

From Pots to Pan Pipes: Specimen Exchanges between the Field Museum's Paul S. Martin and Harold Gladwin of Gila Pueblo Archaeological Foundation

*Catherine A Nichols**

Abstract

Specimen exchange saw widespread use in the nineteenth through mid-twentieth centuries among museum-based anthropologists as a means of collections growth and refinement. This paper examines organizational aspects of specimen exchange at the Field Museum, and presents a case study of exchanges between anthropology curator Paul Martin and Harold Gladwin of the Gila Pueblo Archaeological Foundation. I show how Martin navigated both the Field Museum's centralized administration and other curators in charge of various collections to provide Gladwin the specimens he desired, arguing that understandings of specimen exchange must consider both organizational policy, and personal-professional praxis. Though specimen exchange is no longer practiced by museum-based anthropologists, as a form of deaccessioning it provides a venue to consider how the use and valuation of anthropological collections figures into their circulation out of museums.

Key words: specimen exchange, anthropology, Field Museum, Gila Pueblo Archaeological Foundation

Introduction

The development of museum collections refers not only to growth through acquisition, but also to refinement: evaluation of objects in terms of their cultural, historical, aesthetic, and heritage values. When collections grow unwieldy and disjointed, or increase in size such that storage areas are strained, museums may evaluate the contents of their collection with respect to their organizational mission and scope. Objects deemed ancillary to the core functions of the museum may be slated for deaccession (Malaro 1998). Museums have always engaged in the removal of accessioned and catalogued objects from their permanent collections. One means of doing this was (and is) through exchange. 'Specimen exchange' was a means through which museums traded what they had in excess for what they lacked. While there has been much attention paid to collections-building through both active and passive means (Parezo 1987), far less attention has been given to how museum staff shaped the contents of theirs and others' collections through exchange, which can be considered a form of deaccessioning (e.g. Welsch and Mooiman 2015). In addition to contributing the networked histories of collections-building (Philp 2011), specimen exchange has also been taken up by scholars as a venue for the consideration of the valuation of museum objects (Walsh 2002; Foster 2015; Nichols 2018).

From the mid-nineteenth century to approximately the 1970s, many museums with anthropological collections collectively developed norms of specimen exchange practice, which relied on inter-organizational cooperation for trading specimens. Specimen exchange required the participation of many museum staff: curators to decide if an exchange was desirable and what to offer in return, a director to approve the exchange, registration staff to notate the record books and collection ledgers, assistants to prepare the descriptive inventories and cross-check catalogue numbers, and to pack and ship the specimens. For large museums, like the Field Museum and the Smithsonian Institution's U.S. National Museum, specimens exchange policies were put in place to determine what was considered acceptable and ideal practice.

The paper considers how specimen exchange is shaped by organizational aspects of

the museum, and how the praxis of museum professionals intersects with our knowledge of the care and use of collections. The setting for this analysis is a series of specimen exchanges in the 1930s between the Field Museum's Curator of Anthropology Paul S. Martin, and archaeologist Harold Gladwin, director and founder of Gila Pueblo Archaeological Foundation (hereafter Gila Pueblo), an archaeological research center in the American Southwest. In analyzing specimen exchange practice, I emphasize the bureaucratic character of the museum (Gray and McCall 2018), following Max Weber's theory of bureaucracy as the most efficient and rational organization of human activity in the modern world. In addition to analyzing Martin and Gladwin's correspondence, I closely examine some of the hallmarks of the museum's bureaucracy: published documents, forms, and inter-office correspondence, and memos, in order to attend to how individuals - specifically curators - upheld, enforced, resisted, and bent the rules according to their own understanding of specimen exchange practice, and their professional interests and relationships. I argue that Martin and Gladwin's professional identities and relationship shaped the way they went about practicing specimen exchange. While Gladwin essentially had singular control over Gila Pueblo's collection, Martin's position as a curator in a large museum required adherence to museum policies, which establish and normalize professional standards of practice. Following an overview of specimen exchange and the norms of its practice at the Field Museum, I consider how museum technologies such as registration forms reveal concepts of acceptable professional practice. Focusing on Martin's work as a museum-based anthropologist and Gladwin's intellectual contributions, I examine a series of specimen exchanges in which both parties navigated the Field Museum's bureaucracy to provide each other with desired specimens. I use this case to draw attention to both the organizational aspects and personal-professional relationships that shape the movements of museum objects.

Specimen Exchange

As producers of scientific knowledge, anthropology and natural history museums have used specimen exchange to shape the contents of their collections, adding and subtracting through trade. An exchange is characterized by a set of practices: typically the removal of objects from the collection, and the resulting addition of objects from the exchange partner. The 'specimen exchange industry', that is, the trading of 'duplicate' specimens between museums and individuals, is rooted in the development of natural history methodologies and organizations (Philp 2011). Prior to the growth of the great natural history museums in the West, naturalists, explorers, and military personnel traveled to new places where they collected both natural and artificial curiosities that were then arranged to reflect their own worldviews (Shelton 1994). Early natural history work focused on descriptive vocabularies and conventions, and the development of taxonomic systems (Oglivie 2006). With the establishment of widely used scientific naming conventions, naturalists entered into mutually beneficial and reciprocal relations of trade. Writing of Linnaeus and the scientific community in the mid-eighteenth century, Staffan Müller-Wille notes that botanists were not only dependent on one another for the exchange of seeds, but that one's ability to accumulate large quantities of distinct seeds would then put a botanist in the best position to do the work of classification (2003: 160). Tony Bennett draws attention to the ways nineteenth century natural history museums reassembled objects in 'new and more systematic configurations' which 'permitted the development of abstract and totalising frameworks of knowledge because of the new relations they made perceptible' (2004: 21). Not only was specimen exchange a mechanism that resulted in the movements of particular specimens into museums in modern centers (Sheets-Pyenson 1998b), it played a role in the production of anthropological knowledge by concretizing knowledge categories. This was accomplished primarily through the naming conventions of the museum catalogue, reflecting Eurocentric biases and assumptions (Turner 2015a). These categories were also materialized through the development of museum's inalienable 'type' and exchangeable 'duplicate' specimens (Nichols 2016).

The exchange of duplicate specimens was an established practice used by collectors and scientific societies, predating the establishment of the large natural history and anthropology museums in the United States (e.g. Thomas 2011). Smithsonian Institution Assistant Secretary

Spencer Baird initiated the exchange of anthropological duplicates in 1859 (Nichols 2014b). As a naturalist, Baird had used this practice to build his personal research collection (Smith 2012: 29). Implemented at the Smithsonian in order to increase specimen diversity and collections breadth, it also raised the Smithsonian's scientific profile both in Europe and the United States. Many museums in this period practiced specimen exchange (Sheets-Pyenson 1988a), but not all. During an 1889 visit to the natural history departments of the British Museum, Smithsonian curator of ethnology Otis Mason noted that while they had ample stocks of duplicates, they did not exchange them (Nichols and Parezo 2017).

Specimen Exchange at the Field Museum

By the time the Field Museum was established in 1893, the circulation of duplicate specimens had been well incorporated into US American scientific practice. In 1896 the Field Museum published its first (and likely only) *Annual Exchange Catalogue*. The front matter explained the catalogue's purpose:

The Field Columbian Museum begs to submit this list of excess and duplicate material for the consideration of kindred institutions and of individual collectors. The specimens and examples contained herein are offered in exchange for an equivalent in similar material. All offers should include as much detail as possible concerning both the specimens and objects desired and those offered as an exchange. Unless otherwise provided it will be understood that the consignee pays all transportation charges in each case. Please address all communication to Frederick JV Skiff, Director (Field Columbian Museum 1896).

