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ABSTRACT
Hannah Marie Wormington’s (1914–1994) archaeological career spanned six decades. She made many important contributions to the development of North American archaeological method, theory, and knowledge, particularly in the study of Paleoindian and Archaic cultures across the American West. This paper offers a critical analysis of Wormington’s contributions to archaeological research, collections acquisition and curation, and exhibition and outreach activities, among many programs that were her responsibility as a museum-based archaeologist. In so doing, this paper offers new insights on the career of a fascinatingly complex scientist whose legacy and career, 33 years of which occurred at the Denver Museum of Nature & Science, have yet to receive the critical attention they so deserve.

RESUMEN
La carrera de Hannah Marie Wormington (1914–1994) se extendió a lo largo de seis décadas. Sus contribuciones fueron muchas y su importancia fue significante en relación al desarrollo de los métodos, la teoría, y el conocimiento del estudio de arqueología norteamericana, específicamente en referencia al estudio de las culturas paleoindianas y arcaicas a través de la región occidental de norteamérica. Este artículo ofrece un análisis crítico de las obras arqueológicas de Wormington con respeto a sus investigaciones científicas, y también en relación a sus trabajos en el contexto de la adquisición, conservación, y exhibición de colecciones en los museos, y en la promoción de sus actividades a la comunidad. Al hacer eso, este trabajo ofrece una nueva visión reveladora de la carrera y el legado de una científica fascinante y compleja, la que dedico 33 años al “Denver Museum of Nature & Science”, la cual todavía no ha sido apreciada con la atención crítica que se merece.

INTRODUCTION
Posthumously described as “one of the great human landmarks of Denver” by historian Tom Noel (Robinson 1994), Hannah Marie Wormington (1914–1994; Figure 1) was by all accounts a remarkable scholar. A pioneering woman in a man’s archaeological world, she carved a niche for herself not on the edges of North American archaeology, but on its frontiers, actively embracing areas, time periods, and tasks that were largely ignored, if not shunned, by her contemporary male colleagues.
Wormington spent most of her career at the Colorado Museum of Natural History (which changed its name to the Denver Museum of Natural History in 1948 and to the Denver Museum of Nature & Science in 2000; hereafter “DMNS” or “the Museum”). There, she helped popularize North American archaeology in general and Paleoindian archaeology in particular, through publication, public lectures, and exhibitions. Three of her books—Ancient Man in North America (Wormington 1939b), Prehistoric Indians of the Southwest (Wormington 1947), and The Story of Pueblo Pottery (Wormington and Neal 1951), ran through multiple editions and became standard textbooks in undergraduate- and graduate-level archaeology courses across the continent. She published using her initials—“H. M.”—rather than her full given and middle names, in order to partially hide her identity, as so many women
scholars had to do in the middle twentieth century in order to be taken more seriously by the academic establishment (see Parezo 1993: 8–10). In spite of these challenges and insults, by the end of her career she was a highly respected and sought-after consultant on archaeological matters, particularly Paleoindian and Paleolithic studies.

Wormington’s career has not been critically examined in detail. Four obituaries testify to her popularity and provide chronicle and perspective on a remarkable career (Agogino 1994; Day 1994; Stanford 1996; Tate 1994). Linda Cordell published a short essay in Nancy Parezo’s ground-breaking Hidden Scholars: Women Anthropologists and the Native American Southwest (Cordell 1993; Parezo 1993). Ruthann Knudson published a brief account in Notable American Women: Completing the 20th Century (Knudson 2004). David Browman and Stephen Williams (2013) make brief mention of her in their history of anthropology at Harvard. David Hurst Thomas offered Wormington as an example to dispel the myth that Americanist archaeology is only for macho-men (Thomas 1989). None of the above contributions do justice, however, to the full complexity and conflicted legacy of Hannah Marie Wormington.

This paper considers Wormington’s archaeological career with an eye on her intellectual legacy, which was variously affected by gender bias, institutional conflict, and a tenacious and focused personality that alienated some and led to lifelong and unflinching devotion among others. The purpose is to more fully document the highs and lows of a remarkable career, and to achieve a better understanding of the long-term impact and implications of Wormington’s professional life on archaeology, museology, and the Denver Museum of Nature & Science.

To frame the analysis, I posit that museum-based archaeologists are typically responsible for making professional contributions in five realms: (1) research (typically, though not exclusively, in the field), (2) collections acquisition and curation; (3) exhibitions and outreach; (4) administration; and (5) service, the latter to the discipline of archaeology as a whole, to home institution, and to students (Nash 2010). Although the time, effort, and resources that an individual archaeologist invests in any one of these realms will change in response to shifting institutional priorities, idiosyncratic historical moments and opportunities, and new personal and professional trajectories, they provide a useful framework on which to analyze the career of any museum-based archaeologist.

Four questions come to the fore: How was it that Wormington, a very young woman with only a bachelor’s degree in anthropology, made such significant contributions to archaeology and museology so early in her long career? Does her manifold success give the lie to the proposition that American archaeology was an “old-boys network” in the 1930s and beyond? Did museum-based archaeology change during her 33-year career at the museum and if so, how?
Why is Wormington, undeniably one of the most famous archaeologists of the twentieth century, still so underappreciated?

THE DATA

The data for this paper include Wormington’s publications, the relevant associated literature, particularly contributions by her museum associates and her professional colleagues, and the unpublished archives and oral histories at DMNS and in the National Anthropological Archives in Washington, D.C. (Maxwell 2004). The archaeology section of the Denver Museum’s annual reports from 1935 through 1967 provides incredibly detailed information on her activities, as well as those of her paid associates, particularly Curator of Asiatic Archaeology Charles A. Mantz, Betty Holmes Huscher, Arminta “Skip” Neal, and Mary Chilton Gray (Table 1).

This paper relies heavily on Wormington’s undated, but post-1983, curriculum vitae in the DMNS archives, which provides the sample of career activities that she wanted to emphasize. When compared to data contained in the museum’s annual reports, it is clear that the CV is not at all comprehensive. Indeed, it reduces her remarkable career to six single-spaced pages.

Another significant source of data is Wormington’s March 11, 1983, address to the fifth annual meeting of the Colorado Council of Professional Archaeologists (hereafter CCPA), in a series called “Colorado’s Pioneer Archaeologists.” Some of the facts presented in this address do not jibe, however, with those presented in the annual reports, CV, and her professional correspondence; these discrepancies are identified as they arise. A controlled analysis and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1935–1936</td>
<td>Wormington</td>
<td>Staff Archaeologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936–1941</td>
<td>Wormington</td>
<td>Curator of Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938–1943</td>
<td>Mantz</td>
<td>Curator of Asian Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942–1944</td>
<td>Wormington</td>
<td>Honorary Curator of Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945–1968</td>
<td>Wormington</td>
<td>Curator of Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936–1939</td>
<td>Holmes, Betty</td>
<td>Associate in Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940–1942</td>
<td>Holmes Huscher, Betty</td>
<td>Associate Curator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938–1943</td>
<td>Mantz, Charles G</td>
<td>Curator of Asiatic Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950–1955</td>
<td>Neal, Arminta P.</td>
<td>Preparator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950–1955</td>
<td>Gray, Mary Chilton</td>
<td>Artist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
comparison of the data found in the published and unpublished data sources nevertheless provides a tantalizing and insightful look at a fascinating career.

