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INTRODUCTION

It should always be remembered that the number of archaeological sites in the United States is strictly limited, and that once a site has been carelessly excavated, its value has been destroyed. These ancient ruins are really material documents that comprise the very stuff of American history.


By the early part of the 1890s, the American frontier, which in itself encapsulated the dreams and romantic ideals of a growing nation, closed, ending the so called "Manifest Destiny" and the nation's further westward expansion. The once little-explored lands of the western portion of the country were no longer out of reach to the common citizen, as the railroad now stretched from the Pacific to the Atlantic, and travel to the places in between became a matter of days, rather than a matter of weeks. By the time this happened, the documentation of the archaeological bounty of the American west was well underway. As early as the 1870s, the federal government

---

was sponsoring surveys and exploration in the region through the United States Geologic and Geographic Survey, and published materials relating to the wealth of natural and cultural resources in the area had become readily available. Collection of the antiquities of the region began in earnest as museums and private patrons put out the call to increase their holdings, not to mention their reputations. Both the American public and those from well beyond became fascinated with the cultures of the desert southwest, as they represented a pre-industrialized, uncomplicated way of life that had been lost to European-based cultures centuries before. They were anxious for images, artifacts, living examples, anything of this "savage" and curious land, whether it be representative of the past inhabitants, or those of the present day. Men and women who were daring enough sought to satisfy this demand, providing materials for museum exhibits, the World's Fairs and private purchase.

This interest held strong well into the early 20th century, with the public devouring that which was native to this part of the country with enthusiasm. The nation as a whole seemingly adopted the culture and history of the Native American as their common history, bringing a country of immigrants a past with which they could call purely American. Travel into the remote regions of the Southwest quickly escalated, as many
tour companies offered itineraries which included excursions into the grandest sites.\(^2\) With few limitations placed upon the tour companies or groups as to what they could visit or take as souvenirs of their travels, the fragile remains of the ancestral Puebloan cultures of what would become the four-corners region of the United States were being destroyed at the hands of those who claimed such an avid interest in their existence. This relative disregard for the value of these remains, for both their historicity and educational importance, was not limited to the casual tourist. Many learned men and women employed by well known institutions and museums also took part in the removal of artifacts from these sites under the guise of the new professionalism of anthropology. The beginnings of concern over these types of actions signified the beginning of the end of unregulated exploration.

The protection of cultural resources, both historic and prehistoric, and the concern for the value of such in terms of science and education, was a concept which developed in

\(^2\) One of the largest of the tour companies offering travel into the remote reaches of the Southwest during this period was the Fred Harvey Company. Harvey, a businessman who began his career in the Southwest in the management of hotels that were established for the Atchison, Topcksa & Santa Fe Railway, was a prominent figure in the creation of a thriving tourist business in the major cultural and natural attractions of the United States, particularly in the greater Southwest region. His Indian Department was a major player in the creation of displays intended for the World’s Fairs of the period, which depicted the lifeways, cultural material and architecture of the Native American, as were they major collectors and merchants in the artifacts of these groups. Hal Rothman, *On Rims and Ridges* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993) 110; and Snead, *Ruins and Rivals* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2001), 102.
the elite circles of the east coast in the latter part of the 19th century. This concern quickly filtered into the Southwest, as a result of the great archaeological discoveries of the period and the combined public and scientific interest in these ruins. The first instance of outcry by the American public for the preservation of cultural sites occurred in Boston in 1882 with a group of concerned citizens petitioning for the preservation of the archaeological resources of the Southwest. Nothing came of this petition, but it did signal the beginnings of a concern that would involve the federal government and all of its departments, the academic world of both the eastern and western regions of the country, private groups seeking the preservation of specific interests, economic groups seeking to preserve their standing, collectors seeking to increase their cash flow, activists and politicians attempting to gain sway with the public and museums seeking to increase their collections and their reputations.

As the natural conservation movement in the United States was gaining momentum, and great portions of land were being set aside for the preservation of natural resources made available to the American public, so the preservation movement with regard to cultural resources was beginning to take form. Beginning with the

---

government decision to set aside the ruins of Casa Grande as an archaeological "preserve" in 1889, these resources would be in the public eye and on the government table for years to come. As no legislation existed at the time which afforded any protection to the archaeological remains of the United States, the following years would be characterized by a push by several individuals, most notably Edgar Lee Hewett, to persuade the government to place regulations on land claims which included valuable cultural resources, on excavation of these resources and on the artifacts and architecture that could so well serve to educate and inform the scientist, as well as the layman. This would eventually come in the form of the Antiquities Act of 1906, also known as the Lacey Act, a bill which laid out provisions for the president to set aside lands for their cultural or scientific value as a means of protecting them from despoliation.\(^4\) In addition to this presidential power, the rules and regulations submitted regarding these public lands laid out strict controls as to who could excavate sites of cultural importance, which federal institution would oversee this work, and where the goods retained through this work would reside. Much of the government sanctioned work on the greatest sites in the Southwest began after the passage of this bill. One such group of sites to be brought into the battle for claim, control and collection during this period of development in Southwestern

\(^4\) *An Act for the Preservation of American Antiquities, 1906.*
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archaeology, site preservation and ruins stabilization that reside within what is currently known as Bandelier National Monument are the pueblo, cliff-dwelling and ceremonial remains in Frijoles Canyon.

Site Identification

Currently Bandelier National Monument encompasses 32,737 acres, 23,000+ of which are wilderness (Figure 1.1\(^5\)).\(^6\) Within the Monument, Frijoles Canyon remains the main interpretive area for the National Park Service, as many of the major ruin sites are there, although there are several other accessible sites within the park boundaries. This thesis will examine this portion of the park as it has been the most public from the time of the areas “rediscovery” by Adolph Bandelier through to the present day. There are various architectural elements (or remains of such) within this portion of the park, most of which were constructed between the 13\(^{th}\) and 16\(^{th}\) centuries. As envisioned by Hewett, these elements included:

...four community houses in the valley [including Tyuonyi] and one on the mesa rim near the southern brink of the cañon, and a series of cliff-houses extending from a distance of a mile and a quarter along the

---

\(^{5}\) All figures appear in Appendix A

base of the northern wall. These cliff-houses are of the excavated type sometimes known as ‘cavate-lodges.’

The ancestry of the inhabitants of the Pajarito Plateau can be traced loosely to the Tewa and Keres speaking tribes of the Southwest, which include the San Juan, Santa Clara, San Ildefonso, Nambe and Tesuque, all Tewa, and the Cochiti, Santa Domingo, San Felipe, Santa Ana and Zia, all Keres. It appears to be most likely that the inhabitants of Frijoles Canyon are in fact ancestors to the modern Cochiti. Abandonment of the cliff villages and pueblos occurred between 600 and 800 years ago, some time in the late 16th century, due to climactic changes, probably a loss of their water supply. Some of the sites of the area were probably reoccupied late in the 17th century during the period of the Pueblo Revolt, but were altered little, if at all, through this last period of use.

---

Archaeological investigation of these sites has increased over the past twenty years, as have the methodology and documentation practices utilized been improved as the fields of Southwestern archaeology and ruins preservation have increased in professionalism. The initial studies in Frijoles Canyon have been criticized as being done haphazardly, yet they do represent some of the earliest work of their kind. Much of the work that was done is reflective of the developments in the fields of archaeology, archaeological site preservation and site stabilization during the formative period in which they were performed.

The main sites for which preservation and stabilization measures were accomplished through the period characterized by the work of Edgar Lee Hewett and the School of American Archaeology / School of American Research in the Frijoles Canyon include the Tyuonyi pueblo ruins and the Big Kiva, the cavate lodges referred to as Sun House and Snake House, and the remains within the Ceremonial Cave. These sites represent the variety of ruin types extant within the park bounds, including the pueblo, cavate or cliff-dwelling, talus village and kiva. Definitions or descriptions of the site typology of Frijoles appear in many of Hewett’s works, and are as follows:
The page contains a block of text with multiple paragraphs. The text is not legible enough to transcribe accurately. However, it appears to be a continuous narrative or discussion, possibly from a book or an article. The content seems to be related to a specific topic, but the exact details are not discernible due to the handwriting and quality of the image.
Pueblo: Pueblo remains are the most common to be found in the region. In its ancient and modern form, a pueblo is a permanent dwelling of the Native Americans, independent of support by natural rock formations, located on mesas, in valleys or on plains. They are many-chambered community houses which include clusters of room or cells with varied organization, going from one story to three or four stories. The main pueblo of Frijoles, Tyuonyi, was such a community house which probably stood between two and four stories high at the point of its peak period of use.

Cliff-dwelling: The cliff-dwelling label "designates a certain geologic location...made to include all those ancient dwellings of the sedentary Indians of the Southwest that are wholly or in part embraced within cliffs, against cliffs or under overhanging ledges." In Frijoles Canyon, these cliff-dwellings are referred to as "cavate lodges," as they are of the excavated type, existing as either natural open caves which have been slightly, if at all, enlarged by excavation or wholly artificial dwellings excavated into the cliff-face and fronted by natural rock in-situ, porches and built up masonry. Most of these cavates appear now as hollowed out rooms, some with intact plaster and soot on the walls and floors, with no remaining frontal material.

Talus village: The talus villages of Frijoles Canyon are extensive, stretching for almost two miles at the foot of the northern wall of the canyon. Talus is built up debris which appears at the foot of these cliffs, resulting from erosion of the cliffs themselves, as

---

11 Hewett, Ancient Life in the American Southwest, 195.
12 Descriptions of the cavates of Frijoles Canyon come from two works of Hewett, Antiquities of the Jemez Plateau, BAE Bulletin 32 (1906), 28; and Ancient Life in the American Southwest, 218-219.
well as that of the former dwellings which resided there. The talus houses were built on top of this detrital material, forming the façades of the cavate or cliff dwellings previously described.¹³

Kiva: The kiva is the most complex of the Native American structural remains as per its purpose. The kiva is thought to have been, and remains as such in most extant Pueblo cultures, a room of ceremonial nature. Most often subterranean, this sanctuary was the nucleus of every clan, with living and storage areas being built up around it. The kivas of the Pajarito Plateau bear a resemblance to those of the Mesa Verde region in their organization and elements. The layout of many of these kivas resembles a circular room with walls of built up stone. A ventilator shaft appears at one end and certain symbolic elements, a sipapu and fire pit, are built into the floor.¹⁴

Tyuonyi

The largest and most visible of the sites of Frijoles Canyon is Tyuonyi (Figure 1.2, 1.3), the great circular pueblo on the floor of a valley surrounded by soaring pockmarked tuff cliffs,¹⁵ flowing water and lush vegetation. At the height of habitation in the area, the 15th century, this pueblo would have been a hub of activity, with many

---

¹⁴ Hewett. *Ancient Life in the American Southwest,* 210-211.
¹⁵ Volcanic tuff (originally laid down as volcanic ash millions of years ago) appears on the eastern slope of the Jemez Mountain Range (hugging the Rio Grande to the west). Because of the formation of natural caves in this soft rock, the early nomad tribes of the Rio Grande Basin settled here. Ibid, 199-201.
small rooms, one on top of another, accessed by ladders. An inner court at the
structure’s heart held three ceremonial kivas, their placement being symbolic of their
importance to the culture. Conducive to defense as well as cultural development, the
pueblo was built and used over a period of about 400 years.\textsuperscript{16}

The walls of the Tyuonyi pueblo consist of large shaped tuff bocks sitting in beds of
mud mortar interspersed with chinking stones. Vigas, roof supports, no longer exist in
situ, but they would have appeared as timber cut from the surrounding trees, and these
would have been topped with latillas covered with brush, grass and mud. Holes would
have been cut in the finished roofs to serve as ventilation openings for the smoke
which would have been created by the hearth fires. The quality of the construction of
Tyuonyi pueblo is not up to that of other pueblo constructions of the region that would
come later in the development of the site, possibly due to the fact of its early date and
the speed with which it may have been erected. The pueblo appears to have been
fairly regular in plan, consisting of rooms for habitation, storage and containment of
animals (\textbf{Figure 1.4}). Archaeological study in and stabilization of the Tyuonyi pueblo

\textsuperscript{16} J.W. Hendron, \textit{Prehistory of El Rito de los Frijoles, Bandelier National Monument}, Southwestern
Monuments Association, Technical Series, No. 1, May 12, 1940, Coolidge, AZ, 49.
occurred throughout the early history of Anglo involvement in the park, from the earliest work of Bandelier and Hewett, through the present day.

The Big Kiva

Kivas appear in three situations within Frijoles Canyon, these being contiguous to the pueblo structures on the valley floor, sunk into the talus in front of the cliff-dwellings and excavated out of the walls of the cliffs themselves. The Big Kiva is often associated with the Tyuonyi pueblo as it resides a few hundred feet east of the pueblo edge, and it is of the first type indicated above. It is the largest structure of its kind in the valley, hence its name, and appears as a circular room measuring about 42 feet across at its center. Reference to this kiva appears in the writings of Bandelier as a "the remains of a circular tank fifteen meters (49 feet) across...some doubts in regard to...antiquity." It is constructed of a double-width wall of tufa blocks, with a

---

17 Also referred to as "The Large Kiva" in many works. (See Appendix E-2, HABS Documentation for The Large Kiva, Bandelier National Monument)
vertical shaft on the western side that would have served as its ventilator shaft, and a second shaft, thought to be a ceremonial entrance opposite the ventilator. In the floor appears the sipapu, the ceremonial entrance from the underworld, and six post-holes which would have supported the roof structure (Figure 1.5). The date of construction for the Big Kiva is thought to be around 1513 A.D.

**Talus Villages and Cavates**

The remains of the villages which existed all along the cliff-sides in Frijoles Canyon extend approximately a mile and a quarter into the canyon. Known collectively as "Long House," (Figure 1.6) there are over 300 cave rooms visible in the cliffs, making up a total of 13 "talus pueblos." These dwellings stood three to four stories, each pueblo containing an arbitrary number of rooms.

---

20 The ventilator shaft is a common feature of the kiva style sanctuary, which served to carry the smoke out of the structure and fresh air in. Hewett long disagreed with the designation of this feature as a ventilator, a determination made by Jesse Walter Fewkes subsequent to the excavations at Spruce Tree House at Mesa Verde National Park. Hewett calls this a "ceremonial entrance" in his initial publications, stating that he awaits further evidence of use. Hewett, "The Excavations at Tyuonyi, New Mexico in 1908." 445.


22 Ibid, 52-56.
The talus villages and cavates, or cliff dwellings\(^{23}\), of the Rito de los Frijoles were codependent domiciles at the time of habitation. The cavates themselves (Figure 1.7) served as the back rooms of the structures that were built up in the talus at the base of the cliffs of the northern wall of the canyon. All that currently remains of these talus villages are the low foundation walls, as much else has crumbled over time. Viga holes in which the floor and ceiling timbers of these exterior constructions rested also appear all along the cliffs, as do remnants of plaster, referencing the height and decorative elements of the original dwellings. The cave rooms that once served as a backdrop to these pueblo-like frontispieces now represent the majority of the ruins extant in Frijoles Canyon. Separated into groups by Hewett, those cliff-dwellings and

\(^{23}\) In Hewett’s “The Excavations at Tyuonyi, New Mexico in 1908,” he refers to the “cliff-houses” of the Rito as follows:

These cliff-houses are of the excavated type sometimes known as ‘cavate lodges,’ but this term is one that should be rejected from the nomenclature of Southwestern Archaeology. The excavated cliff-house is as much a true cliff-dwelling as the pueblo built in the natural cave. The true character of the so-called ‘cavate lodge’ has not been fully understood. Some of these excavated rooms have been used as domiciles independently of any construction upon the talus against the cliff, but through the entire Pajarito region, where the type of cliff-dwelling culture reaches its culmination, the excavated rooms were not generally used as independent domiciles: they served more often as back rooms of the houses built upon the sloping talus against the cliff wall. (438)

His argument denouncing the use of the term “cavate” is legitimate, as the rooms are not the sole element of the initial construction. There were pueblo-like structures built up against the cliffs, similar in style to the constructions of the Mesa Verde cliff houses, making them more complex than excavated rooms in the cliff-side. See H. Walcott Toll, An Analysis of Variability and Condition of Cavate Structures in Bandelier National Monument, Intermountain Cultural Resources Center Professional Paper No. 53, Santa Fe (1995), 213-218.
talus villages for which archaeological investigation and preservative work were accomplished at the time of his tenure in the park were those of Group E, the House of the Sun People and the House of the Snake People. In addition to these villages, the "Large Cave Kiva," a small, isolated sanctuary completely contained within the cliff of the canyon, was tended to and preserved.

