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150 Years of Utah Archaeology

BY JOEL C. JANETSKI

Utah's rich archaeological heritage has lured scientists and antiquarians from around the world to excavate in the deep caves of the western deserts, explore the well-preserved Anasazi ruins, and study the enigmatic and unique Fremont culture. They came with varying intent:
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many simply wanted to explore the rugged West; others were hired to collect objects for museums; some wanted answers to questions about the past. As a consequence, the history of archaeological research in Utah tends to be eclectic. However, as noted by Elmer Smith over forty years ago, the theoretical interests of Utah archaeologists in many ways mirror national trends. This continues to be the case as Utah archaeologists have been and continue to be very much a part of the regional, national, and international archaeological community.

Smith, writing in the days when archaeological practitioners were few, traced the history of the discipline by describing the research activities of the faculty at the University of Utah (U of U). Today, archaeological work has expanded dramatically with active research being done by all the major universities in the state, the Utah Division of State History (Utah State Historical Society), various federal agencies, and several private archaeological contracting firms. The number of professionals has increased greatly as has the amount of archaeological data generated and reported. This explosion of personnel and data makes writing a history more difficult for the recent period (post-1980 especially) and requires a much broader scope than was necessary forty years ago. The structure of this history is chronological, although I have attempted to characterize the prevailing interests and the significant contributions of the period.

1850–75: Early Explorations and Observations

Antiquarian interests, observations, and speculations characterize this early era. Early archaeological information is very sketchy and primarily incidental. After the mid-nineteenth century the several organized government expeditions sent west to identify transportation routes and exploitable resources included members who were interested in the aboriginal people and the remains of their past lifeways. Few excavations were made and fewer still were reported in any detail. The primary contribution of this period is the initial identification of highly visible concentrations of ruins.

The earliest written description of archaeological sites in the state was made in 1776 by the renowned Spanish explorers, Fathers Domínguez and Escalante, who traveled from Santa Fe, New Mexico, north into western Colorado and into the Uinta Basin of northern

---

Utah. Their detailed journal contains priceless descriptions of the countryside and its inhabitants. Included is a description of ruins near the confluence of the Uinta and Duchesne rivers:

We continued upstream along the latter [the Duchesne River] and after going west one league we saw ruins near it of a very ancient pueblo where there were fragments of stones for grinding maize, of jars and of pots of clay. The pueblo's shape was circular, as indicated by the ruins now almost completely in mounds.5

Domínguez and Escalante traveled on to the Wasatch Front and south to the Virgin River drainage before returning to Santa Fe, but they had little more to say about archaeology in Utah.

Few data of an archaeological nature were recorded in the first half of the nineteenth century until shortly after the Mormon arrival in 1847. Settlers who encountered archaeological ruins occasionally described them in journals and letters. Perhaps one of the most intriguing and detailed early descriptions of ruins was by Brigham Young, who, in a letter dated to 1851, described what he saw at Paragoonah (later Paragonah) in Parowan Valley north of present day Cedar City:

... We visited the ruins of an ancient Indian village on Red Creek, where we found quantities of broken, burnt, painted earthenware, arrow points, adobes, burnt brick, a crucible, some corn grains, charred cobs, animal bones, and flint stones of various colors. The ruins were scattered over a space about two miles long and one wide. The buildings were about 120 in number, and were composed apparently of dirt lodges, the earthen roofs having been supported by timbers, which had decayed or been burned, and had fallen in, the remains thus forming mounds of an oval shape and sunken at the tip. One of the structures appeared to have been a temple or council hall, and covered about an acre of ground.4

These Parowan Valley sites were to be investigated many times during the coming decades.

Government exploration of the Four Corners region in southeastern Utah commenced at about the same time as Mormon settlement in the north. Between 1849 and the late 1870s James H. Simpson, J. N. Macomb, J. S. Newberry, William H. Jackson,

---


5 Manuscript History of the Church, History of Brigham Young, Microfilm on file, LDS Church Archives, Salt Lake City, 1851, pp. 46-47.
Ferdinand V. Hayden, William H. Holmes, and others traveled the Four Corners area discovering and documenting many Anasazi sites in southeastern Utah and the Mesa Verde region of southwestern Colorado. Noted photographer William H. Jackson, for example, photographed ruins at Hovenweep and other sites in the Montezuma Canyon vicinity. In 1869 and 1871–72 John W. Powell made his two historic trips down the Green and Colorado rivers taking notes on the geology and Native Americans, including some observations on archaeological sites. Most of the work by government employees consisted of reconnaissance for reasons other than archaeology, although descriptions often include archaeological sites, and some collections were made.

An exception is the work of Mark Severance and H. C. Yarrow who in 1872 and 1874 excavated sites at Beaver and Provo during a U.S. Geological Survey expedition led by Lt. George Wheeler. Severance and Yarrow seemed most interested in collecting human remains, although they provided provocative descriptions of mounds excavated in Provo and Parowan Valley. At the latter location (described earlier by Brigham Young above) they estimated that there were “400–500 mounds.” Of the mounds at Provo they stated:

West of the town, on its outskirts and within three or four miles of the lake, are many mounds, of various construction and in different states of preservation. . . . Mounds of various sizes and shapes, in different parts of the plain, were dug into and examined, and these miscellaneous bones [were] found at all depths and in every mound entered, scattered without order, and without evidence of careful arrangement or systematic distribution.

As part of their research they questioned local Utes about the mounds and were told: “The (Utes) say that their oldest men remember them in youth, and that their fathers had told them nothing in regard to them.” Pottery and broken bones (animal?) were found in the Provo mounds, but few other details were offered. Severance and Yarrow also dug three historic Southern Paiute buri-

---


4 Ibid. p. 395. These comments presage one of the most intriguing (and unresolved) research issues in Utah prehistory: Was there cultural continuity between the Fremont farmers and modern indigenous peoples?
als at Beaver and near Gunnison, Utah, collected a “mummified cranium” from a “rock grave” similar in construction to those examined at Beaver. The full extent of the collections made by Severance and Yarrow is unknown.

These initial explorations and observations identified locations of productive archaeological sites or regions in the state. This knowledge was used to direct the numerous intensive artifact collecting expeditions that characterized archaeological interests over the next few decades.

1875–1910: INSTITUTION AND UNIVERSITY SPONSORED EXPLORING AND COLLECTING EXPEDITIONS

The early part of this period was still largely exploratory, although the expeditions became more focused on finding sites that would produce “relic” collections. Large museums—the Peabody at Harvard and the American Museum of Natural History and the Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, both in New York, and others—sponsored expeditions specifically to gather collections for display and study. Little attention was given to documentation or the publication of findings.

Active in Utah during this time was Edward Palmer, a medical practitioner and professional collector, who visited Utah primarily in the late 1870s, gathering up archaeological and ethnographic artifacts. Funded by the Smithsonian, he excavated in “mounds” at Santa Clara near St. George, Kanab, Paragonah, and Payson and made ethnographic collections of the Southern Paiutes.9 The driving force behind Palmer’s collecting activity was preparation for exhibits at the 1876 United States Centennial celebration to be held in Philadelphia. In a letter to the Smithsonian, he mentioned that he had “four applicants for these specimens,” meaning that he was also acquiring items for other collecting institutions.10 The list included the Peabody Museum, and some portions of the collections excavated from the Santa Clara sites and Payson went there.