**EARLY BIOGRAPHIC AND ACADEMIC CHRONICLE**

Wormington was born in Denver, Colorado, on September 5, 1914. Her mother, Adrienne Roucolle, was a 40-year-old French national born in Toulouse. Her father, Charles Watkins Wormington, was a 60-year-old British national born in Worcester. He died in 1923, when Wormington was nine. The Wormington household was bilingual and steeped in both French and English culture, cuisine, and custom (Knudson 2004).

A lifelong resident of Denver, Wormington graduated in 1931 from the renowned East High School, just across City Park from the museum. She attended the University of Denver (hereafter DU), six miles south and east of the museum, earning her B.A. in Anthropology in 1935. Notable among her schoolmates at both East and DU was John Lambert Cotter (1911–1999), who came to archaeological fame excavating the Lindenmeier Site near Fort Collins, Colorado in the 1930s (Cotter 1935). Although Cotter later shifted his focus to Colonial archaeology and the East Coast, he and Wormington remained lifelong friends, confidants, and colleagues (Roberts 1999).

Wormington gained her first exposure to archaeology at DU through coursework with self-trained archaeologist Etienne B. Renaud (1880–1973) during her sophomore year. Renaud’s background was in physics, chemistry, mathematics, and romance languages, but he ultimately came to gainful employ in, or more precisely as, the Department of Anthropology at DU in 1924. Renaud’s enthusiasm and support for students became legion, even if his mastery of archaeological matters left something to be desired: “[Renaud] knew very little about archaeology, but he was a very dynamic speaker, and a great many archaeologists got their start [under him]” (Wormington oral history, taped January 27, 1987, p. 3, DMNS Archives). Having lived in Denver since 1914, Renaud was familiar with the museum’s strengths and weaknesses, including the fact that it did not have a department of archaeology, much less an archaeologist on staff. Given the lack of archaeological expertise at the museum, it is perhaps not surprising that the museum ultimately turned to a local university for help, and it was Renaud who suggested that Wormington and her DU classmate Betty Holmes begin to volunteer at the museum during the winter of 1934–1935 (Haglund 1994; Knudson 2004). Both eager young students followed his advice and began volunteering in Paleontology (p. 4, CCPA, March 11, 1983, DMNSA). Whereas Holmes’ association with the museum lasted only until 1942, when she joined the war effort, Wormington’s service set in motion a productive if tumultuous relationship with the museum that would span six decades.
Wormington began graduate studies at Radcliff College in 1937, taking a 10-month leave of absence from the museum to do so. Despite intensive coursework during another leave of absence (1942–1944) in the war years, she did not obtain her Master’s Degree until 1950. She defended her Ph.D. dissertation, “The Archaeology of the Upper Colorado Plateau Area in the Northern Periphery of the Southwestern United States,” in 1954, becoming the first woman to receive a Ph.D. in anthropology from Harvard (Herold 1988). It is unclear why it took so long for her to obtain the advanced degrees, but having published her first book, Ancient Man in North America (Wormington 1939b), when she was just 24, and her second, Prehistoric Indians of the Southwest (Wormington 1947) at 33, perhaps she simply did not feel the need to formally prove herself as a student until later in her career. Decades later she admitted, however, that “I really knew nothing about archaeology [in the 1940s] and something [had] better be done about it” (p. 5, CCPA, March 11, 1983, DMNSA).

Wormington married geologist and fellow Denver resident Peter Volk in 1940. Married for almost 40 years until his sudden death of a heart attack in 1980, they never had children.

THE PAST AS PROLOGUE: 1935 AND THE GRAND TOUR OF EUROPE

In the spring of 1935, museum president Jesse Dade Figgins hired Wormington and Holmes into paid positions to catalog the museum’s Folsom and Yuma projectile point collections (Renaud 1932; Figgins 1934, 1935; Wormington 1946, 1948). Wormington was hired as the senior member of the team, for she was about to graduate from DU; Holmes was her junior.

In Figgins, Wormington and Holmes found a useful ally, particularly when contrasted with the next museum director, Alfred M. Bailey (1894–1978), who succeeded Figgins on May 1, 1936. By some accounts, Bailey lacked Figgins’ interest in, and empathy toward, both archaeology and women, and especially women archaeologists (p. 4, CCPA, March 11, 1983, DMNSA). Bailey unsuccessfully tried to close the museum’s Department of Archaeology in the early 1940s, using a wartime budget crisis as justification, and attempted to do so again while Wormington was studying at Radcliffe (Colorado Museum of Natural History Annual Reports [hereafter CMNHAR] 1942, 1943, 1944). Wormington and Bailey were forced to establish détente for more than three decades.

The archives are unclear about how much gender discrimination Wormington faced during her first years at the museum (Wormington 1981; Agogino 1994). Her situation may have been ameliorated because she was doing collections-based work, traditionally perceived as women’s work, not fieldwork, which is often perceived as men’s work (Parezo 1993). Her situation may have been eased as well because Depression-era federal work programs, like the Works Progress Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps, meant
that more people, both male and female, were working in archaeology and museums than ever before, thus expanding the definition of socially acceptable employment roles (Redman 2011; Means 2013; Nash 2013).

With regard to the broader disciplinary context, American archaeology in 1935 was still dominated by men: of the 38 signatories to the original charter of the Society for American Archaeology, only four were women (Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2009). (The four female signatories were Katherine Bartlett, Frederica de Laguna, Anna H. Gayton, and Florence M. Hawley, all of whom went on to successful careers in archaeology.) Given Wormington’s personality, productivity, and fortitude, any discrimination or comparative anonymity she suffered simply was not going to hold her back.

In addition to being the first year that Wormington earned a museum salary, 1935 is notable because of her grand tour of Europe, which had significant implications both for her career and the museum. Long before graduation, Wormington and her mother embraced the idea of working in Europe and conducting a grand tour of the continent in the Victorian tradition that so many American students had come to enjoy, if not expect, after matriculation. The archaeological project on which Wormington hoped to work was canceled at the last minute, but the mother–daughter team was not about to let such a minor inconvenience disrupt their plans. It is here that Wormington’s unparalleled networking capabilities first become clear, for she took advantage of Renaud’s professional acquaintances and French identity, not to mention her own precocity and French fluency, to enhance her career goals while serving, if not setting, her institution’s research and exhibition agenda (Cordell 1993).

