

IN MEMORIAM



A Tale of Two Giants:

WILHELM G. SOLHEIM II (1924–2014)

AND

WILLIAM A. LONGACRE JR. (1937–2015)

The history of the beginning of any field of study is probably most understandable through an examination of the lives of the men and women who were the first students in that field than it is through a direct examination of the field.

—Bill Solheim (1969), introducing his insightful obituary of H. Otley Beyer

This essay is not so much an obituary or combined obituaries as a personal appreciation of two archaeologists, Wilhelm G. Solheim II and William A. Longacre Jr., both of whom profoundly affected their home universities, Philippines studies, and the lives of many scholars. For this tale of two giants, I draw on my own and others' memories, writings of others cited herein, and an amazingly detailed vita in my possession covering Bill Solheim's work from 1947 through 1986. This is not a detailed accounting of their many research projects and accomplishments, but instead highlights the latter decades of their careers as they increasingly focused their research on theoretical and topical issues concerning the Philippines. I will attempt to write this accolade in the styles of both men, with the casualness of Bill Solheim and the clarity of Bill Longacre.

The lives of the two Bills are intertwined with the Philippines, embedded in the archaeological passions they shared with the students and colleagues with whom they lived and worked. Bill Solheim died in Manila in 2014, at age 89. He spent his final retirement years at the Archaeological Studies Program (ASP) in the University of the Philippines, Diliman (UPD), well cared for by ASP staff and his wife, Nene. He died at the university. Likewise, after his retirement from the University of Arizona (UA), Bill Longacre spent a semester every year at UPD until illness caught up with him. Unable to return from his Tucson home to his condominium in Manila after illness setbacks, he died at age 78. Both Bills were truly part of the Philippines and Philippine archaeology and their lives in university settings show some surprising parallels.

Bill Solheim told me tales of how he connected with the Philippines long before his prime archaeology days (see also Stark 2015). He came off his WWII service in Africa to arrive in Manila in 1949, where he was greeted by H. Otley Beyer, who became his mentor, colleague, and eventually friend. Bill knew he was stepping into

uncharted territory, as Beyer was the only professional archaeologist in the country. Hanging out at the Jai Alai club with Beyer must have been fun. To stop and think that Bill was involved in Philippine archaeology for sixty-six years is humbling. To be sure, Bill traveled widely in Asia, ranging from Sri Lanka to northern East Asia and through Indonesia to then Irian Jaya. He and his students made international news with their archaeological work in Thailand, too. But the Philippines always drew him back.

Bill worked throughout the Philippines, from Fuga Island (where he examined jar burials) to the wild coastline of southeastern Mindanao. He paid his dues to gain great depth of knowledge of the Philippines and build strong social and academic relationships. He served Beyer first as a UP Museum of Anthropology Museum Preparator (1947–1949) and then as Research Associate (1950–1954). Bill's work in 1950–1951 saw him gaining an understanding of ceramics and sites that became emblematic of his work: Calatagan in Batangas and Kalanay in Masbate—the names of these sites still ring loudly in Philippinists' ears.

According to his vitae, Bill taught at the University of the East, took an M.A. in History at the American School, and was a Provincial Public Affairs Officer for the U.S. Information Service. Fred Eggan of the Philippine Studies Program at the University of Chicago then pushed him to attend graduate school at the University of Arizona. He took a fellowship there and thus proceeded on his path to a university career. He obtained his Ph.D. from the Department of Anthropology, which at the time was dominated by the eminent Emil Haury, the grand man of Southwestern archaeology and ceramics. Needless to say, Bill S.'s dissertation focused on ceramics, but of the Philippines. The Masbate collection became the basis of his dissertation titled "The Philippine Iron Age" (1959).

How Bill with his beard survived UA and Haury's hatred of beards remains an untold story. I was nearly tossed out of UA because of my beard, but then mine were the hippie days, whereas Bill lived in the days of Navajo silver belt buckles and jeans. Why I never asked Emil Haury about Bill Solheim's tenure at UA remains a mystery to me. We archaeologists do not adequately consider our own oral histories.

After completing his doctorate, Bill stayed briefly at Florida State University, then moved permanently to the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa in 1961. Bill and I were colleagues at the University of Hawai'i from my hire in 1969 until his retirement in 1991, when he moved to live at UPD. We remained in contact and our relationship intensified upon my own 2006 retirement and residential move to the Philippines.

