Remembering Emil Haury

Raymond H. Thompson
Professor Emeritus of Anthropology,
Former Director of the School of Anthropology & Arizona State Museum
University of Arizona

I am honored and pleased to have this opportunity to review the life of Emil Haury, but first I must conform to the ethical standards of modern scholarship and disclose to you that I am an unabashed great admirer of him.

Although I try to avoid using the perpendicular pronoun, a brief explanation is in order. After a tour of duty in the north Pacific with the U.S. Navy Seabees, I returned to Tufts University to complete the education that had been interrupted by World War II. I applied to Haury's new archaeological field school at Point of Pines in Arizona. He accepted me as one of the twenty lucky students and I spent the summer of 1947 happily confirming my boyhood desire to be an archaeologist. It was there that I found the rancher's daughter who brightened my life for three score and five years.

When I arrived at Point of Pines my GI Bill budget was down to the lonely buffalo nickel left in my pocket. At the end of the field season, Emil took me to Tucson, put me up in his home, fed me, hired me to build an exhibit on Ventana Cave in the Arizona State Museum, and greatly facilitated my pursuit of you know whom. At the end of the following summer, Emil played a key role in getting us married. He consoled her parents by assuring them that the impoverished graduate student who was taking their youngest daughter Molly far away from the ranch was somehow reliable. He bought me a suit, a shirt, and a tie, drove me to Tombstone to watch us get married on this very day sixty-six years ago, and then put us on the train to Cambridge so that I could complete my graduate studies at Harvard University. Emil, who continued to foster my career, soon hired me as an Assistant Professor and within a few years asked me to take on the task of nurturing and expanding the fine anthropological program Cummings and he had established at the University of Arizona. Clearly, my great admiration for Emil Haury is honest and appropriate. Now that I have completely absolved myself of any possible complaint about bias or conflict of interest, I want to share with you

some stories about this remarkable man.

Emil Walter Haury, born in Newton, Kansas at the beginning of the twentieth century on 2 May 1904, was the youngest of the four sons of Gustav Adolf Haury and Clara Katharina Ruth. The story of his life, however, has its beginnings in the terrible loss of life during the Thirty Years War in the first half of the seventeenth century. Some two hundred Mennonite families, Haury's among them, left the Aargau of north central Switzerland to settle in the Palatinate in southwestern Germany. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, many of them moved to Bavaria to farm undeveloped land on the Danube west of Ingolstadt. However, by the middle of the nineteenth century, lack of land for the expanding population, poor economic conditions, the failure of Germany's Revolution of 1848, and the constant threat of military service caused many Mennonites to look to America.

Emil's paternal grandparents, Jakob Haury and Maria Schmitt, migrated to Iowa where Emil's father, Gustav, was born. His mother, Clara Ruth, was born in Illinois where her parents, John Ruth and Elise Strom, had settled. Before long, many of the Iowa and Illinois Mennonites, including the Haury and Ruth families, moved to east central Kansas where Gustav and Clara were married 11 June 1891. Two years later, Gustav became one of the founding faculty members of Bethel College, the oldest Mennonite institution of higher learning in the country, along with Peter John Wedel, the father of Waldo, who became an authority on the archaeology of the Great Plains, and Heinrich Daniel Penner, who would later become Emil's father-in-law.

Emil and his brothers grew up on the campus of Bethel College in the modest, comfortable, orderly, and academic environment provided by his liberal and supportive parents. It was there that Emil learned the traditional values of hard work and industriousness, integrity and honesty, cleanliness and simplicity of living, personal loyalty and commitment, cooperation and community service, and compassion and help for others – values to which he subscribed throughout his life. Emil and Waldo roamed the nearby fields and woods, exploring especially the prehistoric treasures of Sand Creek, that legendary incubator of both of their archaeological careers. If Emil were here, he would remind us that Bethel College and the University of Arizona produced a third archaeologist,

Roland von Steen Richert, who gave many years of public service to Southwestern archaeology in the National Park Service.

In 1923 Emil began his freshman year at Bethel College, nurturing his ambition to be an archaeologist, but wondering how in the world to make it happen. About that same time a former Bethel College faculty member, Emil Richert Riesen, who was teaching philosophy at the University of Arizona, learned that pioneer Arizona archaeologist, Byron Cummings, was making a trip east to seek funding for his excavations at Cuicuilco in central Mexico. Riesen suggested that Cummings stop in Kansas and give a lecture at Bethel College on his archaeological work in Arizona.