Palmer visited Payson in part to explore a rumor that a local farmer had opened a mound in his field and found the skeleton(s) of a giant over six feet tall holding metal weapons that crumbled to dust

---

10 Ibid, p. 20.
when touched. In addition, the story went, the mound was reported to have contained two sealed stone boxes filled with wheat. Palmer was unable to confirm the story. His research led him to conclude that those who had occupied the mounds “must be classed with the Pueblo tribes,” a conclusion of cultural affiliation that remained largely unchanged for nearly seventy-five years.

During the 1890s antiquities collecting intensified due to the search for material to exhibit at the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago. In preparation for its exhibit, the Utah Territorial World’s Fair Commission appointed Don Maguire of Ogden as chief of the Department of Archaeology and Ethnology. His credentials included working with John Wesley Powell and university training in geology, which was his primary interest. Given this grand title, Maguire proceeded with great energy to excavate sites, usually mounds, to collect antiquities for exhibition in the Utah Pavilion. He dug at archaeological sites near Willard, Plain City, and other sites in or near Ogden, at Provo and Payson in Utah Valley, and at the massive Paragonah site described earlier. He spent two weeks excavating at Paragonah, assisted by five helpers and two teams of horses. The latter were used to remove topsoil overlying artifact-bearing layers. He reported finding walls “four feet thick” encircling a courtyard seventy-five feet square. Along the north wall of this courtyard he encountered a pile of skeletons of men, women, and children “thrown there without any aim at order” by, he presumed, their assailants. After his assault on Paragonah, Maguire traveled on to productive excavations along the Santa Clara and Virgin rivers near St. George. He later trekked to Nine-Mile Canyon and San Juan County, acquiring antiquities by excavation as well as purchase.

Another 1890s view of the Paragonah site comes from Henry Montgomery, professor of natural history at the University of Utah. At about the same time as Maguire was making his collections for the Chicago World’s Fair, Montgomery visited ruins in Nine Mile Canyon, the Nephi Mounds (which he called Mason City), sites in Beaver, Utah, Millard, and Tooele counties, southeastern Utah, Paragonah, etc. In fact, he excavated at Paragonah at the same time as Maguire. Montgomery contrasted his careful excavation techniques using

---

“shovel, trowel, and brush” with the horse-powered “plough and scraper” of Maguire. In apparent reference to Maguire’s “pile of skeletons,” Montgomery mentioned the remains “of several human skeletons” uncovered by Maguire, but stated that they were three feet beneath the floor of a house. All of this attention to the mounds was not lost on the local Mormon settlers in Paragonah for whom “digging in the Indian mounds” was an activity for the entire community.14

Montgomery’s interests went beyond making collections, however. He was particularly interested in architecture and was intrigued by the adobe buildings that he found in the central and northern part of the state. He commented on the uniformity of houses and other artifacts throughout the area and lumped the pottery-making, house-building people of Utah and the Four Corners area. He saw all as peripheral to the greater civilizations of Mexico: “Utah being on the outskirts of the country occupied by a great nation whose headquarters were probably in Mexico, might properly be expected to be provided with a considerable number of military posts or watch stations such as those herein described.”15 These comments were made following work in Nine Mile Canyon where solitary ruins perched on ridgetops are not unusual.

The tendency for ruins and other antiquities observed in the Southwest, including Utah, to be interpreted as evidence of Mexican (Aztec) presence or influence was common during the nineteenth century. Frenchmen Jules Remy and Julius Brenchley, who traveled through Utah in 1853, noted that early Cedar City settlers had discovered quantities of pottery and speculated that the city was “built on the site of a considerable city belonging to the Aztecs, a people long since extinct, and once the most civilized of the two Americas.”16 Throughout the Southwest, place names allude to the

16 Jules Remy and Julius Brenchley, A Journey to Salt Lake City: with a Sketch of the History, Religion,
Aztecs or assume an Aztec presence: Montezuma Creek, Montezuma Valley, Aztec Ruin, Montezuma’s Castle, etc. The source of this perception likely derives from assumptions of cultural connections between the elaborate southwestern societies and the powerful Aztec empire to the south, coupled with an incomplete knowledge of the details of the Spanish conquest of Mexico and the fate of the Aztecs, some of whom were thought to have fled northward with Aztec riches.\(^7\) The fact that the early farmers of Utah and the Southwest raised corn, a crop of Mexican origin, added credence to these assumptions.

Southeastern Utah was the focus of intense archaeological collecting in the 1890s. Several expeditions by Charles Mcloyd and Charles Graham of southwestern Colorado were made into southeastern Utah in the early 1890s. Mcloyd and Graham’s brother Howard had worked earlier with the Wetherills at Mesa Verde where they developed an interest in relic hunting. Mcloyd and Graham focused their efforts west of Comb Ridge in White and Lake canyons and Grand Gulch, or Grand Wash as it was often called. The collections they made, which were praised by the *Illustrated American* as the best in the world, went to various eastern museums.\(^8\) In the summer of 1891 Mcloyd was accompanied by the Reverend H. C. Green, a Baptist minister from Durango, Colorado, who had earlier purchased a large Grand Gulch collection from Mcloyd. They traveled into Grand Gulch and apparently into adjacent canyons in their quest for “relics.” Green was highly enthusiastic about their finds and later speculated that these artifacts were the most ancient in the New World.\(^9\)

The Wetherill brothers, cattle ranchers on the Mancos River in southwestern Colorado, had actively explored for ruins to the east and discovered the great cliff dwellings at Mesa Verde. They became interested in southeastern Utah in 1893 at the World’s Fair in Chicago.

---

\(^7\) Aztec traditions place their origins to the north, a fact noted by nineteenth-century historians. This information was not lost on white settlers moving into the Southwest who concluded ruins were left by Aztecs gradually moving to their historic home in the Valley of Mexico. For more on this topic see William H. Prescott, *Conquest of Mexico* (1843); Robert H. Lister and Florence C. Lister, *Those Who Came Before: Southwest Archaeology in the National Park System* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1983).

\(^8\) Ibid.

Fortuitously, Richard Wetherill met the Hyde brothers, the wealthy heirs to the Bab-O soap fortune who were fascinated by archaeology. The Hyde brothers and Richard Wetherill organized the Hyde Exploring Expeditions and, between 1893 and 1903, thoroughly explored southeastern Utah, especially Grand Gulch. The collections made on those trips were usually purchased from the Wetherills by the Hyde brothers who then donated them to the American Museum of Natural History in New York.

The Wetherills’ contribution to our understanding of the prehistory of the Southwest is significant. In Cottonwood Wash the Wetherills excavated a series of oval cists that contained mummies covered by conically shaped, coiled baskets four to five feet in diameter. They noted that no pottery was present with these remains, there was no evidence for the bow and arrow (only atlatls and atlatl darts), there was no cranial deformation, and the sandals were different. Most important, Richard Wetherill noted that these features and associated artifacts were located stratigraphically below Cliff Dweller ruins. Wetherill called these earlier folks the Basketmaker, thereby establishing a relative chronology for the Anasazi. That chronology was later formalized by Alfred V. Kidder with his Pecos classification, a scheme that has persisted to the present (with some refinements).

