

Archaeology in the National Park Service

Author(s): A. R. Kelly

Source: *American Antiquity*, Apr., 1940, Vol. 5, No. 4 (Apr., 1940), pp. 274-282

Published by: Cambridge University Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.com/stable/275197>

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Cambridge University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Antiquity*

JSTOR

## ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

A. R. KELLY<sup>359</sup>

**B**RIEFLY the historical background for the legal framework and administrative machinery established for archaeological survey and research in the National Park Service, should be reviewed. The Antiquities Act of 1906<sup>360</sup> and the Historic Sites Act of 1935,<sup>361</sup> the latter growing out of a special study of European and American legislation and precedents for the conservation of historic monuments instituted by the Secretary of the Interior, are particularly important. Also passed in 1935, was an Act to create a National Park Trust Fund which compares with the National Trust of Great Britain; the National Park Trust of the United States grew out of the same studies which found legal expression in the Historic Sites Act of 1935.<sup>362</sup>

More recently, by coöperative agreement, arrangements have been made for the review of archaeological and historical restoration projects carried out under relief auspices; these involve the operative procedures established by the Works Progress Administration, requiring the technical review of all research and survey project applications by the Smithsonian Institution and the National Park Service, Branch of Historic Sites.

---

<sup>359</sup> Chief, Archaeologic Sites Division, Branch of Historic Sites, National Park Service.

<sup>360</sup> Antiquities Act of June 8, 1906, entitled "An Act for the perservation of American antiquities . . ."; 34 Stat. 225.

<sup>361</sup> Historic Sites Act of August 21, 1935; 49 Stat. 666, entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of American sites, buildings, objects and antiquities of national significance and for other purposes."

<sup>362</sup> Act of July 10, 1935; 49 Stat. 477, entitled "An Act to create a National Park Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes." The model for the National Park Trust is found in the National Trust of Great Britain, a private organization established in 1895 which was strengthened by the National Trust Act of 1907, incorporating the pre-existing organization, for the purpose of preserving historic buildings and lands. The governing board of the English Trust is a self-perpetuating body consisting of members and representatives of learned and scientific societies; in the United States, the Board consists of the Secretaries of the Treasury and the Interior and the Director of the National Park Service and two persons appointed by the President for five years each. The purpose of the National Park Trust Fund is very similar to that of the English National Trust and the authority given to receive gifts, estates, to set up corporations and other trusts for the administration of preserved sites and antiquities, is much the same except that the American Act gives greater powers. Pertinent information relative to foreign legislation, including Great Britain, can be found in the comparative "Report to the Secretary of the Interior on the Preservation of Historic Sites and Buildings," prepared by T. Thomas Schneider, in 1935, now in press.

A consideration of the policy of the National Park Service, past and present, toward archaeological research and survey in the areas within its jurisdiction, is in order. Archaeological areas were among the first to be included as national monuments and parks when the National Park Service was established in 1916. Subsequently, extensive land acquisition has resulted in a marked increase in areas which involve either archaeological or historical-archaeological connections, or both. Many of these areas have been transferred from other departments, especially the War Department and the Department of Agriculture. Various institutions, including the Smithsonian, have cooperated in studying the merits of proposed areas, to determine the justification of establishing national monuments and parks.

The policy of the National Park Service in the past has been primarily protective, to hold and conserve important historical and archaeological shrines, with little attempt to do any more research or survey than was necessary or incidental to the primary protective functions. Increased public use and tourist travel have necessitated the physical development of many areas long dormant. Survey is badly needed, in many instances to determine the extent and nature of the archaeological resources to be policed by park rangers and guides. Again, in general, park and monument museum presentation of prehistory require more information and data than is available from existing exploration. Roads, trails, building foundations, drainage, and other construction result in inadvertent uncovering of archaeological materials which require technical attention. Stabilization of walls, rooms, foundations, frequently necessitate some exploration where remains rest on thick midden and other cultural debris. The net result is that however reluctant the National Park Service may be to undertake any extensive archaeological research, the conditions themselves impose a minimum of such work incident to effective preservation and educational presentation to the public.<sup>363</sup>

---

<sup>363</sup> At Tonto National Monument, Arizona, there is urgent need for stabilizing walls of upper rooms built over several feet of undisturbed cultural debris. Stabilization must begin with foundation structures, which means that the midden must be excavated with scientific investigation. At Aztec Ruins National Monument, Colorado, it will be necessary to clear two rooms and to provide technical archaeological supervision for excavations in the plaza incident to trail preparation and the drainage of the area. At Chaco Canyon National Monument, N. M., stabilization of walls in the ruins of Chetro Ketl and Pueblo Bonito requires archaeological direction. The Chaco, one of the best known and oldest explored areas in the Southwest, is regarded as one of the most advantageous points at which to work out methods of coordinating techniques of field exploration with the problems of structural restoration and stabilization.