Emil attended that lecture in early 1924 and asked Cummings to let him take part in the following summer's explorations in northern Arizona. Cummings could not grant that request because he expected to be in Mexico, but he urged Emil to keep in touch. The following year Emil wrote to Cummings asking to be considered for the summer of 1925. When Cummings replied that he would again be in Mexico, which he considered one of the best places to be introduced to archaeology, Gustav Haury offered to pay his son's train fare to Mexico if Cummings would allow him to join the Cuicuilco project. Cummings not only agreed, but also offered to pay Emil's fare from Mexico to Tucson and to give him a student job in the Arizona State Museum so that he could complete his college education in archaeology at the University of Arizona.

In 1927 Emil and Clara Lee Fraps earned the first BAs in archaeology at Arizona. Emil had planned to spend the following summer furthering his romantic interest in Hulda Esther Penner, whom he had known since elementary school. Her parents, Heinrich Penner and Katharina Dalke, were among the many Mennonites who migrated to Kansas in the 1870s from the large Molotschna colony on the Black Sea when they lost the exemption from military service granted to their ancestors by Catherine the Great in 1786.

Hulda was conveniently in Tucson visiting her oldest sister, Rachel Rebecca, the wife of Professor Riesen. However, Cummings sent Emil to northern Arizona to collect archaeological material for the State Museum. The summer was not a total loss because Cummings invited three students, Emil, Clara Lee and Florence Hawley, who had earned her BA with a major in English, as well

as Hulda, to join him in attending the conference on Southwestern archaeology hosted at Pecos, New Mexico by Alfred Vincent Kidder, the nation's leading archaeologist. Cummings was President of the University in 1927, so they traveled to Pecos in the president's Lincoln touring car with Emil as the driver. He remembered that journey as much for its many flat tires as for its archaeological and romantic benefits. He, Hulda, and Clara Lee had a unique opportunity to observe the greats of Southwestern archaeology. However, poor Florence Hawley did not accompany them because her mother did not think the group was properly chaperoned.

Cummings promised his three students teaching jobs if they would continue their studies at the graduate level. They earned the first MAs in archaeology at Arizona in 1928 and began teaching that year. This employment allowed Emil to propose to Hulda and they were married by her father on 7 June 1928. They had two sons, Allan Gene, an engineer born in 1934, and Loren Richard, a biological oceanographer, born in 1939. Emil's first year of teaching made him acutely aware that his education was incomplete and his experience limited. An opportunity to expand his horizons came from Andrew Ellicott Douglass, an astronomer at the University of Arizona, who was interested in long term climatic change for which he hoped to find evidence in the growth records of coniferous trees. He had assembled a chronology of tree rings extending from the present back to AD 1260 and had a second older, but unconnected sequence of 585 years based on archaeological collections. Emil and Lyndon Hargrave helped Douglass find archaeological specimens to connect these sequences. On 22 June 1929, a small piece of charcoal was found at the Show Low Ruin that closed the gap between the two tree-ring sequences, enabling Douglass to date many of the major prehistoric sites in the Four Corners region of the Southwest.

Emil was the first person Douglass trained in dendrochronology and his year of work on the huge backlog of undated specimens provided the first independent test of the Douglass method. He helped Douglass teach the first class in tree ring dating, with Waldo Wedel, Clara Lee Fraps, and Florence Hawley among the students. Emil was one of the key figures in the development of dendrochronology and in 1937 was one of the cofounders of the Laboratory of Tree Ring Research

at the University of Arizona, today a world leader in the study of climate change. The lab now occupies a new building made possible by a gift from Emil's second wife, Agnese, and named for Bryant Bannister , one of Haury students who directed the lab in the critical years following World War II.