Although the exact date is not recorded in the archives, at some point in the mid-1930s, unnamed European archaeologists and museums had made formal requests of the museum for Folsom points and artifacts, or at least photographs thereof, so that they might have first-hand evidence of the museum’s recently discovered Paleoindian materials (Figgins 1927, 1931; Renaud 1931, 1932). Wormington approached the museum’s trustees with a formal and brilliant proposal—she would photograph the point collection and travel with the photographs, thereby allowing her to act as the museum’s agent-in-the-field by negotiating trades of European Paleolithic artifacts, photographs, and line drawings for casts of Folsom and other Paleoindian artifacts from the museum’s fledgling collections. The trustees approved her proposal, and the 20-year-old Wormington set sail with her mother for England, France, and Spain in the summer of 1935.

During at least portions of their European sojourn, Wormington traveled with American archaeologist Edgar B. Howard of the University of Pennsylvania, who had excavated Clovis deposits at Burnet Cave in the Guadalupe Mountains of New Mexico in 1931. She also studied collections at the Musee de l’Homme and the Laboratoire d’Anthropologie in Paris, which were projects that she
considered important enough to still list on her CV half a century later. In England, Wormington audaciously called Paleolithic archaeologist Dorothy Garrod (1892–1968) in the absence of a letter of introduction, not recognizing the socially awkward, if not inappropriate, nature of her approach. Nevertheless, she later named Garrod as a mentor and source of continuing inspiration.

The museum formally created a Department of Archaeology in the fall of 1936. Although Wormington was not appointed curator until 1937, circumstantial evidence suggests a cause-and-effect relationship between her grand European tour and collecting trip, the creation of the Department of Archaeology, and her establishment as curator. The rest of Wormington’s career may be examined in five categories: research, collections, exhibition and outreach, administration, and service, by far the most well known of which is her research career.

FIELD RESEARCH, COLLEAGUES, AND CONSULTANCIES

Table 2 lists the archaeological field research included on Wormington’s CV. Notable here is the fact that, in addition to listing field projects she directed (e.g. excavations at the Johnson Folsom Site [1936], Casebier and Moore rockshelters [1937, 1938], the Turner-Look Site [1939–1941, 1947; Figures 2 and 3], the Taylor and Alva rockshelters [1951, 1952], and survey work in Alberta [1955, 1956]), she listed by name three notable scholars with whom she had worked: Henri Martin at La Quina in France in 1935, Joe Ben Wheat at the Jurgens Site in 1968 and 1970, and Larry Agenbroad at the Hudson-Meng Site in the early 1970s. It is not clear why she omitted Robert Lister of the University of Colorado, with whom she excavated the Taylor and Alva rockshelters in 1952, and William Mulloy, with whom she surveyed western Alberta in 1955 (Denver Muesum of Natural History Annual Reports (DMNHAR) 1952, 1955). In spite of these omissions, the listings demonstrate the critical place that professional networks occupied in Wormington’s sense of professional self.

Wormington lists five sites for which she served on the “advisory committee” or as a “consultant”, all of which post-date 1952. It is not clear what distinction she intended between these two titles (one may represent a more formal commitment) but her visits to at least two of these sites (i.e. the Texcoco mammoth site, Mexico City, in 1952 and the Turin human remains site in Iowa in 1955) seem to have been quite brief, if not cursory.

Table 3 offers a select sample of the many dozens of smaller archaeological projects published in the museum’s annual reports between 1935 and 1968, none of which Wormington deemed important enough to list on her CV. Nor did she list any of the extensive excavations conducted by her museum associates, students, and protégés, including Betty Holmes Huscher and Harold
Huscher on hogan sites in western Colorado (Huscher and Huscher 1943), or the Huschers’ work with Henry and Cynthia Irwin (later Irwin-Williams) at the LoDaisKa and Magic Mountain sites near Denver in the 1950s (Irwin and Irwin 1959; Irwin-Williams and Irwin 1966). Perhaps Wormington was simply being magnanimous and did not want to claim undue credit for these projects, but the published and unpublished acknowledgements of her support and mentorship suggest that her protégés considered her absolutely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Publication (If Any)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Paleolithic Sites, France, with Henri Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Johnson Folsom Site, La Porte, CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Casebier and Moore rockshelters near Montrose, CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Casebier and Moore rockshelters near Montrose, CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Turner-Look Fremont Site in Grand County, UT</td>
<td>(Wormington 1955b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Turner-Look Fremont Site in Grand County, UT</td>
<td>(Wormington 1955b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Turner-Look Fremont Site in Grand County, UT</td>
<td>(Wormington 1955b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Turner-Look Fremont Site in Grand County, UT</td>
<td>(Wormington 1955b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Taylor and Alva rockshelters in Mesa County, CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Taylor and Alva rockshelters in Mesa County, CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Consultant, Texcoco mammoth, Valley of Mexico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Consultant, human remains near Turin, IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Survey, Alberta, Canada</td>
<td>(Wormington 1965)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Survey, Alberta, Canada</td>
<td>(Wormington 1965)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Advisory Committee, Tule Springs, NV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Advisory Committee, Onion Portage, AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Frazier Site, Weld County, CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Frazier Site, Weld County, CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Jurgens Site, Weld County, CO, with Joe Ben Wheat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Consultant, Jurgens Site, Weld County, CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Consultant, Hudson-Meng Site, Chadron, NE, with Larry Agenbroad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Consultant, Hudson-Meng Site, Chadron, NE with Larry Agenbroad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Consultant, Hudson-Meng Site, Chadron, NE with Larry Agenbroad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Consultant, Hot Springs Mammoth Site, SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
critical to their success. Perhaps Wormington’s emphasis on professional network development caused her to focus her attention exclusively up in station and beyond her home institution.

By the mid–late 1950s, after completing fieldwork in Alberta (1955, 1956) and completing the museum’s new Hall of Man in 1956 (Figure 4), Wormington became less and less engaged in fieldwork and more interested in attending professional meetings, particularly large international gatherings, in visiting excavations at internationally important sites, and in revising her popular books. A particularly active such period occurred in 1960–1961.

In 1960, Wormington visited Mesoamerican sites including Palenque, Uxmal, and Chichen Itza, attended the Society for American Archaeology
meetings in New Haven, Connecticut, and studied Old Copper Culture collections at the Milwaukee Public Museum (DMNHAR 1960). In 1961, she attended the International Association of Quaternary Research meeting in Warsaw, visited Hallam Movius’ Harvard University excavations at Abri Pataud and François Bordes’ University of Bordeaux excavations at Combe Grenal, both of which are Paleolithic sites in southwestern France. She also visited and studied museum collections in Barcelona, Rome, Vienna, Prague, and Budapest (DMNHAR 1961). The implication of all of this is that she spent a lot of time traveling, away from Denver.

Although Wormington published three popular books that went through multiple printings, a critical examination of these publications reveals that she published surprisingly little in the way of new archaeological data, and the
books read like extensive literature reviews. In one light, this is not surprising, as Ancient Man in North America (Wormington 1939b) was intended as a textbook, was the first book of its kind, and was completed when she was just 24 years old. Wormington simply would not have had direct professional access to much new data at that point in her career.

