult to read sympathetically.

Curie began his war-time entries praising the British spirit (Curle Diary 13th October 1914) but after eleven months of war this optimism was wearing thin:

... we are just awakening to the fact that our supplies of ammunition are inadequate, and also our guns. (Curle Diary 25th June 1915).

However, by June 1916 he was once again convinced that Britain was winning:

We are still being thrilled with details of the great naval battle which took place off the coast of Jutland on the afternoon and evening of Wednesday 31st May . . . German losses, both relatively and absolutely, were greater than ours, and it is not expected that their ships will be in a condition to venture an engagement again of any sort for some months. (Curle Diary 10th June 1916).

Despite the losses in France and the ambiguity of the Somme battles, Curie was still triumphantly reporting ‘Always gains to the allies and never now any success for the Germans’ (Curle Diary 14th August 1916). Curie also believed and reported the propaganda about the conditions in Germany. As early as 1915 he reported that the ‘Austro-Germans’ were suffering far worse food shortages than the British, and again in 1916 after hearing a propaganda lecture on the subject (Curle Diary 19th December 1916). Although it took another two years to end the war Curie remained ebullient:

Yesterday was truly a Red Letter Day in the calendar of the British Empire for on it the Armistice was signed which brought hostilities to a close, and signified the total defeat of Germany and the passing of the German Empire, as we have known it, with its creed of militarism, and its sabre rattling Emperor. (Curle Diary 12th November 1918).

Curie obviously felt that the war was entirely the responsibility of the Germans, and his remarks about the peace conference reflected this view:

... the Germans are, at last, having it driven into their obtuse pates that they are a conquered nation. (Curle Diary 23rd February 1919).
Throughout the First World War there were scare stories about German spies. After the first Zeppelin raid in 1916 Curle noted:

There seems to have been much signalling by spies by means of lamps. I am incredulous of most of the spy stories, but men whose judgment I can rely on saw some flashing going on. The on dit is that at least six spies were captured. It is also said that a map was found dropped from one of the raiders showing the position of every building of importance in the town. That they should have come and gone scathless makes us all boil with wrath, but if all I hear is true, on their next visit they will meet with a more suitable reception. (Curie Diary 4th April 1916).

This entry was annotated with a later undated correction which stated the ‘spies’ were ‘probably people picking their way in the dark with electric lamps’.

One of the complaints from those serving at the front was that those at home had no understanding of life in the trenches and that they supported those in authority who unnecessarily prolonged the war. Curle was certainly guilty of war-mongering and it is here that his distance from the physicality of war was most marked:

We all know that the price of victory will be a heavy one, many of these brave youths who have answered the country’s call will return no more, but the people do not flinch, and everywhere is a spirit of absolute confidence in the victory of our allies. (Curle Diary 18th July 1916).

He was aware of the numbers dying for the Allies, but as late as 1918 was still expressing bloodthirsty sentiments:

If it were not that it would entail greater losses of life to us many of us would like Germany to suffer invasion before the end. (Curle Diary 3rd November 1918).

Yet, on other occasions Curle worried about the consequences of the war both economically and in terms of casualties. In June 1915 he recorded that the war was reputed to be costing £3,000,000 a day and later that year he remarked:

Today I was told that the war office now estimate the duration as at three years more! Who will be left to fight by the end of that time and who will have money to pay the piper? (Curle Diary 3rd August 1915).

And, he knew men who died, on the 18th of July 1916 he recorded that ‘One of the young assistant keepers from the Royal Scottish Museum has fallen’. The death of ‘Poor Wishart’, one of the attendants at the National Museum whom he obviously knew better, was recorded with more emotion (Curle Diary 25th June 1915). Curle recorded no other deaths in his diary and this appeared to be the closest he came to being personally touched by the war. I am not suggesting he was unmoved by the numbers killed, early in the war he remarked:
One's usual pre-occupations seem so trivial now in the light of such happenings. No-one can care for Museums and Archaeology. (Curle Diary 3rd August 1915).

I am suggesting however, that his distance from the fighting gave him a different attitude to actual combatants such as Wheeler or Crawford, or those such as Dorothy Garrod and Gertrude Caton Thompson who lost friends and family.

Curle was more actively involved in the war than just a recorder of events. In 1915 he wrote:

I am a special constable for the period of the war. At first our duties were nominal, but now that 200 out of the 1000 men who constitute the police force have enlisted, we are given some serious employment. On the occasion of military paroles or processions we are called out to line the streets. Every third Sunday also we are told off to take a policeman's beat for four hours. (Curle Diary 25th June 1915).

Curle remained a special constable until at least 1920 when he was on duty for the Royal Family's visit to Edinburgh in July. In addition Curle was an air-raid warden and recorded his first zeppelin raid:

... about 9.15 the electric lights suddenly sank to a dull glow ... A horrible gloom throughout the house with the filaments of the electric lamp merely showing red, tended to make one jumpy ... [We] were just coming to the conclusion that the airships were not going to arrive when about 11.30 we heard a distant boom. It was not definite enough to convince us that it was a bomb explosion, but we had not long to wait for satisfaction ... after the bombing had ceased, we looked out of the door and away to the southeast saw the glare of a great fire which we thought must be Leith docks (it really proved to be a whisky store) ... I said goodnight to my companion and left my post, some ten minutes before 3.0. I was relieved to find no signs of damage on my way home and more so to know that my family had come safely through the attack and without undue trepidation. (Curle Diary 4th April 1916).

Curle noted the shortage of male civilians:

Young men of the better classes one never sees now, of the working classes the few one meets bear the munitions badge ... In offices and shops there is increasing difficulty in carrying on business, and women are being more and more employed. For months girls have been acting as tram conductors, now a 'post missie' delivers our letters. (Curle Diary 18th July 1916).

Decreasing availability of manpower affected Curle, in 1916 he was offered the post of Director of the Royal Scottish Museum in addition to his post at the National Museum. Even with this added responsibility he felt he was making an insufficient contribution to the war effort and joined those making munitions in the museum workshops three evenings a week. Curle appears to have been frustrated by his inactivity and the
National Museum, which was in the process of being modernised when the war began, was closed for the duration (Curle Diary 25th June 1915). As was noted in the previous chapter, excavations were largely discontinued during the war, and after a short season at Trapain Law in 1915 no further excavation took place until 1919. Curle’s assistant curator Mr Edwards had joined up in 1914, ‘I am left with George Archibald’ the library assistant (Curle Diary 13th October 1914). By August of 1915 even Archibald ‘whom we all regarded as a nincompoop’ (Curle Diary 3rd August 1915) had joined the Artillery. The gallery attendants had already ‘returned to the ranks’ (Curle Diary 13th October 1914) and Curle was left with his female secretary in a largely empty museum.

Other social issues affected civilians. Food shortages became increasingly severe after the poor harvest of 1916 and the onset of the German submarine campaign in 1917:

In consequence we have all been requested to put ourselves on voluntary rations 2½lbs of meat, ¾lbs of sugar, 4lbs of bread, or 3lbs of flour per head per week. We are allowed, however, to make up with oatmeal and other substitutes. At breakfast we never have any other ‘dish’ than porridge, and we use barley, or wheatmeal bread, and oatcakes as much as possible. We all thrive quite well; personally I have never felt better. (Curle Diary 18th February 1917).

The shortages continued, Curle took on an allotment. ‘Potatoes’ he recorded ‘are very scarce and we have given up eating them, using semolina fried in little cakes instead’. Sugar was rationed to half a pound a week in 1918, this was followed by the rationing of tea, fat, meat and bacon (Curle Diary 21st April 1918).

There were aspects of Curle’s life that were relatively unaffected. He still took long summer holidays, in 1916 he and his family went away for six weeks (Curle Diary 18th July 1916), in 1917 they were away for two months (Curle Diary 4th August 1917). He continued to dine with the Society of Antiquaries Club, he formed an Art Lover’s Club, and was a member of the University Dining Club (Curle Diary 17th December 1916). The Curle family still employed servants (Curle Diary 4th April 1916 & 14th August 1916). The war did little to change Curle’s philosophy, he was particularly class conscious (see sections 5.3.2 and 5.3.3 above) and this attitude was not changed by the war. Despite his remark that ‘the spirit of the people in all classes could not be better’ (Curle Diary 13th January 1918) Curle was still an unreflexive member of Britain’s hierarchical society. In his milder moments this was indicated by references to the middle and upper classes as ‘the better classes’ (Curle Diary 18th July 1916) and to his...
son Sandy's fellow officers in the Gordon Highlanders as 'temporary gentlemen' (Curle Diary: 23rd February 1919), which were obviously intended to be humorous. This insensitivity was more pronounced when it was mixed with fear that the working classes were becoming too self-assertive, Curle wrote of compulsory rationing:

To us it will probably make little difference in the amount [we eat] but it will mean a proper reduction to those in the working classes, miners, munitions workers etc who are making huge wages and spending them extravagantly on food. (Curle Diary 13th January 1918).

This attack on working-class improvidence reflects the middle-class belief that the working-classes needed to be monitored and externally controlled as was seen in section 4.3.4 above.

As I have argued (section 4.3.3) the first World War did little to change the status of the working classes, or women. However, in the inter-war period archaeology became a recognisable discipline mainly through the work of those who survived the First World War. Reading Graves, Sassoon, Brittain and Holtby and then reading Wheeler, Crawford and Caton Thompson there is a similarity. The energy and drive of these archaeologists combining relief at survival and a need in Caton Thompson's (1969: 361) words to 'compensate' for those who died by making archaeology a respectable 'scientific' pursuit had its echoes in those who campaigned for the social involvement from the government or who attempted to be the best writers and poets of their generation. Obviously Wheeler or Graves were driven by personal ambition but it is also feasible that some of Wheeler's 'demonic energy' was a result of being a survivor. Crawford's war-time experiences led to his interest in the use of aerial photography in archaeology, but his almost missionary zeal to spread the word of archaeology through Antiquity is a less obvious off-shoot. But as Wheeler (1955: 66) remarked his generation felt they were the new voice of archaeology they were challenging the old guard of Bushe-Fox and Reginald Smith, developing new techniques and approaches. This energy and enthusiasm attracted a whole new generation of archaeologists and archaeology became more accessible. As I have suggested above there was little difficulty in becoming involved in archaeology, the difficulty was remaining involved.

The Second World War is less relevant to this thesis since the consequences go beyond my timespan, but it is worth noting how it immediately affected archaeology and archaeologists. The authorities were far more prepared for this war than the previous
one, conscription, fuel and food rationing, and the internment of 'enemy aliens' including the Bersus were immediately implemented. Civilians found it easier to become involved. In the First World War despite having some medical training Margaret Murray had been unable to find war work due to her age:

I did manage to go for a few weeks to St Malo to help in a French hospital staffed by English doctors and nurses. (Murray 1963: 104).

In the 2nd war, at the age of seventy-five, she was more successful:

I became a lecturer in the organisation which sent lecturers to isolated camps of anti-aircraft guns and of search-lights, whose local H.Q. was Cambridge. (Murray 1963: 106).

Whereas in the First World War only Arabic speakers amongst archaeologists were seen as especially useful, in the World War II few archaeologists served in the ranks, instead the majority were drafted into non-combative work. Leonard Woolley was appointed Archaeological Adviser to the War Office and Katherine Woolley became his honorary assistant (Brittain 1960: 209)\textsuperscript{\textendash}. Jacquetta Hawkes worked in propaganda, Christopher Hawkes was at the Ministry of Aircraft Production (Hawkes 1989: 52); Veronica Seton-Williams and Joan du Plat Taylor were also at the Ministry of Information (Seton-Williams 1988: 95), while Grace Thornton, who with Glyn Daniel had studied Nordic and Germanic languages under Chadwick, joined the Foreign Office and was Petty Minister in Iceland during the war (Daniel 1986: 84). Margaret Stewart who had done graduate work at Edinburgh while Childe was the Abercromby Professor worked at Bletchley (Proudfoot in conversation, 2000). There were a great number of archaeologists working in Photo Intelligence at the Central Air Photographic Unit at Medmenham including Phillips, Clark and Daniel. Through Daniel's influence (1986: 135), Stuart Piggott and T.G.E. Powell were pulled out of the ranks and sent to the Air Photographic Unit, a great relief to Piggott who had hated the boredom of the regular army (Piggott in conversation, 1994). In 1942 Daniel (1986: 136) was sent out to India to set up a training school and photo intelligence centre there. Again he was joined by Powell and Piggott, and later Peter Murray Thriepland and, when the WAAF were cleared to go abroad, Elspeth Macalister.

Once again Arabic speakers were in demand, Seton Lloyd worked in Intelligence in Baghdad (Lloyd 1986; 89), Peggy Drower joined Freya Stark's organisation, setting up and disseminating propaganda to sympathetic Arab cells (Drower in conversation, 1994). Max Mallowan (1977: 170) was initially overlooked for service, which he felt
was due to having an Austrian father, but through personal contacts he managed to join the RAF’s Intelligence branch. Similarly in 1942 with the help of Glyn Daniel Dorothy Garrod managed to by-pass the age restrictions and join the group at Medmenham (Daniel 1986: 99). Perhaps the most impressive example of using friends and contacts was that performed by Mortimer Wheeler. Through his connection with Colonel King ‘who was high in the counsels of the Middlesex Territorial Association’ Wheeler was given the order to raise a light anti-aircraft battery (Wheeler 1955: 121):

Our official war-time destiny was to guard the Enfield Powder and Small Arms Factories. But that was no sort of destiny for men of good and adventurous heart. (Wheeler 1955: 124).

In 1941 Wheeler and his regiment were sent to North Africa (ibid).

