

“The 3 stone axes were from Canyon del Muerto”:
The Relic-Hunting Economy
in the late 19th Century Southwest

James E. Snead
California State University, Northridge

*"I would not, if I could, count these treasures with the cold precision of a scientist, if such a counting involved the foregoing of that indefinable exhilaration, akin to awe, with which the enthusiastic layman beholds them"*¹

Introduction

The Euro-American response to indigenous antiquities in the southwestern states and territories in the late 19th and early 20th centuries is a poorly-understood process. This is surprising, given the rich heritage represented by these remains and the diverse, complex cultural traditions related to ruins and monuments held by all parties in this encounter.

Most of the historical treatments that do exist can be placed into three categories. Histories of American anthropology and archaeology often discuss how conditions in the region influenced the growth of these disciplines, with the Southwest serving – in the words of Don Fowler – as a “Laboratory for Anthropology.” A second body of scholarship emphasizes cultural preservation, examining the trajectory of public and governmental interest in establishing parks and monuments to protect archaeological “resources.” Some attention to the esthetic response to Southwestern antiquities by Euro-American artists and writers can also be found in the literature, focusing on such luminaries as Henry Cheever Pratt, the Kern brothers, or Willa Cather.²

Many of these approaches share a certain teleological orientation, construing the relationship of Euro-Americans and the material past as one of an evolution toward modern traditions of scholarship, stewardship, or both. In part this reflects the disciplinary orientation of many of those working on these issues, be they archaeologists, preservationists, Such “internal” accounts vary in rigor, and have received their share of criticism, but at least potentially contribute a distinct and nuanced practitioner’s point of view that is difficult to establish in other ways. What they lack almost by definition, is a broader cultural or historical perspective, particularly in regard to other perspectives on antiquities that might fall outside a narrow definition of “archaeological.” This is a fundamental element of disciplinary histories, so that the central intellectual work of the field, Bruce Trigger’s *A History of Archaeological Thought*, might easily be retitled “A History of the Thoughts of Archaeologists.”³

With the exception of Curtis Hinsley, historians themselves have expressed only modest interest in the encounter with antiquities in the western landscape, an omission that is less easy to explain. Archaeology as a practice is addressed in some classic works, but broader cultural

issues are rarely engaged in detail. In some sense this gap in scholarship suggests that the ill-defined intellectual niche of archaeology is shared by its subject matter. Although in North America the field is most typically situated within the social sciences, it largely absent from general histories of this subject and even those of anthropology, within which it is usually subsumed. It is interesting that a similar void exists regarding the history of paleontology, another subject which ought to play an interesting role in the history of western exploration. It may be that the fog of expertise that has grown up around these fields has diminished their interest or even an appreciation of their potential importance. I am also persuaded that the 20th century narrative of indigenous peoples finding their voices in the American context has dampened curiosity regarding earlier eras when a very different set of expectations was dominant – and even the historical connection between indigenous peoples and the material remains left by their ancestors was disputed.⁴

In cases where historical attention has focused on the cultural role of southwestern antiquities it has emphasized the conscious creation of ideology by southwestern elites. My own work has examined the interplay between archaeology and boosterism through the careers of individuals like Edgar Lee Hewett and Charles Lummis. The theme of this research has been how the indigenous past was coopted in the late 19th and early 20th centuries by in an effort to construct a new southwestern identity. My work in a sense is an echo of other studies that examine the manipulation of western history in the service of Euro-American ambitions, such as the rise of the “Santa Fe Style” in architecture or the complex construction of identities in southern California from Hispanic or Mediterranean ideals. A more complex perspective on the material past emerges from this work, but it remains within the framework of exploring archaeology as a profession. Other interests and ambitions regarding antiquities appear in this work but are largely subsumed by the central narrative.⁵

There is thus a compelling opportunity to take a more detailed look at how the southwestern past has been used by audiences and actors outside of - or perhaps parallel to – any “professional” context. I am particularly drawn toward the potential of studying this process from the ground up - specifically, in the ways that antiquities were used by Euro-American, Hispanic, and indigenous peoples living in the region between 1850 and 1920. I am less concerned with accounts of expeditions and other “formal” explorations of this past and more with the perception by local peoples of the significance and opportunities presented by the ruins and relics within their environments.

An illustration of the complex relationships that evolved around antiquities in the southwestern landscape and thus opportunities for further inquiry can be drawn from the correspondence of Frank Russell, an archaeologist based in Tucson in 1901. Russell – a young Harvard professor who retreated to Arizona following a TB diagnosis and briefly joined the Bureau of American Ethnology – traveled extensively in the region, reporting on conditions “on the ground” to his superiors in Washington.

In the Verde Valley Russell found cemeteries in canyon alcoves that had been disturbed by guano excavators, leaving “scores of human bones...crumbling in the heat of the southern sun.” Nearby was Montezuma Castle, which had recently been restored by the Phoenix-based Arizona Archaeological Society for the purposes of tourism. “The plan of leaving a register for names in the ruin,” he wrote, “seems not to have preserved the walls from being defaced by

brainless youths who have not, it is to be lamented, the Amerind's reticence about divulging their names.”

Russell did, however, find that indigenous people deeply engaged in issues of antiquities and their exploitation. At one point he encountered an armed party of Navajo suspicious of archaeological activity.

"They cited the case of the Field Columbian Museum parties that worked the Little Colorado ruins last year. That party, they said, (and they spoke truly for I saw them myself) had dug about the ruins of the ancient people and left their bones lying about on the ground. 'If any of our women who are with child see these bones while herding the sheep it will be bad for them.'"⁶

In northern Arizona Russell heard accounts of large artifact collections made in the Tsegi Canyon country by the Wetherill brothers and shipped out to destinations unknown. At Bluff, Utah, the Mormon inhabitants had “appropriated five hundred dollars for the purpose of clearing away the debris from the small pueblo that overlooks the town. They intend to preserve the ruin as an example of Hebrew architecture!” Near the end of his trip Russell visited Chaco Canyon, where the Hyde Exploring Expedition had been excavating under the auspices of the American Museum of Natural History. In the process he was able to refute rumors that the team’s work had been mere “vandalism” but also reported that Harvard students who had worked with them the previous summer had “accomplished practically nothing.” Letters written by those same students provide an interesting counterpoint to Russell’s reports, among other things documenting the deep involvement of the local Navajo population in the relic trade. Alfred Tozzer noted that the ruin of Penasco Blanco was “filled with pits where relic hunters, mostly Indians, have tried to find silver and gold ornaments and turquoise.”⁷

Russell’s reports and associated correspondences document a surprisingly busy scene among the Southwest ruins. Most of the communities of interest that can be discerned here make only rare appearances in historical narratives. The field parties of the Bureau of American Ethnology and the Field Columbian Museum had long since returned to the east, but there was considerable activity in their wake. Such different trajectories are indeed drawn out by the formal inquiry – in the shape of Russell’s mission – but the direction they take has been rarely followed.