Wormington’s three research volumes, A Reappraisal of the Fremont Culture with a Summary of the Archaeology of the Northern Periphery (Wormington 1955b), Archaeological Investigations of the Uncompahgre Plateau in West Central Colorado (Wormington and Lister 1956), and An Introduction

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Moore Rockshelter, near Montrose, CO, excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Johnson Folsom Site, near Fort Collins, CO, excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Folsom sites in northwest Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visit to E.B. Howard’s excavation at Clovis Site, NM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pinto Basin site north of Fort Collins (one mile from the Johnson Site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Four Basketmaker Sites near Grand Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey work near Escalante and Dominguez Canyons (H. Huscher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Survey work near Saguache CO (Huscher and Holmes Huscher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stratified site along Lower Gunnison River, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cave site near Gypsum, CO, recorded probable Ute petroglyphs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Huscher’s hogan sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stratified site near Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stratified site in Tracy Canyon, La Garita, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Stratified site in Tracy Canyon, La Garita, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey of western Colorado (Huscher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Cherry Creek reservoir salvage archaeology, Denver, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Woodland double burial excavated near Cornish, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>No fieldwork, but visits to other excavations in Cody, WY, and new rockshelters near Grand Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Site near Fort Morgan by George Agogino for Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Alaska (Wormington and Jack Putnam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frazier Site (Wormington not involved), Harvard/National Geo crew helped; then Lister’s students from CU helped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface survey of Early Man site near Greeley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to the Archaeology of Alberta, Canada (Wormington 1965), do contain new archaeological data and are in fact standard fare for the culture history era in which they were published, with lots of “facts” and very little conjecture. That said, and given a 33-year career at a single institution, Wormington’s roster of journal articles is surprisingly short and devoid of new scholarly contributions. As with her overview books, they consist mainly of literature reviews that summarize new discoveries by other scholars (Wormington 1966, 1983). “The Present Status of Studies Pertaining to Early Man in the New World” (Wormington 1952); (see also (Wormington 1962)), for example, reads like a four-page précis of her most recent revision of Ancient Man in North America (Wormington 1949). “A Reappraisal of the Archaeology of the Northern Periphery of the Southwestern United States” (Wormington 1955a) reads like a seven-page précis of her book of the same year and essentially the same title (Wormington 1955b). There is nothing wrong, or necessarily unethical, with publishing stylistically different contributions in different venues, and Wormington was a trusted and valued archaeological authority during this period. Nevertheless, when considering her archaeological oeuvre, the lack of new data, analyses, and theory is rather striking given her stature in the discipline. Her prestige and reputation obviously derived elsewhere, largely from the professional networks she worked to develop and maintain for decades, aided by her central location in
Denver, a gateway between east and west, and by the museum, home to the Folsom point and other important Paleoindian artifacts and collections.

The data present in the museum’s annual reports and in Wormington’s CV make clear that she put a lot of time and effort into establishing and maintaining professional networks. Attendance at scholarly meetings and international symposia was clearly a priority, particularly later in her career. The opening line of Wormington’s Department of Archaeology report in 1962 is telling: “The Curator’s travels began in March…”, as if the curator’s travels were the most important archaeological events to occur at the museum that year (DMNHAR 1962). Her 1962 travels included a lithic workshop in Bishop, California, the Sixth International Conference of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences in Rome, the Thirty-fifth International Meeting of Americanists in Mexico City, and a celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Philadelphia Anthropological Society in Philadelphia. Important meetings to be sure, but the record is mute as to whether she ever visited George Agogino’s excavations at a Folsom site near Fort Morgan, Colorado, 80 miles northeast of Denver, which he conducted for the museum and therefore under her tutelage.

One is left to speculate on how the museum administration, particularly Wormington’s supervisor and nemesis Bailey, responded to these repeated and extensive absences. Wormington was the only paid member of the Department of Archaeology for much of her career (see Table 1). She relied heavily on volunteers like Robert L. Akerley to cover her collections-related duties, and on Neal and Gray to cover her exhibition-related duties. Either the arrangement was agreeable for all parties involved, or her travels served only to aggravate an already difficult relationship with Bailey.

Table 4 lists the professional meetings Wormington listed on her CV, including participation in some of the most important archaeological meetings of the middle twentieth century. Two notable examples effectively bracket her career: the 1937 International Symposium on Early Man in Philadelphia and the 1964 Lithic Technology Conference at Les Eyzies, France, in 1964.

The Early Man Symposium was organized by Howard, Wormington’s 1935 European travel partner (Howard 1937). In attendance was a Who’s Who of worldwide Paleolithic and Paleoindian archaeologists, including Garrod, as well as Kirk Bryan of Harvard University, who later provided Wormington with geoarchaeological instruction at Radcliffe College (Wormington 1939a). Wormington and Holmes presented a paper on their typological differentiation between Folsom and Yuma points based on their collections-based work. Their work was well received, and engendered a great deal of discussion about the Folsom and associated finds. Indeed, the discussion spilled over into the next day’s sessions (Howard 1937; Wormington 1948). Not a bad reception for work by recent college graduates, who also happened to be women.
Almost thirty years later, the 1964 Lithic Technology Conference ushered in the modern era of Paleolithic stone tool analysis. The conference publicized and legitimized experiments by François Bordes (1919–1981) and Don Crabtree (1912–1980) that replicated stone tool technologies found in France and the United States, respectively, and for bringing together, if not uniting, lithic analysts from the two continents (Jelinek 1965).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>International Symposium on Early Man</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Symposium on Typology and Terminology</td>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>International Congress of Americanists</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>International Congress of Geologists</td>
<td>Algiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>International Congress of Americanists</td>
<td>Cambridge, U.K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Congress of the International Union of Anthropologists and Ethnological Sciences</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Program de Historia de America</td>
<td>Havana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>International Congress of Americanists</td>
<td>Sao Paulo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Congress of the International Union of Anthropologists and Ethnological Sciences</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Congress of the International Union of Anthropologists and Ethnological Sciences</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>International Association for Quaternary Research</td>
<td>Warsaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>International Congress of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>International Congress of Americanists</td>
<td>Mexico City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Lithic Technology Conference</td>
<td>Les Eyzies, France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>International Congress of Americanists</td>
<td>Barcelona; Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Congress of the International Union of Anthropologists and Ethnological Sciences</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>International Association for Quaternary Research</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>International Congress of Americanists</td>
<td>Buenos Aires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Symposium on the Archaeology and Geology of Valsequillo, Mex.</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Congress of the International Union of Anthropologists and Ethnological Sciences</td>
<td>Tokyo and Kyoto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Australia-New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Primer Simposium Mondial de Arquelogia Nicaraguense</td>
<td>Managua</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wormington did not list the hundreds of national annual meetings she attended during her long career, including the annual Society for American Archaeology and American Anthropological Association meetings, as well as the annual Plains Anthropological Conference, the Great Basin Conference, and the Pecos Conference (Woodbury 1993). Although this is certainly due to space limitations, it is yet another indication that her focus, attention, and reputation were indeed global.