At UH, Bill maintained a tradition of hosting parties in his home that welcomed all students, who were feasted and allowed to run wild. The years he was married to Ludy Montenegro Solheim were especially noteworthy since the level of cooking and hospitality was so high. They even hosted more than one foreign student (and spouse) in their home until other accommodations could be found. His aloha to all is part of the man we celebrate in our own lives.

Within the Philippines, Bill stood out as a giant, along with his friend and colleague Bob Fox. On my first visit to the country, I was able to attend the First Regional Seminar on Southeast Asian Prehistory and Archaeology in Manila in July 1972. What an education and inspiration! Bill, Bob, and eminent scholars from throughout Southeast Asia, even Cambodia, discussed and debated the history of the region. Chet Gorman, Bill's senior student at the time, was there, as were other seniors such as R. P. Soejono from Indonesia. Bill moved comfortably among the

juniors and the seniors. I studied his gentle, considerate, and positive demeanor toward whomever he met. This lesson was repeated during the 1978 Indo-Pacific Association meeting in Puna, India, where I gained even greater understanding of the respect accorded Bill. He treated everybody—from new students with dubious qualifications and ideas to the most senior Indian archaeologists—the same. Respectful. Listening. Considering. No put-downs. He treated even the whackiest ideas with a gentle hand. He was the perfect example of a non-colonial mentality. Folks at that time recognized and valued him for what he was. That he unabashedly promoted Southeast Asia as the earliest origin of rice and bronze did not hurt the region's enthusiasm for him. Bill S. was never heavy-handed with his students or colleagues. Doctoral students at the University of Hawai'i were given free rein to explore topics they felt most important. Bill stood by to offer insights, encouragement, and assistance obtaining funding. Chet Gorman and Donn Bayard in Thai archaeology ran their digs in Ban Chiang and Non Nok Tha and gained proper portions of recognition for the results. Bill's mentoring enabled Karl Hutterer, Jean Kennedy, David Welch, Jane Allen, and others researching outside Southeast Asia to obtain Ph.D. degrees. Many other students ranging from undergraduates through M.A. and Ph.D. levels learned the ropes by years of analyzing collections from Thailand. Riveted by Bill's casually deployed knowledge, Bert Davis devoted hundreds of hours to the collections.

Bill's first decade in Hawai'i saw an explosion in international status—at least among Southeast Asians and the general public. Archaeologists were sometimes less enthusiastic. I recall Kent Flannery commenting disparagingly that Bill sometimes published results in popular media. Still, a photograph of Bill examining a large ceramic jar in the March 1971 issue of *National Geographic*, followed by publication of a major article in *Scientific American* in 1972, did bring him fame, if not fortune. And his suggestion that the “earlier agricultural revolution” started in Southeast Asia with the domestication of rice and casting of bronze certainly warmed the hearts of professionals throughout the region and enhanced Bill's status as a Big Man.

Bill, we must understand, was through and through a culture historian. While Bill had little use for arguments and positions about theory, he appeared, grew, and matured as a product of his time, well before Bill Longacre's New Processual and Behavioral archaeology. Culture History, as articulated best by Gordon Willey and Philip Phillips (1958), is oriented on artifacts; it places artifacts in space-time distributions and copes with independent invention versus diffusion. Classification of artifacts into types and then organizing them into temporal periods is the rule. Similarity, not variation, is sought in types. Migrations of peoples are often a component in explanations of change. This theoretical framework, whether articulated or not, governed Bill Solheim from his early work with Haury and Beyer through to grappling with the Nusantara and the spread of peoples likely to have been Malayo-Polynesian speakers.

Bill S.'s scholarly contributions deserve a separate, lengthy article, complete with the pro and con reasonings of the naysayers who found his Nusantara model of human dispersal throughout Island Southeast Asia untenable. For this brief obituary, I will merely point to the importance of the model and summarize the foci of Bill's interests. The peopling of the Philippines following an alleged ancient in-migration of Negrito peoples was one focus. The origins and flows of the Proto-Austronesian language and those subsequently termed Malayo-Polynesian was another. Still another focus was the cultural and “racial” foundations of the archipelago's inhabit-