The activities and findings of these professional collectors in the Four Corners area did not go unnoticed by archaeologists at the U of U. As noted, Henry Montgomery traveled throughout the state excavating and making observations and collections. Byron Cummings, a professor of classical languages at the U of U, also became interested in archaeology and worked with Montgomery to increase the university’s artifact holdings. He traveled to the Four Corners area several times between 1893 and 1914, excavating sites and making collections, although very little of his research was ever published. Cummings’s contributions to Utah archaeology are twofold: he founded the Department of Archaeology at the U of U in 1914, and he trained several students who went on to become influential professionals. During his 1908 excavations at Alkali Ridge near Blanding, for example, his students included Neil Judd, A. V. Kidder, and Jesse Nusbaum, all of

---

41 However, see Byron Cummings, “Kivas of the San Juan Drainage,” *American Anthropologist* 17 (1915): 272-82.
whom went on to distinguished careers in archaeology. Judd and Andrew Kerr, another archaeology student at the U of U, continued investigations and collecting activity after Cummings left the university for an influential career in Arizona. Judd’s contributions to Utah archaeology are great and are discussed in detail in the following section. Kerr went on to Harvard and returned to Utah in 1922. His subsequent research in southeastern Utah focused on collecting objects rather than systematic research.

Collecting expeditions into Utah continued as late as the 1940s. The latest of these was sponsored by the Carnegie Museum of Pittsburgh in 1945 and 1946 to explore the triangular-shaped region east of the Colorado River and north of the San Juan.23

Significant contributions of this era of institutional collecting

were the popularizing or publicizing of archaeological remains and
the beginnings of speculation about temporal relationships and affilia-
tions. By the early 1900s the archaeological “hot spots” in Utah had
not only been identified, they had been well explored, exploited, and,
in many cases, depleted. Tragically, little documentation of site con-
text or even site location for the collections was preserved through
publication. In the early 1900s information consisted mostly of archae-
ological lore. That lore and the few written pieces, such as
Montgomery’s, identified a well-traveled archaeological path through
Utah leading from Willard to Utah Valley, Nephi, Kanosh, Beaver,
Paragonah, Nine Mile Canyon, and various locations in southeastern
and southwestern Utah. By the turn of the century the scene was set
for more disciplined study.

1910–47: BEGINNING OF PROFESSIONAL ARCHAEOLOGY

Professional archaeology in the United States was growing rapidly
in the early twentieth century due to employment opportunities at
major museums and the acceptance of anthropology as a university
discipline.⁴¹ As a consequence, a generation of formally trained pro-
fessionals entered the field and began a new era of archaeological
research.

Professional interests at the turn of the century focused on
understanding the time depth of New World civilizations with regional
syntheses based on material traits a fundamental goal. A rapidly
expanding literature reporting archaeological research in all areas of
North America made such summaries possible.

Neil Judd was the first university trained archaeologist to work in
the state and was an important and influential early figure in Utah
archaeology. A Nebraska native, he moved to Utah where he taught
public school.⁴² In his early twenties his interests shifted to archaeol-
ogy, and between 1907 and 1911 he studied archaeology and earned a
bachelor’s degree under Byron Cummings at the University of Utah.
Afterwards he worked at the Smithsonian as an aide and in 1913 com-
pleted a master’s degree at George Washington University. Between
1915 and 1920 Judd surveyed and excavated at numerous mounds in
several Wasatch Front valleys and at Anasazi sites in northwestern


Arizona and near Kanab. He spent considerable time excavating on the George Bradshaw farm at Beaver and at the now familiar Paragonah site in Parowan Valley. Like Palmer, Judd concluded that the ruins he investigated along the Wasatch Front were related to the Puebloan cultures of the Southwest:

... [they are] definitely and directly related to those pre-Pueblo [Basketmaker] and Pueblo cultures represented by the prehistoric ruins of northern Arizona, New Mexico, and Colorado. These archaeological observations north of the Rio Colorado have extended far to the north and west that area known to have been inhabited by ancient Pueblo peoples.26

Several factors influenced this conclusion. He was impressed by the presence of pueblo-like, above-ground, adobe-walled houses at Beaver and Paragonah and by Palmer's description of similar structures at Payson. In addition, Judd excavated what he concluded was a kiva at Beaver (see also the discussion of Steward's research at Kanosh below). Other Puebloan influences were evident in the pottery, especially the painted bowls and corrugated ollas at the Beaver and Paragonah sites, which he described as "unquestionably Puebloan."27 And, of course, the groups were, like the Puebloans, farmers. Judd's findings were very influential. Subsequent researchers working along the Wasatch continued to refer to mound sites and their associated material culture as Puebloan until the 1950s,28 despite Noel Morss's important research along the Fremont River which differentiated between farming societies in that area and the Anasazi (see below).29

Professional activity was continued in 1920 by Jesse Nusbaum, who had developed an interest in the Southwest through his work with Edgar Lee Hewitt (an early southwestern archaeologist) and Byron Cummings. Nusbaum, now employed by the Museum of the American Indian in New York, excavated DuPont Cave a few miles north of Kanab. This was an important Basketmaker II cache site with several large, slab-lined cists containing corn, elaborate nets, square-toed sandals, a moun-

tain sheep horn sickle, and basketry. The site was ceramic and similar to other Basketmaker occupations recently found south and east of the Colorado by the Wetherills and A. V. Kidder and Samuel Guernsey. Nusbaum’s findings established pre-Puebloan occupations north of the Colorado River and provided more credibility for Judd’s Puebloan characterization of farming groups along the Wasatch Front.

In the late 1920s the Peabody Museum at Harvard renewed its interest in Utah archaeology with the Claflin–Emerson Expedition. William H. Claflin, Jr., and Raymond Emerson were Boston businessmen interested in the American Indian. Claflin was also the curator of southeastern archaeology at the Peabody. At the suggestion of A. V. Kidder, who had done field work in southeastern Utah under Cummings, they explored the region west and north of the Colorado River in 1927 for rich archaeological areas. Encouraged by their findings, Claflin and Emerson and their wives financed four years (1928–31) of archaeological research in eastern Utah, focusing on the Green River drainage north of the

---

30 Jesse L. Nusbaum, A Basket Maker Cave in Kane County, Utah, Indian Notes and Monographs, Miscellaneous Series No. 29, Museum of the American Indian (New York: Heye Foundation, 1922).


juncture with the Colorado, the Fremont River, Boulder (Coombs Site), the Kaiparowits Plateau, Nine Mile Canyon, and a number of other adjacent locales.