Ceremonial Cave and its Contents

The Ceremonial Cave (Figure 1.8) is the last of the major sites that Edgar Lee Hewett and his School of American Research worked on. The cave itself is about three quarters of a mile up canyon from the last of the cliff and talus houses, also in the northern wall. It is situated 150 feet above the canyon floor, and is accessible through a series of ladders, stone stairs and trails that were installed in 1909 by Jesse Nusbaum, one of Hewett's colleagues. The original entrance, which probably consisted of a series of footholds and steps leading up from the canyon floor, has disappeared as a result of the erosion of the tufa cliff. Within the cave are the remains of a cliff-house which once stood against the back wall, and a small kiva in the front at the east end. The cliff house is thought to have stood two stories high as indicated by
the viga holes extant in the cave walls, with three cave rooms at the rear. The rooms of the dwelling were roofed by the natural ceiling of the cave, its slope allowing for the two storied appurtenances at the front of the structure, and only one at the rear. The kiva, before restoration, appeared as a circular, roofless sanctuary 12 to 13 feet in diameter (Figure 1.9). A ventilator shaft, fire pit and seven holes, three of which still contained loops of reeds indicating the possible presence of a loom, were elements apparent in the kiva. No sipapu was found in the floor, which was covered with black plaster (see Appendix E-1 for HABS documentation of the Ceremonial Cave).24

Overview

The work of discovery within Frijoles Canyon continues in the present through a combination of archaeological investigation, stabilization and ethnographic studies in the area. A number of individuals, groups and institutions are involved in these studies, and interpretation of the prehistorically occupied sites resulting from this work continues to change with every new discovery. Publications are issued throughout this process, as is documentation kept as to the what, why and how, so as to keep a running

dialogue of these developments for future reference. Compilations are brought together regarding the various methods and theories applied, as a means of gaining an understanding of that which occurred in the early stages of the development of this region, so as to incorporate them into the current bodies of work. Much of the early work in the canyon has been utilized as a resource for the current work within the park, with one exception, this being the preservation of the sites and the philosophies and methods through which this was accomplished. With all of the works that have been produced on the preservation of archaeological sites during the early years of government involvement in cultural studies, little appears to focus on the area that was to be the first cultural park in the system, Bandelier National Monument, and the person who propagated the work there, Edgar Lee Hewett. From the earliest days of its recognition as an important cultural area, el Rito de los Frijoles, now referred to as Frijoles Canyon, was wrapped in controversy and public awareness. This thesis will attempt to lay out the developments in Southwestern archaeology and site preservation in the United States as they relate to the sites within Frijoles Canyon. With an emphasis on the period characterized by the work of Edgar Lee Hewett and his School of American Archaeology/School of American Research, a critical analysis of the development of a preservation program within the area will be presented, from both the philosophical perspective and the physical reality of the work which was
accomplished. The main intention of this thesis is to bring together, into one comprehensive document, the early campaigns of archaeological study and preservation in Frijoles Canyon. Bandelier National Monument has a complex history of controversy and controversial personas. The writings of the period in which the ruins of this portion of the Pajarito Plateau were in the public eye provide insight into work which was going on throughout the Southwest during the same period, and the ideas developed for and work done to aid in the preservation of these remains of the ancestral Puebloan culture helped to establish the precedents for American archaeology and the field of sites conservation early on in the development of these fields.
BANDELIER’S “RE-DISCOVERY” AND THE EARLY SURVEYS

We set out to reconstruct the life and times of the ancient people of the American Southwest. It has required a long series of explorations in many and varied fields. In the course of these wanderings, you who have gone all the way must have found something of the charm of the Southwest. It is not alone for the naturalist, the artist, the philosopher, nor for the Indian who is something of all of these. It is for every mind that can see relations, for every spirit that is moved by harmonies of color and light and form. All must have, by this time, pictured its vast canyons, mountains, mesas and deserts, and acquired something of the sense of reverence for space and silence. All these are well-nigh immutable factors, evidences of the play of colossal forces that have shaped the world. In the midst of it all is wreckage, debris of human life, buried in the soil, clinging to the cliffs, piled upon mesa tops. Here is material for meditation, for history, for drama.

Edgar L. Hewett, “The Realm of the Pick and Spade,” 1930

The history of the archaeological investigations of Frijoles Canyon and the concern over the fate of the cultural remains which reside within this portion of the Jemez Plateau began concurrently with similar developments throughout the Southwestern United States. As the frontier of the American west seemingly closed and the population became more and more concerned with the preservation of scenic

---

natural resources, the cultural resources of this undeveloped region came under scrutiny. Beginning with the government sponsored surveys of the 1870s, which were meant to document the natural history, ethnology and archaeology of the lands west of the Mississippi, and continuing through the turn of the 20th century and beyond, the ruins of the newly acquired territories presented an untapped source of knowledge and material relating to a tangible history that could be adopted by the American public, just as the lands themselves had been. The aridity of the region provided conditions which lent to the preservation of the material culture unlike that in the eastern states, and the Native American groups living in close proximity to these ruins of past habitation provided ample study for anthropologists. In 1876, the Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia provided the public with their first glimpse of the archaeological bounty of the region, and there was an outcry for more. As interest in the far reaches of the west became more apparent in the American psyche, groups, institutions and government sectors became dedicated to the study of the Native American, his current state and his mysterious ancestry. By 1880, the Smithsonian Institution (1846), which in itself had a goal to "increase knowledge of man in North
America through surveys and explorations of mounds and other remains,"\(^{26}\) had brought into being the Bureau of Ethnology / Bureau of American Ethnology (1879) in order to carry out this directive, Harvard University’s Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology (1866) had been founded, the Archaeological Institute of America (1879) began its tenure in Boston, initially to provide Americans with an opportunity to participate in overseas research, but with a building interest in the discoveries on their home soil, as had several other research institutions and museums began their work within the American states. These institutional developments were a direct response to the surge in American public interest in the cultural resources, in the form of ruins and extant communities, of the western lands.

**Re-Discovery of a Resource**

In 1880, Adolph Bandelier (Figure 2.1), a Swiss-born ethnographer, historian, explorer and amateur archaeologist, headed for the Southwest on a research mission for the Archaeological Institute of America. Already into his middle years, Bandelier

had bypassed the great Cahokia mounds"\(^{27}\) of his home state of Illinois in order to feed the interest that he had developed in the history of the southwestern region and Mexico. As a student, he had devoured all that he could relating to the aboriginal cultures of the Americas, the period of the Spanish conquest of the region and the reports being produced by the explorers of the day. Influenced greatly by the work of his friend and mentor, Lewis Henry Morgan, often referred to as the father of American ethnology / anthropology, Bandelier devoted his life to his passion for understanding the history and ethnological relationships of the American Indians. This relationship with Morgan created the opportunity for Bandelier’s Southwest excursion, as Morgan had considerable influence in the developing archaeological circles of the period.

In his explorations for the AIA, Bandelier traversed the American Southwest seeking to learn all that he could about the native cultures of the region in the hopes of proving definitively the common ancestry of the Pueblo peoples stretching from Colorado to Mexico. In the process of doing this research and through the various contacts that he made with native peoples, Bandelier was also able to document many of the

prehistoric ruins of the region, some never before seen by European travelers. It was one group of such contacts from the Cochiti Pueblo, which included José Hilario Montoya (Figure 2.2), a “recognized intermediary between the Cochiti and outsiders,” that led Bandelier into Frijoles Canyon on October 23rd 1880. The writings in his journal reveal the wonder that Bandelier felt as he, the first European to set his eyes upon the vast ruins of the canyon, studied the area.

Cañon de los Frijoles...The grandest thing I ever saw. A magnificent growth of pines, encina, alamos, and towering cliffs, of pumice or volcanic tuff, exceedingly friable. The cliffs are vertical on the north side, and their bases are, for a length as yet unknown to me, used as dwellings... It is of the highest interest. There are some of one, two and three stories. In most cases the plaster is still in the rooms. Some are walled in; others are mere holes in the rocks...Aside from the caves, there are ruins of a large pueblo, immense estufas, round towers of two stories, etc...  

Herein lies the first reference in any form to the ruins of the Frijoles Canyon of northeastern New Mexico, and the beginnings of a regional study that would stretch well into the 20th century. Bandelier’s work and the writings that resulted from it, including his novel entitled The Delight Makers, would serve to draw public interest, as well as that of the future students of the area. In many respects, the descriptions of

---

29 Ibid. 162.
the people, places and objects which Bandelier encountered in his years studying the Southwest brought about much of the work which would follow.

**Early Survey Missions**

Bandelier’s explorations for the AIA were carried on throughout the 1880s, encompassing several trips back into Frijoles Canyon. During these visits, Bandelier combined his interests in ethnology, geography and archaeology, keeping up a constant dialogue with his Native guides and undertaking detailed studies of the land and the ruins to which they led him. Published in 1892 by the AIA entitled *Final Report of Investigations Among the Indians of the Southwestern United States Carried on Mainly in the Years from 1880 to 1885*, Bandelier offered descriptions of the ruins of Frijoles, as well as those located elsewhere in the region, with details regarding their exact locations (Figure 2.3, 2.4), the general characteristics of the various ruin

---

30 Bandelier discusses his interest in these three fields of study in the preface to the first edition of his semi-fictitious novel about the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico. I say semi-fictitious because Bandelier himself states that much of his story comes from his actual study of the land and peoples of the Rito de los Frijoles and Puye. The plot is fantasy, but the descriptions of the “country and of its nature...of manners and customs, of creed and rites...” are from “actual observations” taken during his eight years studying in the region. Adolf Bandelier, *The Delight Makers* (New York: Dodd Mead & Co., 1890), xxi.
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types, the specific characteristics of individual ruins which included room dimensions and stonework, the cultural materials remaining (artifacts) and the stories attributed to the ruin groups. Bandelier is the first non-Native to attempt to interpret these ruins, offering them a place in the complex history of the American continent through association with the local Pueblo Indians, and providing for the public a realistic view of their characteristics and use (see excerpt from Bandelier’s Final Report in Appendix B). It is within this report that the first reference to the remains of Tyuonyi pueblo and the cave dwellings of the north wall of the Frijoles Canyon are given.

31 As stated by Bandelier.

The people of Cochiti told me that the caves of the Rito, as well as the three pueblo ruins, were the work of their ancestors, when the Queres all lived there together, in times much anterior to the coming of the Spaniards. The place is called Tyuo-nyi in the Queres language, a word having significance akin to that of treaty or contract. It was so called because of a treaty made there at some remote period, by which certain of the Pueblo tribes, probably the Queres, Tehuas, and perhaps the Jemez, agreed that certain ranges should belong in the future to each of them exclusively. The Queres also told me that their ancestors, after having dwelt at the Rito for a considerable length of time, began gradually to leave it in bands, in order to build pueblos on the mesas south of the Rito.

Adolph Bandelier, Final Report of Investigations Among the Indians of the Southwestern United States Carried on Mainly in the Years from 1880 to 1885, Part II, Papers of the Archaeological Institute of America (Cambridge: John Wilson & Son, 1892), 145.

32 Although Bandelier uses the name “Tyuo-nyi” in reference to all of the ruins of Frijoles Canyon, currently it is used to identify only the large community house on the floor of the canyon. As further research and excavation was done in the area, the cavate groups and other remains were named accordingly.
In the years after Bandelier’s first visit to the ruins of Frijoles Canyon, the federal government began its survey program of the southwestern territories in earnest. The Bureau of Ethnology, which would later become the Bureau of American Ethnology in 1894, sent out several parties, some with the duty to collect specimens for the upcoming World’s Fairs[^33] (Figure 2.5) and the Smithsonian’s National Museum, and others to locate and document the various cultures that “would soon be absorbed by the larger civilization,”[^34] as well as the ruins of those cultures that had already been lost. In 1882, James Stevenson, on one of his many excursions into the region on behalf of the Bureau of Ethnology, visited the Rito de los Frijoles on the Jemez Plateau. Within his study of the area he gave descriptions of some of the habitations


which he encountered, mainly referring to the cavates and trails. J.W. Powell also spent time in the canyon in 1886, offering description of the cavates and their possible uses, as well as a chronological interpretation that has been disavowed through study of the sites since his visit.

Edgar Lee Hewett

Beyond the initial description and study by Bandelier, much of the work to be done in Frijoles Canyon, previous to the entrance of the National Park Service in the 1930s, involving reconnaissance, survey, preservation and display, would be instituted under the direction of Edgar Lee Hewett (Figure 2.6). Hewett, an educator who spent his youth in Adolph Bandelier’s home state of Illinois, arrived in the Southwest in the

---

36 Powell’s chronological determinations regarding the cavates of Frijoles Canyon concentrated on the idea that they were not prehistoric in nature, but from the post-contact period in the 17th century. This interpretation has been disproven through the scientific study of the cultural materials and construction elements apparent within the various sites. Although his initial thoughts on the period of occupation have been laid to rest, his use of the term “cavate” as a descriptive term for the cave-like rooms characteristic of the area has not. It appears as if Powell was the first to offer the use of this term to the features of Frijoles Canyon, although Hewett indicated in “A General View of the Archaeology of the Pueblo Region,” that the word itself had was originated by Otis Mason early on in the period of exploration in the Southwest. This term remains in use today in reference to the dwellings of this type scattered throughout the Pajarito region. See H. Walcott Toll, An Analysis of Variability and Condition of Cavate Structures in Bandelier National Monument, 6-7, and Hewett’s “A General View of the Archaeology of the Pueblo Region,” 587.
early 1890s. First settling in Colorado as the superintendent of the training (education) department at the Normal School in Greeley (1894-1898) and eventually landing in New Mexico by way of an appointment as the president of the New Mexico Normal School in Las Vegas (1898-1903), Hewett adopted the culture and the attitudes of the region as his own. His interest in the archaeology of the American continent and beyond developed through attention paid to the works of the explorers of the day. It was through this interest that Hewett discovered the writings of Adolph Bandelier. Bandelier’s words caught the imagination of this intense figure, and started him on a path towards his future.

Hewett began his long career of exploration, excavation and preservation on the Pajarito Plateau in the summer of 1896. His first encounter with the area, and more specifically with the ruins of Frijoles Canyon, came as a result of his desire to survey the region that Bandelier had described in his writings of the previous decade. Led by Santiago Naranjo of Santa Clara Pueblo, Hewett followed in the footsteps of his predecessor and entered a world untouched by the hands of modern man. He immersed himself in the mystery and solitude of the Plateau, wanting both to protect it
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from the encroachment of civilization, and to document it as a means of disseminating knowledge of a misunderstood culture.\(^\text{38}\) His pedagogic nature won out, and Hewett set out to document the significant attributes, both physical and ethnological, of the area he regarded as a portion of the “pueblo region,” a task which he felt had not sufficiently been done.\(^\text{39}\)

Hewett continued his studies on the Plateau after ascending to the Presidency of the New Mexico Normal School in 1898, a position he garnered as a result of his friendship with Frank Springer, an influential figure in the territory. Believing that education should include hands-on experience, Hewett organized summer programs that would bring his students to the Pajarito Plateau to further survey and map its archaeological resources. This extensive survey work included a minimum of excavation, mainly outside of the Frijoles Canyon section of what he began calling the Pajarito Park, and extensive documentation. It continued throughout his tenure at the New Mexico Normal School, and up until he began his doctoral studies at the University of Geneva in Switzerland in 1903.

---


With the end of his time at the New Mexico Normal School, Hewett embarked on a new ambition regarding the archaeological bounty in Frijoles Canyon, throughout the Pajarito Plateau and beyond into the greater Southwest, that being the protection of the resources by the federal government. The years of survey and reconnaissance in the region were quickly coming to an end as large-scale excavation projects became the norm. Battles were fought between the eastern academics, western land-holders, government institutions and individuals with some stake in the situation, whether that be monetary or otherwise, over control of the most public of sites and their artifacts. As these battles ensued, concern over the loss of valuable representatives of the past began to take hold, instigating a move toward government control of remains existing upon the vast public lands of the region. With Hewett as an integral figure in this movement, Frijoles Canyon would remain in the eye of the storm for years to come.
THE PRESERVATION OF AMERICAN ANTIQUITIES

And if indeed there be any profit in our knowledge of the past, or any joy in the thought of being remembered hereafter, which can give strength to present exertion, or patience to present exertion, or patience to present endurance, there are two duties respecting national architecture whose importance it is impossible to overrate: the first: to render the architecture of the day, historical; and, the second, to preserve, as the most precious of inheritances, that of past ages.