This introduction establishes several norms of specimen exchange. The Field Museum would trade specimens with both museums and individuals. While contemporary deaccessioning practices prioritize keeping museum objects in the public trust, no such distinction is made here. Exchanges involved the trading of specimens for specimens, in line with the putative purpose of specimen exchange: to fill gaps in collections.

Exchangeable specimens were characterized as duplicate or excess, meaning they were sufficiently represented in the originating museum's collection. Duplicate glosses as not needed for core museum functions based on the standards of the time. In *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, Max Weber theorized bureaucracies as 'a fixed area of activity' governed by rules, hierarchical organization, the use of written documents to direct and authorize action, the need for expert training and rules which can be learned, and full-time devotion to one's work (Svedberg and Agevall 2016: 20). As bureaucracies, museums develop their own taxonomic or classification systems to designate some specimens as expendable duplicates and others as inalienable types (Frizzell 1933; Daston 2004). For the museum as a whole, exchange as a transactional collections-building strategy required a supply of (exchangeable) material. Across all departments, duplicates were objects representative of knowledge categories, and objects not needed to be kept. Though material and method of determination differed by department, all departments had duplicates.

The catalogue contained 45 pages divided by department: anthropology, botany, geology, and economic geology. No list of itemized duplicates was listed for zoology as the curator was on an expedition to Africa. It was noted,

The Museum has considerable Zoological material for exchange and will naturally acquire much more as the result of the African mission. A second catalogue if possible, will be published in 1897, containing the excess Zoological specimens omitted now and the accessions of the intervening time, including African duplicates (Field Columbian Museum 1896: 50).¹

Anthropology occupied four pages, arranged geographically and as either 'ethnology' or 'antiquities'. The specificity and scale of descriptions were inconsistent. An example of the more specific of the listings read 'Alaskan Eskimo. 10 fish nets' and 'Northwest Coast Indians. 40 masks' (Field Columbian Museum 1896: 5). The more general listings read 'Africa-Ethnology.

500 specimens of utensils, weapons and ornaments; unassorted' (Field Columbian Museum 1896: 8). The exchange catalogue reflects a confluence of the size of each scientific department and its intellectual control over collections. For the geology department, the catalogue provided a very specific description of duplicates, including: the scientific name of each fossil, its collector, and provenience and/or geologic period classification. For anthropology, the catalogue was meant to give a relatively general idea of what was available. Interested parties would need to make further inquiries for specific specimens.

Closely monitored by the museum's administration and registrar, specimen exchange was an organizational strategy of collections-building. The putative purpose of specimen exchange was to fill gaps in collections, though its practice was negotiated at the disciplinary or departmental level. It served to create and cement professional relationships between museums, curators, and collectors (Nichols 2016). The provision of described specimens proved useful for collections-based research. Exchanges were not a mechanism to dispose of poor quality material or objects that lacked basic documentation. Objects of this kind would not be useful to a trading partner, and they would reflect poorly on the giving institution.

Within bureaucratic organizations, decision-making occurs by those in a position of authority who are responsible for viability of some parts of the organization. Decisions can be interpreted as statements 'representing conscious choices about the way people should act' (Arhne and Brunsson 2011: 85). In short, they establish behavioral norms. Specimen exchange procedures reveal who the decision-makers are, and what authority they have to approve the actions of others in the museum. Within specimen exchange procedures at the Field Museum, the head curator of anthropology was responsible for requesting or endorsing requests for exchanges, which were then forwarded to the museum director for final approval. There is variation in the initiation and receipt of exchange requests, a situation not unique to the Field Museum. In some cases, requests were made initially to the director, while others were forwarded to the director through the head of department, in some cases having been proposed directly with the curator in charge of the material proposed for exchange. Regardless of the actual origination of the request, a successful exchange required endorsement from the departmental head curator and director approval. Documentation of this process is often found in exchange files. In the majority of cases, directors offered pro forma approvals, trusting that the curatorial staff would act in the *museum's* best interest.

This decision-making hierarchy for specimen exchange is similar to that of the Smithsonian Institution. The approval of an exchange was ultimately at the behest of the Smithsonian Secretary, though largely curators decided on the content of exchanges, taking into account both what (if anything) was requested and what was available. The Smithsonian preferred exchange requests to be initially submitted to the administration, who would then ask the relevant curators to make selections (Nichols 2014b: 235-236, 394-395). Informal discussions and solicitations about the possibility of exchange were carried out in regular correspondence between curators, but official requests were routed to the central administration. Generally, this organizational structure characterizes large museums of the time, many in the urban metropolises of the United States and Europe. Smaller museums, particularly those in European colonies, also made extensive use of specimen exchange as a collections building strategy but because there were far fewer staff, directors and curators handled the negotiations and transmissions much more independently (Sheets-Pyenson 1988a: 26, 47-68; e.g. Gill 2010).

The similarity of the organizational decision-making processes for conducting exchanges at the Field Museum, Smithsonian Institution, and other U.S. museums demonstrate that a hierarchical approval process was common in large museums, with museum directors ultimately approving exchanges. Brooke Penaloza Patzak's (2018) description of an exchange between the Smithsonian and Berlin Ethnographic Museum also highlights the role of each museum's administration. Attention to both organizational processes of accessioning and exchange can provide insight as to the control of collections within the museum. The Field Museum had a strong centralized administration, with an Office of the Recorder that would accession collections on behalf of the museum, thus keeping them in the public trust, before turning them over to departments for storage and further cataloguing. Departments gained more autonomy in the 1960s following the retirement of the Field Museum's Board President and the 'directors that ran the Museum for him,' as the administration had maintained tight control over all aspect of

museum management including record-keeping, exhibits and programs, and correspondence (Martin-Ross and Barnett 2002: 244). During the time of Martin's exchanges with Gladwin, the Museum's central administration closely monitored exchanges.

Attention to such authority processes indicates the ways in which different agents relate to objects in large museums. Curators, each with their own geographic purview, have authority to designate which objects can be classified as duplicates, because a duplicate is constituted in relation to disciplinary knowledge. The head curator has authority to approve the request at the departmental level, having to allocate finite resources among curators as each try to refine and build their collections. Heads also bear responsibility for the success of their departments with museum activities such as exhibits and programs.

Standards, Forms & Praxis

One distinct part of the 'information infrastructures' of the museum is the catalogue (Turner 2015b: 9). Historically, catalogues have used so-called objective, standardized fields to describe objects, thus reflecting an empirical tradition which 'privileges classification and lengthy descriptions of both physical attributes and the history of an object' (Cameron and Robinson 2007: 170). Over time, these descriptions become increasingly durable and impervious to change as they are repeated and reinscribed in different formats and technologies. Catalogue fields function as a system of classification. This system accommodates all kinds of objects, making them knowable to specialists by transforming them into specimens. The catalogue's ability to structure how we think about and value objects speaks to their immense power (Bowker and Star 2000). As descriptive and documentary technologies, catalogues record the similarities and differences between objects within established parameters. According to the catalogue, a shield, a loom, and a bowl are all different kinds of objects. By providing a system where objects are described through standardized fields, the catalogue is instrumental in producing 'duplicates' (Nichols 2016). If a museum holds ten examples of one kind of specimen (according to catalogue fields) in its collection, any one of those specimens may be considered a duplicate of another. As catalogues only record particular aspects of similarity, there is a range of curatorial discretion in the ultimate determination of if a specimen is duplicative. The designation of specimens as duplicates is dependent not only on being the same 'kind-of-thing' but also visual and methodological perceptions of similarity. When specimens acquire the status of duplicate, they also acquire the potential for mobility. Thus, the catalogue as a classification system provides an epistemological basis on which specimens are able to leave the museum.