Wheeler was not the only archaeologist to see active service, Clare Fell joined the ATS, Peter Shinnie the RAF, Desmond Clark initially joined the 1st Defence Force guarding Victoria Falls Bridge:

... and then since I was in general opposed to the taking of life, I joined as a sergeant the 7th East Africa Field Ambulance being formed in Northern Rhodesia. (Clark 1989: 141).

Thurstan Shaw, as a Quaker, was a conscientious objector he taught in Ghana during the war and volunteered as an ambulance assistant. Kathleen Kenyon joined the Red Cross and in 1942 was appointed Acting Director of the Institute which she held until Childe’s appointment in 1945 (Evans 1985: 14-16). W.F. Grimes excavated defence sites. With the bombing of Southampton and the hit on the OS HQ Crawford joined the new body called the National Buildings Record which photographed buildings of architectural or historical interest that were in danger of bombing or had already been damaged (Crawford 1955: 275-6). Archaeological wives, although tied to domesticity were equally involved. In his absence Desmond Clark’s wife, Betty, took over the running of the David Livingstone Museum (Clark 1989: 143). When Nash Williams was called up Aileen Fox took over his lecturing at Cardiff (Fox in conversation, 1994). Peggy Guido who was caring for her niece moved to Dorset and became involved in evacuee work (Guido in conversation, 1994).

The difference between archaeologists roles in the First and Second World War was marked. But the reasons seem unclear, whether it was due to the government realising they had lost too many intellectuals in the previous conflict as Veronica Seton-Williams (1988:92) believed. Whether it was due to it now being recognised that archaeologists
had usable skills, or simply that there were enough Oxbridge archaeologists with sufficiently important connections to ensure they had interesting work, is debatable. Whatever the cause, in both wars archaeologists very largely stopped being archaeologists. They, like every other British citizen, were acted upon rather than autonomous actors and became partners in the national crisis which had to be overcome. Archaeologists were visibly part of wider society.

7.9 Conclusion

By the 1920s and 1930s archaeology had a distinct identity. Not only was it possible to study archaeology, archaeologists were also trained in fieldwork and a few found employment in archaeology-related posts. But, this identity went beyond fulfilling a role or undertaking certain tasks. Archaeologists had built up formal and social networks, there were societies, journals and conferences where archaeologists could disseminate their ideas, agree on practices and learn of new discoveries. Archaeologists were interacting, working together, visiting each other’s excavations, socialising together. Archaeologists marked themselves as a particular social group through their clothes and their language. Archaeologists laid claim to being authorities about the past. Through excavations, museum displays and their books archaeologists demarcated the un-written past as their territory. Their authority, and their exclusion of non-archaeologists, was generally accepted by the press and public.

However, archaeologists also inhabited the same society as their public. Their written work reflected that society’s concerns with race, class and gender and these understandings were transferred to the past. Similarly the class and gender relationships seen in inter-war Britain as a whole were reproduced within archaeology. Access to the past and to becoming an archaeologist was reliant on class. The working classes could consume archaeology through museums and publications, but their only active role was labouring on excavations. Middle and upper class women could become archaeologists, but they were careful to present themselves to the public as unthreatening and overtly feminine. And, the two world wars demonstrated that archaeologists were not divorced from their society. In the first world war archaeologists volunteered, in the second they
were conscripted, but they were seen and saw themselves as part of wider British society, as well as members of a smaller and distinct group.

Archaeology’s hegemony over the past was accepted but the press and the public chose which aspects of that past were relevant to them. The press decided which archaeology-related stories to publish, which sites to promote and which exhibitions to cover. Likewise the public chose whether to buy the books, visit the digs or exhibitions, or read the newspaper coverage. Or even whether they chose to purchase a piece of that past. The architects, designers, jewellers and advertisers were all part of that educated public and yet it was they who re-made and reproduced archaeological motifs for popular consumption. Archaeological discoveries became public property and when they did archaeologists lost sole control, they could choose how they presented the past, but not how it was consumed, understood and re-interpreted by the public. It is these contradictions, these connections, reflections, integrations and disruptions which I find fascinating about inter-war archaeology and inter-war society.
Notes.

1 As was suggested by Clark's Presidential address in 1985:
Let me begin by removing one misapprehension. My hands are not dripping with East Anglian blood, nor have I just wiped them clean. The Prehistoric Society was not the outcome of a revolutionary putsch. It stemmed from nothing more dramatic than a recognition that the Prehistoric Society had long ceased to be East Anglian. When we met at Norwich Castle for our Annual General Meeting in 1935 and passed the resolution which eliminated the words 'of East Anglia' from our title we were merely recognizing a fact, that we had long ceased to be East Anglia in anything but name. There were no dissentient voices. (Clark 1985: 1)

2 They celebrated by drinking whisky which Daniel thought the only appropriate drink given it was 8.30 in the morning (Piggott in conversation, 1994).

3 However this tolerance was not universal see Roberts 2002.

4 I have been told that there were rumours about Turville-Petre and a member of the Arab workforce, but then I was also told the same thing, again in confidence, about Howard Carter.

5 Everyone I spoke to mentioned at least one enemy or fellow archaeologist that they actively disliked unfortunately, this was then followed by the request that this remain confidential. So, here I intend to rely largely on published work.

6 Richard Reece informed that Barbara Parker (Lady Mallowan) moved into Eastern archaeology to get as far away from Wheeler as she could (Reece pers comm.)

7 Others including Geoffrey Bushnell called him 'flash Harry' (Fell in conversation, 1994).

8 In fact he was referring to Daniel and Piggott but this was only made explicit in Jacquetta Hawkes' biography of Wheeler (1982: 222).

9 In particular the biographies and autobiographies of archaeologists. Many of the autobiographies were distributed by the smaller publishing houses, Gertrude Caton Thompson's Mixed Memoirs (1983) by Paradigm, Aileen Fox's Aileen a Pioneering Archaeologist (2000) by Gracewing, however some autobiographies were produced by the major houses Crawford's Said and Done (1955) was published by Weidenfeld and Nicholson, Daniel's Some Small Harvest by (1986) Thames and Hudson. Wheeler's Still Digging (1955) was enormously popular reflecting his status as a media celebrity, this was originally published by Michael Joseph with a paperback version by Pan. If the major publishing houses were prepared to publish archaeological autobiographies it suggests that individual archaeologists were well-known and that there was a perceived market for their work.

10 The essence of the scientific attitude, is, indeed the abandonment of personal prejudices and the subordination of private likes and dislikes. (Childe 1948: 2).

11 It may be that I am underestimating Childe's economic narrative of prehistory. I have read a great deal of Marxist history that is both more subtle and more convincing than these works. Having read Childe's less 'simplified' works where he relied as much on artefact typologies as his contemporaries and yet was capable of producing new and exciting understandings influenced by Marxist economics, I found these books clumsy and disappointing.

12 Like that of the Wheelers excavations at St Albans which is now part of the museum's display about the excavations.

13 The premise of this unintentionally hilarious book being that both archaeology and detection relied on 'the scientific method' and Sir Richard solved the case by treating it as an 'archaeological discovery' (Daniel 1952: 64) and by imagining the police as 'rival archaeologists' (1952: 66). However, there is more about clothing, food and wine than either archaeology or crime in this book.
Dr Stone, the supposed archaeologist in *The Murder at the Vicarage* (1930) turned out to be a con-man.

An earlier series dealt with the period from 1066 to the 20th century, but relied on historical documents rather than using any archaeological information.

Examples of the use of archaeology abound in children’s literature, not just Egypt and the East, British archaeology has also been a source of inspiration (Garner 1975; Sutcliff 1954, 1956; 1957; Mayne 1969).

Her report of these riots was as follows: ‘The Jews were not slow to defend themselves and crates of merchandise being unloaded at Jaffa and Haifa had burst open showering out rifles, machine guns and hand grenades consigned by the Zionist authorities in Europe to their more belligerent cadres in Palestine. The Arab fellahin, deserted to a large extent by the landowners who were making a profit out of selling land to the Jews turned to force and tried to take the law into their own hands: after all it was they who were being dispossessed of their ancestral homes.’ (Seton-Williams 1988: 52).

Although James Curle seems to have been even more passionate, his excavation diary has sections on compost and pruning fruit trees.

There was obviously a power struggle amongst the Alpine gardeners because Curle’s entry reads ‘My great interest in the cultivation of Alpines caused me to be elected president of the Scottish Rock Garden Club, but owing to the exceedingly discourteous and irregular behaviour of certain individuals at the annual general meeting in 1938, I have retired and declined to have anything more to do with it.’

Until I read Curle’s diary I had no idea there were any munitions works outside the factories, and have found no reference to other casual arms manufacturing in any of the histories of the war. Whether this was a Scottish thing or more widespread I have no idea, or indeed whether there was a need for such work or if it was simply a way of channelling patriotic fervour.

Katherine Woolley died in 1945 and left £800 as a bequest to fund a travelling fellowship in archaeology (*ibid*).

I had wondered if the strings Wheeler pulled went any higher than Colonel King. Wheeler had become acquainted with Churchill in 1939 and had helped with supplying information for Churchill’s *A History of English-Speaking Peoples* (1956–58) by giving Churchill lectures on prehistory and early British history (Jenkins 2001: 523–4).
8 Conclusions

I said in the introduction to this thesis that I wanted to construct a more human orientated history of archaeology. One that looked at archaeologists as people rather than just as producers of archaeological information. I wanted to try and understand what the term archaeology meant to inter-war practitioners and how the discipline was understood within the wider social context. To understand archaeology in the 20s and 30s I felt it was necessary to look at what had already been said about the period by other historians of archaeology. I explained in Chapter 2 how I had felt disappointed by their coverage of archaeological history, that I felt there was more to this era than was represented by an examination of the written work. The constraints under which these authors were writing meant they presented the history of archaeology as a seamless logical progression from a state of uncertainty to one of knowledge. I am not disputing that archaeologists in the twentieth century knew far more about the past than seventeenth century antiquarians, but I would argue that archaeologists of the twentieth century, like ourselves and antiquarians of the seventeenth century, understood the past in terms of the present. It is those in the present who construct the past and use it for their own purposes. This is neither cynical nor suspect, rather it shows that we continue to find the past relevant, we look to the past for inspiration, for stories that interest us, we examine past traces and form them into histories which please us. Just as this history of archaeology is the one that interests me, it is shaped by my concerns. The scope of study and the conclusions reached represent my understanding of the past.

I felt that there was insufficient information in the standard histories of archaeology to really understand British archaeology in the 20s and 30s, to understand what it meant to be an archaeologist, what an archaeologist did, and how this reflected inter-war British society. I began by looking in detail at that society, and tried to imagine how life was lived in this period. The inter-war period has been labelled as the beginning of state intervention in citizen’s lives, a time when class and gender boundaries were breached, when the British Empire began to collapse, and Britain became a fairer, more democratic society. I argued that this was not the case; that state intervention had begun before the First World War and reached an unprecedented level in that war and then retreated. I suggested that class and gender still remained as categories, as ways of
measuring and constructing sections of British society, and that these constructions were restrictive. Rather than being aware of the imminent end of their empire I stated that British society was saturated in images of that empire and its subject peoples. As part of this imperial ethos race was still seen as determining character and ability. Inter-war British society was, to a modern observer, a sharply divided hierarchical society where inequality and oppression were written into the way that society functioned. Individuals managed to escape from their allotted roles, but for the majority of constructed others the external production of their identity predetermined their destiny.

It was within this restrictive society that British archaeologists grew up, were educated, and went on to perform their archaeology. I emphasised that the overwhelming majority of archaeologists were middle class. The upper classes were markedly absent and, with the exception of a few working class men, proletarian involvement in archaeology was limited to labouring on excavations. Using the archives, field manuals, and site-reports I argued that the hierarchy within British society was reflected in archaeological fieldwork. Those who conducted excavations were those who had access to power and autonomy in British society, likewise those who were relatively powerless were confined to menial roles or to being consumers of the past being produced for them. I also mentioned that, just as was seen in wider society, there was an underlying fear and mistrust of the working classes by the middle class archaeologists. I noted that while excavation was not necessarily as gendered as Lucas (2001: 7) has suggested, women were rarely officially in charge of large-scale excavations either here or abroad. Although falling outside the geographical parameters of this thesis I discussed how ideas of race and colonialism were present in archaeologists fieldwork practices. Wheeler, Droop, and Petrie saw their workers ability in terms of their race, and made generalised statements about how different nations performed in the field.

The bourgeois nature of archaeology was also apparent in the chapter on employment and training. I suggested that there was little in the way of formalised training for those wishing to become archaeologists. The principal form of instruction was through personal mentors, and I noted that by modern standards these archaeologists were grossly under-prepared when they went into the field. I mentioned how archaeologists stressed their work was 'scientific' and yet there was nothing scientific about 20s and 30s archaeology or archaeologists. In fact, most practitioners were arts graduates. The
very fact of them being graduates reinforced the middle class nature of archaeology since the majority of the British working classes were not qualified, and could not afford, to pursue their education beyond an elementary level. I also discussed how employment was more gendered than fieldwork, there were very few employment possibilities and the majority of posts that were available went to men. Again, this reflected the trends of wider British society, and meant that if women wished to remain involved in archaeology they had to possess private incomes, or be married to other, sympathetic, archaeologists. I suggested that this situation benefited archaeology since wives regularly assisted their husbands with their fieldwork, and occasionally with their academic or museum work. While women were not officially excluded from archaeology on the grounds of their sex, the constraints of wider society ensured they had a limited access to the past. In turn this has resulted in their contribution being downplayed or overlooked by later observers, just as the contribution of working class labourers has been generally forgotten.

