ATTITUDES TOWARD ANTIQUITIES:
RHETORICAL ENCHANTMENTS, PRESERVATION ADVOCACY, AND THE AMERICAN SOUTHWEST

Lucy Ann Burgchardt

A dissertation submitted to the faculty at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Communication in the College of Arts and Sciences

Approved by:

Carole Blair

Bill Balthrop

Sarah Dempsey

Alicia McGill

Neal Thomas

© 2018
Lucy Ann Burgchardt
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

Lucy Burgchardt: Attitudes Toward Antiquities: Rhetorical Enchantments, Preservation Advocacy, and the American Southwest
(Under the direction of Carole Blair)

My dissertation evaluates Anglo-American preservation advocacy on behalf of ancient indigenous places in the Southwestern United States, such as Mesa Verde, in southern Colorado, and Chaco Canyon, in northern New Mexico. My dissertation focuses on the rhetorical works of white adventurers, archaeologists, and advocates who were active in the American Southwest between the 1870s and the 1930s. It examines legislation that such social actors advanced during roughly the same historical period, and it also assesses four recent examples of preservation policy affecting Southwestern antiquities.

Throughout this dissertation, I claim that the history and legacy of Anglo-American preservation advocacy on behalf of Southwestern antiquities demonstrate the communication patterns of rhetorical enchantment. I define rhetorical enchantment as an appeal to a cultural myth, often indicated or enhanced by the presence of poetic language. I develop the theory of rhetorical enchantment in relation to dramatism, finding evidence of the technological psychosis, frames of acceptance and rejection, and god terms alongside the myths that rhetors in my study expressed poetically.

The main myths that rhetors in my dissertation prevailed upon were myths of modernity such as scientific rationality, the theory of cultural evolution, primitivism, and

white superiority. These appeared alongside more literary myths, in which rhetors painted the American Southwest as a magical landscape, while they depicted the ancient structures that they found there as New World ruins. While these poetic myths often articulated to the myths of modernity that I critique throughout this dissertation, they undermined rhetors' pretensions to scientific objectivity. Although scientific authority always has characterized Anglo-American engagement with ancient indigenous places in the Southwestern United States, this rhetorical history demonstrates that Anglo-American researchers, advocates, and policymakers always have exhibited a poetic attitude towards Southwestern antiquities. Unfortunately, these poetics typically translated into a fetishistic demeanor towards American Indian social actors, as well.

Together, these rhetorical enchantments have naturalized Anglo-American involvement in the care of ancient indigenous places. Anthropological authority continues to dominate the federal management of indigenous heritage places. My dissertation historicizes and challenges this status quo, and the language that helped to constitute it.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I could not have completed my dissertation without the help and support of academic mentors, near and far. First and foremost, I would like to thank my advisor, Carole Blair, for her stalwart guidance. In working with me on this years-long project, Carole has taught me invaluable lessons in writing, research, and critical thinking. I will be grateful always. I would also like to thank the "marvelous" members of my doctoral committee for their insights, questions, and support over the past years. To Bill Balthrop, Sarah Dempsey, Alicia McGill, and Neal Thomas: Thank you for weighing my ideas, suggesting books, writing letters of recommendation, and performing all of the other work that goes into serving on a doctoral committee. I truly appreciate all that you have done for me, and the wonderful examples that all of you have set for me.

As the daughter of a rhetorician, I have had the unusual experience of having a mentor within my own family, as well. I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the joy of having the ability to consult with my father, Carl Burgchardt, as I came to know myself as a scholar. My father was often the first person with whom I discussed my ideas, as well as the only member in the audience at numerous conference presentations about this project. To my father: Thank you for believing in me. Thank you, also, for raising me in such close proximity to the Communication faculty at Colorado State University, who proved to be superlative mentors, as well. I would like to extend a special acknowledgement to Greg Dickinson, from whom I first learned about rhetoric while attending his graduate seminar in

Fort Collins, Colorado. I would also like to thank Eric Aoki, who introduced me to a number of key resources for going out “into the field,” and who has been generous with his time, as well.

The Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill supported my dissertation research extensively. Thanks to an Off-Campus Research Fellowship, a Summer Research Fellowship, and the Sequoyah Dissertation Completion Fellowship, I was able to visit four archives, attend National Park Service “Interpretive Ranger” training, document public interpretive materials at Southwestern antiquities, and interview thirty heritage practitioners working at Southwestern antiquities. I would like to extend my special thanks to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the Graduate School, the Royster Society of Fellows, Gigi Taylor and the Writing Center, and my home department, Communication, for the outstanding assistance that each has lent to my graduate career.

I must also acknowledge the assistance of many talented archivists, librarians, and professionals within the heritage industry, all of whom enriched my dissertation through the time and energy that they shared with me. To begin with, all of the archivists with whom I worked seemed to have magical powers. To Jessy Randall and Amy Brooks of the Tutt Library Special Collections at Colorado College in Colorado Springs, CO; Brenna Lissoway of the Chaco Culture NHP archives in Albuquerque, NM; Tara Travis of the Mesa Verde NP archives in Cortez, CO; and Nikolai Kendziorski at the Fort Lewis College Center of Southwest Studies in Durango, CO: Thank you for all that you do to support inquisitive minds.

To the NPS personnel at Mesa Verde National Park and Chaco Culture National Historical Park, I give my special thanks. Kristy Sholly and Nathan Hatfield, the Chiefs of

Interpretation at Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon, respectively, impressed me with both their knowledge and their dedication. I observed their fantastic leadership, and had the pleasure of getting to know their wonderful teams. Through their enthusiasm and warmth, they made me feel like running away to join the Park Service. The Crow Canyon Archaeological Center was another invaluable resource as I completed this project, and members of its staff were incredibly thoughtful in sharing insights and resources. Thanks, especially, to Deborah Gangloff, Sean Gantt, and Mark Varien. I would also like to acknowledge a number of important conversations that I had with Jim Bertolini, a dear friend *and* a historian for the Nevada State Historic Preservation Office who clued me into many of the institutional workings of the United States heritage industry.