Practically speaking, the movement of objects out of the museum requires the use of forms. Many forms related to object mobility are created and controlled by museum registrars. The Field Museum used a form known as a 'memo card' or 'invoice of specimens' to record information about the movement of specimens out of the museum. Printed en masse, these cards provided a standardized menu of options to categorize the type of movement. Decisions that diverged from museum policy and could still be accommodated within its norms were notated – usually in the margins – of the cards. Early memo cards were printed with the following options: 'For Examination, For Determination, Exchange'.² Using a sample from the Department of Anthropology's cards, the Field Museum added a fourth category in 1939 so that the options read: 'For Examination, Determination, Study, Exchange'.³ In 1952 the Field Museum phased out the memo cards and replaced them with Invoice of Specimens, which provided seven options: 'Gift, Exchange, Loan at your request, Examination at our request, Return of material borrowed by us, Return of material sent for identification', and a blank selection that could be filled in.⁴

Though sales of Field Museum objects were not as common as exchange, examination, or determination, they happened with some regularity. Although changes in categorical terminology were made over time, sale was never added to the form's printed list. I interpret this as a persistent praxis (referring to enacted, as opposed to idealized or normative) used by curators to provide other museums and private individuals the specimens that each wanted. These forms establish standards for the regular and acceptable basis for objects to leave the

museum. Standards are a view into social (and organizational) values and ethics. The exclusion of a particular option from standardized forms can be a 'moral choice as well as a technical and data-collecting one' (Star and Lampland 2009: 8). The fact that sale is never listed as a regular option on the forms establishes that this type of object movement is not sanctioned by the organization or profession as an encouraged practice, but it was not so egregious as to merit prohibition.

When a sale occurred, it was either marked as exchange, or the term 'sale' was notated in the margin of the card. In the following case, exchange is underlined on the memo card, but correspondence demonstrates it is a sale. Berthold Laufer, Curator of Anthropology, writes to Field Museum Director Frederick Skiff:

With reference to your recent authorisation to enter into negotiations with the Peabody Museum of Harvard University for the exchange of certain South Sea Island material, I now beg to report that Dr. C.C. Willoughby, Director of the Peabody Museum, through his representative Dr. Hooton, at present in Chicago, has selected 98 specimens from the Admiralty Islands valued at \$350. As the Peabody Museum has not material to offer in exchange, a cash transaction is preferred, as shown by Dr. Willoughby's enclosed letter.⁵

The outcome of this transaction conforms to the general goals of specimen exchange. The Field Museum sent described specimens to Harvard, where they ostensibly would be available for research and exhibition purposes, perhaps even more useful in this latter mode than if they had stayed at the Field Museum. In short, a sale to the Peabody invokes no ethical concern. Sales to private individuals, which were made with some regularity, failed to keep objects in the public domain and were more ethically ambiguous. In this case, curatorial praxis (action which bends the rules) seems to never been ultimately reconciled with the technologies (forms) which structured and reflected museum policy and practice.

In the following section I provide another view of specimen exchange on a micro-scale by analyzing a series of exchanges between Paul Martin on behalf of the Field Museum, and Harold Gladwin on behalf of Gila Pueblo. I emphasize how exchanges allowed each agent to further their anthropological and museological work. I then discuss how bureaucratic practices intersected with personal relationships and organizational histories.

Paul S. Martin, Field Museum Curator & Southwest Archaeologist

Paul S. Martin was a Southwest archaeologist and curator at the Field Museum from 1929 to 1972. Martin began his anthropological training at the University of Chicago in 1924 and excavated his first archaeological site for the Milwaukee Public Museum in 1925. After serving as curator of archaeology and ethnology for the State Historical Society of Colorado from 1927 to 1929, he accepted an offer to join the Field Museum as assistant curator of archaeology, where he would work to revive the Museum's long-dormant research program in Southwest archaeology. Martin joined the anthropological department, headed by Sinologist Berthold Laufer, and staffed with five additional assistant curators. Upon Laufer's unexpected death, Martin was promoted to acting curator of anthropology in 1934, and to chief curator in 1935, eclipsing his colleagues. Steve Nash, who has extensively analyzed Martin's work as a museum-based anthropologist, attributes Martin's rise as 'a testament to his ambition, networking, and unmatched productivity in research, collections, and outreach' (2010: 107).

At least discursively, Martin understood and promoted the idea that museums were well-suited to hold collections, as they could best care for cultural materials:

If the specimens are worth collecting and saving, they are worth taking care of, and provision should be made to have them left to an institution where they will be catalogued and preserved and where they will help future students and collectors (Martin 1933: 110).

Martin's track record with cataloguing and other critical aspects of ensuring the longevity of collections was incongruent with this attitude. Though he was a department head, some of the details in his research and museum work fell short of the accepted standards of the time.

Nash recounts several: destruction of excavation records following publication of analyses, publications based on archaeological data left in the field, significant depletions of research collections through poor management and culling, and a failure to catalogue approximately 95 percent of his own collections housed at the Field Museum (Nash 2010: 111-116). It was not a lack of understanding of professional standards, but not enough attention to them.

However careless he was in some aspects of curatorship, Martin clearly understood organizational expectations for his department and used this knowledge to his professional advantage. Much of his correspondence with administrators during excavations notes the recovery of exhibit-quality specimens, particularly whole pottery. In a reflexive essay written in his last year of life, Martin admitted that he devoted effort to 'obtain[ing] a goodly amount of loot for the Museum, for I was, at the time, very museum minded' (Martin 1974: 8). Administrators expected research trips to yield both knowledge and objects that would attract and entice visitors. Martin's regular contributions to *Field Museum News* (a periodical written with visitors and supporters in mind) focused on 'simply phrased explanations of anthropological research for an interested public' (Nash 2010: 115). The combination of public scholarship and education, plentiful temporary exhibits, visibility on the museum floor and in Chicago newspapers 'may have endeared Martin to the museum administration and enabled his meteoric rise to the top of the Department of Anthropology' more than his research contributions (Nash 2010: 115). Martin understood what the museum administration valued and his willingness to work in those directions allowed him leverage in many aspects of his position.

Martin's View of Collections and Specimen Exchange

At the start of Martin's tenure as chief curator, specimen exchange was a regular practice and organizational strategy used to refine one's own collections, and assist colleagues and other museums in doing so. Because specimen exchange operated through a hierarchical approval process, requests required department and director-level approvals. As head, Martin needed only director approval, which easily allowed him to make use of specimen exchange for the benefit of his research colleagues and professional associates. Curators working under him required both approvals, and there is ample evidence that Martin recommended and forwarded the requests of his colleagues onto the director.

Specimen exchange also reveals something about Martin's relationship to the whole of the department's collections. This practice has always been linked to tenuous issues of finite resources, particularly space. By reducing the number of duplicative specimens in a way that would not impede core museum functions of research and exhibition, more resources are freed up to acquire unrepresented materials. The early years of anthropology at the Field Museum were a frenzy of accumulation. Space was plentiful and the drive to collect was strong, abetted by the salvage paradigm. Following the departure of the previous curators/department heads George Dorsey (1897-1914) and Laufer (1915-1934), Martin was put in charge of making and curating his own collections, and managing those of the department as a whole. The partialities of his predecessors, entropic processes associated with the deterioration of organic materials, and an increasing number of objects that suffered from a lack of management (e.g. 'found in collection' or objects with no catalogue numbers) meant that Martin was tasked with dealing with a glut of material with little value for research or exhibition. A physical space in the museum - the 'Exchange Room' - that had been delineated for stocks of exchangeable duplicates was an area that also happened to accumulate collection objects whose value was quickly diminishing.