In Chapter 7 I discussed how archaeologists had created an identity for themselves that was separate from other academics and wider society in general. Archaeologists in the 20s and 30s felt they were creating a new form of archaeology one that was distinct from the work that had preceded it and the ‘establishment’ archaeologists of the Society of Antiquaries of London and the rest of the old guard. This identity involved the development of particular fieldwork methods, but it also included clothing and social networks, as well as the creation of distinct explanations and approaches to examining past societies. This work encompassed the devising of culture groups and culture histories, but also incorporated the development of regional and period syntheses. Within this identity the middle class character of British archaeology and archaeologists was again apparent. The past that was created reflected bourgeois values. It was an hierarchical past of aristocracies and peasants, change in the material record was explained as indicating the arrival of superior peoples who colonised and controlled their new surroundings and the primitive natives. Each new influx of people or ideas was seen as bringing the past closer to the present. Diffusion and migration forced progress and evolution on the barbaric inhabitants of the past until they moved out of their squalor and into ‘civilisation’. Parallels were sought amongst anthropological and ethnographic descriptions of contemporary ‘primitive’ societies. Underlying this understanding of the past, and present, was the Eurocentric belief in Western
supremacy. Race again was seen to dictate ability. This construction of the past also incorporated inter-war concepts of gender; women were presented as negligible, passive and domestic, while men were seen as active and innovative. Regardless of the sex of the archaeologist or their own experience of gender and race constructions, these stereotypes were a constant motif of their written work.

In this penultimate chapter I also discussed how archaeologists interacted with the public, and how the public understood archaeology. Archaeologists relied on public subscriptions for much of their work and museums had to attract the crowds to visit their displays and exhibits. These presentations often echoed the colonialism and imperial discourse of pre-war and inter-war Britain. A view of the world which was passed on to increasing numbers of schoolchildren once museum visits had become an accepted part of the curriculum. Within this atmosphere of progress and evolution, the artefacts unearthed by archaeologists were displayed and explained; the past was primitive, the present civilised.

The ‘public’ was undoubtedly interested in archaeology, they visited the museums, bought the books, visited the sites, joined the local societies and attended lectures. Archaeology was still a hobby, a pursuit for those with leisure, for all that there were now full-time ‘professional’ practitioners. It was also still a predominantly middle class hobby. The newspapers most actively involved in promoting archaeology – The Times, The Illustrated London News, and The Daily Mail – were middle class papers. Crawford’s Period Maps were promoted in The Daily Mail (Crawford 1955: 164) and were bought by the middle classes who could afford cars and touring holidays. A year’s subscription to Antiquity cost 20 shillings, the price of ‘a good dinner’ to Crawford but impossibly expensive to those on a tighter budget. Similarly the 6d entrance fee to Verulamium Museum would have been nothing to a middle class visitor, but for a working man on a pound or two a week such an outlay was a very different proposition. Archaeology was a middle class pursuit, archaeologists explained the past in bourgeois terms, and this past was consumed by a predominantly middle class audience.

The middle class nature of inter-war archaeologists and archaeology is worth stressing, because of the impact it had upon constructions of the past and constructions of an archaeologist’s identity. Educated in imperialism and colonialism, drawn from the class
that administered the Empire at home and overseas, and equally indoctrinated with an ideology that understood gender and class in restrictive terms, archaeologists were part of, and reflected, this middle class discourse of 20s and 30s Britain. There was little questioning of this ideology, little that was radical or revolutionary to inter-war archaeological constructions of the past, and seemingly a lack of awareness of how constrained their understandings were. Yet, this was the period when British archaeologists were going beyond the mere collection of data and were attempting to synthesise their material into coherent narratives that described and explained past societies. The failure of archaeologists to explain, or even recognise, how their intellectual framework was informed by their understandings of the world prevented any serious contemporary critique of their methodology. Childe’s Marxism might seem to contradict this statement, however, even in his most overtly Marxist histories such as *Man Makes Himself* (1936) Childe was writing within the parameters of accepted archaeological explanation and while he may have questioned constructions of class, he was repeating conventional understandings of imperialism, race, and gender. It may now seem that Childe’s peers were naive to deny his undoubted commitment to Marxism, but in his written work this ideology was seen as an insignificant element of his explanations and other archaeologists could use his ideas but ignore his philosophy. And, in his private life Childe may have fraternised with the extreme left, but he was also a member of the Athenaeum Club, a gentleman’s club of unassailable respectability. This membership again meant his peers could dismiss Childe’s Marxism as a ‘pose’ (Daniel 1986: 414). It is in Childe’s fieldwork that we begin to see a departure from the usual inter-war practices; the idea of fieldwork as a collective enterprise and labourers as part of the archaeological workforce rather than simply earth-shifters was a very different approach. Wheeler talked of excavation as a shared endeavour, but as Veronica Seton-Williams (1988: 55-6) made clear there was little communality to his excavations or his narratives. Childe was certainly different in his approach to fieldwork, but to his contemporaries his Marxist politics could be disregarded and his written work reflected the dominant discourse of archaeology and inter-war society. When we look at the rest of British archaeology we see a similar lack of overt political statements, aside from the unreflexive repetition of the politics of imperialism, class structures, and understandings of gender. Other European countries developed extreme political ideologies during the 20s and 30s, and a few British people
adopted communism or fascism but the majority, including archaeologists, endorsed the moderation of inter-war politicians.

This is not to say that there was nothing radical or innovative about 20s and 30s archaeology. In a sense the histories of archaeology are right, this was the period when archaeology 'came of age', became a recognised discipline. However, it was a maturity that was reflected in deliberately creating a distinct identity, in the development of academic departments and civil service posts, and particularly in the recognition, voiced by Wheeler and Kenyon but equally believed by many others, that archaeologists needed to be trained, needed to be taught about the discipline, and how to practice archaeology in the field. It was here that the radical change took place. Archaeology was still dependent on artefacts, it was the artefacts not contexts that were seen to explain the past. Similarly it could be argued that fieldwork techniques were a refinement of, rather than a departure from, established ideas. However, what was new was the emphasis placed on fieldwork, the idea that excavation was the measure of an archaeologist. Equally new was the idea of good and bad excavation practice. Archaeologists might not have been following their own advice, they were not always recording at the detailed level they suggested was necessary, but they were insistent that records should be made and kept. There was, as noted in Chapter 5, a remarkable degree of agreement amongst the post-war manuals suggesting that archaeological excavation had become standardised, that there were agreed upon practices that needed to be fulfilled during the course of an excavation. The emphasis on stratigraphy through sections was, as Lucas (2001: 37-9 & 44) noted, also an innovation. Wheeler's elevation of the section to the same status as the plan may have reflected the desire to locate cultures in time and space. However, the importance assigned to sections has lasted far beyond the belief in culture histories. Likewise, the need for accurate field records, prompt publication, and transmission of information are all aspects of archaeology which we have continued to promote. We have further refined and modified field techniques, and we now question the belief in the objectivity of excavation, but modern fieldwork grew out of the concern with 'good' practice discernible amongst these inter-war archaeologists.

I find it strange that the histories of archaeology have largely ignored archaeological fieldwork in favour of the written work that was being produced. The individual culture
histories and syntheses relied on what was being dug up and the site reports that were published. Yet, the only reference to fieldwork techniques in these histories is a generalised impression of steady improvement. With the Wheeler-Kenyon box system we have a perfect example of a methodology that was initially seen as useful and subsequently abandoned. Rather than seamless progression we have here a dead end, and this makes me wonder how many other such occurrences have been written out of the histories. Equally puzzling is the absence of fieldwork manuals during the inter-war period. With the exception of Woolley's popular *Digging up the Past* (1930), there was no discussion by archaeologists of what they were doing or why. Two explanations suggest themselves. The first is that archaeologists of that period were simply too busy developing fieldwork strategies, writing site reports and syntheses, and generally establishing themselves as archaeological authorities to get around to writing such manuals. It was only after the Second World War that these archaeologists had the space and seniority to write these works. Alternatively, as has been suggested by Mike Hamilton (*pers comm*), the absence of inter-war manuals and the absence of discussion in the histories reflect our ambivalent attitude to fieldwork. It is excavation which separates archaeologists from historians, to the general public digging is what archaeologists do, and it is still our main source of information about the pasts we construct. Yet, at the same time we do not take fieldwork entirely seriously. For all the lip service paid to the idea that archaeology and excavation are inseparable we rate those who 'just' dig far lower than those who publish and lecture. It is conceivable that this attitude was present, if unvoiced, in the 20s and 30s. Woolley in *Digging up the Past* stressed the importance of the fieldworker (1930: 139-42), but it should be remembered that he was one of the very few eminent inter-war archaeologists who never held an academic post.

As I discussed in Chapter 2 there are other elements missing from the standard histories of archaeology. For me, the most telling has been the people themselves. Archaeology was, and is, a social practice as well as an intellectual discipline, by looking only at archaeologists published works we distance ourselves from the idea of archaeologists as people with interests and motives beyond archaeology. Ignoring these aspects means we can study archaeologists in isolation, we can construct our histories without reference to wider social issues, and we can present archaeology as a serious profession with a long and unique history. But, this approach not only ignores the way archaeology reflected
the understandings of its contemporary society, it also removes the human element, the experience of being an archaeologist between the wars. One of the most repeated remarks in the conversations I had with archaeologists was that the time between the wars was tremendous fun. The archaeologists I spoke to were all young in that period, nostalgia undoubtedly coloured their vision of their past, but to ignore their enjoyment is to lose an essential understanding of inter-war archaeology. Also, studying these archaeologists in isolation makes them into two-dimensional figures. Archaeology was sociable, archaeologists socialised with each other. They worked together, they dined together, they visited each other’s excavations, went to the same meetings and conferences. Archaeologists had affairs with each other, they inter-connected in a variety of ways and at a variety of levels. And, they were part of wider society, not only in terms of their understandings of the world, but again at a social level, they lived and worked in wider society and formed friendships outside archaeology. Archaeology may have been their primary interest but it was not their only one. The conversations I had with archaeologists ranged over wide areas, encompassing their other enthusiasms: with Stuart Piggott it was art, poetry, and folklore; with Mrs Chitty feminism and early Celtic Christianity; and with Jacquetta Hawkes I discussed CND. These topics may not be strictly relevant to archaeology but they help us to realise archaeologists were more than the sum of their written work.

As I have stressed throughout this account, this is my history of archaeology. I am aware of all that I have not said, material I have not included, and information I was unable to recover. One of my chief regrets is that I was unable to trace any of the labourers who worked on these excavations. I wanted to include their memories in this history, but this has not been possible. I have tried to mark their presence and note their importance but I am very aware of this omission. Likewise, archaeologists who were bounded by county interests have been hard to trace, but those like Dr Curwen, Mrs Cunnington and Mrs Clifford who were regular contributors to the local journals have been included in this narrative. Although they limited their work to their own county these archaeologists were part of the archaeological scene of the 1920s and 1930s and were accepted by their peers as fellow workers. I would like to be able to say more about local archaeologists contribution to archaeology and I still think this would be a worthwhile investigation. Similarly a regional investigation which compared Irish, Welsh, English, and Scottish archaeologies would repay study and enable a discussion
of whether there were different approaches to the archaeology of these areas, or indeed if nationalistic archaeologies were being formed at this level between the wars.

Although I criticised the over-emphasis given to the published material by historians of archaeology, I would have liked to have included more discussion of that published material. There is far more to be said than the little I have covered here. These works reflect a very conventional understanding of the past, for all that the use of culture groups and histories seems so radical. The environmental and economic determinism written into these views of past societies seem as constraining as the contemporary understandings which were un-reflexively imposed upon the past. A comparison to the work of historians and anthropologists showing how far archaeologists were incorporating ideas current in other disciplines and how far they were developing their own methodologies and explanations would be useful. Looking at archaeology as part of a wider intellectual pattern within inter-war Britain would give us another strand of archaeological history. It would also enable a more thorough discussion of the degree to which gender dictated areas of study. I mentioned above that the writing of syntheses was a gendered area of archaeology and it would be fascinating to discover if this was reflected in other disciplines. Dyhouse (1995: 147-8) has demonstrated that there were certain writers and certain aspects of peoples lives that were considered to be unsuitable for women to study. Similarly Margaret Murray (1963: 98) complained that when she wrote about 'unpleasant' aspects of Ancient Egypt her articles were refused, yet similar articles by men were published. What other areas were closed to women investigators? Women were encouraged to study and take part in archaeological fieldwork but then found they were denied access to positions of authority, was there a similar situation in anthropology? And, what of history, which does not have the same tradition of going 'into the field'? were the archives seen as a similar locus where gender was irrelevant and all contributors were welcome? Not only gender, but constructions of class and race could be studied within anthropology and history, and again these results could be compared to the situation within archaeology. Such an investigation would give us a much deeper understanding of archaeologists written work.

I am also aware that I criticised the histories of archaeology for their assumption that archaeology was prehistory, and yet my account has followed a similar bias. I touched on Roman archaeology, and with Curle's work mentioned his investigation of Viking
Freswick, but I am aware that I have not talked of the perceived differences between archaeologies at this time. Those I talked to were predominantly involved in prehistoric archaeology, but I feel a history of Roman archaeology or Anglo-Saxon archaeology is long overdue.

I am also aware that I have said very little about archaeology within the Empire but outside Britain. There have been fascinating studies of colonial and post-colonial archaeology, particularly with reference to Egypt (Reid 2002; Jeffreys 2003) and South Africa (Hall 2000), but more could still be done. I would love to write a synthesis which looked at imperial archaeology as part of colonial administration and asked for whom was this past being constructed? Was it seen as for the Empire, for all citizens of the Imperial domain? Was it for the inhabitants of that specific country, or solely for the consumption of the metropole? An allied question is how did this creation of these pasts affect how those colonised others were seen, were they worthy or unworthy inheritors of their past? Were they seen to have progressed or regressed? And, in the move towards self-rule how was that past which had been externally constructed viewed, was it accepted or rejected? Was it seen as relevant in the struggle for autonomy? Such an inquiry could examine the degree to which archaeological ideas and explanations in use in the metropole were transferred to the colonies, and whether there was any modification of techniques or understandings. With such an investigation it would then be possible to look at post-imperial archaeology in the colonies and ask to what extent British practices and constructions remained after the British themselves had departed.