Important archaeological and historical-archaeological areas have in some instances achieved national monument or park status with little exploration having been carried out. Others were in the initial stages of investigation when taken over. Ocmulgee National Monument, on the Ocmulgee River, near Macon, Georgia, is an example. Exploration began in the winter of 1933 under Smithsonian sponsorship, continuing through the next four years with local sponsors cooperating with the Works Progress Administration, and lastly became permanent through the National Park Service. At Jamestown, Colonial National Historical Park, and at Yorktown, Virginia, extensive historical and archaeological research has been in progress for some years. The work here involves a variety of historical and archaeological techniques which are related and exhibited educationally through the medium of a temporary museum and laboratory which stresses archaeological method and current field results. It is estimated that a ten-year program is basic to any considered program of out-door exhibits and museum preparation adequate to tell the story of early English colonization. Elsewhere in the United States, several areas, in some instances larger than the state of Rhode Island, have been authorized or are projected for acquisition, which have extensive but unappraised archaeological resources. Accession here grows from a policy of conserving large, unspoiled "primitive areas," considered on scenic grounds or with regard to natural features and scientific resources, including archaeology. The importance of areal survey as a basis for development in these instances is obvious.

The effect of the Historic Sites Act of 1935 has been to place the responsibility for national survey of historic and archaeological sites upon the National Park Service. The objective ultimately is to catalogue and evaluate, on the basis of their scientific importance and urgent need of conservation, all of the historic and archaeological sites in the United States and dependencies. In some cases, public ownership, Federal, state, or local, is required for effective preservation. Otherwise, the designation of particular sites as historic sites, under cooperative agreements made possible by the law of 1935, with voluntary cooperation of landowners and other private or quasi-public societies, will suffice to effect preservation.

Even before the passage of the Historic Sites Act, a beginning was made toward the survey of the more outstanding archaeological sites in the United States whose preservation and public protection was most urgent. In 1934, the Smithsonian Institution, acting in connection with the National Resources Board, circularized the representative institu-

tions and archaeologists of the nation and secured survey data on prepared forms. The cataloguing and evaluation of sites made at that time has been of invaluable assistance to the National Park Service in the few intervening years in appraising the merits of areas proposed for national monument or park status. Since the passage of the Historic Sites Act of 1935, the program of survey and reconnaissance under the Works Progress Administration has gradually been brought into line with the objectives of the Act. Operative procedure as previously described, has found the Smithsonian and the National Park Service acting jointly to stress the importance of site survey, surface collection, type mound and village exploration, topographic and contour mapping, laboratory analysis and comparisons of site materials as an index of site potentialities. Widespread application of the provisions of the Historic Sites Act has been difficult and slow because of inadequate technical personnel and organization.

Under recent reorganization, an archaeological sites division has been set up within the Branch of Historic Sites, in acknowledgment of the growing archaeological responsibilities of the National Park Service. Regionalization of the Park Service administration, with the establishment of four regions in the United States, is another step in reorganization which may lead to more effective regional technical supervision in both history and archaeology. However, no considerable research staff in archaeology is practicable, probable, or desirable in the National Park Service. It must be evident that the technical needs are so great that duplication of functions and staffs must be avoided as much as possible. Yet it is equally apparent that adequate scientific development of the vast archaeological areas under government jurisdiction presents a problem of overwhelming magnitude and it is doubtful if the closest cooperation between government archaeologists and other technicians in the Smithsonian Institution and the National Park Service can alone cope with the task. Moreover, it should be the aim to bring to each developing area, and to each specialized problem of exploration and survey the best informed source of knowledge and technical proficiency, wherever these may be obtained. Frequently, the best authority will be found in the region in which the area exists.

The answer to the problem of national survey is that there must be coordination of survey and research all over the country, looking forward to the conservation, preservation, and deliberated study of particular site situations and developing areas. The participation of not one or two, but of many scientific institutions is indicated. It is recog-

nized that a national survey would require many years to reach completion; what is important now, under the conditions of excellent enabling legislation, prepared on the basis of extended study of both foreign and American models, is to institute a practical working system of cataloguing and evaluating sites. More immediately urgent, however, than the realization of a national catalogue of sites, is the effective use of existing administration and legal machinery, to preserve the outstanding sources of archaeological knowledge and materials.<sup>364</sup>

Archaeological research involving excavations in the Park Service has been held to the minimum necessary to provide scientific data on which physical development of particular areas can proceed. It is important to observe that the problems of the Park Service in this connection are somewhat different from those which ordinarily confront a scientific institution undertaking field exploration. In addition to the collection of scientific data in the field, and the preparation of such data and materials looking forward to publication, the Park Service must consider the preservation of the site, the original context or source of

