American Archaeology and the Conceptualization of Preservation: Edgar Lee Hewett and the Crafting of the 1906 Antiquities Act

by

Adam Fulton Johnson
B.A., Hampshire College, 2007

Submitted to the Department of Architecture in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN ARCHITECTURE STUDIES
AT THE
MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
JUNE 2011

© 2011 MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Signature of Author

Adam Fulton Johnson
Department of Architecture
May 13, 2011

Certified By

Mark Jarzombek
Professor of the History and Theory of Architecture
Associate Dean, School of Architecture and Planning
Thesis Advisor

Accepted By

Takehiko Nagakura
Associate Professor of Design and Computation
Chair of the Department Committee on Graduate Students
**Thesis Supervisor**
Mark Jarzombek, DiplArch, PhD  
Professor of the History and Theory of Architecture  
Associate Dean, School of Architecture and Planning

**Thesis Reader**
Kristel Smentek, PhD  
Assistant Professor of the History of Art
American Archaeology and the Conceptualization of Preservation: Edgar Lee Hewett and the Crafting of the 1906 Antiquities Act

by

Adam Fulton Johnson

Submitted to the Department of Architecture on May 18th, 2011 in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Architecture Studies

Abstract

Edgar Lee Hewett, an amateur archaeologist and pedagogue, came to the Southwestern United States in 1891 and was immediately captured by the monumental prehistoric ruins nestled in the winding canyons of the high desert. Concerned about their destruction, over the next fifteen years Hewett worked to protect these antiquities. In 1906, he successfully drafted federal preservation legislation, the Antiquities Act, which protected the ruins of America’s deep past from looting and destruction; at the same time, sites were made available to scientific teams and curious citizens. Balancing scientific and popular interests, Hewett’s work as a promoter and advocate of America’s prehistoric period ignited an historical consciousness of North America’s great “civilizations” of the past, establishing a continuity between pre-Columbian settlements and the present American nation. The continuity was largely materially based, as the monumental architecture of the “ancient ones” was considered on par with that of Egypt. Contemporaneous Native Americans, the descendants of the “ancient ones,” however, were seen to have an inferior material culture, and their lineage to the past race was questioned. Their place in the historical continuum was cast in the shadow of progress and it was widely thought Amerindians were destined to fade away. Hewett, in crafting the Antiquities Act, facilitated this historical interpretation through the regulation of access to “prehistoric” ruins and the determination of the qualities worthy of preservation, and laid the groundwork for subsequent “historic” preservation in the United States. In the place of American Indians would emerge a great civilization rising from a rich prehistoric past, a United States with a deep history.
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Edgar Lee Hewett came to the Southwestern United States in 1891 and bound himself to the land, the people, and their history. Since the 1848 Mexican Cession of 500,000 square miles of land to the United States, the Southwest had become a beacon for the American mind, especially for those curious to explore a new landscape and the perplexing culture of its inhabitants. Hewett was so inclined. Trained as an educator and school administrator, Hewett developed his interest in archaeology through exploration of the architectural ruins of the Southwest’s deep past. As he educated himself on archaeological history and theories of the interpretation of prehistoric periods, Hewett witnessed the rapid deterioration of the American Indian ruins in the region. He dedicated himself to preventing such destruction, and, while he did not receive formal training in archaeology, Hewett became an important figure in the field. Though not well remembered as a practicing archaeologist, he was, I argue, crucial to archaeology’s preservation movement in the first years of the twentieth century, and responsible for laying the groundwork for subsequent “historic” preservation in the United States.

Hewett became the major crafter of the first national antiquities preservation legislation in America, the Antiquities Act, which was passed on June 6th, 1906. In addition to negotiating the national law, he also had a hand in other major preservation legislation, notably the declaration of the Mesa Verde cliff dwellings as a protected national park. After these successful legal preservation maneuvers, Hewett was elected Director of American Archaeology by the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA), the premier learned society for the science of the deep past, and was tapped to head a field school for the same institute, to be called the School of American Archaeology. Hewett was a tireless worker and a skillful negotiator, and these skills served him well in the climate of American archaeology in 1900–1910. This thesis, however, is not about the spades, sifters, field expeditions, or dusty remains that compose the typical view of archaeology. Instead, it is about a mindset: that archaeology’s sites and artifacts be preserved for posterity. Hewett bridged the different methodologies of archaeologists and regional concerns of everyday Americans, all of whom pondered a similar suite of questions: which antiquities should be preserved, what should protection entail, and for whom should objects be protected? In this thesis, I explore these questions.
Hewett has fascinated many historians and anthropologists interested in the history of archaeology, but these predominantly address Hewett in his later years. A notable exception is the work of James Snead, *Ruins and Rivals: The Making of Southwest Archaeology* (2001), which analyzes the patronage, professionalism, and rationale that characterized late nineteenth and early twentieth century Southwestern archaeology, and to which I am greatly indebted.¹ Other important studies include Curtis Hinsley’s investigation of Hewett’s role in the founding of the School of American Archaeology.² Don Fowler has investigated Hewett and his contentious relationship with the East Coast anthropological faculty in an essay titled “Harvard vs. Hewett,” and Raymond Harris Thompson has written on Hewett and his role in crafting the Antiquities Act;³ both of these works helped me understand the nuances of the cultural, intellectual and legal milieu in which Hewett operated.⁴


By following Hewett through his preservationist and promotional archaeological work, the present thesis is an attempt to understand thinking about the preservation of archaeological sites in the early twentieth century. Specifically, it is an exploration of a specific group of people, predominantly white men, who decided that the material remains of North America’s “prehistoric” past ought to be preserved. What constituted material preservation for these archaeologists and preservationists? How did they arrive at their various “preservationist” philosophies? How did they codify and solidify their conceptions of protection? And what were the realities of actual site preservation?

The individuals who pondered these questions were by-and-large archaeologically minded people. They were amateurs and professionals, concerned citizens and congressmen, Westerners and Easterners; all shared a fascination with the deep past of North America, a time before written history and largely pre-dating European encounters, when Amerindians (the indigenous people of the Americas when Christopher Columbus arrived in 1492) were the sole human inhabitants of the continent. Amerindian settlements, tools, pictograms, and bones were evidence of this previous world before “civilization” and history. Ruins and relics told stories differently than narrative history, and archaeology, a burgeoning science only recently coming into its own, was seen to be the key for the material investigations necessary to constructing a picture of the deep past.

The development of American archaeology runs through the present work, and by following the archaeological debates bridging the nineteenth and twentieth centuries I hope to sketch an approach to history and its “dimmest,” most unknown periods that guided many anthropological scientists of that time. As archaeology matured in the nineteenth century, Anglo-American settlements expanded rapidly onto Indian land. Archaeologists recognized Amerindian burials and mound formations in newly settled territory, but their efforts to save these from destruction were met with apathy. Native Americans were seen by many Anglo-Americans to have a merely superficial material culture, that is, their tools and architecture were considered rudimentary at best. Understood as primitive, Amerindians were denied authority on their own history through much of the nineteenth century. History understood as a progression through stages of material advancement, as it was in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, put little faith in the idea that pre-Columbian Native Americans could possess a history or agency in its creation. These Amerindians were seen throughout the nineteenth century as timeless savages, as unadvanced as at the moment of creation, and far too ignorant to have ever produced important cultural works.

While “conservation” around 1900 has been addressed in work such as Samuel P. Hays' on the progressive conservation movement of the early twentieth century, the language of “preservation” and “preservationism” is intimately linked to the Antiquities Act. Samuel P. Hays, Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency: The Progressive Conservation Movement, 1890–1920 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959).
Monumental architectural remains that indicated the trappings of civilization, such as those of the Ohio River Valley, were ascribed to an extinct race, possibly ancestors of the Aztecs, and not to the forbearers of the contemporaneous North American Indians. This dislocation of past and present can be seen in the depiction of contemporaneous Native Americans in the foreground of Figure 1a; Amerindians look out onto Anglo-American development amid the mounds of a supposedly greater civilization. This juxtaposition of American development and a prior, materially advanced race of people can also be seen in Figure 1b. A graveyard has been erected around a mound formation, indicating that two great civilizations—one extinct, the other currently thriving—lay alongside one another in death, while crepuscular rays shine down on an American barn in the background.

Figure 1a – Image from Ephraim Squier and Edwin Davis’ *Ancient Monuments of the Mississippi Valley* (1848). The Native American “mounds” were the source of speculation regarding American Indians because they no longer built such structures, leading some to speculate that the mounds were made by an extinct race of “Mound Builders.” The mounds are located in the background, alongside the settlements of the American nation, while contemporaneous Native Americans look on from a copse of fallen trees.
If mounds and burial tumuli captured the archaeological mind of the first half of the nineteenth century, cliff dwellings and “pueblos” captured those of the second half. The Mexican Cession had opened up a vast western expanse; when settlers first arrived in the Southwest, they encountered Mexicans and Indians living in dusty towns in the high deserts of southern Colorado and northern New Mexico. The culture was foreign but, with its Catholic tinge, imbued with a fading memory of Europe. But an even stranger, more captivating people were alluded to in the winding canyons and dry riverbeds of the terrain—the Anasazi, the “ancient ones.”

Scattered about the canyons and tablelands of the Southwest, Anglo-Americans also found evidence of past habitations, ruins of abandoned settlements that had yet to decay in the dry climate. Anglo-American discoveries of these ruins increased as settlements advanced, and stories travelled back along the trails leading “out west.” Early military expeditions and surveying teams were accompanied by artists, who helped the public imagine the unfamiliar terrain, architecture, and people; Richard Kern was one of the earliest of these artists, and, as Figure 2 shows, he depicted the mesas of the Western Rockies on a grand scale—but not one that is far from reality.

By 1900, these remains of the past were fast disappearing. The curio market, focused on the Southwestern Indians and the Anasazi before them, was thriving and Anglo-Americans increasingly took weekend touristic jaunts to the ruins in the Rocky Mountain region and beyond. While development on the East Coast had not considered Amerindian antiquities an important resource to preserve, many people in 1900 realized the desirability of protecting

---

6 Anasazi is a Navajo word that means “ancient enemy” and “ancient one.” The term’s use in the twentieth century to describe the ancestral Puebloan people is widespread. I use it for the sake of simplicity, when saying “ancestral people of the Southwest” or some variation thereof would be too cumbersome. While I acknowledge the problematic nature of the term, I do not intend my use of it to be polemical or ironic.
the monumental remains of the West for historical and scientific research, not to mention as
testaments to a past American civilization. It is these preservationist goals that I examine in what
follows.

I begin by detailing Hewett’s early preservationist activity, which necessarily includes his
understanding of archaeology and the deep past of America (and the Southwest) around
1900. Included in Chapter One is a historiography of the Southwest that traces the historical
understanding of the region through time and helps to ground my central question, “Why
preserve antiquities?” This question is simply answered by the discipline of archaeology as
a matter of source material, but as Chapter One shows, ongoing debates about Amerindian
origins colored the interpretive lens of archaeology and the larger discipline of anthropology. Archaeologists believed there was value in protecting ancient remains, but so too did many Westerners with no formal attachment to anthropology. Both sorts of preservation-minded groups sought to make connections between the deep “American” past and the present. For science, the connection was to be empirical; for laypeople, the connection was to the American nation and the spirit of its citizens.

The “objects” of American archaeology in this period were so-called “prehistoric” ruins—that is, material remains that were constructed by a people that lived before written, documented history, and these “prehistorics” were not necessarily understood to be related to contemporaneous Amerindians. Thus, with no “history” to supplement physical data, prehistoric ruins served as the locus for the past as reconstructed by archaeologists and everyday Americans in their imaginations.

To reconstruct the past from scant data, one needs a model of history to apply to the available evidence. In the final years of the nineteenth century, the sequences of materially determined “ages” or “epochs” in history were used in both scientific and popular reconstructions of America’s past. American archaeology in the post-bellum United States brought along with it residual traces of racialist and social evolutionist thinking, even though these theories were defunct scientifically. Hewett did not harbor extreme versions of these views, although sequence-based anthropological theories of material development did influence his early anthropological thinking and would appear in his crafting of the Antiquities Act. As he grew as a scholar and embarked on a dissertation on the ancient peoples of the Southwest, Hewett became concerned with geographical and cultural contexts, eschewing technology-driven sequences. However, Hewett was similarly influenced by romantic, popular histories of the region. His admiration

---

7 The history of anthropology has been approached by both historians and anthropologists alike. For the history of European archaeology and archaeological thought, see Bruce G. Trigger, *A History of Archaeological Thought* (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Alain Schnapp, *The Discovery of the Past*, trans. Ian Kinnes and Gillian Varndell (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1997).


of the peoples of the past and his desire to educate Americans about them motivated him to ensure the protection of archaeological resources. Others shared his preservationist mentality in the period. In charting the authors behind these visions of the past and present, I show various conceptualizations of the approach to the deep past and the (American) present. A continuum between the distant past and contemporary America was conceived by 1906, but the linkages often excluded the actual descendants of the “Anasazi,” the Pueblo Indians.

In 1904, after beginning a doctorate in Geneva, Hewett began drafting legislation protecting American antiquities. Preservation attempts had occurred regularly since 1900, but were held up each time for various reasons, from jurisdictional conflicts to Western concerns over federal withdrawal of public lands. The difference between prior attempts and Hewett’s legislation and the evolution of preservationist thinking are the focus of Chapter Two. I address the power of temporal and comparative language, especially terms like “prehistoric,” “ancient” and “primitive,” because, I argue, terminology guided particular historical, popular and scientific interpretations about the deep past. I also investigate the institutional influences on the Antiquities Act—archaeology, I argue, benefitted from the Act’s use of language whereas Native American groups were excluded by it. It is my contention that the Act’s passage enshrined certain benefits for institutionalized archaeology, and the legislation established the framework within which the discipline could grow and flourish.

That the Antiquities Act helped professionalize archaeology in the United States has been noted before, but otherwise little original scholarship has noted Hewett’s influence (indeed, Chauvenet, his biographer, nearly bypasses the Act entirely). Ronald F. Lee’s monograph on the 1906 Antiquities Act and prior preservationist legislation is a crucial history of an underappreciated law and its crafter.8 Raymond Harris Thompson, in 2000, republished Lee’s study with new commentary and discussion of Hewett’s role.9 Professionalization has been approached in Snead’s Ruins and Rivals and in the respective works of Francis P. McManamon, Raymond Harris Thompson and Joe E. Watkins (together in a volume titled The Antiquities Act: A Century of American Archaeology, Historic Preservation, and Nature Conservation).10

My major claim in Chapter Two is that Hewett’s Antiquities Act influenced the sorts of history

that could be read in the objects preserved. Antiquities deemed important enough to protect in perpetuity determined the cultures chosen to represent the deep American past. The Southwest’s Pueblo Indians, or rather the monuments left by their “Anasazi” ancestors, were given federal protection. Tribes and traditions elsewhere were not, and traditional nomadic Indians everywhere were outside the bounds of the legislation. This distinction reflects an understanding of the status of “civilization,” particularly with respect to technological culture, as an idea embedded in the discipline of archaeology in 1906. Permanence was privileged, and architecture and tools that lasted 400 years were marked for protection while those that decayed in fifty or 100 years—buildings made of wood or animal hide, for example—were forgotten. Popular histories often relied on what could be seen (and even “intuited”) in the landscape, but these unsubstantiated histories were not the only stories that relied on great monuments to stand for the milestones of civilization. I argue that even though it was an empirical, material science, archaeology in 1906 was influenced by notions of social evolution and progress that dominated nineteenth century anthropology.

Though archaeology was ostensibly given an exclusive field for development after the Antiquities Act, the immediate aftermath of the Act’s passage was a confusing time for preservationists. Much uncertainty about the reality of access and interpretative potential of protected sites remained. Focusing on two preservation projects in Colorado around 1905–1908, Chapter Three outlines the divisions of preservationism immediately after the Antiquities Act. I contrast Mesa Verde, a group of cliff dwellings in Colorado protected by unique legislation alongside the Antiquities Act, with Manitou, a reconstructed cliff dwelling built near Colorado Springs. In these different projects, the reasons for preserving archaeological sites are revealed; the two sites presented a history of the deep past, but approached this tale through differing methods—scientific archaeology, on the one hand, and a popular or promotional (“unscientific”) archaeology on the other. Though the sites and the methods of preservation were very different, I argue that the stories each conveyed about the past help to solidify a pragmatic approach to preservationist thinking after 1900, one that developed on the ground in the Southwest and not in the lecture halls of the East Coast. The precision of “scientific” preservationism was impossible, I conclude, because the regional stakeholders were not scientists; local pride powered preservationist dedication and guaranteed antiquities’ protection. Hewett was connected to these projects, as a proponent of scientific preservation at Mesa Verde and as a representative for educational interests in the case of Manitou.

While I do not address Mesa Verde in depth, the work of historian Duane M. Smith remains an

---

11 Steven Conn makes a similar claim using literature, art, and linguistics in addition to archaeology and anthropology. Steven Conn, *History’s Shadow: Native Americans and Historical Consciousness in the Nineteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).
excellent account of the founding of the park.\textsuperscript{12} Joseph Weixelman’s dissertation on the cultural interpretation, tourism, and the “vanishing Anasazi” discussed several of the interpretative stances one might take to antiquities as both Westerner and tourist in the early years of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{13} James Snead and Curtis Hinsley have documented the archaeological and promotional work of this period, especially that of Hewett. For Snead, the notion of professionalization is tightly bound to Southwestern promotional work, and my own approach corroborates his notion but seeks to tease out the implications for the discipline of history.

Associated with such questions is a discussion of the “professional” archaeologist, which compares scientifically minded preservationists with those who worked to promote and popularize archaeology. Examining where Hewett himself stood in the debate regarding end-users and methodological approaches in archaeology, I contend that the Westerner’s approach forged connections between the scientific community and regional, promotional and educational interests; moreover, his tact can be witnessed in the founding of the School of American Archaeology, of which he was elected Director in 1907. The debate over where to house the school concludes Chapter Three and bridges it to my conclusion, as the discussion of location offers a complementary perspective to the question of “professional” archaeology and the scientific versus popular preservationist binary.\textsuperscript{14}

This thesis is about time, its preservation, and the depiction of its passage. Even today anthropology struggles with dislocations of time; the reader may notice analogs of the difficult temporal-cultural reconciliations felt in 1900 still extant today, as addressed by such theoretical anthropological work such as Johannes Fabian’s \textit{Time and the Other} (1983) and the volume \textit{Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography}, edited by James Clifford and George E. Marcus.\textsuperscript{15} In 1900, shaking off teleological and technological biases was even more difficult, and yet traces of theoretical formations regarding Amerindian ancestors and the deep past can be occasionally gleaned. Optimistic that history and prehistory could be joined, the purposeful preservation of the human story—origin, migration, and cultural developments—defined archaeology at the same time as it gave the American nation a constructed image of its own

\textsuperscript{12} Duane A. Smith, \textit{Mesa Verde National Park: Shadows of the Centuries} (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1988).


\textsuperscript{14} This has been addressed before, notably in James Snead’s \textit{Ruins and Rivals} and Curtis Hinsley’s “Edgar Lee Hewett and the School of American Research in Santa Fe 1906-1912,” mentioned above. See also, Nancy Owen Lewis and Kay Leigh Hagan, \textit{A Peculiar Alchemy: A Centennial History of SAR 1907–2007} (Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 2007).

history. Hewett’s preservationist vision began a trend that continues today, wherein America’s history and heritage are promoted and fruitful economic and cultural connections are forged alongside the public’s education and experience of the past.
Chapter 1

The Scope and Science of American “Prehistory”
in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries

An object of great age holds a certain power that something new lacks. To human consciousness, time’s passage seems to endow an object with something beyond function or aesthetic value. On the one hand, this value could be deemed sentimental: a wedding ring passed down through generations carries with it the spirit of a family; an old building may be unused but evocative of a certain era; a metal war helmet reminds a nation of a past world of which they are no longer physically and intellectually a part—and yet, the beholder may feel profoundly connected to it. Sentiment is associated with lineage, cultures, and traditions—that is, what we see in an object is directly bound to our emotional connection to both the moment it represents and its survival through time.

On the other hand, there is a value we see in objects that are not of our own bloodlines or nationalities. History, as a story we tell to ourselves and as a streaming band of events moving through time, is a counterpart to sentiment, though both conceptualizations are not mutually exclusive. If one feels connected to objects of great age, one is likely to want to continue to preserve them. This preservationist desire was held by archaeologists in America in the nineteenth century—men whose families were relatively recent transplants to the American continent, but who found wondrous ruins and artifacts buried in its ground. These artifacts were not of their own kin—an ethnic distinction that was very clear to them—and yet these strange people and their remains captivated them, whether as a part of the human family or as descendants of an atemporal, enduring “American” nation. These archaeologists wanted to uncover, study and decipher the “relics” of America’s past. They sensed history in artifacts and ruins, but the world that could be read from these objects did not resemble anything they knew.

American Indian stories about their own past did exist, but their veracity was questioned and the label of “history” was denied to them by Anglo-Americans. Without physical, documented evidence to support accounts of the past, esoteric myths were all these stories could be. Amerindian belief systems were therefore perpetually contained in the present, existing to Anglo-American interpreters as folklore separated from chronological sequences of history. For these
Figure 3a – Map showing the clusters of ruin sites around the US, from Records of the Past I (1902).

Figure 3b – The territory of the Mexican Cession of 1848. From Henry Gannett, Geography and Travel: North America – The United States (1898).
men, history required written documentation.

Some aspects of history from before Anglo settlement of the western regions of North America following the American Revolution had been recreated. The Spanish, French, and British possessed archives that dated from the Columbian encounter. A picture of America in the sixteenth century could be dimly sketched by anyone interested in the past—the image’s clarity increasing as each century wore on. But written archives only stretched back as far as 1492. Thus, to seek the story beyond this date, history-minded Anglos turned to material remains.

The problematic intersection between Anglo-American conceptions of history and the folklore of Amerindians was physical evidence that indicated events and life practices of times long past. Called “antiquities,” “relics,” “ruins” and “artifacts,” this physical evidence consisted of abandoned settlements, tools, bones, and pictograms of American Indians who formerly inhabited the country and which indicated a long occupation of the continent to Anglo-Americans. Fear or reverence held by Native Americans toward the ancient remains was perceived by Anglo-Americans as ignorance of the ruins’ creators. In this way, Anglo-Americans could justify approaching antiquities as a tabula rasa, in turn formulating their own conception of America’s deep past, before history.

Physical remains of human presence stretched the breadth of the North American landmass, as seen in Figure 3a, but it was not until the late nineteenth century that this evidence was taken seriously and considered valuable, in part because of the monumentality of the antiquities of the Southwest, which had only become American territory in the Mexican Cession of 1848 [Figure 3b]. In the East and Midwest, many abandoned Amerindian settlements had been destroyed—literally plowed over—during the course of the British colonization and the subsequent growth of an independent American nation. Around the middle of the nineteenth century the combination of immense land accumulation in the Mexican Cession, Western frontier settlement, and the maturation of American archaeology sparked a new consideration of Native American antiquities. After the Civil War, individuals interested in the deep past of their country became aware of the necessity to preserve American antiquities if further study of the dimmer parts of its history was to continue. But as they sought to preserve the physical evidence of the past inhabitants of their nation, they ignored the peoples who ancestors had built left these traces behind. This chapter traces the intellectual roots of this preservationist thinking, by turns proud of the present nation and its deep past and forgetful of the real consequences of this history in their own time.

*   *   *   *
Why preserve the antiquities? What value did they hold? And for whom? Using the perception of the “ancient” Southwest as a barometer for the development of national ideas about America’s “prehistory,” and the protection of its source material, archaeological sites, this chapter examines the development of preservationist thinking, specifically through an amateur archaeologist, Edgar Lee Hewett, who went on to spearhead federal antiquities protection in 1906. Hewett, I argue, approached the discipline of archaeology most successfully through preservation. What encouraged amateur, scientifically untrained people like Hewett to consider preservation?

In Hewett’s case, pedagogy initially drove his fascination with the past, but soon the disappearance of ruins seized his attention. Ruins were major bodies of evidence on the deep past, since Amerindians did not have written histories before 1492. Archaeological research on ruins was seen as imperative to unlocking this historical problem and, therefore, the source material of the ruins was deemed important to protect. By sketching the early-twentieth-century conceptions of the deep history of the Southwest, the Spanish colonial period, and the American annexation in 1848, this chapter lays bare a disjunction between history as a process through time and the reconstruction of the past through material evidence. With regard to history’s construction, I outline the development of archaeology and its relationship to history and pedagogy, and examine how ruins aided early theories of the origin and migration of the people of ancient America. While Chapter Two examines how Hewett and other archaeologists worked for federal preservation, this chapter searches for their influences and logics. I argue that American archaeology sought to connect the present American nation to the pre-conquest past and its impressive (but fallen) civilizations. In so doing, they gave their country a history on par with that ancient Greece and Egypt and, because these civilizations were deemed to have passed on, a precedent for the development of a new American civilization at the expense of Native Americans.