In 1931, Emil, who was still in search of ways to expand his archaeological experience, joined Harold Sterling Gladwin at the new Gila Pueblo Archaeological Foundation that Gladwin had established in Globe, Arizona. No longer challenged by his successful career in finance, Gladwin had sold his seat on the New York Stock Exchange and moved to Santa Barbara, California, where he met Kidder and became fascinated with Southwestern archaeology. He began an ambitious program of archaeological survey and excavation, defined problems of regional scope, and challenged established views, but needed a trained archaeologist to help him. Emil was the obvious choice and as assistant director of Gila Pueblo he had an unparalleled opportunity to do field research without the distractions of academy or museum. Moreover Gladwin supported Emil's desire to obtain a doctorate in anthropology at Harvard University which he received in 1934. Kidder continued to advise Gladwin and often visited Gila Pueblo which was a boon to Emil for he had looked upon Kidder as his role model ever since the 1927 Pecos Conference.

While at Harvard, Emil was confronted with the power of a South American Indian medicine man. The Peabody Museum there had an exhibition of Lowland South American ethnographic material that included the ceremonial paraphernalia of that medicine man. Among the many ritual items involved was a medium-sized basket that was suspended on an almost invisible wire. This basket, which hung innocently motionless during the day, was said to become quite active in the late evening hours.

This activity, though unknown to museum officials, was regularly observed by the members of the janitorial staff. Every night, shortly before midnight the basket would begin to rotate first in one direction and then the other and would continue its rotation until about five am when it would abruptly stop. At first the cleaning crew was intrigued and amused by the moving basket and mentioned it to their supervisors as a curiosity. After a while though, they began to be disturbed by the spookiness

of it. When one of them chanced to read the label of the exhibit and discovered that the basket had belonged to a powerful Indian medicine man, their attitude changed. They convinced themselves that the rotating basket was an evil omen of the wrath of that medicine man and they demanded that steps be taken to combat its baleful influence. The academic staff absolutely refused to believe any of these concerns, which they considered to be superstitious nonsense. The janitorial staff responded to this insult to them and to their observational powers by threatening a work stoppage.

In order to avoid such a crisis, museum officials agreed to have someone with scientific training spend a night in the South American exhibit gallery. Emil was intrigued by the whole thing and volunteered to accept that responsibility. He, of course, observed exactly what the janitors had reported. He also noted that there was a weak but constant vibration that could be felt throughout the entire building. Emil determined that the basket turned only in response to that weak vibration which was produced by an electrical generating plant about a mile away on the banks of the Charles River. The vibrations were transmitted to the Museum through the uniform glacial deposits that underlie much of the Boston basin. The basket only turned at night because the competing vibrations from cars, trucks, and subway trains interrupted the weaker vibration from the electrical plant during the daytime working hours. Museum officials accepted Emil's explanation and his recommendation that the basket be suspended on two wires. So the basket ceased to rotate and the janitors happily returned to their duties.

While at Gila Pueblo Emil carried out field research in every region and time period in the Southwest, surveyed many largely unknown areas, excavated many sites, contributed to the further development of tree ring dating, and helped systematize the ceramic taxonomy, all of which he was able to share with his colleagues because Gladwin insisted on and supported prompt publication of field research. The years that Emil spent at Gila Pueblo have been labelled "seven years that reshaped Southwest prehistory."

However Gladwin had a penchant for floating ideas based on vague and far flung similarities that contrasted with Emil's insistence that every hypothesis had to be rooted in at least some empirical evidence. Consequently, problems began to emerge in

the Gladwin-Haury relationship. Once again Cummings presented Emil with an opportunity for change and advancement. During the Depression the legislation had reduced the University of Arizona budget so much that half a dozen or so of the oldest professors were forced into retirement. Cummings, therefore, was retiring as Head of the Department of Archaeology and had anointed Emil as his successor. In 1937 Emil replaced Cummings as Head of the Department and the following year as Director of the State Museum.

Cummings found it difficult to give up the powerful role in university and state affairs that he had enjoyed for almost a quarter of a century. On the very first day of Emil's tenure as Director of the Museum, Cummings explained to him in great detail exactly how things were to be done. Emil told me that then and there he promised himself that when he retired he "would not hover around looking over his successor's shoulder." He kept that promise when he turned the reins over to me in 1964, although he was always available whenever I sought his advice.