ants. When Bill began his culture history, the accepted wisdom about the origins of the Filipino people differed markedly from what academics accept today. Linguistic data had yet to be analyzed by Robert Blust and Lawrence Reid. Archaeologists such as Peter Bellwood had not yet married archaeological and linguistic data into the powerful linear migration model of migrations of Austronesians coming out of Taiwan. Bill instead drew from Beyer a scheme claiming that multiple waves of different peoples had moved into the Philippines, which Beyer had drawn from earlier European theories of how groups of people speaking assorted languages and having different racial characteristics could begin in one place (i.e., China, Viet Nam, or Sumatra) and then travel to another (i.e., locations in the Philippines). This “waves of migration” theory is somewhat discredited today, although the assumption that there were multiple migrations of different groups of people still grounds much archaeological and linguistic thinking. Bill rejected Beyer’s claim that the origins and migrations of assorted people in the Philippines could be traced to specific places in Asia. He instead adopted a modified regional migration model, perhaps better termed “geographic mobility” (Peterson 2007:236). He tested the theory by examining the distribution of different types of artifacts, along with radiocarbon dating. The beauty of the model is its ethnographic sensibility. Bill greeted the problems and potentials that resulted from this theory with amusement and enthusiasm. I recall Bill sitting chuckling in conferences as others railed against heresies such as the Nusantara.

The potential applicability of Bill’s argument, articulated at times as the movement of the Nusantara people (Solheim 2006; see also Ayres 2009; Peterson 2007), remain controversial and to some, especially historical linguists, unacceptable. Bill may be credited as one of those rare scholars whose ideas and research conclusions upset people enough to engender new research in order to solve the conundrum. The universally accepted knowledge of linguistics seems to preclude anything other than the movement of language from Taiwan to the northern Philippines. Lawrence (Laurie) Reid told me that Bill is simply wrong. He and others argue against the Nusantara geographic mobility model of the expansion of the almost certainly Neolithic, horticultural Austronesian-speaking people. I imagine Bill smiling from on high, thinking, “Let’s dig the answer with a shovel. Let’s archaeologically test the linguists’ model or at least tie down the temporal movement of people over space and time.”

Bill S. was more than an esteemed professor and colleague who generated new archaeological knowledge. He contributed to the profession and the region by major involvement in publishing and conferencing. In 1953, years before gaining his doctorate, he resuscitated the Far Eastern Prehistory Association and eventually reshaped it into the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association (Stark 2015). He founded *Asian Perspectives*, our beloved journal, in 1957, basing it at the University of Hawai‘i and guiding it from his office. Not always out in a timely fashion, and sometimes involving wild searches for misplaced or unreviewed manuscripts, the journal survived under Bill for three decades until others stepped in to help. Bill never lost faith in *Asian Perspectives*. His dedication to the field, to his colleagues, and to the Philippines is further reflected in *Southeast Asian Archaeology: Wilhelm G. Solheim II Festschrift*, edited by Victor Paz (2004).

His dedication continued after he retired from UH and moved to UPD and the Archaeological Studies Program. As we know, what goes around, comes around, and so it did to and from Bill. Upon moving to the Philippines, he was provided

on-campus housing and there engaged in tutorials, advising, and teaching. He then donated his entire library to the UPD Archaeological Studies Program, which he had helped found in 1993. He remained loyal to ASP even in his rapidly declining last few years, walking over there nearly daily to visit, talk, attend brown-bag lectures, and remain part of this dynamic academic unit. I cannot over-emphasize Bill's stature in and contributions to the program or the respect and fondness of the students and faculty for Bill. That ASP folks, led by Vic Paz, made sure Bill was cared for is a testament to his position there. The faculty and staff at ASP took very good care of him as he aged into his eighties. Some were with him when he died. As I write, a striking memorial has been placed in one room of the ASP building, including a marble bust of Bill displaying him in his prime with his full beard and gentle gaze. His marble bust stands in his final academic and spiritual home.

Although William Atlas Longacre Jr. did not begin his career in the Philippines, it flowered and saw its final most productive and heartfelt years there. After retiring from UA in Tucson, Bill L. kept his career going full speed by teaching, advising, and conducting research at the UPD Archaeological Studies Program. I often saw the two Bills attending lunchtime lectures or social get-togethers. Bill L.'s long-term ceramic ethnoarchaeology and theoretical foci brought a whole new way of thinking to ASP and certainly gained the interest of many students, some of whom he encouraged to go on to advanced graduate studies at the University of Arizona.