**A Land of Enchantment—A Short but Deep History of the American Southwest**

When Hewett’s interest in ruins and remains of Native Americans was first piqued around 1890, Amerindians in the Southwest had already experienced three hundred years of contact with non-indigenous people. Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca (1480s–1550s) and his three companions were the sole survivors of Pánphilo de Narváez’s fateful exploration of Florida, and are remembered as the first non-indigenous people to enter the Southwest, trekking from the mouth of the Mississippi River through present-day Texas and into New Mexico in the 1530s, and finally southward to the Spanish settlements in Mexico. Cabeza de Vaca’s perception of the Indians he encountered in the southern Rocky Mountain region was strikingly different from the tribes to the East. This sentiment of difference remained nearly 400 years later, when L. Bradford Prince,
an historian and contemporary of Edgar Lee Hewett, wrote of Cabeza de Vaca’s expedition,

On their journey they had found the same radical difference between the nomadic Indian tribes of the Gulf Coast, half-clothed and half-starved, and the civilized natives of New Mexico, living in permanent houses and raising grain and vegetables to eat and cotton to wear, as exists today between the wild tribes of the plains and the peaceful and industrious Pueblo Indians.¹

Prince, writing in 1914, draws a contrast between nomadic or “wild” Indians and settled or “civilized natives” of the Southwest in his own time. The belief that settled, agricultural Native Americans were of a higher civilizational level than their nomadic brethren had been maintained since before the American Revolution; the life practices, mores, architecture, and tools of settled tribes struck European colonizers as more similar to their own—or at least similar to their own cultures’ deep histories in ancient Europe.

The manifest differences between nomadic and sedentary lifestyles was given scientific basis in the nineteenth century. The Danish museum director Christian Jürgensen Thomsen (1788–1865) had in 1819 designed an exhibition about ancient European cultures around technological development, the stone, bronze and iron “ages” of mankind that became known as the Three Age theory. It was believed that only a sedentary culture could develop successive metallurgical techniques; in turn, technological capability extended to represent the whole of a given culture.² Before Thomsen, varying ideas about human development in “four stages,” which were typically grounded on modes of sustenance—hunting, shepherding, agriculture and commerce—moved through Classical and Renaissance social thought, as Ronald L. Meek has demonstrated.³ Thomsen’s reorganization of the progressive phases of human existence from sustenance to material use looked further back in time, to the “prehistorics,” and included their material cultures as evidence of a particular developmental stage. As Alain Schnapp informs us, the categorization of material complexes and architecture of prehistoric European peoples by continental antiquarians following Thomsen helped to give archaeology a scientific foundation, and the science of archaeology took on a three-pronged approach to the past: type, technology and stratigraphy.⁴ European archaeologists and their positivistic methods stimulated discourse about their own ancestors that relied upon empirical data from excavations. In the United States, however, this debate about the past took a different form, as nearly all Americans recognized

Europe as their land of origin. Instead of speculating on their own civilizational development, as European archaeologists did, the object of American archaeologists was their nation’s indigenous past and, by extension, the landscape of North America.

When the first anthropological museums, such as the National Museum in Washington, DC (today the Smithsonian Institution National Museum of Natural History), were erected in the United States following the Civil War, they followed European-style technological sequences: just as varieties of ducks or species of felines were grouped together, “savages” were paired with so-called savage tribes, and “barbarians” with other barbarous peoples from around the world—categories that were technologically and materially determined. “Civilized” people were absent from the sequences laid out in natural history. In America the stages of mankind theory was championed by Lewis Henry Morgan (1818–1881), who believed that all American aborigines shared a similar kinship system with Asians, Europeans and African peoples. Charles Darwin’s demonstration of natural selection was influential to Morgan, but, as Joan Mark has shown, “Morgan was concerned, not with the evolution of species, but with what he thought was the evolution of society within a single species. The mechanism he envisioned was not unexplained variation and then competition in nature but rather human intelligence and learning accumulated through language.” Thus humans were of a common ancestral stock for Morgan, but groups underwent social evolution; the typologies resulting from this—savage, barbaric and civilized—were adopted in the galleries of museums.

When Frederic Ward Putnam began as curator of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard University in 1875, he conceived of a different organizing principle, one that grouped collections together by region instead of by determined type. This was a marked break from the American Museum’s layout. Putnam’s geographical contextualism was later supported by his protégé Franz Boas, who highlighted the idea and linked it to his “culturalist” theory of anthropology, wherein human migration and inter-group contact were stressed over evolutionary sequences. Boas’ culturalism saw human exchanges as transformative across all cultures, and on this premise he sought to unlock “universal psychic causes or laws.”

Although Boas had begun to revolutionize American anthropology and alter public perception about Native Americans near the end of the nineteenth century, the effect was not disseminated in American society at large. While residual traces of racial distinction remained, the conversation

---

6 Mark, Four Anthropologists, 25.
7 Mark, Four Anthropologists, 22.
8 Mark, Four Anthropologists, 35.
centering on biological difference that began around the American Revolution ("are Native Americans a different species from Europeans?") had shifted to cultural difference ("at what stage of civilization are Native Americans?") by the end of the nineteenth century. Nonetheless, this discourse had yet to be cast outside of stages, epochs, or technological determinations as in Putnam’s or Boas’ understanding of contextualized culture. Historians, museum curators, and everyday Americans still subscribed to a notion of history as a trajectory of progress through stages; it was for these reasons of technological advancement that the historian Prince could justify calling the Pueblo Indians encountered by Cabeza de Vaca “civilized.”

As James Snead tells us, however, this “privilege” did not always extend to the present-day Pueblo Indians, regardless of material-cultural evidence that clearly indicated related lineages. On the contrary, at the threshold between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries most historians of the Southwestern United States romanticized the historic Pueblo Indians and their “ancient” and “prehistoric” ancestors at the expense of present-day tribes. In the late nineteenth century, however, there existed a perception of profound disparity between the homegrown social and material developments of Native American and Anglo-American peoples. The perceived technological and sociocultural inferiority of the Native Americans was further exacerbated by a temporal disjunction; because the Amerindians could not produce documented histories of their background, the material practices of these people could be understood as learned, not internally developed. Even if the Pueblo Indians could be associated with archaeological remains of the past based on architectural similarities to current construction, shown in the images in Figure 4, a lack of written testimony of such a lineage permitted doubt to be cast on the relationship; indeed, in the case of architecture the Spanish had “improved” adobe brick making and pueblo-style construction after their arrival in the Southwest (as in Figure 4b), so the lineage between contemporary Pueblos and the Anasazi of the great ruined cities of the Four Corners region (Arizona, Utah, Colorado and New Mexico) could not firmly be established. Without written histories the Native Americans became “prehistoric,” akin to the pre-Roman Celtic and Germanic tribes of ancient Europe. This perceived developmental gap rendered a racialist discourse convenient, which in turn justified the settling of the Native American’s land by Anglo-Americans; because Indians were seen to be so far behind culturally and technologically it was assumed that their cultures would inevitably succumb to the new American empire through

---


And yet, in his 1883 Historical Sketches of New Mexico, Bradford Prince dedicates the book “To the Pueblos, still representing in unchanged form the aboriginal civilization which built the cities and established the systems of government and social life which astonished the European discoverers nearly four centuries ago.” L. Bradford Prince, Historical Sketches of New Mexico (Kansas City: Ramsey, Millett & Hudon, 1883), dedication.
A “Cliff Dweller” ruin, above, at first glance resembled the contemporaneous pueblos, such as Jemez pueblo in the image below, because both were made of earthen walls with wooden roofs sealed with mud and clay. However, the Spanish introduced new construction techniques, such as sun-dried brickmaking, and typological forms, as seen in the mission church to the right.
Approaching the Deep Past Today

Today, archaeology tells us that the so-called New World was settled at the latest around 10,000 or 9500 BCE via the Bering Straight, coinciding with the traditional Neolithic period in Mesopotamia. These “paleo-Indians” quickly spread across the American supercontinent and developed unique cultures. Evidence of the domestication of maize (corn) in present-day Mexico dates to 3600 BCE, and this dietary staple is understood to have reached what is today the Southwestern United States around 2000 BCE. Plant domestication allowed permanent settlements to form and grow to greater numbers than previously possible. From 2000 BCE until the Spanish encounter in the late fifteenth century, the so-called Anasazi people of what is today the Four Corners region of the United States lived in increasingly larger settlements, first in small villages with shallow pit houses where they practiced terraced farming in hilly areas or irrigated the desert expanses, later in rock and mud (adobe) pueblo units, which are essentially square rooms aggregated into cells and terraced on top of one another, as seen in the nineteenth century reconstruction in Figure 5a. Around 1000 CE, in present-day Northern New Mexico, an expansive complex of buildings was constructed by the Anasazi in Chaco Canyon, as it is known today. Chaco was the largest settlement in the Southwest at the time and likely served as a “corn bank” and meeting place for loosely connected pueblos, who shared similar cosmologies but were not necessary unified under distinct political leadership. But political factions grew, and Pueblo Bonito, the largest and oldest of the settlements at Chaco Canyon, was followed by other construction projects—the settlements of Chetro Ketl and Pueblo Alto—potentially mounted by competitive tribal leaders or factions.

Throughout the several phases of its inhabitation Chaco Canyon operated as a central axis connecting regional groups. After 1125 the Anasazi center of gravity moved north, from Chaco Canyon to what archaeologists in the early twentieth century named Aztec Ruins; though this site had no actual connection with the storied Aztecs of Mexico, the name indicates the imagined connection between the ancient Southwestern people and the Aztec civilization by way of their

---

10 While there are many examples of this justification of the Anglo-American settlement of Native American land, Frederick Jackson Turner’s narrative of the “frontier” and the creation of a distinctly American identity is bound up in this idea of Indian obsolescence. Steven Conn discusses Turner in a succinct analysis. Steven Conn, *History’s Shadow: Native Americans and Historical Consciousness in the Nineteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 224–226.


Figure 5a – A speculative reconstruction of Pueblo Bonito in Chaco Canyon. Though the structure has idealized lines, this turn-of-the-century speculative drawing is not far from how present-day archaeology understands the Chaco ruins. From Stephen Denison Peet, *The Cliff Dwellers and Pueblos* (1899).

relative material-cultural similarities. While Aztec was a larger settlement than those at Chaco Canyon, erratic rains weakened the political clout of this town, and smaller groups split from the main community in order to relieve the stress of providing nourishment to large communities. During this period, one Anasazi group built a town in adobe brick under a rocky cliff overhang on a Southwestern Colorado plateau. Almost a millennium later, Anglo-American explorers would find this region and call it Mesa Verde, a Spanish term for the green, arable tableland that shadowed and protected the “palace” below, nestled under an overhanging cliff [Figure 6].

Larger settlements collapsed from drought and political infighting over the course of the next four hundred years; Pueblo oral historians and tribal elders still tell of the corrupting nature of power and of authoritative leadership, and convey the egalitarian character of the period after the Chaco and Aztec (New Mexico) powers. Northern Amerindian groups, equipped with differing cosmologies and material practices from those of the Pueblos, had entered the four corners area by the fifteenth century. Some, such as the Navajos, were agriculturalists that founded settlements of hogans, or temporary rounded wooden buildings a seen in Figure 8, and later became pastoralists, herding sheep among the Mesas. Others, like the Apaches, were nomadic hunters and traders who lived in portable domiciles called wickiups [Figure 7]. The peoples of the Southwest at the climax of the fifteenth century were negotiating their roles as the area became more populated.

---

Figure 7 – A Wickiup, as depicted in Frederick Hastings Chapin, *The Land of the Cliff-Dwellers* (1892). The contrast between the Wickiup and the ruined dwellings of Mesa Verde was striking to nineteenth-century Americans, who believed the former dwelling to be inferior to the enclosed, seemingly permanent cliff houses that more closely resembled their own domiciles.

Figure 8 – Navajo Hogans, both in a drawing and photographs. Hogans, being more fully enclosed dwellings than Wickiups, fared better in Anglo-American than the Apache dwellings, but not by much; the “extinct” cliff dwellers were still regarded as the greater civilization.


To the right, photograph from T. Mitchell Prudden, *On the Great American Plateau* (1906).
At the same time, four strange men with full, bushy beards had been found in the eastern lands that linked the mountains to the Great Plains. These men, led by Cabeza de Vaca, did not fluently speak of any of the regional languages nor any of the Indian languages the Pueblos may have known through trading. The Pueblo Indians had heard of strange foreigners before from their economic activity with tribes to the east, in present-day Texas, and to the south, in present-day Mexico. Cabeza de Vaca and his three companions headed south, toward what they thought were their own settlements and countrymen. Life continued for the Pueblo Indians, who remained unaware that they were about to pass out of a “prehistoric” time and into “history.”

The Spanish Southwest

In 1540, Francisco Vásquez de Coronado (1510–1554), governor of the province of Nuevo Galicia, New Spain (today comprised of the Mexican states of Jalisco, Sinaloa and Nayarit in the Southwest of the country), mounted an expedition to the north, into the present-day American Southwest. Of course, he had heard of the miraculous survival of Cabeza de Vaca and his three companions, and was taken by the idea of exploration as both a contribution to the Spanish Crown’s geographical body of knowledge and its coffers. He sent a friar, Marcos de Niza, with one of Cabeza de Vaca’s entourage, Esteban, a Moroccan and former slave, into the canyonlands and high deserts north of Nuevo Galicia to scout the terrain. De Niza returned without Esteban but with news of golden cities, seven in number, which he called Cibola. With Cibola as his aim, Coronado began his quest for golden cities—a search that, unfortunately for him, would yield no positive wealth.15 “Where populous towns were supposed to exist, ruins were found,” wrote Frederick Hastings Chapin, retelling the history in 1892 and juxtaposing it with modern-day photos of ruins such as Figure 6.16 Coronado and his men were not interested in decaying towns and broken pottery, but their journals would aid those captivated by such desolate sites many centuries later.

Sixty years after Coronado, Don Juan de Oñate (1550–1626) led a party of colonists back into the area of the Southwest. He founded an encampment first on the San Juan River and later, after that settlement’s destruction, at Santa Fe in 1610. The Spanish ruled the southwestern lands of North America for nearly two hundred years; in 1821, New Spain became Mexico, a nation that wrested independence from an overtaxing monarch and stretched from present-day California in the northwest, east to the Rio Grande and following its passage to the Gulf of Mexico, and south to Panama. In 1848, after a two-year war, Mexico ceded its northern territory to the United

---

15 For a history of Coronado written in the early twentieth century, see Prince, A Concise History of New Mexico, 1914, chapters VI and VII. For an updated account, see Stewart Udall, To the Inland Empire: Coronado and Our Spanish Legacy (New York: Doubleday, 1987).

States. Anglo-Americans, as part of westward expansion in the US, then came to the Southwest in great numbers.

**American Archaeology Enters the Southwest**

In order to take stock of the government’s recent acquisition of land, multiple surveying expeditions took place in the Southwest, which subsequently enlarged the potential areas for archaeological examination. The first expedition was made by Lieutenant James H. Simpson’s in 1849; this was followed by an expedition headed by Major John Wesley Powell surveying the Colorado River and the Grand Canyon between 1869–1872. Powell (1834–1902) combined ethnology with geological survey on his reconnaissance and after his surveys he published a book on the methodology of Indian linguistic study in 1877. Two years later, Powell became the first Director of the Bureau of Ethnology (renamed the Bureau of American Ethnology in 1897), a department that worked to formalize the science of anthropology.

Powell’s expedition opened up a geographically and historically distinct region for settlement because it revealed to the world the monumental cliff dwellings of the Southwest. While the Ohio and Mississippi River Valleys and their tributaries were known to hold settlements and structures of the “Mound Builders,” speculative theories of Amerindian origin assumed that this “lost” culture likely originated from the south, in Mexico. Midway between the legendary Aztec cities and the territory of the fabricated “Mound Builders” was a “semi-civilization” in New Mexico, which had recently become a territory of the United States. The archaeological remains of the Southwest surpassed those of the East in size, condition, and apparent complexity, at least to nineteenth-century eyes and minds. As westward expansion continued, accounts of the ancient remains traveled back east.

---


19 By 1820, news of large mounds along the banks of the Ohio River valley had piqued the curiosity of historians and antiquarians in the East. The American Antiquarian Society’s 1820 inaugural publication of its bulletin dedicated to America’s ancient past, *Archaeologia Americana*, included an extensive survey of American Indian “antiquities” by Caleb Atwater. Atwater’s surveys caught the eye Joseph Henry, first Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, who enlisted two other Ohioans, Ephraim Squier and Edwin Davis, to expand on the cursory 1820 work. The result was *Ancient Monuments of the Mississippi Valley*, published as the first volume of the Smithsonian’s “Contributions to Knowledge” series in 1848.

20 “Mound Builders” were the stuff of romantic speculation throughout the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Denominated by their architectural ruins, they were supposed to comprise of an extinct race that was unrelated to contemporaneous Amerindians and were instead thought to be related to the Aztecs and other “semi-civilizations” of Mexico. For a historic account of Mound Builder myths, see Samuel Haven, *Archaeology of the United States* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1856). For an impressive discussion of the racial theories, in addition to the work of Squier and Davis, see David J. Meltzer, “Introduction: Ephraim Squier, Edwin Davis, and the Making of an American Archaeological Classic” in Ephraim Squier and Edwin Davis, *Ancient Monuments of the Mississippi Valley*. (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1998).
In 1880, Adolph Bandelier (1840–1914), a Swiss-American archaeologist, set out to conduct major research on the Southwest and its “semi-civilization” and, in 1881, he published a report in two sections, featuring an “Historical Introduction to Studies Among the Sedentary Indians of New Mexico” and a “Report on the Ruins of the Pueblo of Pecos.” Supported by a fellowship from the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA) in Boston, Bandelier’s work was the first widely distributed ethnology of the Southwestern Indians, and it laid the groundwork for subsequent anthropological investigations. Bandelier’s reports consisted of narrative accounts of his travels and descriptions of his archaeological investigations. The volumes included images, some of which were analytical, such as the plan in Figure 9. Additional images of the extant ruins, however, depict a barren world populated with the remains of a once-thriving community, as Figures 10a, b, and c reveal. Bandelier’s images notably included modern Anglo-American men to give scale, but this juxtaposition of ancient and modern, scientific and nostalgic conjured a sentimental story of the ancient southwest for his readership.

Victor Mindeleff (1860–1948) followed Bandelier with a report in 1891 for the Bureau of Ethnology, a “Study of Pueblo Architecture” [Figure 11]. Mindeleff analyzed both pre-Columbian and contemporaneous Pueblo architecture, but was sure to put Native American figures in the still-occupied settlements. Mindeleff did not draw as stark of a contrast as Bandelier in the separation between the prehistoric and the contemporary, but his pairing of the images together suggests that Amerindians lived in a timelessness world, where material development was slow or nonexistent.

Though both competent anthropologists and surveyors, neither Bandelier nor Mindeleff were trained in excavation techniques. Their work, however, inspired more explorations in the 1890s by anthropologists such as Jesse Walter Fewkes (1850–1930), Frank Hamilton Cushing (1857–1900) and Frederick Webb Hodge (1864–1956). These anthropological surveys included both language and material inquiry and were funded in part by the Bureau of Ethnology. However, this period saw the rise of anthropological work funded by private patrons. Though a scientific discipline at its base, the patron-based funding structures for archaeological and ethnological work necessitated that scientists be part of expeditions that also included journalists, artists, and curious wealthy explorers. Indeed, southwestern anthropology in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was bound to popular writing in both journalistic and in novel forms, which communicated an expedition’s experiences to an eager readership in the East.


Figures 9 & 10a – Above, section and plan drawings for pueblo-style architecture. Below, a drawing of ruins from Bandelier’s work. This and the next page, images from Bandelier’s “Historical Introduction to Studies Among the Sedentary Indians of New Mexico,” Papers of the Archaeological Institute of America — American Series I (1881).
Figures 10b & c – Bandelier’s images depicted sparse landscapes with human figures for scale but also to conjure nostalgic sentiments for readers.
Figures 11c & d – Mindeleff’s study of architecture encompassed both living (above and below) and abandoned settlements (facing page), but without human figures in the depictions it would have been difficult for nineteenth-century Anglo-American minds to separate the two.
Sylvester Baxter (1850–1927), a writer and companion to the ethnologist Frank Cushing, saw the Southwest in terms of temporal change—one in which history was “being made” by Anglo-Americans alongside an ahistorical, cyclical indigenous culture. Baxter harbored sentimentalism for the timeless past to be sure, but, as the historian of anthropology Curtis Hinsley has shown, the colonizing Anglo-Americans folded the aesthetic symbols of Amerindians into their own culture. “Primitive” artifacts and esoteric religious practices were a passion for both Anglo anthropologists and journalists alike and were reminders of the “natural” world they were soon to civilize. Just as American Indian tribes were placed alongside the creatures of the world in many museums in the post-bellum United States, commentators in the Southwest saw the Native Americans as harmoniously embedded within nature, and the stark contrast of the American camp or burgeoning town was understood as a break from the natural environment. Nostalgia for a simpler time, however, did not prevent nature’s elimination; indeed, for Hinsley, nostalgia in the depictions of the Southwest Indians points to a form of ambivalence and powerlessness—a regret that nothing could be done to stop the destruction of these ancient cultures.23

Hinsley notes that the early “explorers” of the Southwest believed they were witnessing an historical period long since passed, or at least a current of history parallel to, but slightly slower than, their own.24 By Hinsley’s account, Baxter “presents the region as awakening, as ‘stirring with life’ after a long slumber—inspiring various images of life giving energy.”25

Charles Lummis, another journalist, who travelled throughout the Southwest with Bandelier, also took up a trope of a culture “awakening” as the American nation began to encroach into the area. Lummis wrote popular books such as *A Tramp Across the Continent* (1892) and *The Land of Poco Tiempo* (1893), the latter of which opens by contrasting a culture in slumber that, though technically within the borders of the US, does not share the same values as those of the American nation at large.

SUN, silence, and adobe—that is New Mexico in three words. If a fourth were to be added, it need be only to clinch the three. It is the Great American Mystery—the National Rip Van Winkle—the United States which is *not* United States.26

---


24 Leo Marx’s words on residues of belief systems can be evoked here. “Although scientific knowledge seemed to drain certain traditional religious myths of their cogency and power, so that it no longer was quite possible to read Genesis as it once had been read, the same knowledge enabled artists to invest the natural world with fresh mythopoeic value.” This sentiment extended to American archaeologists and their journalist companions in this period. Leo Marx, *The Machine in the Garden* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000); Hinsley, “Boston Meets the Southwest: The World of Frank Hamilton Cushing and Sylvester Baxter,” 28.


Indeed, the sleeping culture of the Southwest, like the time-addled character Rip Van Winkle, awakens in a distant future. With Lummis, the “nostalgic” power of the Southwest isolated it from the rest of the United States. It had a lot of catching up to do—but this lack was seen optimistically as an opportunity to craft a distinct culture alongside the rest of the US.

Adopting Hinsley’s formulation of nostalgia in the journalist Baxter, I posit that archaeology during this time used sentimentalism in a similar way, positioning Native American ruins as the link between the present, developing American nation and the simpler past. Because Native Americans were a population widely understood to be in stasis, if not decline, material remains represented an available, straightforward, empirical approach to the past. This teleology, wherein “civilization” eclipses the savage and barbaric stages of human development, can be seen in Morgan, the theory of social evolutionism, and the museum halls previously mentioned.

However, architectural ruins of past settlements were initially difficult to locate in the historical sequence. Remains resembled living, active pueblos and abandoned Spanish missions were found in superficially similar states of decay to mud and rock buildings of the Pueblo Indians. Indeed, ruins from the Spanish colonial period were often depicted in books and survey reports alongside far older architectural remains, as the images in Figure 12 show. Further, unlike the smaller “Mound Builder” works, many abandoned Southwestern Amerindian settlements lay exposed in the desert terrain. Some, like Pueblo Bonito at Chaco Canyon or Cliff Palace at Mesa Verde were still several stories high and visually evocative of large populations and advanced economies. When were these settlements created? And when did they begin to fall into decay?