**COLLECTIONS**

The museum’s annual reports list collections-based work conducted by Wormington and associates, though the substance of this work must often be inferred by the titles of papers presented at professional meetings rather than published declarations of the work itself.

The Archaeology section of the museum’s annual report for 1935 states that “the collection of 275 artifacts sent from Europe has been catalogued and [is] ready for exhibition,” thus demonstrating her ability to start and finish projects in a timely fashion (CMNHAR 1935). Recent work on the collection suggests that her assessment may not be entirely true, however. A note in DMNS Anthropology Accession file 1798 states that “a total inventory of the Paleolithic materials Wormington returned to Denver has never been found in the Museum’s archives,” and some of the collections were apparently not catalogued until 1991. Although Wormington was not technically a museum curator in 1935, her first job at the museum had been to inventory the projectile point collection. She therefore knew, or should have known, the importance of garnering intellectual control over the collections. Perhaps she did fully catalog the materials in 1935, but entropy over the ensuing five decades has muddied her work. Unfortunately, the cataloguing challenges present in her European collections are not unique, and suggest that her attention to detail in collections management tasks leaves a great deal to be desired. Nevertheless, the museum now curates a partially representative collection of Paleolithic stone tools from various sites in England, France, and Spain as a result of her audacious proposal and grand tour in 1935.

Despite the apparent shortcoming in the catalog, it is worthwhile to re-emphasize Wormington’s Paleolithic contribution and the intellectual context in which it occurred. Whereas the systematic study of Paleolithic collections had been an established discipline for more than a century in Europe, confirmed archaeological evidence for the coexistence of Ice Age humans and megafauna had been available in the United States for less than a decade, and the museum was at the center of their study. With unrestricted access to, and first-hand knowledge of, the Folsom, Lindenmeier, Dent, and other Paleoindian collections at the museum, Wormington negotiated herself a desirable,
and indeed enviable, position—she was able to trade photographs, artifacts, and knowledge of the museum’s recent discoveries for access to some of the most prominent Paleolithic archaeologists, collections, and sites then known.

Virtually all of the museum’s annual reports from 1935 to 1968 list a handful, and occasionally more, of donations to the collections. Most of these are piecemeal donations of individual objects that donors had inherited, collected while hiking or working the landscape, or purchased while traveling. The list for 1939 (Table 5) offers a glimpse into the kinds of material Wormington accepted into the collections (CMNHAR 1939).

Some of the objects listed in Table 5 may indeed be exhibition quality material, but few of them have enough associated provenience data to be considered valuable from a modern research perspective. Later acquisitions had research potential, however. These include a sample of Emil Haury’s recently excavated Cochise Culture materials from southern Arizona, which the Arizona State Museum (ASM) donated in 1945, as well as the increasingly frequent donations of archaeological materials Wormington obtained, presumably in trade, from other institutions in preparation for the new Hall of Man, completed in 1956. One such collection was a large assemblage of Hohokam and other Southwestern material culture obtained in 1953 on “permanent loan” from the ASM. Unfortunately, the term “permanent loan” has no legal standing in either Colorado or Arizona, so in 2008 the museum deaccessioned the collection and returned it to ASM. In exchange, ASM returned the seven Folsom points that Wormington had traded for the Hohokam collection.

**Table 5.** Donations to the Department of Archaeology, 1939 (CMNHAR 1939).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact Type</th>
<th>Donor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figurines from Mexico</td>
<td>Mrs. Almeda Boundy, Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figurines from Mexico</td>
<td>Mrs. Gilbert Neiman, Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone and bone artifacts from Sheep Mtn. NE</td>
<td>Jim Browne, Denver, Chief Meyers, Al Moore, Matt Brennan, Charles Simmons, Scottsbluff, Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two skeletons and grave offerings</td>
<td>Forest L. Power, Greeley, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Inca hafted hammers and wooden shovel from Chile</td>
<td>J.H. East, Jr., Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Axe</td>
<td>John W. Taylor, St. Joseph, Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographs of Mayan Petroglyphs</td>
<td>F.L. Titsworth, Denver, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuman Basal Fragment</td>
<td>Nelson Vaughn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metate</td>
<td>P.M. Lockwood, George Ziegler, Springfield, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma [point] Fragment</td>
<td>Joseph Rogers, Los Animas, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mano and metate</td>
<td>Charles H. Martin, Denver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wormington did not mention the fact that she had traded away the Folsom points in the museum’s 1953 annual report, wherein she wrote that the ASM collection “has been given [sic] to us by the Arizona State Museum on the basis of a token exchange of mounted specimens of birds and mammals [sic]” (DMNHAR 1953: 24). The latter error is yet another disconnect between the published, “official” version of Wormington’s collection activities as recorded in the annual reports and the unpublished record handed down in the museum’s catalogs and on the shelves.

There are significant and as yet unresolved cataloging problems with the Wormington collections from the Moore, Casebier, Taylor, Alva, and Turner-Look sites. In some cases, large numbers of objects are simply missing. Certainly, artifacts and field notes were lost in a major 1961 fire at the museum’s Phipps Auditorium (DMNHAR 1962), which ravaged archaeological labs and offices located behind the auditorium. A full accounting of the manuscripts, objects, and field notes lost in the fire will never be available. It is likely that museum collections and documentation were also destroyed in the 1994 house fire in which Wormington died (see “Explanation of early Wormington Collections”, by Isabel Tovar, January 20, 2010, on file in Accessions A1, A2, A3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 533, and 541).

Taken together, the collections Wormington acquired during her 33-year career at the museum constitute a unique resource through which to better understand the early occupation of North America and the history of the museum. Critical examination of their associated records demonstrates how archaeological research and museological standards have changed through the middle twentieth century (see Nash 2010, 2013).

EXHIBITIONS AND OUTREACH

In 1935, when Wormington was first hired at the museum, efforts were already under way to display the Lindenmeier Site artifacts that Cotter and others were excavating (CMNHAR 1935). In 1936, five new cases went on display, one containing the Folsom and Yuma artifacts on which Wormington and Holmes had been working, another containing some of the European artifacts she had just acquired (CMNHAR 1936). First mention of plans for a large, synoptic archaeological exhibition was made in 1938, the outline of which was Colorado-specific and called for six diorama groups, one each for “Folsom Man”, the Basketmakers, the Pueblo Indians, Cheyennes, Utes, and Jicarilla-Apaches. The theory behind the exhibition was firmly grounded in cultural evolution and the loaded prose thereof, such that the cases:

...would show man’s place in nature, his evolutionary development from a creature capable of using stones casually picked up to one able to make and utilize the
microscope and X-Ray tube. The Indian would be shown not just as a racial group but as an integral part of an ancient and world-wide pattern. (CMNHAR 1938).