In a letter to Field Museum Director Clifford C. Gregg in 1941, Martin requested approval to assign particular objects in the 'Sales and Exchange Room' to waste while commenting on perception of object value.

During the last weeks we have been checking over the materials which have accumulated during the past 20 years in the "Sales and Exchange Room". The bulk of this material should have been consigned to waste years ago, but Dr. Laufer insisted that we store such materials in the Exchange Room in hope that we could get rid of it by means of sale or exchange. The materials that were placed there consisted of specimens which we deemed unworthy of exhibition,

study or storage space, and specimens on which we had no information as to source or locality.

During the past few years I have tried from time to time to sell or exchange any or all of this material with no success for the simple reason that no reputable museum would take this material as, naturally, what is not a good museum piece for us is not a good museum piece for any institution. Sale of this material has been particularly difficult because most dealers aren't interested in this kind of material. Mr. Millar has looked over all this material and is unable to use any of it for his Department. In short, and to be frank, it is junk.⁶

Not everything in the Sales and Exchange Room was 'junk' but the materials that were included things like '1 tray miscellaneous articles, broken baskets, gourd vessels, hats, cradles, wooden mortar and pestle, horn spoon, bamboo flutes, etc., all in very poor condition, damaged beyond repair'.⁷ Other materials were described as being unnumbered with an unknown location. This valuation was made in reference to object condition and quality, and lack of documentation.

Martin was frustrated with his predecessor's propensity to retain objects that were becoming increasingly less valuable, while occupying storage areas. With Martin's recommendation, purges occurred regularly. The year prior (1940), Martin focused disposal of Asian objects, recorded in a memo titled, 'List of Chinese, Tibetan and Japanese specimens in very poor state of preservation. To be consigned to waste'.⁸ In Martin's own hand he scratched through the typed text 'in very poor state of preservation' and replaced it with 'unworthy of storage room'.⁹ Disposal was justified through appraisals of object value, constituted in relation to their physical condition and lack of documentation. While Martin would not exchange 'junk' with other museums, the combination of accumulation, overcrowding, interminable cataloguing, and inevitable deterioration created conditions ripe for Martin to move both duplicates and 'junk' out of the museum, while acquiring objects or cash in exchange.

Harold S. Gladwin

Harold Gladwin came to archaeology as a secondary vocation. Born in New York City and educated in England, from 1908 to 1922 he held a seat on the New York Stock Exchange. Tired of life on the East Coast, he moved to California where he met the Harvard-trained archaeologist Alfred Vincent Kidder. On an excursion to northern Arizona in 1924, Kidder acquainted Gladwin with ruins. Thus began Gladwin's efforts to organize and conduct archaeological investigations in the Southwest. In 1927 he founded the independent archaeological research institute called Gila Pueblo Archaeological Foundation. Located in Globe, Arizona, Gila Pueblo was prehistoric Pueblo ruin located on a twenty-acre property Gladwin purchased and went about excavating with a crew made up largely of Pima Indians. The rooms were transformed into living quarters, offices, research facilities, and display areas where Gladwin could exhibit his quickly-growing Southwestern collections in their local context. Until Gila Pueblo's closure in 1950, Gladwin surveyed over ten thousand sites and made significant contributions to the recognition of the Hohokam, Mogollon, and Cochise cultures (Williams 1991: 224-6). Southwest archaeologist Emil Hauray, who worked with Gladwin at Gila Pueblo, characterized it 'as a museum' in that it was 'not adverse to liberally exchanging specimens with other institutions' and was 'always willing to comply if possible' to meet the needs of other museums for specimens (1988: 38).

Gladwin and Martin likely met during the early thirties. In 1932 Martin responded to a letter from Gladwin about receiving publications; the tone was formal and collegial. By 1934 their correspondence was increasingly friendly, and by 1935 they addressed each other with given names.¹⁰ 1934 brought Martin's completion of excavations at Lowry Ruin, and he sent tree-ring samples to Gila Pueblo, and elsewhere for dating (Nash 1999: 102). Gladwin was among the major players in Southwest archaeology at the time. His collections at Gila Pueblo were well-documented with provenience information (site numbers), at least those he exchanged with the Field Museum.

The First Exchanges

In January 1934 Gladwin sent a letter to initiate an exchange of archaeological specimens to the Field's Director Stephen Simms.¹¹ He mentioned his recent visit to Chicago where he had already selected the specimens he wanted to receive, where he was assisted by Martin and Eric Thompson, Assistant Curator of Mexican and South American Archaeology. Though he had already been in negotiations with Martin about exchanges, he understood the official request must be made to the museum's director.

In this initial period of exchange, occurring over the course of 1934 and 1935, Gladwin sent 'representative collections from the Mimbres, Salado, and neighboring cultures,' as well as a 'series of charts' that synthesized recent research on these areas.¹² The first transmission of thirty specimens consisted of mostly bowls with a few pitchers and ladles. Only seven of 30 objects lacked site numbers and all but one included provenance information.¹³ Like Gladwin had done at the Field, Martin had selected these pieces from Gila Pueblo himself, and as a Southwestern archaeologist, they would no doubt be useful in developing the Field's typological series. Described as whole vessels, they were likely well-suited for display. Gladwin offered to 'round out' the Field's 'series of southwestern pottery types' by sending more specimens: again, objects that Martin would select.¹⁴ True to his word, Gladwin sent 13 additional pieces in May 1935¹⁵

In exchange, Gladwin received two Field Museum transmissions. The first contained 17 pieces of pottery from Central and South America, with culture and geographic designations.¹⁶ The second transmission contained nine ceramics and one stone tool, from the American Southwest, Mexico and South America.¹⁷ Though Martin did not send site numbers, he included the catalogue information for each object. For example, 'Clay bowl. Parallel brown lines on outside arranged in triangular areas'. 'Tarascan Indians, Chapala, Jalisco, Mexico'. 'Catalogue Number 95420' 'Accession Number 947'.¹⁸ These exchanges are notable due to the fact that each partner traveled to each other's collection and selected objects either before or during exchange negotiations. This series of events demonstrates Martin's confidence in his ability to secure director approval for his exchanges with Gladwin, as having the requests denied after Gladwin had made his selections would reflect poorly both on the Field Museum and on Martin as a professional colleague. Both parties got what they wanted.

Travel to select duplicates for exchange in person was dependent on the availability and cost of transportation. In 1889 the Smithsonian's Otis Mason traveled to Europe, during which time he visited as many museums and colleagues as he could (Kohlstedt 2008), and inquired about the possibility of exchanges (Nichols and Parezo 2017). It was his only trip. Selecting duplicates via correspondence was an imprecise venture and could result in disappointments (see Nichols 2018; Gill 2011). By the 1930s domestic travel for exchange purposes seems to have been more common, at least at the Field Museum (e.g. Collier 1952). Not only did Martin and Gladwin travel to each other's respective museums, the Field Museum's Curator of Melanesian Ethnology, A. B. Lewis, traveled to the Buffalo Museum of Science in order to select duplicates from their Melanesian collections which were primarily from British New Guinea, to be added to the Field Museum's holdings, which were largely from German New Guinea (Welsch and Mooiman 2015: 115).