In the midst of the excitement about the ruins fueled by journalistic publicity, concerns arose regarding their conditions—increased curiosity was hastening their decay. Pothunters and relic-seekers were accused of blindly decimating entire rooms to find pottery or ancient tools, and even some scientifically minded visitors did not see the value of maintaining the condition of the ruins for future generations. Beginning in the 1880s, archaeological objects began to be considered valuable resources both for science and for the nation. As the archaeologist Fewkes remarked in an article in American Anthropologist in 1896, “at the close of the twentieth century many of the most interesting monuments of the prehistoric peoples of our Southwest will be little more than mounds of debris at the bases of the cliff.”

Edgar Lee Hewett, an educator and amateur archaeologist, was concerned about the destruction of ruins. Impassioned by Amerindian pueblo ruins in the area around Las Vegas, New Mexico, where he was the president of the New Mexico Normal School, Hewett’s interest in archaeology

---

transformed into his profession in the first decade of the twentieth century. With the concerned remarks of people like Fewkes for inspiration, Hewett went from small-town college president to a nationally connected preservationist and director of an archaeological school.

**Edgar Lee Hewett: Collector, Educator, and Anthropological Enthusiast**

Hewett shaped his own path as much as he could.\(^{28}\) Education was central to his self-fashioning. By his own account, his childhood in Warren County, Illinois had planted a great love of learning. “Life on a farm in the middle West where I grew up afforded inexhaustible

\(^{28}\) Born November 23, 1865 to Harvey and Tabitha Hewett (née Stice) of Warren County, Illinois, Edgar was raised in a cabin and was the son of farmers; he came of age in a world where Western towns boomed and settlers domesticated the land with rapid infrastructural development, railroad transportation, and an ethos of rugged individuality and self-sufficiency. Edgar’s parents traced roots back to England (on his father’s side) and Germany and Scotland (on his mother’s). Harvey Hewett and Tabitha Stice married in 1851; the former was a farmer and recent arrival from New England; the latter was a seminary school teacher. Lansing B. Bloom, “Edgar Lee Hewett: His Biography and Writings to Date,” in *So Live the Works of Men: Seventieth Anniversary Volume Honoring Edgar Lee Hewett*, ed. Donald B. Brand and Fred E. Harvey (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1939).
opportunities for beginning the exploration of the world,” Hewett wrote in 1923, reflecting on his life.29 “There were not many books in the library at home,” Hewett continued, “but there was a set of Audubon’s *Birds of North America* and Audubon and Bachman’s *Quadrupeds of North America*, all with wonderful colored plates.”30 An illustrated history book and travel monographs also lay on the family bookshelf, where young Hewett would turn for long hours.

In his young adulthood, Hewett moved around the Midwest, earning a teaching certificate and later teaching at Tarkio College in Tarkio, Missouri. After briefly considering the study of law, Hewett accepted a position as school principal in Fairfax, Missouri, where he met Cora Whitford; the two married in 1891.31 After Fairfax, the Hewetts moved to Colorado, first to Florence where Hewett was superintendent of public schools, and later to Greeley for further study in educational practice. Hewett was captivated by the Anglo-American flood into the Southwestern expanse of the United States that had been recently opened up by the Mexican Cession. Following the masses towards the mountains, the Hewetts made their mark in the classic, now clichéd, Turnerian sense of the frontiersmen—moving into territory previously (or supposedly) uninhabited and transforming the landscape into an environment of his own conception.32

Though infrastructure and railroads had been laid before the couple arrived in Colorado, there was a palpable sense of being a part of something new.

In Greeley, Hewett received his bachelor’s degree in 1893 at the State Normal School (today University of Northern Colorado) and advanced to pursue a master’s degree in pedagogy, awarded in 1898. Pedagogy, a field in the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century that upheld the ideals of social progressivism and that drew inspiration from the idea that the world could be approached as a comprehensible body of knowledge, served as a qualification for educational administrators and offered Hewett the ability to pursue more advanced administrative positions. Indeed, his master’s work proved profitable, and soon after obtaining his degree Edgar was offered the position of college president at the newly created New Mexico Normal School (today the New Mexico Highlands University).33

---

29 Hewett to Raymenton, 3 May 1923, Box 13.6, Edgar Lee Hewett Papers, Fray Angélico Chávez History Library, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

30 Hewett to Raymenton, 3 May 1923, Box 13.6, Edgar Lee Hewett Papers.

31 Teaching Certificates and Course Schedule, 13.5, Edgar Lee Hewett Papers; Beatrice Chauvenet, *Hewett and Friends: A Biography of Santa Fe’s Vibrant Era* (Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press, 1983), 26; Bloom, “Edgar Lee Hewett: His Biography and Writings to Date.”


33 Frank Springer, a New Mexico lawyer with strong political connections in the state, had arranged the presidency position for Hewett. Springer had heard Hewett lecture on anthropological and archaeological topics in Greeley. Both men had connections to the deep past, Hewett through his archaeological work and Springer though his interest in crinoid fossils. Raymond Harris Thompson, “Edgar Lee Hewett and the Political Process,” *Journal of the Southwest* 42, No. 2 (Summer, 2000): 271–318, 281.
Hewett’s journey southward along the front range of the Rocky Mountains charted a line of influence for years to come. His move from Colorado to New Mexico, in addition to his new position of power, ignited newfound confidence that enabled Hewett to develop his archaeological interests in conjunction with a school under his control. Though living in Las Vegas, Edgar and Cora would visit Santa Fe, which was a budding hub of regional archaeological and historical interests. In Santa Fe, Hewett developed lectures on the Southwest’s Amerindian cliff dwellings and abandoned pueblos in the surrounding area. While Cora rested to ease her tuberculosis, the pedagogue would explore the remains of Indian settlements, even making cursory excavations as early as 1896. Covered with dirt but protruding noticeably from the ground, Amerindian material remains—broken pots, arrowheads, trash piles—were common throughout the Southwest. A spade was all one needed to uncover a bulging bit of history.

Concurrent with his installment as president of the Normal School, the group of history-minded individuals orbiting around Hewett evolved into the Santa Fe Archaeological Society, the first archaeological interest group in the state. Hewett must have impressed the Santa Feans, and he expressed confidence in his archaeological skill set, professing knowledge of paleontology and anatomy. “Prof. E. A. Hewitt [sic], of the New Mexico Normal university at Las Vegas left this morning for Santa Clara to visit the cliff dwellings,” reported the local paper, The New Mexican, in early November of 1899. “Last evening Mr. Hewitt examined part of the skeleton

---

34 Like many afflicted with TB, Cora sought the dry heat of New Mexico’s high desert, an area of the southern Rocky Mountains with considerably less rainfall than the rest of that massive continental range. The Hewetts spent portions of their summers in Santa Fe, New Mexico, as did many consumptives. Thompson, “Edgar Lee Hewett and the Political Process,” 279; Chauvenet, Hewett and Friends, 29, 37–38.

of the prehistoric animal found at Tesuque. In his opinion it is what remains of a mastodon. He will mount the petrified bones upon his return here.” Boyhood interest in fossils perhaps upheld his conviction that he could properly identify and mount a mastodon and stoked a desire to start a collection of objects of antiquity. Beginning with fossils chiseled from rocky formations surrounding his childhood farm, the budding scientist had moved on to birds and mammals; later, Hewett recalled, he added shells to his diverse collection. “It all gave way, eventually, to the gathering of Ethnological collections and these have steadily expanded from my first pocketfuls of arrow heads to what now constitute the Museums of San Diego and Santa Fe.”

A Burgeoning Archaeological Interest

Though confident, endlessly curious, and a tireless worker, Hewett’s formal archaeological education consisted of a single anthropology course and a thorough reading of the works of Bandelier and Morgan. As noted above, the influence of Lewis Henry Morgan on American anthropology was considerable. For many, Morgan was the first anthropologist to break from the intellectual framework of the nineteenth-century antiquarian and open up the discipline, challenging antiquarians to think scientifically about ideas of continuity, migration and relation between the past and present races of men.

Morgan’s work was concerned with kinship relations. In *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family* (1871), Morgan showed that anthropologists could document consanguinity, or shared ancestral lineages, between East Asian tribes and American Indians. This idea not only supported the theory of evolution but further linked human groups together, which in turn presumed that all human beings shared common descendants and thus were biologically and mentally similar. Morgan’s major work, *Ancient Society* (1877), investigated the three societal levels of savagery, barbarism, and civilization and their respective treatment of ideas of government, family, and property relationships. Progress through each of the stages was tied to the changes in a given group’s tools and practices through time. Morgan concluded that difference between humans was environmental and largely a condition of chance—one that had exacerbated itself through time. Somewhat radically, Morgan did not assume that each stage had achieved the most egalitarian or appropriate understanding of the categories he investigated: personal property, a quality of the highest level of development, was seen to create anti-
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36 *The New Mexican* [Newspaper], 11 November 1899.
37 Hewett to Raymenton, 3 May 1923, Box 13.6, Edgar Lee Hewett Papers.
democratic sentiments in a population.\(^{39}\)

Late in his life Morgan published an essay on Amerindian architecture in the inaugural issue of the AIA’s bulletin, wherein he supported the idea that the Native Americans in all regions of the continent could be linked through architectural style. New Mexico’s contemporaneous pueblos and ruined settlements were, in his eyes, a key to connecting pre-Columbian settlements with those after the European incursion. To support the material connections, he advocated for ethnological research to supplement archaeological data. For Morgan, the material link established by architecture “must be studied ethnologically; i.e., from the institutions, usages, and mode of life of existing Indian tribes.”\(^{40}\) In other words, contemporary Amerindian architecture was linked to the historical architecture of the Southwest; therefore, studying living Indian tribes could reveal something of the past inhabitants of the region. Morgan advocated that the AIA, seen to be the only organizational institution adequate to carry out both archaeology and ethnology, work to extract this history from the material remains.

Morgan’s social evolutionism, however, was a waning theory as the nineteenth century drew to a close. The work of Morgan’s protégé Bandelier does not resonate with the same language of civilizational stages. In his early work, Bandelier used architecture to investigate the past tribes of the Southwest and their present relationship to one another. However, instead of reading progress in the ruins, Bandelier conceptualized Native Americans as moving into and out of different modes of sustenance. “The Southwest presents cases well authenticated of wild tribes becoming villagers, and of villagers turning to a wandering life.” For Bandelier, these alternating ways of life were not part of a civilizational hierarchy in the pre-Columbian period. Nonetheless, he did not view the prior Amerindians as part of a trajectory of material advancement, as can be seen in his summary of his vision of such a time:

> The picture which can be dimly traced of this past is a very modest and unpretending one. No great cataclysms of nature, no waves of destruction on a large scale, either natural or human, appear to have interrupted the slow and tedious development of the people before the Spaniards came. One portion rose while another fell; sedentary tribes disappeared or moved off, and wild tribes roamed over the ruins of their former abodes.\(^{41}\)
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39 The admission of chance-derived difference and its exploitative consequence was particularly appealing to Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, and Morgan is cited in their works imagining social revolution.

40 Lewis Henry Morgan “A Study of the Houses of the American Aborigines; with suggestions for the exploration of the ruins in New Mexico, Arizona, the Valley of the San Juan, and in Yucatan and Central America, under the Auspices of the Archaeological Institute” in The First Annual Report of the Executive Committee [of the AIA], with Accompanying Papers (Boston: John Wilson and Son, 1880), 30.

Bandelier’s work on the Southwestern Indian tribes is notable because of his extensive use of Spanish records from the seventeenth century. His ethnological dispatches from the field were colored by a vast understanding of the historical context from which late-nineteenth-century Southwestern Indians had come. Bandelier also worked to align known archaeological complexes and extant pueblos with those mentioned by Coronado and subsequent Spaniards. He combined Spanish history and Native American traditions and stories to reconstruct an image of the past, a move that distinguished him from the more categorical Morgan and the empirically focused anthropologists of his day. In addition, he indicated the necessity of protection of ruins and artifacts from ongoing destruction.

Bandelier recognized the limits of history. “I hold it to be utterly useless, and even improper, on my part to speculate any further on these “pre-traditional” people. Perhaps I have already said too much. Excavations alone can throw further light on the subject,” wrote Bandelier in his “Report on the Ruins of Pecos,” composed during his AIA fellowship in 1881. In this way, Bandelier walked a line between empiricist data-mining and ethnological interpretation—a style that gave his work a tentative, though confident, mood in respect to his findings.

During his time in the Southwest, Bandelier was sometimes accompanied by the journalist and author Lummis and the two influenced each other, as seen in Bandelier’s The Delight Makers (1890), a piece of historical fiction intended for a non-scientific audience. Hewett also read Bandelier’s Delight Makers, so Hewett’s conceptualization of archaeology—as a science, as a practice—was largely shaped by Bandelier’s reliance on both science and sentiment. At this point in his career, Hewett appears theoretically indebted to Morgan’s social evolutionism, but Hewett’s vision of archaeology, situated as it was in the “slumbering” milieu of the Southwest, drew from the more poetically evocative (but scientifically grounded) work of Bandelier and the excited, optimistic “nostalgia” of Lummis. Bandelier and Lummis had both gotten their hands dirty (so to speak) and their writing conveyed that lived experience was important for anthropology, both scientific and popular. By 1902, Hewett began weaving archaeological and, by extension, anthropological material into his educational philosophy. Writing a bibliography of Hewett’s work in 1944, Leslie V. Murphey described Hewett’s early published work as centering on the notion that “the sciences of man afford the basic material for education, and that studies in anthropology are of value to the extent that they contribute to general education.”

43 See Adolph Bandelier, “Report on the Ruins of Pecos” (1881), np. Bandelier distinguished between “pre-traditional,” “traditional and documentary” and “documentary” periods in regards to the deep past of North and South America.
45 Leslie V. Murphey, Biography of Edgar L. Hewett, 1893-1944 (Santa Fe: Privately Printed, 1944), in The Collection of the Laboratory of Anthropology Library, Santa Fe, New Mexico.
pedagogy was not to remain Hewett’s primary professional position, these early years situated his understanding of the world as an open and accessible expanse of knowledge.

**Hewett’s Educational Philosophy**

Fundamental to pedagogy, in Hewett’s mind, was a unifying subject that he called “culture history,” a periodizing explanation of the past that relied on stages of material and cultural development to constitute different epochs much like Morgan’s social evolution of man. To Hewett’s mind, a theory of cultural evolution should be taught alongside all disciplines in the education of a child through young adulthood. However, in his training and practice as a pedagogue in last years of the nineteenth century, Hewett found a lack of accuracy in anthropological topics.

To primitive culture we must go for a vast amount of the material for instruction used in elementary education. Teachers are drawing continually on culture history for this material, but an examination of the matter selected, as embodied in many elementary books used in the public schools, will convince anthropologists that it is not their best nor most authentic material which is finding its way into the public schools.

Though he wished that primary school textbooks reflected accurate anthropological thinking, Hewett found the lack of “culture history” at the college level unacceptable. To remedy this lack, Hewett decided that part of education at the New Mexico Normal School was to be experiential, wherein students would venture out into the high desert plateaus surrounding Las Vegas and explore the abandoned settlements that dotted that landscape, and thereby be given a first-hand look at an “epoch” of the past.

As Hewett’s friend Arthur Stanley Riggs said many years later regarding Hewett’s influence in the national archaeological scene, “Being an educator first of all, he naturally took a liberal view of the field, insisting upon the practical advantages inherent in an institution which, some of the rest maintained, should be merely a technical laboratory for the few.” Such a view of Hewett as a man dedicated to practical, broad reaching and teachable science can be seen in his tenure as President of the Normal School. The synthesis of Morgan’s, Bandelier’s and Lummis’ ideas gave Hewett the ability to convey the story of early man, told to his students based on accessibility of materials (both books and sites) and crafted in an historical manner.

---


Boas, Time and Culturalism

While Hewett and his iconic predecessors wove intricate chronologies from sometimes scant data and took freedoms in their interpretive approaches, another methodology in anthropology was emerging from a purely empirical standpoint. Instead of grounding work within a theoretical paradigm of sequences of material or cultural development, the “culturalist” advocated that archaeological, material science should interpret remains and rigorously reconstruct the paths of human evolution and migration. Thereafter, history would be free to fill in the details. Of crucial difference from the accessible work of anthropologists like Bandelier was the audience of this rigorously scientific archaeology. Culturalists first and foremost geared their work toward other scientists. Secondarily, they expected their readers to be part of a curious, knowledgeable public (with its patrons).

Franz Boas (1858–1942), a German anthropologist who worked under Frederic Ward Putnam for much of his early career, published articles as early as 1899 sketching out the “culturalist” model for the development of anthropology. Today largely considered an anthropological polymath—mastering physical anthropology, ethnology, multiple indigenous languages and archaeological practices—Boas was at the beginning of his career in 1900. Boas wrote “Some Problems in North American Archaeology” for the AIA’s American Journal of Archaeology in 1902. The use of writing systems, he obligatorily noted, was not present in the Indian tribes of North America, so their deep past could only be apprehended by archaeological examination of their material remains. He assumed that the pre-Columbian Native Americans were similar to contemporary Amerindians, so ethnological research would help to explain “prehistoric finds.” Boas said that archaeology, linguistics and ethnology, when paired with a geographical understanding of Amerindian territory, could be used to compile vast amounts of data on these people and the migrations and socioeconomic influences of their ancestors. Ultimately, Boas’ deductive practice proposed an historical method for these record-less peoples without fitting them into theorized “stages” of development. Paired with ethnology and linguistic methods, archaeology’s study of material remains and visual symbols would “be a most powerful help in unraveling the history of our continent.”

In 1904, Boas published a “History of Anthropology.” In this work, as Joan Mark has shown, Boas carved his own niche into American anthropology, positing his work as the standard in the American human sciences. Tracing his own methodological influences to Europe, Boas largely

---

passed over American contributors like Fewkes, Hodge, and Cushing. In the essay, Boas understood anthropology to have two distinct approaches, the historical and the general, wherein the historical approach is typically deductive and seeks to understand human development in chronological sequences and the general approach is inductive and discards singular events in favor of trends that inform general laws of humanity. After the Renaissance, rationalist theories positing man as corrupted by civilization proliferated in ways that mixed elements of both approaches. Aside from viewing the trappings of civilization as a negative influence on mankind, classification practices in anthropology developed, following from zoological taxonomy. During the nineteenth century, “the classificatory aspect was combined with the historical one and the leading discussion related to the discovery of mental differences between the zoological varieties or races of men.” This racial evolutionism (not the materialist social evolution of Morgan) was seen in the fraught discourses such as the polygenesis/monogenesis debates in America in the mid nineteenth century. The polygenesis/monogenesis debate centered on the question of a single or of multiple human origins and was informed by all branches of inquiry, mixing legitimate and illegitimate methodologies to justify what was in truth a veiled discussion about the moral validity of slavery; both camps considered disparate non-European peoples such as African slaves, Amerindians and Pacific Islanders evidence for each view, and similarly both understood geography to play a determining role in the development of mankind (as a series of distinct species, as in the polygenist view, or as a shapeable creature of a single origin—namely the biblical Adam and Eve—in the monogenist stance).

Darwin’s 1859 theory of natural selection, which proved the theory of evolution, had a momentous impact on anthropology, and provided a new ground on which all anthropological research was founded. Natural selection among animals was conflated with humanity, giving new justification for the value-laden “stages” of social evolution, as Boas describes:

---

51 Mark, *Four Anthropologists*, 173. Mark’s *Four Anthropologists* is largely a response to the perception of Boas as the dominant patriarch of American archaeology. She contends that “The History of Anthropology” essay leaves out the important, discipline-defining work of Frederic Ward Putnam, Frank Hamilton Cushing, Alice Cunningham Fletcher, and William Henry Holmes (the four anthropologists of Mark’s title).

52 Boas lists as examples Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s (1712–1778) view of education as a mean of advancement from a common, shared state and Johann Gottfried von Herder’s (1744–1803) understanding of the development of the culture of mankind as a whole as examples. The early ethnographies of Captain James Cook’s (1729–1779) voyages offer evidence, for Boas, in support of these Enlightenment notions.

From the very beginning there has been a strong tendency to combine with the historical aspect a subjective valuation of the various phases of development, the present serving as a standard of comparison. The oft-observed change from simple forms to more complex forms, from uniformity to diversity, was interpreted as a change from the less valuable to the more valuable and thus the historical view assumed in many cases an ill-concealed teleological tinge.\textsuperscript{54}

In addition to critiquing the idea of civilizational level, Boas also recognized a widespread belief “it is but natural that in the study of the history of culture our own civilization should become the standard.” Nonetheless, it was important for Boas to note that the comparative methods of anthropology should be approached with unbiased prudence, as nineteenth-century anthropology’s theoretical field had shown it was easy to over-determine evolutionary and emigrational history through over-reliance on one method. Morgan’s social evolutionism, unrelated to theories of biological difference but superficially indicative of such ideas because it relied on sequence, was one example of a theory that meant multiple things to different people.

The anthropology of the twentieth century, for Boas, would emphasize separation of fields but join them in a common dialogue. “Culturalism proclaimed “history” a domain irreducible to natural history. It relativized human, cultural time and left universal time to biological evolution,” writes Johannes Fabian, and “the eighteenth-century élan in the search for a theory of universal human progress was all but abandoned.”\textsuperscript{55} Boas’ belief in contextual understanding of culture could be informed by scientific histories of a given people, but speculative histories that sought linkages between the deep past and other moments in time were generally baseless. As for archaeology, Boas believed that “prehistoric,” non-historical time could be documented—but that documentation, which included sequential material history or migration tracings, could not be considered “history” alone, only evidence of a people. All scientific approaches of anthropology were needed to paint an image of the past.

“Later than the older sciences, [anthropology] has outgrown the systematizing period and is just now entering upon the empirical revision of its theories,” wrote Boas.\textsuperscript{56} By noting such a revision, he advocated for the preservation of anthropological resources, from ruins to potsherds to arrowheads. With culturalism, assuming adequate protection of source material, Boas signaled the birth of a truly independent anthropology—separated from disciplines like history and political economy—because it had developed a “new historical point of view,” with its own perspective that was separated from historical time and utterly aware of the contemporaneous position of the observation.

\textsuperscript{54} Boas, “The History of Anthropology,” 515.


\textsuperscript{56} Boas, “The History of Anthropology,” 522.
Boas’ lasting impression on anthropology is due in no small part to his theoretical rigor. He ably transformed the tactics of “armchair theorists” and racially charged anthropological conceptions into a disciplinary toolbox that underscored context in a cultural milieu, consideration of the “mind of primitive man,” and thorough and careful documentation. While Hewett had only begun to work on anthropological problems in 1900, Boas’ work was already sophisticated: he laid out problems as he saw them, reflectively analyzed his discipline’s methodology, and proposed a rigorous research program. Hewett in time came to appreciate Boas’ contextualist stance, eschewing his universal developmental scheme. Hewett met Boas in the early 1900s, but their relationship from the start was tense, and to my knowledge Hewett never admitted the influence of Boas on his thought. Though Boas and Hewett would have a well-publicized spat in 1912 stemming from hostility in 1907 over the AIA’s field school in the United States, which Hewett went on to direct, during this decade the two maintained cordial relations.

Hewett’s Dissertation and American Field Work

In later years, Boas found Hewett’s archaeological fieldwork unprofessional and thought his interest in the discipline superficial. Hewett was sensitive to Boas’ perception even in 1900, and the German scientist was not alone in his view. Hewett understood that his pedagogy master’s degree did him no favors when dealing with professors like Putnam or Boas. To allow him more flexibility in dealings with the Eastern anthropologists and archaeologists, he would need another advanced degree.

In 1904, the prospects of continuing at the New Mexico Normal School had dried up and Hewett looked for other options. He considered other college presidencies, but also applied to do doctoral work at several universities. Ultimately, he enrolled at the University of Geneva, working with Professors Edouard Naville, an Egyptologist, and Louis Wuarin, a sociologist, on his dissertation. Both professors had no experience in American anthropology, and their influence on Hewett’s dissertation is questionable. The University of Geneva certainly lacked the rigor of the German system of education, which was heavily focused on grounding general scholars before specialization; it appears that the University of Geneva simply allowed Hewett to
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57 See Franz Boas to Francis Kelsey, 16 December 1910, SAR Archives, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

58 Chauvenet, Hewett and Friends, 50; Fowler, “Harvard vs. Hewett,” 169. These previous works on Hewett suggest that, because he came from an educational background of little renown, he needed further credibility if he wanted to pursue anthropological science and be taken seriously by pedigreed east coast institutions. This is a logical assumption in light of the classical obsession of the most powerful archaeological interest group, the AIA, a bias that lasted until 1903.

do as he pleased.\textsuperscript{60}

With this flexibility, Hewett returned to the US in the summer of 1904 to begin a slew of archaeological projects, including work for his dissertation, which was completed in 1908. The hundred-page text, \textit{Les Communautés Anciennes dans le Désert Américain} (Ancient Communities in the American Desert), was accompanied by 17 pages of photographs and around 20 maps and plans of ruins in the Southwest, some of which are included in Figure 14b. The dissertation content was based on some 1904 work that Hewett did for the US Government concerning ruins in the Southwest titled “Memorandum Concerning the Historic and Prehistoric Ruins of Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, and Utah, and their Preservation.”\textsuperscript{61} The memorandum’s purpose was to inform preservation legislation. “Every cliff dwelling, every prehistoric tower, communal house, shrine and burial mound is an object which can contribute something to the advancement of knowledge, and hence is worthy of preservation,” wrote Hewett.\textsuperscript{62} Preservation undergirded his dissertation in a significant sense as Hewett considered it a prerequisite to all archaeological work; his inclusion of images and speculative reconstructions of impressive, monumental architecture supported this belief.