An important consequence of the Claflin–Emerson Expedition was the research carried out by expedition member Noel Morss on the Fremont River in 1928 and 1929. Based on this work, Morss defined a new archaeological culture, the Fremont, named after the river. He described the Fremont Culture as peripheral to the Southwest based on a number of material differences: "a distinctive unpainted black or gray pottery; by the exclusive use of a unique type of moccasin; by a cult of unbaked clay figurines; by abundant pictographs of distinctive types; and by a number of minor features which tended to identify it as a Southwestern culture on approximately a Basket-maker III level." Morss recognized that the Fremont economy utilized domesticated crops but also relied heavily on wild foods. He contrasted Fremont and Puebloan pottery and basketry and noted the absence of cotton and turkeys. Morss saw the Fremont Culture as extending west to the Beaver–Paragonah area and north to Nine Mile Canyon and Vernal and concluded that this area was clearly influenced by the Southwest but a pattern had evolved that was "not an integral part of the main stream of Southwestern development." Morss's research and his publication *The Ancient Culture of the Fremont River in Utah* are classics in Utah archaeology. He introduced the term Fremont which has become the generic referent for the horticultural groups north of the Colorado–Virgin river drainages. Initially, Fremont referred only to farmers on the Colorado Plateau where Morss worked.

Another member of the 1931 Claflin–Emerson Expedition was John Otis Brew, who acted as the assistant director of the project under Donald Scott that year. Partially because of his experience in Utah and again partially due to suggestions from A. V. Kidder, Brew initiated excavations at a series of sites on Alkali Ridge east of Blanding. His report on this project is a cornerstone of southwestern archaeology. His interpretation of Site 13 defined the Pueblo I period (A.D. 700–900), and his probing ruminations on the various issues in southwestern archaeology are as thought-provoking today as they were nearly fifty years ago.

 Shortly after Morss's research on the Fremont River, Julian H.
Steward came to the U of U as chair of the Department of Anthropology. He arrived in 1930 and remained on the faculty until 1933, although he continued his Utah research through 1935. His contributions to the anthropology of the Great Basin and Utah cannot be overstated. His archaeological work is overshadowed by his ethno- graphic research on the peoples of the Great Basin, particularly the Western Shoshone of Nevada and the Owens Valley Paiute. These studies contributed significantly to the development of Steward’s cultural ecology concept, a perspective that continues to be highly influential in archaeology, as well as his notions of the structure and evolution of bands.

Steward’s archaeological research during his short tenure at the U of U included excavations at mound sites near Willard, Grantsville, Provo, and Kanosh. Although today these sites are classified as Fremont, Steward, like Judd and others before him, concluded that the people who had built the houses that formed the mounds were either Puebloan or closely related groups who had not “progressed” past the Baskemaker level. Steward used the label “Northern Periphery” to refer to that portion of Utah north of the Anasazi. The implication of this term was that Fremont cultural developments were greatly influenced by, but peripheral to, the Anasazi. (The term “Northern Periphery” was later rejected as obscuring the uniqueness and depth of Utah’s prehistoric past.)

Steward also carried out a wide-ranging reconnaissance effort in the Kanab and Glen Canyon area that was organized specifically to assist in understanding the Puebloan-like settlements north of the Anasazi. In addition, he excavated a series of caves around the Great Salt Lake. Based on his observations there and research in Utah Valley, Steward defined a relative (there were no absolute dating techniques at that time) cultural historical sequence that remains viable today, including the stratigraphic differentiation of Puebloan (Fremont), post-Puebloan or Promontory Culture, and the Shoshone. Operating

---

Smith, “Utah Anthropology.”

Steward, “Early Inhabitants,” 1933. Steward apparently borrowed the term from A. V. Kidder who referred to the area north of the San Juan drainage as the “Northern Peripheral District” in his classic report of excavations at the Pecos Ruin entitled, An Introduction to the Study of Southwestern Archaeology (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1924).


with no absolute dating tools other than stratigraphy, Steward was able to "guess-date" much of the prehistory of the eastern Great Basin with unsettling accuracy. He was the first to recognize the variability in the Northern Periphery and to formalize that recognition with a model of regional variation based on material traits. Later adopted and altered by several scholars, that scheme remained largely intact for decades.

Steward left the U of U in 1933 for a two-year job at Berkeley en route to a staff position at the Bureau of American Ethnology at the Smithsonian in 1935. His departure left a void partially filled by the appointment of John Gillin in 1935. During his two years at the U of U, Gillin pursued an active field program. He worked first in Nine

---


Mile Canyon and produced one of the few monographs describing the archaeology of that important region.\textsuperscript{43} In 1937 he embarked on a project in central Utah jointly sponsored by the Peabody Museum and the U of U.\textsuperscript{44} It took him to Marysvale, Ephraim, and Tooele where he excavated various mounds during the summer of 1938. He excavated square and round pit houses in and near the mounds and, like Steward and Judd, maintained the Puebloan perspective by concluding they were probably kivas. Like several scholars before him, Gillin was assisted by students and staff who went on to make substantive contributions of their own, e.g., Robert Lister (then at the University of New Mexico and later an important figure in Glen Canyon work), William Mulloy, and Carling Malouf.

With Gillin's departure, Elmer R. Smith was asked to represent archaeology in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology and to act as the curator of the Museum of Archaeology at the U of U. Smith conceptualized a regional approach to understanding (identifying) the state's archaeological resources. During the summer of 1937 he investigated previously unknown archaeological sites and revisited well-explored ruins in the central and southern portions of the state. During his visits to these sites he made crude maps, took brief notes on his excavations, and published very preliminary reports on the work, including a suite of pressing preservation issues and research questions.\textsuperscript{45}

Much of Smith's field work, however, focused on caves around the Great Salt Lake. In 1941 he tested a site known as Hands and Knees Cave near Wendover but renamed it Danger Cave after falling rocks nearly hit members of his crew.\textsuperscript{46} Smith also spent four seasons (1938–41) excavating Deadman Cave, a sheltered site at the north end of the Oquirrh Mountains\textsuperscript{47} and worked at Black Rock II Cave near Deadman.\textsuperscript{48} Smith was absent from the university during World War


\textsuperscript{44} John Gillin, *Archaeological Investigations in Central Utah*, Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology Vol. 17, No. 2 (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1941). The foreword to this publication was written by Donald Scott. Scott, who directed the Claffin-Emerson Expedition described above, was director of the Peabody Museum and remained current in the archaeology of the Northern Periphery.

\textsuperscript{45} Elmer R. Smith, Archaeological Resources of Utah, MS on file, Department of Anthropology, (Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1957).


II; afterwards his interests were in applied anthropology rather than archaeology. He obtained detailed insights and familiarity with the archaeological resources through his statewide reconnaissance and, because of that work, provided an important transition between the more influential scholars, Julian Steward and Jesse Jennings (see below). Much of Smith’s research findings appeared in the University of Utah Archaeology and Ethnology Papers, a series that he initiated and edited.

At about the same time that Gillin and Smith were at the U of U, Albert Reagan arrived at Brigham Young University (BYU) and initiated an interest in local archaeology. Reagan retired in 1934 from his position with the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs in Vernal to become special professor of anthropology at BYU until his death in 1936. He was an energetic field worker and a prolific, if not scientifically rigorous, writer who published numerous short articles on Utah prehistory and ethnography. His archaeological attentions were divided between his long-standing interest in the Uinta Basin and new research in Utah Valley and the Nephi mounds.8 His work is important for its detailed descriptions of sites and findings and documentation of rock art.

Professional archaeology was well established in Utah by the 1940s. Serious students had access to numerous publications on field projects. The most influential contributions came from Judd and Steward, both of whom went on to brilliant, nationally prominent careers in anthropology. Judd’s most notable contributions were in the archaeology of the Southwest while Steward emerged as one of the preeminent American anthropologists of the twentieth century.