I am particularly drawn toward arrangements for the sale and distribution of southwestern antiquities. At various points in his Southwestern travels Russell encountered artifacts being procured for a complex market that had been in existence for more than a generation. In this exchange southwestern “relic hunters” collected materials and sold them to local, national, and international clients. The motivations of these “producers” were diverse, as were those of the “consumers” at the other end. A desire for economic gain was universal, but a desire for achievement and recognition was also widespread. Local identity was also intertwined with these motives, a sense that antiquities could play some role in defining relationships between Euro-Americans and this new landscape. A final and intriguing common denominator was the

desire to obtain hidden knowledge and learn secrets, to experience the ‘indefinable exhilaration’ of uncovering something long lost.

My discussion of southwestern relic hunters and their patrons – producers and consumers – that follows draws out these diverse impulses as expressed largely through correspondence between 1880 and 1910. The interplay between these related communities, their parallel but often conflicting desires, played out in settings ranging from the southwestern deserts and territorial parlors to the major public institutions and venues of the East. Together they define an important engagement with the Southwestern landscape and history that needs to be an important component of our own historical narratives.

Producers: Relic Hunters

Encounters with antiquities was a feature of Euro-American settlement of the Southwest right from the beginning. The early federal survey parties that documented ruins in the region were often shown the way by settlers who had first discovered them while building their homesteads. Inscriptions from the 1860s are present in some of the cliff dwellings along the Rio Mancos in southwestern Colorado; in 1873 W. H. Jackson was guided to these same ruins by John Moss, who had recently established a ranch nearby. Thus by the time news of these antiquities reached the scientific community and the eastern public, they had been investigated by the local inhabitants for half a generation.⁸

Initially the new southwesterners’ perception of antiquities reflected pragmatic attitudes toward the land and its resources. Lewis Henry Morgan, who visited the Southwest in the summer of 1878, observed that archaeological sites along the Animas River in northwestern New Mexico were being dismantled for building materials by new arrivals. “It is to be hoped,” he wrote, “that the number of these settlers inclined to Vandalism will not increase.” The fact that the nearby town was named “Aztec” – and the associated ruins designated the “acropolis” – also suggests, however, that cultural interests in the ruins were engaged early on.⁹

The dominant utilitarian ethos quickly led to the emergence of local markets for antiquities. In most cases residents supplemented their income by relic-hunting in their spare time, selling artifacts to schoolteachers and other interested parties. The antiquities trade expanded along with the tourist trade. When Adolph Bandelier arrived in Santa Fe in 1880, shortly after the completion of the railroad, he found artifacts for sale in curio shops. This business was successful over many decades, with curio dealers listing such items as “idols and stone vessels from the cliff dwellings” in their inventories.¹⁰

Bandelier’s sojourn in the Southwest coincided with the first great collecting expeditions of the Bureau of Ethnology, which spurred demand for artifacts and connected the local antiquities market to the eastern Museum trade. Col. James Stevenson, in particular, placed priority on acquiring ethnographic and archaeological materials to bring back to Washington. Writing from Fort Wingate in October 1878, he described “two large wagon loads - loaded up to the bows - comprising the most curious & choice specimens ever gathered from this country, & I sent the wagons back early in the morning for another large load which I had packed up but could not bring away with me.” Stevenson made some efforts to acquire archaeological materials directly. At his instigation cursory excavations were made at the “old sites of Nambé, Pojuaque,

and Cuyumungue.” He also dispatched assistant F. G. Galbraith to Puyé with tools and burros to “make collections & sketches,” and Stevenson wrote about his intent to dismantle a cliff dwelling and ship it back East to John Wesley Powell. This plan and Galbraith’s work never came to fruition, and most of the artifacts brought back to Washington were purchased.¹¹

In Stevenson’s wake the antiquities market functioned sporadically. Institutional demand was low, since few of the major public museums that emerged during the 1880s had the resources to acquire large collections or to launch expeditions. Some of the more entrepreneurial relic hunters wrote to institutions and collectors in the East, offering their services, although these queries were not particularly successful. Nonetheless tourism continued to develop, and visitors increasingly found opportunities to acquire collections, visit ruins, and excavate their own antiquities. The relic hunters themselves were largely men from rural places at the social and economic margins, a group dominated by Euro-Americans but also included Hispanics and Native Americans. At the turn of the century one Juan Baca was described “as the most assiduous pottery digger” in eastern Arizona.¹³ During the same era Navajo involvement in the relic trade was apparently so significant that the Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs advised Indian Agents to intervene in the “traffic in prehistoric relics which...will enrich the Indians slightly and will cause serious loss to the scholarship of this country.”¹²

Despite the pragmatic values at the core of the relic hunter economy, Many of those who delved in the ruins expressed an intellectual interest in their collections. Correspondence with actual and potential clients is filled with comments about the finds and their significance. “To a phrenologist,” wrote one supplier of “mummies,” “I would say their skulls would compare [sic] in high development with the Caucasian [sic] race.”¹³

Considerable concern was also expressed about the deterioration of antiquities in an unregulated environment. Universally, relic hunters decried the damage that uncontrolled excavation caused at archaeological sites even as they proceeded to dig themselves. Interest in the interpretation of ruins and their conservation was sincere, and not seen as incompatible with the exploitation of artifacts for financial gain.¹⁴

Given the opportunity, some relic hunters expressed the visceral appeal which they found in the hunt for antiquities. One of these was W. O. Norrell, quoted at the beginning of this paper, who contacted the avocational archaeologist T. Mitchell Prudden in 1901 looking for work. In addition to describing the “indefinable exhilaration” brought on by the discovery of relics, he also discussed esoteric interpretations of the Southwestern past. “[M]ay I ask,” he wrote,

“...if you have read the series of articles contributed two years ago to a leading Masonic Magazine by one ___ Mahomet, a learned East Indian traveler, concerning the Pueblos, their origin, traditions, folklore, etc? That writer made extended explorations of the Pueblo ruins, describing minutely the architectural designs of buried temples and endeavoring to prove their construction by a people learned in the cult of free Masonry.”¹⁵

Prudden, a medical doctor when he was not traveling in the Southwest, made no response to Norrell – indeed – but the sentiments expressed provide insight into the distinctive character of the relic hunting economy.

Southwestern Colorado was the center of the relic trade at the beginning of the 1890s. A local market may have developed alongside the very earliest publicity about “cliff dwellings” in the region in the late 1870s, but it seems to have been quite modest in scale. The analogy between artifacts and exploitable natural resources is evident in the chain of events which kicked the relic economy into motion a decade later. These circumstances are usually associated with the family of Benjamin Kite Wetherill, operating out of the Alamo Ranch in Mancos. The Wetherills ran cattle in Mancos Canyon and the margins of the Mesa Verde, becoming familiar with the ruins of the region in the process. But excavations had already been started by other local residents; soldiers from nearby Fort Lewis also dug in the cliff dwellings during the mid 1880s, but none of the material derived from this work appears to have been sold.¹⁶

According to the journal of another relic hunter, Charles Carey Graham, the market for Mesa Verde antiquities was established in 1889. After an abortive attempt to trap in the vicinity that winter, a party that included Graham’s brother Howard and Charles McLoyd cast around for other opportunities.