---

<sup>364</sup> Cataloguing devices employed to date are admittedly inadequate, and temporary. The best general summary of the problem, with recommendations for procedure, is to be found in the Report of the Recreation Committee of the National Park Service to the National Resources Board in 1936. Very regrettably, this admirable document has not been made available in published form. The section on "Historical and Archaeological Sites" states the principles involved in a national survey appraisal of sites, stressing conservation as the objective, and provides a tentative scheme or schedule for evaluation. A list of known archaeological sites in the United States, whose preservation or acquisition was urgently recommended, was graded into "A," "B," and "C" classes on the basis of their apparent scientific and historic importance. "A" sites were "... selected because of their preëminent significance and because certain of these are faced with imminent destruction through unqualified excavation." "A" sites especially designated (s.d.) were recommended for semi-permanent preservation "... on the grounds that: (1) under existing conditions of archaeological exploration they might yield only duplicate information; or because, (2) steady archaeological advances in scientific techniques and methods would make them even more important repositories of scientific data than had appeared, or would appear, now—i.e., tree-ring dating has changed evaluations of a number of leading southwestern sites. These "A s.d." sites might thus constitute a special group of "reserved monuments." In connection with this classification, the recommendation was made: "... That scientifically valuable archaeological sites on Federal lands not at present within a national park or monument be designated as national monuments and that Federal protection be given the sites so designated; that scientifically valuable archaeological sites on other lands be acquired and added to the monuments; that all archaeological sites which are administered by the Federal Government be classified and treated according to the system of archaeological categories developed herein above, namely 'A,' 'A (s.d.),' 'B,' 'B (s.d.),' 'C,' 'C (s.d.)' ..."

knowledge *in situ*, with a view to the maintenance of open-air museums and exhibits and the presentation educationally to the American public of the story unfolded on the site. The question of what constitutes adequate scientifically authenticated restoration constantly arises. The tendency to architectural rationalization or idealization must be restrained and subjected to rigorous discipline from archaeological field work and historical documentation which emphasize methods and interpretations of a more precise nature than those which would ordinarily be required for the simple preparation of a scientific monograph based on the study of the "internal evidence" of so many documentary sources. It is not enough, in this instance, to find out *what happened*; it is equally essential to demonstrate the evidences in or on the ground. If, as frequently happens, the evidences of this nature cannot be brought out adequately and exhibited *in situ*, then other means of presenting the information and context must be had. This means, usually, that the park or monument museum must carry the burden of proof in the form of special models, dioramas, and display of objects and sources. In any event, from the preceding it should be apparent that restoration policy and the planning of educational or museum exhibits contemplating the history and prehistory on a particular site must be carried out with a degree of coordination and changing methodology not ordinarily required in field exploration.

The necessity of blueprinting, of preparing historical and archaeological base-sheets, which enter into the master plans of development for different areas just as do the plans and designs for roads, buildings and other engineering constructions, means that the methods and techniques employed in Park Service archaeology need to be varied. Time and space permit of only a few examples of such complex adaptations of present techniques.

Dendrochronology as an aid to both history and archaeology in the eastern United States may be cited. Tree-ring chronology has been demonstrated to be applicable to historical and archaeological contexts in Georgia; it is hoped to continue and complete studies begun on living trees and to begin the identification of archaeological charcoal series taken from an historic trading post site on the Ocmulgee, charred wall posts from the assumed protohistoric Lamar village site, and some 1500 charred beams taken from the prehistoric ceremonial earth lodge on the Macon Plateau. In the same region, at St. Augustine, Florida, well preserved stockade posts secured by archaeological exploration of the moat around Fort Marion are available for study. At Parris Island, South



Carolina, in clearing and landscaping a fortification site of unknown period, 18-inch cedar posts were found in stockade alignment with artifacts and other features indicating much older fortifications, now thought possibly to be the site of 16th century Spanish and French settlement.<sup>365</sup>

In addition to the historical-archaeological situations uncovered at Jamestown, Ocmulgee, St. Augustine, and Parris Island, others should be mentioned as showing the same conditions requiring combined historical, dendrochronological, ethnographical, and archaeological research. Dr. J. R. Swanton's southeastern researches have summarized extant knowledge of the ethnography of tribes in the area and have resulted in descriptions, checked on the ground in many instances, of a number of Indian villages along the Chattahoochee, in both Alabama and Georgia. A quarter of a century of study of the De Soto itinerary has produced a welter of historic-ethnographic presumptive sites which now need archaeological confirmation. The work of the Smithsonian Institution at the Peachtree Mound, Murphy, North Carolina, may mark the inception of such exploration. TVA archaeology in Tennessee has yielded archaeological series which Professor W. S. Webb discusses as *possible Cherokee* and these materials, including numerous house sites, must be compared with other sites in North Carolina, considered to be Cherokee inhabited, which show differing material culture indices, including pottery. In Georgia, the survey of historical and archaeological sites along the course of the Oglethorpe Trail, from Savannah to Augusta, is uncovering other problems, comprising the historic Indian villages of a number of Muskogean tribes, with Silver Bluffs, presumptive De Soto site of Cofitachequi, and Mount Pleasant, historic stamping grounds of the elusive Yuchi, outstanding. The Natchez Trace Parkway, 450 miles long, has a number of historic Indian sites in historic-ethnographic context highlighted by the writings of French soldiers and travellers of the 17th and 18th centuries, with the main interest centering on the Ackia