The Second Exchanges

Only weeks after the second Field Museum transmission, Martin again petitioned Simms, forwarding Gladwin's request to 'obtain sixty to eight-five Melanesian specimens,' for which the Field would receive 'some very fine Basket Maker pottery of which the Museum has none, [and] a typological series of pottery found at [Gladwin's] new site, Snaketown'. Martin was 'very eager to obtain this material' and had consulted with and convinced the curator in charge of it, Albert Lewis, to allow the exchange.¹⁹ In order to get what Gladwin wanted, Martin relied on the cooperation of his colleagues to release duplicates from the collections under their care. Martin assured Simms that there was 'abundant duplicate material from Melanesia' in the 'Exchange Room'.²⁰ Simms approved the request, noting his 'understanding that the Melanesian material is of a duplicate character and is not suitable for exhibition purposes in Field Museum'.²¹ The repetition of the duplicate character of the material to be exchanged demonstrates how the

specimen exchange system depended on this organizational classification. Simms wanted to be sure that he was only giving approval to the exchange of duplicate material, which was less valuable to the Field Museum.

Once the exchange was approved, Martin made a separate request to Simms. During Gladwin's last visit, he had also inquired about the possibility of purchasing some African and South American specimens which were 'now in the departmental Sales and Exchange Room'.²² Martin noted that Gladwin would be 'willing to pay any price that you wish to put on the material'.²³ While deaccessioning through exchange was business as usual, Martin felt compelled to handle the sale request with more care and finesse to ensure a positive outcome for Gladwin. He furthered his case:

Since this material is all in our Sales and Exchange Room, I feel that it is perfectly safe to recommend this sale. If this suggestion meets your approval, I shall select the materials, gather them together in one room, and shall await a time when you can come up and put a price on the various specimens.²⁴

These objects were clearly not the aforementioned 'junk' but rather specimens with exchange value that Martin would feel confident in selling to a close colleague.

Gladwin had requested both the exchange and the sale during his last visit to the Field Museum. However, Martin divided these requests administratively to ensure successful approval and avoid confusion in the accounting of what Gladwin would owe. In the first request, Martin refers to the 'Exchange Room' while in the second, he refers to the 'Sales and Exchange Room'. These terms were used interchangeably by Martin, so these were not separate spaces with different contents. Martin emphasizes that the duplicate material held in this space was perhaps preferably used for exchanges, but could also be sold for cash. Both requests were approved.

The transmissions contained 101 specimens from Melanesia, and 51 from South America, Africa, Australia, the Philippines, New Zealand, and China. These contents are a departure from the Southwest and Central American material that Gladwin had previously received. Though there is little correspondence that reveals Gladwin's purpose for the objects, he remarked to Martin: 'I am amusing myself building up my analogy room and getting a tremendous kick out of the things which you sent me. It is all making a very brave showing'.²⁵ Gladwin was likely putting these objects to use for an intellectual purpose. Gladwin was not acquiring them to put them to use in further exchanges, which was not an uncommon practice. Indeed, most if not all of these objects remained at Gila Pueblo until its closure in 1950. Though Gladwin had more direct control and decision-making power over Gila Pueblo's collections, they were held in the public trust by Gila Pueblo and subsequently transferred to the Arizona State Museum where they are currently curated (Haury and Reid 1985). As Haury (1988: 36-38) notes, though Gladwin was required to allow public access to the artifacts recovered under the guise of federal excavation permits, Gila Pueblo functioned more like a research institute than a museum in terms of public access. Visitors were welcomed by appointment, and their access to the open-storage style exhibits was closely monitored.

Gladwin's Use of Non-American Collections

Perhaps Gladwin drew inspiration from these materials in his promotion and dissemination of the diffusionist hypothesis, a rejection of New World independent invention. In 1947 Gladwin published *Men Out of Asia*, which Stephen Williams characterizes as a 'hyper-diffusionist spoof' based on Gladwin's scant use of scientific evidence and far-fetched claims as to the peopling of the New World (1991: 229). In this text, Gladwin's prose style was conversational, his ideas subversive. Williams provides a sound critique of Gladwin's text, acknowledging that he was 'reacting to a real archaeological problem' of chronology (1991: 230). He points out Gladwin generally omits scholarly citations, and characterizes the content as being 'such a mishmash of cultural traits and time periods that it boggles the mind' (1991: 233). In Gladwin's obituary, Haury and Reid refer to Gladwin's later writings as 'whimsey [sic]', which 'tended to obscure his earlier contributions' which were substantial in terms of the development of archaeological methods and contributions to the definitions of the Hohokam, Mogollon, and Cochise cultures (1985: 280).

In *Men Out of Asia*, Gladwin offers no fine-grained analysis of anthropological data to uphold his assertions of his version of the diffusionist hypothesis, which he claimed encompassed five population migrations from Asia to the Americas via a land bridge and the Bering Strait, and one via the Pacific. He avoids formal comparisons of well-provenanced specimens, instead opting for loose comparisons of object function:

men...taking their calabashes filled with lime they would first remove the swizzle stick which also served as a stopper, lick off some lime, and chew a plant - tobacco if in Mexico; coca, if in South America; or betel, if in Oceania (Gladwin 1947: 274).

Some of the objects he refers to in the text mirror (in catalogue description) ones sent from Martin at the Field. Gladwin had received a lime stick (Field Museum #134571) and lime spatula (FM #106200) from the Admiralty Islands, and a lime gourd from St. Matthias Island in the Bismarck Archipelago (FM #137160) (Image 1).²⁶

Another comparison was between pan pipes where Gladwin wrote,

by listening carefully one might have heard a song played on Pan pipes in either Melanesia, Colombia, Panama, or Peru. In case you do not know them by name, Pan pipes are ingenious little musical instruments which came originally from Greece....It is interesting, some may regard it as significant, that the pipes in Melanesia and those in South America have been shown by Hornbostel to have tonal identity and the same pitch (1947: 272).

Gladwin had received three pan pipes from the Field Museum. Two were from Accession 1072 (FM #112349 and 112350), Aneri Islands, New Ireland. Both with seven bamboo tubes, one only had fastening at the base. The other was from Accession 1069 (FM #112464), Ieta, Buka Straits, Buka Bougainville, Solomon Islands, and had eight tubes with four of them open. Gladwin had received specimens such that he might make close study and comparisons of form, but he makes no mention of these specific specimens in his text.²⁷ Gladwin showed little regard for scientific controlled comparisons to advance his thesis. Though these specimens received from the Field were in Gladwin's analogy room and he may have used them in developing his hypothesis, he failed to represent them in his text in a way that would convince academic anthropologists.

Whether or not Gladwin was thinking with these duplicates to develop and advance his diffusionist hypothesis, his use of these objects would have arguably been limited by the lack of contextual information required to make theoretical generalizations. As Jude Philp notes, duplicate specimens were sent out of museums through exchange with 'minimal information' as to their provenance (2011: 273). While the documentation that accompanied the specimens sent to Gladwin did provide the accession number, collector name, and some geographic information, the removal of these specimens from their originating collections in the Field Museum has a tendency to limit their research potential. Gladwin would likely not have regular access to the written field notes and documentation for the originating collections so would be unable to consider intra- or inter-category variation. In this way, specimen exchange as a strategy of museum collections refinement has the tendency to circumscribe the research potential of specimens to typological modes.

Discussion

The preceding analysis raises three points, which I discuss in relation to specimen exchange, and which may be applied to broader considerations of the intersections between museum professionals, organizational policies, and collections. First, exchanges emphasize that the movement of museum objects results from a negotiation between organizational requirements, and individual and curatorial praxis. Exchanges served both Martin and Gladwin's professional products: publications and exhibitions. Gladwin had only to comply with federal requirements that specimens be kept in public depositories. Martin carried out exchanges within the context of the Field Museum's bureaucratic organization, working with other curators in his department



Image 1. Lime gourd from St. Matthias Island sent to Harold Gladwin, FM #137160. Arizona State Museum #GP-48770. Photo credit: Catherine Nichols

as well as the museum's administration. He understood the museum's requirements for exchanges, as well as how to successfully offer collections for sale, even though this was not quite within the realm of regular practice. Martin's willingness and desire to provide Gladwin with the materials he had selected reflects a personal and collegial relationship between these two men within the context of the anthropological discipline.