American archaeology in the 1940s was deeply committed to detailed material studies focused on developing relative cultural chronologies. However, preoccupation with such studies was coming increasingly under attack by those who felt archaeology had lost sight of the anthropological goals of understanding human behavior and cultural change. Fortuitously, radiocarbon dating was developed in the late 1940s, a discovery that revolutionized archaeology. Two very important consequences of radiocarbon dating were (1) the continentwide availability of absolute or calendar dates allowing, for the first time, the construction of regional, absolute culture chronologies and (2) the relaxing of the highly involved seriation studies, freeing archaeologists to attend to behavioral issues and the reconstruction of

---

prehistoric lifeways. No one was more aware of the importance of these changes and the opportunities they offered than Jesse D. Jennings, the father of Utah archaeology.

1948–80: The Jennings Era

Jesse D. Jennings came to the U of U in 1948 and, over the succeeding thirty years, brought stability and a fundamental understanding of the cultural history of Utah and the Great Basin region. His ability to synthesize a wealth of archaeological data in a readable and coherent fashion combined with a steady focus over his long tenure, set Jennings apart as the most influential figure in Utah archaeology. He came to the university with a wealth of field experience. While pursuing graduate studies at the University of Chicago, he worked in the Midwest and Southeast, excavated at the massive Guatemalan site of Kaminaljuyu with A. V. Kidder, and worked for the National Park Service in the Southwest. Immediately prior to his faculty appointment at Utah, he was employed by the NPS in Omaha, Nebraska.\(^5\) He brought to his position a flair for organization and logistics, high expectations for students, and a very clear vision of how archaeology should be done.

Jennings’s impact on the archaeology of Utah and the Great Basin was immediate and significant. In 1949 he organized the Utah Statewide Archaeological Survey and, through a series of large-scale reconnaissance surveys that built on the preliminary work of Neil Judd, Julian Steward, and Elmer Smith, obtained a preliminary understanding of Utah’s archaeological resources, including an assessment of the known and not-so-well-known regions.\(^5\) During and following this survey work he pursued excavations at sites that promised information about the prehistory of the state. To insure prompt publication of research findings, he replaced the old Archaeology and Ethnology Papers series with the University of Utah Anthropological Papers.

The 1950s–70s was a time of incredible archaeological activity at the U of U. The all-important Danger Cave work occupied much of the early fifties, while the massive Glen Canyon project was the focus of the late fifties and early sixties. Concurrent with Glen Canyon was the archaeological survey at Flaming Gorge.\(^5\) In addition, Jennings

\(^{5}\) See Jesse D. Jennings, *Accidental Archaeologist* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1994), for a full bibliographical account.

\(^{51}\) See, for example, the survey work of Jack Rudy, 1953, in the western deserts of Utah.

personally or through graduate assistants directed excavations in all parts of the state. Research tended to focus on caves (e.g., Hogup Cave, Sudden Shelter, Cowboy Cave) or Fremont structural sites (e.g., the Bear River sites, Nephi Mounds, Pharo Village, Snakerock, Median Village, and others). The work was accomplished as part of the archaeological field school program, but much was also completed as salvage or contract work. The research budget was often supplemented with grants from the National Science Foundation.

At least two projects deserve expanded treatment: the Wendover caves and Glen Canyon. These projects resulted in significant publications, concepts, or facilities developments.

**Wendover Caves Project**

Jennings’s most influential work was done during the 1950s. The Wendover caves project was one of the earliest and perhaps the most important that he completed. The work centered on several dry caves in Utah’s west desert near Wendover. The most productive was Danger Cave where excavation was begun in 1949 and completed in 1953. As noted above, Danger had been investigated earlier by Robert Heizer and Elmer Smith, but testing had been limited and poorly controlled. The difficulties in excavating a large, dry cave are graphically presented by Jennings in the introductory section of the Danger Cave report and exemplify his writing skills:

> These caves should, in theory, have been the easiest and most readily understood sites the archaeologist could encounter. Each told the same story; each was the simple, uncomplicated statement of the accumulation of cultural habitational debris in conjunction with the operation of natural forces. There was nothing except layer after layer of fill lying smoothly upon one another. The very formlessness and monotony of the debris made for difficulty in understanding. Dry for millennia, the colloidal fine particles of dust and ash which comprised the fill were quite unstable. In a waste heap or exposed in a face, the gray or buff fill ran in rivulets when touched or disturbed by the transmitted shock of digging anywhere in the cave. Once disturbed all the fill materials flowed like water downward and outward until a precarious stability was achieved. As the dust eddied in the restless air, a gray pall settled on all exposed cuts dulling the already subdued colors and obscuring contrasts between layers.\(^3\)

The wonderfully deep and artfactually rich, yet monotonous, deposits in Danger and other western desert caves provided the basis for one of Jennings’s most enduring (and controversial) legacies, the

\(^3\) Jennings, *Danger Cave*, p. 9.
Desert Culture concept. The impact of this concept derived equally from archaeological materials recovered from Danger Cave and the ethnographic data generated by the earlier research of Julian Steward.\textsuperscript{24} Jennings's articulation of the highly detailed, ecologically oriented ethnography of the central Great Basin Western Shoshone with the archaeological assemblages from Danger Cave was very effective.\textsuperscript{25} To some, however, the suggestion that Great Basin prehistory was accurately characterized by Steward's Western Shoshone model or the contents of the Wendover caves was unacceptable.\textsuperscript{26} These differences led to lively debates over concepts and definitions. Jennings's own criterion for the success of the idea was the amount of research it stimulated, and that has been considerable.

The importance of the Danger Cave research, regardless of the Desert Culture concept, was and is great. The radiocarbon dates obtained from the basal layers established a human presence in the Great Basin at the close of the Pleistocene.\textsuperscript{27} The controlled research on the recovered materials confirmed the reality of a hunting and gathering lifeway that endured for a very long time (about 8,000 years) over much of North America. The Danger Cave sequence encompasses the entire temporal span of pre-European cultural history in the Great Basin. The significance of the Danger Cave excavations and Jennings's report was recognized by the Society of American Archaeology which published the work as a memoir.\textsuperscript{28}

\textit{Glen Canyon Project}

During the late 1950s archaeological research in the canyons of the Colorado River began in anticipation of the construction of the Glen Canyon Dam and the filling of the truly huge reservoir area to be called Lake Powell. From 1956 until 1963 the Glen Canyon Project, a joint effort of the U of U and the Museum of Northern Arizona,
explored the canyon for archaeological remains and to document and recover data before Lake Powell inundated it. Although the region had been explored no fewer than thirty-seven times by people like Byron Cummings, Earl Morris, John Wetherill, Neil Judd, and Julian Steward, little had been written describing their findings. The project was massive—a logistical nightmare in many ways—and in many ways tailor-made for Jennings who, as noted earlier, had a talent for managing complex projects. The research was multidisciplinary and involved historians, geologists, and botanists, as well as archaeologists, and set a standard for environmental studies in advance of destructive development. Always interested in a broader view, Jennings supplemented the work being done in the canyon with research on nearby Kaiparowits Plateau, near Kanab, at the Coombs Site (now Anasazi State Park) near Boulder, and in the St. George area. In keeping with his insistence on “closing the circuit,” Jennings reported all findings in the thirty-one volumes of the Glen Canyon Series of the Anthropological Papers.