Following Bandelier’s lead, Hewett believed that in the prehistoric period, humans developed in conversation with their surroundings. The environments inhabited by human groups affected their material and cosmological development over time. Groups split off from one another, but the consistency of racial identity linked all of these people to a common material-cultural complex. This “natural” development shifted course once an outside source—foreigners of a distinctly different race—entered the picture.

\textsuperscript{60} According to Hewett’s biographer Chauvenet, “the university did not record classroom attendance or grade a candidate’s progress. Achievement was measured in academic conference.” Hewett was thus able to travel in Europe to see the ruins of the Classical world before returning to the United States in 1904. It seems he never went back to Geneva, casting a bit of doubt on the viability of the dissertation, since it was ostensibly granted without Hewett ever giving an oral defense of the work.

\textsuperscript{61} The memorandum is found in several places, but was originally composed for W. A. Richards, the Commissioner of the General Land Office. It was published in a circular by the GLO and was also included in a congressional report in 1905, and repeated in another report that preceded the passage of the American Antiquities Act of 1906. For the GLO circular, see Department of the Interior, General Land Office, \textit{Circular Relating to Historic and Prehistoric Ruins of the Southwest and their Preservation} (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1904). For the congressional documents, see \textit{Prehistoric Ruins on Public Lands}, Report 3704 [to accompany S. 5603], 58\textsuperscript{th} Cong., 3\textsuperscript{d} Session (19 January 1905); \textit{Preservation of American Antiquities}, Report 2224 [to accompany HR 11016], 59\textsuperscript{th} Cong., 1\textsuperscript{st} Session (12 March 1906).

With the arrival of the Spaniards began a period of consciousness of self. The simple process of cultural development gave way then to a complex process of the ethnic mind aroused for the first time by the external stimuli of the most violent sort, and thus suddenly conscious of its own possibilities and limitations. The type of mind developed under such conditions is totally different from that formed solely under the influence of the natural environment.

Hewett saw human development as materially progressive as humans responded in different ways to the external stimuli of their environments—some faster than others, due to the scattering of human groups across a plethora of geographical areas. “The element of time in this process has never been constant. The gap between the most advanced and the most primitive ethnic groups may have been bridged under favorable conditions by the action of two generations, but, without this stimulus, it might perhaps have taken centuries.” The Americas, the most recently diversified continent, therefore posed the best “laboratory” for studying ethnic interaction.

By 1908, the sequences of material and cultural history had been dropped, but Hewett still relied (as did nearly every anthropologist) on material complexity to differentiate between groups, as seen in words such as “advanced” and “primitive.” Maintaining this distinction, for Hewett, was crucial to establishing the different character of the “American desert,” but it in no way indicated Native American inferiority in the present.


64 Hewett, Ancient Communities in the American Desert, 6.
Hewett used photographs to portray present day sites, but also included speculative reconstructions, as seen here.
It is tempting to become lost in conjecture and wonder whether the halt in the development of the desert cultures was inevitable or not. The environment tended to limit progress. However this was not an insurmountable barrier for today we are witnessing a reoccupation of these regions. The type of men that they produced are by no means inferior. It is hard to determine what cause this lack of success should be attributed.\textsuperscript{65}

To help Hewett with this determination, he turned to his dissertation advisor Naville, quoting from the latter’s Egyptological work: “Psychological and sociological limitations were imposed on them by circumstances and the impetus required to break through these natural barriers never occurred.”\textsuperscript{66} This turn at the closure of his work was designed to allow Hewett the authority to conclude that the “ancient peoples of the American desert” were physiologically able to overcome their environmental constriction, but they lacked a catalyst to do so.

To support the claim of Amerindians were not inferior to Anglo-Americans, Hewett included a page of photographs of contemporary Native Americans to indicate their ability to occupy both the past and the present, reproduced in Figure 14c. These images showed various Southwestern “types” in both traditional and American Western attire; the shots were arranged around a central figure, an stoic old man who peers out past the left shoulder of the reader, seemingly in deep thought. Flanking this figure are two additional old men, whose images have been oddly tilted, as if in reverence to the central figure. All of these elders are photographed as busts, suggesting their commemoration rather than present-day existence. Above, three younger Amerindians stand in modern dress, representing the present, capable and adaptable state of their respective tribes.

Hewett’s Native American “types” were influenced by a similar series, “Southwestern Types,” by Charles Lummis in his journal \textit{Land of Sunshine}, wherein he literally typologized Amerindians, as seen in Figure 14d. The three elderly men give an indication of deep age to the indigenous people, while the younger man and woman unsmilingly recognize an oncoming age. Lummis’ “types” recognized the presence of Native Americans in contemporary society—not to mention their diverse cultural roles within their own societies—and, in documenting them, the author hoped to preserve their cultural distinction. Native Americans, for Lummis, were an important component of the Southwest and unique history and place in contemporary America.\textsuperscript{67}

Hewett’s work, like Lummis, did not envision Native Americans as outside of time or incapable of progress, though both men relied on an archetype of an old Native American man as

\textsuperscript{65} Hewett, \textit{Ancient Communities in the American Desert}, 103.
\textsuperscript{66} Hewett, \textit{Ancient Communities in the American Desert}, 104.
Figure 14c – Hewett also included pictures of contemporaneous Native Americans, left, depictions that were similar to Lummis’ “types,” seen below.

Figure 14d – Types of Amerindiens from Lummis’ magazine *Land of Sunshine*, right and below.
memory-keeper and sage. Hewett had respect for Amerindian culture and its great age, but also understood that the unique characteristics of these peoples’ culture was in danger of extinction, and had been for some time. In line with Boas’ contextualist approach, Hewett’s answer to the question of the Southwestern Amerindian’s “arrested development” was environmental and situational, and therefore the material remains of the Anasazi were only indicators of their cultural practices, not of their “progress” as a civilization. Morgan and social evolutionist thinking had fallen from Hewett’s toolkit by 1908. He retained a bits of the romantic sentiments of Lummis and the focus on the environmental susceptibility of culture in Bandelier’s work. Hewett’s concept of time was anthropological, with Boas, though not explicitly formulated as such. His dissertation advisor Naville, it seems, was called on to substitute for Boas’ position.

Superficially, it is easy to understand Hewett’s dissertation as born out of two disparate archaeological and anthropological milieux, one American and one European. However, as mentioned, his time in Geneva was limited and the influence of his advisors—aside from the nod to Naville at the end of his dissertation—seems minimal. Instead, the bibliography of the dissertation is aligned with the reigning anthropological and archaeological influences in the Southwest at the time; notably absent from the cited sources was the rising star Boas. Yet, with the presence of popular authors such as Lummis and Chapin alongside the contemporaneous Southwestern archaeologists, Hewett’s dissertation was ultimately positioned to influence the continued protection of the “ancient communities in the American desert” and their monumental architectural remains.\footnote{Hewett, Ancient Communities in the American Desert, bibliography.}

**Conclusion**

Boas’ lack of archaeological engagement in the Southwest may be the simple answer to the absence of citation in Hewett’s work. Citation conventions of the time, too, may be a reason for the omission. But Hewett did try to follow Boasian guidelines for empirical research, albeit with Bandelier as his model. He supplemented his archaeological understanding with a sort of nostalgic ethnography. Hewett’s juxtaposition of past and present maps onto Boas’ notion of anthropological time; he forwent deterministic sequences in favor of straightforward comparison within a given ecological and social milieu.

With an empirical approach and a deductive methodology for reconstructing the deep past, ruins and artifacts became archaeological resources. But resources for what? Herein lies the fundamental difference between Boas and Hewett: for the German anthropologist, ruins and artifacts were scientific resources; for the Western educator, they were cultural resources. While Boas desired bottom-up, reconstructive histories, Hewett’s approach to the past was more
complex, mixing notions of environment, anthropological type, and material culture to construct a history. Hewett advocated for science and the advancement of knowledge, but this knowledge of the distant past geared toward wide dissemination in the interest of preservation, not oriented toward science exclusively. Boas likely would not have disagreed with this intention, but he was wary of the potential extrapolations that might result. His worries were not baseless, as we will see.

In 1904, Hewett returned from Geneva to Washington just as federal legislation protecting antiquities had been tabled. With his interests in preserving archaeological resources, Hewett immediately found a leadership position in the ongoing struggle. The next chapter explores the renewed vision that he brought to this battle. As this chapter has shown, many questions surrounded archaeology in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, not least among them the question of Amerindians and history. Early on, this question was approached through theorizations of time in anthropological fields, instead of through fieldwork, in part because the discipline of archaeology did not have the proper financial or institutional setting. Beyond that, as I have shown, the theoretical motifs of this time were colored by romantic, popular understandings of the deep past that largely lacked scientific basis. These residual traces of racist science and social evolutionism had not yet been cast off, and interpretive modes—even in sophisticated, well-educated archaeological circles—still relied on sequences and technocultural complexes as crutches for armchair theory.

Morgan’s evolutionism positioned Native Americans on a table of savage, barbaric, and civilized states; his teleology was not value-laden from his perspective, but its implication was, especially as a notion of new social progress percolated into American society at large. Similarly, Bandelier had great respect for Native Americans, but his construction of them as a people bound to the environment further entrenched a static, timeless conception of these people. Lummis and Baxter’s work, with similar intentions, nonetheless distinguished modern American time from a nostalgic, time-without-a-time when referring to Amerindians.

Boas’ culturalist theory conceptualized time in a contextualist sense, noting that anthropological time was different from history or the present, and good research required this recognition of position with respect to the anthropologist. Romance and nostalgia had no place in Boas’ scheme; to work anthropology into history required care in order to ensure accurate, scientific chronology. To study it with rigor, anthropological resources needed to be preserved.

Hewett understood the need to educate Americans on the “culture history” of their nation, and sought to affect change through teaching. His own credentials needed expanding, and he actively pursued a new path in archaeology. As he worked on his dissertation, Hewett came to recognize
the environment and situating constraints in societal development. With this, he began a journey toward an imagined, graspable education for all. His journey, however, was to begin with preservation, as he was keenly aware of the necessity to preserve the data that would compose “culture history.”
Chapter 2

Preservationism in Archaeology and the American Antiquities Act of 1906

The kind of government we have does not intend that any American institution shall be allowed to prosecute research in American archaeology. Of course the government can’t help itself in the East, because there it does not own any land, but in the East there is no more American archaeology left, bigger than the tip of your finger.

Out West, where almost every square mile in a million and a half square miles is underlaid with archaeology, the government does own the vast majority of the superficies, and nobody “dast” dig.

Charles Lummis, from a letter to AIA President Thomas Day Seymour 14 August 1905

Almost fifty years after the initial wave of immigration following the Mexican Cession, Edgar Lee Hewett came to the state of Colorado with his fiancée Cora in 1891. Edgar and Cora enjoyed exploring the backcountry of their new home, riding horses and outfitting a covered wagon for extensive trips. Examinations of pueblos and ruined settlements stoked Edgar’s interest in archaeology, and after the couple moved to Las Vegas for Edgar’s new position at the New Mexico Normal School archaeology became a dominant feature of their lives. Excavation, however, is a tedious business, requiring a large labor force in order to be productive and a management team to ensure scientific accountability. Hewett and his students would excavate in the field, but, without financial support for labor, this tiresome task could not reach far beyond experiential learning for college students. Without experience to connect him to the sorts of excavations he desired, Hewett engaged with archaeology from another angle: preservation.

During trips to the abandoned pueblos and cliff dwellings Hewett had noticed that human presence was creating artificial stress on the ruins’ already tenuous conditions. On one particular trip to Chaco Canyon, the immense ruin complex [Figure 2], Hewett encountered a group that
called itself the Hyde Expedition. Though scientists and trained archaeologists were among
this excavating party, Hewett perceived their presence in the canyon as destructive to both the
architectural remains and the material artifacts embedded in the strata, and set about stopping
what he perceived as a clumsy robbery.1 This fateful encounter marks the visible emergence of
a preservationist attitude in Hewett, and, as this chapter shows, his staunch dedication to the
preservation of American antiquities helped propel preservation of these objects into law.

After meeting the Hyde Expedition in Chaco Canyon, Hewett became attuned to the potential
destruction of archaeologically significant sites, even by scientifically minded crews. Though
the larger Chaco Canyon was beyond the reach of his powerful connections in New Mexico,
Hewett attempted to withdraw a large piece of archaeologically rich public land near Santa Fe
from sale to homesteaders. This land included the Pajarito Plateau [Figure 15], which was home
to significant cave dwellings and pueblo ruins, and which Hewett wanted to make a national park
with the help of his contacts at the Santa Fe Archaeological Society.

In 1900, Hewett succeeded in convincing the General Land Office (GLO) to withdraw 153,000
acres of government land from sale.2 Having saved Pajarito from homesteader development,
Hewett subsequently sent a proposal to transform the area into a national park to Major John
Fletcher Lacey (1841–1913), an Iowa congressman and the chairman of the Committee on the
Public Lands of the House of Representatives, which held the power to recommend relevant
legislation. Unfortunately for Hewett, the plan for the Pajarito National Park failed to gain
traction when introduced in 1901; nevertheless, the land withdrawn by the GLO remained in
place until 1938.3 The withdrawal tactic seen at Pajarito would be used with some success as an
alternative strategy to federal preservation, and Lacey and Hewett had sparked a professional
relationship that was fruitful in the years to come.4

Hewett’s efforts to partition land from public sale did not sit well with the territorial governor of

1 James Snead, Ruins and Rivals: The Making of Southwest Archaeology (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2001),
52–56.
2 Cliff Dwellers’ National Park, Report [To accompany H.R. 13071], 56th Cong. (23 January 1901). Around 1900,
public land was intended for homesteaders and could be purchased from the US Government for a reasonable price
after a given homesteader had developed the land to certain prescribed conditions; the “withdrawal tactic” affected
the status of saleable public land, which was managed by the General Land Office, part of the Department of Interior
of the US Government, removing it from sale or further development.
3 Raymond Harris Thompson, “Edgar Lee Hewett and the Political Process,” Journal of the Southwest 42, no. 2
(Summer 2000), 281–282.
4 Chaco Canyon, where Hewett encountered the Hyde Expedition, was recommended for withdrawal by GLO Special
Agent Holsinger in 1901; the land was withdrawn by Secretary of Interior Hitchcock on April 5th, 1904. A sizeable
portion of Mesa Verde, in southern Colorado, was withdrawn sometime before 1904. See Ronald F. Lee, Antiquities
Cliff Dwellers area, withdrawals had been made in the Jemez Cliff Dwellers region and at El Morro, or Inscription
Rock; in Arizona at Petrified Forest and Montezuma Castle; and in Colorado at Mesa Verde. Custodians had also
been appointed for Casa Grande, Walnut Canyon, and Canyon del Muerto, all in Arizona, but there were no funds
for others.”
New Mexico, who prevented his contract from being renewed at the Normal School in 1903.\(^5\) Though out of a job, his archaeological efforts and political connections in the region made during his tenure as President of the Normal School helped to connect Hewett to the major archaeological networks on the east coast. Hewett had met Congressman Lacey during a visit to Washington, DC, in 1900, where the college president had also spoken with Alice Cunningham Fletcher, an expert on Plains Indians, and William Henry Holmes, Director of the Bureau of American Ethnology (BAE). All three would prove to be especially important allies for Hewett’s continuing dedication to the preservation of American archaeological resources.

As shown in chapter one, Hewett’s understanding of archaeology and the necessity to preserve archaeological resources was shaped by both scientific and popular conceptualizations of the deep past. In 1904, he went to study at the University of Geneva, and after setting up his program of study, he and his wife toured the great classical antiquities of Europe before returning to the US in the summer of 1904. Cora Hewett had struggled through Europe in a wheelchair because her health had weakened considerably after a life of tuberculosis. She died soon after the couple returned to the United States, and Hewett, grief stricken, threw himself into working full-time on archaeological projects from a residence in Washington, DC. Some promising archaeological preservation bills had recently faltered in Congress, and a major project of Hewett’s between 1904 and 1906 was to rewrite antiquities legislation so that it was amenable to all interested parties—archaeologists, representatives and the US Government alike.

The passage of the 1906 Antiquities Act, a piece of legislation designed to protect important American archaeological remains from destruction, opened up a path for the professionalization

---

of the nascent discipline of American archaeology. The law not only provided US archaeological institutions with exclusive permits to conduct research, but also, I argue, sanctioned the classification of an object or place as “prehistoric” or “historic,” a designation of temporality and progress. In so doing, the framer of the Antiquities Act, Edgar Lee Hewett, fenced in a specific space within which the history of America’s deep past could be interpreted.

The Act directly and indirectly established the operating boundaries of the discipline of archaeology and American “prehistory.” This chapter details the 1906 Antiquities Act and the prior legislation from which it evolved. Of specific interest is the operation of language in the Act and its legislative predecessors because, I argue, words such as “monument,” “ruins” and “antiquities” became enshrined as part of the official language of archaeological objects. These words were modified with adjectives such as “ancient,” “prehistoric,” “primitive” and “aboriginal,” which are temporal and cultural determinations. Though these words had been used by historical and anthropological disciplines before, by looking at the way these words circulated through legislative iterations I argue that the law fixed certain temporal and material-cultural designations about Amerindians in the American scientific and popular consciousness. The consequence was that archaeology viewed the protagonists of America’s past (both deep and recent) as corralled into given sets of material complexes (i.e., items or architectures that specifically described a people) and rigid-but-rudimentary temporal locations (i.e., some people were “prehistoric” while others were “historic”).

The Antiquities Act’s language also affected the idea of archaeological preservation. Legally, objects of significant age were to be preserved in the Act, but no indication was given as to how such protection would occur. Beyond prosecution of those seeking to destroy the objects, the processes of preservation were open questions in this period, in part because of the generalizing language of the Act. Were descriptive words such as “prehistoric” or “ancient” the crux that made an object worthy of preservation to archaeology and an American public fascinated with the past? What constituted an “archaeological specimen,” and what was one to do with such an object?

While formal preservationist theory was lacking, the intuition of archaeologists and antiquarians—men like Hewett—served to direct the procedures of preservation. Following Hewett’s life and thought, this chapter tracks the history of the American Antiquities Act and closely examines the language of Hewett’s draft, considering the implications for the reconstruction of the story of the deep past. Meanwhile, as the terminology of legislative proposals will demonstrate, the domain of “the ancients” was largely closed to American Indians.

---

6 Previous work on the topic of professionalization in archaeology has benefited my own research immensely, and I particularly indebted to the prior works of James Snead and Curtis Hinsley. In some cases where archives were not available to me given the time frame of this thesis, I have relied on their expositions.
First Attempts at Preservation Legislation and the Casa Grande Ruin

The idea of reserving land containing archaeological objects for further scrutiny was the hallmark of antiquities legislation when it was first introduced in the United States. The first legislative attempt to protect antiquities came in the form of a bill in 1882 that broadly proposed withholding the sale of land containing “the remnants of very ancient races in North America, whose origin and history lie yet unknown in their decayed and decaying antiquities.”

“Very ancient,” here, referred to people—perhaps “Indians,” perhaps some other race—whose architecture and material remains predate the Columbian encounter. Further, these ruins were continuing to deteriorate. The “origin and history” of the people who created them was fast becoming dust, the proposal noted, and the lands they occupy must be withdrawn from sale.

The 1882 proposal died when it was referred to the Committee on the Public Lands (referred as “PLC,” in both Senate and House contexts, in what follows), largely due to its preservation method of withdrawing land from sale. At this time, “the very word ‘withdrawal’ aroused Western farmers to a fighting pitch,” Samuel P. Hays asserts in his history of the progressive conservation movement.

Noting such resistance, in 1889 a petition to protect a single ruin in Arizona was presented to Congress, thereby evading a generalizing bill that would be inevitably rejected. The proposal detailed “the ancient and celebrated ruin of Casa Grande, an ancient temple of the prehistoric age of the greatest ethnological and scientific interest.” The Casa Grande bill proved more successful than its predecessor, and an appropriation act for 480 acres of land on which the ruin was situated was approved March 2nd, 1889.

Casa Grande [Figure 16] was the first federal archaeological preservation project. Though

---

8 The proposal did not differentiate between occupied and abandoned settlements in the Southwest except to say that these “towns” existed on public lands, and even mentioned that Pueblo Indians inhabited some of these “towns.” 1882 Senate. “Petition for the Preservation of Antiquities and Ruins of Extinct Cities and Pueblos.” Congressional Record, 47th Congress, 1st Session. Proposed by Senator Hoar (Massachusetts), May 10, 1882, on behalf of the New England Historic Genealogical Society.
10 For the congressional document, see Legislation for the Protection from Destruction of the Ancient Ruin of the Temple of Casa Grande, Mis. Doc. No. 60, 50th Cong. (1889). This was proposed by Senator Hoar of Massachusetts, February 4, 1889, on behalf of fourteen Boston-area residents, many of whom were involved with the Hemenway Expedition to the Southwest. An appropriation act was approved March 2, 1889 and $2000 was placed under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior; in addition, the President was given power to establish a reservation on Casa Grande site. President Harrison enacted this June 22, 1892. See Lee, Antiquities Act of 1906, 20.
plagued in the early years by lack of funds, the Casa Grande structure, which was in peril as tourists increasingly visited the ruin, was reinforced with brick underpinnings and plastered concrete.\textsuperscript{12} Cosmos Mindeleff (brother of Victor Mindeleff), acting for the Department of the Interior (DOI) on behalf of the Bureau of Ethnology, visited the Casa Grande ruin in 1892 after a contract to re-stabilize the ruins had been completed, where he crafted a report for the DOI and the Smithsonian Institution. He detailed the brick underpinning and the use of wood and wrought-iron rods to stabilize individual walls, as seen in his plan drawing in Figure 17. Cavities in the pounded-earth structure were also filled with concrete and plastered flush to the original extension of the wall.

Mindeleff addressed restoration of the ruin, but his report gave little indication of the end-users of the preserved site. Would tourists continue to visit the ruin and was this desirable? What would science gain from the ruin? And what were the real intentions of the object’s preservation? Nonetheless, the protection of Casa Grande proved that legislative progress could be made, at least in specific instances of land withdrawal, but for archaeologically inclined individuals a broadly applicable preservation law was what was truly needed.

While land in the American West was a touchy

subject for homesteaders and entrepreneurs, who sought to maintain an ethos of development rather than restriction, other Americans seeking to protect and maintain the natural resources of the West contrasted the “hands-off” mindset. This latter group managed a small victory when Congress passed the Forest Reserve Act in 1891, which allowed the President to preserve large tracts of forests to ensure proper timber supplies and to protect the scenery of the West. Management was not included until 1897, when the “Organic Act” designated that the DOI establish regulatory standards for forestry use and deploy foresters, employed through its General Land Office (GLO), who would manage the reserved woodlands. Though not directly concerned with antiquities, these early conservationist maneuvers proved that land could be reserved from sale and protected as natural resources, establishing a precedent for antiquities legislation in the years to come.

After the continued care of Casa Grande was secured in 1889, legislative attempts to protect antiquities ceased for nearly a decade, then reemerged as a topic of interest in the first years of the twentieth century. During 1900–1906, three “rounds” of antiquities legislation circulated through Congress, first in 1900, then in 1904, and finally in 1906. Though no legislation passed until 1906, the evolution of thinking indicated within the legislation shows the conceptualization of preservation in early years of the new century.

**Round I**

On February 5th, 1900, Representative Jonathan P. Dolliver of Iowa submitted a bill to the House of Representatives “for the preservation of prehistoric monuments, ruins, and objects and to prevent their counterfeiting.” The Dolliver bill (HR 8066) stipulated that “the work of prehistoric...
and primitive man” situated on lands in the public domain be protected from harm by penalty of fine or imprisonment. The authority to protect was to be vested with the Secretary of the Interior, who could also grant excavation permits to any “educational institution with a view to increasing the knowledge … of archaeological science.” The bill further explained that the Presidential power of land withdrawal and preservation, which had been previously used in the Forest Reserve Act of 1891, would be expanded to “prehistoric or primitive works, monuments, cliff dwellings, cave dwellings, cemeteries, graves, mounds, forts,” in addition to natural formations of scenic and scientific value.