Cummings favored a fiscally conservative approach that contrasted sharply with the advice Emil received from his brother-in-law, Emil Riesen, who had become the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts. We might even speculate that the close relationship between the Riesen, Penner, and Haury families must have been a factor in the recruitment of Emil as Cummings' successor. In any event, Dean Riesen urged that Emil not waste the advantage of being a new comer for whom many had high expectations. Despite the fact that the University was suffering from those massive Depression era budget cuts, Emil took Riesen's advice and began a vigorous and ultimately successful campaign to increase the budget, the size of the faculty, the library holdings, student support, and research activity. During his forty-three years of active service to the University of Arizona he developed opportunities for field training, carried out significant research projects, created a nationally ranked doctoral program, professionalized and modernized the State Museum, and co-founded the Laboratory for Tree Ring Research, the Bureau of Ethnic Research (now the Bureau of Applied Research in Anthroopology), the Radiocarbon Age Determination Laboratory, the Arid Lands Program, and the University of Arizona Press.

The task of professionalizing the Museum was much more

difficult than the expansion of the program in anthropology. Cummings was quite modern in his thinking about the nature of anthropology, but his concept of a museum was typical of the antiquarian approach of the nineteenth century. Haury started by trying to clean some of the items hanging on the walls. Photos in the Museum taken in the thirties show Navajo blankets on the walls with a flat basket attached to the middle of each one. Emil told me that when he tried to remove them from the wall many of the textiles simply disintegrated. They had been largely consumed by colonies of insects residing behind the baskets and were only still in one piece because they were semi-attached to the wall by the secretions of the insects.

Emil constructed special storage facilities and established guidelines for future collecting. He shifted attention from objects to the ideas they represent and provided explanatory and interpretive labels for the new exhibits. He introduced a modern cataloguing system and began to improve the care and conservation of the collections. He also set out to expand the almost nonexistent staff. It was not until 1943, fully fifty years after the founding of the Museum, that Edwin Booth Sayles, one of Emil's former colleagues at Gila Pueblo, became the first full time staff member. Although most of the teaching faculty was employed full-time, Museum staff members, including both Cummings and Haury, were all part time prior to the appointment of Sayles. I was a grateful beneficiary of that staff expansion, for the second of those full time staff members was that rancher's daughter who began her museum employment in 1947, the year that I showed up at Point of Pines.

Haury recognized and took advantage of the uniqueness of the Arizona State Museum. Although it was established in 1893 as a state museum, it was also an institution in Arizona's land grant university with its three-fold mandate of teaching, research, and service. The mutually reinforcing responsibilities and opportunities in this situation were skillfully exploited by Haury.

He provided archaeological services in Arizona instead of trying to control the State's archaeology as Cummings had done. He continued Cumming's efforts to protect archaeological resources from looting and indiscriminate digging, obtaining new legislation that not only protected those resources on State Land, but also made them available to all qual-

ified researchers. He modified Gladwin's archaeological site survey to create a more comprehensive system that continues today to serve researchers through the AZ Sites program. Instead of competing and battling with eastern colleagues, as Cummings and Hewitt in New Mexico had done, he joined forces with them to establish national and international standards.

Emil Haury was clearly a master teacher and like his father, a dedicated institution builder, but more than anything else, he was one of the preeminent archaeologists of the twentieth century. He received many honors, among them the Viking Fund Medal for Archaeology; election to the National Academy of Sciences, the first faculty member in Arizona to be so honored; election to the American Philosophical Society, which appealed to Emil's practical sense because it was founded in 1743 by Benjamin Franklin for the "promotion of useful knowledge;" appointment as the first Riecker Distinguished Professor of Anthropology, the University's first endowed chair; the Conservation Service Award of the Department of the Interior, one of the highest awards given to a civilian by the federal government; and the Alfred Vincent Kidder Award for Eminence in American Archaeology, which Emil especially prized because of his admiration for Kidder. No small wonder then that President Richard Harvill, who admired Emil very much, chose Anthropology as one of the two disciplines—the other was Astronomy—on which to base his efforts to establish the University of Arizona as a nationally ranked research institution.

Emil was a consummate field archaeologist who gained an intimate knowledge of all regions and time periods of Southwestern archaeology that no one else before or since has enjoyed. Because he was a skilled observer with an excellent memory, he was able to use that knowledge to great advantage. While still a graduate student he observed details that proved the so-called Roman lead artifacts found near Tucson had been planted as a hoax. He remembered a potsherd his parents had picked up at Walnut Canyon in 1908 and enshrined in the cabinet of curiosities in their parlor, well enough to place it in the ceramic taxonomic system of Southwestern archaeology.