I knew Bill L. from the very beginning of my own career. I was Bill's first doctoral student, served as his Dig Foreman and Assistant Director of the Grasshopper Field School 1967–1969, and completed my Ph.D. under his supervision in 1969. He and I began our second bursts of research at the same time in the Philippines. Both of us left southwestern United States archaeology, where we had worked together, to pursue long-term research in northern Luzon. We both began ethnoarchaeological research, he with Kalinga hosts, I with Agta hosts, in the early 1970s. We met yearly in the Philippines to discuss our mutual interests in ethnoarchaeology until his death.

Bill L. found the perfect research for his ceramic ethnoarchaeology among the Kalinga of the northern Philippines Cordillera Central. This research grew out of his groundbreaking analyses of the variation of design elements on potsherds at Carter Ranch Pueblo. In contrast to the culture history approach of Bill Solheim, Bill L. and his colleagues made a radical shift to the "New Archaeology" in the early 1960s. This intellectual ferment actually influenced another old Philippines hand, Fred Eggan, who had been one of Bill's professors at the University of Chicago. His impact on archaeology concerning social organization and thinking about past cultures of both the southwestern United States and the Philippines has seldom been recognized. The University of Chicago at that time was a center of intellectual unrest. Lew Binford, another of Bill's mentors, helped drive the new archaeology and its interest in the dynamics of variation and change. Out of this environment came the Carter Ranch Pueblo archaeology, and eventually the birth of ethnoarchaeology as a subfield (Longacre 1970).

To understand the genesis of his Kalinga study and years of subsequent research, we must understand what drove Longacre as he began his career (see Stark and Skibo 2007). Bill stated his reasons in an accessible and thorough overview of the research on the Kalinga through 1991:

The Kalinga Ethnoarchaeological Project was forged during the era of the “New Archaeology.” Reacting against traditional archaeological approaches, proponents of the New Archaeology emphasized explanation over description. One of their aims was to develop the means to infer aspects of past societies that are difficult or impossible to excavate, such as social organization and certain behaviors of interest to the archaeologist. New Archaeologists frequently used excavated pottery in making their inferences. Could the abundant pottery the Kalinga still make and use in their daily lives hold the key? We thought it could. (Longacre et al. 1991:5)

Edward Dozier of the Department of Anthropology had recently carried out ethnographic research among the Kalinga (Dozier 1966). Knowing the pottery-making practices of the Kalinga, Dozier guided Bill to his eventual field site and provided the means of gaining access. After securing the Kalinga’s permission to do research in 1973, Bill returned for a year of data collection in 1975–1976. He later enthusiastically recounted his fieldwork, weight loss, and compatibility with the Kalinga hosts. His capacity for drinking alcohol (unlike the missionaries) was certainly approved by his hosts. Bill returned to Luzon after a hiatus due to the Kalinga battling against the Marcos government’s effort to dam the Chico River and displace thousands of Kalinga. After the Kalinga won the war, they welcomed Bill back in 1987–1988. In the years before his return, his Kalinga assistants continued to collect and transmit data to him outside the contested territory.

Bill usually spent the hot Tucson summers in the Philippines. In 1987, he began taking research to a different level by including graduate student researchers from the University of Arizona and the University of the Philippines in fieldwork in the Kalinga villages. Miriam Stark, James Skibo, and others went on to complete dissertations and send ethnoarchaeology in a variety of new directions. The participation of students from the University of the Philippines began a tradition of educating UP students by leading them to new field locations and research projects outside Kalinga Province. Bill and his students worked on the Carcar Ethnoarchaeological Project (Cebu), the Paradijon Ethnoarchaeological Project (southern Luzon), and in San Nicolas in Ilocos. His UP student Rhayan Melendes is currently carrying on his Gatbuka Ethnoarchaeological Project dealing with locally made earthenware pots. A quick perusal of the University of Arizona Department of Anthropology website lists other Filipino students with recent doctorates, including Zandro Villanueva (2009) on Lubang Island archaeology and Jenny Cano (2012) on ethnoarchaeology of burnay pottery in Vigan, Ilocos.

Bill’s loyalties were not limited to UA and UP. He drew students from around the world to follow his research foci. He assisted young scholars in attending the school of their choice; some came to Arizona and others went to different institutions. For example, Stephen Acabado graduated from the University of Hawai‘i, which Bill was familiar with as a Visiting Professor; Acabado went on to follow in Bill’s footsteps in Ifugao Province of the Philippines.