In short, Dolliver’s bill was crafted with a view to increasing anthropological knowledge through antiquities preservation. This view came directly from the archaeological community, as the Dolliver bill was authored by members of the Committee on the Protection and Preservation of Objects of Archaeological Interest, a joint group of the AIA and the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS).

Though no action was taken on the legislation in its designated committee, the PLC, the bill signaled a desire to protect so-called prehistoric monuments. Dolliver’s legislative proposal was followed by three similar bills from Congressman John F. Shafroth of Colorado, the first

---

15 A Bill for the preservation of prehistoric monuments, ruins, and objects, and to prevent their counterfeiting, H.R. 8066, 56th Cong. (5 February 1900)

16 This power, as in the forestry Act, included the ability to appropriate land through eminent domain, with requisite compensation. HR 8066 gave the President the authority to “set apart and reserve for use as public parks or reservations… any public lands upon which are monuments, cliff-dwellings, cemeteries, graves, mounds, forts, or any other work of prehistoric, primitive, or aboriginal man, and also any natural formation of scientific or scenic value.” Lee, a student of land conservation and historic preservation, also notes the introduction of the word “monument,” a term that would come to embody the objects of protection both legislatively and for conservationists in the United States, “though in a somewhat different sense than it eventually acquired.” See Lee, Antiquities Act of 1906, 49.

Interestingly, the Dolliver bill included harsh penalties for forgery, and anyone found counterfeiting objects and selling them as authentic was to be fined a maximum of $10,000, an incredible sum compared to the maximum fine of $100 for the destruction of ruins. Logically, a higher fine for forgery indicates that the government was concerned about the profitability of prehistoric ruins; perhaps, the thinking was that if there were increasing numbers of objects of antiquity on the market, interest in exploiting and illegally excavating authentic objects of antiquity would rise in turn. Another motivation for the higher fine could have been preservation-minded: if dubious businessmen and curio dealers were profiting greatly on fake antiquarian objects, the market of fakes would inevitably be revealed, in turn raising the price on authentic objects. A rush on archaeological sites would certainly cause their immediate destruction.

17 Lee, Antiquities Act of 1906, 47. Notable archaeologists on this committee included Franz Boas and Frederic Ward Putnam. In 1899, the AIA had set up a Standing Committee on American Archaeology, though they themselves were not actively engaged in the American field. Simultaneously, the American Association for the Advancement of Science established a committee “to promote a bill in Congress for the permanent preservation of aboriginal antiquities situated on federal lands.” Called the Committee on the Protection and Preservation of Objects of Archaeological Interest, the AAAS and the AIA soon agreed to combine their efforts with AAAS member Thomas Wilson (“Lawyer, diplomat, and since 1887 curator of prehistoric archaeology in the U.S. National Museum”) as chairman. Wilson worked closely with an attorney from the Department of the Interior to draft a newly conceptualized antiquities bill. Wilson and the DOI attorney were a logical pairing since any antiquities protection in situ would inevitably require dedicated land, which would be regulated by the DOI. Indeed, the interests of both parties—archaeologists and the natural conservationists of the DOI—were well-represented in HR 8066; works of “prehistoric, primitive, or aboriginal man” are placed alongside scientific and scenic natural resources; history and landscape were to be protected under the same legislative umbrella.
of which was introduced just a day after Dolliver’s, followed by an expanded proposal a month later.\textsuperscript{18} Whereas the first bill merely restricted injury or theft, the second Shafroth bill (HR 9245) sought to identify ruins in need of further protection.\textsuperscript{19}

The third bill introduced by Shafroth, HR 10451, was more expansive in its preservationist scope. This bill, “for the preservation of prehistoric monuments, ruins, and objects on public lands,” gave the Secretary the authority to care for and protect works of “primitive” or “aboriginal” man, and the ability to grant permits to the Smithsonian Institution and reputable educational institutions. By specifically indicating the purpose of excavation—“for the advancement of archaeological science”—the third Shafroth bill shared a directive with the Dolliver bill: both understood the scientific value of anthropology and, in turn, a desire to preserve America’s deep past for the benefit of the nation.\textsuperscript{20}

In the House Congressional Report on the bill on April 21\textsuperscript{st}, 1900, the PLC recommended the passage of the bill with a slight amendment to the geographical language. Whereas the first draft applied to “any public lands” where ruins were extant, the PLC altered the language to specify the Four Corners region. Indeed, it appears their recommendation hinged on the change, which isolated the Southwest as an archaeological territory of great importance. Its contemporaneous ethnographic importance, however, was not as highly regarded, and the PLC’s reasons for recommendation convey a specific Anglo-American conceptualization of the so-called ancient ruins, and their connection to Amerindians living in the Four Corners region in 1900:

These monuments and cliff dwellings indicate that a highly civilized race hundreds of years before the discovery of America occupied this portion of the United States, and built pretentious dwellings, castles, forts, and palaces in that region of the United States.

\textsuperscript{18} A Bill to preserve the aboriginal antiquities and prehistoric ruins on the public lands, H.R. 8195, 56\textsuperscript{th} Cong. (6 February 1900). HR 8195, the first Shafroth bill, was short and to the point, a mere nine lines long, and it isolated the restriction and punishment of the Dolliver bill: no one could injure or remove objects of antiquity from public lands without permission, by punishment of up to $100 or ninety days in jail. Though “to preserve” was in the title of HR 8195, the language was purely restrictive; all preservation was to happen by way to preventing harm.

\textsuperscript{19} A Bill to segregate from public lands certain tracts on which are situated ancient houses and ruins and to provide protection for these, H.R. 9245, 56\textsuperscript{th} Cong. (7 March 1900). The second Shafroth legislation was linked to the historical precedent set by John Wesley Powell, the former surveyor of the Colorado River Valley and the Grand Canyon for the US Geological Survey and the then-director of the Bureau of American Ethnology. Not only did the bill make an overture to the BAE, but also it was likely designed to insist on a formal survey of human-built ruins in the Four Corners region, which included Shafroth’s home state of Colorado, much like the Geological Survey had done for natural formations. The bill’s language ordered the Director of the Geological Survey, under the oversight of the Bureau of American Ethnology, to examine land in the Four Corners region and survey sites with “ruins of temples, houses, or other structures built by the former inhabitants of the country.” Once identified, the Director would make recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior regarding certain ruins that ought to be protected; thereafter the Secretary of the Interior could withdrawal land from settlement and sale, and place a Smithsonian-directed custodian to care for the place.

\textsuperscript{20} A Bill for the preservation of prehistoric monuments, ruins, and objects on public lands, H.R. 10451, 56\textsuperscript{th} Cong. (5 April 1900).
The character of the buildings and of the pottery and utensils used by them indicate that they were a much superior race to the Indians, who afterwards inhabited that country.21

Ethnologically, the report distinguished twentieth-century “Indians” from an unnamed, impressive race. This temporal-racial distinction mirrored the debate a half-century earlier regarding the so-called Mound Builders and the Indians of the Mississippi and Ohio River Valleys. The legal language does not indicate a theory to account for the disappearance of this former “race;” rather, the PLC understood the scientific value of such a theoretical pursuit, which would require the preservation of the ruins for further study. By denying the contemporaneous Amerindians a hereditary link to the land they occupied, the US Government would become the steward of the historical value of the ruins. In this sense, then, the worth of the ruins went beyond scientific value—the presence of a deep and unknown history was an attractive prospect to the recently expanded American nation.

With the recommended changes, Congressman Shafroth submitted the bill to the entire House of Representatives, where it was never voted on.22 Though no action was taken on the legislation, the preservationist bills proposed in the Congress of 1900 reveal a specific line of thinking about archaeology and its object of inquiry, “prehistoric” man. “Prehistoric,” “primitive” and “aboriginal” are terms that express depth of time, cultural or geographical originality, and are positioned in contrast to the technological and intellectual developments of “civilization.”23

21 *Preservation of Prehistoric Monuments, Etc., Report* [To accompany H.R. 10451], 56th Cong. (21 April 1900).

22 It is not clear why HR 10451 was not acted upon. We can speculate, however, that its protectionist language and regional specificity in the second iteration of the proposal were designed to quell opposition to a generalized land withdrawal bill; HR 10451 did pass the Committee on the Public Lands, which was composed of the same Western congressmen who opposed the Forest Reserve Act; nonetheless, it seems that even a specific, regional bill was unsatisfactory to the Committee of the Whole House of Representatives. Yet, another preservationist bill “to establish and administer national parks, and for other purposes” (HR 11021) was later proposed, sent to the Committee on the Public Lands, and rejected by that body—suggesting that the preservation of antiquities in the Southwest had the support of the Western congressmen, whereas a general “public lands” bill, which would preserve scenic and recreational land in addition to antiquities, did not.

23 “Prehistoric” was the most recent arrival to the English language, having been introduced by Daniel Wilson in 1851; Wilson used the term in an archaeological context, setting a precedent for future use in the discourse of archaeology, both Old World and New. For the first use of “prehistory” and “prehistoric,” see Daniel Wilson, *The Archaeology and Prehistoric Annals of Scotland* (Edinburgh: Shetland and Knox, 1851). For a history of Wilson and his use of the term see Alice Beck Kehoe, *The Land of Prehistory: A Critical History of American Archaeology* (New York: Routledge, 1998). As an adjective, prehistoric is linguistically generated from the word “historic” and its meaning is derived directly from its radical and the prefix “pre,” meaning “previous, before.”


Tracking the use of the word “aboriginal,” the term is most commonly used in writing or language regarding colonial expansion, dating back to the Latin *ab origine*, “from the beginning, from the creation of the world,” wherein “aboriginal” is placed in contrast to (invariably newer) races or nations now inhabiting that place. “aboriginal, adj. and n.,” *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, 2010. http://www.oed.com/viewdictionaryentry/Entry/486 (accessed February 12, 2011).
As I discussed in the last chapter, categories of civilizational level such as “primitive” were commonly conflated with temporal designations such as “aboriginal;” within these separate determinations, the term “prehistoric” floats freely, because history was, on the one hand, a measure of progressive, linear cultural-intellectual development and, on the other, a temporal, comparative designation (usually used as an adjective, as in “historic” and “prehistoric,” wherein prehistoric clearly refers to something earlier than history and therefore something very old). The 1900 propositions show that all three words are used interchangeably and often in contextually specific ways, and care must be taken not to overdetermine a single word’s import. But taken as a whole, a binary appears, consisting of the “primitive” on one side and the “civilized” on the other. Native Americans, as considered in these bills, were never thought to be on the civilized side of the binary.

“Primitive” has a necessary opposite, “civilized”—the two constitute one another. This binary had deep roots in anthropological thinking in America and Europe over the previous two hundred years, as exemplified by Lewis Henry Morgan’s savage, barbaric and civilized stages of mankind. While natural selection had little theoretical bearing on Morgan’s ideas of social evolution, the categories of primitive and civilized were reified in popular culture by Darwin’s theory of the evolution of species. Thus, even as evolutionism in anthropology waned, the construction of material “stages” as touchstones of civilization development remained. As Fabian phrases it,

> When, in the course of disciplinary growth and differentiation, evolutionism was attacked and all but discarded as the reigning paradigm of anthropology, the temporal conceptions it had helped to establish remained unchanged.  

For Morgan, it was not biology and mentality but rather ideas and material innovation that developed over time, which in turn affected the entirety of societies in which they were present. The PLC’s ascription of Southwestern antiquities to a more advanced “race” than the contemporaneous Amerindians did not fit with Morgan’s social evolutionist theory, but was rather a conflation of evolutionism with nineteenth-century racialist anthropological ideas that were still prevalent in everyday Anglo-American culture.

**Pajarito Plateau and Colorado Cliff Dwellers**

The conflation between the past and present occurred not only in terms of the ancestral peoples of America and the contemporary indigenous tribes, but also in terms of a new American people


who were seen to be connected to the prior inhabitants of American soil. Concurrent to Shafroth and Dolliver bills, Hewett was agitating on behalf of the ruins situated on the Pajarito Plateau, as outlined in this chapter’s introduction. After Congressman Lacey introduced legislation, the Committee on the Public Lands released a report on the proposed “Cliff Dwellers’ National Park,” on January 23rd, 1901 recommending the preservation of the ruins of Pajarito because their destruction would be an injustice to the descendants of these people. Strangely, however, the descendants were implied to be Anglo-Americans:

Each generation usually destroys the works of its ancestors. Modern Rome is built out of the remains of the ancient city. In the United States the prehistoric works of the aboriginal races have rapidly disappeared under the hand of the white race.26

The bill’s sentiment appealed to preservation of history contained in the works of the “aboriginal races” and lamented the past destruction of national heritage. As with the 1900 proposals, no action was taken.27 Nonetheless, the idea that the current American nation had stock in the deep past was pervasive, and subsequent legislation took up the idea in more general terms.

Round II

Though discouraged by the inaction of the legislature on antiquities bills, the drive to preserve the remains of the past continued. In 1904, competing legislative attempts from the Smithsonian Institution and a man named Reverend Henry Baum were introduced on the Hill. Both parties remodeled previous bills, continually modifying the language to increase the likelihood that Congress would abandon its anxiety over public land withdrawal and enact a preservationist law. The Smithsonian was the first out of the gate, crafting legislation that was introduced February 5th, 1904 by Senator Shelby Moore Cullom of Illinois (S 4127). “A Bill for the preservation of aboriginal monuments, ruins, and other antiquities, and for other purposes” included the creation of protective reservations for antiquities by presidential proclamation; a claim that all antiquities on public land were explicitly the property of the US Government; and a permit-granting process to ensure scientific credibility in excavation or ruin sites.28 Contentiously, all excavations required monthly documentation of collection activities by permit holders to be sent to the Smithsonian; if archaeologists failed to send this information, permits would be immediately revoked. The bill

26 Cliffs Dwellers’ National Park, Report [To accompany H.R. 13071], 56th Cong. (23 January 1901).
27 Meanwhile, Congressman Shafroth introduced region-specific legislation for the state of Colorado. HR 14262, proposed February 22, 1901, sought to create “the Colorado Cliff Dwellings National Park,” through the withdrawal of sale and settle of public land in the southern part of the state. It is an indication of desire, but the proposed bill did not reflect any changing conversation or thinking regarding antiquities and the peoples who built them. Two years later, both Lacey and Shafroth reintroduced their bills (as HR 7269 and HR 6785, respectively) without changing the wording in any significant form.
28 A Bill for the preservation of aboriginal monuments, ruins, and other antiquities, and for other purposes, S. 4127, 58th Cong. (5 February 1904).
proposed that foreign governments could excavate on American soil, provided that all artifacts were sent through the National Museum in Washington, DC, which would also been overseen by the Smithsonian.29 This restrictive language was tempered by a clause implying a desire on the part of the government to promote archaeological activity by way of circulating “archaeological specimens” to museums at various points of the country.

The Smithsonian-backed bill approached the American past with a tone different from previous legislation. Also called the “Langley bill” for then-Secretary of the Smithsonian Samuel P. Langley, the Smithsonian bill departed from the language of the “prehistoric” and the “primitive,” instead relying on the term “aboriginal” to include all Native Americans, past and present. By recognizing “ancient” and contemporary “aborigines,” the proposed legislation also put ethnological research on par with that of archaeology, implying that both of these anthropological fields could benefit from the preservation of antiquities. Even Spanish-influenced missionary remains were to be preserved, an acknowledgement that blurred the line previously drawn by the “prehistoric,” as Spanish missionaries were then the greatest source of pre-Anglo American history.30 Thus, an intellectual link between contemporary American history and anthropology and the diversity of historical objects of the American past was drawn.

The Smithsonian bill was approved in the PLC and then in the Senate as a whole, and was sent to the House of Representatives as HR 12447, where it was introduced unchanged by Congressman Robert R. Hitt, also of Illinois, on February 16th. The Smithsonian bill was not the only legislation on the table, however, as two other antiquities bills were introduced in the same congressional session. An independent group had also crafted a broad reaching preservation bill under the leadership of Reverend Henry Baum, and another bill was put forth by a Western congressman, Bernard Shandon Rodey of New Mexico, emphasizing regional control of land. Both of these men had seen Southwestern antiquities first-hand during a tour of various ruins with Hewett in 1902. Hewett had taken Baum (b. 1848), an amateur biblical archaeologist and editor of a monthly magazine called Records of the Past, on a tour of antiquities early in the year, impressing upon him the abundance of ruins in the Four Corners region. Baum later produced a map that depicted the plethora of ruins in the region, as seen in Figure 3a (Chapter One). Later that year, Hewett had also taken Congressman Lacey and Congressman Rodey (1856–1927) on a tour of the Southwestern ruins. All three of Hewett’s travelling companions were impressed by

29 Allowing foreign governments and qualified foreign archaeologists to engage in excavation on American soil was reasonable, argued scientifically minded people, because the nations that qualified (namely Western European nations and Mexico) allowed similar explorations on their own soil. This was beneficial to all involved because archaeological excavation (that is to say, digging in the ground) is a prohibitively expensive pursuit, and was especially so in this period before mobile heavy machinery. Shared data would improve the science of archaeology globally.

30 A Bill for the preservation of aboriginal monuments, ruins, and other antiquities, and for other purposes, S. 4127, 58th Cong. (5 February 1904), 2.
the state of the ruins and recognized the necessity of their protection.31

Two years later, during the Smithsonian bill proceedings, Congressman Rodey introduced a competing bill, “to protect ancient ruins on the public domain.”32 Though it, too, did not use “prehistoric” or “primitive,” the approach to preservation taken in the bill was quite different from the Smithsonian proposal because it sought regional, not federal, oversight of antiquities. The bill did not seek protection of antiquities through land withdrawal, but rather through a permit-granting process overseen by the Bureau of American Ethnology and the regional university in whose vicinity excavations were to occur. Upon acceptance, the state or territorial university would provide a manager who would be on the excavation site at all times. Second, the proposed legislation granted equal authority to the Smithsonian and state and territorial universities, which comparatively decreased the federal control of antiquities, rather seeking to put power in the individual state/territorial hands.

Rodey’s bill, however, was pushed aside by the momentum of a competing bill to the Smithsonian’s drafted by Reverend Baum. Baum was a grandiloquent writer, and the 1902 inaugural issue of his magazine pounded home the need for the preservation of American antiquities.

Every one interested in the history of man on this Continent—and who should not be?—must feel humiliated over the failure of this Government to protect the ruins within its territorial limits,—ruins that bear witness to a race of great builders, long since vanished, and not unworthy of comparison with the builders of the Century that has just closed.33

Baum did not explicate a connection between living Native Americans and those of the distant past; rather, he drew a qualitative connection between a people “long since vanished” and Anglo-American settlers of the nineteenth century. Baum himself did not believe in a connection between the living Pueblo Indians and the people who built ruins like Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon.34 When Baum presented competing legislation to the Smithsonian bill through Congressman Rodenberg of Illinois, the same linkage between the deep past and the American nation was theorized.

The Baum bill reintroduced the distinction of “historic or prehistoric” ruins, again allowing

32 A Bill to protect ancient ruins on the public domain, H.R. 12141, 58th Cong. (10 February 1904).
the sites of interest to be categorized as separate from living Amerindians. As before, this separation was not explicit, but rather allowed the interpretation of cultural and temporal distinction to remain a viable theory. The Baum bill vested power in the DOI to protect ruins and grant permits “for the purpose of increasing and advancing the knowledge of historical, archaeological, anthropological, or ethnological science.” While typical clauses regarding custodians, fines, and protection against counterfeiting were included, the Smithsonian Institution was left unmentioned as having a role in the preservation of American antiquities. This was not an unintentional omission, and the slight perceived by the Smithsonian would cause problems for Baum’s widely supported bill.

Baum’s bill passed the House of Representatives and was introduced on the Senate floor by Senator Lodge of Massachusetts on April 20th, 1904 and sent to the Senate PLC. With preservation bills by Baum and the Smithsonian in the PLC, a hearing before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands took place on April 22nd in which both bills were to be discussed. The hearing, however, consisted solely of supporters of the Baum bill. The major note emphasized by each speaker was the necessity for the immediate passage of antiquities legislation. When Baum’s turn to speak came, he detailed the failures of previous bills, which he ascribed to a lack of concerted effort on the part of archaeological, anthropological, and educational interests. For Baum, the Smithsonian’s bill represented a single-minded conception of preservation, excavation and presentation of archaeological objects. Baum understood that the Smithsonian bill would give the institution an advantage in any excavation dispute. As he saw it, the Smithsonian had already proved themselves unable to excavate responsibly. “Tourists and commercial vandals are not alone guilty of partially excavating ruins for their most valuable treasures,” wrote Baum, but the Smithsonian, too, had “opened ruins and taken what they wanted and then deserted them.” The Secretary of the Interior and the DOI, with no conflicting interests, would be the appropriate government oversight agency.

Following the testimonies of archaeologists and other antiquities-minded individuals, a discussion ensued, wherein several minor amendments were proposed. The bill was ultimately

35 A Bill for the preservation of historic and prehistoric ruins, monuments, archaeological objects, and other antiquities, and to prevent their counterfeiting, H.R. 13349, 58th Cong. (2 March 1904).
37 A Bill for the preservation of historic and prehistoric ruins, monuments, archaeological objects, and other antiquities, and to prevent their counterfeiting, S. 5603, 58th Cong. (20 April 1904).
38 Hearing before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands, Senate Document No. 314, 58th Congress, 2d Session (28 April 1904).
introduced with amendments, striking a clause that withheld sale or homestead preemption of lands with isolated ruins on them. Finally, on April 26th, 1904, the amended Baum passed the Senate. The bill was received in the House of Representatives and moved to the House PLC. However, the bill made no further progress and Congress went into recess before a vote could be taken.

Though there remained a winter session of Congress in which to take action on the bill, Baum lashed out at the Smithsonian’s “agents,” whom he perceived to have pressured the Committee to take no action on the bill. Baum’s anger reverberated throughout the community through a specifically directed editorial in his society’s journal, *Records of the Past*. As “round two” came to a close, the pervasive preservationist thinking that permeated Congressional legislation and its framers took issue with governmental control; decentralized, equal opportunity excavation was an important requirement for the archaeological community at large. The language of the 1904 preservation proposals vacillated between a progressive account for “aboriginal” architecture and artifacts in the Smithsonian’s bill to the more traditional, classificatory “primitive and prehistoric” language that marked the Baum bill and earlier attempts.

**Round III — Enter Edgar Lee Hewett**

Following the initial defeat of Baum’s bill, the AIA formed a new committee dedicated to crafting and passing antiquities preservation legislation, marking the end of the AAAS-backed Committee on the Protection and Preservation of Objects of Archaeological Interest. The new group, Committee on the Preservation of the Ruins of American Antiquity, dropped the words “Objects of Archaeological Interest” and “Protection” and added “Ruins of American Antiquity.” The group and its name were less “archaeological,” and sought a broader support base with the addition of “ruins”—a mystically inflected word that the public could identify with and that was specific enough to be beneficial to archaeology because of the word’s association with the study of American antiquity. The AIA believed itself the proper organization to lead the charge for antiquities preservation, for it had the institutional focus, credibility and network to design specific legislation. As AIA president Thomas Day Seymour wrote,

---

40 This is a shortened account. For a more complete, albeit colorful, account, see Henry Mason Baum, “Pending Legislation for the Protection of Antiquities of the Public Domain,” *Records of the Past III*, no. V (May 1904).
41 See Henry Mason Baum, “Pending Legislation for the Protection of Antiquities of the Public Domain,” *Records of the Past III*, no. V (May 1904). Though Baum was no longer in the picture, his bill was introduced to the House in January of 1905 by Congressman Lacey, and it was pushed to the Committee on the Public Lands. The Committee found problems with the wording of the Senate bill and essentially rewrote the text but maintained its sentiment throughout. A memorandum by Hewett accompanied the bill to the House floor after the Committee on the Public Lands deliberation. On January 19th, 1905 the bill was put on the House Calendar, the final step before it could be voted on (before being sent back to the Senate). However, the bill was never voted on and Congress adjourned again without taking action.