The history that I have written is a very partial history, and I can see so many other areas that need investigation. If we are to incorporate the archaeologists themselves into our histories we need to do so now. I am aware that I spoke to only a tiny proportion of those archaeologists who were active in the 20s and 30s, most of whom have now died, and this will continue to be an issue. We have already lost most of the inter-war generation, it is important that we gather the oral testimonies of those archaeologists who were active in the 40s, 50s, and 60s before they are no longer available for consultation. To me that would be enormously sad since I found the people who were involved to be the most interesting aspect of inter-war archaeology. I hope that this history reflects how much I enjoyed meeting these archaeologists and the excitement I felt at hearing how they saw their lives within and outside archaeology.
Notes.

1 Petrie was the exception, but by the time he wrote *Methods and Aims* he had been a professor for 12 years.
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Appendix A

Summary of Conversations with Archaeologists

As part of the research for this thesis and my previous MPhil I talked to several of the archaeologists who were active during the inter-war period: Mary Chitty; Margaret Drower; Clare Fell; Aileen Fox; Peggy Guido; Jaquetta Hawkes and Stuart Piggott. These conversations provided an invaluable insight into 20s and 30s British archaeology, and also shed light on more general aspects of inter-war life. I asked each archaeologist a series of questions (see below), but invariably these questions led on to further discussion rather than being the entirety of the conversation. Much of what we discussed was arguably irrelevant to my research, however, as I have stressed these digressions helped me to understand inter-war archaeology and to see the participants as real people rather than characters of a narrative.

These conversations lasted a varying amount of time, so I spent an afternoon talking to Stuart Piggott, a weekend with Mrs Chitty, and visited Peggy Guido several times while doing research at the Devizes Museum. With the exception of Jaquetta Hawkes these discussions were informal and hugely enjoyable. My one notable failure was Jaquetta Hawkes, and I am still uncertain what went wrong during this interview. We had exchanged a series of letters and had had several telephone conversations discussing the history of archaeology and, because of my political beliefs, CND. We had, I believed, established an amiable relationship and I was looking forward to further discussions. However, I arrived on the day when the housekeeper had given notice, and within ten minutes of my arrival I was asked to leave and discouraged from seeking a further interview. Since our conversation had been limited to discussing Elsie Clifford, I am unclear how I managed to offend Jaquetta Hawkes, but obviously I did. As far as I am aware this was the only occasion when my questions were considered intrusive.

In each case preliminary contact was made by letter requesting an interview and explaining the nature of my research. This was followed by a meeting, during which I asked each participant the same questions. The answers to these questions, and more often the non-answers, led on to further discussion. With the exception of Peggy Guido
these conversations were recorded\textsuperscript{1}, and in each case I sent a transcript of our conversation to the archaeologist in question, to give them the opportunity to comment further on particular issues or to request that I suppress certain remarks they had made. I have not provided full transcripts of these conversations since it was never part of our agreement that I would do so, and to do so would be a breach of copyright (http://www.oralhistory.org.uk/ethics/). Instead I have summarised these conversations giving details of those areas most relevant to this thesis.

**Questions Asked:**

How did you become involved in archaeology?
What opportunities were there for you to become involved in archaeology?
How easy was it to become involved in archaeology?
Were there class or gender barriers to your involvement in archaeology?
What training did you receive?
What did archaeologists do?
Were archaeologists a recognisably separate section of society?
Was there a particular dress code for archaeologists?
How did archaeologists socialise?
Who were the archaeologists who most influenced your work?
Who were the most important archaeologists of your generation?
Who has been overlooked in the development of archaeology?

\begin{footnote}{Simply because I talked to Peggy Guido before I had any recording equipment.}\end{footnote}
Mary Chitty nee Kitson Clark

Mary Chitty was born in 1905 at High Heddingly near Leeds. She was the youngest of three children and the only daughter. She attended school in Scarborough before going up to Cambridge in 1923. Mrs Chitty was strongly encouraged by her family to continue her education, her father and brothers had attended Cambridge, her second brother George was a don at Cambridge while she was a student there, and her cousins both male and female also attended. Mrs Chitty noted that her mother had been determined that her daughter would go to Girton, despite Mrs Chitty being profoundly deaf.

At Girton Mrs Chitty read history for three years, and then won a bursary which enabled her to study archaeology for a year. Her involvement in archaeology, however, pre-dated this period of study. Mrs Chitty explained that her father, Edwin Kitson Clark, was a keen amateur archaeologist, a member of the Leeds Archaeological Society, the Yorkshire Archaeological Society, and a founder member of the Roman Antiquities Committee of the Yorkshire Archaeological Society. From an early age Mrs Chitty had accompanied him on expeditions with these societies. She recalled two other particular factors which had provoked her interest in archaeology. The first was finding a flint axe in their grounds and being very excited by the discovery even after her father had explained it wasn’t a prehistoric artefact but one he had made to experiment with. The other influence was the proximity Kirkstall Abbey, a favourite destination for family walks.

During her bursary year Mrs Chitty studied at the Downing Street Museum, she was taught the Palaeolithic by Miles Burkitt, later periods by Maureen O’Reilly, as well as studying palaeography and architecture. After her four years at Cambridge Mrs Chitty moved back to Yorkshire and became Secretary of the Roman Antiquaries Committee of the Yorkshire Archaeological Society. In her capacity as Secretary Mrs Chitty was involved with Ian Richmond and Dr John Lancelot Kirk’s excavations at Cawthorne Camps. In addition she organised excavations for other YAS members and raised funds for their excavations. At the same time Mrs Chitty was working on a number of other non-Yorkshire excavations, she worked with the Wheelers at Verulamium, and spent a season with Dorothy Garrod at Mount Carmel. Mrs Chitty also compiled a gazetteer of Roman sites in East Yorkshire, based in part on Cyril Fox and O.G.S. Crawford’s ideas of landscape archaeology (Kitson Clark 1935: 1-132). During the Second World War
Mrs Chitty volunteered at the Yorkshire Museum, as well as being involved in teaching archaeology to adult education classes.

Aside from her father Mrs Chitty named those she had worked with, Tessa Wheeler, Dr Kirk, Ian Richmond, Miss M.V. Taylor, Miss Lily Chitty, and Dorothy Garrod as having influenced her understanding of archaeology. In addition she cited O.G.S. Crawford and Gordon Childe as important figures in the development of archaeology. At no time did Mrs Chitty feel her gender prevented her involvement in archaeology, she stated that her decision not to direct excavations was based on her feeling of being inadequate as regards the practical nature of excavations rather than directly a consequence of her being a woman. However, Mrs Chitty did say that many women archaeologists, particularly Lily Chitty and Dorothy Garrod, were not given the recognition they deserved and she felt that this was, at least in part, because they were women.

Mrs Chitty also stressed the social nature of archaeology, she mentioned taking tea with Gordon Childe at the Athenaeum, and how he visited her family in Yorkshire. O.G.S. Crawford was another archaeologist she counted as a friend, as was Peggy Guido, and Kathleen Kenyon. While out in Palestine with Dorothy Garrod, Mrs Chitty met her future husband Derwas Chitty, who was also conducting an excavation there and there was considerable socialising between the two sites. Talking to Mrs Chitty I realised again that all the archaeologists working in Britain during the 20s and 30s knew each other, and that meetings such as the Proto and Pre-Historic Conferences were largely meetings of friends. She also stressed that archaeology was booming in the 20s and 30s 'we were on the edge of a new world and were opposed to the old fashioned ways'.

Other information gained from Mrs Chitty was that the majority of workers on Dorothy Garrod's excavations, both the staff and labourers, were predominantly women and although this may not have been a conscious decision Mrs Chitty felt it reflected Dorothy Garrod feeling more comfortable working with women. On excavations Mrs Chitty wore 'land girl' breeches with a matching coat, the advantage being that the jacket had large 'poacher's pockets'. Although she wore this uniform to dig in or go walking, Mrs Chitty did not wear these clothes when she went to meetings.
Peggy Drower (Margaret Hackforth-Jones)

Ms Drower was the only Egyptologist that I talked to, although she did state that she was an historian rather than an archaeologist, having only worked on two Egyptian excavations, before becoming a lecturer in Ancient History at UCL. Despite her training in Egyptology she had worked with the Wheelers at Verulamium and also attended at least one season at Maiden Castle. She shared a tent with Peggy Guido at Verulamium and the two became firm friends, sharing a flat in London while studying at UCL. Her experiences somewhat contradicted Stuart Piggott’s assertion that Egyptologists and those working in Classical Archaeology were seen as separate to those working in British archaeology. However, Ms Drower’s friendship with Peggy Guido and her experience of excavating on British sites does seem to have been a rare case of archaeologists and Egyptologists mixing socially.

For most of her life Ms Drower’s parents were stationed in Baghdad, her father was the legal adviser to the Iraqi Government and her mother an anthropologist who produced books on the Yezidis and Sabaeans Mandaeans. Tutankhamun was found while Peggy Drower was at school and she became very interested in Egyptology. Her mother was also interested and Ms Drower recalled her visiting Woolley’s excavations at Ur. When Ms Drower announced she wanted to be an archaeologist her mother took her to see Flinders Petrie who recommended that she attend his diploma, but that first she should spend time in the Middle East and learn German. Ms Drower spent the winter in Iraq, visiting a variety of excavations and learning Arabic, and then 6 months in Berlin. She began the diploma with Margaret Murray, but when Glanville took over from Petrie in 1933 he developed Egyptology at UCL into a degree – Archaeology and Egyptology – and Ms Drower transferred to this.

After completing her degree and gaining a 1st she went out with the Egypt Exploration Society to dig with Pendlebury at Armana and then spent 2 seasons with Oliver Myers at Armant before returning to UCL and taking up a post as Lecturer in Ancient Near Eastern History.

During the Second World War Ms Drower was seconded to Iraq and joined Freya Stark in organising the Brotherhood of Freedom. This propaganda organisation involved setting up discussion group cells, and according to Ms Drower their main message was
simplistic, the Nazis were horrid, dictatorships were nasty, and democracy was wonderful. Although Ms Drower was sceptical that they achieved anything, she was pleased to be with her parents and took the opportunity of visiting archaeological sites.

Although there may seem to have been more women working early on in Egyptology, Ms Drower stressed that they were initially there because their husbands were interested, and this, she felt, has affected how they have been remembered. Ms Drower offered the example of Hilda Petrie who, she argued, had developed into being an archaeologist in her own right, but was overshadowed by Petrie and has been seen largely as an appendage to him. Ms Drower, speaking from her experience at Verulamium and Maiden Castle, suggested that Tessa Wheeler was at least as good an archaeologist as Wheeler but his personality, and longevity, has led to her neglect.

However, she also felt it was not only wives who have been forgotten, Ms Drower remarked that Amelia Edwards while not an archaeologist was an ‘inspiration’ to archaeology, yet she has been forgotten outside Egyptology. Likewise Gertrude Bell was also an inspiring writer and an archaeologist whose influence is often overlooked. As a student and then a lecturer at UCL Ms Drower noted that there were more women than men studying Egyptology but few of these women went on to become archaeologists. Ms Drower implied that women may have found it more difficult than men to continue in archaeology after university.

Of her student days Ms Drower remembered Margaret Murray as being a very good teacher whose lectures were wide ranging and very amusing. In particular she related that Ms Murray took a ‘malicious’ pleasure in shocking her conservative colleagues by discussing the sexual nature of witch cults. Ms Drower felt that Ms Murray would have flourished as an Egyptologist had it not been for her and Hilda Petrie’s dislike of each other. Aside from this Ms Drower commented that there was little practical work in the Archaeology and Egyptology degree. The students were expected to be familiar with the various material culture of the areas they studied, they were sent out to survey the car park and garden opposite University hospital, and there was a skeleton named Charlie that they could use to memorise human bones. Aside from this there was little that was practical about the course.
Perhaps because she was aware I knew little of Egyptology, Ms Drower named few archaeologists as being particularly influential. She called Stuart Piggott a ‘genius’, praised Tessa Wheeler, and remarked that Kathleen Kenyon’s digging techniques were revolutionary.
Clare Fell

Clare Fell’s interest in archaeology stemmed initially from her parents who were members of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society. In spite of this interest when Miss Fell went up to Cambridge in 1931 her original intention was to read Economics. This proved to be a mistake, and Miss Fell’s tutor suggested she switch to Archaeology and Anthropology. After completing Section A Miss Fell was advised not to attempt Section B and instead she spent a further year in the department learning more about prehistory and Anglo-Saxon archaeology. Toty de Navarro then suggested she undertake some independent research, recommending she write up the excavation of Hunsbury hill-fort (Fell 1936). Miss Fell continued to be involved in archaeology until the Second World War when she joined the ATS and only returned to Britain in the winter of 1946/7. From 1947 Miss Fell worked at the Downing Street Museum, initially as a cataloguer and then as an assistant curator. She gave up this post when her elderly parents became ill and she moved back to Cumberland to care for them.