Thereafter, no additional mention of a new, large archaeological exhibition is made until 1948, although a small exhibit of Folsom materials was installed in the Fossil Hall in 1946, “adjacent to exhibits of fossil mammals which were hunted by these primitive people” (CMNHAR 1946; DMNHAR 1948).

In 1949, Wormington was finally able to report that “plans for the Hall of Man are progressing nicely” (DMNHAR 1949). At this time, plans were in place for displays of both Old World and New World cultures, thus greatly expanding the 1938 proposal and reflecting Wormington’s global interests. Neal and Gray were added to the Department of Archaeology staff in 1950 as preparator and artist, respectively, and were expected to focus their energies on development of the new Hall of Man (DMNHAR 1950).

Their work was slow but steady. Gray spent 1951 conducting research to ensure the accuracy of her murals; Neal completed the first of 18 planned dioramas, this one on the Neanderthals. Wormington’s published description of the Neanderthal diorama demonstrates the resonating power of the 1950s, white, middle-class, nuclear-family, Cold War-era domestic American trope of man-the-protector, complete with Soviet metaphor (see Yastrow and Nash 2003);

It shows a Neanderthal family of the Old Stone Age defending its cave home against a cave bear. A man with upraised spear stands silhouetted against the cave entrance; to the left a woman and children are frantically assembling torches at a fire. An adolescent boy, carrying a flaming torch, runs toward a man who has just sprung up from a corner of the cave where he has been at work chipping stone tools, and a young child, unaware of the danger, moves toward the bear. (DMNHAR 1951: 16)

In 1952, Wormington lamented the “smallness of our collections,” which had made “acquisition of specimens suitable for display [in the Hall of Man] an urgent matter” (DMNHAR 1952: 17, 20). Given a lack of tradable (usually Folsom or other Paleoindian) collections at the museum, Wormington enlisted Neal to prepare casts of the early projectile points in the collections, which had been in great demand since the 1930s and remain so today.

Wormington’s efforts to secure exhibition-quality material enjoyed a remarkable boost in 1953. The University Museum at the University of Pennsylvania sold the Denver Museum an original fragment (half) of Stela 3 from Caracol, British Honduras (now Belize) and casts of five other Mayan stelae from their collections, and tendered a loan of three other casts with the
possibility of passing future title, all for a total of $1,500 (equivalent to $12,100 in 2010 dollars). A fortuitous discovery on April 20, 1953, made the trade all the sweeter for Denver. While excavating at Caracol, archaeologists from the University Museum recovered the second half of Stela 3, a half-mile from where the first fragment had been discovered. In a gesture of almost unbelievable magnanimity, the University Museum and the government of British Honduras donated the fragment to the Denver Museum so that both pieces could be reunited. Although full details on the Stela 3 transactions are not well recorded in the DMNS archives, Wormington’s association with the University Museum was by then two decades long and must have had an effect on decision making.

The annual reports for 1954 and 1955 document Wormington’s on-going efforts to secure exhibition-quality material for the museum (DMNHAR 1954, 1955). Only in 1956 were she and the museum finally able to formally celebrate the opening of the section of the Hall of Man that was devoted to the prehistoric peoples of the Americas. Of particular, if macabre, interest to the general public was “Theodora,” the mummy of a Ancestral Pueblo woman (DMNHAR 1956). Over the next three years, new murals were added to the exhibition as Gray finished them. Small changes and temporary exhibitions were added periodically, but no substantive revisions or changes were made until the exhibit was completely deinstalled in 2000.

From an outreach perspective, Wormington gave numerous public lectures, particularly in the late 1930s and early 1940s. Too numerous to recite herein, the annual reports usually list the number of such lectures and the number in attendance. One is left to guess at the subject matter (DMNHAR 1935–1968).

ADMINISTRATION

For all intents and purposes, Wormington was the museum’s Department of Archaeology between 1936 and 1968. Table 1 lists only the paid employees, but there were many volunteers and research associates whose activities are poorly recorded in the annual reports. Curator of Asiatic Anthropology Charles A. Mantz deserves special mention, as he is the only other full curator to have served during the Wormington era (Table 1). He joined the museum in 1938 and immediately spent six months excavating five sites in Japan (CMNHAR 1938). As a result, he returned significant collections to Denver, some of which went on display in 1939, and completed at least four publications.

In spite of the apparent stability of having a single person in charge of the department, it is curious that only five other Department of Archaeology employees warranted inclusion in administrative lists of the museum’s annual reports between 1935 and 1968. That said, we know that Wormington supported and mentored more than a dozen archaeologists during this period.
Although they are not listed in the museum’s annual reports, all took pains to acknowledge her support in their publications, letters, and remembrances.

Wormington’s field school at the Turner-Look Site in the late 1930s and early 1940s included all-female crews, some of whom certainly got paid, making their omission from the annual reports all the more glaring. The Turner-Look Site staff roster for 1940, for instance, includes Helen Elliott as field assistant and Barbara Morrell as surveyor and cartographer, but they are not listed as museum employees in the annual report (CMNHAR 1940). Little is recorded about them, but Elliott had served on the 1939 crew as well (CMNHAR 1939). The Turner-Look Site “field school” was again conducted in 1941, but in retrospect it is difficult to discern how it could have been deemed a field school as many of the participants were repeats from 1940, and the institutional destination for each student’s academic credit is not recorded (Chazin and Nash 2013). Whatever the case may be, Wormington reported that “without exaggeration... it would be difficult, if not impossible, to find a finer field crew” (CMNHAR 1941).

Given the glaring discrepancies between the museum’s annual reports and what can be gleaned from published accounts, it appears that Wormington sought to create administrative distance between her work as curator and exhibit developer for the museum and her work as archaeologist in the field. One is nevertheless left to wonder how Bailey reacted, for such separation does not do justice to the institutional backing and resources the museum provided for her research.

**SERVICE**

Wormington’s post-1983 CV stresses her service to the Society for American Archaeology (SAA), which she served as vice-president in 1950–1951 and again in 1955–1956, and as president in 1968–1969. She was the first woman to hold the latter post, and received the SAA’s Distinguished Service Award in 1983 (Tate 1994) and the Colorado Archaeological Society’s C.T. Hurst Award in 1985 (Figure 5). Beyond that, she served as editor of the museum series section of American Anthropologist, but does not list the dates thereof on her CV. She was also instrumental in founding the Colorado Archaeological Society and supporting amateur archaeologists throughout her career (Wormington 1936). In C. Vance Haynes’ words:

Everyone took great pride in being a part of Marie’s world, and for every new find of every new season we couldn’t wait to tell Marie. Her response was invariably enthusiastic and charged with encouragement. One always left Marie on a high note. Seldom did she disapprove of one’s actions, but if she did you knew about it right then and there. (Haynes unpublished manuscript, 1994, on file DMNS Archives)
On June 1, 1968, Wormington began a scheduled 15-month leave-of-absence from the museum to conduct excavations at the Jurgens Site with Joe Ben Wheat of the University of Colorado. The Jurgens Site is a stone’s throw away from the Frazier Site, where Wormington had just finished National Science Foundation-sponsored excavations for the museum. During the academic year 1968–1969, she was to serve as a visiting professor in the Department of Anthropology at Arizona State University as “‘a change’ from the Museum” (Wormington, quoted in “Visiting Anthropologist Goes ‘Anywhere, Anytime’”, The Arizonan, November 28, 1968). On July 22, 1968, however, Bailey wrote to Wormington to tell her that, because of “budgetary and other factors, we have decided to discontinue archaeological research for 1969 and 1970, and possibly...
longer, in order to apply funds available toward other fields of endeavor, especially in ethnology and paleontology” (letter Bailey to Wormington, July 22, 1968, DMNSA; see also Bailey to Hudson Moore, July 22, 1968, DMNSA).