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Congressman</th>
<th>Relevant Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For the preservation of prehistoric monuments, ruins, and objects,</td>
<td>5-Feb-00</td>
<td>Dolliver</td>
<td>AIA/AAAS Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and to prevent their counterfeiting (HR 8066)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Iowa)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To preserve the aboriginal and prehistoric ruins on the public</td>
<td>6-Feb-00</td>
<td>Shafroth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lands (HR 8195)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Colorado)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To segregate from public lands certain tracts on which are</td>
<td>7-Mar-00</td>
<td>Shafroth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>situated ancient houses and ruins and to provide protection for</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Colorado)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>these (HR 9245)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the preservation of prehistoric monuments, ruins, and objects</td>
<td>5-Apr-00</td>
<td>Shafroth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on public lands (HR 10451)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Colorado)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To set apart certain lands in the Territory of New Mexico as a</td>
<td>14-Dec-03</td>
<td>Lacey</td>
<td>Hewett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public park, to be known as The Pajarito Cliff Dwellers' National</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Iowa)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park, for the purpose of preserving the prehistoric caves and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruins and other works and relics therein (HR 7269)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the preservation of aboriginal monuments, ruins, and other</td>
<td>5-Feb-04</td>
<td>Cullom</td>
<td>Smithsonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antiquities, and for other purposes (S 4127)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Illinois)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To protect ancient ruins on the public domain (HR 12141)</td>
<td>10-Feb-04</td>
<td>Rodey</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the preservation of historic and prehistoric ruins, monuments,</td>
<td>2-Mar-04</td>
<td>Rodenberg</td>
<td>Baum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>archaeological objects, and other antiquities, and to prevent their</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Illinois)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counterfeiting (HR 13349)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To establish and administer national parks, and for other purposes</td>
<td>4-Mar-04</td>
<td>Lacey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HR 13478)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Iowa)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the preservation of American antiquities (HR 11016)</td>
<td>9-Jan-06</td>
<td>Lacey</td>
<td>Hewett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Iowa)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Institute, being a national organization, having affiliated Societies both in the East and in the West, and including in its membership the heads of the principal American museums as well as explorers, has peculiar facilities for ascertaining what is best and what is practicable.\textsuperscript{43}

Aside from the commission to prepare a bill to be presented to the legislature, a Preservation Committee would be created to formalize a permitting procedure that could be recommended to Congress.\textsuperscript{44} Discussions of preservation—what it meant to preserve an archaeological object, who it was for, and how to accomplish such preservation—were ongoing in AIA circles. Overall, archaeologists wanted a decentralized, non-governmental science to dictate the preservation and excavation of antiquities, cast like Baum’s bill but divorced from such a polarizing figure; the role of the government would be solely federal protection and regulation, not the interpretation of ruins and their history. The story of America’s deep past, then, could be told from a position of relative autonomy.

This was an ideal view from within the AIA, but the organization was willing to hear the governmental side of the story. Negotiating between the two ultimately fell to Hewett, just returned from Geneva. Hewett was seen to be well suited to working on the antiquities bill; after receiving the Preservation Committee’s notes on Congressional objections to previous bills, notably land withdrawal and jurisdictional claims by different government departments, Hewett set to work on a draft.\textsuperscript{45} Hewett drew on his personal experience exploring and studying Southwestern ruins and his familiarity with the “talk” of Western congressmen to edit the language of the bill, adding certain generalized phrases that appealed to a majority of Congress. Ultimately, he deftly recast the language of the legislation so that the antiquities bill was suitable not only to the Smithsonian and the AIA, but to a majority of Congress as well.

At a joint meeting between the American Anthropological Association and the AIA in Ithaca, New York on December 28\textsuperscript{th}, 1905, Hewett presented his research during the course of the year, along with an amended bill.\textsuperscript{46} He began by detailing the successful preservation work of the past, noting that some antiquities were protected by forest reserves and others through their location on Indian land. He then briefly discussed some AIA-affiliated parties seeking to

\textsuperscript{43} Seymour to Kelsey, 15 June 1904, Box 13.b, Archaeological Institute of America Records.
\textsuperscript{44} Seymour to Kelsey, 15 June 1904, Box 13.b, Archaeological Institute of America Records.
\textsuperscript{45} Draft of letter to archaeological institutions, signed Edgar Lee Hewett, William Henry Holmes, Mitchell Carroll, and Alice Cunningham Fletcher, 13 March 1905, Box 11.b, Archaeological Institute of America Records. See also, Thompson, “Hewett and the Political Process,” 274. Hewett was an apt choice, according to Thompson, because he “brought to the task some special personal qualities: prodigious energy and the ability to use it productively, well-developed organizational skills, a superb sense of timing, an ability to identify quickly and define clearly the key elements in a problem, total but diplomatic perseverance in the pursuit of a goal, and a keen insight into the nature of the human condition.”
\textsuperscript{46} For a copy of his speech at Ithaca, see Edgar Lee Hewett, “Preservation of American Antiquities; Progress During the Last Year; Needed Legislation,” American Anthropologist 8 (1906): 109–114.
excavate on government land and the conversation about permit-granting and preservation that had ensued. Even when antiquities were located on land that had been preserved, local societies were having trouble obtaining official permission to examine nearby ruins due to overlapping jurisdictions—sites could, for instance, be located on the border of protected forests (overseen by the Department of Agriculture after 1905) and a military reserve (overseen by the Department of War). Hewett reasoned that the hurdles to excavation could be overcome by combining a broadly encompassing federal preservation doctrine and a dynamic, multi-pronged permit-granting authority into a single legislation.

Hewett’s point of entry altered previous language, which described the area in which antiquities were situated as “public lands,” to the more broadly defined “lands owned or controlled by the Government.” The language of former bills (such as the Smithsonian and Baum-backed bills) focused on the withdrawal of usable space from the public sphere. Not only did Hewett’s change to “government-owned lands” convey that these properties were already possessed in some way, but the phrasing also encompassed areas beyond “public land” to include Indian reservations, forest reserves and military compounds.

The final version of the Act outlined four different facets of preservation. First, it protected antiquities from vandalism or theft. Second, it gave the President the power to create “national monuments.” Third, it required that permits be obtained for excavation of any objects of antiquity, and that permits be granted only to institutions of scientific credibility; further, these permits would be granted through application to a joint board of oversight that included the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture and War, thereby allowing permits to be easily granted for lands that lay in multiple jurisdictional boundaries. Finally, the maintenance of the rules and regulations for permit-granting would be overseen by the three governmental departments; in essence, this meant that the three departments were to publish guidelines as to what institutions they collectively deemed “qualified” for excavation. Protection of the ruins was implied across all government land, no matter if the President had proclaimed a given site a national monument, and it was the archaeological community that decided which sites were of most interest for science, education and tourism. Each section was directed toward certain ends and yet represented a synthesis of polyvocal positions. After wrapping up these points, Hewett presented the draft that would become the Antiquities Act.

His draft was unanimously endorsed, and the bill was given to Congressman Lacey and introduced—without changes—to the House of Representatives on January 9th, 1906 as HR

47 This change is noted by both Lee and Thompson. See Lee, Antiquities Act of 1906, ch. VI–VIII; Thompson, “Hewett and the Political Process,” 300–303.
48 Lee, Antiquities Act of 1906, 74.
49 Hewett, “Preservation of American Antiquities; Progress During the Last Year; Needed Legislation,” 113.
AMERICAN ANTIQUITIES ACT OF 1906

16 USC 431-433

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any person who shall appropriate, excavate, injure, or destroy any historic or prehistoric ruin or monument, or any object of antiquity, situated on lands owned or controlled by the Government of the United States, without the permission of the Secretary of the Department of the Government having jurisdiction over the lands on which said antiquities are situated, shall, upon conviction, be fined in a sum of not more than five hundred dollars or be imprisoned for a period of not more than ninety days, or shall suffer both fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.

Sec. 2. That the President of the United States is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to declare by public proclamation historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest that are situated upon the lands owned or controlled by the Government of the United States to be national monuments, and may reserve as a part thereof parcels of land, the limits of which in all cases shall be confined to the smallest area compatible with proper care and management of the objects to be protected: Provided, That when such objects are situated upon a tract covered by a bona fide unperfected claim or held in private ownership, the tract, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the proper care and management of the object, may be relinquished to the Government, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to accept the relinquishment of such tracts in behalf of the Government of the United States.

Sec. 3. That permits for the examination of ruins, the excavation of archaeological sites, and the gathering of objects of antiquity upon the lands under their respective jurisdictions may be granted by the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, and War to institutions which they may deem properly qualified to conduct such examination, excavation, or gathering, subject to such rules and regulation as they may prescribe: Provided, That the examinations, excavations, and gatherings are undertaken for the benefit of reputable museums, universities, colleges, or other recognized scientific or educational institutions, with a view to increasing the knowledge of such objects, and that the gatherings shall be made for permanent preservation in public museums.

Sec. 4. That the Secretaries of the Departments aforesaid shall make and publish from time to time uniform rules and regulations for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Approved, June 8, 1906
Five months later, with no major alterations, and no competing antiquities legislation, the bill passed. President Theodore Roosevelt signed it into law on June 8th, 1906. Three months later, Roosevelt used his new powers for the first time, proclaiming Devils Tower in Wyoming a national monument. The first monument was, incidentally enough, a natural geological formation, as Figure 18 shows, but the “volcanic neck” stuck conspicuously out of the landscape and evoked the vulcan landscape of the prehistoric past. Months later, Roosevelt used the Act in December of 1906 to declare the Native American petroglyph wall known as El Morro (Figure 19, in New Mexico) and the so-called “Montezuma Castle” ruin (Figure 20, in Arizona) monuments as well. With these three monuments, the commemoration of America’s deep past began.

Language, Generality, and Acceptable Channels of Interpretation

In Ronald F. Lee’s exhaustive 1970 account of the Act’s history he also provided his own estimation of the legislation’s effective measures. As stated previously, Hewett’s wording of “lands owned or controlled by the Government,” was deemed important, as was his introduction of the term “national monument” to the language of conservation, because “to make small archaeological reservations ‘National Parks’ must have seemed inappropriate and probably difficult to get through Congress.” With this, Lee perceived Hewett’s stipulation that monuments be protected by the “smallest area compatible with the proper care and management,” as agreeable to Westerners but vague enough to allow flexibility in the actual detailing of the sites to be protected.

Lee found section four to be a conciliatory point: by requiring the three permit-granting agencies (Interior, Agriculture, and War) to publish uniform rules and regulations, it was largely assumed that organizations such as the Smithsonian or the AIA would act in advisory roles. Further, the Act extended a hand to sciences outside of archaeology; Lee remarks that natural areas were a novel addition to “antiquities” to be protected in the legislation. The inclusion of objects of “scientific interest” was significant because natural curiosities, geological formations or unique landscapes could be protected from destruction.

50 Lee, Antiquities Act of 1906, 72–76.


52 Lee, Antiquities Act of 1906, 75.


Further, as Raymond Harris Thompson notes, “by placing the national monument idea into Section Two he [Hewett] avoided having land withdrawal appear in the first sentence or in the title,” a move that promoted the protection of monuments but did not over-emphasize the federal government’s possession of the land they were on. The bill also authorized the Department of the Interior to accept private donation of land on which historic landmarks were situated, an important point for the preservationist Lee, since private donations were assured protection from sale under the Act. See Thompson, “Hewett and the Political Process,” 303.

54 Lee, Antiquities Act of 1906, 74–76.
In “The Foundation for American Public Archaeology: Section 3 of the Antiquities Act of 1906,” Francis P. McManamon builds on Lee’s 1970 interpretation of the Act, specifically arguing that the Act’s third section—the granting of permits for excavation and exploration—did three things: established archaeological objects as public resources, asserted that antiquities were primarily “educational and commemorative,” and laid the ground for the professionalization of American archaeology. By considering “historic and prehistoric ruins” as a part of the trove of national resources, the Act cast the preservation of antiquities as a public concern, especially with regard to maintaining a notable past for the American nation.

“Defining archaeological resources as non-commercial and public is the most basic public policy established by the Antiquities Act.” Only universities and educational institutions that were qualified in the eyes of the government could participate in the federally sanctioned excavation, ensuring that commercial ventures would be excluded from archaeological work.

James Snead traces the professionalization of archaeology further back than McManamon, but notes that the Act garnered the ingredients of professionalization. Following the passage of the Antiquities Act, the AIA “used the new momentum to promote the American field, further professionalize the discipline, and consolidate the hold of the universities and major museums on the conduct of archaeology.” Between the AIA and the government, however, there was a difference of opinion regarding which institutions and individuals were deemed qualified—a difference that spoke to contrasting conceptualizations about the scope and audience of

---

58  Snead, Ruins and Rivals, 81.
archaeology, one that mirrored the scientific, Boasian anthropology and the popular, romantic archaeology of Lummis, as detailed in Chapter One. Hewett, as I have shown, occupied a middle ground between these schools of thought, a centrist position that he maintained through his crafting of the Antiquities Act.

As Hewett and like-minded individuals began to think of prehistoric ruins as archaeological resources, the question of the audience of end-user came to the fore. Antiquities legislation since 1900 had included mention of museums and public display, which was understood as the bridge between science and the American public at large. Hewett’s Act was no different:

> Provided, That the examinations, excavations, and gatherings are undertaken for the benefit of reputable museums, universities, colleges, or other recognized scientific or educational institutions, with a view to increasing the knowledge of such objects, and that the gatherings shall be made for permanent preservation in public museums.\(^{59}\)

---

\(^{59}\) Antiquities Act of 1906 (16 U.S. Code 431-433), statute text.
The Act advocated commemorating America’s deep past, but sequential temporal boundaries were vaguely defined as “prehistoric” and “historic.” Because the legislation did not speculate on an end result, nor did it define what constituted a qualified institution, the Act left open the possibility for polyvocal historical interpretations. What constituted “scientific” interpretation was a broad-ranging field; Baum and many congressmen, as I have shown, still subscribed to a “lost race” theory of prehistoric American civilization. Further, the indeterminacy of “qualified” interpretation meant that history could be constructed to promote commercial or nationalistic interests. Though in 1906 science-minded men like Hewett eschewed a “lost” or “extinct” race theory, the Act allowed multiple parties the ability to interpret contemporaneous Amerinds, the deep past, and the connection between the two—including individuals that might cast the American Indians in a variety of unflattering ways.

McManamon reads the Antiquities Act as a document shaped by the mood of the progressive era, seen through the language of federal control, a desire to appropriately manage its natural
resources, and the stress on expertise and scientific knowledge at a federal level of oversight.\footnote{McManamon, “The Foundation for Public Archaeology,” 166. Thompson also notes the language of the progressive era in “Hewett and the Political Process.”}

This idea extends into the domain of history as well because the idea of progress in early twentieth century America did not include a future for American Indians as distinct cultural groups. They had been relegated to reservations and were understood to be destined for acculturation or, at worst, extinction. Due to these pervasive sentiments there were few storylines that could portray contemporary Native Americans positively; while their ancestors may not have been excluded from history, their contemporaneous outlook was bleak.

The Historic and the Prehistoric—Native Americans and Their Connection to the Past

Joe E. Watkins rightly states that the Act had the effect of presenting a particular “idea” of the past from the perspective of Americans of European descent.

In some ways the Antiquities Act of 1906 can be seen to be a continuation of government policies that were aimed at erasing the image of the contemporary American Indian from the landscape in favor of the “dead and disappearing culture” destined to exist only in museums or to be engulfed in mainstream America… The “past” was protected for its scientific value as a means of understanding the “soon-to-have-disappeared Indian” and not because of its value to a living, vibrant culture.\footnote{Joe E. Watkins, “The Antiquities Act at One Hundred Years: A Native American Perspective,” in The Antiquities Act, ed. David Harmon et al (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2006), 196.}

Watkins, himself a Native American, notes the governmental “ownership” of the past and of history. As I have shown, however, the Antiquities Act made the past, as contained in ruins, a resource to be protected for its value to contemporary America, but not Native Americans. Anglo-America was invigorated by the extension of history into the deep past, regardless of the state of Amerindians.

The government was the steward of this past and, as noted, left its interpretation to “qualified” parties of interpreters, notably archaeologists. Native Americans were never “qualified” interpreters as designated in the Act. From the point of view of scientific institutions, objective analysis from Amerindians was impossible to reconcile into a coherent narrative of history. Since only oral or mythopoeic accounts of pre-Columbian America could be gathered, the viability of information was not acceptable to these empiricists.

I contend that although multiple interpretations of Native Americans and their history were available, none of these, in actuality, allowed them a voice in their own past. In fact, I wish to suggest that Anglo-Americans actually adopted the deep history of America’s inhabitants as their
own, even if they believed Native Americans to be the descendants of the people of the distant past. Hewett was not the instigator of this pervasive sentiment, but in crafting the Act he ensured this narrative could be played out. Recalling Hewett’s periodizing idea of “culture history” in his pre-dissertation thinking, concepts of antiquity—primitive, prehistoric and ancient among them—were educational terms in his view. By using these easily comprehensible conceptions in federal legislation, Hewett ensured overlapping understandings of the past that were agreeable to a multiplicity of interests.

The implications beyond Hewett’s use, however, had many more consequences. For one, “prehistoric” denotes a period of time that is inaccessible to the traditional tools of history. “Prehistory” is both temporally vague and accessible via two opposing methods—popular speculation and science. Unlike early twentieth-century historians, who relied largely on written accounts, archives and journals to reconstruct stories of long ago, archaeologists of the period used material remains to explore and explain the past. “Prehistory” was crucial for archaeologists in interlocking ways. The “prehistoric” defined archaeology’s field of examination: it differentiated archaeological work from that of historians reading Spanish chronicles as a source material. American Archaeology could define its scope as that which was before history; “prehistoric” was, then, a conceptual space of archaeological expertise, with its own analytical methods. With a scope and a method, the enshrinement of “prehistoric” in the American Antiquities Act laid out an uncontested field within which archaeological work could prosper. As McManamon and Snead have pointed out, professionalization was strengthened all the more within the context of the Act’s progressive goals of scientific knowledge, university training programs, resource preservation, and public education through museum display.

As demonstrated in the first chapter, American anthropological science in the nineteenth century found it difficult to shake the usage of stages or levels of civilizations. As Hewett composed the draft, the American public was primed for understanding the progression of the past in terms of technologically and materially determined epochs—for instance, in the classic Stone, Bronze and Iron Age sequence. In passing the legislation, the sequential and progressively developmental understanding of history would be even more difficult to cast off. In other words, archaeologically minded individuals in the early twentieth century understood American Indians to have some form of history, but it was up to others to reconstruct that past, be they scientists

---

62 There is also evidence of the AIA’s understanding of “prehistoric” as a sort of timeless period, which was especially used to describe Native American culture. In a pamphlet describing the learned society appears the phrase: “The importance of prehistory ethnology as aiding in the solution of obscure problems in the archaeology of antiquities of higher stages of culture becomes each decade more and more apparent.” For an example of Bandelier’s use of “prehistoric,” see Adolph Bandelier, “Final Report of Investigations Among the Indians of the Southwestern United States, Carried on Mainly in the Years from 1880–1885. Part II,” *Papers of the Archaeological Institute of America—American Series IV* (1892), 589–590. For the AIA, see The Archaeological Institute of America [AIA], “The Archaeological Institute of America 1904–1905,” Pamphlet, Box 11, Folder 7, Archaeological Institute of America Records.
or storytellers. Indian stories constituted a timeless idyll beside the scientific chronology of “prehistoric” developments (usually a technological comparison), and because these stories could not be reconciled with predominating scientific structures—the language of epochs and ages—Amerindians had no real say in their own deep, or even recent, past.

Conclusion

This chapter has shown that preservationist thinking in America in the early twentieth century turned on questions of jurisdictional control, qualitative scientific practice and the field of historical interpretation. Through tracing the different approaches to antiquities preservation, I have presented the groundwork for the conceptualization of the deep past (or “prehistory”) through material evidence, the terms of its access through excavation, and the available interpretative outcomes that can be offered. Though the consequences were not fixed, by and large the deep history of the continent and the continuity between the inhabitants of America in past times and the contemporaneous American Indians was restricted to all but a few parties and, at least in the case of antiquities, largely in governmental control. The story of history—as written by scientists, professional historians or enthusiastic observers—was altered by the passage of the Antiquities Act. Though less apparent at the moment, boundaries were placed on time, space and authority; the very people whose ancestors lived the past—leaving behind the monumental ruins, artistic works, and everyday tools that were protected by the Antiquities Act—were silenced.

I have shown that the diffuse concept of “prehistory” (and similar words) as used in the American Antiquities Act was a charged term whose effects can be seen in a variety of areas of the American intellectual landscape. In the ways these words circulated through legislative iterations, I argued that the Act fixed certain temporal and material-cultural designations about Amerindians in the American scientific and popular consciousness. The bill’s language enshrined definitions in history and archaeology in both temporal (prehistoric vs. historical) and technological (artifacts, architecture, burials) terms. “Prehistory” became conditioned as a categorization of a world with a narrow field of knowledgeable, qualified inquiry. Through archaeology, education and the popularization of the deep past, “prehistory” percolated into American society at large as a term comprehensible enough for everyday Americans to understand its suite of meanings—ancient, timeless, ahistorical, unwritten. Atop this “prehistoric” ground the ideas of intellectual and political development, Anglo-American settlement, and material-technological progress could be laid, bringing a contrast to the progressive aims of the American nation and establishing a direct link with a distant past of which Americans could be proud.
Chapter 3

Acts of Preservation and the Professional Archaeologist

Hitherto Westerners have been too busy making a living and getting rich to bother their heads much about cliff dwellings and cave homes, but the time will come when men and women will feel a curiosity to know something of the prehistoric past of the Southwest.

Eugene Parsons, “The Mesa Verde National Park,” American Antiquarian (1906)\(^1\)

Eugene Parsons anticipated an emerging interest in the “prehistoric” past of America in an article on Mesa Verde, an expansive network of cliff dwellings located in southwestern Colorado. Parsons understood that to the eyes of average Americans, Mesa Verde would be an impressive representation of the former “semi-civilization” on American soil—these average Americans needed only to be informed of its existence. With the passage of the Antiquities Act in 1906, monuments to America’s past were to be protected by the President’s proclamation power, and it was the federal government’s obligation to ensure that antiquities of archaeological interest were protected from harm.

While the law guaranteed preservation, the reality of the process of protection was slow moving immediately following the Act’s passage, as technicalities and bureaucracy arrested previous momentum. The Act was passed in a moment of compromise, and with so many stakeholders and a complicated permit-granting system, the law was effectively stalled by disagreement over the rules and regulations that determined who could excavate and where uncovered artifacts were to be housed. When amendments to the rules and regulations were finally passed nearly a year after the initial approval of the Act, archaeological discourse had turned to a different question—what made an archaeologist a professional? To answer this question the theory and method of archaeological preservation would need to be put into practice. Excavation techniques were not the only practical concern. Previously, I showed the variations in archaeological and historical

\(^1\) Quoted in Duane A. Smith, The Mesa Verde National Park (Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 1988), 65.
paradigms—through anthropological theory in the first chapter and via congressional legislation in the second—that addressed the deep past of North America. In the present chapter, I follow the advocates of scientific and popular archaeology into the “field,” pursuing the conceptualization of preservation and history after the Act. As this chapter will show, conflicting paradigms of archaeological and preservationist thought were deployed on archaeological sites in the Southwest—as if in a race to establish a precedent.

All parties believed that the active preservation of ruins should minimize further damage and control access to archaeological sites to ensure their present appearance was retained. Beyond this, archaeologists, concerned individuals, local residents and politicians had a diversity of views on three elements of preservation: (1) the future of particular ruins, (2) public access, and (3) the relevance of the past—as information contained in the ruins—to the present. I argue that the various understandings of these three aspects of preservationism fall into two narrative categories—the scientific and popular paradigms that have appeared throughout this thesis—each with different conceptualizations of how the story of the past should be told.

In this chapter, I look at the two ends of this (heuristic) spectrum of preservationist views, locating preservation-minded individuals that fall at different places within this scheme. In addition to Hewett, two characters are familiar from the first chapter, Franz Boas and Charles Lummis. These assertive, archaeologically inclined men each conceptualized an American archaeology aimed toward different ends. For Boas, preservation and subsequent excavation of antiquities was first and foremost scientific and secondarily educational. For Lummis, preservationism was more promotional and romantic (or idealized) in that he considered himself a Westerner first and human scientist second. Parallel to these men, I contrast the preservationist thinking of two women who were proponents of regional development of archaeological resources, Virginia McClurg and Lucy Peabody. One-time allies, a split between these two over the preservation and regulation of Mesa Verde highlights different attitudes toward preservation. McClurg was what one might call a romantic, who believed that loose interpretations could be justified to promote economic development and the dissemination of knowledge about geographically and culturally distinct pasts of the United States. Peabody, on the other hand, was a proponent of federal protection and region-centered archaeology; in other words, Peabody believed that regional archaeological groups should engage in excavation on federally protected land, thereby simultaneously promoting regional and national interests in the deep past.