Peer mentoring also contributed significantly to the way my ideas for this dissertation ended up on the page. I would like to acknowledge, especially, the graduate students who sat next to me in coffee shops, at kitchen tables, and in libraries, as we each worked on our respective projects and tossed ideas back and forth. Thank you, Mary Domenico, Maggie Franz, Keiko Nishimura, Jing Jiang, and Nicole Castro, for tolerating my writing habits. To my "Grad Buddies" Chris Dahlie (and his wife Roz, who baked me a cake before she ever met me), Elizabeth Melton, Zac Parker, and Evan Jones, I am so glad that our department gave us an excuse to bond over scholarship and graduate education. I would also like to thank the following individuals for their friendship and advice over the course of finishing this dissertation: Bryan Behrenshausen, Emily Brennan, Andrew Davis, Amy Fallah, Jonathan Foland, Eileen Hammond, Ashley Mattheis, Robert McDonald, Alex McVey, Smita Misra, Ali Na, Julia Scatliff O'Grady, Jessica Rich, Wayne Rysavy, Carolin Suedkamp, Freya Thimsen, Megan Wood, Heather Woods, and Kurt Zemlicka. All these fellow UNC

graduate students were always willing to share their own work and experiences as I tried to understand “how to get the thing done.” Countless other friends and colleagues informed my research and enriched my graduate experience, and I will never forget their support during these years.

To all of my dear friends, thank you for your enduring laughter, sympathy, and wit, and forgive me for not mentioning all of you by name. Know that you helped make this process enjoyable, as well as enlightening! My family also provided tremendous support. To my mother, Jill, and my sister, Jane, thank you for bearing my distractions and concerns over the phone, these past six years. To Patrick Lang and Tombo the Corgi, thank you for the daily morale boosts.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge the ancient indigenous places that lie at the center of this dissertation. While I critique Anglo-American preservation advocacy and preservation policy over the course of this dissertation, I am truly glad that places like Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon exist, and I long for them to keep existing. For me, such places inspire reflection on what it means to be human, what it means to make history, and the various ways that people depend on their surroundings and each other. These thoughts matter, and the “matter” that inspires them deserves to be recognized.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS v

TABLE OF CONTENTS ix

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION 1

Significance 8

Ancient Indigenous Heritage and the American Southwest 10

The Federal Management of Indigenous Heritage in the United States 22

Critical Concepts 26

Rhetorical Enchantments 28

Myths, Modernity, and Enchantment 35

Review of Literature 48

Conceptual Connections 49

Connections by Subject 58

Critical Heritage Studies, Public History, and Archaeology 64

Rhetoric of Antiquities 72

Terminological Clarifications 81

Chapter Descriptions.....86

Summary.....95

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....97

CHAPTER TWO: THE TECHNOLOGICAL AND POETIC PSYCHOSES IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY ACCOUNTS OF MESA VERDE.....108

Technological and Poetic Psychoses.....111

The Historical Moment.....118

The Technological Psychosis.....123

Scientific Heroism.....123

Research Methodology.....128

Measuring Cultures through Cultural Evolution.....136

Deflected Poetics and Cultural Evolutionary Assessments.....143

The Poetic Psychosis.....148

Romantic Ruins.....150

Tragic Fates.....157

Preservation Advocacy.....161

Conclusion.....166

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....170

CHAPTER THREE: ATTITUDES TOWARD PRESERVATION ADVOCACY AT THE TURN OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.....173

Frames, Poetic Categories, and Rhetorical Enchantments.....175

The Historical Moment.....181

Plaints against Vandalism and Government Relations with American Indian Peoples.....189

Plaints against Vandalism 192

Plaints against the Government 196

Tragedy, Epic, and Comedy in Preservation Advocacy at the Turn of the Twentieth Century.....206

Bandelier: Tragedy and the All-Knowing Narrator 208

McClurg: Epic and the Trailblazer 214

Hewett: Comedy and the Reverent Critic 234

Conclusion 246

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....251

CHAPTER FOUR: SCIENCE AS THE GOD TERM OF PRESERVATION POLICY IN THE AMERICAN SOUTHWEST 253

God Terms and Rhetorical Enchantments 258

Federal Preservation Policies.....262

A Nationalistic Science in Federal Preservation Policies 267

National Park and National Monument Designations for Southwestern Antiquities 278

First Generation Park and Monument Designations in the American Southwest 279

Second Generation Monument Designations in the American Southwest 289

Conclusion 303

BIBLIOGRAPHY 307

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION 310

Primary Claims 311

Contributions.....319

Current Problems 329

Limitations, Biases, and Further Enchantments 340

Future Directions 346

Summary 348

BIBLIOGRAPHY 352

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

In December 2016, President Barack Obama designated Bears Ears National Monument, redefining the management and use of 1.35 million acres of federally-owned land in southeastern Utah. The Bears Ears landscape was noteworthy for its variety of cultural, natural, recreational, archaeological, and paleontological resources. Supporters of the national monument designation considered it long overdue and celebrated it as "a victory for indigenous rights."[1] After all, Bears Ears was the first and only national monument ever to be requested by a coalition of Tribal governments, and the new national monument encompassed the ancestral homeland of several Native nations residing in the American Southwest, along with over 100,000 Ancestral Puebloan sites. At the same time that proponents called the Bears Ears designation a victory, Utah Congressman Jason Chaffetz called it a "slap in the face to the people of Utah, attempting to silence the voices of those who [would] bear the heavy burden it impose[d]."[2] Chaffetz' statement summarized well the conservative opposition to the new national monument, which soon became a symbol of executive overreach that the Trump administration was determined to exploit.

---

[1] Julie Turkewitz and Lisa Friedman, "Interior Secretary Proposes Shrinking Four National Monuments," *The New York Times*, August 24, 2017, https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/24/us/bears-ears-utah-monument.html.

[2] Jason Chaffetz qtd. by Robinson Meyer, "Obama's Environmental Legacy, in Two Buttes," *The Atlantic*, December 30, 2016, https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2016/12/obamas-enviromental-legacy-in-two-buttes/511889.

In December 2017, President Donald Trump ordered a reduction of Bears Ears National Monument from 1.35 million acres to 201,876 acres. Those in favor of the eighty-five percent cut called it "an unquestionable victory for Utah," excluding those indigenous stakeholders living in Utah who had fought for Bears Ears to gain recognition in the first place.[3] While Trump's Secretary of the Interior, Ryan Zinke, took to Twitter to revel in the reduction of Bears Ears' boundaries, opponents to Bears Ears' reduction described it as "an attack on minorities," and "an affront to the Native American tribes that actively petitioned against [the reduction]."[4] The outdoor recreation company, Patagonia, began a web campaign declaring that the reduction was both unethical and illegal, and joined with environmental conservationists, archaeological researchers, and the Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition to pursue legal action against the Trump administration.

The conflict over Bears Ears' boundaries demonstrates an irrefutable dimension of public memory places: Collectives invest differently in memory places, and express diverse values for them in their discourses. In the Bears Ears controversy, the value of the land ranged from its role in the protection and respect of indigenous identities, to its utility for recreational enjoyment, to its research opportunities and educational benefit, and to its potential for natural resource extraction. The latter valuation, of course, considered Bears

---

[3] Orrin Hatch, qtd. by Robinson Meyer, "Obama Conserved 1.3 Million Acres in Utah - Can Trump Undo That?," *The Atlantic*, June 14, 2017, https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2017/06/obama-conserved-13-million-acres-in-utahcan-trump-un-conserve-them/530265/.