Jennings’s assessment of the Glen Canyon work focused on the “genius of the Anasazi culture” which he saw as based on “ancient foraging skills,” including the “ability to develop and exploit limited water.” This genius is revealed in the multitude of small Anasazi ruins in regions where even small-scale farming seemed impossible.
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91 Jesse D. Jennings, Glen Canyon: A Summary, Anthropological Papers No. 81, Glen Canyon Series No. 31 (Salt Lake City, University of Utah Press, 1966), pp. 62-63.
skills honed over the millennia of the preceding Archaic and acquired/inherited by Anasazi gardeners provided the key to Anasazi survival. Jennings considered these “backwoods Anasazi” more representative of the Anasazi pattern than the great ruins at Mesa Verde or Chaco. Significantly, he included the Fremont in his discussions of Utah farming strategies but argued that it was best understood on its own terms rather than as a dilute form of the Anasazi pattern. In summing up, Jennings stated that the “main contribution” of the Glen Canyon Project was removing “the region from the limbo of the unknown. Instead of an empty place on the maps of biologists, historians and archeologists as it once was, Glen Canyon emerges as the best known archeological area of comparable size and difficulty in the West.” Additionally, the Glen Canyon work made clear that the Anasazi–Fremont boundary was real and dynamic through the research at the Coombs Site and the Kaiparowits Plateau which documented Anasazi settlements well north of the Colorado River around A.D. 1100.63

Jennings’s Contributions

The Desert Culture may be the phrase that most often comes to mind when Jennings’s work is discussed, but other contributions equal it in importance. Primary is the totality of the archaeological data generated at Utah during his thirty years of field work, all of which were promptly analyzed and objectively reported for the benefit of contemporary or future scholars. The University of Utah Anthropological Papers series, which contains numerous volumes reporting site excavation results, stands as evidence of this significant contribution to Utah archaeology as well as to his commitment to bringing projects to appropriate completion.

Jennings’s influence also extended to the political and administrative arenas. In 1953 he, along with other Great Basin scholars, founded the Great Basin Archaeological Conference (later the Great Basin Anthropological Conference). He expanded the Museum of Anthropology (which he had inherited upon his arrival in 1948) into the Utah Museum of Natural History. The latter was formally established by the legislature in 1963. Jennings nursed the new facility

---

through the critical early period by serving as its director for ten years. In 1973 he shepherded the first useful state antiquities law through the legislature. It established the Antiquities Section, headed by a state archaeologist, within the Utah Division of State History. The concern driving the legislation was archaeological vandalism, an issue eloquently addressed by Jennings in his 1972 letter to legislators:

My research in Utah has been exclusively with an effort at understanding Utah’s incredibly rich prehistory. All over Utah I have seen evidence of wanton despoliation of Indian sites whose ages go back thousands of years. The destruction falls into three classes: outright vandalism, uninformed but intense curiosity, and died-in-the-wool commercial collecting. I can testify that the state’s rich resources are being stolen and destroyed from one end of the state to the other. Utah has lagged in the establishment of a serviceable antiquities law and, except as I have interested myself in it, has expended little money in the protection of this resource. The rich saga of Utah’s past has been an inspiration to me and led me to participate in the development of this legislation. I heartily commend it to your earnest consideration.

The law passed in the 1973 session.

Finally, Jennings trained several generations of archaeologists through the U of U field school and graduate program. Students that experienced his field school are numerous, and many continue to be active professionals. He has been described as something of a taskmaster in running his projects; however, his occasionally stern discipline was balanced by a sincere concern for the future success of the survivors. The many publications in the Anthropological Papers series authored solely by students (rather than co-authored by himself) is ample evidence of his unselfish emphasis on the quality and completeness of the student’s experience.

Like others who had done archaeology in Utah, his field work was focused for the most part on two kinds of sites: caves and rock shelters and open Fremont structural sites. He brought to this work a deep interest in human ecology (inspired certainly by Steward’s research) and a commitment to telling the story of Utah’s cultural past. His ability to choose sites that would provide the kind of data to accomplish that goal served him well. In addition to being the father of Utah archaeology, Jennings is one of the great synthesizers of North American prehistory. He wrote one of the first texts on North
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60 Jesse D. Jennings, letter dated December 26, 1972, addressed to state legislators, Utah Museum of Natural History Archives, University of Utah, Salt Lake City.

American archaeology (Prehistory of North America, now in its third edition) and edited numerous other volumes on the archaeology of the New World and Polynesia.54

Other Archaeological Activity during the Jennings Era

Jennings dominated Utah archaeology for three decades, but others made important contributions during that era. Marie Wormington of the Denver Museum of Natural History worked at the Turner-Look Site north of Moab between 1939 and 1948 (with time out for World War II). This site was relatively small (about nine structures), but Wormington’s discussion of the Fremont in the Turner-Look report was highly detailed and clearly the most definitive coverage of “Northern Periphery” archaeology at the time.60 Colorado archaeologists also carried out research in and near Dinosaur National Monument at sites such as Mantles Cave and Thorne Cave.66 Between 1963 and 1965 the University of Colorado surveyed and excavated in Dinosaur National Monument under the direction of Robert Lister and David Breternitz. Their emphasis was primarily on Fremont structural sites (Cub Creek Village, Boundary Village, Wholeplace Village, etc.), although some small shelters were excavated along with the larger Deluge Shelter.67

In 1946 the Department of Archaeology was established at BYU. From the mid-1940s into the early 1960s the primary interest there was Mesoamerica; however, Ross Christensen and, later, Ray T. Matheny and Dale L. Berge excavated mounds in Utah Valley.68 During the late 1960s and early 1970s Matheny pursued research at Anasazi sites in Montezuma Canyon in southeastern Utah as part of the BYU archaeological field school program.69 Berge’s field work in Utah focused primarily on historic sites such as Simpson Springs, old Goshen town in

54 See C. Melvin Aikens, “Jesse D. Jennings, Archeologist” in Condie and Fowler, eds., Anthropology of the Desert West, pp. 1–5; and Jennings, Accidental Archeologist, for details on Jennings’s contributions, accomplishments, and awards.
56 Hannah Marie Worthington, A Reappraisal of the Fremont Culture with a Summary of the Archaeology of the Northern Periphery (Denver: Denver Museum of Natural History, 1955).
Utah Valley, Camp Floyd in Cedar Valley, and the mining town of Mercut.\textsuperscript{36}

Jennings directed his research at the northern three-fourths of the state. With the exception of the Glen Canyon project, research on the Anasazi in southwestern and southeastern Utah was left to others. Matheny's work in Montezuma Canyon, mentioned above, and the research of Richard Thompson at Southern Utah University helped fill those gaps. Thompson pursued field work almost exclusively at Virgin River Anasazi sites on the Utah-Arizona border and along the Virgin River near St. George. He reported his findings in part in the \textit{Western Anasazi Reports}, a publication series he initiated.