“They knew the Wetherill brothers were down on the Mancos River, so Howard and Lee Patrick went down there, thinking maybe there would be some good trapping there. They got to digging around and found a few relics and then McLoyd came down to the Wetherill camp. They made up about four of them would go digging and see what they could find.”¹⁷

The collection that was gathered by this party, described as “ancient Aztec relics,” was exhibited in Durango in the spring of 1889 before moving on to Denver, where it was sold to the Colorado Historical Society. News that \$3000 had been paid for these artifacts galvanized the settlers of southwestern Colorado, and for some beaver trapping was set aside for a potentially more lucrative activity.¹⁸

Charles McLoyd was one, and together with Charles Carey Graham moved westward to dig in the the Grand Gulch country of southeastern Utah in late 1890. Additional parties followed them in the summer of 1891, with another trip by Graham and McLoyd in the winter of 1892. Graham’s laconic journal of their first trip is one of the few first-hand accounts of relic hunting in the period.

“11 [Jan] Sunday. We worked in Cliff house No. 1. Graham Canon, found 6-7 bone awls, 1 stone axe, some sandals, one bone awl, and small jar. Some cloth, one small coil vase with skeleton.

“12 [Jan.]. The skeleton we got out whole. In the afternoon worked in house no. 2., Graham C. got two coil jas, one of th3em with designs, 2 gone drawing knives, 1 wooden knife, 1 wooden dipper, the large coil jar was full of shelled corn in perfect condition.”¹⁹

This artifact rush quickly saturated the local market for antiquities, and duplicating the previous season’s success proved difficult. The Wetherill family had participated in this work

only obliquely, but their tourism business expanded rapidly after 1889 and it is probable that many small collections were produced for their clientele. This had significant benefits for their long-term participation in archaeology, because it produced a durable network of patronage that could never be equaled by their competitors. They also spent part of the summer of 1891 excavating with the Swedish aristocrat Gustav Nordenskiöld, whose comparative concern for detail left a deep impression. Nordenskiöld himself was struck by the relic hunting activity that characterized the region. "This entire spectacle was set in motion," he wrote his father, "by a few farmers who see the ruins and the treasures to be found in them as a good source of income for the future."²⁰

Many of the most prominent relic hunters produced catalogs to present their wares. One example is provided by Reamer Ling, a self-described "collector" living in St. Johns, Arizona. Ling prepared both a general brochure – entitled "Inklings Apropos Pre-Columbian Relics and the ruins wherein found" – and a more detailed listing of the items in his collection. On further inquiry, Ling advertised, he would supply more detailed information. One of the interesting elements of Ling's catalog is that he took pains to indicate that the artifacts were obtained on private land, suggesting that even in the 1910s legal protections for sites on federal property were widely acknowledged.²¹

Consumers

As the example of the Stevenson expedition indicates, the "destination" of artifacts unearthed in the late territorial Southwest was often the major eastern and midwestern institutions of the day. Considerable scholarship has been devoted to the development of the anthropological collections of these museums, and those in the Southwest itself that emerged in the early 20th century. In the context of the emergent antiquities market of the 1880s, however, these "consumers" were unreliable. Only a few of the public museums were truly active in the Southwestern arena, and this interest – confined to the acquisition of type collections – could be quickly satisfied. Once the Bureau of American Ethnology or the U.S. National Museum completed their acquisitions there were few others to turn to. The attention of nascent local institutions were even less predictable. In the Colorado case no major collections were purchased following that of the Colorado Historical Society, if for no other reason than there was no other such institution buying.

Yet relic hunters like Juan Baca, Charles Carey Graham, and W. O. Norrell were also complemented by a parallel network of relic collectors. These were typically individuals of some means and education who took an interest in antiquities for various reasons and built collections accordingly. Some undoubtedly patronized establishments like "Gold's Free Museum" on San Francisco Street in Santa Fe, or took advantage of the mail order curio business that Gold and his contemporaries were developing. To the relic hunters this community was a secondary market after the institutional buyers, but one with which they could operate on somewhat more equal terms. The evolving relationships between these thus provides a useful example for the dynamics of the relic hunter economy in general.

One of the local southwestern collections about whom the most is known is LeBaron Bradford Prince. Prince was a politician from Queens, New York, who came to New Mexico in the late 1870s, serving first as a supreme court justice and eventually, from 1889-1893, as

governor of the territory. He led an active political and cultural life and, with his wife, Mary, was a fixture of Santa Fe Society. The history of New Mexico was one of Prince's particular interests, and he dominated the State Historical Society for more than 40 years.²²

At some early point Prince also became interested in antiquities, over time assembling a substantial collection that was displayed in the chambers of the historical society in the governor's palace on the plaza as well as his Palace Avenue home. At least initially these materials were assembled in a haphazard fashion. A bill of sale for one transaction in Prince's papers, for instance, indicates that in one 1886 transaction he spent \$13.30 on 27 items, including stone animals, projectile points, and pottery.²³

In the mid 1880s Prince's engagement with indigenous artifacts took a distinctive turn, when he and Mary came into contact with a native of Cochiti Pueblo named Cleto. Cleto may have sold the Princes different sorts of antiquities but their attention was captured in particular by stone figurines referred to as "idols." Photographs of these items depict rudimentary anthropomorphic images pecked out of basalt or similar local stone. The idols captivated the Princes, and through the obliging Cleto they soon acquired a large number. In one note from this era Mary describes the purchase of 61 idols for \$45 and a set of clothes.²⁴

Cleto not only provided the idols themselves but provided some ethnographic context for their production and use. An account of an "idol dance" was revealed, and the secrecy associated with these images was repeatedly emphasized. Cleto told Mary Prince that he had "received fifty lashes on his bare back" after Cochiti elders were tipped off by envious curio dealers about the illicit trade. All of this served to heighten the Prince's personal interest in the material and to bolster a sense of expertise in their regard. Their collection gained not only some local renown but, after the publication of an article in *Leslie's Weekly*, attracted broader attention.²⁵

It is evident that Prince faced some competition for artifacts in Santa Fe, particularly from those in the curio business such as Jake Gold. Individuals may also have bid for artifacts that were destined for the Princes, although since word of this came via Cleto himself it may have been a ruse designed to get a better price. A few years later curio dealers in Santa Fe were stirred up by rumors that artifacts were being sold by the librarian of the Museum of New Mexico.²⁶

As publicity regarding the idols enhanced Prince's status in the community of collectors he developed an extensive – even international – correspondence. Some were interested in exchanges, offering to send him various items of their own in exchange for idols. In many cases these individuals had access to official reports and demonstrated considerable expertise. A dentist from Topeka, Kansas, wrote knowledgeably about 'fetishes' collected at Taos and described his own, substantial anthropological library. Prince's papers include letters from an Alice Hadley accompanied by lists of artifacts entitled "Mrs. Hadley's Idols."²⁷

Collectors were rarely immune to any financial opportunities represented by their artifacts, and Prince was contacted by many with items to sale and who also sought his aid as a possible broker for museums. Even as early as 1887, Prince had begun to seek a buyer for his own collection. Correspondence with numerous institutions about the idols ensued. "They are, no doubt, highly interesting," responded the "Sutro Museum" in San Francisco, but no buyers were found. Like the relic hunters Prince sought to attract the attention of the Smithsonian, and

carried out an extensive correspondence with the U.S. National Museum and the Bureau of American Ethnology. Writing to John Wesley Powell in 1890, he noted that