John Ruskin, The Seven Lamps of Architecture, 1849

Previous to his leaving the Southwest in 1903 to work on his dissertation, Hewett had begun to lay the foundations for that which would become his greatest achievement, the passage of the Antiquities Act of 1906. Drawing the attention of various government bodies to the value of the resources of the Southwest and the need for greater controls regarding excavation and collection rights, Hewett set the stage for the power struggle that would ensue upon his return late in 1904. Having already attempted to establish a national park in the region, centered on the ruins of Frijoles Canyon, Hewett caught the attention of those in positions of power in the federal

government and great institutions of the day. Whether his concern was a result of his trying to keep the ruins of the Pajarito Plateau to himself, or his belief that these areas of cultural significance were severely threatened by the amateur archaeologist and pot-hunter, had no bearing on the results. Hewett became, through his concern over the ruins of his dominion, as well as those throughout the greater region, the spokesperson for the preservation of the resources and their greatest champion. This is not to say that there were no other figures involved in the process of bringing the interest of the public, and in so doing, that of the federal government, to the realm of the archaeological bounty of the Southwest.

Beginnings of Concern

The call which emanated from the individuals, groups and government officials throughout the middle part of the 19th century regarding the need for sanctions regarding the use, exploration of and collection of remains from areas of cultural value began to increase in volume towards the turn of the 20th century. Many of those who were involved in the development of American archaeology as a scientific and controlled discipline were distressed by the flagrant disregard that many colleagues
and collectors had displayed in their work of the past years and were ready to speak out for regulation. The recent developments in the realm of natural resources, and the call for the conservation of such provided a means by which the vast cultural resources of the nation could be called to the attention of a nation fearing scarcity. By presenting the sites of the Southwest as an endangered and non-renewable resource, those involved in their study could draw the public sentiment that they would need in order to push the federal government to take action. The academics of the eastern universities, the federal government in the form of the Smithsonian Institution, specifically the Bureau of American Ethnology, various regional interest groups, as well as several others wished to keep those who would not make use of the information hidden in these sites for educational and scientific purposes out of the running for their excavation and possible display of their resources.

By the middle part of the 19th century, the sustainability of the natural resources of the United States had become a major concern of the federal government and the general public, as the country had fully incorporated all lands from the Atlantic to the Pacific. In 1872, the first act which would set aside lands on the public domain for the purpose of preservation of these resources was passed in the form of the Yellowstone National Park Act. This act set aside “a certain Tract of Land lying near the Head-waters of the Yellowstone River as a public Park” for the “benefit and enjoyment of the people,” with regulations provided as to the “preservation, from injury or spoliation, of all timber, mineral deposits, natural curiosities, or wonders within said park, and their retention in their natural condition.” This idea of sustainability would carry over into the realm of cultural resources soon after this first National Park designation. S. 392, H.R. 464, 42nd Congress, 2nd Session, Stat. 17 (1872), 32-33. For further information on the idea of sustainability in the National Park System, see Bob R. O’Brien, Our National Parks and the Search for Sustainability (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1999) and Richard West Sellars, Preserving Nature in the National Parks: A History (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997).
Early Measures

The first indication that the American public was aware of the delicate nature of the newly discovered aboriginal remains in the Southwest developed as a result of interest garnered by the work of Adolph Bandelier and the Bureau of Ethnology in the early part of the 1880s. The discovery of sites such as Casa Grande in Arizona, Chaco Canyon in New Mexico and the ruins of el Rito de los Frijoles, as well as a multitude of others, caused those who were already concerned over the fate of the natural resources of a nation that had expanded to fill its natural boundaries, to seek protection for those cultural remains that were also in jeopardy of disappearing. In that year, the New England Genealogical Society, a group of concerned citizens based in Boston, Massachusetts, petitioned Congress to create a designation for these Southwestern ruins which clearly separated them from the rest of the public lands owned by the federal government. Within this proposal, the importance of these sites relative to the history of the United States and her native cultures was laid out, as were the threats which posed imminent danger to their survival. It was the desire of all involved that,

...some of these extinct cities or pueblos...may be withheld from public sale and their antiquities and ruins preserved, as they furnished
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Invaluable data for the ethnological studies now engaging the attention of our most learned scientific, antiquarian, and historical students.\(^{42}\)

The petition died in committee, but it did encompass the first attempt by a concerned group to conserve the cultural resources of the Southwest.

The First Attempt to Preserve Frijoles Canyon

Concern over the fate of the ruins of Frijoles Canyon began not with Edgar Lee Hewett, but Alice Fletcher (Figure 3.1), an ethnographer and avid student of the Native American cultures of the United States, particularly the Southwestern region. After Fletcher was appointed by Frederick Ward Putnam to the newly formed Committee on the Preservation of Archaeological Remains on Public Lands in 1888, a committee which formed early on in the pursuit for the federal protection of archaeological sites under the auspices of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, she and Tille E. (Matilda Coxe) Stevenson began their personal pursuits for the salvation of the great ruins of the Southwest. At this point, public concern for these sites had been tentatively established, but no great revelation

on the part of the governing bodies of the United States had been indicated. Fletcher and Stevenson, after recommending the preservation of many of the great ruins of the Southwest and elsewhere, decided to make an example of one tract of land containing these valuable cultural remains as a means of inaugurating the precedent of federal regulation over archaeological sites. The site that they chose was that which so intrigued Adolph Bandelier in his travels, that being Frijoles Canyon, and a bill was submitted to Congress detailing their suggestion. Soon after, a faction of Boston’s influential elite who were also seeking to inaugurate the precedent of preserving the cultural remains of the Southwest, a group which included Mary Hemenway, the patron of the Hemenway expedition of 1888, petitioned Congress to set aside 120 acres in Arizona upon which sat the Casa Grande ruins (Figure 3.2). Congress agreed to the measure, and appropriated funds for the monuments repair and protection.

This petition, which resulted in the creation of the Casa Grande Ruins Reservation in

43 The sites recommended for preservation included Chaco Canyon, Canyon de Chelley, Walnut Canyon, the ruins of the Verde Valley and a group of cavates near Flagstaff, AZ, the cliff dwellings of the Mancos valley in Colorado, the pueblos of New Mexico and Arizona not contained within the bounds of existing reservations, and several others in the Dakota Territory, the Southwest and in Alaska. The recommendations were too broad for those westerners who were wary of the federal government and their land practices. They felt that “too much land had already been ‘reserved.’” and specific boundaries needed be set in the designation of protected lands. Raymond Harris Thompson, “Edgar Lee Hewett and the Political Process,” in Journal of the Southwest, Vol. 42, No. 2, Summer 2000, 275-6. Reference to this first attempt of Fletcher and the Committee on the Preservation of Archaeological Remains on Public Lands appears in Don Fowler’s “Conserving American Archaeological Resources,” 141.

1892 as an official act of President Benjamin Harrison, offered protection to the cultural resources within the reserve, but made "no provisions for American antiquities in general."\textsuperscript{45} In the end, the Boston petition had been realized and that of Fletcher and Stevenson forgotten. The ruins of Frijoles Canyon would not receive the attention of the federal government at this point, but the Hewett years were coming, and he would not let up until the area was recognized for its value as a cultural and educational resource.

\textit{Hewett Takes Over}

Although survey and mapping of the archaeological sites of the Pajarito Plateau were Hewett’s primary focus in his first years of work, his concern over the fate of the ruins soon took over. Early on in his tenure, Hewett had begun to devise a plan which would establish in the area a national park dedicated to the protection of the pueblo and cavate remains of the Pajarito as they were "particularly vulnerable...because they were isolated and inaccessible, the ruins offered an easy target for depredators."\textsuperscript{46} At

\textsuperscript{45} Rothman, \textit{Preserving Different Pasts}, 12.
\textsuperscript{46} Hal Rothman, \textit{Bandelier National Monument: An Administrative History}; Southwest Cultural Resources Center Professional Papers No. 14 (Santa Fe, 1988), Chapter 1. This resource appears as an
the turn of the 20th century, designation as a national park was the only way to
guarantee the protection of government owned land from despoliation and
unauthorized excavation of archaeological sites. Lands could be temporarily
withdrawn from public use by the General Land Office of the Department of the
Interior through provisions in the Homestead Act of 1862, and forest reserves could be
created as per the General Revision Act of 1891, but no legislation made specific
reference to the protection and regulation of cultural resources as yet. Hewett’s
national park proposal would bring the interest of the federal government, the
suspicions of local interests and the beginnings of activity that would eventually lead
to the preservation of all of the indigenous resources existing in the public domain.

\[\text{e-book at www.nps.gov/band/adhi/adhi1.htm, and page numbers are arbitrary. For this reason, any}
\text{references to this work will be given in terms of chapter rather than page.}\]

47 Many westerners, at the turn of the 20th century, were against the intrusion of the eastern scientists and
government officials onto their land. As stated in Rothman’s Preserving Different Pasts,

\text{The focal point of western resentment was the federal policy of withdrawing land in the public domain from homestead claims. As long as a tract was withdrawn, it remained the property of the federal government. No one could enter claims of ownership upon it, and prospecting, grazing, and farming necessitated government permission. To western farmers and ranchers, withdrawal seemed an arbitrary policy designed to deny them their living. This posed a real problem for supporters of legislation to protect and preserve the remains of prehistoric Indian civilizations of the Southwest. Preserving the unique but obscure heritage of the region required the withdrawal of lands that contained tangible ruins. More often than not, these lands also included resources that had commercial value. (17)}
A National Park on the Pajarito Plateau

By the end of the 1890s, Hewett had begun his quest to control the archaeological interests of the Pajarito Plateau. He began to formulate his plan for the Pajarito National Park and brought the government to the ruins of the region. In establishing this park, Hewett sought to provide the American public with the chance to view and learn from the "treasury of information concerning the history of primitive man" in this "silent old haunt of primeval clans" which contains the "greatest aggregation of the villages of the so-called 'cliff-dwellers' in the world." He invoked support in the form of the General Land Office, who, after sending James Mankin to "examine and report upon the ruins of Pajarito Park" in 1899, recommended the withdrawal of over 153,000 acres on lands already under the administration of the Department of the Interior. This withdrawal, which occurred in July of 1900, was the first step in the establishment of such a park and represented the first real move towards the actual preservation of the ruins of Frijoles Canyon and its surrounding mesas and canyons. Hewett’s bill was presented to Congress in January of 1901 (Figure 3.3) by Congressman John Fletcher Lacey of Iowa, a figure who would take the lead in future

---

49 Ibid, 2.
years for the preservation of resources in the public domain, but it was never to be realized. This did not dissuade Hewett in any way, as he continued to promote his idea for the establishment of this park well into the new century, with the following cited as benefits:

1. *Its desirability as a great tourist attraction;*
2. *The advantage of Government exploitation* [as opposed to that of unqualified, unaffiliated individuals seeking monetary gain rather than scientific knowledge];
3. *Strict custodianship of the antiquities.*

The bill would be amended several times, but it was not meant to be, as it seemed to tread on many of the rights of the ranchers and timber merchants who made use, through concessions, of the government owned lands for their livelihood. Hewett realized this, but he also believed whole-heartedly that control by the government was necessary for the insurance of the survival of these sites. Hewett would broaden his focus to include various other ruins of the Southwestern territories in the early part of the 1900s, but his main interest would remain in those of his Pajarito Park. He would continue to push for their protection, gaining the support of some and the distaste of others, well into the next phase of his work.

---

The Preservation of American Antiquities

A Quest for Legislation

Hewett left the Southwest after his contract with the New Mexico Normal School ran out in 1903, and began the pursuit of a Ph.D which would give him the academic standing necessary in order to “be taken seriously within the emerging milieu of American anthropology.” He soon returned to continue with his pursuit for site protection and regulation, immersing himself in the political realm rather than that of the field archaeologist. In 1904, Hewett took a position with the BAE in Washington D.C., his job to create a map of the prehistoric resources of the Southwest (Figure 3.4). Once established in the nation’s capital, he began to make contacts to which he could present his case. His main goal in the period following his initial proposition to the federal government regarding the Pajarito Park was to secure legislation for its protection, as well as that of places of similar value throughout the Southwest. Hewett

52 This map was created in order to show the “location of the most important ruins in the Pueblo region,” by “geographical districts.” In addition to the map, which Hewett identifies as approximate, but enough to serve as “a beginning for something more exact and more complete,” he offered his Memorandum Concerning the Historic and Prehistoric Ruins of Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado and Utah, and their Preservation. Within this memorandum, Hewett takes the liberty to “point out how adequate protection might be afforded such as are on the public domain.” He also states that, “all measures for their preservation should look toward the encouragement of research and the advancement of knowledge, and not towards its restriction.” Hewett, Memorandum Concerning the Historic and Prehistoric Ruins of Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado and Utah, and their Preservation (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1904), 3-4.
also wanted to keep the control of the ruin sites of the region in the Southwest, rather than placing unhindered control in the hands of the eastern academics, a group with which he had never had a good relationship. His quest for this government involvement would occur simultaneously to those of others with similar concerns, but with a lesser feel for the wants and desires of all involved, specifically the population of the Southwest.

The earliest attempts at legislation never went further than their initial hearings in Congress. Many of these propositions once again came from the eastern concerns that had been seeking control over the lands and ruins of the Southwest through the close of the 19th century, but westerners were also beginning to take an active role in these matters as they saw their lands being appropriated and pilfered under the guise of

53 Throughout Hewett’s career, there was a constant bitterness between himself and the major figures in the study of anthropology and archaeology in the east. Franz Boas, the director of the Anthropology Department at Columbia University and the so called “father of American anthropological study,” despised Hewett and denounced him and his work with every chance that he got. Hewett’s uncouth educational practices and questionable experience in archaeological site excavation and documentation brought about much angst in the developing profession at the turn of the 20th century. The only matter to which all were able to come to any sort of agreement was that of the Antiquities Act, which Hewett himself penned in order to stimulate government interest in the custodianship and preservation of the archaeological resources of the United States. A full overview of the battle between Hewett and the eastern academics appears in several sources, including Don. D. Fowler, “Harvard vs. Hewett.” in Assembling the Past: Studies in the Professionalization of Archaeology, edited by Alice B. Kehoe and Mary Beth Emmerichs (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1999). Hal Rothman, Preserving Different Pasts (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1989), James E. Snead, Ruins and Rivals: The Making of Southwest Archaeology (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2001).
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The concern over government control of public lands was still apparent, but a developing pride in the history of their home-territories caused many in the West to consider greater government involvement. Bills such as that proposed by the AIA and the Association for the Advancement of Science in 1900, H.R. 8066, which attempted to place the power to create reservations centered on prehistoric, historic and scientific interests in the hands of the executive office, with no restrictions on the size of the holding, was seen as too broad by western standards. H.R. 8195, introduced by a Colorado Representative, which focused on the ruins rather than the lands, proposing to punish those who vandalized ruins rather than reserving the lands on the public domain, was too narrow-minded according to the bodies in the east.55 A

54 One such expedition which caused a clamor in the growing field of American archaeology was the Hyde Exploring Expedition. This group of entrepreneurs and explorers set out in the mid-1890s, a period in which “the need for collections to fill expanding museum galleries and the cliff dweller mystique fueled by the Columbian Exposition made southwestern antiquities a locus of institutional competition.” Sponsored by F.W. Putnam and the American Museum of Natural History and under the leadership of George Hubbard Pepper, the second phase of the expedition was to concentrate on the excavation of Pueblo Bonito in Chaco Canyon. In 1896, this work began, with Richard Wetherill, one of the discoverers of the cliff dwellings of Mesa Verde, as a main player. The first year of the exploration was a great success, resulting in a large body of artifacts for the AMNH’s future exhibitions. This success would be tempered in the following field seasons, as by 1898, the Hyde Exploring Expedition would be linked with a “mercantile operation” centered in Pueblo Bonito. This trading post business would bring about the displeasure of many in the professional circles of the east coast, as well as the distrust of local interests in the area. Conflict over the archaeological bounty within Chaco Canyon would eventually bring about the end of the Hyde Expedition, and a great push for legislation concerning the control of cultural sites and the property found within. For a more detailed account of the Hyde Exploring Expedition, see James Snead, Ruins and Rivals: The Making of Southwest Archaeology, 32-64.
compromise had to be reached if the resources of the Southwest were ever to be afforded a semblance of protection from the relic-hunters of the period.56

The Antiquities Act of 1906

While employed at the BAE, Hewett began to devise a plan which would be acceptable to the academics, government officials and western idealists now involved in the quest for preservation. This work, which Hewett himself indicates, grew out of his early work with the archaeological sites of the Pajarito Plateau.57 Through his close ties with this small portion of the Southwestern region, Hewett was able to evaluate, first hand, the damage being done at the hands of those whose interest was mainly commercial in nature, and develop strategies which would effectively curb these actions.58 Within his various publications regarding the archaeology and ethnography of Frijoles Canyon, the Pajarito Plateau and the entire Pueblo region, Hewett put out a call for the preservation of the antiquities therein. Working alongside

57 Hewett, “Appendix II: Preservation of American Antiquities,” Hewett Collection: 89ELH.009, Archives of the Laboratory of Anthropology, Museum of Indian Arts and Culture, Santa Fe.
58 Ibid.
many of the most powerful names in anthropology and archaeology at the institutional level, Hewett began relaying his views regarding the actions necessary for the preservation of antiquities. As early as 1904, the Government Printing Office issued Hewett’s *Memorandum Concerning the Historic and Prehistoric Ruins of Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado and Utah, and their Preservation*, which furnished the Department of the Interior with information on the “location and nature” of geographical districts containing the greatest concentration of ruins, and recommendations as to preservative measures and government involvement in the care of such.\(^{59}\)

Correspondence between Hewett and the various heads of Departments in

---

\(^{59}\) The twenty districts indicated are as follows:

I. The Rio Grande Basin
   a. The Pajarito Park district (which includes Frijoles Canyon)
   b. The Pecos Pueblo district
   c. The Gran Quivira district
   d. The Jemez district
   e. The Acoma district

II. The San Juan Basin
    a. The Aztec district
    b. The Mesa Verde district
    c. The Chaco Cañon district
    d. The Cañon de Chelley district
    e. The Bluff district

III. The Little Colorado Basin
     a. The Tusayan district
     b. The Flagstaff district
     c. The Holbrook district
     d. The Zuñi district

IV. The Gila Basin
    a. The Rio Verde district
    b. The San Carlos district
    c. The Lower Gila district
The Preservation of American Antiquities

the federal government, namely W.A. Richards, the Commissioner of the General Land Office, was extensive, and for the most part positive in terms of reaction to Hewett’s suggestions and ideas. Within two years, Hewett’s suggestions would become the foundation for the bill entitled An Act for the Preservation of American Antiquities, and the Regulations associated with such.