[4] Eleanor Cummins, "Trump's Cuts to National Monuments Hurt Native Americans Most," *Slate*, 2017, http://www.slate.com/articles/health_and_science/science/2017/12/trump_s_attack_on_national_monuments_is_also_an_attack_on_minorities.html.

Ears less as heritage and more as an economic prospect. That, too, bore on the identities and ethics of the players involved.

The example of Bears Ears is of interest because it has to do with the ancient indigenous places present on the landscape, and the diverse publics who came together to advocate on behalf of the antiquities there. As a former archaeologist, a Westerner, and a historic preservation advocate, I was troubled by the reduction of Bears Ears' boundaries. Yet, the discourse pertaining to the Bears Ears controversy demonstrated the stakes, constituencies, and worldviews that are made manifest in deliberations over the federal protection of ancient indigenous places. Historically, conservative stakeholders, industry, and states' rights advocates have opposed large-scale federal interventions in land use. In the American Southwest, these conflicts have been particularly pronounced, due to the fact that so many of the states once were federal territories, and hence, much of their land remains under federal control. The fact that the heritage places situated on those lands have belonged primarily to American Indian history rather than Anglo-American history serves to intensify the conflicts pertaining to their status.[5] The fact that these heritage places reflect Pre-Columbian history, or rather, deep history, also contributes to their malleable roles in contemporary public life. Many contemporary Anglo-American social actors do not understand them, nor do they feel a personal connection to them. So, what use are they?

Divergent valuations of places like Bears Ears can make their ongoing ethical care difficult, even when several parties who are in favor of their preservation unite to dedicate time, money, and other resources to that cause. This is not a recent phenomenon, but has

[5] Throughout the dissertation, I use the term Anglo-American to refer to English-speaking Americans, rather than to refer exclusively to Americans of English descent. In the Southwest, the term "Anglo" is shorthand for a non-American Indian person.

been a persistent feature of Anglo-American engagement with indigenous heritage for as long as preservation has been a cultural concern in the United States. Non-American Indian tourists, scientists, and politicians historically have attributed a wide range of values to American antiquities, many of which have undermined the values attributed to ancient places by American Indian constituencies. Power dynamics established in the nineteenth century, favoring white researchers as the authorities on indigenous heritage, and utilitarian valuations of ancient places over cultural and religious ones, have endured into the present. These hierarchies continue to inform preservation advocacy on behalf of ancient indigenous places, today. The prominent role of archaeologists and outdoor enthusiasts in the advocacy on behalf of Bears Ears, as well as within the rationale of Obama's proclamation designating Bears Ears a national monument, illustrates the status quo.

While the *use* of ancient indigenous heritage places for research and recreation may not be as damaging as the uranium mining and hydraulic fracturing that threaten heritage places most imminently today, it can be detrimental to the ongoing ethical care of ancient indigenous places. It also undermines the cohesion and integrity of the coalitions who might join together to counter such political moves as the Trump administration's reduction of Bears Ears National Monument, and creates a hierarchy within preservation advocacy that diminishes the importance of indigenous worldviews. Anglo-American archaeologists often have advocated on behalf of places like Bears Ears because of the purported mysteries for science that these places possess, in addition to or instead of privileging their cultural importance for descendant populations. When non-indigenous archaeologists join American Indian social actors in coalitions on behalf of preservation, the archaeologists have a history of assuming leadership positions and dominating the discourses of the social movement.

Troublingly, the utilitarian valuations of indigenous heritage sites expressed by some archaeologists and archaeology "buffs" have much in common, rhetorically, with the very industrial and economic initiatives that allow for their destruction. All of these participate in a technological rationality. Whether extracting data or extracting oil, both mainstream comportments towards ancient indigenous places serve to subvert them as memory places. Both, therefore, play a part in colonizing them.

This dissertation poses the question of how rhetoric has participated in the creation of the elliptical power dynamics that define preservation advocacy and the federal management of ancient indigenous heritage, and how rhetoric might contribute to a more equitable practice of preservation advocacy now and in the future. This project addresses the political lives of ancient indigenous places, so-called antiquities, because it is primarily the ancient places that have garnered Anglo-American affection over time. People with no hereditary link to ancient structures *can* feel compelled by them, and can become passionate advocates on their behalf. At times, these advocates also take part in their interpretations of indigenous rights movements, sometimes problematically, and sometimes with sensitivity. Certainly, the federal treatment of indigenous heritage places, no matter their age, demonstrates aspects of Anglo-American comportment towards contemporary American Indian peoples. When decisions about indigenous heritage places are made without the consent of descendant peoples, or when these places are not shielded from industry, or when they are identified primarily as scientific or recreational prospects, it is clear that Anglo-American interests have gained an upper hand.

Given that challenges to indigenous heritage, sovereignty, and wellbeing remain conspicuous, it is appropriate to call for a change—particularly among those who would call

themselves allies. Typically, these allies are those like the researchers, recreationists, and environmental conservationists evident in the Bears Ears controversy. As my dissertation will illustrate, similar allies have intervened in the treatment of indigenous heritage places in the United States since the end of the nineteenth century, and have set precedents for preservation advocacy among Anglo-American publics. However, problematic features of early Anglo-American engagement with ancient indigenous places have persisted alongside the structures that these social actors sought to preserve. I focus in this dissertation on the establishing rhetorics of Anglo-American preservation advocacy on behalf of ancient indigenous places in the American Southwest, attending in particular to discourses from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In addition to its unique deep history, its more recent history shows that the American Southwest was one of the first places in the United States about which deliberations concerning the federal preservation of ancient indigenous places occurred, and these conversations are far from over.

This project is about the history of Anglo-American preservation advocacy on behalf of ancient indigenous places in the American Southwest. I selected the Southwest for study because one of the most significant Pre-Columbian polities, the Ancestral Puebloans, built a thriving culture in that region of the country, most notable from roughly 800 CE to 1250 CE. Many of the buildings they created still stand today, and have been central to preservationist discourse since the mid-nineteenth century. Some of these Ancestral Puebloan places continue to play central roles in contemporary political conversations about indigenous rights, environmental conservation, states' rights, and the status of science. The origins of these most recent controversies date back to the historical period I assess in this dissertation.