At Cambridge Miss Fell had been taught by Miles Burkitt and Toty de Navarro, with Dorothy Garrod was her supervisor. The emphasis had been on familiarising the students with material culture, but there was little else that was practical about the course. The students were encouraged to volunteer on T.C. Lethbridge’s excavations for the local Cambridgeshire archaeology society, but excavation was not a compulsory part of their studies. The only other practical experience Miss Fell remembered as a student was being sent out with a plane table ‘to see if you could do a survey of some area of Cambridge’. Yet, Miss Fell also remarked, as did Mrs Chitty, that archaeologists in the 1930s were expected to be proficient in all aspects of excavation right through to the writing of site reports.

In response to my questions Miss Fell stated, very firmly, that she had never felt that being a woman had affected her participation in archaeology, she maintained that there were so few archaeologists gender was irrelevant. Nor did she feel that women were excluded from posts in archaeology. Miss Fell stressed that it was because she was single, rather than because she was a woman, that she was expected to give up her job and care for her parents. However, Miss Fell did note that women were not a success on *Animal, Vegetable, Mineral?* And suggested that this was because the whole
programme had the ‘air of a Gentleman’s Club’ and ‘women were not jocular enough’.

The idea that archaeology inhabited a very small social world was also reinforced by Miss Fell. She was a contemporary of Glyn Daniel, Basil Megaw, Eleanor Hardy, Terrence Powell and Kenneth Jackson. In addition she was one of the many archaeologists who assisted Elsie Clifford on her Gloucestershire excavations, and through this got to know Christopher Hawkes and Molly Cotton amongst others. Even when Miss Fell moved back to Cumbria she kept in touch with the wider archaeological world.

Miss Fell named Grahame Clark as perhaps the most important archaeologist of her generation, and mentioned that Childe and Wheeler were also enormously influential. She praised Glyn Daniel for his popularisation of archaeology, especially through Animal, Vegetable, Mineral? ‘It made all sorts of people, who otherwise wouldn’t have been interested in archaeology, it made them think’.
Aileen Fox nee Henderson

When I talked to Lady Fox she was in the process of writing her autobiography (Fox 2000) and had obviously been reflecting on her life in archaeology. This meant our conversation was more orderly than those I had with other archaeologists, but it also means that many areas of our discussion were repeated, and amplified, in her autobiography.

Lady Fox talked of her parents’ astonishment when she announced she wanted to go to university but they supported her decision, and she went up to Newnham to study English. At the end of her degree in 1930 Lady Fox was unsure what to do next, quite by chance and needing something to occupy that summer she volunteered for Bushe-Fox’s excavations at Richborough. She began by mending pottery and ended the 2 month season as a site supervisor and determined to become an archaeologist. She returned to London and assisted Bushe-Fox with his post-excavation work, then went out to the British School at Rome for 6 months as a paying scholar. On her return she again worked at Richborough and this became the pattern for subsequent years, working at Richborough, assisting Bushe-Fox, and then travelling in Europe learning languages and visiting museums and excavations.

Although she stressed how much she owed to Bushe-Fox, Lady Fox was aware that the Wheelers were developing and imparting more advanced excavation techniques. Rather than volunteer on their excavations, she joined Dorothy Liddell’s excavations at Hembury and Meon Hill, believing that there she would learn how to draw plans and sections, and really get to grips with archaeology. In actuality, Lady Fox stated, all the work was still done by labourers and it was W.E.V. Young, rather than Ms Liddell who was in charge of the site.

In 1933 Aileen Henderson married Cyril Fox and moved to Cardiff. Although she was never officially anything other than the wife of the Director, Lady Fox was aware of everything that was going on at the museum, and was consulted by Cyril Fox about all of his archaeological work. Together they excavated in and around Glamorgan and worked jointly on the Glamorgan County History, as well as working on separate projects. Lady Fox stated that Cyril Fox was delighted to have a wife who was as interested in archaeology as he was, but she also remarked he had been surprised at how
Stuart Piggott

As with Lady Fox, Stuart Piggott had already written about his life in archaeology, some of his remarks will be familiar to anyone who has read The Pastmasters (1989) or his article in Antiquity (1980).

Stuart Piggott’s father, a schoolmaster in Petersfield had a ‘mild’ interest in archaeology and this in part led to Stuart Piggott’s interest in the past. Despite there being nothing in the way of training or a career structure, or indeed Piggott being aware of any ‘professional’ archaeologists, he was ‘determined’ to become an archaeologist. While he was a schoolboy, Stuart Piggott wrote an article for his local newspaper about some Roman pottery he had found, this was at the time when Crawford was compiling information for his Roman Britain map, and Crawford contacted Piggott’s father and from this beginning became a family friend and careers adviser to Stuart Piggott1.

Having ‘no ability to pass exams’ Stuart Piggott left school at 17 and went to work as a general assistant at Reading Museum for 10s a week. After a year Crawford put him onto a vacancy at the Ancient Monuments Commission for Wales and Piggott became a junior investigator under W.J. Hemp and Leonard Munroe. Stuart Piggott spent his holiday entitlement excavating, initially with the Curwens’ in Sussex and then with Keiller in Wessex. Piggott’s connection with Keiller began when Piggott contacted Keiller about the Neolithic material from Windmill Hill and Keiller invited him to visit his private museum in Charles Street. Their friendship grew and it was while they were working together on the Thickthorn Long Barrow that Piggott left the Ancient Monuments Commission and, again on Crawford’s recommendation, became Keiller’s private archaeologist. Together they excavated Avebury, which Stuart Piggott dismissed as ‘megalithic landscape gardening’. At the same time Piggott was attending Wheeler’s diploma course at Lancaster House. Stuart Piggott had a fund of anecdotes about this period but imparted very little actual information. During the Second World War Stuart Piggott was in the AP unit, and afterwards he wrote his thesis on Stukeley for his Oxford MA and was appointed to the Abercromby Chair at Edinburgh.

Stuart Piggott reiterated the view that 30s archaeologists were conscious that they were

1 In The Pastmasters Piggott stated that it was the local vicar who wrote the article based on Piggott’s findings (Piggott 1989: 21-2)
doing something new. He told me the story of taking over the Prehistoric Society of East Anglia, dismissing Grahame Clark’s version as ‘He doesn’t remember it with the pleasure that I do’. In Stuart Piggott’s version they plotted to get rid of the old guard by calling an unexpected meeting, Piggott borrowed an MG sport scar from Keiller and raced from Wiltshire to Norwich to attend the meeting. Disregarding the inaccuracies of this tale it demonstrates that Piggott and his set felt they were the new guard of archaeology, and that they had a great deal of potential power. At the same time Stuart Piggott stressed British archaeology was a small world ‘we were all friends or enemies’. Archaeologists socialised extensively with each other, meeting up for ‘a meal or a drink’ and talking archaeology when they did so. They visited each other’s excavations and shared information. According to Piggott there were only about a dozen people in archaeology during the 30s, and the impression he gave was that they were all prehistorians. Aside from Wheeler (who could be argued to be as much a prehistorian as Romanist), Kendrick, Leeds, Collingwood and Richmond were the only non-prehistorians he named. Piggott stated that there while his generation were in contact with European prehistorians there was little contact with British archaeologists working outside Britain.

Stuart Piggott was uncertain how far the 30s and 40s marked the beginning of specialisms within archaeology. He considered his 1930s self to be a Neolithic specialist, Hawkes to be the Iron Age specialist and Clark the Mesolithic one, but remarked these were only nominal titles. He, like many other archaeologists of his generation, found himself working on a wide variety of sites. There was, he declared, so much to do and ‘so few people to do it’ that ‘you turned your hand to whatever was needed’. Within this world he also argued that there was less snobbery about what constituted proper work for an archaeologist, folk lore for example was a perfectly respectable subject for archaeologists. Stuart Piggott collected information about Mummers plays, some of which he published and the rest he turned over to E.K Chambers. At the same time Piggott stressed that there was growing antipathy to amateurism, this was part of the reason he and Charles Phillips decided to reconstruct the Prehistoric Society of East Anglia, and he suggested this was why Elsie Clifford was blackballed by the Society of Antiquaries.

Gender was an equally difficult subject, Piggott argued that on the one hand women,
particularly wives, were welcomed as archaeological equals 'we didn’t think anything, you know, odd about it, we were just glad to find someone who was an archaeologist'. At the same time he agreed these wives were overshadowed by their husbands, and that this had been particularly so with Tessa Wheeler, and indeed Peggy Guido. He also agreed that women were unlikely to be appointed to the few posts available in archaeology and that a private income was a necessity for women archaeologists.

Professor Piggott named Wheeler, Clark and Hawkes as the important archaeologists of his generation. He described Wheeler as a 'revolutionary' although he also claimed responsibility for the remark that 'Rik writes his report, does all the illustrations, and then does the excavation'. Crawford he cited as a very important influence for getting others involved in archaeology, either as his 'ferrets' or through publishing their work in *Antiquity*. Childe was a 'remote and strange' scholar that everyone respected but no-one understood. His work on cultures was very important to their understanding of the past, and he was interested in the theory and methodology of archaeology at a time when no-one else was. Professor Piggott also mentioned a number of archaeologists that he considered to be overrated, the main one being Jaquetta Hawkes. In addition, and contradicted by the letters in the Avebury Museum, he played down the feud between Keiller and the Cunningtons and particularly his own role in this relationship.
Appendix B

Employment and Education of Archaeologists

The following lists are not exhaustive. They do not detail every archaeologist who was working between the wars. Rather they constitute a sample of these workers based entirely on archaeologists of whom I had heard and knew at least a little of their lives. I have tried to include everyone mentioned in the main body of the text. Although Table 1 suggests that the majority of archaeologists studied archaeology at university, these figures post-date 1927 and the introduction of the Archaeological Tripos at Cambridge. Prior to that date archaeologists were unable to study archaeology as a degree subject.
Table 1. Higher Education of Archaeologists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Archaeology</th>
<th>Classics</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No Higher Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glyn Daniel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.G.D Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.G. Powell</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyril Fox</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare Fell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen O'Reilly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaquetta Hawkes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurstan Shaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Desmond Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles McBurney</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Fagg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Drower</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Egyptology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winifred Lamb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.F.C. Hawkes</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Mallowan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.E. Lawrence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hogarth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Randall-Maclver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Woolley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.E.M. Wheeler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Chitty</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Evans</td>
<td>✓ with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Phillips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Garrod</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gertrude Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Seton</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>political science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Nowell Myres</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tessa Wheeler</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Kenyon</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.G.S. Crawford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.N. Gardner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Leakey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modern Languages and Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Garstang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Maxwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sorbonne, degree unspecified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyslop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalassa Cruso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Cotton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.F. Grimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latin, Greek and Philosophy at Sydney, B.Litt Oxford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.G. Childe</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aileen Fox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh O’Neill</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hencken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitty Richardson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsie Clifford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Piggott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan du Plat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Guido</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Leakey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gertrude Caton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Murray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maud Cunningham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Liddell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothea Bate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilda Petrie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Tufnell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|        | 9 | 2 | 12 | 8 | 9 | 13 |

In addition Veronica Seton Williams; Stuart Piggott; Peggy Guido; Kim Collingwood; Lesley McNair Scott, Rachel Maxwell-Hyslop, Barbara Parker, Molly Cotton and Ione Geddye all studied for the London University Institute diploma.
Table 2. Archaeologists’ employment pre 1945

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Service</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No formal post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.F.C Hawkes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. G. S. Crawford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyril Fox</td>
<td>Cyril Fox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. F. Grimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Phillips</td>
<td>Maureen O'Reilly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen O'Reilly</td>
<td>Maureen O'Reilly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. O. Curle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. C. Kendrick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan du Plat Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalassa Cruso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Desmond Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Fagg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Leakey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurstan Shaw</td>
<td>J. N. L. Myres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. G. D. Clark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glyn Daniel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dorothy Garrod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V. Gordon Childe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret Murray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miles Burkitt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tety de Navarro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellis Minns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. E. Nash-Williams</td>
<td>V. E. Nash-Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peggy Drower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kathleen Kenyon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barbara Parker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Winter Crowfoot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W. M. F. Petrie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dorothea Bate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elinor Gardner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gertrude Caton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aileen Fox</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jaquetta Hawkes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peggy Guido</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max Mallowan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winifred Lamb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leonard Woolley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Veronica Seton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tessa Wheeler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesley McNair Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maud Cunningham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexander Keiller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elsie Clifford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helen O'Neil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Leakey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dorothy Liddell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hilda Petrie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grace Crowfoot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lily Chitty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>No formal post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Kitson Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arthur Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kathleen Woolley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clare Fell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kim Collingwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hyslop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kitty Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Molly Cotton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Olga Tufnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Archaeologists’ employment post 1945

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Service</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>No formal post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elinor Gardner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gertrude Caton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jaqueta Hawkes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peggy Guido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winifred Lamb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesley McNair Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elsie Clifford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Leakey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lily Chitty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Kitson Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Olga Tufnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kim Collingwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Molly Cotton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kitty Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.E.M Wheeler</td>
<td>Maureen O'Reilly</td>
<td>Maureen O'Reilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurstan Shaw</td>
<td>V.E. Nash Williams</td>
<td>V.E. Nash Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Phillips</td>
<td>Dorothea. Bate</td>
<td>Dorothea. Bate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyril Fox</td>
<td>Barabara Parker</td>
<td>Barabara Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Desmond Clark</td>
<td>Kathleen Kenyon</td>
<td>Kathleen Kenyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Fagg</td>
<td>W.F. Grimes</td>
<td>W.F. Grimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare Fell</td>
<td>Dorothy Garrod</td>
<td>Dorothy Garrod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalassa Cruso</td>
<td>Glyn Daniel</td>
<td>Glyn Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Leakey</td>
<td>J.G.D Clark</td>
<td>J.G.D Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen O'Reilly</td>
<td>V Gordon Childe</td>
<td>V Gordon Childe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.E. Nash Williams</td>
<td>Peggy Drower</td>
<td>Peggy Drower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Atkinson</td>
<td>Richard Atkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.F. C Hawkes</td>
<td>C.F. C Hawkes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aileen Fox</td>
<td>Aileen Fox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stuart Piggott</td>
<td>Stuart Piggott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Veronica Seton</td>
<td>Veronica Seton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel Maxwell-</td>
<td>Rachel Maxwell-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hyslop</td>
<td>Hyslop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nowell Myres</td>
<td>Nowell Myres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max Mallowan</td>
<td>Max Mallowan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joan du Plat Taylor</td>
<td>Joan du Plat Taylor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Table 4. Women Archaeologists up to 1945