The Antiquities Act (see Act in its entirety in Appendix C-1), passed into law on June 8, 1906, gave the federal government full custodianship of the cultural resources in the public realm. The Secretaries of War, Agriculture and the Interior were given the authority to grant permission to qualified institutions for the “examination of ruins,

d. The Middle Gila district
e. The Upper Gila district
f. The San Francisco River district

Each district is described in detail, recommendations are offered as to their custodianship and a bibliography of works pertinent to each is listed. Hewett, Memorandum Concerning the Historic and Prehistoric Ruins of Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado and Utah, and their Preservation (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1904), 3-12.

60 In a letter titled “Preservation of Historic and Prehistoric Ruins, etc. on the Public Domain.” Richards states,

...I desire to express my appreciation of the service you have rendered this office in furnishing valuable information...This office fully appreciates the necessity for protecting these ruins...for the benefit of recognized scientific and educational institutions, with a view to increasing the knowledge of such objects; and aiding in the general advancement of archaeological science...The entire absence of specific legislation for the protection and preservation of such ruins...is a serious matter...

Temporary withdrawals of land, and reserves created containing the districts named by Hewett in his Memorandum Concerning the Historic and Prehistoric Ruins of Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado and Utah, and their Preservation are outlined, as are actions taken in order to create custodial positions for many of the ruins referenced. Richards to Hewett. AC 105, Hewett Collection, Fray Angelico Chavez History Library. Santa Fe.
the excavation of archaeological sites, and the gathering of objects of antiquity upon
the lands of their respective jurisdictions,"61 and to punish, though fines and/or
imprisonment, those who would "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 permission."62 In
addition, this bill gave the President of the United States the authorization to create
national monuments of "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."63 This was to be done through
the reservation of land parcels, "the limits of which in all cases shall be confined to the
smallest area compatible with the 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...may be relinquished to the
Government."64 The publication of rules and regulations for the purpose of carrying
out the Antiquities Act was a qualification also alluded to within the bill, and the first
of these were provided concurrently with it (see Appendix C-1 for the initial set of
regulations passed with the Antiquities Act). These regulations were objected to

62 Section 1, An Act for the Preservation of American Antiquities, 1906.
64 Ibid.
within the archaeological community of the period, academic and government body alike. Hewett stepped in once again, revising such to conform more to the spirit of the bill for which they were created. This spirit is written as follows:

...to invoke the aid of the government in preserving the ancient ruins and natural wonders of the country for scientific research; for public use and education; to enable the most conspicuous of them to be set apart in a special manner as national monuments under the special custodianship of the nation; to protect all from the vandal; to rescue them from commercial exploitation; to bar the incompetent and destructive investigator.\(^6\)

Hewett, with his ties to the government agencies, was integral to the passage of the Antiquities Act, having drafted the final version of it, all the while constantly pushing for the legislation which it would provide. His proximity to the ruins and his domination of the work on the Pajarito Plateau gave him credibility that was oft debated within the academic institutions with similar interests in the regional archaeology. His work was viewed as pseudo-science by many, as his practices differed from the careful documentation and analysis being recommended by men such as Franz Boas and others in the eastern institutions. Battles over sites and the work that was to be allowed on them ensued between the government, Hewett and

academia, each racing to be the first to unearth and document the treasures contained within the earth.

The passage of the Antiquities Act gave the federal government the ability to regulate excavation of sites under their domain. They had to issue permits for the work, many of which ended up in the hands of the Smithsonian and BAE as they “did not need to make collections to ensure future support for their work,” making them the best fitted for the work in their minds. It came down to the fact that these institutions would base their work on the pursuit of scientific discovery, rather than in an attempt to improve their reputations and increase their museum collections. This represented a move away from the romantic ideals previously afforded to the archaeology of the Southwest, bringing it into a more scientific realm. Affiliation was the most important personal attribute, and being affiliated with the “responsible” government programs got one further than field experience. This changed with the advent of university-trained archaeologists, a group which began to emerge around 1910. These new academics replaced the self-trained archaeologists who had earlier replaced the unaffiliated 19th century amateurs and pot-hunters.

---

The Preservation of American Antiquities

Up to the beginning of the 20th century, there was a lack of custodianship for archaeological and historically important sites. The AIA, the Smithsonian and numerous other institutions (the Peabody Museum at Harvard University, the American Museum of Natural History in New York City, etc.) finally realized the problem and the Lacey Act (the American Antiquities Act of 1906) was the result, as was the designation of Mesa Verde National Park (Figure 3.5), which occurred soon after the passage of the act. The introduction of the School of American Archaeology/School of American Research, a school of the AIA which was fully dedicated to the study of American archaeology and the Southwest would follow soon after, as would the development of academic programs focused on this region.

The Future: National Monument Status for the Pajarito Plateau

After years of relative disregard on the part of the federal government towards the ruins of Frijoles Canyon and the Pajarito Plateau as a whole, it was finally offered the status of National Monument on February 11, 1916 (see Appendix C-2 for designation proceeding). On this day, President Woodrow Wilson, using the powers
null
deemed to him under section 2 of Hewett’s Antiquities Act of 1906, set aside 18,000 acres in northern New Mexico, creating the Bandelier National Monument. Citing the area as having “...certain prehistoric aboriginal ruins...of unusual ethnologic, scientific and educational interest,” this portion of the Pajarito Plateau, within the Santa Fe National Forest, was recognized for its archaeological importance. There is no reference within made to the natural resources of the region, due, perhaps, to the fact that it had been designated as National Forest land earlier in the century. Although the National Park Service was created in the same year as this designation was offered, control of the new monument was handed to the National Forest Service, with whom it would remain until 1932. In that year, Bandelier National Monument was “excluded from the Santa Fe National Forest,” the National Park Service assumed “supervision, management and control” over the park, and the borders were extended to incorporate additional lands (see Appendix C-2 for proclamation regarding border change) (Figure 3.6). Coming over 15 years after Hewett’s initial attempt at garnering national park status for the region, this designation only included a portion of the sites cited by him as significant to the history of the Pueblo peoples, as well as that of the nation as a whole. This recognition did not cause, nor did it conclude the

work of many in their attempts to understand, uncover and preserve the remains of the ancestral Puebloans that inhabited the area hundreds of years before.
BEYOND LEGISLATION: FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE

Neither by the public, nor by those who have the care of public monuments, is the true meaning of the word restoration understood. It means the most total destruction which a building can suffer: a destruction out of which no remnants can be gathered: a destruction accompanied with false description of the thing destroyed...it is impossible, as impossible as to raise the dead, to restore anything that has ever been great or beautiful in architecture...

John Ruskin, The Seven Lamps of Architecture, first edition published in 1849

Once the Antiquities Act had been passed and the regulations set as to access to and research involving the prehistoric sites of the Southwest, Edgar Lee Hewett was free to once again focus on the ruins of his area of interest, those of the Pajarito Plateau (Figure 4.1). His quest to have the area designated as a national park, as Mesa Verde had been immediately following the passage of the act, continued, and his work to uncover, preserve and present the history of the region began in earnest. The status of his Pajarito Park, in terms of the government recognition and protection in the area, would be a continual concern for Hewett, as much attention was diverted to larger, more prominent sites, and no standing offered to it outside of its designation as

national forest land until Woodrow Wilson’s declaration. As many of the major ruins of the Pajarito region were clustered in Frijoles Canyon, much of Hewett’s subsequent work would be carried out there. Although there are records of work done on the cavates and pueblo sites of the Puye mesa on San Ildefonso Pueblo lands, as well as the sites outside of the main canyon, the focus of the following chapter will remain on the activities centered around the pueblo of Tyuonyi, the cavates and talus dwellings along the north wall of Frijoles canyon and the remains contained within the Ceremonial Cave.

Hewett, the AIA and the SAR

By 1906, the Archaeological Institute of America had stretched well beyond Boston with affiliated societies and museums developing nationwide. With schools having already been established by the Classicist founders of the institution in Rome, Jerusalem and Athens, it was time for the Americanists to assert themselves. In that same year, while the federal government was still deciding the fate of the Antiquities Act, the Americanist Committee of the AIA granted to Edgar Lee Hewett a fellowship in order to “help stimulate and develop western chapters of the Institute and to see an
archaeological survey of the Mesa Verde, in anticipation of its becoming a national park.\textsuperscript{70} In addition to this work, Hewett was to comparatively study the prehistoric art and architecture of the Pueblo region of the Southwestern United States and that of the ancient Mexicans in order to establish whether or not there was actually a connection between the two.\textsuperscript{71} This work being well under way, Alice Fletcher would further Hewett's career in the AIA with the suggestion of creating a position for a Director of American Archaeology, both to "map...the cultural areas of the American continent, as a contribution to the world study of human race"\textsuperscript{72} and to "direct and coordinate" the work of the regional societies of the Institute and provide educational experiences to those graduate students wishing to receive "instruction and employment in field research."\textsuperscript{73} This position would be a preparatory step in the creation of a school dedicated to the study of American Archaeology. The Committee on American Archaeology, which consisted at that time of two great names in American anthropological research, Frederick Ward Putnam and Franz Boas, and a benefactor of archaeological and anthropological study in this period, Charles

\textsuperscript{70} This is the famous survey of the region done in 1906 by Hewett for which he recruited A.V. Kidder and Sylvanus Morley from Harvard, among others. Richard B. Woodbury, \textit{ Alfred V. Kidder} (New York: Columbia University Press, 1973), 10-11.

\textsuperscript{71} Fowler, "Harvard vs. Hewett," 174.

\textsuperscript{72} Charles Bowditch, "Chairman's Statement, January 2, 1907," in \textit{Organic Acts and Administrative Reports of the School of American Archaeology, 1907 to 1917}, Santa Fe, New Mexico, 4.

Bowditch, accepted Fletcher's proposal in January of 1907 and Hewett was given the newly created position. The School of American Archaeology came into existence following another proposal by Fletcher in December of 1907, and by the end of 1908, the School had been established in Santa Fe. With the position as director of this school, Hewett had achieved two of his primary goals, as of June 8, 1906, his Act for the Preservation of American Antiquities had been passed into law, and he now had the institutional backing that he would need to further his work in the Southwest and on the Pajarito Plateau. By 1910, the School of American Archaeology had settled itself in the Old Governor’s Palace in Santa Fe (Figure 4.2, 4.3), the Museum of New Mexico had been established through an act of the New Mexico Legislature and Edgar Lee Hewett had settled into his position as Director and his place in the history of Southwestern archaeology. Controversy would follow him for the rest of his days, but Hewett could now work relatively unhindered in his adopted land.

74 Alice C. Fletcher. “Chairman’s Statement 1908,” in Organic Acts... 24-29.
Preservation and Restoration

Although Hewett had conducted some small-scale excavations in the Pajarito region previous to his affiliation with the AIA, only his early surveys concentrated on the Frijoles ruins (Figure 4.4). The first excavations in Frijoles Canyon began as a result of the summer programs that he instituted as the Director of the newly formed School of American Archaeology in Santa Fe. In the summer of 1908, Hewett and his staff, which included Kenneth Chapman and Jesse Nusbaum (Figure 4.5), former peers at the New Mexico Normal School, and several students, which included A.V. Kidder and Sylvanus Morley, two Harvard University students who would become legendary figures in the study of Southwestern archaeology, began excavations on the great community house of Tyuonyi, several small scale ruins and the Big Kiva. Work of these summer sessions would continue to involve the study of this portion of the Pajarito Plateau, extending to the talus villages and cavates, mainly because of the setting that it provided.\(^{75}\) As archaeology and preservation came hand in hand in the

---

\(^{75}\) Hewett, in many of his publications regarding the archaeology of the Pajarito Plateau and the Southwest in general, refers to the dramatic beauty of Frijoles Canyon. His affinity for the area is unquestionable, as is his belief that the ruins therein provided an educational experience unsurpassed. Hewett states in his report of 1913 as the Director of the School of American Archaeology, “In connection with the Summer School there was an excursion to El Rito de los Frijoles where some excavating was done in the talus towns under the direction of Mr. Chapman. The main work of excavation here is finished but the site is still a good field for demonstration purposes. Because of the
Southwest, the stabilization of various ruins occurred simultaneously to these excavations. As Hewett held a great belief in the use of the ruins to educate, it was necessary for him to develop his own philosophy regarding the treatment of them, and the methods by which they could be best preserved for the American public.

**Hewett’s Philosophy**

The importance of the preservation of the archaeological resources of the Southwest became apparent in Hewett’s work towards the passage of the American Antiquities Act. In all of his writings, sections often appear which detail his views on the need for the protection of these valuable cultural resources, but an actual philosophy regarding the methods and practices necessary to actually do that does not appear until he begins to work closely with the ruins themselves. Previous to the passage of the Antiquities Act in 1906, Hewett’s use of the term “preservation” referred more to the protection of archaeological resources, mainly from the hands of “vandals,” and the custodianship charming location and the extent of the ruins laid bare in past years, the Rito is a favorite spot for class work. Practically every phase of the cliff-dwelling culture of the Rio Grande drainage is to be seen and the main points of interest have been made easily accessible.” Organic Acts and Administrative Reports of the School of American Archaeology, Santa Fe. 139.
Beyond Legislation: From Theory to Practice

of such by the federal government and its agencies. After 1906, beginning concurrently with the first field seasons which involved excavation and repair work on the sites of Frijoles Canyon, this term came to mean something very different. Preservation was no longer a state of being, but an action involving “excavation and...additional means as will prevent deterioration, and...the recovery of objects buried in the debris...such as to have a definite educational value.” Preservation, to Hewett, had become an action through which the ruins could be retained and presented to a public willing to learn from them. Interpretation of the ruins became an issue, as did the methods by which they were to be preserved. In 1909, Hewett revealed his developing philosophy in his report as the Director of American Archaeology under the heading “Preservation”:

In all the work done by the School the idea of preservation of the archaeological remains has been foremost. This involves, first, the preservation of the buildings by excavation and by such additional means as will prevent deterioration, and, second, the recovery of objects buried in the debris and their preservation either in the buildings excavated, in proper relation to the surroundings in which they were originally used, or in the museum where they may be studied and compared, such as have a definite educational value to be placed on exhibition for the benefit of the public. This is believed to be a correct interpretation of the law for the Preservation of American Antiquities.