His store of knowledge about prehistoric pottery in the Southwest was legendary. He had what many enviously called a "feel" for ceramic identification. Long after his retirement, his colleagues

continued to come to him bearing some nondescript potsherd in the hope that he would be able to help them. They were seldom disappointed. His use of regional distribution, stylistic seriation, stratigraphic control, dendrochronology, and ceramic cross-dating, to establish the Hohokam chronology at Snaketown is a classic example of the kind of interpretation that was possible because of his great store of detailed information witnessed first hand.

Emil understood that until some reasonable semblance of chronology was achieved, it was very difficult to undertake cultural interpretations. For example, before the advent of tree-ring dating, archaeologists working in the Four Corners region of the Southwest were fully convinced of a great antiquity for the Basketmaker-Pueblo sequence developed at that first Pecos Conference in 1927. Kidder even talked about the cherished but never discovered BC, that is Before Christ, dates. Dendrochronology reduced that presumed great antiquity more than in half and placed the first Basketmakers in the early centuries of the Christian era instead of around 2,000 BC, causing major shifts in the interpretation of cultural change and development. Dendrochronology gave Southwestern archaeology precise chronological controls that all other regions of the country lacked until the advent of radiocarbon dating after World War II.

Shortly after the war, Walter Taylor published a scathing review of the work of six of the country's most productive archaeologists, including Kidder and Haury, accusing them of emphasizing chronological concerns instead of cultural interpretation. Taylor generated a great deal of ill will that delayed the acceptance of his own more positive ideas about the processes of cultural development. Emil had, of course, suffered criticism before, for example, when he proposed the Mogollon culture for the central mountainous region of the Southwest. He tried to treat criticism in a professional manner preferring to respond to it by obtaining new evidence rather than by citing theoretical or ideological positions. He made every effort to avoid having professional disagreements affect his personal relationships.

I remember being on the edge of a conversation between Emil and Walt Taylor when Emil suggested that Walt might want to consult with Dick Woodbury on whatever it was they were discussing. Walt responded that he would never talk to Woodbury. When Emil

asked why, Walt explained that Woodbury had said some unkind things about him in a review of Taylor's monograph. Emil chuckled and pointed out that Walt had said some unkind things about him in that very monograph, but that it did not prevent him from talking to Walt.

The most telling of Woodbury's criticisms was that Taylor ignored the fundamental requirement of archaeology that a firm and fine grained chronology was a prerequisite to all further interpretation. There was, of course, some merit in Taylor's criticisms and several approaches were introduced in the 1960s to facilitate broader cultural interpretations. It is not surprising that when practitioners of the so-called New Archaeology, and their processual and behavioral successors, wanted to test their ideas they turned to the rich body of chronologically controlled data that had been created by Kidder, Haury, and many others in the Southwest, the only place in the country where such data were available.

Emil worked in all periods of Southwestern prehistory. He dug mammoth kill sites that documented the hunting activities of Early Man at the end of the Ice Age. He helped to define the Archaic Cochise culture that followed and his work at Matty Canyon showed that agriculture was introduced before pottery. He provided most of the evidence for Gladwin's Hohokam culture and he forced researchers of the Anasazi or Ancestral Pueblo culture to refine their ideas by introducing the concept of the Mogollon as a separate and competing culture.

The chronological framework of Southwestern Archaeology was constructed of several shorter segments of the regional chronology that overlapped to create the whole. It was not until Emil dug Ventana Cave that the entire sequence was found in undisturbed stratigraphic order in one place. Ventana cave contained evidence of the entire cultural sequence of southern Arizona from the time of the Ice Age hunters to the brief visits of recent tourists who discarded flash bulbs on the surface. It has, therefore, an iconic place in American archaeology.

Emil contributed a great deal to Southwestern archaeology, but he fully understood that his legacy would depend not on his work, but that of his students and others. They would be the ones to refine, connect and expand his conception of the Southwestern past. And they have, for example, by discovering huge villages of preceramic farmers near Tucson;

by showing that his belief in considerable antiquity for the early Hohokam was as erroneous as Kidder's view of the antiquity of the Basketmakers; by reassessing the role of warfare in the prehistoric Southwest; and by exploring the influence of climate change in the Hohokam irrigation system through the reconstruction of stream flow from tree-ring records. The last of the thirty doctoral students whose dissertations he chaired has shown that the unique cylindrical vessels from Chaco canyon were used for drinking the foaming chocolate from the civilizations of Mesoamerica to the south.