More specifically, this project interrogates two sets of historical texts, and examines the oeuvre of federal preservation policies affecting Southwestern antiquities. In looking at these three collections of texts, I chart the development and sedimentation of Anglo-American preservationist attitudes. The first collection of texts is a set of documents written by white adventurers and researchers who encountered Mesa Verde, an exemplary Southwestern antiquity, and introduced it to the rest of the English-speaking world. The second collection of texts is comprised of the works of three influential preservation advocates, who began their work on behalf of Southwestern antiquities at the turn of the twentieth century. Some of these rhetors' valuations of the past filtered into the first set of preservation policies passed by Congress, and helped form the precedent for contemporary preservation practices. Several of the federal preservation policies that I assess stemmed from concern over the Southwest, in particular, but affect the country at large. I examine policies from roughly a century of federal intervention on behalf of Southwestern antiquities, beginning with the institution of Casa Grande Ruins National Monument in 1892, and ending with Obama's designation of Bears Ears National Monument. I also assess general policies such as the Antiquities Act of 1906 and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979. These texts reflect the people and policies that have urged the rest of the Anglo-American public that it is in their interest to *save* ancient indigenous places.

While it seems hyperbolic to suggest that people can *save* the past, preservation campaigns regularly described and describe the need to *save* objects or historic sites, and publics have rallied routinely to support these causes. Salvific descriptions of preservation work invite serious questions, however. Namely, from what, for what, and for whom should heritage places be saved? What about the past is worthy of saving, and to what ends? How

can the past ever really be saved? Furthermore, how is it that preservation advocates position themselves as protectors of the past, and what do they work to preserve, precisely, when they protect ancient places? In the specific context of Southwestern antiquities, what does it mean for white researchers and politicians to attempt to save the indigenous past? Can the past really belong to everyone?

The manuscript that follows is an attempt to address these questions. As my analysis of early explorations, advocacy campaigns, and preservation policies will demonstrate, efforts to protect the past are linked invariably to the values and prerogatives of those who engage in research and preservation. While preservation advocacy, to date, has been effective at safeguarding the materials composing ancient indigenous heritage places, it also has perpetuated a number of Anglo-American cultural myths that have disadvantaged the people to whom these places most rightly belong. This, too, is a problem in preservation advocacy, to be raised throughout this dissertation.

Significance

In addition to analyzing the origins of Anglo-American preservation advocacy on behalf of ancient indigenous places in the American Southwest, this project identifies parallels among the federal treatment of these public memory places, and broader attitudes towards indigeneity, environmental conservation, uses of public lands, the status of science, states' rights, and national identity. Although it focuses on the American Southwest, it has a bearing on social issues writ large, on the nature of social movements involving both indigenous and non-indigenous social actors, and on the dynamics among rhetoric, enchantment, and myth.

Furthermore, this project will demonstrate how preservation efforts, in general, become politicized, how they influence and are influenced by memory institutions, and how they reveal the attachments of the people who work to safeguard parts of the past, while protecting their contemporary values and the visions of the future that they hold dear. In understanding better the investments that people can make in the *materials* of the past, we can begin to understand these rhetors' often tacit attachments to ideal presents and futures, and to various forms of social engagement. In this way, perhaps we can understand better how to translate investments in things and fantasies into improved relationships amongst communities in the present. We also can examine the possibilities and limitations of invoking heritage places as a means of fostering coalitional politics, inspiring progressive change, and supporting improved material conditions for people living today.

In terms of considering the significance of this project, this study will be of interest to those concerned with the interplay between reason and enchantment; modernity and myth; advocacy and self-advantage; poetics and politics; institutions and publics; and history and identity politics. This study contributes to the field of rhetoric by exploring the rhetorical potency of places of memory, which have experienced centuries of discursive uptake, helping to constitute a variety of publics. It also contributes to rhetoric by examining a particular form of social movement through advocacy campaigns and allyship. Conceptually, it contributes to the field by extending ongoing conversations about Kenneth Burke's theory of dramatism, and by the development of the theme of rhetorical enchantment. Finally, this study hopes to offer the opportunity for reflexivity to all of the people who have ever found themselves enchanted by the past, without quite knowing why, nor how to verbalize that feeling appropriately. Heritage places signify many things to many people. It is necessary to

look through both their wonder and their intellectual worth, to see the political and ethical processes also at work.

Prior to engaging in the rhetorical analysis of the adventurers, advocates, and policymakers who shaped the history and practice of preservation advocacy on behalf of ancient indigenous places in the American Southwest, more orientation is required. In the rest of this introductory chapter, then, I shall describe further the rationale for discussing Anglo-American preservation initiatives in the American Southwest, and I shall provide an overview of the federal government's role in stewarding ancient indigenous places in the United States. I will comment more extensively on the general research design, and I will describe the theoretical emphasis and contribution of this work. Finally, I will outline the manuscript's chapters, before reprising the project's main themes and contributions.

Ancient Indigenous Heritage and the American Southwest

This project's focus on the American Southwest has everything to do with the deep human history of the region. The Southwest, defined here as the area encompassing Arizona, New Mexico, southern Colorado, and southern Utah, has hosted human cultures for thousands of years.[6] Between 800 CE and 1250 CE, there was a marked period of prosperity and growth in the area, signaled by the construction of large sandstone homes and public structures, as well as the emergence or transformation of several ceramic traditions and food ways. Today, we call the people who built these Great Houses of the Southwest the Ancestral Puebloan people, though this term elides the significant diversity of cultural practices evident

[6] Boundaries of the Southwest suggested by David J. Weber and William DeBuys, *First Impressions: A Reader's Journey to Iconic Places of the American Southwest* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017), 3.

throughout the region during this epoch. The contemporary Pueblo people share this diversity of identity with their ancestors, and they likely share some of their ancestors with a number of other affiliated Native nations still living in the Southwest, such as the Navajo nation.[7]

Though the arid desert landscape of the Southwest strikes contemporary visitors as inhospitable, the Ancestral Puebloan people understood it and how to negotiate a livelihood in it, relying on rainy seasons, trade, and agriculture to build their communities. Researchers today tend to conclude that the overexploitation of the land over centuries may have rendered the northern territory less desirable over time, contributing, along with other factors, to the ultimate southerly migration of most of the population by the year 1300 CE.[8] Some of those who moved south helped to found the Pueblos of Arizona and New Mexico, which remain vibrant communities today, though much changed from their original establishment.

Ancestral Puebloan architects were skillful, and deserts are among the best climates for the preservation of material remains, including the mortar holding the sandstone structures of the Southwest together. For that reason, the Four Corners region of the United States still hosts many "iconic and conspicuous places," set against the dramatic backdrops of mountains and plains.[9] The current names of these places tend to exhibit the mélange of cultures who have interacted with them over the years, reflecting a mix of indigenous, Spanish, French, and English words, erroneous theories as to the origins of the places, as well as the surnames of predominantly white researchers and explorers who brought fame to the

---

[7] Gregson Schachner, "Ancestral Pueblo Archaeology: The Value of Synthesis," *Journal of Archaeological Research* 23, no. 1 (2015): 49–113, doi:10.1007/s10814-014-9078-4.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Weber and DeBuys, *First Impressions: A Reader's Journey to Iconic Places of the American Southwest*, 3.