"I have never disposed of a single image, and I like to keep them together. But I cannot, and go on with the work, for I am absolutely drained of money. I have kept myself poor for five years by this continual excavating, in remote and difficult localities, and much of it (as you know is altogether the case) dead work in places where nothing is found. The very transportation of what is found, over mountains, & down cliffs in many cases where they have to be carried by hand, has been no small item."²⁸

It is difficult to evaluate Prince's claims of hardship, since the evidence suggests he purchased idols rather than excavated them himself, but he was prepared to send 100 of them to Major Powell for \$2000. A few months later he had dropped the price to \$1000, but on the recommendation of curator William Henry Holmes Powell did not commit. Undaunted, Prince sent individual idols to high federal officials, including the Secretary of the Interior, who promised to "value it highly." One subset of the collection was put on exhibit at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, where Prince perhaps hoped it might attract a purchaser.²⁹

Unlike relic hunters such as Charles McLoyd, Prince's social status and reputation provided some direct access to the eastern institutional market. Yet this access did not guarantee sales, and it seems that financial duress was shared by most participants in the relics trade. The absence of a "marketplace" – an established framework in which producers and consumers of southwestern artifact could conduct business – was a central feature of the antiquities trade throughout most of the period.

The Middleman: Horatio Nelson Rust and the Antiquities Market

Occupying the middle ground between the relic hunters on the ground in the western states/territories and the various markets for their product was an eclectic community of middlemen. These individuals came from diverse backgrounds. Many were Westerners themselves, who for various reasons were more capable of turning the boom of public interest in antiquities to their advantage than the relic hunters themselves. Most members of this entrepreneurial class thus make brief appearances in the historical record. Unique opportunities to bring antiquities to the marketplace – such as that provided by the World's Columbian Exposition – attracted both entrepreneurs and capital.

Among those who profited through the sale of antiquities at the Chicago Fair were C. D. Hazzard, who not only bankrolled a collecting expedition prior to the event, but bought and combined several smaller collections available at reduced prices at the close of the festivities before selling it all to Phoebe Hearst (and thus the University Museum in Philadelphia). Hazzard – and his field agent, H. Jay Smith – do not appear in the history of the Southwest again. Neither does the Rev. C. H. Green, who had bought the collections of McLoyd and Graham, joined forces with a prominent member of the Fair's establishment, Selim Peabody, and created a paper organization called the "Society of Cliff-Dweller Archaeology of America" which vanished –

along with Green – after Hazzard bought the artifacts. These individuals seized the economic opportunity provided by Chicago – and the resultant public demand for “cliff dweller” antiquities – much as they would have taken advantage of a spike in price in any sort of commodity, before moving on to other business ventures.³⁰

There was, however, another, more invested “class” of middlemen involved with the southwestern relic trade. These individuals were typically collectors themselves, characterized by a more substantive personal interest in collecting while at the same time reliant on their sale for at least a portion of their income. This group included some businessmen, such as the owners of the curio stores that were increasingly prominent as tourism expanded across the West. In these circumstances collecting could be a manifestation of market value and connoisseurship. Others were more directly engaged in antiquities as intellectual capital, often with a concomitant interest in the Native American population. Prominent in the latter community – and a significant architect of the “identity” of southwestern antiquities – was Horatio Nelson Rust.³¹

Rust’s career as collector and entrepreneur began early. He was raised on a Massachusetts farm in the 1830s: according to his autobiographical notes, his uncle gave him a small set of Indian artifacts when he was eleven, “saying ‘My boy, I want you to keep these, and try to get more, and to learn all you can about them.’” As a youth he spent time in the museum at Amherst College; after the early death of his father, however, Rust turned to various more pragmatic trades, ultimately settling into the life of a traveling salesman. His deeply abolitionist convictions made him a avid supporter of John Brown, and he drove an ambulance at Antietam.³²

Such a peripatetic career provided numerous opportunities to visit collections and befriend collectors. It is evident that the buying, selling, and exchanging of artifacts was a central part of his activities and to a certain extent a source of income. Rust’s initial network was in the New England states, involving not only his old associates at Amherst but others throughout the region. By the late 1860s, however, he was ranging much further afield, with contacts throughout the Midwest and Great Lake states. These ranged from individuals to institutions. His pocket diaries for the period are filled with references to the relic collections of county surveyors and station agents, visits to “cabinets,” and orders for artifacts made by others met along the way. In the mid-1870s Rust took time away from supervising a warehouse in Chicago to conduct his own excavations on archaeological sites in Missouri, producing collections that were sold to Othniel Marsh at Yale.³³

It was not until relatively late in life that Rust went West, moving to Pasadena in 1881. What began as local trips around southern California quickly expanded to cover larger parts of the state. At first his experience in the region mimicked his earlier routine, and his notes describe the familiar routine of engaging local relic collectors while maintaining his long-distance network. Rust’s journal entry on September 7, 1881, for instance, notes that he “Met Dr. Barton who gave me bowl & pestle & wampum. Must send him pottery in exchange.”³⁴

Even as he acquired relics from California and the Southwest Rust continued to explore sales of collections locally and elsewhere. Collections amassed at his Pasadena home during the 1880s and 90s were ultimately sold to a variety of collectors. The largest of these went to Beloit College in Wisconsin, but Rust continued to work with collectors at the other end of the scale. In the process he also built deeper ties with the existing infrastructure of curio and relic dealers in the region as well as intellectuals interested in the “Indian Question.” These included Helen

Hunt Jackson, the Santa Barbara relic hunter Lorenzo Yates, and instructors in archaeology at regional universities such as Mary Barnes at Stanford.³⁵

One close connection was made with Thomas Varker Keam, whose trading post at Keam's Canyon had become a destination for travelers interested in the Hopi. Keam first wrote Rust seeking a buyer for his own collection – then housed temporarily at the Smithsonian – but interested him in visiting Arizona for himself, as he described in 1889.

“Aside from the ancient relics I have to show you – I would be glad to take you over to the Moki villages – there are seven of them – scattered on precipitous mesas – and they display nearly the same condition of social life as when Coronado discovered them 350 years ago. The adjoining pastoral Navajos are also an interesting people – and the regions of the cliff and other ruins are within two days of my place. I shall be very glad to show you all there is of interest here – or as much as you can find time to visit – and there have been no Cook's tourists tramping over our wonders.