Through Edgar Lee Hewett’s engagements with all four of these individuals, I will show the educator’s preservationist position lay near center of the spectrum. Neither fully scientific nor absolutely populist, I contend that Hewett’s ambiguous stance allowed him to draw theoretical
and practical elements from these preservationists to create a foundational framework for a proposed School of American Archaeology (SAA). The SAA was sanctioned by the AIA, and was designed to create a cadre of “professional” archaeologists. Though the discipline had been professionalized in its legal sanctioning by the United States government, the question remained open as to what constituted a “professional” archaeologist. As Hewett was the interlocutor through which the terms of professionalism were to work out following the Act, this chapter shows a variety of conceptualizations of the “professional.”

Hewett had been raised in the West and his self-directed education and belief in experiential pedagogy aligned him with the popular and promotional camp. However, he clearly desired acceptance from scientists, as documented by his reverential correspondence with anthropologists such as Putnam and pursuit of a doctoral degree. By having a foot in both scientific and popular camps, Hewett had the unique ability to siphon energy and resources from one theater to another. His political and educational connections spanned the entire country, which put him in an ideal position to develop American archaeology through the SAA.²

The SAA was the first field school for archaeology specifically geared toward prehistoric research on the American continent. The ultimate choice for the school’s locale, Santa Fe, New Mexico, was a contentious decision and, as this chapter shows, a decided boon to the “popular” camp. Indeed, the process of choosing a suitable location was indicative of various opinions that existed within the AIA’s upper ranks regarding the method, scope, and practice of archaeology and its object, the “prehistoric” past. The victors—Hewett and a Western leaning, “popular” contingent—marked a substantial shift in power from the so-called elite institutions and archaeology faculty on the East Coast to the self-promoting, “nationalizing” archaeology in the West.³

Preparing for Preservation and Celebrating Formal Incorporation of the AIA
In December of 1906, after the June passage of the Antiquities Act, the AIA prepared to inaugurate an era of archaeological practice in America, moving to correct its formerly paltry American work. The AIA had been federally incorporated around the time of the Act’s passage, ensuring national recognition and endowing the institute a legal body capable of possessing property.⁴ At a party celebrating the AIA’s formal incorporation held on January 2nd, 1907, Alice

---
⁴ A Bill Incorporating the Archaeological Institute of America, S. 5131, 59th Cong.
Cunningham Fletcher (1838–1923), chairwoman of the AIA’s American Committee and a noted ethnologist of the Plains Indians, conveyed the immediate need to map the nation’s “culture areas,” on which ongoing American archaeological work could be correlated and regional gaps would be exposed. The map plan laid the groundwork for a substantial organizational project that would gather all American work done under the auspices of the AIA. “A preparatory step toward the carrying out of this basal plan would be the appointment of an officer to be known as Director of American Archaeology, whose immediate duty would be to direct and coordinate all work undertaken by the affiliated societies of the Institute,” said Fletcher. “This step should be followed by the establishment of a School of American Archaeology, in which graduate students should be received for instruction and employment in field research, and so fitted to be workers in the wide field opened by this basal plan.”

Edgar Lee Hewett, riding on the success of his legislative drafting, was then announced as the Director of American Archaeology and of the School of American Archaeology. With field schools in the Classical world, an American school represented a natural extension of the reach of the AIA. Already, the location of such a school had been discussed. “If a school of American Archaeology should be established in Santa Fé, the old Governor’s palace would probably be placed at their disposal,” Fletcher noted. The AIA’s East Coast anthropology professors believed Hewett was the man for the sort of promotional work that would fall under the capacity of Director of American Archaeology, but questions arose regarding his credibility and ability to run a school intended to train professionals. Eminent professors such as Boas openly questioned Hewett’s ability to conduct thorough research in a scientific way, and sought to rein in Hewett’s control over the new institution and its educational mission. The wheels of the SAA were already in motion, however, and though lacking a home base for the school, Hewett wrote to Frederic Ward Putnam, curator of Harvard’s Peabody Museum, asking the anthropology professor to put an advertisement for a summer field school in the student newspaper, the Harvard Crimson.

The Hindrance of the Rules and Regulations
Meanwhile, practicing archaeologists around the country awaited the publication of the rules and regulations mentioned in the Antiquities Act, which would outline the permit-granting process. Members of the AIA believed that the rules would be crafted along the general lines of Act—institutional qualification, science-minded collecting practices, and transparent publications of results—but would be explicit in its stringent adherence to scientific principles. The government,

---


6 Snead, Ruins and Rivals, 79.
however, had to come to grips with its own understandings of preservation and democratic scientific practice.

The Secretaries of Agriculture, War, and the Interior released a set of “Uniform Rules and Regulations” on December 28th, 1906, five days before Hewett became the AIA’s Director of American Archaeology. The first rules were marked by negative language, and sounded more like restrictions than an outline for the permit-granting process to educational and scientific organizations. Archaeologists were surprised to learn that no exclusive permits would be granted, which meant that proud field excavators would have to compete with multiple teams on archaeologically rich ground that may not be more than several acres in size. Further, time limits were set, and exhaustive reports were required in triplicate. One set of reports was required to go to the Smithsonian for review, in addition to a copy of collection descriptions and photographs, frustrating the proponents of an independent science, especially those who remembered the failure of Reverend Henry Baum’s bill in 1904.

The rules stipulated that, during the excavation, institutions were responsible for restoration of the site to a “satisfactory” state, determined by a field officer from one of the three empowered departments. It was unclear if “restoration” meant structural stabilization, as in the Casa Grande preservation appropriation of 1889, or simply that teams must carefully reorganize altered remains; no further indication of conservation or continued preservation was given. Most significantly, a clause stated that preservation and investigation should, whenever possible, be done “in situ.” This was almost universally condemned, as the restriction of archaeological activity to the field was not only costly, but also went against the cause of archaeological promotion and development because the clause could be invoked to restrict any collection activities. Moreover, the government thereby maintained control over all antiquities by requiring them to remain in situ, on federally owned land.

The rules’ most contentious point, however, was a blatant contradiction. Following the “in situ” requirement for excavation and study, strict rules mandated that collections from sites always be located in public museums; violation of this public display requirement would result in the

7 Uniform Rules and Regulations, 28 December 1906, Edgar Lee Hewett Vertical File, Fray Angélico Chávez Library, Museum of New Mexico, Santa Fe, New Mexico.
8 Letters to Edgar Lee Hewett, 1.1, Edgar Lee Hewett Papers, Fray Angélico Chávez Library, Museum of New Mexico, Santa Fe, New Mexico.
appropriation of all objects to the possession of the Smithsonian Institution. In this way, the Act’s rules and regulations began by envisioning the public visiting monuments protected in situ, but ended with an image of the museum-goer. These conflicting understandings indicated to archaeologists that the relationship between antiquities and the public had not been resolved by the government offices.

As the new Director of American Archaeology and crafter of the legislation from which the rules came, Hewett immediately heard the discontent brewing among his fellow AIA members. He set to work on a revised set of rules, sending copies of the government document to noted archaeologists to be hand-corrected by them and mailed back to Hewett, who would compile the corrections into a replacement draft. Following this epistolary round of editing, Hewett presented a newly conceived rule set to the three government offices. After some initial resistance, Hewett’s recasting was adopted, the second such victory for the educator.

Hewett’s amended rules and regulations were released in June 1907, nearly a year after the passage of the Act and six months after the first rulebook. Reflecting the influence of archaeologists and educators, the amended rules approached the preservation and excavation of archaeological sites from a broader perspective that offered flexibility in excavation and the public’s relationship with the material past.

Several alterations were notable. The “in situ” clause was struck entirely from the second version, and additional time for study was granted to excavators and scientists. An exclusivity clause was added, which allowed single-party excavations to be granted on “specific sites”—“a structure or a closely related group of structures with such accessories as burial places, reservoirs, ditches, ceremonial places, etc.” Hewett’s version included forms that standardized the permit-granting process, thereby removing the previous vague requirements for legal access to archaeological sites. Finally, addressing preservation, the new rules indicated that “every reasonable precaution” was to be used for the protection (but not necessarily restoration) of

---

9 “Every collection made under the authority of the act and of these rules and regulations shall be preserved in the public museum designated in the permit and shall be accessible to the public. No such collection shall be removed from such public museum without the written authority of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and then only to another public museum, where it shall be accessible to the public; and when any public museum, which is a depository of any collection made under the provisions of the act and these rules and regulations, shall cease to exist, every such collection in such public museum shall thereupon revert to the national collections and be placed in the proper national depository.” Uniform Rules and Regulations, Government Document, 28 December 1906. Copy from Edgar Lee Hewett Vertical File.

10 Letters to Edgar Lee Hewett, 1.1, Edgar Lee Hewett Papers.

11 Uniform Rules and Regulations [Revised], undated [June 1907?]. Copy found in 1.1, Edgar Lee Hewett Papers.
standing walls and burial places with human bones were to be reburied if not of use to science.\textsuperscript{12}

The role of the “field officer” had been considerably altered in the second iteration of the rules, wherein the previous role of supervisor had been recast into a multifunctioning preservationist, protector, manager, and tour guide. If the site were deemed a National Monument by order of the President, custodians would be deployed to the region, who were

required to give their entire time to the care of the property under their charge. They must keep ruins in the condition in which left by excavators and repairers, report needed repairs, prevent the unauthorized carrying away of specimens and the injury of property, keep a register of visitors, when required to do so, and be at all times ready to receive, guide, and give information to them. They shall report from time to time any surface finds made by themselves or visitors, and hold the same subject to the order of the Department. They are forbidden to accept gratuities.\textsuperscript{13}

Hewett’s new role for field officers confirms that visitors were expected at the monuments. Visitors were seen to be able to engage with their appropriated deep history on the very ground in which it was situated, under the controlled guidance of a custodian. This caretaking activity was seen to be unrelated to excavation, and would facilitate both protection and presentation while freeing archaeologists to do their own work. Indeed, the shifting language from version one to version two indicates that independent scientific parties would produce the evidence of the past, narrate how it was the be presented, and then rely on the government to act as its steward.

\textbf{Boas and the Isolation of the East}

Even those with the highest standards were pleased with Hewett’s redrafting; “heartily approve regulations as drafted by your committee,” telegraphed Boas.\textsuperscript{14} The professor’s assessment, however, merely noted Hewett was a diplomatic and agile organizer. Boas was wary of Hewett’s actual archaeological abilities, as he reflected several years later,

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{12} As for the Smithsonian, it was to maintain an advisory role regarding the application process, and the imagined benefit of a “public museum” still existed. Also remaining in the second version was the ability for government agents to seize any illegally excavated material and arrest the offenders. Further, a courtesy clause was added, extending a mandate to treat all excavators with respect and, importantly, without suspicion. Uniform Rules and Regulation, 1.1, Edgar Lee Hewett Papers.

\textsuperscript{13} Uniform Rules and Regulations, 1.1, Edgar Lee Hewett Papers.

\textsuperscript{14} Telegraph, Boas to Hewett, 20 May 1907, 1.1, Edgar Lee Hewett Papers.
\end{flushright}
So far as I know, Mr. Hewett is capable of conducting an examination of a local archaeological site, but he has never succeeded in convincing me that he has a knowledge of objects of archaeological and, in general, anthropological research. His paper, “On the Groundwork of American Archaeology,” may be cited to substantiate this point.\footnote{Letter from Boas to Kelsey, 16 December 1910, SAR Archives, Santa Fe, New Mexico.}

Boas’ condemnation in 1910 stemmed from the inferior archaeological and educational activities he perceived in Hewett and the School of American Archaeology. Boas was no doubt referring in part to a now-famous account of the first SAA field season in the summer of 1907. Putnam’s Crimson advertisement had attracted three students—Sylvanus Morley, Alfred Kidder, and John Gould Fletcher—who ventured with Hewett to McElmo Mesa in southeastern Utah. After setting up camp, Kidder recalled,

Hewett waved an arm and said, “I want you boys to make an archaeological survey of the region. I’ll be back in six weeks. You’d better get some horses.”\footnote{Kidder’s story is quoted from Nancy Owen Lewis and Kay Leigh Hagan, A Peculiar Alchemy: A Centennial History of SAR 1907–2007 (Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 2007), 6.}

Though lacking guidance during the summer of 1907, Kidder and Morley went on to become distinguished, nationally recognized archaeologists (Fletcher dropped the discipline for literary pursuits). The next summer field season saw the return of Kidder, who was joined by two Harvard professors, Roland B. Dixon and Alfred Tozzer (1877–1954), for an excavation in Hewett’s favorite archaeological area, the Pajarito Plateau. Tozzer and Hewett did not get along, the former finding the latter volatile and unprofessional, and despite the loyalty of the younger generation, Tozzer communicated his lack of faith in Hewett’s abilities to his colleagues on the East, including Boas.

Tozzer and Boas held archaeology to be akin to carefully reconstructing a puzzle, one piece at a time. Boas explicated his methodological requirements in his 1910 letter against Hewett:

The criticism which I make in this respect is a fundamental one: the progress of science requires slow and steady work by well-trained observers, and forbids work by local talent that requires supervision. The artificial stimulation of local interests, without the possibility of insisting on and providing for scientific work, appears to me little short of criminal, because the remains are much safer where they are, under ground, where they may await the time when competent men will save them.\footnote{Letter from Boas to Kelsey, 16 December 1910, SAR Archives. It should be noted that this letter from Boas regards Hewett’s ability to run a school; I believe the quote to be an accurate reflection of Boas’ view of Hewett in 1907 and afterwards.}
Though Hewett’s “artificial stimulation” of interest was mandated by his directorship, promotional work had become an imperative part of archaeology since the late nineteenth century and the practice complicated the integrity Boas hoped archaeology would have. As James Snead shows in *Ruins and Rivals*, patronage was essential to funding American archaeology, a necessity of which Boas was aware. Nonetheless, Boas was rigid on the point of amateur archaeology—the respected academic despised the idea of unqualified people digging for relics in the ground, regardless of any intentions for scientific advancement or commercial gain. Boas held a personal requirement of professionalism, and he trained many of the soon-to-be leading archaeologists of the 1910s and 20s. Boas and his scientifically minded compatriots initially saw the Antiquities Act as an opportunity, and “used the new momentum to promote the American field, further professionalize the discipline, and consolidate the hold of the universities and major museums on the conduct of archaeology.”

Hewett, who was not tied down by a university appointment, had the time, energy, and Western connections to promote archaeology and gather patrons around the institute; even as he worked to recast the rules and regulations, he operated as a sort of travelling archaeological lobbyist, securing new members to regional AIA societies and stimulating new interest in America’s deep past. Boas, only secondarily interested in the presentation and educational value of archaeology, could not harness controlled, “slow and steady” archaeological work. As Snead puts it, in Hewett, Boas and other East Coast anthropologists “faced a rival who was constructing a personal network largely beyond their influence.”

**The Promotion of the Southwest: The Legacy of Charles Lummis**

In 1907, Hewett was building such a network while actively promoting the establishment of

---

19 Snead, *Ruins and Rivals*, 50.
20 In the account presented in this thesis, few archaeologists had the same qualified training as Boas. Most “trained” archaeologists, including Boas, were students of Frederic Ward Putnam, a Harvard curator and professor of archaeology who tended to be more sympathetic toward the “promotion” camp than his former pupil.
regional affiliates for the AIA, per the Institute’s request. Francis Kelsey (1858–1927), the AIA vice president and professor at the University of Michigan, was actively interested in developing the Institute’s regional societies because affiliate growth would, it was thought, stimulate regional archaeological interest, increase scientific patronage, and fill the society’s coffers. Kelsey put faith in Hewett. He knew from the educator’s agile diplomacy during the Antiquities Act that Hewett could get along with Westerners, who took pride in their disdain for the overly intellectual East. Kelsey perceived that Western cultural and scientific institutions operated on different principles, and that men such as Hewett were on board with the archaeological aims of Easterners in theory but that, in practice, the West did things in a different style.

No one embodied this different style better than Charles Lummis of the AIA’s Los Angeles chapter, the Southwest Society. Lummis had been a thorn in the side of the AIA for some time; a famed journalist and sometime sidekick of Adolph Bandelier, Lummis had filled the Southwest Society’s membership rolls with more subscribers than any other affiliate. In cranky and colorful language Lummis had berated AIA President Thomas Day Seymour in 1905–1906 to reverse the affiliate society’s dues to the overarching institution, threatening to secede from the AIA if his demands were not met. Seymour refused; at the end of November 1906, the Southwest Society withdrew from the AIA. Communications continued, however, as Hewett stepped in to mediate. The
AIA eventually decided that Lummis’ group in the West was too promising to pass up. Seeking to appease the uppity Westerner, the AIA included Lummis in its developmental committees in the early years of the twentieth century.

Though the Southwest Society problems were at root financial issues, the strength of the society’s membership was due to Lummis’ promotional fervor. President Seymour’s difficulties with Lummis reveal the tension between East and West, the former being of an anthropological mindset similar to Boas: steady, careful, top-down scientific work. Lummis, on the other hand, took a wide view of the discipline of archaeology, which he used predominantly as a tool for the promotion of the West as a region in the midst of developing a distinct culture.

For Lummis, the Southwest was an America entirely different from the puritanical Northeast. Through *Land of Sunshine* (Figure 23, later retitled *Out West*), Lummis championed the idea of the “West” (by which he meant the territory of the Mexican Cession, and thereby more accurately represented as the Southwest) as rugged but charmed: it was beautiful and open, by

26  Lummis to Seymour, 14 August 1905, Box 11, Folder 8, Archaeological Institute of America Records.

27  Lummis to Seymour, 14 August 1905, Box 11, Folder 8, Archaeological Institute of America Records.
turns Himalayan in its epic ranges and sublime power and Mediterranean in climate and lifestyle. Along with a geographical distinction from the East, to Lummis’ mind the West also possessed a history unique to the country. Lummis ventured through the Southwest with Bandelier in the early 1880s, and, as mentioned in Chapter One, considered the region the “National Rip Van Winkle—United States that is not United States.”

Archaeology was crucial to Lummis’ conception of the Southwest because the practice revealed a long duration of “human” presence captured in the ruins—historical evidence that would also appeal greatly to the public. Indeed, Lummis sought to create a Southwestern museum to showcase the archaeology and history of the region. But while a museum was useful for educational curation, the visual experience it would provide would be equally valuable; to his mind, inhabitants of the Southwest were captured within a continuum linking past history and present progress.

With Lummis, at times it appeared as if one’s physiology would change upon entering the Southwest, that one would become a different person entirely—an experience people like Hewett understood from the relief provided to TB patients in the hot, arid climate of the region. Lummis’ Southwesterners shared a similar consciousness due to the spatial and temporal effects that geography, climate and archaeology endowed on inhabitants. Land of Sunshine and Lummis’ romantic novels conveyed the literary sublime of the Southwest, while the Southwest Society focused on promoting the mythologies and material cultures of Native Americans in the region population.

For Lummis, the West was autochthonous—generative, alive, casting people into a distinctive type as they adapted to the environment. Lummis’ phenomenology, following Johannes Fabian, naturalized time in a similar way to evolutionism, because it presupposed intersubjectivity, meaning that it assumed that all participants in social interactivity shared a similar orientation of consciousness. For Lummis, preserving archaeological ruins was part and parcel of maintaining the history and ethos of the region.

Hewett shared Lummis’ belief that preservation of archaeological resources in the West was crucial to reconstructing and perpetuating the distinct heritage of the American Southwest. Hewett’s own archaeological interests were centered in the region, as indicated by the 1907 and 1908 field schools in Utah and New Mexico, respectively. In addition to work related to the field school, Hewett travelled extensively in the Four Corners region in 1906–1908 for his ongoing

29 Snead, Ruins and Rivals, 128.
dissertation, for government-backed archaeological surveys, and to promote preservation through local archaeological societies. Of particular interest was the Mesa Verde area of Colorado, as it had inspired locals to actively pursue protection and promotion of the site.

**Virginia McClurg, Mesa Verde, and the Colorado Cliff Dwellers Association**

In 1906, preservation of Mesa Verde had been a regional priority for over two decades. Virginia McClurg (1857–1931), a prominent citizen of Colorado Springs, journeyed to Mesa Verde in 1886 with a group of amateur explorers and was inspired to protect the vast array of sites. Before McClurg, the ruins scattered about the Mancos valley had been known to Anglo-Americans for years through the photos of William Henry Jackson, who captured the area on film in 1874. But, on that day, McClurg’s amateur exploration team discovered the famous “Balcony House” at Mesa Verde [Figure 24], which would become one of the chief touristic attractions and areas of scientific interest of the complex.\(^{31}\) McClurg later recalled that as they entered Balcony House, they witnessed

> beams of dark red cedar, with loops and bands of yucca fibre, extended across the room and were secured in niches in the walls. On the floor below lay all the spindles, bobbins, and loom-sticks of hard wood. I was ten years less wise than now. I did not realize that this was a unique treasure, the like of which will probably never be seen again. The two priceless beams we brought with us, and forgive us, O Science! We were so enfeebled by insufficient food and bad water that we were forced to leave them half way down the cliff.\(^{32}\)

The excitement of experiencing deep history firsthand captured McClurg’s party and intoxicated them to the degree that scientific foresight left them entirely. Realizing the error and how easily one could destroy such precious objects, McClurg dedicated herself to preserving the ruins. McClurg’s memory reveals the impressive condition of the remains during the early years of Anglo-American exploration of Mesa Verde, a condition that was in jeopardy in part because of curious explorers like herself. Though regretting her first misstep, she saw a difference between tourists, or people who seek to visit a place just to experience it, and relic-hunters, who she thought were decimating the ruins in search of pottery. Both sorts of people brought relics away from ruins, but the latter group did so in greater quantities and without regard for condition.


By regulating touristic ventures, many people could experience the same ambiance and mystery that captured the early explorers of Mesa Verde, in addition to receiving a sense of the deep past.

McClurg was unafraid to flex her connections and work hard to achieve her preservation goals. She lectured about the prehistoric world of the cliff dwellers, captivating a large enough audience that she spoke at the 1893 Columbia Exposition in Chicago on the subject. Following another lecture, “The Prehistoric West,” in 1894, a petition was circulated asking Congress to protect the Mesa Verde complex as a national park. Though the petition was unsuccessful, it inspired McClurg to form the Colorado Cliff Dwellings Association (CCDA), a women’s group cast in the model of the preservationist Mt. Vernon Ladies Association, in 1895.

McClurg’s vice regent of the CCDA was another powerful woman in Colorado Springs, Lucy Peabody (1864–1934), the wife of a former executive of the US Geological Survey, Major William Sloane Peabody, and the sister-in-law to a future Colorado governor, James Peabody. By 1904, legislation for antiquities was becoming more common and a CCDA-backed bill specific to Mesa Verde was drafted. In the following two years, as the federal preservation of Mesa Verde seemed increasingly likely, Peabody and McClurg fell out over a disagreement regarding federal versus state control over the proposed Mesa Verde National Park. McClurg had previously supported federal preservation, but seems to have changed her mind in 1905, desiring the CCDA to administer and protect the ruins complex as a State Park. As Mesa Verde historian Duane A. Smith points out, McClurg’s proposition “would, in effect, place the cliff dwellings under her control.” Meanwhile, Peabody had drafted a bill that was submitted to Congress by the Colorado Representative Herschel Millard Hogg. The bill (H.R. 5998) made its way through
the House and was supported on the Senate floor by Senator Thomas Patterson, also of Colorado. Incidentally, the Hogg Bill relied on inaccurate information, wherein the proposed withdrawal excluded the major ruin sites entirely and instead encompassed some of the Ute Indian Reservation. McClurg used this misinformation against Peabody and the Hogg Bill, but was thwarted by a last-minute amendment drafted by Hewett.

Hewett had previously surveyed parts of Mesa Verde for William Henry Holmes (himself a surveyor of the ruins in 1875) of the Bureau of American Ethnology, and realized that the Department of the Interior, which would control any proposed national parks, held the jurisdiction of Indian land. Hewett wrote Holmes,

A simple amendment to the bill extending the jurisdiction of the park officers over all the ruins within five miles of the boundary established in the bill would completely compass the desired end and could work no injustice to the Ute Indians since both they and their lands are under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, which department also has control of all National parks.37

The Utes, who were unrelated to the Anasazi of Mesa Verde by their own account (and by ethnology of the day), were not included in the discussion. Distant American history would be protected by the present nation. The error was saved by amendment, and on June 27, 1906, President Theodore Roosevelt signed the Mesa Verde Bill into law, 21 days after the Antiquities Act.

**The Manitou Cliff Dwellings**

Anticipating the bill’s success, Hewett had told Holmes of the value of Mesa Verde and its benefits to science, history, and public enjoyment and edification.