Southwest. Two ancient places in the Southwest have been particularly focal to this study: Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon, which I shall describe in further detail. These are joined by other places key to the story of preservation advocacy in the Southwest, such as the Pecos Pueblo, Casa Grande, Canyon de Chelly, Montezuma Castle, Gila Cliff Dwellings, and Tonto. All of these sites, and others like them, came within the purview of white adventurers, researchers, advocates, and policymakers beginning in the mid-nineteenth century, and their fates have been tied together by regional socioenvironmental issues, as well as shared federal management practices.

In addition to representing a variety of significant indigenous cultural traditions, the sandstone structures of the American Southwest posed a problem for public memory when they were encountered by Anglo-American parties migrating west in the nineteenth century. As these settlers journeyed inland, they encountered undeniable proof of the deep history of North America. The American Southwest, an unusually picturesque example of this deep history, served as a pronounced source of fascination for settlers. As one journalist wrote, that region of the country possessed "not merely traces but very well preserved ruins of the dwellings of a people who lived so long ago that not history or tradition, or even legend . . . kept even so much as the shadow of their memory. They were and are not, is all we know."[10] Such was the prevailing sentiment among members of the Anglo-American public, who struggled to incorporate this new history into their national identity. It was not, and is not, the sentiment among the descendant peoples—but their stories were eclipsed, for the Anglo-

[10]"The Cave Dwellers on the Cliffs of the Mancos Canon," *Colorado Springs Gazette*, June 23, 1877.

American public, by the astonishment of those who were encountering Southwestern antiquities for the very first time.

The purported mystery shrouding Southwestern antiquities did not remain for long. In response to curiosity about newly-encountered ancient structures, a fleet of ethnologists and archaeologists deployed to seek new knowledge about America's indigenous pasts. Not only did these early researchers bring American antiquities to public attention, but they often used their findings to advance racialized theories about American Indian contemporaries. In doing so, these researchers contributed directly to new national narratives, adapting the history of the land to suit its changing borders, occupants, and political climate, while maintaining their own place of prominence. These early studies of Southwestern antiquities were influential in their day, and have had a lasting impact on research ethics, public policy, and indigenous rights.

As already noted, this project begins its analysis by probing how that early cadre of white explorers conveyed their findings about a place called Mesa Verde to the rest of the Anglo-American public. These social actors failed to become preservation advocates in the sense that we might understand the term today. Even so, they described the value of this ancient place to their readership, while promoting their professional identities and the perceived mystique of the site. I selected historical descriptions of Mesa Verde for the second chapter's analysis because Mesa Verde stands out as an unusually beautiful and well-preserved site. The language used to describe and promote Mesa Verde was so exaggerated that this discourse called out for study, though more modest versions of the same linguistic tendencies reverberated throughout historical writings about Southwestern antiquities.

Mesa Verde is best known for its alcove dwellings, which I interpret as the primary reason for the heightened poetic engagement with the site. The alcove dwellings are extensive sandstone apartment complexes nestled into large, naturally-formed indentations—visually similar to giant caves—along the sides of canyons. The first authors who wrote about these structures dubbed them cliff dwellings, and imagined them as castles, eagles' eyries, and fortresses. These authors captivated the imaginations of other Anglo-Americans by showing pictures and replicas of these sites at events like the Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition of 1876.[11] It was they who shrouded Mesa Verde in mystery, by grafting their preconceptions and wonder onto the site. For all that Mesa Verde is lovely and old, however, it was once home to at least hundreds of people, and quotidian in that respect.

In antiquity, Mesa Verde was located towards the northeastern edge of the broad region occupied by Ancestral Puebloan people, and went through at least two "depopulation" periods, the second ending close to 1300 CE.[12] The architects at Mesa Verde used the same building styles witnessed throughout the area, constructing modest domestic spaces as well as Great Houses of a few stories, with many agglutinated rooms. Among these Great House rooms were subterranean circular spaces that likely served multiple purposes, including hosting religious events, and perhaps serving as a recreational or community space. Interpreters of Mesa Verde typically call these circular rooms by the Hopi word *kiva*, though some eschew the term on the grounds that it is uncertain whether or not the rooms' use by the Ancestral Puebloans was analogous to the current religious use of similar circular structures

---

[11] Don D. Fowler, *A Laboratory for Anthropology* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000), 83.

[12] Schachner, "Ancestral Pueblo Archaeology: The Value of Synthesis," 59.

among the Hopi people today. The term *estufa* sometimes stands in, instead, to indicate a more generic place of assembly, but not necessarily a religious space.[13]

The *estufas* all shared a variety of architectural features, including benches, storage surfaces, and hearths, and often looms were housed within them. Some speculate that foot drums made of stone and leather might have been present in the *estufas* and common courtyard areas. At Mesa Verde and at similar sites, researchers have recovered a wide variety of objects through excavation, including baskets, seashells, turquoise, and cotton. Many of these goods traveled great distances to appear in Mesa Verde, suggesting to archaeologists that they were extremely valuable to their owners.[14] The ceramic decorations throughout the Ancestral Puebloan world included a distinctive black-on-white style, decorated with complex geometrical patterns. Petroglyphs and pictographs decorated many of the walls in and around neighborhoods.

It is likely that, at some point, some commerce or migration occurred between Mesa Verde and another site highlighted here, Chaco Canyon, though the population size of each territory ebbed and flowed elliptically. Today, it is a two and a half hour car ride from Mesa Verde to Chaco Canyon. Many researchers and explorers in the mid- to late-nineteenth century also made the 135-mile trek between these two places, likely traveling along roads that the Chacoans built during their greatest period of cultural influence. Chaco Canyon was significantly more central to Ancestral Puebloan culture than Mesa Verde was, and

---

[13] This information came from interviews with and public presentations made by NPS personnel of long tenure at both Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon. Both terms, *kiva* and *estufa*, appear throughout the literature on Ancestral Puebloan archaeology. I find the rationale behind the use of the term *estufa* compelling, and prefer to use this term when possible.