Except for two Latin American projects, all of Emil's archaeological work was carried out in the Southwest. In 1925 he was with Cummings at Cuicuilco in Central Mexico, his very first archaeological experience, and in 1949-50 he excavated sites of the little known Chibcha culture of Colombia in northern South America. Whlie there the Haury family stayed in a pension in Bogota where they had an amusing culinary experience. Also at the pension was an American researcher whose wife responded to a request from the owner of the pension for favorite dishes with a comment that she enjoyed *senos de ternera*. The owner, though somewhat surprised, agreed to prepare some. Within a few days she served them some smell bits of tough and rubbery protein in a cream sauce. The American woman had meant to ask for calf brains or rather *sesos de ternera*. *Sesos* are brain and *senos* are breasts, which in the case of a calf is an udder.

Emil's successes in Southwestern archaeology are substantial and widely recognized, but less-well known are his contributions to national policy. Because his archaeological interpretations were well-grounded in empirical evidence untainted by narrow theoretical bias or ideological constraints, it was expected that he would apply similarly rigorous standards when offering advice on policy matters. Of equal importance was Emil's realization that government officials have to cope with many difficult issues, such as historical conditions, bureaucratic problems, personal ambitions, political interference, competing agendas, and pressure groups. He understood that the role of outsiders like himself was to identify problems and demand solutions, but that lobbying for specific solutions developed without concern for the circumstances of the affected government agency was counter-productive. This

was the kind of useful and practical knowledge for which Emil admired Benjamin Franklin.

Agency heads and political leaders came to him for advice for they knew that he would offer well-reasoned arguments for what he thought would best serve the needs of the nation. As a key member of the independent Committee for the Recovery of Archaeological Remains he was in a position to pressure for action to protect the nation's archaeological heritage. He played an important role in paving the way for the gradual adoption of the environmental and historical legislation that now provides the protection he requested. He was especially helpful to the Department of the Interior when it became necessary to restructure the role of the National Park Service as the lead agency for archaeological and historic preservation. Emil contributed significantly to the development of our national program in compliance archaeology that now involves all relevant federal agencies, many Indian tribes, most state agencies, many cities and counties, and a large number of private companies in the field of cultural resource management. As these changes began to produce results, Emil applied his deep understanding of the political and bureaucratic processes to make the Arizona State Museum a national leader in cultural resource management.For example, Haury developed one of the nation's first successful programs in highway salvage archaeology, something that he accomplished with the accidental but critical help of a famous Mexican revolutionary, Doroteo Arango, otherwise known as Pancho Villa. When President Woodrow Wilson recognized Villa's rival, Venustiano Carranza, as the legal president of Mexico, Villa began to attack and kill Americans and even raided Columbus, New Mexico in 1916. Wilson responded by sending General John Pershing and the US Army on a punitive expedition to capture Pancho Villa, but he hampered Pershing by ordering him not to commandeer Mexican railroads to transport troops and equipment. As a result, Pershing was terribly frustrated by the desperate conditions of the roads, when they were any, on both sides of the border. Though unable to capture Villa, Pershing escaped public embarrassment only because he left Mexico early in 1917 to lead American forces in Europe in World War I.

When Pershing returned to Washington after the War, he decided to address the transpor-

tation problems that he and his mules had encountered in Mexico and the Southwest. He assigned the task of designing a national system of military highways to a young lieutenant fresh out of West Point. As a part of that project, that young officer traveled across the country from Maryland to California with a contingent of troops. It took them three months to accomplish. When that young officer, whose name was Dwight Eisenhower, became the thirty-fourth President of the United States, he dusted off the report and sent it to Congress where it became the Federal-Aid Highway and Highway Revenue Act of 1956. We are all familiar with the main result of the legislation, the Interstate Highway system, but perhaps less aware that it authorized the use of federal funds for archaeological salvage on federal highway projects.