Rust traveled to Keams Canyon that summer, and corresponded with both Keam and Alexander Stephen thereafter.³⁶

In fact the fundamental difference of Rust's time in the West concerned the possibility of regular interaction with Native Americans, a rare experience for the eastern collectors in his original network. Predictably some of these encounters focused on artifacts, and were often conducted by proxy. For instance, his correspondent Daniel Hawkins, the treasurer of Alpine County, California, was able to commission the manufacture of arrowheads from a Kumeyaay elder he called “Indian Tom” that presumably were passed on to Rust's customers. Yet even from his earliest years in the state Rust visited Native American communities in person, preparing brief reports about the conditions he witnessed there. Thus even while he was amassing artifacts and taking on additional assignments – such as promoting California citrus projects – he was gaining considerable firsthand experience with both indigenous practices and policy issues pertaining to their status in the 1880s West.³⁷

The ultimate result of Rust's interest in Native Americans and his assiduous cultivation of political interest was his 1889 appointment as Agent for the Indians of the Mission Tule River Agency. With this development his interests in Indians and artifacts intersected with his abolitionist heritage, providing an opportunity for merging theory and practice that – among 19th century anthropologists – was perhaps equaled only by the experience of Alice Cunningham Fletcher. That Rust's tenure at the agency was not a success – four years of covert and overt resistance to his initiatives ultimately led to his replacement – is perhaps indicative of the dissociation between these different motives. The episode is evidence, however, of a form of engagement associated with relic hunters and the social issues of the day. Rust's friends in small Midwestern towns may have spent happy evenings smoking their pipes and arranging arrowheads, but the potential correlations of such hobbies should not be overlooked.

Conclusion

The various participants in the western relic trade discussed here – Charles Carey Graham, LeBaron Bradford Prince, Horatio Nelson Rust – played shifting roles in an economic practice that engaged diverse intellectual currents in the Territorial West. They are placeholders for dozens – if not hundreds – of others who were also active in this marketplace. We may not know the names of the Mormons and Navajos encountered by Frank Russell, but it is clear that they were themselves representative of widespread exploitation of antiquities, with distinct perspectives and overlapping motivations.

These different elements came together only rarely. The World's Columbian Exposition was one of these venues; while Prince was laboring to sell his idols, Rust was serving as judge of the anthropology exhibits – among which were artifacts excavated by Graham. Rust's notebooks describe – in their terse fashion – a tumultuous marketplace. Regarding one collection under review, he noted with satisfaction that the “3 stone axes were from Canyon del Muerto in the ...Valley for the Cliff Dwellers.” Collectively this activity fed the burst of popularity associated with “Cliff Dweller” relics in the 1890s, and for a few years this ancient society maintained a presence in the public mind.³⁸

The ironies within these stories are not restricted to Rust's failure to put his abolitionist principles in play in managing an Indian Agency. Despite Bradford Prince's failure to find a buyer for his collection, his asking price continued to rise: what had been a few thousand dollars in 1890 was \$50,000 by 1900. In contrast, one of the people from whom he purchased the idols, a man named Anastacio, wrote Prince that same year asking for \$5 to get married, an irony probably not noticed by any of the participants. There is an even greater irony in the fact that the “idols” themselves were fake. Awareness that they had been manufactured rather than discovered must have been increasingly widespread within the Santa Fe community, since years later the Edgar Lee Hewett reported that he had even visited the place near Cochiti where Cleto had made them.³⁹

The complex questions circling over the Prince idol collection – in particular, who was taking advantage of whom – and the intricate maneuvers between relic hunters and patrons over the Pre-Columbian artifacts of the Southwest provided window into a relationship with indigenous antiquity that extends far beyond the disciplinary histories of archaeology. Among the themes engaged is that of exploitation – certainly economic, given the terms of the exchange, but with unexpected nuance. What might loosely be considered “environmental” exploitation should also be considered, since the impact of the relic hunters on cultural resources was devastating. Formal archaeological research began in the Southwest decades after market forces had entered the domain, and the impact that the relic rush had on the nature of those resources has never been properly evaluated.

Issues of identity were also engaged, particularly since it was only a few years before cultural nationalists began manipulating images of southwestern antiquity to enhance local ambitions. Susan Stewart has argued that antiquarian collecting in the New World “centered upon the discovery of a radical cultural other,” with relevant opportunities to coopt the indigenous past. This would appear to apply to Bradford Prince – although prestige is the value most closely associated with the acquisition and attempted sale of his collection - as well as to

Rust, even while the concept of “cooption” must be more thoroughly evaluated. Artifacts were capital, of many kinds: and examining how these engagements shifted in different contexts is an important step in building the context of the history of the material past in the American Southwest.⁴⁰

Notes

1. Norrell to Prudden, 20 May 1901. AMNH 1.
2. Fowler 2001 is the most substantive of the archaeological histories. See also Snead 2001. Recent historians of the preservation movement include Rothman (for instance, 1988, 1989) and Thompson (2000), among others (see Altherr 1985; Harmon et al 2006; Lee 1970). For Pratt, see Sweeney (1996). The Kerns are discussed in Weber (1985). Interest in Cather focuses on *The Professor's House*, particularly her portrayal of the relic hunter Tom Outland. See Harrell (1992); Horwitz (1995). A more general perspective on the relationship between art and archaeology in the Southwest is provided by Goetzmann and Goetzmann (1986: 360) and Mullin (1993).
3. Some of the best recent southwestern archaeological histories focus on distinctive elements of the discipline, such as dating (Nash 1999), field training (Reid and Whittlesey 2005), and field conferences (Woodbury 1993). Trigger's erudite and wide-ranging work places archaeological theory and practice in a global context and is thus not intended as an exploration of detailed contexts (1984, 1989)
4. Of particular note regarding this subject are Hinsley 1988, 1989, 2002; Hinsley and Wilcox 1996. Bieder's *Science Encounters the Indian* (1986) remains the most consistently cited work regarding the intellectual context for archaeology in the 19th century US; the approach receives a necessary update in the recent work of Steven Conn, although his emphasis is on the eastern and midwestern states. For an example of histories of the social sciences “without” archaeology, see Ross 1991. A casual survey of the principal publication series on the history of American Anthropology identifies notably few discussions of archaeological topics (for example, Stocking 1983). A case for the potential relevance of paleontology to this issue can be found in the work of Ronald Rainger (for example, 1990).
5. My approach is most thoroughly discussed in *Ruins and Rivals* (2001). More topical presentations of the argument can be found in Snead (2002a, b). In essence, this work was intended to illustrate that archaeology was a more complex activity than usually thought, but only occasionally stretched to explore the importance of other ways that the Pre-Columbian southwestern past has been perceived. For Santa Fe style, see Wilson (cite); for southern California, Deverell 2004.

6. Russell to WJ Mcgee, 30 June 1901. BAE.
7. FR to JWP, 9 September 1901. BAE. Alfred Tozzer to Family, March 10, 1901. Transcription, ATP.
8. Blackburn and Atkins (1993); Smith (1988: 10); see Hardacre (1878), Holmes (1878).
9. Morgan (1881: 175); Lister and Lister (1990: 5).
10. Lange and Riley (1966: 409; 1970: 332-333); J. S. Candelario to M. Mill, 1 August 1902 (Candelario Papers, MNM); see also Batkin (1998); Wade (1985).
11. Stevenson (1883: 433); Stevenson to Pilling, 12 October 1878; Stevenson to Pilling, 27 October 1880; Stevenson to Powell, 12 October 1881 (BAE).
12. This is the era of the famous letter from Benjamin Kite Wetherill to W. H. Holmes at the U.S. National Museum, often cited to indicate the disregard of the anthropological “establishment” towards local interest in antiquities. See Harrell (1987); Blackburn (2006). The reference to Juan Baca appears in Hough (1903: 327); a letter from the acting commissioner is preserved in the Edgar Lee Hewett Papers, MNM.
13. Perry ___ to H. A. Ward, 13 May 1893 (FWP 1)
14. Norrell to Prudden, 20 May 1901 (AMNH 1)
15. There is considerable scholarship on the Wetherill family and the events associated with early Mesa Verde archaeology. See Anonymous (1927: 141); Atkins (1993); Blackburn (2006); Blackburn and Williamson (1997); Brugge (1980); Fletcher (1977); Gabriel (1992); Gilmor and Wetherill (1934); Harrell (1987, 1992); Lister and Lister (1985); McNitt (1966); Smith (1988); Snead (2001).
16. Daniels (1976: 9).
17. Phillips (1993: 194).
18. Daniels (1976: 10). See also Blackburn and Atkins (1993)
19. "Inklings Apropos Pre-Columbian Relics and the ruins wherein found" and "Descriptive catalogue, Pre-Columbia Relics, 'L' Collection', Reamer Ling, St. Johns, Arizona." Spier, Leslie, File 573, January 1912 - 1920. AMNH 2.
20. Snead 2001: 21. For Nordenskiold, see Diamond and Olsen 1991.