[14] Schachner, "Ancestral Pueblo Archaeology: The Value of Synthesis."

archaeologists presume that it acted as something like a city hall or place of pilgrimage for those living throughout the region during the height of the Chaco phenomenon. Like Mesa Verde, Chaco Canyon continues to host remarkable structures. Chacoans built higher and broader than Mesa Verdeans, and there are few alcove dwellings in the Chaco area. Rather, the most famous sites at Chaco Canyon would have been visible for miles, coated in light-colored plaster, imposing and bright on the desert landscape. In a testament to their good taste, the Chacoans imported chocolate (cacao, technically) from Mesoamerica.[15]

One of the most influential preservation advocates of the twentieth century, Edgar Lee Hewett, dedicated the majority of his career in archaeology to understanding Chaco Canyon. Hewett pursued this research after conducting surveys of Mesa Verde, recording the vandalism committed on that site and others, completing a doctoral thesis in Geneva, and joining the antiquities bill alliance in Washington, DC, which led to the passage of the Antiquities Act of 1906. Like Mesa Verde, Chaco Canyon has been involved in conversations about vandalism, preservation, and research for well over a century. Both of these sites are representative of the preservation history and challenges characteristic of the American Southwest, and hold a special place within the realm of archaeological research. Both are managed by the National Park Service, and also reflect the federal management of indigenous heritage places in the United States more generally. In fact, they represent the *best* of federal management of indigenous heritage places in the United States, and they are also a part of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization's World Heritage List.

[15] Ibid.

In spite of the high degree of protection offered to Mesa Verde, Chaco Canyon, and other ancient places maintained on federal land, there remain problems in tending well to these sites. Mesa Verde routinely experiences wildfires, which are likely to intensify with ongoing climate change. One of the most photographed structures at Mesa Verde, Spruce Tree House, has been closed to tourists since 2015 due to the threat of rock fall—exacerbated by the traffic that tourism brought with it. A large portion of Chaco Canyon's most famous structure, Pueblo Bonito, itself was crushed by a rock fall in 1941.[16] Today, Chaco Canyon's boundaries are adjacent to hydraulic fracturing, and advocates fear the contamination of the land, as well as quakes that might disturb the ancient structures. Graffiti and the theft of artifacts always have concerned those who care for Southwestern antiquities, and emerge routinely as further problems to the preservation of these sites.

In addition to these physical impediments to the ongoing preservation of ancient indigenous places in the American Southwest, there are ideological challenges. Historically, entrepreneurs, land developers, and industry have opposed expansive preservation initiatives because of the loss of economic opportunity. Before the Antiquities Act of 1906, many individuals profited from pot-hunting and the sale of artifacts, activities that quickly became taboo. More recently, the protection of Bears Ears and Chaco Canyon has impeded uranium mining and hydraulic fracturing, respectively. Whereas pot-hunting has been criminalized, uranium mining has not, hinting at the malleable and classed values of antiquities when they appear to interfere with the livelihoods of those living in the present. Evidently, according to

[16] Robert H. Lister and Florence C. Lister, *Those Who Came Before*, 2nd ed. (Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press, 1994), 128. The rock was called Threatening Rock for decades, and it lived up to its name.

current norms, one cannot profit *from* an antiquity, but one's company can profit *in spite of damage to it*.

Because ancient indigenous places so often lie in the path of environmentally-harmful business practices, they have fit fairly neatly into the rhetoric of environmental conservation, even becoming symbols of environmentalist movements, such as the ongoing anti-fracking campaigns near Chaco Canyon in New Mexico. Beginning in the 1970s, indigenous heritage places started to be taken as emblematic of the status of American Indian peoples, as well, thanks to the American Indian Movement and allied social movements. In the case of recent anti-fracking movements near Chaco Canyon, environmental justice and indigenous rights merged for the Navajo members of that coalition, who campaigned against the contamination of both indigenous heritage and indigenous bodies by the forces of industry.

Whereas the federal government once regarded ancient indigenous places primarily for their aesthetic and scientific attributes, the government and the Anglo-American public increasingly recognize their status as identity markers, historic sites, and fora for cultural education among indigenous constituencies. Archaeologists retain positions of expertise in many decisions regarding the preservation and care of ancient indigenous places, but discourses pertaining to indigenous rights and the treatment of ancient indigenous places are showing a shift in attitudes among at least some of those who advocate on behalf of places like Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon.

It is at once strange and predictable that white social actors would have dominated the preservation and management of indigenous heritage places for so long, and that in many cases, they continue to do so. It is strange because heritage places bear most directly on the identities of the people whose narratives are represented by them. In the cases of Mesa Verde

and Chaco Canyon, the story told by the stones is that of the Ancestral Puebloans, whose descendants continue to relate to such places as a way of educating themselves and outsiders about their histories, and as a way of reaffirming their identities. Many social actors have a personal connection to Southwestern antiquities, but only among the affiliated Tribes and Pueblos is that connection also a matter of history, culture, and descent.

Other stories are told at and about Mesa Verde, Chaco Canyon, and other ancient indigenous places across the Southwestern landscape. These are the stories of Spanish monks and conquistadores who wondered at the strange buildings in the desert, and named them after places out of legend. These are the stories of ranchers losing cattle in a canyon, and stumbling upon ancient "palaces." These are the stories of intrepid archaeologists, battling disbelief and the elements in order to contribute to knowledge. These are even the stories of the National Park Rangers who continue to live rough in order to conserve the nation's patrimony. These stories, of the predominantly white social actors who have engaged with Ancestral Puebloan places over the centuries, have been shared more loudly and with more recognized authority than the ones that express being, identity, and deep history. These newer myths about Southwestern antiquities also have played a part in colonizing indigenous histories, and remain an insidious reminder of the normalization of colonization in this settler society. Indeed, some of these myths have incorporated ancient indigenous heritage within Anglo-American narratives of success, progress, or enlightenment—not as heritage, but as science.

Settler societies, such as the Americas, South Africa, New Zealand, and Australia, have complex heritage environments because of the history of colonialism each nation may be prompted to address within its representations of national identity. At contemporary

indigenous heritage places managed by federal governments, representations of indigeneity often place settler culture in relation to indigenous culture(s). For instance, New Zealand's government established a new national museum to try to bring together Maori and Pakeha (non-Maori) perspectives, highlighting a number of historical tensions between Maori populations and the "largely white New Zealanders, the majority of whom [were] descendants of English, Welsh, Scots, and Irish settlers."[17] However, this well-intentioned effort to pay respect to multiple cultures and to address a history of systemic racism managed to decontextualize its representations of Maori history in such a way as to make the group seem timeless, and consequently, primitive. In place of problematic attempts to represent histories of colonialism, also it has been common for public representations of national identity in settler societies simply to gloss over the mistreatment of indigenous peoples as perpetrated by the settler communities who later occupied the land.[18] Cultural appropriation of indigenous heritage *as* settler heritage also has been identified, for instance through remarks about the universal ownership of indigenous heritage places—that they "belong to everyone."[19]

---

[17] Charlotte J. Macdonald, "Two Peoples, One Museum," in *Contested Histories in Public Space: Memory, Race, and Nation*, ed. Daniel J. Walkowitz and Lisa Maya Knauer (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009), 32.