The full story behind Wormington’s 1968 departure from the museum may never be known. Theories abound. In one account, Bailey dismissed Wormington because the museum’s trustees recognized a discernable conflict of interest in her serving as a consultant to Wheat’s excavations, which were, after all, for the University of Colorado Museum (Neal 1984). In another, the lack of attention Wormington gave to curatorial matters, particularly later in her career, caught up with her and the museum administration finally demanded accountability (Neal 1984). In another, Wormington already planned to leave the museum (see letter Wormington to Dick [unknown surname], February 22, 1968). As she wrote colleague Douglas Byers of the Peabody Museum at Andover Academy in Massachusetts: “I am leaving the Museum on June 1st” (letter April 21, 1968, DMNSA; see also undated letter to J. O. Brew, University of Colorado, National Anthropological Archives, Wormington Papers, hereafter NAAWP; see also letter Doug Byers to Wormington, April 24, 1968, NAAWP).

Details from, and the context of, the first letter suggest a full-fledged departure from the museum, not just a leave of absence:

This has been the most difficult decision, for my whole professional life has been centered [at the museum] since I was seventeen and started working as a volunteer in the Department of Paleontology. The situation with the Administration, however, has progressed from the virtually impossible to the totally intolerable. Attempted sabotage of my N.S.F. grants, no secretarial help, a very small salary, and years of petty harassment, were bad enough, but having the Old World Hall of Prehistory turned over to the Exhibits Designer [Neal] was the last straw.

What is curious here is that Wormington’s 1968 salary, adjusted for inflation, would have been equivalent to $69,000 in 2010. Not excessive, but certainly not “small” either. Details on the other points of contention are not well recorded in the archives.

Other accounts, including some in Wormington’s own pen, suggest that she undermined Bailey’s authority in his attempts to acquire the Mary W. A. and Frances V. Crane Collection of Native American material culture (Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. 2010). As Wormington wrote the Cranes:

When I last wrote to you, I was still following the advice of [Museum Assistant Director] Roy Coy, and not telling you that I had been dismissed from the Denver Museum of Natural History. This was undoubtedly a great mistake, for the cause of the dismissal was a copy of a letter I had written [on April 21] to Doug Byers [a close friend of the Cranes], suggesting that he warn you about possible dangers
to your collection [if it came to the Denver Museum]. Whether it was Coy or [museum trustee] Richard Davis who gave a copy of [that] letter to Bailey, I do not know. Certainly, Doug did not, and neither did [museum trustee] Ned Grant, who died two weeks before I was dismissed. (Undated letter Wormington to Cranes, NAAWP, see also Wormington to Byers, April 21, 1968, DMNSA)

Although Wormington’s April 21 letter to Byers may have been the proximal cause for her dismissal, it was merely one manifestation of a severely dysfunctional relationship with Bailey that festered for over three decades and that infected the museum more widely. It appears that Wormington was unhappy at the museum, had been so for many years, and repeatedly let colleagues and friends know this fact both verbally and in writing. As Akerley said, “she talked herself out of a job” (transcript, Robert L. Akerley oral history, 1982, DMNSA).

Bailey is clearly at fault as well. Aside from accusations of outright gender bias, he did not handle the situation well, dismissing a colleague of 33 years with a letter instead of a face-to-face meeting. In so doing, he tarnished the museum’s reputation in the archaeological and civic communities for decades. An anonymous source soon wrote a widely circulated letter containing a detailed reaction to Wormington’s dismissal, not pulling punches in the process, thereby communicating the political and emotional damage done:

A Catastrophe: Dr. H. M. Wormington is no longer connected with the Denver Museum of Natural History which, actually, was only of importance because of her contributions to it. Dr. Wormington took a year’s leave of absence June 1 after 33 years with the Museum. On July 22, Alfred Bailey, director of the museum, decided to eliminate the Department of Anthropology [sic—Archaeology] of which Dr. Wormington was head. She is currently teaching at the University of Arizona [sic—Arizona State University] at Tempe. Of course, this fiasco will immediately lead to the discredit of Bailey (and what has he done for Anthropology?). Dr. Wormington is in a bad situation. Naturally, she is in demand as a professor all over the world. We have several spots for employment ourselves. The difficulty, which many happily married couples have, is that each partner has a profession and usually they cannot find employment in the same place at the same time. Dr. Wormington is also Mrs. George (Pete) Volk and her husband is a petroleum engineer based in Denver. We do not need to tell any of our readers about Dr. Marie’s distinguished career but maybe you did not know that the royalties from her books went to the Museum and not to her. This seems to us to be a disgraceful situation from which only Dr. Marie can emerge with honor. As all who know them will attest, the Volks are warm, outgoing and extremely intelligent people. We predict a considerable hassle over this situation. Dr. Wormington will soon have a new book on the market [sic—Ancient Hunters and Gatherers of North America was never completed] and this time
she will get the royalties and not Bailey and his devalued Museum. (undated, anonymous manuscript on file, DMNS Archives; see also letter Wormington to Richard Ambler, February 20, 1986, NAAWP)

George Agogino, an archaeologist at Eastern New Mexico University in Portales and one of Wormington’s many protégés, was direct in his scorn for Bailey and expressed concern for the future of the archaeological collections at the museum, and demonstrated his sensitivity to the implications of Wormington’s dismissal:

Suffice to say, the actions of Bailey show his typical ingratitude, biased, and thoroughly irresponsible actions. How could he possibly have had the nerve, the gall, and the ability to send you a letter such as he did, after it was clearly understood that you were on Sabbatical [sic—this term had no formal meaning at the museum], is beyond me. I really fear for the vast archaeology collections now in the museum. A man with that type of irresponsible mind,—those collections are probably in danger. He might actually trade them for a fish head or a rare bird or something. Here is the Denver Museum of Natural History, which has a historic role in the development of Early Man [studies] suddenly divorcing itself from the archaeological picture entirely because of the diabolical actions of a man of monstrous intrigue and apparently little understanding of the role of what the Denver Museum has done in the formation of Early Man. I am just sick. (Letter Agogino to Wormington August 22, 1968, NAAWP; see also letter Emil W. Haury to Wormington August 24, 1968, NAAWP, and letter Lita Osmundson to Wormington February 29, 1969, NAAWP)

As she later wrote, “it’s a shabby return for some thirty years of work, and it would have been possible to fight it; but there is much to be said for escaping from an administrative pattern of nepotism, favoritism, and opportunism that is in the tradition of the Borgias” (undated “1968 report from the Volks,” DMNSA; see also “1968 Report” in Teocentli, National Anthropological Archives, Wormington Papers (NAAWP)).