37 Hewett to Holmes, 12 June 1906, Box 1, Folder 4, Archaeological Institute of America Records.
There can be no doubt as to the advisability of the government assuming control of this great archaeological district and opening it up to the public. These are unquestionably the greatest prehistoric monuments within the limits of the United States. Aside from their great historic and scientific value, I doubt if there are any objects in our country in the form of either cultural remains or natural wonders that would be of more general interest to the public.\footnote{38}

Mesa Verde, then, held the sort of scientific archaeological value that would suit Boas but also had the potential to attract a plethora of Americans to Lummis’ West, where they would experience firsthand the deep past of the country. Following the passage of the Mesa Verde Act, Peabody set to work finding a superintendent to run the park, removing herself as vice-regent of the CCDA and rising to Secretary of the Colorado Society of the AIA. McClurg, though her regionalist vision was not realized, also worked to find a supervisor for the park. Meanwhile, McClurg threw her support behind another “cultural remain,” Manitou Cliff Dwellings. The trouble was that the ancient Anasazis had never lived as far north as Manitou Springs, a small settlement near Colorado Springs.\footnote{39} Manitou’s cliff dwellings were fake, bricks from ruins elsewhere that were trucked in and built under a blown-out cliff face.

In February of 1907, an English professor at Colorado College and member of the AIA’s Colorado Society, Atherton Noyes, wrote to Edgar Lee Hewett about the controversial construction project in nearby Manitou Springs. In 1904, a new transplant to Manitou Springs named Harold Ashenhurst started the Manitou Cliff Dwellers’ Ruins Company. Anasazi ruins were not extant in Manitou Springs, but with the company’s incorporation Ashenhurst sought to change this. Upon finding a suitable spot in “Cliff Canyon,” the group blasted into the rock wall, opening up a grotto nearly thirty feet high. After dynamiting, Ashenhurst spent upward of

\footnote{38} Hewett to Holmes, 12 June 1906, Box 1, Folder 4, Archaeological Institute of America Records.

\footnote{39} Manitou Springs lies below the towering Pikes Peak of Colorado; referring to both the wellspring and the town, Manitou Springs was named after the Amerindian spiritual source “manitou,” an idea circulating in Anglo-American popular culture in the 1870s and 80s. The town was founded by Anglo-Americans after 1871, fashioning itself as a “Saratoga of the West,” a spa-like community a short distance from the larger financial and cultural center of Colorado Springs.
$100,000 in October 1906 moving an Anasazi settlement from privately-held land in McElmo Canyon in southwestern Colorado to Manitou Springs—amounting to some forty boxcar loads over a million pounds of rock.40 “Stone by stone,” the company prepared to reconstruct the ruin [Figure 25].41

Noyes had heard conflicting accounts of Hewett’s opinions on the project; how should dedicated and scientifically inclined AIA members react to the removal of an entire Anasazi ruin and the construction of a fake? Hewett responded, steadfast in his opposition to the project,

---

40 Manitou Cliff Dwellers’ Ruins Co., Historical Facts of the Ancient Cliff Dwellers and a Glimpse of the Ruins and Canon at Manitou (Colorado Springs: The Out West Printing and Stationary Co., 1907). Joseph Weixelman’s work on this problem indicates that Ashenhurst hired “ten cowboys at $2.50 a day to tear apart pueblo ruins north of Cortez [Colorado] and haul the sandstone blocks by wagon to Dolores, where they were loaded into 40 boxcars and hauled across the Rockies to Colorado Springs.” See Joseph Weixelman, “Hidden Heritage: Pueblo Indians, National Parks, and the Myth of the ‘Vanishing Anasazi’” (PhD diss., University of New Mexico, 2004), 356.

41 Information on Manitou Cliff Dwellings is sketchy at best. The best synthesis I know of to date is Weixelman, “Hidden Heritage,” in Chapter Eight of his dissertation. One source that talks about Manitou’s ruins in an aside is Marshall Sprague, Newport in the Rockies: The Life and Good Times of Colorado Springs (Athens, Ohio: Sage/Swallow Press, 1980), 155, 340. Sprague claims that McClurg actually fought the relocation of the ruins, but his study is not focused on Manitou Cliff Dwellings aside from its presence in his regional history. Other secondary sources used for the discussion of Manitou include Robertson, The Magnificent Mountain Women; Mary Swanson, “‘Let it be a Woman’s Park’: Gender, Identity and the Battle over Mesa Verde” Thinking Gender Papers (1 February 2009)(UC Los Angeles: UCLA Center for the Study of Women. Retrieved from: http://www.escholarship.org/uc/item/6x93f1v1); and Troy Lovata, Inauthentic Archaeologies: Public Uses and Abuses of the Past (Walnut Creek, California: Left Coast Press, 2007).
Such a structure in or near Colorado Springs would be absolutely without scientific value. No scientist would think of studying such a ruin except in situ, and as a means of teaching facts of archaeological science, the probability of error in reconstruction is so great as to make the results valueless if not actually misleading and pernicious.

Several lines later, Hewett even addresses the potential value of the site, only to reject it:

It will, of course, be said in extenuation of an act of this kind that “the ruins are being destroyed anyway by the owners and by other vandals. This will save them;” just as persons violating the laws of foreign countries against the carrying off of objects of antiquity say, “If we don’t take them they are wasted or taken by someone else.” This is moral obliquity which scarcely calls for comment.42

Noyes replied several days later. “Ashenhurst said to me, and repeated it to Dr. Fynn here the other day, that if it was shown that he was doing any harm to the cause of archaeology in moving those stones, he would leave them alone.”43 What had already been shipped to Manitou, however, could not be returned nor could Ashenhurst’s $100,000 investment. Noyes, it seems, justified the situation by noting that the entrepreneurs were maintaining some authenticity at the site. Mentioning a set of plans Ashenhurst had shown him, Noyes wrote, “the drawing shows that parts of the Balcony House, the Cliff Palace, and the Spruce Tree House are to be made in replica. ... They declare that extraordinary pains have been taken to make their copy exact in the small details, including the markings on the walls and the chinks in the walls.”44 Hewett thought little of this in his reply; to Hewett’s mind, there could be no authenticity in replication of Balcony House, Cliff Palace, and Spruce Tree House—all real Mesa Verde sites. In Figure 26, one can witness the shared facade elements in the authentic and the fake ruins. Also included alongside these turn-of-the-century pictures are contemporary images of the Mesa Verde sites in question, suggesting that later reconstructions at Mesa Verde produced similar results to the construction at Manitou.45

Noyes tried several times to get Hewett and the AIA to see the practical side of the Manitou matter; it appears he succeeded, at least in part. While the science was surely lacking, Hewett did not contradict Manitou’s interpretation of archaeological “resources.” Gained by technically legal

42 Hewett to Noyes, 15 February 1907, Edgar Lee Hewett Papers.
43 Noyes to Hewett, 21 February 1907, Edgar Lee Hewett Papers.
44 Noyes to Hewett, 21 February 1907, Edgar Lee Hewett Papers.
45 “The proposed building at Manitou is not to be a reproduction of the original structure from which the stones came (which was probably simply an ancient pueblo) nor is there to be any attempt to construct a genuine replica of any cliff dwelling in existence. It is simply a building following the cliff dwelling style of architecture with parts taken from several different structures. So the use of the ancient stones becomes quite useless and almost absurd and I hardly see what can be claimed for it.” Hewett to Noyes, 12 March 1907, Edgar Lee Hewett Papers.
purchase from a site on private land, there was no legal recourse for the Director of American Archaeology. Manitou, at least, could further promote the discipline of archaeology—so long as it was understood that the ruins were fake. From the perspective of Joseph Weixelman, writing on Hewett and the Manitou matter in his dissertation on Southwestern tourism and its relationship to constructed mythologies, Hewett may have simply decided that the promotional potential of Manitou—and its position along the touristic Denver & Rio Grande Railroad—was too great to pass up. Eventually, Noyes’ pressure on Hewett wore the educator down, and apparently he was present at the opening ceremony in 1907.46

Visitors coming to Manitou Cliff Dwellings after 1907 were sold a 25 cent pamphlet explaining the site. The document evoked the distant history of North America, where, once upon a time,

there dwelt among the canon [sic] fastness of what is now known as Colorado, a mighty race of men. Well versed in the science of warfare, irrigation, and scientific cultivation of the soil, skilled in the manufacture of weapons of offense, textile fabrics, pottery and ornamental jewelry, they lived and flourished in their fortified dwellings in the sheltered ledges along the faces of the cliffs ‘tending their fields and flocks, well provided with the necessities of life, and waging common warfare against their unfriendly neighbors.47

Deep history, here, was constructed on the vague backdrop of “Colorado.” Though later pamphlets hid the constructed nature of the ruins, this initial publication noted that “the inaccessibility of the original ruins prevents many from making the trip to the Cliff Dwellings, and it has remained for the enterprising citizens of Manitou to bring these interesting evidences of the pre-historic race of North Americans to a place where they can be easily seen and studied by the expenditure of the slightest effort.”48 In other words the region’s entrepreneurs brought the ruins to Manitou for the education of their countrymen and to further the economic development of their community. In so doing, these enterprising citizens reconstructed Mesa Verde’s deep past in the canyons just outside their town, moving the evidence of both time and place to suit their

46 While this does seem true, evidence is scarce and I cannot confirm this account. Future archival research will unravel more of this story, which I intend to compile into an article. See Weixelman, “Hidden Heritage,” 391.

47 Manitou Cliff Dwellers’ Ruins Co., Historical Facts of the Ancient Cliff Dwellers and a Glimpse of the Ruins and Canon at Manitou (Colorado Springs: The Out West Printing and Stationary Co., 1907). The copy examined in the present work is from the University of Pennsylvania Library. Further, “flocks” is a questionable addition to this already constructed narrative, as domesticated sheep, goats, cattle, and chickens arrived in American after 1492.

Figure 26

This page and the next, photographic comparison of Manitou Springs Cliff Dwellings and those at Mesa Verde, as they looked around 1900 and today.

All images on this page are from Manitou Cliff Dwellers’ Ruins Co, “Historical Facts of the Ancient Cliff Dwellers and the Glimpse of the Ruins and Canon at Manitou” (1907).

Next page, 1891 photos from Duane A. Smith, Mesa Verde National Park (1988), 1900 photo from Edgar Lee Hewett, “Circular relating to Historic and Prehistoric Ruins of the Southwest” (1904); all contemporary shots from the National Parks Service (nps.gov, accessed April 25th, 2011).

Below, two images of Spruce Tree House at Manitou.
Cliff Palace at Mesa Verde, as photographed in 1891.

Balcony House at Mesa Verde, as photographed in 1891.

Spruce Tree House at Mesa Verde, from around 1900.

Cliff Palace today, courtesy National Park Service.

Balcony House today, courtesy National Park Service. Note the significant reconstructions at Balcony House.

Spruce Tree House Today, courtesy National Park Service.
James Snead remarks on the fundamental belief in the promotional value—both educational and economic—of regional archaeology. “Rather than treat antiquities as exploitable resources, as had relic hunters, Hewett, McClurg, and their associates argued that ruins and artifacts of the Southwest were cultural assets to be shared by local residents as a whole. . . . Antiquities were also unique resources, to be preserved and exploited for the benefit of Southwesterners.” This exploitation was seen in Ashenhurst and his backer McClurg; as Peabody told Hewett, McClurg “had contented herself with her up-to-date cliff dwellings at Manitou. If the scheme is the success they anticipate her 50,000 shares of stock should be profitable.”

While McClurg may have been content with Manitou’s constructed past, Hewett was not keen on false representations, as shown above. But had Manitou been authentic, its storytelling would have appealed to him, as the idyllic Southwest was a successful image for promoting—and thereby continuing to preserve—the deep history of the Southwest.

The School of American Archaeology

Manitou alerted Hewett and the AIA to the immediate need for a strong, centralized advocate for responsible preservation of the past. The SAA, with Hewett as Director, was to be the headquarters of such a project. First, however, a location was required. The internal discussion within the AIA considered Colorado and other Southwestern territories, notably New Mexico. Los Angeles was suggested by Lummis and his Southwest Society, while some, like Franz Boas, desired the school to be located in Mexico City.

Peabody and the Colorado Society made direct overtures to the AIA to house the SAA in the state. Peabody determined it was crucial to get a political ally installed to oversee Mesa Verde who could woo the state government to house and provide funding for the SAA. The first superintendent of Mesa Verde, Major Hans Randolph, a member of the Colorado State Militia, was in part chosen by the Colorado Society because they believed he would be amenable to AIA

---

49 As Weixelman tells us, “A later, undated version of this pamphlet,” quoted from Hewett, among others. This indicates that Manitou was at least giving a nod to scientific archaeology, but other voices were underscoring the profit-making mindset of Manitou Cliff Dwellings. Weixelman, “Hidden Heritage,” 394. I have no had an opportunity to see this undated pamphlet, so I cannot corroborate Weixelman’s claim, nor his citation of an unpublished paper by Troy Lovata. An instructor from Pikes Peak Community College (Colorado Springs) named Ursula Monroe produced an undated pamphlet on the Manitou Cliff Dwellings. Monroe writes, “In 1907, the museum was acknowledged by Dr. E. L. Hewitt [sic], Director of American Archaeology, for it’s [sic] exact workmanship.” As the reader knows from my own work, Hewett did not have his PhD in 1907, and the vague “directorship” shows the lack of contextual depth put into these pamphlets.

50 Snead, Ruins and Rivals, 52.

51 Peabody to Hewett, 2 April 1907, Edgar Lee Hewett Papers.

52 For an involved description of the debates around whom would become the Superintendent of Mesa Verde, see Smith, Mesa Verde National Park: Shadows of the Centuries, ch. 5.
Peabody believed Randolph might attract Hewett and his school to Colorado. In May of 1907, she wrote to Hewett that, when it came to Major Randolph, “any suggestions you make will be considered as orders.”

Simultaneously, the Colorado Society was working to get an extravagant donation from the state’s newly elected Senator, Simon Guggenheim, who was the son of the wealthy smelting and mining magnate, Meyer Guggenheim. Major Randolph, it seems, was friendly with “Guggie’s” political allies, and Peabody boasted to Hewett that the Senator might be persuaded to provide a building for the SAA, complete with a significant endowment. The Senator might endow a building, Peabody wrote to Hewett,

He [Randolph] thinks that he can get the “powers” that made Guggie Senator, to go to him and explain what a lovely thing it would be for him to “give up” about $500,000 for a building for that purpose. Explain to him that no other United States Senator has ever done such a liberal thing and how his name will go down in history, both in the Old and New World, as a patron of the sciences! Now if we could get a building that would be a credit to both the Institute and the State, would that not reconcile you to coming to Denver? Randolph is ready to try, if I will help him and attend to the writing. He will get the political bosses ready for the proposition, then hie himself to the Mesa Verde and leave the rest to you and me. Before taking any steps, he wants to talk to you about it and get your ideas. “Guggenheim Hall”! Think of it!

Think Hewett did, but he had other options on the table. A proposal from the territorial government of New Mexico (with support from Hewett’s old friends in the Archaeological Society of Santa Fe) had offered its historic Palace of the Governors in Santa Fe to the AIA for the purposes of the school. The territorial government argued that Santa Fe was the city closest to the majority of ruins in the Southwest; the deal was sweetened with an offer of additional funding for the SAA. Further, it was suggested that the territorial government would also create and maintain a state history museum that would be attached to the school and work in tandem with it under a common administration. While New Mexico’s offer was not as lavish as Colorado’s, Santa Fe appealed to Hewett because he would become the director of the proposed “Museum of New Mexico” in addition to the SAA. To his mind, the Santa Fe proposal was best.

While Hewett felt confident in his decision, the AIA was working through the location problem on its own time. Arguments abounded, but finally, on December 19, 1908 Hewett and his allies overcame the dissenting members of the American Committee (namely Boas, Putnam, and

53 Peabody to Hewett, 27 May 1907, Edgar Lee Hewett Papers.
54 Peabody to Hewett, 10 May 1907, Edgar Lee Hewett Papers.
55 Joint Resolution #8, New Mexico Territorial Legislature, 1907.
Charles Bowditch), and the Palace of the Governors in Santa Fe was named the location for the School of American Archaeology.56

**Conclusion**

The idea of the school at its creation was that it would be a training center for professional archaeologists. While the SAA never became this sort of facility (becoming instead a cultural institution for the region), the climate in which it was developed shaped the focus and preservationist thinking of its Director, Edgar Lee Hewett. He sought to distance himself from the charged interests of Colorado’s archaeological scene, ultimately returning to New Mexico, where his archaeology and preservationism began. As Hewett stated, “the city of Santa Fe, in the midst of the great archaeological field has, I believe, a more substantial enthusiasm for archaeology than any other place and can, moreover, offer many inducements that no other place can.”57

Popular support of archaeology was thought to be crucial in the years after the Antiquities Act, as this chapter has shown. Boas and like-minded anthropologists were too self-serious and disconnected to the region and regional conceptions of history, and failed to win support from the American public, which desired accessible scientific inquiry to the deep past. Lummis, as shown, was able to conjure the history of America and portray it to people—a quality that Hewett ultimately picked up in his recasting of the rules and regulations, and his preservation work at Mesa Verde. Even Manitou, though problematic for history and archaeology, indicated rising economic interest in archaeological resources. But to utilize these resources, empirical science had to reach beyond the purist ethos of slow and steady research. Regional politics, therefore, still held sway on the ability for archaeological science to investigate, convey and promote interest in the deep past.

The regional influence of archaeology—which included the ability to furnish patrons—was well understood by Hewett and people such as Lummis in the AIA. This knowledge dictated the programming of the SAA once it had found its home in Santa Fe. In the end, the school designed to train professional archaeologists was affected by the discourse on preservation of archaeological resources and the cooptation of Native American history for Anglo-America.

---


57 Hewett to Kelsey, 24 April 1906, Edgar Lee Hewett Papers.
Conclusion

The School of American Archaeology was officially incorporated in Santa Fe, New Mexico, on February 19th, 1909, when the Territorial Legislation granted use of the Palace of the Governors for the school’s permanent facility. Further, a Museum of New Mexico was created, which was to be administered by the school, and which served as an outlet for the education of New Mexicans about the long history of the territory. Edgar Lee Hewett and his supporters in the AIA had successfully lobbied for Santa Fe and the Palace of the Governors as the school’s home, and the February legislation merely codified a negotiation process several years in the making. But beyond the logistical aspects of the founding of an institution, the SAA symbolized the power of preservationism. Hewett’s efforts began in earnest the preservationist movement in the United States, and he signaled that the preservation of historic, even “prehistoric,” national resources was a realizable goal in America, and one with a future through institutions like the SAA and the Museum of New Mexico.

The SAA was conceived within the AIA as an American-focused field school to supplement ongoing research headquarters in the Classical world. With the passage of the Antiquities Act in 1906, protecting American ruins of scientific and commemorative value, the SAA could capitalize on the exclusivity in excavation and research granted to their organization; it would “map” the cultures of America, past and present. The passage of the Act was crucial to the professionalization of archaeology, and while the SAA tried to fill the demand for well-trained professional archaeologists, its ability to do so faltered in the first years. In fact, within ten years, the name of the institute had changed to the School of American Research, dropping the word archaeology from its title entirely. However, where the training of professional archaeologists faltered, preservationism grew.

A 1987 history of the School of American Research (as it was known until 2007, when the name changed again to the School for Advanced Research) claims that Hewett envisioned the SAA as a “Smithsonian of the West,” but where archaeological research and presentation of its object, “prehistory”—were conjoined.
Hewett and his supporters saw the School and its Museum as part of a cultural complex that would some day evolve into a sort of “Smithsonian of the West.” The School was the administrative, research, and academic center of the institution; the Museum of New Mexico served as the interpretive, public education branch. The administration of the Museum by a private organization, the School, would protect it from the machinations of state politics—an essential component of Hewett’s plans.¹

The SAA, in actuality, had been formed from the preservationist ethos of the West, as I have shown. East Coast oversight (both the government and university faculty) was resisted and the continuum of history stretching back to the earliest humans to the contemporaneous American nation was highlighted. Where it failed to uphold the Boasian rigor in its training methods (recall Hewett’s alleged six week absence from the 1907 field school), it supplemented with a full-force promotional campaign for America’s distant past.²

Hewett had a vision for “prehistoric” America, though only glimpses could be caught in the years 1900–1908, when figures like Lummis, Boas and Putnam dominated the representation of the deep past. Hewett’s, however, was bound specifically to the Territory of New Mexico. Becoming the Director of the Museum of New Mexico, Hewett took on the role of curator. The Museum, which was housed in a seventeenth century “palace” of the former Spanish government, was renovated in an architectural synthesis of the deep past and its mud-and-brick adobe and cellular structure and the new aesthetic and sanitary codes. The past and the present were conjoined in a building; inside, the long durée of New Mexico history was presented for the residents of the territory, and the first exhibition “Old-New Santa Fe” presented the continuity between the deep past and the optimism of the American present, bridging the Pueblo Indians, the Spanish settlement, and the development of the American nation.³

The “semi-civilization” of the prehistoric past was connected to the American civilization of the present; the natural idyll became the American dream. The separation between prehistory on the one hand, which is representationally grouped with nature and non-human animals in the context of the museum, and history on the other is seen in galleries even today (see the American

³ For a history and analysis of the Palace of the Governors and the SAA, see Chris Wilson, *The Myth of Santa Fe: Creating a Modern Regional Tradition* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997).
Museum of Natural History or the Field Museum, for example). As this thesis has shown, preservationism and the presentation of temporal continuity in American history became viable under the guidance of Edgar Lee Hewett, his promotion and perseverance, and the crafting of the 1906 Antiquities Act. While we are rethinking many sorts of "historic" preservation in 2011, the residues of past thinking are hard to dismantle.

As this thesis has shown, preservationism and the presentation of temporal continuity in American history became viable under the guidance of Edgar Lee Hewett, his promotion and perseverance, and the crafting of the 1906 Antiquities Act. While we are rethinking many sorts of “historic” preservation in 2011, the residues of past thinking are hard to dismantle.

*   *   *

Preservation of the past, of history, was Hewett’s first and foremost interest, and he was the vehicle for this change in the first decade of the twentieth century in the United States. As Hewett stated in the opening of his dissertation, preservation was the first gesture of any archaeological endeavor—even if a site were later destroyed, the archaeologist approaches a given remain with a mind to document, to inscribe. Ironically, at the end of his life Hewett burned all of his field notes, sending up in flames the written accounts of the past that his preservationist work had facilitated.

In 1910, when Boas and other up-and-coming archaeologists such as Tozzer claimed Hewett was a poor excavator and archaeological pedagogue, they referred directly to his skills as a man who put a spade to dirt, opened up troves of data, and interpreted the results. While their criticisms may have been just, they passed over Hewett’s remarkable organizational capability and dedication to the cause of archaeological preservation. Without preservation, the remains of the deep past were in danger of being lost to science and the nation; Hewett was the character driven to securing the protection of monumental ruins for Anglo-Americans—scientists and laypeople alike. Above all else, he set a precedent for future preservation of historical resources.

This thesis has questioned the scope of empirical archaeological science and asserted that preservationism was a much larger field that stretched beyond archaeology and into regional cultural realms across the US. I have claimed that the theoretical rigor of empiricism was valid, particularly in the thought of Franz Boas. However, I have also conveyed that the mindset of scientific archaeology to pursue rigorous standards for excavation clashed with the pragmatic concerns of preservation of sites.

The first successful preservationist law was crafted by Hewett and passed in 1906. I have

---

4 As Don Fowler noted in 1986, the separation between nature and advanced technological culture “is further symbolized by the fact that even today contemporary Indian art works are shown in the Smithsonian Natural History Museum; contemporary Euroamerican art is shown in the Hirshhorn.” Don D. Fowler, “Conserving American Archaeological Resources” in American Archaeology Past and Future: A Celebration of the Society for American Archaeology 1935–1985, David J. Meltzer, Don D. Fowler, and Jeremy A. Sabloff, eds. (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1986), 151. Fowler contrasts the position on the United States with that of Mexico, which he sees as having conjoining “prehistory” and history in Quetzalcoatl and Guadalupe.

argued that the language of the Act, specifically its use of terms like “prehistory,” restricted the interpretation of Amerindian history to certain individuals. The terms and structure of the law designated a break between “historic” and “prehistoric” time, rendering the earlier period the exclusive domain of archaeological inquiry. Deemed “national resources” in the Act, objects of antiquity became the property of the US government and the history that could be read from the ruins became accessible only to qualified institutions. These never included American Indians. Hewett, though well-intentioned in his draft, erected boundaries for the writing of the deep history of the country and set the stage for the professional development of archaeology and its historical interpretation within that ground. At the same time, he primed the nation for future historic preservation and anthropological conservation that would continue to outline a specific image of America’s past.
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