---

<sup>365</sup> The following accounts concerning this little-known, but very important site, should be mentioned: Salley, A. S., Introduction to F. M. Hutson's *Prince William's Parish and Plantations*, Richmond, 1935, gives his view of Spanish settlement on Parris Island; also see his conclusions in Appendix C of Mrs. Connor's *Jean Ribault*, Florida Historical Society, 1927. Major George H. Osterhout, Jr., reports on the explorations which uncovered pertinent data in his article, "Three Hundred and Fifty Years"; being the story of "Charles' Fort," built by Jean Ribault in 1562 on what is now known as Parris Island, S. C., in the *Marine Corps Gazette* for June, 1923; also, by G. H. Osterhout, "The Sites of French and Spanish Forts in Port Royal Sound," *Transactions of the Huguenot Society of South Carolina*, No. 141, Charleston, S. C., 1936, pp. 22-35.



Battleground National Monument site near Tupelo, Mississippi (in the midst of Chickasaw Old Fields), and upon several large historic village sites on St. Katherine's Creek near Natchez, Mississippi, shown on comparative study of materials and historical documentation to be Natchez Indian. Fort Raleigh, Roanoke, Ocracoke Island, Cape Hatteras, site of the proposed Cape Hatteras National Seashore Monument, comprise the area of Raleigh's Lost Colony and the neighboring contemporaneous villages described by various English writers and illustrated in the camera drawings of John White. No more promising sites for combined historical, ethnographic and archaeological study could be imagined.

Going further afield, and taking up the subject of 16th, 17th, and 18th century Spanish mission sites, a wide variety of areas has been included in State and National Park development, including the disputed ruins of Santo Domingo State Park in southeast Georgia, numerous mission sites in Texas with the park restoration at Goliad, Tumacacori, and numerous others in the southwest. Whitman Mission in the State of Washington is an interesting 19th century site.

The military history of the United States is well represented in many sites which involve archaeological problems, frequently connected with the ethnography of historic Indian tribes. Fort Ridgely in Minnesota, explored and restored under the technical direction of the National Park Service, is an example of pure historical archaeology requiring a coordination of historical, archaeological, and architectural research. Similarly, Fort Laramie in Wyoming, Fort Abraham Lincoln and Fort Keams in North Dakota, comprising the important historic and proto-historic Mandan Indian villages explored in joint expeditions of Columbia University and the North Dakota Historical Society, represent site explorations involving the so-called "direct historical approach to archaeology." The restoration of entrenchments, redoubts, batteries, magazines, and other military features at the site of the Siege of Yorktown, Virginia, illustrate the combined architectural and archaeological problems involved in such work.

Thus far, emphasis has been put upon the more specialized aspects of research in the Park Service where historical and archaeological problems and methodology are concerned. It must not be overlooked that a vast amount of survey and exploration is needed on park areas in the purely prehistoric field.

It may not be generally known that archaeological areas are among the oldest to come under Federal protection and to have been incorporated into the national park system. Among the older established

archaeological areas, some of which have been set aside for thirty years, are the following:

	<i>Established</i>
Casa Grande Ruin, Arizona (Made National Monument, 1918)	1889
Mesa Verde, Colorado	1906
El Morro, New Mexico	1906
Montezuma Castle, Arizona	1906
Chaco Canyon, New Mexico	1907
Gila Cliff Dwellings, New Mexico	1907
Tonto, Arizona	1907
Tumacacori, Arizona	1908
Gran Quivira, New Mexico	1909
Navajo, Arizona	1909
Walnut Canyon, Arizona	1915
Bandelier, New Mexico	1916

Acquired soon after the establishment of the National Park Service in 1916 are the following: Yucca House, Colorado, in 1919; Hovenweep, Utah and Colorado, in 1923; Wupatki, Arizona, in 1924. Several of these older established areas comprise extensive territory containing thousands of archaeological sites never surveyed. The urgent need for areal survey, basic to park development, may be noted with particular reference to two of the oldest areas, Chaco Canyon and Mesa Verde.