Second, exchange transactions may be understood as functioning as part of the iterative nature of data collection and knowledge production. The 13 additional objects Gladwin sent in 1935 (Accession 2094) were recorded by Field Museum collections staff as being associated with the first exchange *and* the second, which is revealing with regard to the position of exchanges in terms of the professional as opposed to the organizational realm. A scrawled note has been written on the accession card indicating that the whole of the accessions and memos were somehow connected, but it was difficult for the registrar to keep track of exactly which Field Museum transmissions were sent for which Gila Pueblo returns.²⁸ The notations on the cards speak to the fluidity in the way that Martin and Gladwin exchanged, both traveling to each other's home institutions and selecting desired objects.

In letters to the Field's director, Gladwin specifically emphasizes that organizational cooperation is needed for knowledge production. The pottery he received 'will be of the greatest value to us in building up our comparative series,' emphasizing its use in determining stylistic and cultural boundaries.²⁹ Following Kidder's excavations at Pecos Pueblo, both Gladwin and Martin were instrumental in the development of the 'stratographic revolution' in which cultural chronologies were developed through ceramic analyses.

The development of chronological dating methods is considered one of the most important advances in American archaeology in the twentieth century, and the work of Kidder, Gladwin, Martin and others firmly established the American Southwest as one of the most important archaeological areas in the Americas (Willey and Sabloff 1974: 88-130). Gladwin predicted that 'Southwestern Archaeology' would 'soon take a place in the front rank of New World civilizations' due to 'an intelligent and coordinated attack shared by the Field Museum, Carnegie Institution, and Gila Pueblo,' which would allow for more coordinated research effort.³⁰

The tenor of Gladwin-Martin exchanges demonstrates how disciplinary practitioners needed organizations to work together, sending specimens on an as-needed basis. This is apparent in correspondence to the 1935 Field Museum transmission, where Martin requests

permission to send the ceramics that are ready.³¹ He notes that he is unable to 'consummate the exchange' because a small group of Maya potsherds promised to Gladwin would not be ready until the following May.³² Gladwin understood the delay with the sherds and this fact did nothing to stop him from continuing to send and request objects from Field Museum. From the vantage point of Southwest archaeologists like Gladwin and Martin, who were at the forefront of 'stratigraphic and seriation methods, pottery and artifact typology, [and] culture unit classification', there was no need to wait for an exchange to be started and then finished before proceeding to the next (Willey and Sabloff 1974: 115). Martin's comment indicates that the museum registrar may have felt differently.

Third, professional-personal motivations and actions do not always align with policies designed to maintain an organization's viability and reputation. Across large museums, specimen exchange has a strong organizational recording and monitoring component. This is associated with the need by organizations that collect things *en masse* to maintain intellectual and physical control over them. It also serves to standardize care and management over time and personnel changes. Specimen exchange's hierarchical approval process, duplicative record-keeping, and the use of economic valuation to ensure exchange equivalence indicates efforts to manage collections diligently by the Field Museum. But between Martin and other professional anthropologists, the flow of specimens between museums and research institutes was in service of the field's growing knowledge of Southwest archaeology.³³

These points call attention to the broad dynamics of object movement in the museum, which now occurs most frequently for loans and repatriation. I have characterized specimen exchange as form of deaccessioning in order to associate its analytical insights to more common contemporary practices. Museum policies are interpreted and enacted by professional staff, and are responsive to shifts in disciplinary ethics, methods, and theories. Moreover, organizational policies are shaped by a variety of factors including standards developed by the larger community of practitioners, as well as those who bear the fiduciary responsibility to support museum activities. Particularly in complex, bureaucratic organizations, the movement of objects results from the direct and indirect actions of individuals and communities of practice.

Conclusion

I have characterized specimen exchange as a collections-based practice to serve organizational, disciplinary, and personal goals and relationships. I have focused my analysis on descriptive organizational policies while attending to how specimen exchange's practice is reconciled in bureaucratic technologies such as forms, in order to explore how museum professionals, who may also be disciplinary practitioners, manage collections under their purview. The Martin-Gladwin exchanges function as a case to describe how exchanges were carried out while offering an analysis that can be applied broadly to object movements, particularly those that concern deaccessioning.

In order to visualize the full picture of how objects circulate within and between museums, and within the broader contexts of collectors and scholars, attention must be paid to both the organizational components as well as the professional-personal aspects of curatorial work of collections building and refinement. The Field Museum's foundational anthropology of over 50,000 specimens came from the World's Columbian Exposition of 1893 (Haskin, Nash and Coleman 2003: 65). There is perhaps no better example at the Field Museum of how personalities figured into the scope and content of the anthropological collections than the work of the head curator of anthropology from 1895 to 1915, George Dorsey. Dorsey's collecting methods and attitudes – ones that he instilled in his subordinates – were voracious and relentless, fueled by an urgency born from competition with other museums and concerns over the disappearance of indigenous cultures. Dorsey's two main goals in building the Department's collections were to fill gaps, and create a 'representative sample of material from a given tribe' (Almazan and Coleman 2003: 88). Dorsey advocated acquisition by any means necessary, including coercive purchasing, and stealing. By the time Martin became head curator there were fewer funds for large-scale collecting expeditions, and exchanges became a more commonly used means of refining the massive collections. As a counterpoint to Dorsey's acquisitiveness, in 1972 the Department of Anthropology issued a policy on the acquisition of antiquities, in response to concerns about 'the scientific, ethical, legal, and diplomatic problems involving in

acquiring new specimens' (Collier 1973: 514). Though Martin's early collecting habits as an archaeologist were in line with Dorsey's model of acquisition, his exchange practice reflects his desire not only to build collections, but also to encourage the continual professionalization of the field. The timing of the 1972 statement on collections acquisitions and the curtailment of anthropological specimen exchange are probably not coincidental, both reflecting shifting ideas about the value of anthropological collections.

Though specimen exchange has declined for anthropological collections, duplicates were exchanged with regularity for decades (see Philp 2011: 271). Though they are usually not considered to be artifacts of a singular and spectacular nature, their use in exchange points to the commodity potential of museum objects (Foster 2015), and that preservation is contingent on an object's value. As repatriation now represents a substantial portion of the permanent movement of materials out of anthropology museums, the bottom line in many of the contemporary discussions of cultural patrimony center on an object's value, and how possession circumscribes interpretive prerogative (Marselis 2016). Consideration of specimen exchange, as a form of deaccessioning, is well positioned to contribute to these contemporary conversations (Nichols 2014a).

The decline of specimen exchange in contemporary museum practice further contributes to the tendency to associate the museum with processes of acquisition and preservation, while downplaying the hot-button issue of deaccessioning and disposal. Museum associations address deaccessioning and disposal through guidelines and codes of ethics, but promotion and implementation of these activities is not widespread.³⁴ In light of the growing expense of properly caring for museum collections, some contemporary museum practitioners are now advocating for active and regular evaluations of museum collections in terms of their use and importance, in an attempt to destigmatize responsible deaccessioning (Wood, Tisdale and Jones 2017). Nick Merriman's work emphasizes the need for principled disposal policies to shift museums to more sustainable organizations. He emphasizes that museum collections are not products of 'collective memory' but rather 'partial, historically-contingent assemblages which reflect the tastes and interests of both the times and the individuals who made them' (2008: 3). I suggest that organizational bureaucratic configurations may contribute to the production of collections as collective memory, and therefore it becomes critical to reconstruct past contexts of individual praxis and disciplinary emphases in developing and enacting principled deaccessioning policies. This particular case of exchanges between Martin and Gladwin draw attention to not only how organizational requirements and processes impacts the movement of objects out of museums, but also the role of personal and disciplinary orientations and preferences of curators and scholars.