[18] Miranda J. Brady, "Governmentality and the National Museum of the American Indian: Understanding the Indigenous Museum in a Settler Society," *Social Identities* 14, no. 6 (November 2008): 763–73, doi:10.1080/13504630802462885; James Clifford, "Four Northwest Coast Museums: Travel Reflections," in *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century* (London: Harvard University Press, 1997), 138-39; Amy Lonetree, *Decolonizing Museums: Representing Native America in National and Tribal Museums* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2012).

[19] Julie Marcus, "The Journey Out to the Centre: The Cultural Appropriation of Ayers Rock," in *Race Matters: Indigenous Australians and "Our" Society*, ed. Gillian Cowlishaw and Barry Morris (Canberra, ACT: Aboriginal Studies Press, 1997), 33.

In the United States, ancient indigenous places invite reflection upon the fact that "we" white Anglo-Americans are new to this country. They should remind us of the history of colonization in this country, even if, due to their age, their inhabitants were spared from it. Ancient indigenous places should cause us to interrogate our own presence on the land, and our relationship to its first nations. Instead, it is often the case that archaeologists, advocates, and policymakers frame places like Mesa Verde or Chaco Canyon within appropriative discourses. These places are the "nation's" history, and the "nation's" heritage. We can learn so much about "all" of humanity by examining them. These are "our" sites. There is much to be lost, and much to be gained, by narratives like these, especially when so many preservation advocates were and are a part of the white majority. Temporal distance between the original construction of Southwestern antiquities, and their later incorporation into settler narratives about national patrimony, seems to make the universalizing interpretation of such places all the easier. Yet, it does not change the fact that such places remain indigenous history, and indigenous heritage, and that the settler government often controls these structures and manages them in ways that oppose the wishes of affiliated Tribes and Pueblos. Indeed, Anglo-American preservation advocates historically have fought for the federal government's right to manage indigenous heritage.

My analysis focuses on the white preservation advocates, adventurers, archaeologists, and policymakers who turned indigenous heritage places in the American Southwest into scientific artifacts and national patrimony. Note, however, that this is far from hagiography. It is time for these historical figures to be rendered strange, since so much of what they did in their lives was to render others Other. These social actors helped to colonize indigenous heritage through their actions and their rhetoric, while exerting a substantial influence on

public attitudes. At the same time, they largely secured the ongoing care of ancient indigenous places—to the extent that they understood what that care entailed. These figures did harm and good, and we are left with their legacy regardless of our opinion of them.

Before scrutinizing the preservation advocacy of the adventurers, archaeologists, and policymakers whose works have left a lasting impression on the ancient indigenous places of the American Southwest, I offer an overview of some of their most significant actions, and their bearing on the institutional structure of federal heritage management in the United States, today.

The Federal Management of Indigenous Heritage in the United States

As the third and fourth chapters of this dissertation will discuss, one of the most significant outcomes of preservation advocacy at the turn of the twentieth century was the passage of the Antiquities Act of 1906. That bill enabled the president of the United States to establish new national monuments of the "smallest area compatible" with the proper care and management of objects of scientific interest.[20] Southwestern antiquities fell into this category at the time, as they were the domain in which archaeologists studied humanity, civilization, and the deep past of the New World. The Antiquities Act also established as a crime the vandalism or unpermitted excavation of American antiquities, with fines or imprisonment listed as possible punishments for those who might diminish the value of any ancient or historic site housed on federal land. While the punitive aspect of the Antiquities Act has been replaced by the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) of 1979, the president's

[20] The Antiquities Act of 1906 (Pub.L. 59–209, 34 Stat. 225, 54 U.S.C. §§ 320301–320303).

right to declare new national monuments under the auspices of the Antiquities Act persists to this day.

Ten years after the passage of the Antiquities Act, Congress passed the Organic Act. The Organic Act established the National Park Service (NPS) in 1916, and helped streamline the method by which the federal government managed new national parks and monuments. Other preservation policies followed the Organic Act, resulting in things like the National Register of Historic Places, and more stringent protections for a wide variety of heritage places in the United States. The Archaeological Resources Protection Act (1979), the Native American Religious Freedom Act (1978) and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (1990), increasingly embedded in the law the obligation for researchers, the NPS, and other federal agencies to consult with American Indian constituencies in management decisions at indigenous heritage places.[21]

Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon are the two Southwestern antiquities that have garnered the most significant degree of federal protection, and their histories chart the development of federal heritage institutions at almost every key moment. Government expeditions identified both Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon during the mid- to late-nineteenth century, and members of those expeditions recognized both sites as unique immediately. Mesa Verde became a national park in 1906, according to a standalone park bill put forth for its protection and passed by Congress. Mesa Verde's park designation followed years of deliberation over whether it would fall under state or federal control, foreshadowing many other debates that would take place in the context of Southwestern antiquities. A year later, in 1907, Theodore Roosevelt established Chaco Canyon as a national monument through the

[21] Laurajane Smith, *Uses of Heritage* (London: Routledge, 2006).

authority of the Antiquities Act, joining several other Southwestern heritage places that he set aside during his presidency. These park and monument designations recognized Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon as representative sites of the ancient American world, which held special interest for American archaeologists who were attempting to professionalize their field. Both sites had experienced graffiti and vandalism during the late nineteenth century, as tourism in the Southwest increased, and both earned government protection.

Archaeological inquiry continued at Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon throughout the early twentieth century. During the Great Depression, both were work sites for the Civilian Conservation Corps. Excavations of the central structures in both districts tapered off by the mid-twentieth century. In 1966, both joined the National Register of Historic Places. In 1978, Mesa Verde joined UNESCO's World Heritage List, as the first cultural heritage site in the United States to receive that designation. Two years later, Chaco Canyon was relisted as a national historical park, rather than a national monument. In 1987, it joined Mesa Verde on the World Heritage List, and its boundaries later expanded to include other ancient structures in the surrounding region. Both Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon are managed by the National Park Service (NPS), and have been managed by the NPS since its establishment in 1916.