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Married with formal post</th>
<th>Married with no formal post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Garrod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Kenyon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan du Plat Taylor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Parker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothea Bate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Murray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Liddell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winifred Lamb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elinor Gardner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Seton Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gertrude Caton Thompson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily Chitty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Tufnell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitty Richardson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare Fell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen O'Reilly</td>
<td>Peggy Drower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Guido</td>
<td>Peggy Guido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tessa Wheeler</td>
<td>Tessa Wheeler (Kim Collingwood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Wheeler (Kim Collingwood)</td>
<td>Jaqueta Hawkes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Leakey</td>
<td>Mary Leakey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilda Petrie</td>
<td>Hilda Petrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Clark (Mrs Desmond Clark)</td>
<td>Maud Cunnington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsie Clifford</td>
<td>Elsie Clifford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Kitson Clark (Mrs Chitty)</td>
<td>Molly Cotton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mrs Chitty)</td>
<td>Lesley McNair Scott (Mrs Murray Thriepland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Cotton</td>
<td>Grace Crowfoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley McNair Scott (Mrs Murray Thriepland)</td>
<td>Rachel Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Crowfoot</td>
<td>Hyslop (Assistant Lecturer at Institute from 1947)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Maxwell</td>
<td>Aileen Fox (lecturer at Exeter from 1947)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyslop (Assistant Lecturer at Institute from 1947)</td>
<td>Aileen Fox (lecturer at Exeter from 1947)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single with formal post</th>
<th>Single with no formal post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married with formal post</td>
<td>Married with no formal post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Garrod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Kenyon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan du Plat Taylor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Parker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothea Bate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Murray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Liddell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winifred Lamb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elinor Gardner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Seton Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gertrude Caton Thompson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily Chitty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Tufnell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitty Richardson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare Fell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen O'Reilly</td>
<td>Peggy Drower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Guido</td>
<td>Peggy Guido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tessa Wheeler</td>
<td>Tessa Wheeler (Kim Collingwood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Wheeler (Kim Collingwood)</td>
<td>Jaqueta Hawkes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Leakey</td>
<td>Mary Leakey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilda Petrie</td>
<td>Hilda Petrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Clark (Mrs Desmond Clark)</td>
<td>Maud Cunnington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsie Clifford</td>
<td>Elsie Clifford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Kitson Clark (Mrs Chitty)</td>
<td>Molly Cotton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mrs Chitty)</td>
<td>Lesley McNair Scott (Mrs Murray Thriepland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Cotton</td>
<td>Grace Crowfoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley McNair Scott (Mrs Murray Thriepland)</td>
<td>Rachel Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Crowfoot</td>
<td>Hyslop (Assistant Lecturer at Institute from 1947)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Maxwell</td>
<td>Aileen Fox (lecturer at Exeter from 1947)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyslop (Assistant Lecturer at Institute from 1947)</td>
<td>Aileen Fox (lecturer at Exeter from 1947)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single with formal post</th>
<th>Single with no formal post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married with formal post</td>
<td>Married with no formal post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Garrod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Kenyon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan du Plat Taylor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Parker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothea Bate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Murray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Liddell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winifred Lamb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elinor Gardner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Seton Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gertrude Caton Thompson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily Chitty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Tufnell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitty Richardson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare Fell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen O'Reilly</td>
<td>Peggy Drower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Guido</td>
<td>Peggy Guido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tessa Wheeler</td>
<td>Tessa Wheeler (Kim Collingwood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Wheeler (Kim Collingwood)</td>
<td>Jaqueta Hawkes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Leakey</td>
<td>Mary Leakey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilda Petrie</td>
<td>Hilda Petrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Clark (Mrs Desmond Clark)</td>
<td>Maud Cunnington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsie Clifford</td>
<td>Elsie Clifford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Kitson Clark (Mrs Chitty)</td>
<td>Molly Cotton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mrs Chitty)</td>
<td>Lesley McNair Scott (Mrs Murray Thriepland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Cotton</td>
<td>Grace Crowfoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley McNair Scott (Mrs Murray Thriepland)</td>
<td>Rachel Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Crowfoot</td>
<td>Hyslop (Assistant Lecturer at Institute from 1947)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Maxwell</td>
<td>Aileen Fox (lecturer at Exeter from 1947)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyslop (Assistant Lecturer at Institute from 1947)</td>
<td>Aileen Fox (lecturer at Exeter from 1947)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single with formal post</th>
<th>Single with no formal post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married with formal post</td>
<td>Married with no formal post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Garrod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Kenyon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan du Plat Taylor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Parker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothea Bate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Murray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Liddell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winifred Lamb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elinor Gardner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Seton Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gertrude Caton Thompson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily Chitty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Tufnell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitty Richardson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare Fell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen O'Reilly</td>
<td>Peggy Drower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Guido</td>
<td>Peggy Guido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tessa Wheeler</td>
<td>Tessa Wheeler (Kim Collingwood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Wheeler (Kim Collingwood)</td>
<td>Jaqueta Hawkes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Leakey</td>
<td>Mary Leakey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilda Petrie</td>
<td>Hilda Petrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Clark (Mrs Desmond Clark)</td>
<td>Maud Cunnington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsie Clifford</td>
<td>Elsie Clifford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Kitson Clark (Mrs Chitty)</td>
<td>Molly Cotton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mrs Chitty)</td>
<td>Lesley McNair Scott (Mrs Murray Thriepland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Cotton</td>
<td>Grace Crowfoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley McNair Scott (Mrs Murray Thriepland)</td>
<td>Rachel Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Crowfoot</td>
<td>Hyslop (Assistant Lecturer at Institute from 1947)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Maxwell</td>
<td>Aileen Fox (lecturer at Exeter from 1947)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyslop (Assistant Lecturer at Institute from 1947)</td>
<td>Aileen Fox (lecturer at Exeter from 1947)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single with formal post</th>
<th>Single with no formal post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married with formal post</td>
<td>Married with no formal post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Garrod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Kenyon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan du Plat Taylor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Parker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothea Bate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Murray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Liddell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winifred Lamb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elinor Gardner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Seton Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gertrude Caton Thompson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily Chitty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Tufnell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitty Richardson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare Fell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen O'Reilly</td>
<td>Peggy Drower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Guido</td>
<td>Peggy Guido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tessa Wheeler</td>
<td>Tessa Wheeler (Kim Collingwood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Wheeler (Kim Collingwood)</td>
<td>Jaqueta Hawkes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Leakey</td>
<td>Mary Leakey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilda Petrie</td>
<td>Hilda Petrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Clark (Mrs Desmond Clark)</td>
<td>Maud Cunnington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsie Clifford</td>
<td>Elsie Clifford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Kitson Clark (Mrs Chitty)</td>
<td>Molly Cotton</td>
</tr>
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<td>(Mrs Chitty)</td>
<td>Lesley McNair Scott (Mrs Murray Thriepland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Cotton</td>
<td>Grace Crowfoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley McNair Scott (Mrs Murray Thriepland)</td>
<td>Rachel Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Crowfoot</td>
<td>Hyslop (Assistant Lecturer at Institute from 1947)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Maxwell</td>
<td>Aileen Fox (lecturer at Exeter from 1947)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyslop (Assistant Lecturer at Institute from 1947)</td>
<td>Aileen Fox (lecturer at Exeter from 1947)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Posts in Archaeology

A. Civil Service

The functions of the three branches of the Civil Service which deal with archaeological matters are described in Chapter IV.

Recruitment for the Inspectorate of Ancient Monuments and Historic Buildings, for the Royal Commissions and for the posts of Archaeology Officers of the Ordnance Survey is by advertisement and open competition. The Civil Service Commissioners, who are responsible for the recruitment, give notice of vacancies in the Press, and those interested have to apply for entrance forms and particulars. Candidates are required to supply details of their training and qualifications, and to give the names of referees for qualifications and character. Candidates are then interviewed by a selection board. Posts are open to both men and women. Vacancies do not occur at any regular intervals, as they depend on promotions and resignations within the branches. Those appointed must join the Civil Service Superannuation scheme, and they are therefore eligible for pensions when they retire.

The present establishment and salaries\(^1\) of the three branches are given below. The salaries given are those for men. Women receive somewhat lower salaries at each grade, and a lower rate of increment.

| Inspectorate of Ancient Monuments and Historic Buildings, Ministry of Works |
|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| **Grades of personnel** | **Present salary scale** | **Present numbers** |
| Assistant Inspector of Ancient Monuments | £350 x £20 to £700 | 8 |
| Inspector of Ancient Monuments | £750 to £950 | 5 |

Candidates must be between 23 and 30 years of age. Qualifications required are an Honours Degree, and an enthusiasm for and some knowledge of archaeology, especially

---

\(^1\) The scales of the Royal Commissions have just been revised (1951). The revision of those of other departments is under consideration.
of the Mediaeval period. Promotion to the grade of Inspector is by merit and according to vacancies.

The Headquarters of the Inspectorate is in London, except for Scotland, where it is in Edinburgh; two of the posts of Assistant Inspector are in Scotland. The posts involve a considerable amount of travel about the country.

Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades of personnel</th>
<th>Present salary scales</th>
<th>Present numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>£380 x £25 to £ 750</td>
<td>Combined complement of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Investigator</td>
<td>£800 x £30 to £900</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
<td>£850 x £30 to £1050</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidates must be at least 21 and under 35 years of age. They must satisfy the Civil Service Commissioners that they have received such systematic education and possess such knowledge as to fit them for the post. Those holding a university degree or corresponding qualification will be given preference. A knowledge of the history and practice of English architecture is necessary.

Royal Commission on Ancient Monuments (Scotland)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades of personnel</th>
<th>Present salary scales²</th>
<th>Present numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>£380 x £25 to £ 750</td>
<td>Combined complement of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Investigator</td>
<td>£800 x £30 to £900</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
<td>£850 x £30 to £1050</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidates must be at least 22 years of age; the upper age limit is subject to adjustment. The qualifications of candidates are not stereotyped, but some of the posts are filled by architects, not archaeologists.

Royal Commission on Ancient Monuments in Wales & Monmouthshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades of personnel</th>
<th>Present salary scales¹</th>
<th>Present numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>£380 x £25 to £ 750</td>
<td>Combined complement of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Investigator</td>
<td>£800 x £30 to £900</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
<td>£850 x £30 to £1050</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Subject to normal Civil Service provincial differentiation.
Candidates must be at least 2.1 years of age; there is not at present an upper age limit. Candidates should normally have a first or second class Honours degree, but candidates without this qualification may be accepted if otherwise exceptionally well qualified. Up to two years increments may be given for postgraduate work, and a further two for service in the armed forces. Candidates must have a knowledge of architecture, the history of applied art, or the archaeology of Britain. Knowledge of Welsh is not essential, but of two candidates with otherwise equal qualifications, the one with a knowledge of Welsh would be preferred. Any competent Investigator can rely on promotion to the Senior Investigator Grade. About one third of the working time of the staff is spent in examining monuments in the field. The small number of the staff makes it necessary for each investigator to be capable of dealing at least with the minor monuments of all periods, whatever his own special interest.

**Archaeology Branch, Ordnance Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades of personnel</th>
<th>Present salary scales</th>
<th>Present numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Archaeology Officer</td>
<td>£370 x £20 to £510 x £25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology Officer</td>
<td>to £700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology Officer</td>
<td>£850 x £30 to £1,050</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draughtsmen and Surveyors</td>
<td>According to age</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class IV</td>
<td>At 21 from £240 to a maximum of £500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>£350 x £20 to £550</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>£550 x £20 to £650</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>£650 x £25 to £750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Archaeology Officers are recruited in the same manner as for other Civil Service posts. The Draughtsmen and Surveyors are recruited from these grades within the general staff of the Ordnance Survey. Those showing an interest in and aptitude for archaeological work would stand a good chance of appointments to this Branch, after their initial training in drawing and surveying. Vacancies for draughtsmen and surveyors in the Ordnance Survey are advertised in the press, and appointments are made by examination and selection. The examination is in mathematics, geography, English and general knowledge. Candidates must be between the ages of 16 and 25. The Headquarters of the Archaeology Branch are at Chessington, Surrey.
The Archaeological Survey of Northern Ireland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades of personnel</th>
<th>Present salary scales</th>
<th>Present numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>£550 x £30 to £750</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>£750 x £30 to £950</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Adviser to the Government of Northern Ireland</td>
<td>At present held in conjunction with university lectureship</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1: Thomsen showing his Three Age system to museum visitors.

2.2: Childe with anonymous workmen (Trigger 1989: figure 25)
4.1: The Jazz Party

4.2: Travel poster, 1920s
4.3: Travel poster, 1931

4.4: Empire Day leaflet, Canada 1927
4.5: Empire Day brochure, Australia 1907

4.6: Empire Day celebrations England
4.7: Empire Day recording

4.8: John Bull and Sons and Daughters: Empire Marketing Board poster
4.9: 'The Old Order Changeth' trophy display (Edwards 2001: figure 3.4)

4.10: Solomon Island artefacts in the British Museum (Edwards 2001: figure 3.5)
4.11: *Jungles today are Gold Mines Tomorrow*, Empire Marketing Board poster

4.12: *Tobacco Plantation in Nyasaland*, Empire Marketing Board poster
4.13: *Smoke Empire Tobacco* Empire Marketing Board poster

4.14: Rowntree’s Chocolates, 1920s
4.15: Tour South Africa, travel poster 1920s, reproduced by permission of the Museum of London
The first step towards lightening

The White Man’s Burden

is through teaching the virtues of cleanliness.