---

Beyond Legislation: From Theory to Practice

The theory underlying all the work of preservation is not restoration and repair, but rather preservation by the arrest of deterioration. It is doubtful if restoration on a large scale is ever justifiable, because of the liability to error from interpretation of the archaeological remains. Rebuilding on a large scale is never practiced, but the restoration of small details for the purpose of illustrating special features, such as a door, a meal box, an altar, or even an entire sanctuary, is allowable and sometimes advisable, but this should not be done until the restorer is certain through the study of numerous examples that it can be done with accuracy. Necessary repairs should be scrupulously attended to from beginning to end, but solely with reference to the preservation of the structure. The skyline of walls should never be altered if avoidable and all existing outlines of the ruin should be preserved. Repairs and restorations have a tendency to detract from the picturesqueness of the ruin, from its interest to the public, and its value to science. The dominant idea should be its preservation as a ruin and not its restoration according to the ideas of any one. Its preservation as an object of future interest should be kept foremost. Its rebuilding might be made very misleading. The theory is that it is easy to carry on additional work in the future than it is to undo erroneous work.

Special attention has been given to making accessible all these points of interest. After a ruin has been excavated and put in proper condition for inspection, necessary trails have been constructed, stairways put in place, always if possible following the archaic plan of construction and placement. In some cases the more important furnishings of rooms have been restored to their original places and the idea of the field museum, developed last year, somewhat extended.\(^{78}\)

Hewett viewed preservation of the archaeological remains of his Pajarito Plateau, as well as those of the greater Southwest, as the “foremost” idea in his work and that of the SAR, and the most important means of educating the public as to the true history

of the former and current inhabitants of the region. Making the ruins accessible, stabilization of deteriorating features and the creation of museum-like installations were done as part and parcel of this idea of preservation, as was the archaeology which exposed the various features of the ruins and the artifacts associated with them. In some sense, Hewett’s failures as an archaeologist can be blamed on his drive to preserve the sites upon which he devoted his attentions. Archaeological study aided in the exposure of these sites, but excavation was not Hewett’s ultimate goal. Perhaps this was the reason that his field protocols and documentation procedures were not as carefully controlled or detailed as were his ideas on the supervision of sites, the value of their existence in terms of history, and the continuation of their being for the purpose of education. Rather than unearthing these resources, gathering the clues offered by their study and leaving them to the elements, Hewett sought to retain the original and avoid the “destructive” nature of restoring a ruin to a pristine state, one which would belie the true nature of its age value. Feature restoration was appropriate in Hewett’s view, but “rebuild” was inherently wrong. Preservation of the archaeological remains of the ancestral Puebloans was a means by which their culture could be kept alive. It meant the preservation of their methods of building, their lifeways and their religion. To rebuild these sites with modern hands would be akin to constructing in the methods thought to have been utilized. The value of the site would
be forever lost, as it would no longer be representative of the prehistoric peoples, but
of the modern interpretation offered them through the eyes of the modern world.

It is apparent through Hewett’s word usage that he was a follower of John Ruskin and
his philosophy of preservation as expressed in his *Seven Lamps of Architecture*, as was
he well read in the works of the period regarding the picturesque nature of European
ruins and their presentation to the public. As early as 1904, in his article for *American
Anthropologist* entitled “Archaeology of Pajarito Park,” Hewett references Ruskin in
his discussion of the “deeds...words...and ...art” of the primitive peoples of the
Southwest.⁷⁹ He continues to reveal the influence of this writer on his philosophy
regarding the history, and preservation of such well into the 20th century. In the 1930s,
well after his work in Frijoles Canyon was completed, Hewett again brings in Ruskin,
now directly quoting passages from the section of his *Seven Lamps of Architecture*
entitled “The Lamp of Memory,” stating emphatically that his theory on the treatment
of the prehistoric ruins of the Southwest “may have been derived in part” from this
work. It was his feeling at this time, that the statement which will follow should be

"placed in the hands of every employee of National Parks and Monuments, Indian Reservations, National Forests, and on the Public Domain."  

...Neither by the public, nor by those who have the care of public monuments, is the true meaning of the word restoration understood. It means the most total destruction which a building can suffer: a destruction out of which no remnants can be gathered: a destruction accompanied with false description of the thing destroyed. Do not let us deceive ourselves in this important matter; it is impossible, as impossible as to raise the dead, to restore anything that has ever been great or beautiful in architecture. That which I have above insisted upon as the life of the whole, that spirit which is given only by the hand and eye of the workman, can never be recalled. Another spirit may be given by another time, and it is then a new building; but the spirit of the dead workman cannot be summoned up, and commanded to direct other hands, and other thoughts...

Do not let us talk then of restoration. The thing is a lie from beginning to end. You may make a model of a building as you may of a corpse, and your model may have the shell of the old walls within it as your cast might have the skeleton, with what advantage I neither see or care: but the old building is destroyed, and that more totally and mercilessly than if it had sunk into a heap of dust, or melted into the mass of clay: more has been gleaned out of desolated Nineveh than ever will b out of rebuilt Milan. But, it is said, there may come a necessity for restoration! Granted. Look the necessity full in the face, and understand it on its own terms. It is a necessity for destruction. Accept it as such, pull the building down, throw its stones into neglected corners, make ballast of them, or mortar, if you will; but do it honestly, and do not set up a lie in their place. And look that necessity

---

80 Edgar L. Hewett, "Appendix D: The Treatment of Ancient Monuments," in Annual Report of the Schools of American Research of the Archaeological Institute of America, 1934, 59. This statement also appears in a letter dated August 7, 1933 from Hewett to Jesse Nusbaum regarding the preservation of the ruins of the Pu-ye. Within this letter, Hewett states that the work done here will create a standard by which all future work will be judged, and for this reason, the words of Ruskin should be followed. Hewett to Nusbaum, Letter dated August 7, 1933. AC 105, Hewett Collection, Fray Angelico Chavez History Library, Santa Fe, NM.
in the face before it comes, and you may prevent it...Watch an old building with an anxious care; guard it as best you may, and at any cost, from every influence of dilapidation. Count its stones as you would jewels of a crown; set watches about it as if at the gates of a besieged city; bind it together with iron where it loosen's; stay it with timber where it declines; do not care about the unsightliness of the aid; better a crutch than a lost limb; and do this tenderly, and reverently, and continually, and many a generation will still be born and pass away beneath its shadow. Its evil day must come at last; but let it come declaredly and openly, and let no dishonoring and false substitute deprive it of the funeral offices of memory.

Of more wondrous or ignorant ravage it is vain to speak; my words will not reach those who commit them, and yet, be it heard or not, I must not leave the truth unstated, that it is again no question of expediency or feeling whether we shall preserve the buildings of past times. We have no right whatever to touch them. They are not ours. They belong partly to those who built them, and partly to all the generations of mankind who are to follow us. The dead have still their right to them: that which they labored for, the praise of achievement, or the expression of religious feeling, or whatsoever else it might be which in those buildings they intended to be permanent, we have no right to obliterate. What we have ourselves built, we are at liberty to throw down; but what other men gave their strength and wealth and life to accomplish, their right over does not pass away with their death; still less is the right to use of what they have left vested in us only. It belongs to their successors...

The falsification of restoration and reconstruction, the necessity for the preservation of the remnants of the past and the protection of the spirit of history are tenets which Ruskin proclaims throughout his work. These are the

---

same principles which serve to guide Hewett’s philosophy through much of his career. The twenty or so years following the passage of the *Antiquities Act* would challenge his views on the work involved in the preservation of ruins and their presentation to the public, but his views would remain steadfast. Prehistoric cliff-dwellings, historic mission churches and modern museums of the Southwest and beyond were Hewett’s future, and publications would ensue from his work on all three. Throughout all though, Hewett’s initial feeling on the value of archaeology, preservation and history in general would remain apparent, though his actions would provide fodder for his opponents to continually challenge his ability and credibility.

The Work

1908...

The 1908 field season was the first in which excavation work was performed at Frijoles Canyon. The intent of this work was to fully document the ruins through,

...determination of...character and extent...in the cañon; the preparation of topographical and archaeological maps, plans, etc.; the photographic record of the remains now visible; the excavation of 43
null
rooms in the great community house of Tyuonyi and about 60 in outlying ruins; the excavation of two great kivas or sanctuaries, one of these being the largest ever discovered; the study of the language and myths of the Tewa Indians, and the restoration of one excavated cliff dwelling to its original condition.\textsuperscript{82}

In addition to the work done on Tyuonyi and the kivas, some clearing was performed in the Ceremonial Cave, the kiva within was excavated, and trenches were laid through the talus parallel to the cliff wall. No stabilization was performed on these ruins, but they were attended to with a goal of preservation rather than solely archaeological excavation.

Hewett's initial foray into the stabilization of ruins, or rather the restoration of such for the purpose of interpretation, also occurred with this first field season in the canyon. The decision by Hewett to "restore" a cliff dwelling to its original condition imparts his first attempt at bringing his ideas on the physical preservation of these resources to life. A "typical, well-preserved" dwelling was chosen and the appearance of life was recreated within (Figure 4.6, 4.7). Ladders were placed at its entrance to make it accessible to the tourist, and the "appurtenances of its former domestic life restored to

\textsuperscript{82} Hewett, "Report of the Director, 1908," in Organic Acts..., 34.
their proper places." Representative of Hewett’s philosophy of “restoration of small
details for the purpose of illustrating special features,” this cliff dwelling was to
become the field museum that Hewett so often called for in relation to cultural sites.

_The entrance of the Western States through these local institutions into
active field work in archaeology is a noteworthy step. Nearly all the
ancient ruins of the Southwest have been more or less dug over and
only a very small per cent of the material therefrom has found its way
into reputable public museums accompanied by the necessary data to
give it scientific value. These States now join actively in the work of
evacuating and preserving their ancient ruins and saving the
collections therefrom for installation in their own museums. There can
be no question of the wisdom of this policy. Cultural material is
nowhere else so instructive as in conjunction with the buildings and in
the environment where it was produced. Therefore the field museum
should be developed wherever it can have proper custodianship. A cliff
house in such a place as the Rito de los Frijoles or the Mesa Verde
National Park at once furnishes a fire-proof dwelling which can be
made inaccessible at will and affords an opportunity to display
material in exactly the condition in which it was used. Such museums
should, of course, be developed only in places in which, like those
mentioned, are visited by many travelers and can be placed in proper
custodianship._

With this field museum in place, it would now be possible “for the first time for
travelers to see in the great cliff dwelling region of the United States a house with its
ancient furnishings in place and the manner of life that existed there made clear.”

This would be the first instance of preservation to appear in the writings of Hewett,

---

86 Ibid, 34.
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and the first attempt to create an interpretive exhibit on site in Frijoles Canyon. Although he emphatically states, as revealed previously, that "restoration" is not "justifiable" in most cases, Hewett reconciles the work on this particular cliff dwelling, and that which he will perform later in his tenure in Frijoles, through statements which excuse the "restoration of small details" as being "allowable and sometimes advisable" if the persons involved in the restoration are "certain through the study of numerous examples that it can be done with accuracy."\(^{87}\) By placing the "articles recovered from the ruins" back in their original context, Hewett believes that they can be more "instructive" than they would be elsewhere.\(^{88}\) The restoration of these dwellings was of a superficial nature, in that he recreated the image of use rather than reconstructing the room itself for the purpose of presenting an image to the visiting public.\(^{89}\) The methods of preservation regarding this dwelling are of a different nature than some of Hewett’s campaigns of the future, particularly those of the kiva in the Ceremonial Cave (1910), in which a ruin is reconstructed in part through the addition of a roof, and the Talus House (1920), in which Hewett actually calls for the rebuilding of a ruin, also for the purpose of interpretation and education. The work performed in creating this Talus House is similar in nature to Hewett’s

---

\(^{88}\) Hewett, “The Excavations at Tyuonyi, New Mexico in 1908.” 454-5.  
\(^{89}\) Ibid., 66.
future work in the realm of ruins "preservation" on sites such as Kuaua Pueblo in Coronado State Monument, New Mexico, where in 1929 he rebuilt the pueblo structure as an earthen "ruin." 90

1909...

In 190991, work continued in Frijoles Canyon, with excavations and preservative work in the talus dwelling groups referred to as the House of the Sun People and House of the Snake People,92 the Ceremonial Cave and the large cave kiva. The work of this field season was done by a group of individuals which included Sylvanus Morley, John P. Harrington, Kenneth M. Chapman, Carl Lotave, Jesse L. Nusbaum, and a crew

---

90 Frank Matero, conversation with author. 19 April 2002.
91 1909 was a fortunate year for Hewett and his School of American Archaeology. In February of that year, the Legislature of New Mexico passed an act which established the Museum of New Mexico, to be under the direction of the School. The Palace of the Governors was offered for use as this Museum, and as the seat of the School of American Archaeology of the Archaeological Institute of America. Within the bill, an annual stipend was given to the Museum and School for the "care and improvement of the building [Palace of the Governors], grounds and museum, the obtaining of collections, books and equipment for the museum, the excavation and study of ancient ruins for the benefit of the museum, the preservation of archaeological sites in New Mexico..." Alice Fletcher, "Chairman's Statement, 1909," in Organic Acts..., 47.
92 These talus villages were so named by Hewett on account of the imagery that appears on each in the form of petroglyphs and pictographs. The imagery on the "Sun House" consists of an "etching of concentric circles" often painted red; that of the "Snake House" appears within the kiva at the center of the grouping of rooms, and consists of both etchings and a painting of the "Great Plumed Serpent." Edgar L. Hewett, "Excavations at El Rito de los Frijoles in 1909," in American Anthropologist, Vol. 11, 1909, 651-661.
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of twenty Tewa Indians. A total of 28 rooms were exposed in the excavation of the “Sun House,” and the determination was made that the village once consisted of forty to fifty rooms in total (Figure 4.8, 4.9). The rooms fell into all classes, those being “cave rooms, those entirely enclosed in the natural rock walls; alcove rooms, those partly enclosed in cliff walls; exterior rooms, or those enclosed either wholly or in part by walls of masonry.” The “House of the Snake People” is larger than that previously mentioned and is accessible by the use of ladders inside and outside, and holds within it. The area focused on in the excavations of this season was the kiva which holds the imagery for which the village was named.

There is no mention of restoration or preservation in relation to these talus villages, rather this type of work seems to have been reserved for the “Large Cave Kiva” (Figure 4.10). The large cave kiva, which is situated outside the bounds of the aforementioned cliff-villages, is wholly contained within the cliff walls. Due to the state of preservation in which it was discovered, and its being a good example of its type, it was chosen for preservation. As stated by Hewett,

As it is the best example of its type that has been discovered, it was deemed best both to put it in condition to prevent further deterioration

94 Ibid., 654.
and to restored as an example of this form of sanctuary. Accordingly, the floor was cleared, and the vestiges of ...rows of loops...were discovered; also the remains of the fire-pit, or sipapu. The position of the altar is determinable, as is also that of the ceremonial entrance and main doorway. The restoration of these features was...planned and commenced.\textsuperscript{95}

The restoration was not completed in this field season, but would be during the next. It is stated in Hewett’s report as Director, that Jesse Nusbaum had “personally directed in the field all work connected with the repair and preservation of the ruins, the reconstruction of details, the building of ladders, stair ways, and everything necessary for making the ruins accessible for excavation.”\textsuperscript{96}

In addition to the excavation of the talus villages and the work in the large cave kiva, ladders, rock trails and stairways were installed by Nusbaum, leading up to the Ceremonial Cave. Excavations on the floor of the cave were not initiated, but a drawn “reconstruction” and ground plan of the rooms within were tentatively drawn up by Kenneth Chapman (Figure 4.11).\textsuperscript{97}

\textsuperscript{95} Hewett, “Excavations at El Rito...,"663.
\textsuperscript{97} Ibid, 666.
1910...

The field work carried out during the 1910 season included an “archaeological and topographical survey” of Frijoles Canyon, and the continued excavation of Tyuonyi pueblo and the talus houses. In addition, the kiva in the Ceremonial Cave was stabilized and reconstructed, in part, all under the direction of Jesse Nusbaum (Figure 4.12). In his report as the director of the SAR for the year 1910, Hewett reveals that Nusbaum “had charge of the photographic and reconstruction work at the Rito de los Frijoles during the summer.”98 The following is an overview of what was done in the kiva during this restoration:

...the building stones of soft volcanic material had fallen from the top of the wall on the west and southwest portions between the time of abandonment of the cave and the time of excavation of the kiva in 1908. Mr. Nusbaum built the wall up to an equal level and then proceeded with the reconstruction of the roof... The roof construction consisted of only three main vigas of Ponderosa Pine approximately six inches in diameter, and long enough to extend through the walls several inches. Across these were nailed vigitas or poles of pine varying from two to four inches in diameter with the bark left on. They were laid northwest to southeast. Pine needles and juniper boughs were laid over the poles and were followed by several thicknesses of the Denver Post, dated August 23, 1910, and addressed to Jesse L. Nusbaum. Over this were placed additional pine boughs, and on top a coating of dirt several inches thick. The final course of rock around the top was apparently laid without mortar.