In southeastern Utah, William Lipe (a student of Jennings) continued research on Cedar Mesa and Grand Gulch begun during the Glen Canyon Project. He and his colleague R. G. Matson represent the few scholars with long-term commitments to regional study in this portion of the state. Surprisingly few archaeologists have returned to the spectacular canyons north of the San Juan River, the scene of the furious collecting activities of the 1890s. Lipe's interests have consistently centered on understanding Anasazi communities and settlement patterns.\textsuperscript{71} Both Lipe and Matson have continued their interest in this historic archaeological region, with Matson most recently emphasizing the origins and horticultural dependence of early Basketmaker peoples.\textsuperscript{72}

Archaeological research in Utah during the Jennings era occurred primarily within the culture history paradigm. The important concerns dominating this research included the timing of human arrival in the area, the distribution of the Fremont pattern, whether the Fremont strategy was a result of migration or diffusion, Fremont variant models, definitions of pottery styles, etc.\textsuperscript{73} However, changes in research emphases by American archaeologists during the 1960s and 1970s had an impact on the direction of Utah archaeology as well. The


\textsuperscript{73} Particularly influential in modeling Fremont variation was Jennings student John P. Marwitt, \textit{Median Village and Fremont Culture Regional Variation}, Anthropological Papers No. 9 (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1970); another Jennings student, C. Melvin Aikens, published important thoughts on the fate of the Fremont in his \textit{Fremont-Promontory-Plains Relationships in Northern Utah}, Anthropological Papers No. 82 (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1966)
so-called New Archaeology with its interest in cultural evolution, concern with explaining cultural change or process, and deductive approach to archaeological research, among other things, became very influential. Explaining cultural process contrasted sharply with the more descriptive goals of cultural historical archaeology during the first half of the century. The prioritizing of explanation led archaeology historians Gordon Willey and Jeremy Sabloff to dub this era (the 1960s and 1970s) the Explanatory Period.  

An important interest of the New Archaeology in the 1970s was "middle range theory," which focused on obtaining a better understanding of how the archaeological record was formed. Those interested in this field turned to studying living peoples to document site organization and human behaviors responsible for material patterning. This field of study is called ethnoarchaeology. During the 1980s middle range studies and ethnoarchaeology influenced Utah archaeological research in a number of ways. The background and consequences of this change in emphasis is laid out below.

1980 TO PRESENT: HUNTER-GATHERERS AND ETHNOARCHAEOLOGY

For several reasons, not the least of which was Jennings's departure in the early 1980s and the burgeoning field of Cultural Resource Management (CRM) archaeology (see below), field work in the state following the late 1970s was not dominated by the U of U, although that institution continued to be highly influential theoretically. In the mid-1970s, for example, the newly established Antiquities Section in the Utah Division of State History, directed by David B. Madsen, the first state archaeologist (a position established by the Utah Antiquities Act of 1973), became an important player in Utah archaeology. Prior to his appointment, Madsen had earned a master's degree at the U of U under Jennings and a Ph.D. from the University of Missouri at Columbia. His research interests were in paleoenvironmental reconstruction and subsistence. As a student at the U of U he had worked at Hogup Cave in western Utah, at O'Malley Shelter in southeastern Nevada, and at a number of Fremont sites, and was thus familiar with the archaeology. He initiated a publication series, the Antiquities Section Selected Papers, and set up a central location for the management of all archaeological records for the state, a task previously performed by the U of U.

Madsen’s interests in subsistence and environments redirected Fremont research in the late 1970s into the 1980s. Based on excavations at Backhoe Village, a Fremont site in Richfield, Madsen and assistant state archaeologist La Mar Lindsay proposed that the Fremont along the Wasatch Front practiced a “Subsistence economy [that] is based on a dependence on collecting of wild flora and fauna, primarily from marsh environments, and is supplemented by corn agriculture.” Their conclusions, inspired by the discovery of abundant cattail pollen on the floors of the houses at Backhoe, reversed the traditional notion that Fremont settled life relied most heavily on corn. This position sparked debate and stimulated more rigorous investigations of the Fremont subsistence economy.

Madsen’s continuing interest in the Fremont resulted in a formal symposium at the Great Basin Anthropological Conference in 1978 and a publication, *Fremont Perspectives*. Shortly afterwards, he and James F. O’Connell (see below) edited a collection of papers entitled *Man and Environment in the Great Basin* published by the Society for American Archaeology. Madsen’s interests in environmental reconstruction and subsistence are evident in this volume that synthesized...
Holocene environments and culture histories for all portions of the Great Basin. O'Connell's contribution (with Kevin Jones and Steve Simms) to *Man and Environment in the Great Basin* reviewed the limitations of current theoretical perspectives in Great Basin archaeology (such as culture history and descriptive ecology), offering evolutionary ecology as a more powerful body of theory for understanding human behavior. This short paper foreshadowed the influential work of O'Connell and his students in the coming decade.

Ironically, *Fremont Perspectives* marked the end of more than a century of preoccupation with the Fremont by Utah archaeologists. The 1980s saw a new research interest emerge in the state—hunter-gatherer studies and middle range research—a focus stemming in part from the influence of Jennings's heir-apparent at the U of U, James F. O'Connell, and the shifts in the emphasis of American archaeology noted earlier.

O'Connell was trained at the University of California, Berkeley, under Jennings's long time sparring partner, Robert Heizer, and did his doctoral work on an archaeological study of Surprise Valley in northeastern California. Following this, however, O'Connell shifted his focus to ethnoarchaeology. He came to the U of U in 1978 and for three summers directed the field school at Nawthis Village, a large Fremont site in the central part of the state. Afterwards he turned his full attention to ethnoarchaeological studies of extant hunter-gatherers in Australia and Africa. Publications by O'Connell and U of U colleague Kristen Hawkes on their hunter-gatherer research are numerous and highly influential in the field. That influence is clear in a generation of U of U graduate students whose doctoral studies were chaired by O'Connell. Several of them remain in Utah, including Joel Janetski, Kevin Jones, Duncan Metcalfe, and Steven Simms. Jones, Metcalfe, and Simms established research agendas focusing on
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80 As of 1996 Jones was the state archaeologist, Metcalfe was the curator of North American archaeology at the Utah Museum of Natural History, and Simms was on the faculty at Utah State University. Janetski (department of anthropology at BYU) studied under both Jennings and O'Connell at the UofU and bridges the interests of the two with his culture-historical and ecological research on hunter-gatherers,
middle range topics revolving around hunter-gatherer behavior and/or site structure. Perhaps the most active has been Simms whose studies of hunter-gatherer foraging behavior and thoughtful theoretical perspectives are widely cited. The trend is also reflected in research by David Madsen, whose interest in middle range studies and evolutionary ecology is apparent in several papers. Both Janetski and Simms have prioritized research on post-Fremont (Late Prehistoric) hunter-gatherers who had seldom been investigated previously. Janetski and Madsen’s common ecological interests led to the publication of *Wetland Adaptations in the Great Basin*, which focuses almost exclusively on hunter-gatherer strategies.

The interest in hunters and gatherers and middle range studies continues in Utah to the benefit to our understanding of the past. Research on Late Prehistoric hunter-gatherers, for example, has enabled archaeologists to describe, if not explain, the transition from farming to hunting and gathering at about A.D. 1300.