Pears’ Soap

is a potent factor in brightening the dark corners of the earth as civilization advances, while amongst the cultured of all nations it holds the highest place — it is the ideal toilet soap.
4.17: Gosages’ Soap advertisement

4.18: Missionary postcard c.1903 Nkanga, Pondoland, Transloci, produced by the South Africa General Mission
4.19: Lambert and Butler Cigarette cards 1936 *Empire Air Routes* series

4.20: Free *Flags of Empire* poster, 1920s
4.21: *Women of Britain say Go!* Poster commissioned by the Parliamentary Recruiting

4.22: *VAD* recruiting poster, Joyce Denys, undated but post-1915

4.23: *Munitions* recruiting poster

4.24: *WRNS* recruiting poster, Joyce Denys
British Women! — the Royal Air Force needs your help.

4.25: *WRAF* recruiting poster 1918

Every woman not doing vital work is needed NOW.

4.26: *WRNS* recruiting poster

4.27: *ATS and WAAF* recruiting poster

4.28: *ATS* recruiting poster
4.29: Auxiliary Fire Service recruiting poster

4.30: Evacuation service recruiting poster
4.31: Women as a percentage of the total workforce 1901 to 1951. Data from Beddoe (1989)

4.32: Employed women’s occupations 1901 to 1951. Data from Beddoe (1989)
4.33: ‘Mother’ - War memorial, Norfolk

4.34: Women MPs elected 1918 to 1945. Data from Pugh (1991)
4.35: ‘Officer’ in Women’s Auxiliary Army Corps Uniform 1918
5hex not so CARELESS TALK COSTS LIVES

4.36: Fear of women, Careless Talk poster

NATIONALITY OF MARRIED WOMEN

How many women realise that even to-day, in spite of equal suffrage, BRITISH MARRIED WOMEN are still under British Law classed with

INFANTS, LUNATICS AND IDIOTS

as persons unfit to decide the question of their own nationality? A married woman is still the chattel of her husband and must accept his nationality, whatever he may choose to make it, whether she wishes to do so or not.

During the late war thousands of loyal women of British birth suffered terrible injustice and hardships through this wicked and archaic law.

As a result of ceaseless agitation during the past seven years by organisations representing over Two Million British Women a Bill to repeal the law and to give British Women the right to choose their Nationality on Marriage has been introduced in the House of Commons. This Bill is

THE NATIONALITY OF MARRIED WOMEN BILL

and unanimously passed its Second Reading in the House of Commons on November 28th last and is now before the Standing Committee of the House. It will receive its Third Reading and be passed into Law if Women of all classes and all Parties will bring pressure to bear to right this shameful wrong by resolutions through their local organisations forwarded to the Government, by personal letters to their Member of Parliament.

WOMEN of MOST FOREIGN COUNTRIES already have the RIGHT to CHOOSE THEIR OWN NATIONALITY.

SUCCESS IS IN SIGHT.

YOUR HELP & INTEREST IS NEEDED NOW.

Published by THE WOMEN'S GUILD OF EMPIRE, 185, Windsor House, Victoria St., S.W.1.
and Printed by WIGHTMAN & CO., LTD., Regency Street, Westminster, S.W.1.
5.1: Aerial photograph of excavations at Verulamium

5.2: Aerial photograph of excavations at Maiden Castle
5.3: Petrie excavation photographs (Petrie 1904)
5.4: The effects of wall following (Wheeler 1961)

5.5: Tracing masonry buildings (Kenyon 1952)

5.6: Excavation of a building (Atkinson 1946)
5.7: Verulamium, Excavation of buildings, Verulamium Archive

5.8: Verulamium excavation of buildings, Verulamium Archive
5.9: Excavation on the modified box system (Atkinson 1946)

5.10: Wheeler / Kenyon box system in India (Wheeler 1961)

5.11: Ditch section at Maiden Castle (Wheeler 1961)
special and rather cumbersome arrangements are made, the records
are exclusively parallel with one axis of the mound, and the other
axis is not adequately recorded. In a majority of instances, this par-
tiality does not matter, but it might.

The alternative method in general use meets this objection. It

is known as quartering or the quadrant method. The mound is marked
out into four quarters by two strings, laid preferably to the cardinal
points of the compass, and over the approximate centre. Opposite
quarters are then excavated in turn, a balk 14-3 feet wide being left

Fig. 18. The Ysceifiog barrow, Flintshire, showing the layout for excavation.
After Cyril Fox

5.12: Excavation and illustration of Ysceifiog Barrow (Wheeler 1961)

Fig. 19. Selected sections across the Ysceifiog barrow (om. 5 and 6 omitted).
After Cyril Fox

5.13: Round barrow excavation (Kenyon 1952)

5.14: Round barrow excavation (Atkinson 1946)
5.15: Childe's excavations at Castlelaw. RCAHMS Crown Copyright

5.16: Childe's excavations at Castlelaw. RCAHMS Crown Copyright
5.17: Verulamium Excavations, Verulamium Archive

5.18: Maiden Castle excavations (Wheeler 1943)
5.19: General Pitt-Rivers visiting the Wor Barrow excavations (Mark Knight)

5.20: Wag of Forse wages, Curle archive. RCAHMS Crown Copyright
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 17</td>
<td>Paid Matheson, Son &amp; Co.</td>
<td>£1 3'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 12</td>
<td>Wages, John McLeod, pass book</td>
<td>£2 7'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insurance stamp, Health</td>
<td>£4 6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Unemployment)</td>
<td>£6 7'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wages, Christopher McLeod, pass book</td>
<td>£1 5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wages, John Macleod</td>
<td>£2 7'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alice McLeod</td>
<td>£2 2'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Morrison, Motor Hire, pass book account</td>
<td>£1 17'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wages, Christopher McLeod, pass book</td>
<td>£1 15'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John McLeod</td>
<td>£2 7'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alice McLeod</td>
<td>£2 1 3'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paid William Morrison, Motor Hire, pass book account</td>
<td>£1 10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health Insurance stamp</td>
<td>£2 9'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wages, John Macleod</td>
<td>£1 19'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alice McLeod</td>
<td>£1 14 3'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher McLeod</td>
<td>£1 5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paid W. Morrison, Motor Hire, pass book</td>
<td>£2 18 3'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lochinver, Inverness Motor E</td>
<td>£1 14 6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Morrison, carriage on box of stones</td>
<td>£2 7 12 2'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 3'</td>
<td>Wages, John Macleod, pass book</td>
<td>£2 3 11'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alice McLeod</td>
<td>£2 1 3'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paid William Morrison, Motor Hire</td>
<td>£1 14'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharpening Pick</td>
<td>£1 1'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wages, John Macleod</td>
<td>£2 8'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alice McLeod</td>
<td>£2 1 3'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paid William Morrison, Motor Hire</td>
<td>£1 16'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wages, John Macleod</td>
<td>£1 19 3'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alice McLeod</td>
<td>£1 10 9'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paid William Morrison, Motor Hire</td>
<td>£2 3 4'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Unemployment stamps</td>
<td>£1 6 12 3'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.21: Wages paid, Cree's notes Inchnadamph excavations. RCAHMS Crown Copyright
EMPLOYERS' INDEMNITY POLICY

Estimated Amount of Wages, Salaries, and other Earnings £100.

minimum Premium on above £1.12.6

Whereas James Ritchie, Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh, (hereinafter called "the Insured")

[INFLATION ADJUSTED]

contracting with the
near Inchnadamph, Sutherland,
and as other for the purposes of this Insurance, on the basis of a proposal and declaration agreed by or on behalf of the Insured, dated the —— 6th —— day of —— June —— 1927 and held to be incorporated with the
Caledonian Insurance Company (hereinafter called "the Company"), in consideration of the payment to the Company of the above-mentioned Premium (which Premium is subject to adjustment as hereinafter provided) for the following Indemnity:

It is hereby agreed that if at any time during the period from the —— 1st —— day of —— June —— 1927 to the —— 30th —— day of —— September —— 1927 both dates inclusive, subject to the receipt of said Premium, as the Company (hereinafter called "the Company"), in consideration of the payment to the Company of the above-mentioned Premium (which Premium is subject to adjustment as hereinafter provided) for the following Indemnity:

Whereas James Ritchie, Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh, (hereinafter called "the Insured")

of the Company under this Policy, which Conditions are to be read as part of this Policy, shall be a condition precedent to any liability of the Company under this Policy.

Conditions of this Policy, which Conditions are to be read as part of this Policy, shall be a condition precedent to any liability of the Company under this Policy.

1. Every notice or communication to be given or made under this Policy shall be delivered in writing at the Head Office or any Branch Office of the Company.

2. The Insured shall give notice to the Company of any accident or claim arising under the Policy or any injury resulting therefrom, etc., to the knowledge of the Insured or of the Insured's representative for the time being, and shall forward to the Company forthwith, after inspecting the place and examining witnesses, etc., or to any written notice of claims received or information received of accident, injury or death to any Employee in the Insurer's immediate service, including therein the contracting of disease of the kind described in the above-mentioned business of the Insured, including therein the contracting of disease of the kind described in the Third Schedule to the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1923, and the Third Schedule to the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906 as applied to Northern Ireland, to the effect stated in said Acts, and in case the Insured shall be liable to make compensation for any injury under the Fatal Accidents Act, 1846, the Employers' Liability Act, 1880, the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906, as amended by the Workmen's Compensation (Northern Ireland) Act, 1933 ; the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1935 ; or at Common Law ; the Company shall indemnify the Insured against all claims for which the Insured shall be so liable, and will, in addition, be responsible for all costs and expenses incurred with its consent in defending any claim for such compensation ;

Provided always that the truth of the statements in said proposal and the due observance and fulfilment of the Conditions of this Policy, which Conditions are to be read as part of this Policy, shall be a condition precedent to any liability of the Company under this Policy.

Provided always that the truth of the statements in said proposal and the due observance and fulfilment of the Conditions of this Policy, which Conditions are to be read as part of this Policy, shall be a condition precedent to any liability of the Company under this Policy.

Any question or difference shall arise touching the meaning of this Policy, including its conditions, or as to the right, obligations, or liability of either party hereto, the same shall be referred to the decision of an Arbitrator or Arbitrators to be appointed in writing by the parties hereto, or in case of their failure to agree upon any such person or persons within three months from the date of such question or difference, or in case of their disagreement as to the decision of the Arbitrator or Arbitrators in writing before entering upon the reference.

And it is declared that this Policy is granted subject to the provisions of the Caledonian Insurance Company's Act, 1933.

In witness whereof, this Policy has been subscribed on the —— 17th —— day of —— June —— 1927.

One Thousand Nine Hundred and Twenty-seven.

By Order of the Directors

First Superintendent

Form 1.

5.22: Employer's Indemnity Insurance, Inchnadamph excavations. RCAHMS Crown Copyright
5.23: Caerleon anonymous excavation staff

5.24: Un-named workers on Petrie’s excavations at Tanis (Petrie 1904)
5.25: Caerleon excavations 1927

Selection of tools from an Eastern excavation (See p. 181)

5.26: Archaeological tools (Wheeler 1961)
5.27: Pitt-Rivers' Labourers and tools (Bowden 1991)

5.28: Lady Petrie with notebook (Seton-Williams 1988)
5.29: Measuring (Kenyon 1952)

5.30: Labourer trowelling, Skara Brae. RCAHMS Crown Copyright
5.31 Tools as labourers, Mumrills excavation. RCAHMS Crown Copyright

5.32: Tools as labourers, Skara Brae. RCAHMS Crown Copyright
5.33: Labourers as scale, Mumrills excavation. RCAHMS Crown Copyright

5.34 Labourers as indicators of features, Mumrills excavation. RCAHMS Crown Copyright
5.35: Hierarchical ditch at Maiden Castle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Measurements</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IV 6' x 3'−5' 6&quot;</td>
<td>△ Brown sand</td>
<td>Iron knife blade 3' long</td>
<td>(Sketch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>III 3' 4&quot; x 2' 3&quot;−6' 2&quot;</td>
<td>△ Loose reddish earth with occasional patches of ash</td>
<td>Spherical agate bead</td>
<td>In a local patch of wood-ash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.36: Wheeler's proposed recording system

5.38: Wheeler section conventions
This was dug by Catlin & is a cut in the S. E. come in same area but not yet connected up with Dixon's earlier cut S. of actual wall of cellar.

5.37: Verulamium notebook, Catlin and Dixon, Verulamium Archive
5.39: Wheeler section examples (Wheeler 1961)

5.40: Maiden Castle pit sections (Wheeler 1943)
5.41: Published section, Freswick Links (Curle 1939)

5.42: Newstead sections (Curle 1911)
Section of deposits filling the inner cave
3 ft from lip of roof

**Specimen Number**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen</th>
<th>6&quot; of deposit</th>
<th>5&quot; of deposit</th>
<th>8&quot; of deposit</th>
<th>7&quot; of deposit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>14&quot; clay sill, with a few small pieces (angular) of roof material</td>
<td>19&quot; angular pieces of roof material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Sleepy sand with smallish gravel, the sand having on greater proportion to the gravel. A few angular pieces of roof material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>6&quot; of deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>5&quot; of deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>8&quot; of deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>7&quot; of deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.43: Ritchie field recording of stratigraphy: Inchnadamph Cave RCAHMS Crown Copyright
5.44: Childe's schematic sections, Skara Brae notebook. RCAHMS Crown Copyright
5.45: More conventional section from Childe’s Skara Brae notebook. RCAHMS Crown Copyright

REPORT ON THE EXCAVATIONS AT SKARA BRAE.