The entrance or central opening was built in the southwest portion of the roof and consisted of short lengths of pine notched at the ends...The entrance was large, being as long as the distance between two of the main vigas to which the framework of the entrance was nailed, and no more than here feet wide. A ladder approximately 30 feet long was placed through the opening, the side pieces resting directly in front of the firebox where the floor of the kiva had been worn down, evidently from the constant scraping of feet.  

The stabilization of the kiva in the Ceremonial Cave was considered one of the School’s greatest accomplishments in the realm of preservation by their proponents. In 1913, it was written by someone affiliated with the School of American Research that, “The kiva with all of its fittings was restored as it was in the days that Tyuonyi and its nearby talus villages as well as the cave dwellings were occupied by cliff dwellers.” In reality, this reconstruction was a divergence from Hewett’s philosophical dictates regarding the misleading nature of reconstructions and restorations. Throughout his career, Hewett was very concerned with the interpretive aspects of the ruins afforded to visitors of the region, and his attempt at restoration in the form of re-inventing that which was lost at some unknown period in the past was his way of providing a “convincing example” of the ruins of Frijoles Canyon. 

Stabilization and repair of this magnitude was undertaken elsewhere in the Southwest

---

during this period, Balcony House at Mesa Verde National Park being one such example (Figure 4.13).\textsuperscript{102} Hewett would veer even further from his stated directives in the future with the larger-scale reconstruction of the Talus House, although his reasons for sanctioning each project remained honorable. Through each project, he was attempting to educate those with little knowledge and minimal exposure to the history and cultural remains of the prehistoric cultures of the region as a whole.

1911-1919...

The beginning of the official summer school programs of the School of American Archaeology began with the 1911 field season (Figure 4.14). Announced in Hewett’s report at the end of 1910, this school was to be held in the cañon of el Rito de los Frijoles, with coursework offered in American archaeology and ethnology. During the summer field season, the excavation of “the elliptical communal dwelling by the Rito [Tyuonyi]”\textsuperscript{103} was continued, though not completed. The work at Tyuonyi and in the talus villages was continued through the teens, with no significant work being published to present what was done. The summer sessions continued, with two weeks

\textsuperscript{103} Alice C. Fletcher, “Chairman’s Statement, 1911,” in \textit{Organic Acts...}, 98.
of field work per season, mainly involving small-scale excavations in the canyon. In 1912, Hewett stated that "the ruins of the Rito de los Frijoles...have been to a great extent excavated and partially repaired," indicating that the work here would soon be coming to an end. The museum continued their involvement in the restoration of the cliff dwellings, their work deemed to have "succeeded to such an extent, that these ruins so easily accessible from all parts of New Mexico, have become the most famous tourist feature in the United States." Until 1920, there exists no further discussion of site preservation work in Frijoles Canyon. Much of the work of the school at this point focused on the Panama-California Exposition in San Diego, the restoration of the Palace of the Governors, the work of the School at Quirigua and the lecture series that was developing with the Universities in the region.

1920...

The last significant work of the School of American Research in the realm of preservation in Frijoles Canyon was the reconstruction of the Talus House (Figure

106 As stated previously, the School of American Archaeology became the School of American Research (SAR) in 1917, at the point of its incorporation. This was done to release the school from the
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4.15) This project began with the resumption of the SAR’s research program in the Southwest, which was put on hold to a large degree due to the focus on museum development through the years between 1910 and 1920. The work on the Talus House, a portion of the House of the Sun People which was excavated in 1909, began in 1920. This work was done in cooperation with the National Forest Service, as this federal department became the governing body in the park with its establishment as Bandelier National Monument in 1916. Reconstruction was chosen in this case for the benefit of the visiting public. As stated by Hewett,

A large number of tourists visit the Rito annually to enjoy the canyon, and see the ancient ruins. Even with the aid of the pamphlets that have been published with restorations on paper of typical ruin groups, it has not been possible to convey a satisfactory picture of these ancient ruin settlements to people of average information on such subjects. It was therefore decided to select a typical village and rebuild enough of it to make a convincing example of the ancient Pajaritan cliff village.

implied confines of the term archaeology. “The word ‘Archaeology’ implies a field confined to antiquity. The study of new-world cultures does not permit of such restrictions.” The new “research” program of the school was to include “archaeology, ethnology, history and art.” Edgar L. Hewett, “Annual Report. 1918,” in Official Acts and Administrative Reports of the School of American Research, 1918 to 1927, Santa Fe, 6-9.

107 In addition to the establishment of the Museum of Archaeology in the Palace of the Governors, the Museum of Art in Santa Fe, and the museums attributed to the Panama-California Exposition in San Diego, those devoted to the American Archaeology, Indian Arts, Physical Anthropology (the Science of Man Museum) and Fine Arts were tended to by the SAR and Edgar Lee Hewett in this period.

The work was organized by Kenneth Chapman, "a student of the architecture and art of the region," and a group of Tewa men from the San Ildefonso Pueblo, who also took part in many of the past excavations in the canyon. Meant to be an "attraction" as well as an educational element to the park, "not a feature of the restoration was carried out until every remaining ruin in the canyon had been carefully studied for historic authority." Materials used were indigenous to the canyon in that building stone and soils for mortars and surface treatments were collected along the talus slopes, in the excavated material from the work done at Tyuonyi, on the valley floor and along trails, and wood was cut from local trees, and formed into beams and vigas by the San Ildefonso men. The final construction consisted of five small rooms with features relevant to its typology (for a report on the reconstruction of the Talus House, see Appendix D). Work on the Talus house began in May and concluded in August.

---

The years following the reconstruction of the Talus House were quiet ones in Frijoles Canyon and on the Pajarito Plateau. Little field work was carried out by Hewett or his associates within the SAR. Hewett's last field season in the area was in 1927, with work done at Pu-ye mesa. He issued several reports and publications regarding his work of the two decades on the Plateau throughout the period, but his future interest lay in the arts, with little to no new field work done in the realm of archaeology or site preservation. This is not to say that there was no future in the form of the preservation and stabilization that Hewett had initiated in the early part of the century.

In 1932, the National Park Service took over the supervision of the resources in Frijoles Canyon, and efforts which included the trail work and construction projects of the Civilian Conservation Corps, a development of President Roosevelt's Works Progress Administration, and the archaeological investigation and stabilization projects instituted by the administration in the park began in earnest. Jesse Nusbaum and Kenneth Chapman remained as participants in the preservation of the sites on the Pajarito Plateau, all the while utilizing Hewett's knowledge and expertise through
continual contact and questions. Under men such as J.W. Hendron, T.B. Onstott and Robert Lister, the various sites tended to by Hewett, as well as several others that were either left alone or of which work was never detailed in his published works, would be stabilized and re-stabilized. This work would begin during the Depression, span the years between the great wars, and continue on well into the future.

---

111 In a letter from Hewett to Nusbaum dated August 7, 1933, Hewett offers advice as to the preservation of the Puye ruins. Nusbaum had requested that Hewett return to aid in the “planning and directing” of the proposed work, but Hewett refused, offering suggestions for excavation, stabilization and restoration instead. Hewett refers to the work of the Puye project as of the “utmost seriousness” as it would be “the first example of a ruin of this character to be treated for preservation.” Perhaps it was the scale of the proposed project, that being a very large pueblo and an extensive cliff-village on the top of Puye mesa, as opposed to the smaller projects that he undertook throughout Frijoles Canyon in the past that cause him to separate the work of Puye from the past preservation of sites in the region. He again denounces the restoration of ruins as “altogether bad.” He advocates “justifiable repair” but not “unintelligent rebuilding,” revealing the same opinions that were outlined in the report of 1909 which was detailed earlier in the chapter. It seems as if he is again providing fodder for others to challenge his actions of the past in the form of the restorations of the Ceremonial Cave kiva and the Talus House, but he makes no mention of these as having been examples of work done wrong. He does make mention of “past mistakes,” perhaps here passing judgement on the work for which he served as director. Hewett to Nusbaum. Letter dated August 7, 1933. AC 105, Hewett Collection, Fray Angelico Chavez History Library, Santa Fe, NM.
Conclusion

...a mystical world of an abandoned civilization, the likes of which were unequaled in the United States.


In the Southwestern region of the United States, archaeology and preservation developed hand in hand. The discovery of the great sites of Puebloan ancestry, and their subsequent study occurred during a period of American history that was characterized by a yearning for the romance and mythology of the Native American, and the adoption of such into the annals of American history. The initial attempts at the preservation of the archaeological remains of Frijoles Canyon occurred during this period, a time in which the field itself was in its early stages. Discovered in a period characterized by the exploration of the unknown reaches of the newly acquired Southwestern territories, the pueblo, cliff-dwelling (or cavate) and ceremonial elements of this verdant valley became a source of inspiration, dedication and

---

education for a small group of men and women who would attempt to bring it's secrets into the public realm. Through a period of forty years, most characterized by the work of one Edgar Lee Hewett and his School of American Archaeology, Frijoles Canyon went from an unknown remnant of Native American ancestry to a highly visible, frequently visited, government managed National Monument dedicated to the preservation and display of a prehistoric culture. Hewett, through his constant politicking, brought about the national attention afforded to this area, as did he create, through his archaeological studies, stabilization and restoration attempts and educational practices, a prototype for the future development of prehistoric cultural areas in the country. Providing this public with a means of access to the sites of prehistoric man, and the history that these remains could reveal, Hewett established his place in the preservation movement in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

Preservation and Education

Hewett's theories and philosophical revelations regarding the preservation of archaeological resources seem to remain fairly consistent throughout his forty year career in the region, but his work exhibits allowances made for the purpose of
increasing visitation to the park and providing interpretive exhibits in situ. Throughout his work, one thing is apparent, that being the basic tension between the goal of preservation of sites for their scientific value, with protection and stabilization as the main objective, and preservation and presentation of the same for their value as essential tools in the education of the general public. For Hewett, these two goals often served in combination, although it seems as if the educational value of these sites is the more significant asset to him.

Hewett adamantly proclaims early on in the period in which preservation is his main interest, that "repairs and restorations have a tendency to detract from the picturesqueness of the ruin, from its interest to the public, and its value to science," and yet restoration is the means by which he attacks several sites within Frijoles Canyon and beyond. Hewett provides justification for this though, stating from the earliest of his publications that his ultimate goal is the education of a public which is not afforded much exposure to history. Although Hewett strove to be accepted into the developing professional field of archaeology at the turn of the century, in the end he did not veer too far from his original calling. The projects that he supervised, the works that he published and the organizations with which he was involved, all

gravitated towards this concept of education through field work and on site experiences. Even the School of American Research, which had officially been founded with the intention of conducting archaeological studies of the Southwestern region, had, through Hewett, organized itself around the summer field school and lecture programs which were actually very light on scientific method in their archaeological research. From his earliest publications on the remains of the Pajarito Plateau, through his pursuit of protective legislation that would result in the American Antiquities Act, and into the period in which he supervised the archaeological investigation, stabilization and restoration of the sited of Frijoles Canyon, Hewett’s pedagogic nature was apparent.

*The Importance of History*

Knowledge of the archaeological studies and stabilization practices employed by Hewett in the area currently known as Bandelier National Monument, previous to the entrance of the National Park Service in 1932, is sparse. The work on this portion of the Pajarito Plateau, which would become the focal point of interpretive programs preceding, and just following the passage of the Antiquities Act of 1906, is revealed
through Hewett’s texts on the Pueblo region, the short references encapsulated within the anthropological journals of the period and reports of those organizations that he was involved with. These include the *El Palacio*, the journal of the School of American Research; the monthly and annual reports of the SAR, of which he had a great influence in the founding and direction of, and its parent organization, the Archaeological Institute of America; the annual reports of the Bureau of American Ethnology and its parent, the Smithsonian Institution; Hewett’s published articles in *American Anthropologist*; and throughout correspondence between Hewett and his colleagues (Lummis, Nusbaum, Morley, etc). These references are spotty, at best, with Hewett leaving little or no notes regarding the work done on the sites in the canyon beyond the short published reports that he generated and repeatedly issued.114

It is for this reason that many who write on the preservation movement as it relates to the archaeological resources of the Southwest omit the work of Frijoles Canyon, most

114 As a result of the close relationships that Hewett had established with his Native American guides and informants, and the private nature of much of the ritual and religious information which he was provided, he chose not to leave his notes, which would have spanned over 40 years of research and study in the region, for the perusal of the masses. As stated in Malinda Elliot’s *Exploring Human Worlds: A History of the School of American Research*, a work published by the SAR in 1987. With one of his last actions, Hewett once again provoked controversy. Basing his writings on notes taken during discussions with Indian informants..., he left his books and memoirs for posterity; but to the consternation of many of his colleagues, he burned the irreplaceable notes themselves. Hewett took this drastic step because he had promised his Indian friends that he would never betray their trust...In the eyes of many anthropologists, this action placed his friendship with the Indians before his responsibility as a scientist. Yet Hewett acted, as always, on the basis of his personal vision. (35)
Conclusion

opting to concentrate instead on the well documented practices involved in the preservation of such areas as Mesa Verde National Park, Chaco Canyon and Casa Grande. This is not to say that the work done within was any less relevant to the developing field.

Though not the largest or the best preserved of the ancient Puebloan sites in the American Southwest, the area currently known as Bandelier National Monument certainly is representative of the practices, problems and possibilities of the region at large. While the larger scale cultural parks such as Mesa Verde have been traditionally associated with the joint development of applied archaeology and preservation in the United States, Bandelier represents one of the first and longest lived archaeological areas which served as the testing ground for ideas, policies and practices of cultural resource investigation, analysis, interpretation and presentation. Frijoles Canyon contains within its history the hopes, possibilities, successes and failures of the preservation movement in its nascent stages.
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FIGURES
Figure 1.1 Current park and visitor center area map showing park boundaries and geographical features. ([www.nps.gov/band/pphtml/maps.html](http://www.nps.gov/band/pphtml/maps.html), 10 April 2002)
Figure 1.2  Tyuonyi and cliff, before excavation was complete, 1909 (Courtesy of H.S. Poley Collection, Denver Public Library)

Figure 1.3  Tyuonyi pueblo, current layout (Photograph by author, July 2001)
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Figure 1.4  Conjectural restoration of Tyuonyi pueblo, aerial view (J.W. Hendron, Prehistory of El Rito de los Frijoles, 50)

Figure 1.5  Interior of Big Kiva showing subfloor features (J.W. Hendron, Prehistory of El Rito de los Frijoles, 16)
Figure 1.6 Talus village and cliff, Frijoles Canyon, 1910. The shadow of the original dwelling known as Long House is apparent through the remains of viga holes and door openings in the cliff-side. (Courtesy of H.S. Poley Collection, Denver Public Library)
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Figure 1.7  Close-up view of cavates in cliff, Bandelier National Monument, 1910 (Courtesy of H.S. Poley Collection, Denver Public Library)

Figure 1.8  View of Ceremonial Cave, n.d. (Courtesy of H.S. Poley Collection, Denver Public Library)
Figure 1.9  Restored kiva in Ceremonial Cave, Frijoles Canyon, 1909
(Courtesy of H.S. Poley Collection, Denver Public Library)
Figure 2.1  Adolph Bandelier, 1865. (Melinda Elliot, *Exploring Human Worlds: A History of the School of American Research*, 3)
Figure 2.2  José Hilario Montoya. Bandelier’s guide and informant during his travels in the Southwest, n.d. (Charles H. Lange and Carroll L. Riley, editors, *The Southwestern Journals of Adolph F. Bandelier*, n.p.)
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Figure 2.3 Sketch map of EL Rito de los Frijoles and the area south to Potrero Chiato, c. 1881 (Charles H. Lange and Carroll L. Riley, editors, The Southwestern Journals of Adolph F. Bandelier, 173)