21. For the acquisition of major anthropological collections, see Jacknis 1999; Parezo 1987; Wade 1985; Wilson and Falkenstein-Doyle 1999. Stewart (1984) remains an essential reference for the psychology of collecting. For Gold's, see Batkin (1998).
22. For Prince's political career, see Donlon 1967. I briefly summarize his involvement in the antiquities business elsewhere (2001: 15-16), but my earlier interest in Prince focused on his role in opposing the creation of the School for American Archaeology (2001: 132-133). For the historical society, see Stensvaag (1980). The idol controversy is taken up by Lange (1998).
23. LBP.
24. Mary Prince to L. B. Prince, n.d. LBP. For photos, see NAA 2, Box 9.
25. Mary Prince to L. B. Prince, 5 March 1886. LBP.
26. A. C. Weeks to the Santa Fe Merchant's Association, 6 April 1916. Correspondence 1916 [file 1 of 4] Edgar Lee Hewett Papers, MNM.
27. S. G. Hewlett to Prince, 16 December 1894; James Wickersham to Prince, 20 May 1892; A. H. Thompson to Prince, 14 December 1894; (Alice Hadley to Prince, April 1898. LBP.
28. L. R. E. Paulin to Prince, 29 December 1894; Jenkins Sacster to Prince, 16 August 1897: LBP. Prince to Powell, 3 May 1890: BAE 1.
29. Sutro Museum to Prince, 3 October 1887: LBP. Prince to Powell, 3 May 1890; Prince to Powell, 22 July 1890: BAE 1. Holmes' tepid response is written on the obverse of this letter. Sec. of the Interior, to Prince, 17 February 1890; Fuller to LBP, 3 February 1890: LBP.
30. Allen 1990 provides a succinct discussion of the Hazzard Collection: see also Hayes 1993.
31. Rust has received relatively little scholarly attention: see Apostol 1979/80; Kroeber 1907; Militello 2005. The biographical information presented here is derived from primary source material archived as part of HNR.
32. HNR to "Prof. Beardsley," 24 May 1894. Box 10, HNR.
33. For example of New England travels, Edward Hitchcock to Rust, 14 March 1866; Fearing Burr to Rust, HNR, 31 March 1873. Box 6, HNR. Institutional correspondents during this era included the Kent Scientific Institute Museum in Grand Rapids and the

Davenport Academy. For a typical early notebook, see Vol. 10, HNR, begun Jan.1, 1869. The Missouri collections are noted in Stewart Culin to HNR, 12 February 1895, Box 6, HNR.

34. Pocket Diary Volume 24, HNR.
35. See Jackson to Rust, 20 May 1883, Box 8; Yates to Rust, 28 December 1890, Box 9; Barnes to Rust, 24 October 1894, Box 10: HNR.
36. Thomas Varker Keam to HNR, 21 February 1889. Box 9, HNR.
37. Robert Relt to HNR, 19 June 1889. Box 9, HNR.
38. Rust, April 28, 1893. Memorandum book, "Chicago during the Fair." Pocket Diary Vo. 38. HNR.
39. McGee to Prince, 10 July 1899; Prince to to Mrs. Humpel-Zeman, 6 July 1901; Anastacio to Prince, 13 March 1901. LBP. For the idol controversy, see Lange et al (1975: 451-452, n602); Lange 1998.
40. Snead (2001b); Stewart (1984: 141).

References Cited

Primary Sources

- AMNH 1: Accession File 1894-45, Folder labeled "Pueblo Bonito, N.M. George Pepper, Collector and 2nd Wetherill Collection Utah & Arizona." Archives, American Museum of Natural History, Department of Anthropology. New York.
- AMNH 2: General Correspondence Files, Archives, American Museum of Natural History, Department of Anthropology. New York.
- ATP: Alfred M. Tozzer Papers, Archives, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University.
- BAE 1: Bureau of American Ethnology Papers, Letters Received. National Anthropological Archives, Washington, DC.
- NAA 2: Photo Lot 40 – Department of Anthropology, Division of Archeology, Miscellaneous Photographs. National Anthropological Archives, Washington,

DC.

- FWP 1: Putnam, F. W. - General Correspondence, 1851-1947. HUG 1717.2.1 Harvard University Archives.
- FWP 2: Putnam, F. W. - World's Columbian Exposition - Correspondence A-Z. HUG 1717.2.12, Harvard University Archives
- HNR: Horatio Nelson Rust Papers, Huntington Library, Pasadena, California.
- LBP: Historical Notes and Events, Folder 18. LeBaron Bradford Prince Papers, New Mexico State Records Center and Archives, Santa Fe.
- MNM: Archives, Fray Angélico Chavez Library, Museum of New Mexico, Santa Fe.
- WKM: Warren K. Moorehead Papers, MSS 106. Ohio State Historical Society, Columbus.

Secondary Sources

Allen, Rebecca

- 1990 The History of the University Museum's Southwestern Pottery Collection. in Brody, J.J. *Beauty from the Earth: Pueblo Indian Pottery From the University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology*, pp. 61-88. University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Altherr, Thomas L.

- 1985 The Pajarito or 'Cliff Dwellers' National Park Proposal, 1900-1920. *New Mexico Historical Review* 60: 271-94.

Anonymous

- 1927 *Biographical Sketches and Letters of T. Mitchell Prudden*. Yale University Press, New Haven.

Apostol, Jane

- 1979/80 Horatio Nelson Rust: Abolitionist, Archaeologist, Indian Agent. *California History* 58(4): 304-315.

Atkins, Victoria M., ed.

- 1993 *Anasazi Basketmaker: Papers from the 1990 Wetherill-Grand Gulch Symposium*. Cultural Resources Series No. 24. United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of

Land Management, Salt Lake City, Utah,

Batkin, Jonathan

1998 Some Early Curio Dealers of New Mexico. *American Indian Art* 23 (3), pp. 68-81.

Bieder, Robert E.

1986 *Science Encounters the Indian, 1820-1880*. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.

Blackburn, Fred M.

2006 *The Wetherills: Friends of Mesa Verde*. Durango Herald Small Press, Durango.