Bailey’s decision to eliminate the Department of Archaeology and dismiss Wormington left bad feelings all around. Given that she lived the remaining 26 years of her life within a mile of the museum, and that she hosted weekly cocktail parties for the archaeological community, these bad feelings lasted a very long time. Wormington admitted that she was not “psychologically able” to re-enter the museum building until 1980, when a lecture by Mary Leakey, as well as kindness extended by then Curator of Anthropology Joyce Herold, induced a less than triumphant return (letter Wormington to “friends,” March 29, 1980, NAAWP). In 1988, the museum belatedly granted Wormington emeritus status, and created a lecture series in her name that continues to this day. She never again enjoyed
employment stability, serving only in temporary positions at colleges and universities around the country. She died of smoke inhalation in a fire in her home the early morning of May 31, 1994, apparently after having left a cigarette smoldering overnight in the cushions of her living room couch (Robinson 1994).

CONCLUSION
How was it that Wormington, a 20-year-old woman with only a bachelor’s degree in anthropology, could make such significant contributions to archaeology and museology so early in her career? Wormington’s self-confidence, networking ability, and French fluency allowed her to make tactical steps that impressed the museum and its trustees, thereby filling an archaeological gap at the museum that had persisted for almost a decade since the 1927 Folsom discovery. Why Figgins had not laid more ambitious plans for archaeology at the museum is a matter of speculation, but it is now clear that the museum was edged out of early human studies by East Coast establishment museums, particularly the American Museum of Natural History in New York (Meltzer 2006). This created an institutional gap into which Wormington could fit, and in which she could personally and professionally expand, if not thrive.

Does Wormington’s manifold success give the lie to the proposition that American archaeology was an “old-boys network” in the 1930s? Not necessarily. In publishing popular books that were essentially literature reviews, Wormington was able, even as a 24-year-old, to carve a niche for herself that was arguably easier for a young woman to fill in the 1930s than a more traditional academic appointment would have been. When she did begin full-scale excavation projects, she did so on the northern frontiers of Southwestern archaeology, a space where few men were working and where she could again opportunistically carve a personal and professional niche for herself without direct opposition from others.

Did museum-based archaeology, as seen through the Denver Museum and Wormington lenses, change during the her 33-year career at the museum? Museum-based archaeology did indeed change during Wormington’s tenure, in significant ways, from an object- and exhibition-oriented approach in the 1930s to a more scientifically focused archaeology in the 1960s (Nash 2010). That said, Wormington’s career moved in a slightly different direction, as she migrated away from archaeological field research and toward a self-defined role as international consultant, if not arbiter, of worldwide Paleoindian and Paleolithic matters.

Why is Wormington, one of the most famous archaeologists of the twentieth century, still so underappreciated, if not controversial? Wormington’s personality could be as off-putting as it was endearing, depending on one’s perspective and station. Being based in a smaller regional museum, Wormington did not have a steady stream of students to carry her archaeological mantra to the masses. Her most successful archaeological student and protégé, Cynthia Irwin-Williams,
died prematurely in 1994. The long-lasting bad feelings that resulted from her
departure from the museum tarnished the memory of an already strained relation-
ship with her home institution. The fact that Wormington was so successful and
powerful as an archaeologist, not to mention as a woman running a one-person
shop under a challenging director, made her a sympathetic yet legendary figure
that friends and protégés preferred to remember in a particular light.

**EPILOGUE**

Precocious, audacious, ambitious; these adjectives might have been used to describe
Wormington as a young professional in 1935. Prolific, connected, cavalier; these
adjectives might be used to describe her career in retrospect. Scholarly biography
can never capture the true essence of a person; human lives and personalities are
much too complicated. Such is ever more the case when considering a true
pioneer whose life affected everyone with whom she came in contact. John Cotter,
Wormington’s lifelong friend and colleague, captured her essence in a poetic eulogy:

We hardly noticed each other at East Denver High. She was in the class behind
mine, and only 15, when I was a senior, lost in the gulf that separates high
school years. But she did sign her picture in my 1930 yearbook in a firm, practiced
hand, “Hannah Marie”. She used to say that those were her “Hannah years”. She
was just becoming visible.

She blossomed at Denver U. All of a sudden everybody knew Marie; even saying
she reminded them of Claudette Colbert, the movie star. She was young, bright,
and good fun. Besides, she spoke French, to the approval of Prof. Etienne
B. Renaud, the quintessential French chairman of the one-man Anthropology
Department whose doctoral dissertation at D.U. was on [French poet and drama-
tist] Edmond Rostand. Un schooled in Anthropology, he lectured with an open
text before him; yet he was strangely motivational. He produced enthusiastic
field groups, and Marie was right there with them.

There was that 1933 field school at Santa Fe, to which five of us made the long
drive in Gil Bucknum’s roadster. We chattered of many things. If a time warp
had given us a glimpse of our last days to come, I can hear Marie say, in her mock
plaintive, slightly throaty way, “Well, I wouldn’t be surprised if I died of smoke
inhalation, but not THAT way.” Then she would giggle and light another cigarette.
Like most youngsters, we assumed, barring accident or disease, that we would live
as long as we wanted to. Perhaps, in a way, we could be right.

Marie was determined and resourceful in the field. She was one of those contor-
tionists who managed to put on a girdle in a sleeping bag, writhing like a trapped
caterpillar, to emerge dressed for a trip to town. Meanwhile, she continued to
smoke like a chimney, drank with the crowd, but knew how to keep in focus,
while admiring but less wary associates skidded down the alcohol trail.

Today, if she were granted a moment of retrospect, I know her first comment
would be: "It was an easy way to go for the cat and me, but I AM sorry about
the house. It’s such a NICE house." So it is—small, like her, lovely and distinctive.
(June 11, 1994, manuscript on file, DMNS Archives)

Chippendale (Chippendale 1989) warns us that “a knowing superiority from hindsight is the easiest and most pernicious attitude to fall into” when writing the history of archaeology, but it is difficult to avoid the impression that Wormington was at once a victim and a perpetrator, a larger-than-life figure with uniquely human faults and foibles, blessed with a strong personality from which neutrality and failure were not options.
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NOTES

“Distribution of Shell Mound Cities”, in Bulletin of the Asiatic Society; “Japanese Neolithic Corner Tang Implements”, and “Prehistoric Japan” (CMNHAR 1938). Unfortunately, no further details seem to be available for these publications.
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