Figure 2.4 Sketch of ruins from Frijoles Canyon, c. 1881 (Charles H. Lange and Carroll L. Riley, editors, The Southwestern Journals of Adolph F. Bandelier, 228)
Figure 2.5  Cliff Dwellers exhibit at the World’s Columbian Exposition, Chicago, 1893 (Chris Wilson, *The Myth of Santa Fe: Creating a Modern Regional Tradition*, 89)
Figure 2.6  Edgar Lee Hewett, 1898 (Raymond Harris Thompson, "Edgar Lee Hewett and the Political Process." 274)
Figure 3.1  Alice Cunningham Fletcher, n.d. (Melinda Elliot, *Exploring Human Worlds: A History of the School of American Research*, 10)
Figure 3.2  Casa Grande Ruins, Coolidge vicinity, Pinal County, AZ (Historic American Buildings Survey John P. O'Neill, Photographer March 2, 1937 View of Tower from West, HABS, ARIZ, 11-COOL.V, 1-1)
Figure 3.3  Archaeological Map of the proposed National Park of the Cliff Cities, 1914. The original proposal for this park came in 1901, as a result of the work of E.L. Hewett. (Thomas J. Altherr, "The Pajarito or Cliff Dwellers' National Park Proposal," 274)
Figure 3.4 Map Showing Location of Prehistoric Ruins of New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado & Utah, compiled by Edgar Lee Hewett to show the most important ruins in the region, and those in need of preservation through government custodianship and regulation, 1904 (Hewett, Memorandum Concerning the Historic and Prehistoric Ruins of Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado and Utah, and their Preservation, insert)
Figure 3.5 View of Cliff Palace before stabilization, 1901 (Courtesy of H.S. Poley Collection, Denver Public Library)
Figure 3.6

Map of Bandelier National Monument within the Santa Fe National Forest after borders are extended, 1932 (Hal Rothman, Bandelier National Monument, An Administrative History, Appendix D)
Figure 4.1

Archaeological Map of the Jemez Plateau, 1906 (Hewett, et. al., Antiquities of the Jemez Plateau, insert)
Figure 4.2 Palace of the Governors, Santa Fe, before restoration by School of American Research, c. 1878 (Photograph by Ben Wittick. Chris Wilson, *The Myth of Santa Fe: Creating a Modern Regional Tradition*, 61)

Figure 4.3 Palace of the Governors after restoration by School of American Research, c. 1913 (Photograph by Jesse Nusbaum. Courtesy of Denver Public Library)
Figure 4.4 Sketch map of the Canyon of the Rito de los Frijoles showing location of ruins, mainly those associated with the pueblo of Tyuonyi, c. 1909 (Hewett, “Excavations at El Rito de los Frijoles, New Mexico in 1909,” 652)

Figure 4.5 Jesse Nusbaum and A.V. Kidder during field season at Mesa Verde National Park, 1908 (Melinda Elliot, Exploring Human Worlds: A History of the School of American Research, 13)
Figure 4.6, Figure 4.7  Interior of restored cliff-dwelling, Frijoles Canyon, 1908 (Hewett, "Excavations at Tyuonyi, New Mexico in 1908," 451)
Figure 4.8 Plan of the Sun House showing location of rooms, c. 1909 (Hewett, "Excavations at El Rito de los Frijoles, New Mexico in 1909," 656)

Figure 4.9 Sun House, after excavation by School of American Research, 1909 (Courtesy of H.S. Poley Collection, Denver Public Library)
Figure 4.10  
Ground plan of the large cave kiva, to be restored by School of American Research, c. 1909 (Hewett, “Excavations at El Rito de los Frijoles, New Mexico in 1909,” 664)
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Figure 4.11 Conjectural restoration of the Great Ceremonial Cave by Kenneth Chapman, c. 1909 (Hewett, “Excavations at El Rito de los Frijoles, New Mexico in 1909,” 667)

Figure 4.12 Restoration of kiva roof in Ceremonial Cave, 1909 (Courtesy of H.S. Poley Collection, Denver Public Library)
Figure 4.13 Tourists pose in the reconstructed Balcony House ruins, Mesa Verde National Park, n.d. (Photograph by George L. Beam, Courtesy of Denver Public Library)
Figure 4.15  Talus House, reconstructed by School of American Research, c. 1920
(J.W. Hendron, Frijoles, A Hidden Valley in a New World, n.p.)
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BANDELIER'S OBSERVATIONS
Excerpt from Adolph Bandelier’s Final Report...¹

IV.


...From the southern edge of the Ziro-Ka-nash, or Mesa del Pajarito, we look down into the Rito as into a narrow valley several miles long and closed in the west by rocky ledges, over which the stream descends to the bottom lands of the Rito. Through these it flows for several miles as gushing brook, enlivened by trout, bordered by thickets of various kinds of shrubbery, and shaded at intervals by groves of pine, and tall, isolated trees of stately appearance. In the east, not far from the Rio Grande, a narrow, frowning gateway is formed by lofty rocks of black basalt, leaving space for the bed of the stream, the waters of which reach the river only during freshets, while in the valley they are permanent. The slope of the mesa lining the Rito on the south is gradual, though steep; ledges and crags of pumice protrude from the shrubs and grass growing over it. Tall pines crown it above. The average depth of the Rito below both mesas is several hundred feet; in place, perhaps as much five hundred feet or more. It is not properly a valley, since its greatest width hardly attains half a mile, but a gorge or “canon” with a fertile bottom and a brook running through it.

Descent into the Rito from the north is possible in several places, though tedious on account of the steepness and of the vegetation covering the slopes. If we cross the bottom, ascent the southern mesa, and from its brink look down again into the gorge, the northern wall presents a striking appearance. With few intervals, it is a long line of light-colored of very friable tufa, in places vertical and smooth, but mostly worn into angles and crags, running in sharp zigzag

¹ Adolph Bandelier. Final Report...
lines, like the “coulisses” of a stage. A talus of varying height, steep and covered with rocky debris, extends from the bottom of the gorge to the foot of these cliffs. As seen from the brink of the southern mesa, the view of the Rito is as surprising as it is picturesque.

The effect is heightened by the appearance of a great number of little doorways along the foot of the cliffs, irregularly alternating with larger cavities indicating caves, the fronts of which have partially or completely crumbled away. The base of the cliffs rises and falls, so that the line of caves appears to be at different elevations, and not continuous. There are spaces where the rock has not been burrowed into; in some places two, in others three, tiers of caves are visible. The Whole length of this village of troglodytes is about two miles, rather more than less. Upon the assumption that all the grottos were occupied simultaneously, the population the Rito would have been much larger than that of the Pu-ye, and might have equaled that of the Pu-ye and Shu-finne combined, amounting to nearly twenty-five hundred souls; but it is more likely that fifteen hundred represents the number of the inhabitants. Here was a little world of its own. The bottom afforded a sufficient extent of very fertile soil; there was enough permanent to permit irrigation, and there are even traces of acequias of both sides of the brook. Trees stood in front of their homes, and the mesas above are well wooded. Game of all kind, deer, elk, mountain sheep, bears, and turkeys, roamed about the region in numbers, and the brook afforded fish. The Rito is cool in summer and not very cold in winter, compared with the surrounding table-lands and the Rio Grande valley. It was a choice spot, admirably fitted for the wants of a primitive people.

It was also excellently situated for protection against a savage enemy. The inhabitants of the Rito could neither be starved out nor cut off from their water supply. Prowling Navajos might render hunting on the mesas very unsafe for months, but only a direct attack in great force could imperil the cave dwellers at home. It was easy for the ladder to guard against surprise, since the foot of the cliffs affords lookouts over the whole bottom up and down.

The cave dwellings of the Rito are so much like those of the Pu-ye and Shu-finne that they scarcely need description; the differences are purely local and accidental. As in the Tehua country, they have
artificial floors, and are whitewashed inside or daubed over with yellow clay. There are the same types of doorways, air-holes, and possibly loop-holes; the same kind of niches and recesses; but the cave dwellings at the Rito are the most perfect scene by me anywhere.

The hearth or fireplace offers nothing remarkable, simply made of two slabs set on edge against the outer wall of the cave. Above it, and 0.50 m. (22 inches) above the floor, is a hole serving as a means of escape for the smoke. Here are the only chimneys to be found in caves of artificial make, and since the Rito during the past and present centuries has been inhabited several times, and since shepherds and cattle thieves have repeatedly made the caves their abode, their antiquity is doubtful. There are also some metate frames unquestionably modern, as similar ones can be seen at the Zuni village, at the village of To-ya or Nutria, inhabited during summer by portions of the Zuni tribe, and the remains of one existed in 1886 in one of the caves of the Pu-ye.

The same doubt as about the chimneys arises in regard to a cave occupying the corner of a projection of one of the cliffs on the upper part of the Rito, and it stands by no means alone. Three sides of the cave are of natural rock, but the third is closed by a thin wall of blocks of stone laid in mud and well built. The doorway has a frame of stones, and two lintels, the upper one made of half-round strips of wood, the lower of round sticks, laid lengthwise against across the opening. Both wood and stone work appeared to me suspiciously fresh; still, the place is well sheltered, and this may account for their preservation.

The caves themselves, like those at the Pu-ye, are poor in relics, except those in the upper tiers, in which a few jars and bowls have been found. The valley of the Rito, especially the ruins, of which I shall speak further on, abounds in fragments of pottery, stone axes, arrowheads, metates, grinders, and the like. Obsidian in sharp splinters and chips, is profusely scattered about; and the rock itself contains nodules of that material so valuable to primitive man in the southwest. The axes are mostly of basalt. I have been shown a fetich made of lava, which was reported to have been found at the Rito, and pictographs exist in several places. The potsherds are of various kinds, corrugated and plain black, the very ancient black and white, and black and red,
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thickly glazed designs. In short, we have in the manufacture objects also a repetition of features noticed at the Pu-ye and the Shu-finne.

I measured nearly every cave through the whole length of the canon as far as traces of former habitations extended, but must confine myself to some details only. Against such of the cliffs as rise vertically, and the surface of which is almost smooth, terraced houses were built, using the rock for a rear wall. Not only are the holes visible in which the ends of the beams rested that supported roofs and ceilings, but in one or two places portions of the beams still protrude. They were round, and of the usual size. Along the base of these cliffs extends an apron, which was once approximately leveled, and on this apron the foundations of walls appear in places. It would seem that a row of houses, one, two, and even three stories high, leaned against the cliff; and sometimes the upper story consisted of a cave, the lower of a building.

Chambers nearly circular, larger in size than the majority of caves, are also found in the cliffs, some of which have a low projection around the room like a bench of stone. These are doubtless estufas, as I was told by one of the Indians who accompanied me to the spot. There is a distinct estufa not far from the bank of the brook opposite those caves situated in the upper portion of the valley, and a smaller one still higher up. Including the four estufas connected with the pueblo ruins, of which I will speak further on, I have noticed at least ten such constructions at the Rito.

In describing the Pu-ye, I spoke of the pueblo ruins which lie on the top of the cliff of that name. At the Rito de los Frijoles there are at least three similar ruins, but they lie in the river bottom. Two of them are in front of the caves at a short distance from the talus sloping up to them. One was a one-house pueblo of the polygonal type, which probably sheltered several hundred people; the interior court still shows three circular depressions or estufas. The other, which lies about sixty meters east of it, shows thirty-nine cells on the ground floor’ and sixteen meters north of it is an estufa twelve meters in diameter. Farther east are the remains of a circular tank fifteen meters across, and still beyond stand the remains of a round tower, which was certainly built in the past century by Spanish owners of the Rito. There are some doubts in regard to the antiquity of the tank also. The
average dimensions of forty-four rooms on the larger ruin are 3.2 by 3.8 meters. The three estufas in the courtyard of the polygonal ruin measure respectively 7, 10, and 11 meters across. The walls of these buildings were of blocks of pumice from the cliffs, of various sizes, but nearly regular in shape. As usual, they were laid in adobe mud, in courses, without breaking joints.

A third ruin, situated nearly a mile farther down the gorge in a grove of pine trees, formed an L, with a rude stone enclosure on its north side, and connected with it is a small estufa. It is quite as much decayed as the large polygon, and the potsherds covering its surface are similar.
APPENDIX C:

LEGISLATION CONCERNING FRIJOLES CANYON

C-1: AMERICAN ANTIQUITIES ACT, 1906

UNIFORM RULES AND REGULATIONS, 1906

C-2: ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BANDELIER NATIONAL MONUMENT, 1916

BORDER AND CUSTODIAL CHANGE, 1932
Appendix C: Legislation Concerning Frijoles Canyon

Appendix C-1

American Antiquities of Act, 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 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 excavation 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
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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

www.cr.nps.gov/local-law/anti1906.htm
Uniform Rules and Regulations

Prescribed by the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, and War
To Carry Out the Provisions of the “Act for the Preservation of American
Antiquities,”
Approved June 8, 1906

34 STAT. L. 225

1. Jurisdiction over ruins, archeological sites, historic and prehistoric monuments and structures, objects of antiquity, historic landmarks, and other objects of historic or scientific interest, shall be exercised under the act by the respective Departments as follows:

By the Secretary of Agriculture over lands within the exterior limits of forest reserves, by the Secretary of War over lands within the exterior limits of military reservations, by the Secretary of the Interior over all other lands owned or controlled by the Government of the United States, provided the Secretary of the Interior in the supervision of such monuments and objects covered by the act of June 8, 1906, as may be located on lands near of adjacent to forest reserves and military reservations respectively.

2. No permit for the removal of any ancient monument or structure which can be permanently preserved under the control of the United States in situ, and remain an object of interest, shall be granted.

3. Permits for the examination of ruins, the excavation of archeological sites, and the gathering of objects of antiquity will be granted, by the respective Secretaries having jurisdiction, to reputable museums, universities, colleges, or other recognized scientific or educational institutions, or to their duly authorized agents.

4. No exclusive permits shall be granted for a larger area than the applicant can reasonably be expected to explore fully and systematically within the time limit in the permit.
5. Each application for a permit should be filed with the Secretary having jurisdiction, and must be accompanied by a definite outline of the proposed work, indicating the name of the institution making the request, the date proposed for beginning the field work, the length of time proposed to be devoted to it, and the person who will have immediate charge of the work. The application must also contain an exact statement of the character of the work, whether examination, excavation, or gathering and the public museum in which the collections made under the permit are to be permanently preserved. The application must be accompanied by a sketch plan or description of the particular site or area to be examined, excavated, or searched, so definite that it can be located on the map with reasonable accuracy.

6. No permit will be granted for a period of more that three years, but if the work has been diligently prosecuted under the permit, the time may be extended for proper cause upon application.

7. Failure to begin work under a permit within six months after it is granted, or failure to diligently prosecute such work after it has been begun, shall make the permit void without any order or proceeding by the Secretary having jurisdiction.

8. Applications for permits shall be referred to the Smithsonian Institution for recommendation.

9. Every permit shall be in writing and copies shall be transmitted to the Smithsonian Institution and the field officer in charge in the land involved. The permittee will be furnished a copy of these rules and regulations.

10. At the close of each season’s field work the permittee shall report in duplicate to the Smithsonian Institution, in such form as its secretary may prescribe, and shall prepare in duplicate a catalogue of the collections and the photographs made during the season, indicating therein such material, if any, as may be available for exchange.

11. Institutions and persons receiving permits for excavation shall, after completion of the work, restore the lands upon which they have worked to their customary condition, the satisfaction of the field officer in charge.

12. All permits shall be terminable at the discretion of the Secretary having jurisdiction.
13. The field officer in charge of land owned or controlled by the Government of the United States shall, from time to time, inquire and report as to the existence, on or near such lands, of ruins and archeological sites, historic or prehistoric ruins or monuments, objects of antiquity, historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest.

14. The field officer in charge may at all times examine the permit of any person of institution claiming privileges granted in accordance with the act and these rules and regulations, and may fully examine all work done under such permit.

15. All persons duly authorized by the Secretaries of Agriculture, War, and Interior may apprehend or cause to be arrested, as provided in the act of February, 6 1905 (33 Stat. L., 700), any person or persons who appropriate, excavate, injure, or destroy any historic or prehistoric ruin or monument, or any object of antiquity on lands under the supervision of the Secretaries of Agriculture, War, and Interior respectively.

16. Any object of antiquity taken, or collection made, on lands owned or controlled by the United States, without a permit, as prescribed by the act and these rules and regulations, or there taken or made, contrary to the terms of the permit, or contrary to the act and these rules and regulations, may be seized wherever found and at any time, by the proper field officer of by any person duly authorized by the Secretary having jurisdiction, and disposed of as the Secretary shall determine, by deposit in the proper national depository or otherwise.

17. 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 by 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.
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The foregoing rules and regulations are hereby approved in triplicate and, under authority conferred by law on the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, and War, are hereby made and established, to take effect immediately.

SGD: E.A. Hitchcock
Secretary of the Interior.