Bill has not been forgotten in the Kalinga villages. He never trumpeted his role in providing for his host community, but his impact is known through his support of many young Kalinga in furthering their education. Many attended university in Baguio City, the main college town that Cordillera tribal men and women feed into. He went to extraordinary lengths to help keep students in school and was noted for forgiving young men for putting aside from their studies and for continuing to sup-

port them until jobs could be found. For example, Bill once asked me to take a young man who had graduated in nursing into my home for the lengthy period he needed to study for licensing exams. Bill then subsidized his stay. This is how I learned about the extent of Bill's contributions to Kalingas' successes. Bill even traveled to Baguio for annual dinner feasts with his Kalinga students. Perhaps this part of Bill's character should be central to this obituary and our understanding of this extraordinary man. A memorial for Bill L. in the ASP building is in the works.

Much more could be said about the two Bills. These two giants devoted much of their personal and professional lives to the acquisition and transmission of knowledge of Philippine archaeology and anthropology. They loved the country and nurtured its students. Along with their Filipino colleagues, they played key roles in developing a rigorous Philippine archaeology. They both stand out as examples of what a professional scholar can and should be: selfless, tireless, enthusiastic academics whose humanity, intellect, and contributions live on in the scholarship of their successors.

P. Bion Griffin

REFERENCES CITED

- AYRES, WILLIAM S.
 2009 Review of *Archaeology and Culture in Southeast Asia: Unraveling the Nusantara*, by William G. Solheim II. *Rapa Nui Journal* 25(1):73–74.
- CANO, JENNY R. M.
 2012 Crafting Community, Reconstructing Identities, and Performing Traditions: Ethnoarchaeology of Burnay Pottery Tradition and Community Integration in Vigan Ilocos, Sur, Philippines. Ph.D. diss. University of Arizona, Tucson.
- DOZIER, EDWARD P.
 1966 *Mountain Arbiters: The Changing Life of a Philippine Hill People*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- LONGACRE, WILLIAM A.
 1970 *Archaeology as Anthropology: A Case Study*. Anthropological Papers of the University of Arizona 17. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- LONGACRE, WILLIAM A., JAMES M. SKIBO, AND MIRIAM T. STARK
 1991 Ethnoarchaeology at the top of the world: New ceramic studies among the Kalinga of Luzon. *Expedition* 33(1):4–15. <http://www.penn.museum/sites/expedition/ethnoarchaeology-at-the-top-of-the-world/>.
- PAZ, V., ED.
 2004 *Southeast Asian Archaeology: Wilhelm G. Solheim II Festschrift*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- PETERSON, JOHN A.
 2007 Review of: *Archaeology and Culture in Southeast Asia: Unraveling the Nusantara*, rev. ed. Diliman, Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press. *Asian Perspectives* 46(1):235–237.
- SOLHEIM, WILHELM G. II
 1959 The Philippine Iron Age. Ph.D. diss. University of Arizona, Tucson. <http://hdl.handle.net/10150/552262>.
 1969 H. Otley Beyer. *Asian Perspectives* 21:1–18.
 1972 An earlier agricultural revolution. *Scientific American* 226(4):34–41. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican0472-34>.
- SOLHEIM, WILHELM G. II, DAVID BULBECK, AND AMIKA FLAVEL.
 2006 *Archaeology and Culture in Southeast Asia: Unraveling the Nusantara*, rev. ed. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.

STARK, MIRAM T.

- 2015 Wilhelm "Bill" Solheim, II, November 19, 1924–July 25, 2014. <http://www.anthropology.hawaii.edu/people/emeritus/solheim/index.html>.

STARK, MIRIAM T., AND JAMES M. SKIBO

- 2007 A history of the Kalinga Ethnoarchaeological Project, in *Archaeological Anthropology: Perspectives on Method and Theory*: 93–110, ed. J. Skibo, M. Graves, and M. Stark. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

VILLANUEVA, ZANDRO

- 2009 Cultural Encounters and Transformation of Early Historical Polities on Lubang Island, the Philippines, ca. A.D. 1200–1800. Ph.D. diss. University of Arizona, Tucson.

WILLEY, GORDON R., AND PHILIP PHILLIPS

- 1958 *Method and Theory in American Archaeology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.