**Cultural Resource Management or Contract Archaeology**

During the 1960s and 1970s Congress passed legislation requiring that archaeological sites on public land be protected from destruction by construction projects using federal funds. These laws and regulations (for example, the National Environmental Policy Act and Executive Order 11593) have been particularly important in states like Utah that contain large amounts of federal land managed by agencies such as the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and United States Forest Service (USFS). Archaeologists working for the BLM, USFS, Bureau of Reclamation, and the National Park Service, and others now manage cultural resources (historic and prehistoric sites) on their lands in Utah. State agencies (Department of Transportation, State Lands and Forestry, State History) also have archaeologists on staff to protect archaeological sites. These legislative changes ushered in the era of Cultural Resource Management (CRM) archaeology, an era
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84 David B. Madsen and David Rhode, eds., *Across the West: Human Population Movement and the Expansion of the Nama* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1994).
whose consequences and contributions are still being evaluated. The result has been the emergence of a very different archaeological environment. Prior to the 1970s, archaeology was pretty much the exclusive domain of the universities. Over the last two decades, however, the number of archaeologists working for federal agencies and for private contracting firms and the amount of archaeological information being generated have increased many-fold. Although many CRM projects are small, some are very large and require institutional support. Consequently, several universities now support archaeological contracting offices with staffs dedicated to CRM projects.

Excavations in advance of large developments (dam construction, highway projects, building construction, oil and coal exploration) have often resulted in the recovery of important archaeological data and, in some cases, the development of public-oriented facilities. Examples include the Coombs Village (part of the Glen Canyon project) and Clear Creek Canyon excavations, both of which led to the construction of popular heritage parks. Despite some recent slowing in contract work, by far the majority of the archaeological work being done in the state is CRM-related.

NATIVE AMERICAN GRAVE PROTECTION AND REPATRIATION ACT

In 1990 Congress passed legislation that gave Native Americans much more control over their past including the disposition of Native American remains and associated objects. Utah passed a companion bill for state lands in 1992 as part of the Antiquities Protection Act. The increasing involvement of Native Americans in preservation and archaeology has resulted in changes in the way archaeology is done in Utah and throughout the country. Recovery and study of Native American human remains, for example, can only be done with the approval and cooperation of appropriate tribal groups. An example of such a cooperative project is the recovery and subsequent reinterment of the many burials exposed along the shores of the Great Salt Lake during the flooding in the mid-1980s. Excavation and analysis of those remains was done in collaboration with the Northwest Band of the Shoshone Nation. The Fish Lake Project, a BYU archaeological
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87 Steven R. Sinns, Carol J. Loveland, and Mark E. Stuart, “Prehistoric Human Skeletal Remains and the Prehistory of the Great Salt Lake Wetlands,” 1991, MS on file, Department of Sociology, Social Work, and Anthropology, Utah State University, Logan.
field school on Forest Service lands, included several Native American participants representing the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah and may offer a model of how pure research projects will be structured in the future.87

PUBLIC AND AVOCATIONAL ARCHAEOLOGY

Archaeology in the United States has always been supported by active non-professionals or amateurs, and Utah is no exception. Numerous amateurs have had a long-standing interest in the prehistory of the state. Unfortunately, that interest has often taken the form of uncontrolled collecting, but many moved beyond that preoccupation to contribute to archaeology in positive ways. Prior to the formal organization of the Utah Statewide Archaeological Society (USAS), several amateurs made significant contributions to Utah archaeology. The activities of Don Maguire of Ogden have already been mentioned. In Utah Valley the father and son team, Robert and James Bee, made systematic and well-documented collections during the 1930s. Their detailed notes and collections have been donated to the Museum of Peoples and Cultures at BYU. Also active in Utah Valley during the first half of this century was John Hutchings whose collections and notes now reside at the Hutchings Museum in Lehi. Amateur Leo Thorne worked with Albert Reagan in the Uinta Basin, made collections from local sites and took many photographs of the wonderful Uinta Basin rock art. Thorne’s collections are stored in the Western Park Museum in Vernal. Eldon “Doc” Dorman of Price has been a fixture in Utah archaeology for half a century, lending his assistance to the Prehistoric Museum in Price and to professional archaeologists.

The Utah Statewide Archaeological Society (USAS) was founded in 1962 with support from Jennings. From the beginning USAS conceived of itself as a statewide organization with chapters in various communities, a structure that remains to the present. In the mid-1980s USAS was revitalized (after sagging interest during the 1970s) through the joint efforts of state archaeologist David Madsen and USAS member George Tripp, both of whom felt that amateur and public support for archaeology was critical to controlling site vandalism and assisting in research. As new chapters were formed, professionals from univers-

sities or state or federal agencies stepped forward to act as chapter advisors. In 1988 Utah Archaeology, formerly the USAS newsletter, was reconceptualized as an annual state journal supported by the Utah Professional Archaeological Society, USAS, and the Division of State History. As a consequence, USAS membership boomed. In 1990 enrollment was over 400 in ten chapters scattered throughout the state. Public participation in research projects has become the rule as amateurs play an ever-increasing role learning about Utah’s past.

Agency archaeology has also come to emphasize public participation and public access to archaeology. The BLM has emphasized educational programs and has produced a formal curriculum for elementary and secondary schools. The Passport in Time program sponsored by the Forest Service and the BLM’s Adventures in the Past are both national programs intended to educate the public about archaeology and site preservation through participation in field research. All federal and state agencies as well as many private organizations sponsor Utah Heritage Week devoted to providing public access to archaeology and educating about archaeology and paleontology.

CONCLUSIONS

Utah archaeology in the 1990s is a dynamic and highly diverse field, dramatically different from the early part of this century when professional work began. At that time practitioners were few in number and the literature on the prehistory of the state would barely fill a shelf. Today archaeologists are employed by every major land managing agency and university in the state, and publications on Utah archaeology would fill rooms. The chronological framework of the state was established by the 1950s, and patterns of subsistence and settlement have been described for much of the area. Archaeologists are now building on this foundation to explore issues of economics, group interaction, regional diversity, and explanations for the ebb and flow of cultural change over the past 10,000 years of human presence. The past remains elusive, but Utah is fortunate as it continues to attract some of the best minds in the field to tell the story of Utah’s complex and intrinsically fascinating history and prehistory.

Archaeology’s greatest challenge at the end of the twentieth cen-

---

tury has not changed since the 1930s when Elmer Smith drew attention to the incessant looting of archaeological sites around the state. According to Smith: "The present writer failed to visit one locality where the archaeological material had not been disturbed in one way or another." This was written in 1937! Smith went on to recommend that "an educational program should be undertaken to acquaint the public with rules and regulations governing archaeological resources of the state." Smith's recommendations were not pursued at the time. Vandalism has, in fact, escalated over the past fifty years despite the efforts of many preservation-minded citizens and the passage of legislation designed to protect antiquities. More effective forms of protection are needed to care for our precious and irreplaceable cultural resources. Without it, the remaining unwritten history of the native peoples and early settlers of Utah will certainly be lost. The new era of Native American involvement could bring a new and different energy to the preservation of the past.

89 E. Smith, "Archaeological Resources."
90 Only recently, through the combined efforts of state and federal agencies have such programs been instituted. See especially S. Smith, et al., Intrigue of the Past.