SGD: James Wilson
Secretary of Agriculture

SGD: Wm H. Taft
Secretary of War

Appendix C-2

Establishment of the Bandelier National Monument

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
A PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS, certain prehistoric aboriginal ruins situated upon public lands of the United States, within the Santa Fe National Forest, in the State of New Mexico, are of unusual ethnologic, scientific, and educational interest and it appears that the public interests would be promoted by reserving these relics of a vanished people, with as much land as may be necessary for the proper protection thereof, as a National Monument;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the power in me vested by section two of the Act of Congress approved June 8, 1906, entitled “An Act for the Preservation of American Antiquities”, do proclaim that there are hereby reserved from appropriation and use of all kinds under all of the public land laws, subject to all prior valid adverse claims, and set apart as a National Monument, all the tracts of land, in the State of New Mexico, shown as the Bandelier National Monument on the diagram forming a part hereof.

The reservation made by this proclamation is not intended to prevent the use of the lands for forest purposes under the proclamation establishing the Santa Fe National Forest. The two reservations shall both be effective on the land withdrawn, but the National Monument hereby established shall be the dominant reservation, and any use of the land which interferes with its preservation or protection as a National Monument is hereby forbidden.

Warning is hereby given to all unauthorized persons not to appropriate, injure, remove, or destroy any feature of this National Monument, or to locate or settle on any of the lands reserved by this proclamation.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

[SEAL] DONE at the City of Washington this eleventh day of February in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixteen, and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and fortieth.

WOODROW WILSON.

By the President:
ROBERT LANSING,
Secretary of State.

NATIONAL MONUMENTS BANDELIER

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
A PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS it appears desirable, in the public interest, to add to the Bandelier National Monument as established by proclamation of February 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 1764), certain lands of the United States within the Santa Fe National Forest, in the State of New Mexico, and to exclude said national monument as enlarged from the Santa Fe National Forest;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Herbert Hoover, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the power in me vested by section 2, act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225; U.S. Code title 16, sec. 473), do proclaim that the boundaries of the Bandelier National Monument be, and they are hereby, changed so as to include certain additional lands in T. 19N., R. 7E., New Mexico principal meridian, subject to all valid existing rights, and that the reservation as so enlarged is hereby excluded from the Santa Fe National Forest, the lands within the reservation as enlarged being described as follows:

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN

T. 19N., R. 7E.,
   South half of secs. 7, 8, and 9;
   Secs. 16 to 21 inclusive;
   Fractional secs. 28, 29, and 30;

All lands in unsurveyed Tps. 17 and 18N., R. 6E., lying north of the Canada de Cochiti Grant, south of the Ramon Vigil Grant, and west of the Rio Grande River.

Warning is hereby given to all unauthorized persons nor to appropriate, injure, remove, or destroy any feature of this national monument, nor to locate or settle on any of the lands reserved by this proclamation.

Nothing herein contained shall modify or abridge the right of the public to travel over any or all public roads now existing within or upon the lands herein described or roads
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subsequently constructed to take the place of such existing roads, nor shall public travel over said roads be subject to any restriction or condition other than those generally applicable to the use of public roads in the State of New Mexico.

The Director of the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall have the supervision, management, and control of this monument as provided in the act of Congress entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535-536), and acts additional thereto or amendatory thereof.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

[SEAL] DONE at the City of Washington this 25th day of February, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and thirty-two, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and fifty-sixth.

HERBERT HOOVER.

By the President:
HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of State.

APPENDIX D:

STABILIZATION OF THE TALUS HOUSE
Excerpt from Southwestern Monuments Supplement for December, 1937...

Stabilization of Talus House

By J.W. Hendron

During the year 1920, while Bandelier National Monument was under the administration of the United States Forest Service, the School of American Research resumed field work in the Rito de los Frijoles in cooperation with the Forest Service. This piece of field work was the restoration in part of the Talus Village, called the House of the Sun People, which was excavated by the School in 1909...

Mr. Kenneth M. Chapman, who at the time was a member of the Museum staff, and who had for twenty years been a student of the architecture and art of the region, was selected for the job. He was assisted by a number of Tewa Indians from the village of San Ildefonso in the Rio Grande Valley, who had for years past been in the employ of the School in the excavation and study of ancient ruins in the Pajarito Plateau. These men had been not only students of the ancient architecture of their race, but they had experience in building important structures along the ancient lines under the auspices of the school. They assisted in the construction of the "Painted Desert" at the Panama-California Exposition, and in the building of the Art Museum in Santa Fe. Not a feature of the restoration was carried out until every remaining ruin in the canyon had been carefully studied for historic authority. The result has been a most interesting addition to the attractions of the famous region. (Hewett, Edgar L.: Official Act and Administrative Reports of the School of American Research, Archaeological Institute of America, Santa Fe, New Mexico, U.S.A., ns. Paper No. 22, 1918-1927, p. 53-55.)

I have been fortunate enough, through the kindness of Mr. Chapman, to obtain a detailed account of the restoration and also the names of most of the Indians employed by the School at that time.

Seemingly Mr. Chapman was unable to leave Santa Fe until about two weeks after the project was agreed upon and so Wesley Bradfield was sent out ahead and employed San Ildefonso men to cut vigas and small beam poles for roofing. He was advised not to use pine cut at that season (May) for vigas, so he selected cut oak, and alders for the other material from the floor of the canyon. Four to six men were used for several weeks gathering building stone from the talus slopes and from the excavations at Tyuonyi. The old footing of the walls was located, partly by excavation and partly by study of Mr. Chapman’s plan published in the report of the 1909 excavations. (The Excavations at El Rito de los Frijoles in 1909, Papers of the School of American Archaeology, Archaeological Institute of America, No. 10, p. 656.) In some instances, it was necessary to cut back several inches into the weathered tuff to get satisfactory footing for the walls.

The valley soil was found to be too sandy for mud mortar, so it was mixed with clay obtained at the top of the trail, where it was exposed on a slope among the junipers, pinons and pines. The Indians packed it down in sacks on burros. This same clay was also used for interior plastering of the rooms. To get rid of leaves, sticks, roots, and coarse gravel, the clay was stirred to a consistency of cream, in buckets. The floating vegetal material was skimmed off and then the clean clay was poured off, leaving the gravel and sand. After settling, the water was poured off and the clay then used with the valley soil. For the plastering, sifted sand was used with the clay.

This reconstruction consists of five small rooms, and to enable the reader to view the situation clearly, a detailed description of the features of each room will be given. I shall number these rooms from 1 to 5.
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Room 1 is to the front of the structure and forms the southeast corner. It measures 8.3 feet across the back wall on the inside, 9 feet across the front, the west wall, 5.6 feet, and the east wall, 7.1 feet. The 8 main vigas of oak were laid the width of the room. They were approximately 5 inches in diameter. Poles or vigas of alder approximately 2 inches in diameter were laid across the main vigas and nailed. It was found that these poles in some cases were flattened with an ax so that they would lay an inch or so into the end strong walls. Apparently strong branches were used to fill in the gaps between the poles. Over the poles was laid a thin layer of brush, pine needles and grass. On this, 2 x 4’s were spiked down edgewise at intervals to provide nailing surfaces for a 3-ply roofing material. In the space between the 2 x 4’s was places crushed tuff, 1 to 2 inches in diameter and bedded in a clay mortar and finished to the level of the 2 x 4’s. Over this, when dry, the 3-ply roofing was cemented and nailed down to the 2 x 4’s, and brought up as flashing at the sides, and flashed into the rain troughs of oak. Over the flashing, the final course of building stone or parapet wall was laid in cement mortar colored to imitate the mud mortar used between the rest of the building stone. After testing the pitch of the roof to make sure that the water poured on every part reached the drain troughs, the Indians laid an earth roof over the 3-ply roofing, using 2 inches of mud, and when that cracked, threw dirt on and worked it into the cracks. This layer was carefully sifted to keep sharp objects from puncturing the sheet roofing. Afterwards, another inch or so of ordinary dry earth was thrown on.

This room has in its front wall a low doorway, enabling a person to view the inside. In the southeast corner is a grinding bin 37 inches long and 32 inches wide, its sides being of slabs of black basalt. One slab divides the bin into two parts and in each compartment is a metate of basalt set in mud, and still in the correct position for grinding. This was, of course, a reconstruction by Mr. Chapman at the time the lodge was built, and was put back in place as near as the original position could be determined. In the southwest corner is the firebox. It is approximately 19 inches square and rather indefinite, some of the stones being missing. Its construction is very simple and it seems that
slabs of basalt were set edgewise so that another slab could be placed flat over them.

Above the firebox, and in the roof 68.5 inches from the floor, is a chimney or smoke hole approximately 10 inches square with a small parapet wall around it. Back of the smoke hole and not more than 15 inches towards the cliff, midway between the the front and back walls is the hatchway. Four lengths of oak notched at the ends and nailed to the main vigas were used for its construction. It is a little longer than wide, and just large enough for a human being to pass through.

The walls on the inside of the rooms were plastered with a coating of natural colored mud, a light brown to be specific, which was followed by a fine coating of plaster 35 inches up from the floor, apparently a clay of a light burnt red color. It is not known why rooms were given a final touching up to this height, but it was probably a measure of cleanliness; plastering the walls whenever the smoke had sufficiently blackened them.

In the northeast corner of the room is a small doorway leading through the back wall into another chamber which I shall refer to as room No. 2. Two slabs of basalt set in a low protrusion of the cliff were used as steps leading up to the doorway 40 inches above the floor of room No. 1. In the bottom of the entrance was set a slab of polished black basalt. The entrance is barely large enough to crawl through.

Room 2 lies directly in back of room 1, and is a good example of a terraced room. It seems that in some instances rooms nearer the cliff were built in rising levels. The chamber is almost square, the inside measurement of the front wall being 7.7 feet, the same for the back wall; the east wall, 6.8 feet; and the west wall, 6.1 feet. The roof consists of 6 main vigas of approximately the same diameter as the vigas of the room previously mentioned, and the roof construction is the same as room No. 1. There was no smoke hole in the roof, but there was a central opening which was nearly in the center of the room near the northwest wall and constructed almost identical to that of room No. 1, and very little larger. From the floor to the ceiling, the
room measures 72 inches and its walls are plastered in the same manner as the room in front of it.

In the center of the back wall is a small doorway with a slab of basalt set in the bottom 13 inches above the floor of room No. 2, leading into a shaft partly cut out of the cliff. The shaft measures 24 inches from the wall to the cliff, and 39 inches from the wall to its roof consisting of small poles of alder approximately 2 inches in diameter. The roof of room No. 2 extends over this covering and 15 inches above it. Four of the main vigas of room No. 2 were mudded into post holes cut into the cliff, and extended over the sides of the shaft, while two other vigas extended just through the wall which separated the shaft from the room in front. Along side these two main vigas were laid short lengths of pine about 55 inches long, extending over the shaft to post holes in the cliff. The shaft is barely large enough for an individual to sit in. Its use is unknown, but it is thought to have been a receptacle of some sort. Parts of its sides are laid up with chunks of tuff almost to the main vigas of room No. 2. I discussed the matter of the shaft with Mr. Chapman and learned that roofing material would soon rot, probably because of the lack of air.

Room No. 3 is the northwest room of the lodge and joins room No. 1 on the west. A low entrance way is in the front wall on the southwest side opening into the small chamber. Its inside measurements are as follows: southwest wall, 10.3 feet; northeast wall, 10 feet; northwest wall, 3.9 feet; and the southeast wall, 6.2 feet. The back wall curves toward the inside of the room and is laid upon a large flat protrusion of tuff, a natural formation which seems to serve as sort of a bench extending 7.5 inches above the floor of the room. Near the southeast wall there is a carved out portion which is just large enough for a person to sit down in.

The height of the room is 5.9 feet from the floor to the ceiling which was constructed in the same manner as the other two rooms mentioned. There were six main vigas in all. No central opening was found in this roof and there was no doorway leading into the room in back of it. In the middle of the back wall and almost down to the ridge of tuff was a
The text on this page is not legible due to the quality of the image. It appears to be a page from a document, but the content cannot be accurately transcribed.
small opening, which appeared to be for cleaning out the adjoining room or for handling objects from one room to the other.

Room No. 4 lies directly in back of room No. 3 and is built next to the cliff. The inside measurement of the back wall is 7.6 feet; the front wall, 8.3 feet; the northwest wall, 7 feet; and the southeast wall, 6.8 feet. From the floor to the ceiling it measures 6.5 feet. The roof is constructed almost identical to the others except that split pieces of timber, apparently pine, were used in some places instead of poles of alder. There were four large vigas of oak. The entrance is through the top almost in the center of the room between the second and third vigas and its size varies little from the hatchways of the other two rooms.

Directly in back of room No. 4 is room no. 5. It is entirely separated from the other rooms of the lodge and has to be entered by first ascending to the roof or room No. 4, and going through a low doorway in the front wall. The front of southwest wall and a small part of the northwest wall are the only ones built in this particular case, the other walls being formed by the cliff. The front wall measures 8.9 feet on the inside. The distance from the doorway in the front wall to the back of the room is 9 feet. From its floor to the roof it is 6.4 feet, and the construction is the same as the other four rooms, with the exception that the vigitas or poles were placed about three inches apart, and covered by small branches, which appeared to be willows, placed very close together. There were 5 main vigas of oak, the floor is on about the same level as the roof of room No. 4, which is directly in front of it, and its walls plastered in the same manner. In the southeast corner were found slabs of black basalt which apparently from the firebox, the smoke hole being in the corner of the front wall just below the roof.

In each one of the rooms was a small rain trough placed in some portion of the roof. Three of the original troughs were still in place, the others had disappeared.

According to Mr. Chapman, except for the interior plastering, done by Tonita Roybal and Ana Montoya, no attempt was made to finish the interiors of the rooms, the main item in this regard probably being the
plastering of the floors and blackened with soot. As near as can be determined, Indians employed other than those previously mentioned were Julian Martinez, Sotero Montoya, Juan Cruz Roybal, and Dionicio Sanchez.
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HABS No. NM-17.

THE CEREMONIAL CAVE
Bandelier National Monument, Sandoval County, New Mexico
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H.A.B.S. No. N.M. 17.

THE CEREMONIAL CAVE

Bandelier National Monument, Sandoval County, New Mexico.


Date of Erection: Late prehistoric times, somewhere between 1200 and 1400 A.D.

Architect: None.

Builder: Pueblo Indians.

Present Condition: Poor; walls of living-rooms entirely destroyed, foundations still in place; kiva twice restored (1910, 1937).

Number of Stories: Living-rooms, none (originally two); kiva, one (as originally).

Materials of Construction: Foundations of living-rooms, rough field stone with adobe mortar; stone with adobe mortar; floors, adobe; roof, vigas, vigitas, brush and earth (originally) rebuilt with similar construction except asphalt roofing felt used under the earth in the reconstruction.


Additional Data: "There is no real justification for calling this cave "Ceremonial"; the people who built and occupied this little settlement presumably selected this almost inaccessible, large cave in the cliff 70 feet above the canyon bottom for purposes of seclusion and defense. There is nothing other than the location to differentiate this sharply from other small Pueblo Indian villages." Erik Reed, Regional Archaeologist, Region III, National Park Service, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Trent Thomas,
Architect in Charge,
HABS, Southwest Unit.

Approved October 16th, 1940.

John Gaw Meem,
District Officer.
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Appendix E: HABS Documentation

HABS No. NM-16.

THE LARGE KIVA

Bandelier National Monument, Sandoval County, New Mexico


Date of Erection: Late prehistoric times; built or rebuilt in A.D. 1513.

Architect: None.

Builder: Pueblo Indians.

Present Conditions: Fair; roof destroyed; most of floor surfacing destroyed; walls partly destroyed and restored (stabilized by National Park Service).

Number of Stories: One.

Materials of Construction: Foundations and walls, rough field stone laid up in adobe mortar with adobe plaster on the interior; roof, vigas, virutas (presumably) brush and earth.

Other Existing Records: Written records, photographs, J. W. Hendron, Jr., report on archaeology of Prijoles Canyon, published by the Southwestern National Monuments Association; also details of stabilization, in report by Hendron of work on large kiva to Southwestern National Monuments, Coolidge, Arizona; Bandelier and many other archaeologists have written on this project.

Additional Data: This subterranean kiva, estufa, or ceremonial chamber, is unusually large for the Rio Grande area, and there are several interesting and unusual features, notably the entrance-passage on the west side opposite the ventilator. This structure was excavated in 1908 by Dr. Edgar L. Hewitt, re-excavated and stabilized for the National Park Service in 1937 by J. W. Hendron, Jr. The probable construction date of A.D. 1513 is derived from tree ring analysis on the burned remains of one large viga; the associated pottery types make this date not improbable. Information furnished by Erik Reed, Regional Archaeologist, Region III, National Park Service, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Trent Thomas,
Architect in Charge,
HABS, Southwest Unit.

Approved 1940.

John G. Nees,
District Officer.
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