Emil, who had been pressuring the Arizona Highway Department (now Arizona Department of Transportation), for the adoption of a similar policy in Arizona since 1938, immediately requested state funding under the new legislation. However, the Highway Department bureaucracy, accustomed to solving problems related to highway construction, but not developing new programs, found it hard to change, so Emil and his supporters there had to wait until the Navajo tribe and the Forest Service created a crisis for them to resolve by refusing to grant rights-of-way across their lands without compliance with the federal requirement for salvage archaeology.

Emil was ready and willing to take care of the crisis if modest funds could be found to help him. Although there were meetings and memos thoughout these negotiations, most of the activity was unofficial, informal, and unrecorded. After a meeting to deal with the Navajo-Forest Service crisis, the manager of advanced planning for the Highway Department wrote to Emil thanking him for the meeting without mentioning the subject matter and commenting that an unspecified "this" appeared to be the opening they were looking for. "This", of course, was the right-of-way crisis. The Highway Commission allocated twenty-five thousand discretionary dollars to "prospect for archaeological artifacts in advance of construction" without making any reference to Emil's longstanding request, to the new federal law, or to the right-of-way matter, nothing that might be politically embarrassing later on. The first Highway Salvage Archaeologist

was employed and within weeks the Highway Department found itself in full compliance with the law, no longer under pressure from Haury, free of any right-of-way crisis with a clear precedent for justifying future state funding for salvage archaeology, all at no great expense and without having to suffer any traumatic breaking of comfortable and cherished old bureaucratic habits.

Emil devoted his long and productive career to the goal of achieving a better understanding of Southwestern prehistory. He recognized the unity, diversity, and regional context of its develoment, employed meticulous and systematic field methods and techniques, accumulated professionally recovered empirical data, set high standards of performance, nurtured and trained students within a broad institutional framework, and established both relative and absolute chronologies. The result is the rational, evidence based, data rich, chronologically controlled, environmentally sound, and anthropologically grounded concept of the Southwestern past that guides our own efforts to meet his high expectations.

In attempting to give you an overall assessment of Emil Haury I find it helpful to turn to the words of others. For example, Peter Wedel, the father of Emil's boyhood friend Waldo, described Emil's father, Gustav, in a brief statement that, with the change only of Arizona for Bethel, describes Emil Haury as well.

> A keen intellect, sound judgment, a strong but pleasing personality, firm convictions positively but not dogmatically expressed, wide reading and intelligent observation gave him a breadth of outlook and a sympathetic attitude that made him one of the chief molders of educational policy, not only during his early years at Bethel/Arizona but throughout his busy lifetime. A fine sense of humor and the ability to tell as well as appreciate a good story made him an almost ideal companion.

However, for a final statement about Emil, I turn to an old Plains Indian, Waldo Wedel, told me about some years ago. Waldo was a student at a summer program in anthropological field training sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation during the thirties at the Museum of New Mexico in Santa Fe. He was one of a small group of students who were being introduced to ethnographic field work by practicing interviewing a blind old Plains Indian. The student began by asking about the rules of kinship and

marriage. Waldo, noting that the old man was not entirely happy with the situation, thought it would be better to ask questions about behavior rather than the rules for behavior. Well informed on Plains ethnography, he decided to ask about the common courtship practice known as lifting the tipi cover. In addition to the familiar slanting exterior hide cover, a tipi has a kind of curtain hung on the inside like the walls in upper story rooms or attics that cut off that awkward space under the eaves. Each occupant of a tipi had a sleeping area next to that curtain. A young man in pursuit of a young woman would note the location of her sleeping area, lift the tipi cover there, after dark, and slip into the space between the cover and the curtain, hoping to spend some quality time in her company. So, Waldo spoke up: "Sir, did you ever lift a tipi cover?" The blind old man turned to face the sound of Waldo's voice, raised his cane in the air as if he were going to strike Waldo, and exclaimed, "Thank God, there's a real human being here!"

So, I could summarize by describing Emil as a promising young man, a loving husband, a supportive father, a dependable friend, a talented artist and draftsman, a master teacher, a skilled administrator, a successful institution builder, a dedicated public servant, and above all, a preeminent archaeologist, but, following Cicero, I will save all those words for another time and instead, following that wise old Indian, simply tell you that Emil Walter Haury was, in every sense of the phrase, one real human being!