Received: 1 March 2018

Finally accepted: 6 December 2018

Acknowledgements

My sincere appreciation goes to the individuals that assisted with this research, including: Steve Nash, Armand Esai, Gretchen Riggs, Diane Dittmore and her staff, Rick Ahlstrom, Nancy Parezo, Liz Hopwood, and Priyanka Jacob. The original draft of this paper has been greatly improved through the insightful suggestions of external reviewers and the superb editorial guidance of Kostas Arvanitis.

Notes

¹ An exchange catalogue was published for 1897-98, but it focused exclusively on library materials.

² Memo 445, All Departments Memos, Field Museum Archives.

³ Memo 881, Anthropology Memos, Field Museum Archives.

⁴ Memo 1935, Anthropology Memos, Field Museum Archives.

- ⁵ Laufer to Skiff, 5 Aug 1918, All Departments Memo 3459, Field Museum Archives.
- ⁶ Martin to Gregg, 18 Jan 1941, Department of Anthropology Memo 978, Anthropology Memos, Field Museum Archives.
- ⁷ Martin to Gregg, 18 Jan 1941, Department of Anthropology Memo 978, Anthropology Memos, Field Museum Archives.
- ⁸ 'List of Chinese, Tibetan and Japanese specimens,' 4 May 1940, Memo 948, Anthropology Memos, Field Museum Archives.
- ⁹ 'List of Chinese, Tibetan and Japanese specimens,' 4 May 1940, Memo 948, Anthropology Memos, Field Museum Archives.
- ¹⁰ Departmental Correspondence 1893-35, Folder GISE to GOLOMSHTOK, Field Museum Archives.
- ¹¹ Anthropology Accession 2061, Field Museum Archives.
- ¹² Gladwin to Simms, 9 Jan 1934, Memo 620, Anthropology Memos, Field Museum Archives.
- ¹³ Anthropology Accession 2061, Field Museum Archives.
- ¹⁴ Gladwin to Simms, 6 April 1934, Memo 620, Anthropology Memos, Field Museum Archives.
- ¹⁵ Anthropology Accession 2061, Field Museum Archives.
- ¹⁶ Memo 620
- ¹⁷ Memo 658, Anthropology Memos, Field Museum Archives.
- ¹⁸ 'List of Material Sent to Harold Gladwin' 4 Feb 1935, Memo 658, Anthropology Memos, Field Museum Archives.
- ¹⁹ Martin to Simms, 30 June 1936, Memo 737, Anthropology Memos, Field Museum Archives.
- ²⁰ Martin to Simms, 30 June 1936, Memo 737, Anthropology Memos, Field Museum Archives.
- ²¹ Simms to Martin, 3 July 1936, Memo 737, Anthropology Memos, Field Museum Archives.
- ²² Simms to Martin, 3 July 1936, Memo 737, Anthropology Memos, Field Museum Archives.
- ²³ Simms to Martin, 3 July 1936, Memo 737, Anthropology Memos, Field Museum Archives.
- ²⁴ Martin to Simms, 7 July 1936, Memo 737, Anthropology Memos, Field Museum Archives.
- ²⁵ Gladwin to Martin, 27 Oct 1936, Anthropology Accession 2129, Field Museum Archives.
- ²⁶ 'List of Material for Exchange with Mr. Harold Gladwin,' Memo 737, Anthropology Memos, Field Museum Archives.
- ²⁷ 'List of Material for Exchange with Mr. Harold Gladwin,' Memo 737, Anthropology Memos, Field Museum Archives.
- ²⁸ Anthropology Accession Card No 2094, Field Museum Archives.
- ²⁹ Gladwin to Simms, 5 March 1935, Memo 658, Anthropology Memos, Field Museum Archives.

- ³⁰ Gladwin to Simms, 6 April 1934, Anthropology Accession 2061, Field Museum Archives.
- ³¹ Memo 658, Anthropology Memos, Field Museum Archives.
- ³² Martin to Simms, 28 January 1935, Memo 658, Anthropology Memos, Field Museum Archives.
- ³³ Steve Nash's detailed study of catalogue and curatorial records of Martin's collections document more than seventy transmissions (either exchange or donation) of specimens from his Southwest archaeology collections between 1937 and 1964 for research and educational uses. Recipients included well-known disciplinary hubs in Southwest archaeology such as the University of Arizona and the Museum of Northern Arizona. See Memo: 'Summary of Exchange/Loan Memoranda' 18 December 1998, Field Museum of Natural History, personal communication with S. Nash, 29 September 2017.
- ³⁴ See [UK] Museums Association. 'Disposal Toolkit: Guidelines for Museums', 2014. <https://www.museumsassociation.org/policy/guidelines>, accessed 4 September 2018. [US] American Alliance of Museums. 'Code of Ethics for Museums', 2000. <https://www.aam-us.org/programs/ethics-standards-and-professional-practices/code-of-ethics-for-museums/>, accessed 4 September 2018.

References

- Almazan, T. and S. Coleman. (2003) 'George Amos Dorsey: A Curator and His Comrades', in Stephen Nash and Gary Feinman (eds) *Curators, Collections, and Contexts: Anthropology at the Field Museum, 1893-2002, Fieldiana, Anthropology New Series* 36 87-98.
- Ahrne, G. and N. Brunsson. (2011) 'Organization outside organizations: the significance of partial organization', *Organization*, 18 83-104.
- Bennett, T. (2004) *Pasts Beyond Memory: Evolution, Museums, Colonialism*, London: Routledge.
- Bowker, G. and S. Starr. (2000) 'Invisible Mediators of Action: Classification and the Ubiquity of Standards', *Mind, Culture, and Activity* 7(1-2) 147-63.
- Cameron, F. and H. Robinson (2007) 'Digital Knowledgescapes: Cultural, Theoretical, Practica, and Usage Issues Facing Museum Collection Databases in a Digital Epoch', in Fiona Cameron and Sarah Kenderdine (eds) *Theorizing Digital Cultural Heritage: A Critical Discourse*, 165-191, Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Collier, D. (1952) 'Notable Mexican Antiquities Received by Exchange', *Chicago Natural History Museum Bulletin*, April 3-4.
- (1973) 'Field Museum Policy Concerning Acquisition of Antiquities', *Current Anthropology* 14 (4) 514.
- Daston, L. (2004) 'Type Specimens and Scientific Memory', *Critical Inquiry* 31 (1) 153-182.
- Field Columbian Museum (1896) *Annual Exchange Catalogue For the Year 1896-1897*, Chicago: Field Columbian Museum.