Blackburn, Fred M., and Victoria M. Atkins

1993 Handwriting on the Wall: Applying Inscriptions to Reconstruct Historic Archaeological Expeditions. in *Anasazi Basketmaker: Papers from the 1990 Wetherill-Grand Gulch Symposium*, edited by Victoria M. Atkins. Cultural Resources Series No. 24, pp. 41-100.

Blackburn, Fred M., and Ray A. Williamson

1997 *Cowboys and Cave Dwellers: Basketmaker Archaeology in Utah's Grand Gulch*. School of American Research Press, Santa Fe

Brugge, David M.

1980 *A History of the Chaco Navajos*. Reports of the Chaco Center #4. National Park Service, Albuquerque.

Conn, Steven

2004 *History's Shadow: Native Americans and Historical Consciousness in the Nineteenth Century*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Daniels, Helen S.

1976 *Adventures with the Anasazi of Falls Creek. Occasional Papers of the Center of Southwest Studies*, 3. Fort Lewis College, Durango, Colorado.

Diamond, Irving L., and Daniel M. Olson, eds.

1991 *Letters of Gustaf Nordenskiöld*. Mesa Verde Museum Association, Mesa Verde National Park, Colorado

Donlon, Walter John

1967 LeBaron Bradford Prince, Chief Justice and Governor of New Mexico Territory, 1879-1893. Ph.D. dissertation, University of New Mexico. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Byers, Douglas S.

1939 Warren K. Moorehead. *American Anthropologist* 41(2): 286-294.

Deverell, William

2004 *Whitewashed Adobe: The Rise of Los Angeles and the Remaking of its Mexican Past*. University of California Press, Los Angeles.

Fletcher, Maurine S., ed.

1977 *The Wetherills of the Mesa Verde: Autobiography of Benjamin Alfred Wetherill*. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.

Fowler, Don D.

2000 *A Laboratory for Anthropology: Science and Romanticism in the American Southwest, 1846-1930*. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

Gabriel, Kathryn, ed.

1992 *Marietta Wetherill: Reflections on Life with the Navahos in Chaco Canyon*. Johnson Books, Boulder.

Gillmor, Frances, and Louisa Wade Wetherill

1934 *Traders to the Navahos; the Story of the Wetherills of Kayenta*. Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston.

Goetzmann, William H., and William N. Goetzmann

1986 *The West of the Imagination*. W. W. Norton and Company, New York.

Hardacre, Emma C.

1878 The Cliff-Dwellers. *Scribner's Monthly* 17(2), pp. 266-276.

Harrell, David

1987 "We contacted Smithsonian": The Wetherills at Mesa Verde. *New Mexico Historical Review* 62 (3), pp. 229-248.

1992 *From Mesa Verde to the Professor's House*. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

Harmon, David, Francis P. McManamon, and Dwight P. Pitcaithley

2006 *The Antiquities Act: A Century of American Archaeology, Historic Preservation, And Nature Conservation*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Hayes, Ann

1993 The Chicago Connection: 100 Years in the Life of the C.H. Green Collection. in *Anasazi Basketmaker: Papers from the 1990 Wetherill-Grand Gulch Symposium*, edited by Victoria M. Atkins. Cultural Resources Series No. 24, pp. 121-141. United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Salt Lake City, Utah

Hinsley, Curtis M., Jr.

- 1983 Ethnographic Charisma and Scientific Routine: Cushing and Fewkes in the American Southwest. in *Observers Observed: Essays on Ethnographic Fieldwork*, edited by George W. Stocking, Jr., pp. 53-69. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.
- 1989 Revising and Revisioning the History of Archaeology: Reflections on Region and Context. in *Tracing Archaeology's Past: the Historiography of Archaeology*, edited by Andrew L. Christenson, pp. 80-96. Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale
- 1990 Authoring Authenticity. *Journal of the Southwest* 32 (4), pp. 462-478.
- 2002 The Lost Itinerary of Frank Hamilton Cushing. In *The Lost Itinerary of Frank Hamilton Cushing*, edited by Curtis M. Hinsley and David R. Wilcox , pp. 3-40. The University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Hinsley, Curtis M. Jr., and David R. Wilcox, eds.

- 1996 *The Southwest in the American Imagination: The Writings of Sylvester Baxter, 1881 - 1889*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Holmes, W. H.

- 1878 Report on the Ancient Ruins of Southwestern Colorado, Examined During the Summers of 1875 and 1876. *10th Annual Report of the United States Geological and Geographical Survey of the Territories*, pp. 383-408. Government Printing Office, Washington.

Hough, Walter

- 1903 Archaeological Field Work in North-Eastern Arizona. The Museum-Gates Expedition of 1901. *U. S. National Museum Annual Report*, pp. 287-358. Government Printing Office, Washington.

Horwitz, Howard

- 1995 Selling Relics, Preserving Antiquities: The Professor's House and the Narrative of American Anthropology. *Configurations* 3(3): 353-389.

Jacknis, Ira

- 1999 Patrons, Potters, and Painters: Phoebe Hearst's Collections from the American Southwest. In *Collecting Native America, 1870-1960*, edited by Shepard Krech III and Barbara A. Hail, pp. 139-171. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington.

Kroeber, Alfred E.

- 1907 Horatio Nelson Rust. *The Journal of American Folklore* 20(77): 153.

- Lange, Charles H., Carroll L. Riley, and Elizabeth M. Lange
 1975 *The Southwest Journals of Adolph F. Bandelier, 1885-1888*. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- Lange, Patricia Fogelman
 1998 Cultural Collecting Fever in New Mexico: Figurines and Governor L. Bradford Prince. *Journal of the Southwest* 40 (2): 217-242.
- Lee, Ronald F.
 1970 *The Antiquities Act of 1906*. National Park Service, Office of History and Historic Architecture, Eastern Service Center, Washington, DC.
- Lister, Robert H., and Florence C. Lister
 1985 The Wetherills: Vandals, Pothunters, or Archaeologists. in *Prehistory and History of the Southwest: Papers in Honor of Alden C. Hayes*, edited by Nancy C. Fox, pp. 147-153. Archaeological Society of New Mexico, Albuquerque.
- 1990 *Aztec Ruins National Monument: Administrative History of an Archaeological Preserve*. Southwest Cultural Resources Center, Professional Papers No. 24. National Park Service, Santa Fe, NM.
- McNitt, Frank
 1966 *Richard Wetherill, Anasazi*. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque
- Militello, Teresa
 2005 Horatio Nelson Rust and his Contributions to American Archaeology. *Pacific Coast Archaeological Quarterly* 41(1).
- Mullin, Molly
 1993 *Consuming the American Southwest: Culture, Art, and Difference*. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor.
- Nash, Stephen E.
 1999 *Time, Trees, and Prehistory*. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.
- Pardue, Diana F.
 1996 Marketing Ethnography: The Fred Harvey Indian Department and George A. Dorsey. In *The Great Southwest of the Fred Harvey Company and the Santa Fe Railway*, edited by Marta Weigle and Barbara A. Babcock, pp. 102-109. The Heard Museum, Phoenix, AZ.
- Parezo, Nancy J.
 1987 The Formation of Ethnographic Collections: The Smithsonian Institution in the American Southwest. in *Advances and Archaeological Method and Theory*, vol. 10, pp. 1-47.