Fig. 2. Sections of Buildings at Skara Brae.

Fig. 3. Sections of Buildings at Skara Brae.

5.46: Published Skara Brae sections (Childe 1931)
5.47: Table of pit stratigraphy, Skara Brae report (Childe 1931)
VERULAMIUM SECTION G-H SHOWING THE "FOSSE"
UNDERLYING THE 2ND CENTURY CITY-WALL NEAR PRAEWOOD HOUSE

Fig. 3.

5.49: Verulamium published section drawing (Wheeler & Wheeler 1936)
5.50: Prismatic Compass from Atkinson (1946)

5.51: Abney Clinometer from Atkinson (1946)

5.52: Plane table from Atkinson (1946)
5.54: Freswick excavation photograph (Curle 1939)
1-4. Combe-case and small-toothed combs.
5. Irish Brooch found at Croy, Inverness-shire.
6. Brooch found at Freswick.

A. O. CURLE.

PLATE XLVII.

5.55: Freswick artefact photographs (Curle 1939)
5.58: Labourers measuring and digging features at Castlelaw. RCAHMS Crown Copyright

5.59: ‘Staff’ labouring at Castlelaw. RCAHMS Crown Copyright
5.60: Verulamium site photographer, Verulamium Archive

5.62: Verulamium ‘staff’ but no labourers, Verulamium Archive
5.63: Verulamium site photograph Verulamium Archive

5.64: Wheeler and workers at the well, Verulamium Archive
5.65: Verulamium open day, Tessa Wheeler giving site tour

5.67: Verulamium open day, pot washing
5.66: Verulamium open day
5.68: Verulamium staff, informally dressed, Verulamium Archive

5.69: Verulamium, formally dressed, staged excavation Verulamium Archive
Fig. 15. Layout of a trench for three-dimensional recording

5.70: Layout of trench for three dimensional recording (Wheeler 1961)

Fig. 73

5.71: Layout of trench for three dimensional recording (Atkinson 1946)
5.72: Measuring triangle (Atkinson 1946)

5.73: Record Card, described by Wheeler in *Archaeology from the Earth* but pictured in *Beginning in Archaeology* (Kenyon 1952)
5.74: Building plan in Curle’s Freswick notebook. RCAHMS Crown Copyright

5.75: Published plan of Freswick (Curle 1939)
5.76: Artefact drawings in Curle’s Freswick notebook. RCAHMS Crown Copyright
5.77: Verulamium record card: obverse and reverse (see 5.73). Verulamium Archive
5.78: Prehistoric pottery drawing conventions (Atkinson 1946)

5.79: Roman pottery drawing conventions (Atkinson 1946)
5.80: Roman pottery from Verulamium (Wheeler and Wheeler 1936)
5.81: Samian ware from Maiden Castle (Wheeler 1943)
5.82: Prehistoric pottery from Maiden Castle (Wheeler 1943)
5.83: Photograph and profile of pottery (Curle 1939)

5.84: Photograph and profile of pottery (Childe & Grant 1939)
5.85: Flint drawings from Skara Brae (Childe 1929)

5.86: Flint drawings from Maiden Castle publication (Wheeler 1943)
5.87: Bronze brooches from Maiden Castle publication (Wheeler 1943)

5.88: Iron Age Brooches (Kendrick and Hawkes 1931)
5.89: Bone tools from Skara Brae (Childe 1929)

5.90: Bone and horn objects from Maiden Castle (Wheeler 1943)
Dear Sir,

I have pleasure in enclosing a short summary of the highly interesting results which have followed from the excavations of the caves near Inchnadamp in Sutherland.

In view of the likelihood of further gains of importance we propose to carry on the work in the summer of 1927, with the unexpended balance of the grant, namely £56.10.1. I have mentioned this proposal in the Report, but do I require to fill in another formal Application Form?

I enclose also a mass of paid bills, including all our expenditure referable to the Grant, with the exception of the Wages Bills. These also I have, but they are contained in small books, and unless they are required for scrutiny it would seem to be unnecessary to send them to you.

Yours faithfully,

Ritchie

5.91: Letter, Ritchie to Royal Society of London. RCAHMS Crown Copyright
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Purchased</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Column, etc.</td>
<td>£2.3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Flask &amp; Case</td>
<td>1.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Paper Bags</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Staves (latter affixed with)</td>
<td>1.3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sand Bags</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-ton. 1/6 Bushel.</td>
<td>2.5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3... 1/8... 4/-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3... 1/4... 6/-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stationery, Newspaper, etc.</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(See Note)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boxwood Rule</td>
<td>2/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Match Box</td>
<td>13/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trench</td>
<td>3/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chisel</td>
<td>6/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shovel</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pick</td>
<td>3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2, Anchor 20.0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pitch Bottle</td>
<td>1/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iron Rod</td>
<td>4/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Log</td>
<td>5/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>2/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Match</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[£6.7.5\]

\[£13.15.8\]

5.92: Inchnadamph excavation expenses. RCAHMS Crown Copyright
6.1: Plan and Section from the First Richborough Report (Bushe-Fox 1926)

6.2: Degree subjects studied by inter-war archaeologists
6.3: Proportion of women archaeologists with Higher Education

6.4: Women and men working at Verulamium, Verulamium Archive
6.5: Women and men working at Maiden Castle (Seton-Williams 1988)

6.6: Numbers of students taking Section A and Section B of the Archaeology and Anthropology Tripos at Cambridge 1928-1948 and proportions of women to men.
6.7: Women archaeologists 1919 to 1939: marital status and employment

6.8: Archaeologists employment before Second World War

6.9: Archaeologists employment after Second World War
7.1: Maria Bersu, Gordon Childe and Alexander Keiller at Avebury during the Congress of Pre and Proto-Historians

7.2: Kathleen Kenyon, Gordon Childe, Richard Atkinson, Stuart Piggott, Grahame Clark and Glyn Daniel at the Congress of Pre- and Proto-Historians 1950
7.5: Stuart Piggott and Harold St George Gray at Thickthorn Down 1933 (Daniel and Chippendale 1989)

7.7: Theodore McCown, Dorothy Garrod and Francis Turville-Petre at Mount Carmel (Bar-Yosef & Callander 1997)

7.8: 'Flappers'

7.9: Jean Batten, Aviator
7.10: Digging clothes, Verulamium c.1930, Verulamium Archive

7.11: The Strand, London in the early 1930s
7.12: Tessa Wheeler excavating at Verulamium, Verulamium Archive

7.13: Lady Petrie in breeches (Seton-Williams 1988)
7.14: Veronica Seton-Williams working at Maiden Castle in slacks (Seton-Williams 1988)

7.15 Women apprentices at Kew wearing knickerbockers, 1896 (Penn 1993)
I thought to myself when I first tested Rowntree’s Cocoa. I was feeling tired after a long day in the yard, but the cocoa soon put new life into me. That was weeks ago, and you’d think the spell of it would wear off after a time, but I like it more every time I taste it. As Dad says, “It seems to grow on one.” It’s lucky it’s so inexpensive—I’ve worked it out, and it costs less than a halfpenny a cup.”

---

7.16: Rowntree’s Cocoa advertisement 1919, working women wearing trousers

7.17: Women aircraft fitters wearing overalls, second world war
7.18: Hilda Petrie wearing bloomers on site in the 1890s (Drower 2004)

7.19: Veronica Seton-Williams and Mrs Garstang (together, far right) at Jericho
7.20: 'Feminine' excavation for the public at Verulamium, Verulamium Archive

7.21: Dorothy Garrod when Disney Professor (Caton Thompson 1969)
7.22: Women's suit and tie, Sears, Roebuck and Co. catalogue 1925

7.23: Una Trowbridge and Radclyffe Hall (Jivani 1997)
7.24: Women in uniform, police patrols during the first world war

7.25: Max Mallowan at Brac (Mallowan 1977)
7.26: Charles Phillips (right) in jacket and tie at Sutton Hoo (Clark 1989)

7.27: Clothing and class at Verulamium, Wheeler and workmen at the well, Verulamium Archive
Applications are invited to the post of Curator.

The Museum is now under construction and duties will commence on the 1st October 1938. Salary £250 per annum rising by annual increments of £10 to a maximum of £300. Candidates must be University Graduates and not over 30 years of age.

The appointment will be subject to three months notice of either side and the appointee will be required to pass a medical examination.

Applications endorsed "Curator stating age and qualifications accompanied by copies of three recent testimonials must be addressed to the undersigned and delivered not later than the 28th June 1938.

W. G. MARSHALL

Town Clerk.

Municipal Offices,
38 St. Peter's Street,
ST. ALBANS.
6th April, 1938.

F. H. E. Crane, Esq.,
Town Clerk's Office,
St. Albans, Herts.

Dear Mr. Crane,

I am greatly obliged to you for your letter and enclosure which have come to me on my return.

The proposed arrangements as to the curator seem to me to be admirable. I would suggest, if I may, that the advertisements, etc. should be published before the end of May with a closing date for entry in the latter part of June. This would fit in best with normal university arrangements and would help to enlarge the field candidature. If the advertisements are deferred until June, we shall of course miss the University term.

As for the evacuation of the old museum premises — this could quite easily be done at the beginning of October, if that is not too late. I would gladly, if required, come over in October and help in this matter. In other words, if you care to guarantee that by the end of October the premises shall be vacated, everything will be easy from our point of view.

Again my thanks,

Yours sincerely,

7.29: Wheeler's reply to F.H.E. Crane 28th April 1938
FIG. 9.—FLINT TOOLS FOUND TOGETHER AT BEXLEY HEATH

7.30: Artefact recognition The Archaeology of Kent (Jessup 1930)
Fig. 2. Central European broad heads.

a, b—A Czech. c—A German (Martin Luther)  
d, e—Dinaric types.

7.31: Illustration of racial types from *The Corridors of Time* (Peake and Fleure 1931)
7.32: Artefact illustration *The Corridors of Time* (Peake and Fleure 1931)

7.33: Tessa Wheeler ‘alone’ at Caerleon Amphitheatre
7.34: Christopher Hawkes giving a site tour at Camulodunum in 1931

7.35: Cyril Fox explaining Tretower to the Cambrian Archaeological Association
7.36: Suspiciously Semitic trader and Briton with currency bar (Quennell and Quennell 1922)

7.37: Woman weaving (Quennell and Quennell 1922)
7.38: Building Iron Age roundhouses, passive but present woman and child (Quennell and Quennell 1922)

7.39: Children playing with dice (Quennell and Quennell 1922)
7.40: Children discovering the laws of leverage (Quennell and Quennell 1922)

7.41: The evolution of artefacts (Quennell and Quennell 1922)
7.42: Artefacts in use (Quennell and Quennell 1922)

7.43: Artefacts in use (Quennell and Quennell 1922)
THE LATEST TUTANKHAMEN DISCOVERIES: A UNIQUE GOLD DIadem.

WEARING A SIMILAR DIadem A CENTURY BEFORE TUTANKHAMEN; A BASS-RELIEF OF THOTHMES III., FROM THE DEIR-EL-BAHARI TEMPLE.

THE FIRST PHARAONIC DIadem EVER FOUND THAT FROM THE HEAD OF TUTANKHAMEN'S Mummy, WITH THE NEKHERET VULTURE AND BITU SERPENT.

SHOWING ONE OF THE MASSIVE GOLD URASS ON THE SIDE APPENDAGES; AND THE TWO BACK "RIBBONS": TUTANKHAMEN'S GOLD DIadem.

SHOWING THE BACK FASTENING ATTACHABLE TO ANY CROWN, THE VULTURE HEAD SEPARATED.

SEEN FROM BEHIND; TUTANKHAMEN'S DIadem, SHOWING THE SYMBOLICAL BOW AT THE BACK, THE RIBBONS, AND SIDE APPENDAGES.

7.44: Tutankhamun in *The Illustrated London News* July 1924
THE TUTANKHAMEN OVER-BLOUSE

4½ gns.

JESSETTE LTD.
29 SLOANE STREET S.W.

New original designs can be had in all white, white embroidered black, navy and Egyptian colours, in heavy crepe de Chine. Any size made to order. The above design is an exact reproduction of the hieroglyphic of the king, from the tomb at Luxor.

These are designed and entirely made by hand in our own workrooms.

7.45: Tutankhamun influenced blouse, London 1920s

7.46: Tutankhamun influenced dress 1920s
POUDRES AND COMPACTS


Poudre: Le Secret du Sphinx
A Face Powder of exceptional freshness, perfumed with the haunting Secret du Sphinx odour. Combining the art of modern Paris with the glamour of ancient Egypt. Obtainable in Blanche, Naturelle, Mauvaise, and Rachel. Modestly priced $1. Obtained at smartest stores. If you experience any difficulty, communicate direct with us.

Ramses "Jewel Case" Compact

LE BEAUTE IMPORT CO., INC.
Exclusive Representatives for the United States and Canada
295 Fifth Avenue, New York

7.47: Ramsés Cosmetics

7.48: Jacket with Egyptian motifs c.1920-29. V&A
7.49: Mecca bingo hall, Islington

7.50: 62 Richmond Avenue, Islington
7.51: Kibbo Kift Kinlog begun in 1924. Reproduced by permission of the Museum of London

7.52: Kibbo Kift Kinlog, open. Reproduced by permission of the Museum of London
7.53: Cigarette Cards John Player & Sons, Egyptian Kings & Queens and Classical Deities series

7.54: Egyptian style biscuit tin Dunmore & Sons, 1920s
7.56: Crawford’s Escape plan.