- Foster, R. (2015) 'Commodity Forensics: The Secret Life of the P.G.T. Black Collection', in Robert Foster and Kathryn Leacock (eds) *Art Artifact Commodity: Perspectives on the P.G.T. Black Collection*, *Bulletin of the Buffalo Society of Natural Sciences* 42 103-111.
- Frizzell, D. (1933) 'Terminology of Types', *American Midland Naturalist* 14 (6) 637-668.
- Gill, B. (2010) 'The Cheeseman-Giglioli correspondence, and museum exchanges between Auckland and Florence, 1877-1904', *Archives of Natural History* 37 (1) 131-149.
- Gladwin, H. (1947) *Men out of Asia*, New York: McGraw Hill.
- Gray, C., and V. McCall (2018) 'Analysing the Adjectival Museum: Exploring the bureaucratic nature of museums and the implications for researchers and the research process', *Museum & Society* 16(2) 124-137.
- Haskin, W., S. Nash, and S. Coleman (2003) 'A Chronicle of Field Museum Anthropology' in Stephen Nash and Gary Feinman (eds) *Curators, Collections, and Contexts: Anthropology at the Field Museum, 1893-2002*, *Fieldiana, Anthropology New Series* 36 65-84.
- Haury, E. (1988) 'Gila Pueblo Archaeological Foundation: A History and Some Personal Notes', *Kiva* 54 (1) i-ix, 1-77.
- Haury, E. and J. Reid. (1985) 'Harold Sterling Gladwin 1883-1983', *Kiva* 50 (4) 271-283.
- Kohlstedt, S. (2008) 'Otis T. Mason's Tour of Europe: Observation, Exchange, and Standardization in the Public Museums, 1889', *Museum History Journal* 1 (2) 181-207.
- Malaro, M. (1998) *A Legal Primer on Managing Museum Collections*, Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Marselis, R. (2016) 'On Not Showing Scalps: Human Remains and Multisited Debate at the National Museum of Denmark', *Museum Anthropology* 39 (1) 20-34.
- Martin, P. (1933) *Guide, Part 2: Archaeology of North America, Hall B (Ground Floor)*, Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History.
- (1974) 'Early Development in Mogollon Research', in Gordon R. Willey (ed) *Archaeological Researches in Retrospect*, 3-29, Cambridge: Winthrop.
- Martin-Ross, D. and W. Barnett. (2003) 'Information Management in the Department of Anthropology: History and Prospects', in Stephen Nash and Gary Feinman (eds) *Curators, Collections, and Contexts: Anthropology at the Field Museum, 1893-2002*, *Fieldiana, Anthropology New Series* 36 243-250.
- Merriman, N. (2008) 'Museum collections and sustainability', *Cultural Trends*, 17(1) 3-21.
- Müller-Wille, S. (2003) 'Nature as a Marketplace: The Political Economy of Linnaean Botany', *History of Political Economy Annual Supplement to Volume 35* 154-172.
- Nash, S. (2010) 'A Conflicted Legacy: Paul Sidney Martin as Museum Archaeologist, 1925-38', *American Anthropologist*, 112 (1) 104-121.
- (1999) *Time, Trees, and Prehistory: Tree-Ring Dating and the Development of North American Archaeology 1914-1950*, Salt Lake City: The University of Utah Press.

- Nichols, C. (2018) 'The Smithsonian Institution's "Greatest Treasures": Valuing Museum Objects in the Specimen Exchange Industry', *Museum Anthropology* 41 (1) 13-29.
- (2016) 'Exchanging Anthropological Duplicates at the Smithsonian Institution,' *Museum Anthropology*, 39 (2) 130-46.
- (2014a) 'Lost in Museums: The Ethical Dimensions of Historical Practices of Anthropological Specimen Exchange', *Curator: The Museum Journal* 57 (2) 225-236.
- (2014b) *Museum Networks: The Exchange of the Smithsonian Institution's Duplicate Anthropology Collections*. PhD, Arizona State University.
- Nichols, C. and N. Parezo (2017) 'Social and Material Connections: Otis T. Mason's European Grand Tour and Collections Exchanges', *History and Anthropology* 28 (1) 58-83.
- Ogilvie, B. (2006) *The Science of Describing: Natural History in Renaissance Europe*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Parezo, N. (1987) 'The Formation of Ethnographic Collections: The Smithsonian Institution in the American Southwest', *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory* 10 1-47.
- Penaloza Patzak, B. (2018) 'An Emissary from Berlin: Franz Boas and the Smithsonian Institution, 1887-88,' *Museum Anthropology*, 41 (1) 30-45.
- Philp, J. (2011) 'Hedley Takes a Holiday: Collections from Kanak People in the Australian Museum', in Sarah Byrne, Anne Clarke, Rodney Harrison, and Robin Torrence (eds) *Unpacking the Collection: Networks of Material and Social Agency in the Museum*, 307-25, New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Sheets-Pyenson, S. (1988a) *Cathedrals of Science: The Development of Colonial Natural History Museums during the Late Nineteenth Century*. Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- (1988b) 'How to "Grow" a Natural History Museum: The Building of Colonial Collections, 1850-1900', *Archives of Natural History* 15 (2) 121-47.
- Shelton, A. (1994) 'Cabinets of Transgression: Renaissance Collections and the Incorporation of the New World', in John Elsner and Roger Cardinal (eds) *The Cultures of Collecting*, 177-203, London: Reaktion Books.
- Simms, S. (1935) 'Annual Report of the Director to the Board of Trustees for the Year 1934', in *Field Museum of Natural History Report Series Publication* 336 Vol. X (2).
- Smith, D. (2012) *Animals and Artifacts: Specimen Exchanges and Displays in Yellowstone National Park, The National Museum, and The National Zoo, 1846 to 1916*. PhD, Montana State University.
- Star, S. and Lampland, M. (2009) 'Reckoning with Standards', in Martha Lampland and Susan Leigh Star (eds) *Standards and their Stories: How Quantifying, Classifying, and Formalizing Practices Shape Everyday Life*, 3-34, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Svedberg, R. and O. Agevall. (2016) *The Max Weber Dictionary: Key Words and Concepts* (Second Edition), Stanford: Stanford Social Sciences.

- Thomas, J. (2011) 'Compiling 'God's great book [of] universal nature: The Royal Society's collecting strategies', *Journal of the History of Collections* 23 (1) 1-13.
- Turner, H. (2015a) 'Decolonizing Ethnographic Documentation: A Critical History of the Early Museum Catalogs at the Smithsonian's National Museum of Natural History', *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 53 (5-6) 658-676.
- (2015b) *Information Infrastructures in the Museum: Documenting, Digitizing, and Practising Ethnographic Objects in the Smithsonian's Department of Anthropology*. PhD. University of Toronto.
- Walsh, J. (2002) 'Collections as Currency', in William L. Merrill and Ives Goddards (eds) *Anthropology, History, and American Indians: Essays in Honor of William Curtis Sturtevant*, 201-10, Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Weil, S. (1988) 'The Museum and the Public', *Museum Management and Curatorship* 16 (3) 257-271.
- Welsch, R. and K. Mooiman. (2015) 'The Ongoing Social Life of Museum Collections: Reflections on Objects Exchanged with Chicago's Field Museum in 1939', in Robert Foster and Kathryn Leacock (eds) *Art Artifact Commodity: Perspectives on the P.G.T. Black Collection*, *Bulletin of the Buffalo Society of Natural Sciences* 42 113-124.
- Wiley, G. and J. Sabloff (1974) *A History of American Archaeology*, San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Williams, S. (1991) *Fantastic Archaeology: The Wild Side of North American Prehistory*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Wood, E., R. Tisdale, and T. Jones (2017) *Active Collections*, New York: Routledge.

***Catherine A Nichols**

Advanced Lecturer in Cultural Anthropology and Museum Studies
Department of Anthropology
Loyola University Chicago
Lake Shore Campus, BVM Tower 706
1032 W. Sheridan Road
Chicago, IL 60660

cnichols@luc.edu

Catherine Nichols is an advanced lecturer in cultural anthropology and museum studies in the Department of Anthropology at Loyola University Chicago. Her research examines specimen exchange in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, especially as it was practiced by the Smithsonian Institution and the Field Museum. She directs Loyola's May Weber Ethnographic Study Collection, a small collection of ethnographic art assembled in the mid-to-late twentieth century.