Academic Press, Orlando

Phillips, Ann

1993 Archaeological Expeditions into Southeastern Utah and Southwestern Colorado Between 1888 and 1898 and the Dispersal of the Collections. in *Anasazi Basketmaker: Papers from the 1990 Wetherill-Grand Gulch Symposium*, edited by Victoria M. Atkins. *Cultural Resources Series* No. 24, pp. 103-118. United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Rainger, Ronald

1990 Collectors and Entrepreneurs: Hatcher, Wortman, and the Structure of American Vertebrate Paleontology Circa 1900. *Earth Sciences History* 9 (1), pp. 14 - 21.

Reid, Jefferson, and Stephanie Whittlesey

2005 *Thirty Years into Yesterday: A History of Archaeology at Grasshopper Pueblo*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Ross, Dorothy

1991 *The Origins of American Social Science*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Rothman, Hal

1988 *Bandelier National Monument: an Administrative History*. Southwest Cultural Resources Center Professional Papers no. 14. National Park Service, Santa Fe

1989 *Preserving Different Pasts: The American National Monuments*. University of Illinois Press, Urbana

Rydell, Robert W.

1984 *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Smith, Duane A.

1988 *Mesa Verde National Park: Shadows of the Centuries*. University Press of Kansas, Lawrence.

H. Jay Smith Exploring Company

1893 *Catalogue of Cliff Dwellers Exhibit, World's Columbian Exposition*. La Monte, O'Donnell & Co., Chicago.

Snead, James E.

1999 Science, Commerce, and Control: Patronage and the Development of Anthropological Archaeology in the Americas. *American Anthropologist* 101 (2), pp. 1-16.

2001 *Ruins and Rivals: The Making of Southwest Archaeology*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

2002a Lessons of the Ages: Archaeology and the Construction of Cultural Identity in the American Southwest. *Journal of the Southwest* 44(1): 17-34.

2002b The “Western Idea”: Local Societies and American Archaeology. In *Excavating Our Past: Perspectives on the History of the Archaeological Institute of America*, edited by Susan Heuck Allen, pp. 123-140. Archaeological Institute of America, Colloquia and Conference Papers 5.

Stewart, Susan

1984 *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

Stensvaag, James T.

1980 Clio on the Frontier: The Intellectual Evolution of the Historical Society of New Mexico, 1859-1925. *New Mexico Historical Review* 55: 294.

Stevenson, James

1883 Illustrated Catalog of the Collections Obtained from the Indians of New Mexico and Arizona in 1880. *Second Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, pp. 423-465. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC.

Stewart, Susan

1984 *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

Sweeney, Gray

1996 Drawing Borders: Art and the Cultural Politics of the U.S.-Mexico Boundary Survey 1850-1853. In *Drawing the Borderline: Artist-Explorers and the U.S.-Mexico Boundary Survey*, Exhibit Catalog, pp. 23-77. Albuquerque Museum, Albuquerque, NM.

Thompson, Raymond H.

2000 Edgar Lee Hewett and the Political Process. *Journal of the Southwest* 42(2): 271-318.

Trennert, Robert A.

1987 Fairs, Expositions, and the Changing Image of Southwestern Indians, 1876-1904. *New Mexico Historical Review* 62 (2): 127-150.

Trigger, Bruce G.

1984 Alternative Archaeologies: Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist. *Man* 19:355-70

1989 *A History of Archaeological Thought*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Wade, Edwin L.

1985 The Ethnic Art Market in the American Southwest, 1880-1980. In *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture*, edited by George W. Stocking, Jr., pp. 167-191. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.

Warrior, Claire

2003 'A Small Collection from New Mexico and Arizona': Barbara Freire-Marreco in the Southwestern United States, 1910-13. *Journal of Museum Ethnography* 15, pp. 115-130.

Weber, David J.

1985 *Richard H. Kern: Expeditionary Artist in the Far Southwest, 1848-1853*. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

Wilson, Chris

1997 *The myth of Santa Fe: creating a modern regional tradition*. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

Wilson, Thomas H., and Cheri Falkenstein-Doyle

1999 Charles Fletcher Lummis and the Origins of the Southwest Museum. In *Collecting Native America, 1870-1960*, edited by Shepard Krech III and Barbara A. Hail, pp. 74-104. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington.

Woodbury, Richard

1993 *Sixty Years of Southwestern Archaeology: A History of the Pecos Conference*. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.

World's Columbian Exposition

1898 *Report of the President to the Board of Directors of the World's Columbian Exposition*. Rand McNally & Co., Chicago.

The 19th (nineteenth) century began on January 1, 1801 (MDCCCI), and ended on December 31, 1900 (MCM). The 19th century was the ninth century of the 2nd millennium. The 19th century saw large amounts of social change; slavery was abolished, and the First and Second Industrial Revolutions (which also overlap with the 18th and 20th centuries, respectively) led to massive urbanization and much higher levels of productivity, profit and prosperity. The Islamic gunpowder empires were formally dissolved and The middle 19th century. During the half century when Romanticism was deploying its talents and ideas, the political minds inside or outside Romanticist culture were engaged in the effort to settle "each party or group or theory in its own way" the legacy of 1789. There were at least half a dozen great issues claiming attention and arousing passion. One was the fulfillment of the revolutionary promise to give all Europe political liberty "the vote for all men, a free press, a parliament, and a written constitution. Between 1815 and 1848 many outbreaks occurred for this cause. Steadily successful His current projects include "Relic Hunters: Encounters with Antiquity in 19th Century America," funded by the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research; "Forgotten Casualties," an archaeological and archival study of the 1928 St. Francis Dam disaster in Los Angeles County; and ongoing fieldwork in the archaeological landscapes of roads, paths, and trails. edit. The 3 stone axes were from Canyon del Muerto: The Relic-Hunting Economy in the late 19th Century Southwest more. by James E. Snead. More Info: Presented in the symposium "Fascinated by Relics and Ruins: Encounters with American Antiquities," 51st Annual Meeting of the Western History Association, Oakland, October 13-16. Publication Date: 2011. Research Interests Economic developments of the 19th century. George Stephenson's locomotive, "Rocket". Developments during this time altered the nature of life, not just in Britain, but all over the world. There were huge population changes: The population grew 260 per cent in the years between 1750 and 1900. In 1750, about 15 per cent of the population lived in towns, but by 1900 it was 85 per cent. By 1900, London had 4.5 million people, and Glasgow had 760,000. In industry " although historians now question the idea of an Industrial Revolution " the period 1750-1914 definitely saw industrial growth: some his The beginning of the nineteenth century was remarkable for Great Britain for its union with Ireland. In Ireland, some of the Irish united under the and began to demand independence, being affected by the French Revolution. They formed the organization known as the United Irishmen. They quickly took the lead of the whole national movement, and attempted to initiate a rebellion in 1796, with the help of the French troops which were ready to land in Ireland. The landing failed, and the English government began to eliminate its enemies. In 1798 it seized a number of the Irish leaders, and placed th