The NPS manages the 417 parks and monuments within the National Park System—including Mesa Verde National Park and Chaco Culture National Historical Park.[22] The NPS is a part of the United States Department of the Interior, and in addition to managing national parks and national monuments, it tends to a variety of other properties, as well as managing

[22] National Park Service, "Frequently Asked Questions," n.p., accessed February 22, 2018, https://www.nps.gov/aboutus/faqs.htm. The National Park Service oversees the management of many types of sites within the United States, including its parks, monuments, historic sites, scenic byways, and other natural environments. The NPS does *not* manage National Forests; that is the domain of the National Forest Service.

the National Register of Historic Places. The NPS also is responsible for administering United States nominations to UNESCO's World Heritage List. The World Heritage List is a register of significant natural and cultural sites across the globe that have been judged by a World Heritage Committee to possess "Outstanding Universal Value."[23] Nomination to the list requires a lengthy dossier defending the importance of each entry, and maintenance of World Heritage Status requires host countries to demonstrate a high level of care for each place listed.[24]

Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon have experienced the highest degree of protection possible for cultural heritage places in the United States and have earned nearly every prestigious designation it is possible for a heritage site to have. Often, these new accolades have come at the behest of a new generation of preservation advocates, left dissatisfied by their predecessors' work. Preservation seems like a perennial battle, in spite of the legislative assurances that Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon are safe already. These places are not wholly protected from the elements, or tourists, or inquiry. Nor are they free from enchantment.

In the next section, I will define the enchantments that affect Southwestern antiquities and their ongoing, ethical care, as I understand them by way of dramatism. Following that, I will review the literature in rhetorical studies that influenced this study, as well as the manner by which other rhetorical scholars have attempted to understand the political lives of ancient

---

[23] UNESCO, *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*, (Paris: World Heritage Centre, 2017), https://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines/, accessed May 17, 2018, phrase appears repeatedly throughout document.

[24] Marc Askew, "The Magic List of Global Status: UNESCO, World Heritage and the Agendas of States," in *Heritage and Globalisation*, ed. Sophia Labadi and Colin Long (New York: Routledge, 2010), 19–44.

places, before clarifying a number of terminological ambiguities that will appear in the upcoming chapters.

Critical Concepts

I rely on the theories of dramatism, developed by American literary critic and social theorist Kenneth Burke, in my analyses of the adventurers and archaeologists who introduced Mesa Verde to the English-speaking public, the Anglo-American preservation advocates who first attempted to safeguard Southwestern antiquities, and the legislation that resulted from that preservation advocacy. Specifically, dramatism informs my analysis by way of key concepts, including the technological psychosis, frames of rejection and acceptance and their accompanying poetic categories, and god terms. All of these concepts contribute to the notion of rhetorical enchantment, which I develop over the course of this dissertation. I identify rhetorical enchantment in the myths of preservation advocacy, and I clarify this concept further on in this chapter.

In the second chapter, I claim that the technological psychosis coincided with a poetic psychosis when white adventurers and archaeologists in the nineteenth century described Mesa Verde to their readership. According to Burke, the technological psychosis is a mentality that is most visible in the language of scientific rationality, and which encourages the transposition of scientific valuations into interpretations of other social conditions.[25] The poetic psychosis, a term that I develop, is a counterpart to the technological psychosis. Even

[25] Kenneth Burke, *Permanence and Change: An Anatomy of Purpose*, 3rd ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 212; Kenneth Burke, *The Philosophy of Literary Form*, 61, 304.

as the researchers who first published about Mesa Verde classified and regimented that ancient indigenous site, they expressed a fixation with the site through poetic language.

In the third chapter, I discuss dramatistic frames of acceptance and rejection, and the poetic categories that accompany both. Burke proposed that social actors adopt narrative styles particular to their historical situations, and that such poetic categories serve as equipment that helps people make sense of the world, and their role within it. Burke claimed that the epic, the tragedy, and the comedy are frames of acceptance that prepare people rhetorically for conflict, resignation, and reflexivity, respectively.[26] In each case, these poetic categories encourage people to accept predominant features of their historical situation. Frames of rejection, such as the plaint, point out deficiencies in the historical situation, while naturalizing aspects of the situation nonetheless.

All of the preservation advocates whose works I analyze in chapter three rejected vandalism and the mistreatment of American Indian peoples in the Southwestern United States using the poetic category of the plaint. At the same time, through the poetic categories of the epic, the tragedy, and the comedy, preservation advocates at the beginning of the twentieth century rhetorically accepted the intercultural conflicts that accompanied settler colonialism during that era, the subjugation of American Indian peoples to white Americans, and radical difference between white Americans and American Indian peoples.

In the fourth chapter of the dissertation, I rely on the theory of the god term in order to understand the main rationalizations present in federal preservation policy affecting Southwestern antiquities in the United States. I conclude that Science is the god term of

---

[26] Kenneth Burke, *Attitudes toward History* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1961); Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives* (New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1955).

preservation policy, presenting a valuation of Southwestern antiquities that is consistent with the modern roots of Southwestern archaeology and Anglo-American preservation advocacy on behalf of Southwestern antiquities. Although Science has been the term-of-terms of federal preservation policy for over a century, the myths that appear in preservation policy have changed over time. Scientific rationality, cultural evolutionary theory, and primitivism were early myths in preservation policy. In recent years, these have been replaced by veneration for the landscape, universal humanism, and the wonder of scientific discovery.

The concepts of the technological psychosis, poetic categories as frames of acceptance or rejection, and god terms, differ from one another significantly. I understand them as a cohesive collection of analytical concepts because of their shared basis in dramatism, and because each has to do with the ways in which the rhetors whom I study in this dissertation expressed myths. Indeed, I understand myths as rhetorical enchantments that characterize Anglo-American engagement with ancient indigenous places.

Rhetorical Enchantments

Dramatism informs my rhetorical analysis of the early archaeology, first advocacy, and enduring legislation affecting Southwestern antiquities. It also forms the basis of a critical concept that I develop over the course of this dissertation, which is rhetorical enchantment.

When one thinks of enchantment colloquially, thoughts of magic or spells come to mind. To be enchanted is to be fascinated, struck, or seduced. To think of rhetoric as an enchantment is to emphasize the incantatory aspect of enchantment, or to consider rhetoric as an invocation, prayer, charm, or spell. Obviously, one cannot use rhetoric to change lead into

gold. Yet, rhetoric can and does change our perception of the world around us. Rhetoric enchants by changing attitudes, moods, and plans.

The rhetors whose works I study in this dissertation demonstrated that they had an enchanted view of the world, and also enchanted their audiences with their words. Their use of rhetoric turned old walls into romantic ruins, convinced politicians that knowledge of the past was a treasure, and transformed landscapes into monuments. The rhetors whose works I study also exhibited their own infatuation with the places and people of the American Southwest, often with reference to prominent cultural myths, and often by way of poetic language. This concept helps us to understand the charged language and cultural narratives that archaeologists, advocates, and policymakers used when discussing—and sometimes deriding—the places and people of the American Southwest.

I define rhetorical enchantment as the communication of myth, primarily through poetic language. Together, myths and poetics constitute the primary signs of rhetorical enchantment. Note, however, that myths and poetics did not always appear simultaneously in the texts that I assessed. The rhetors in my study appealed to a number of cultural myths without calling upon powerful imagery, for the myths themselves predicated the illusion of detachment. For instance, the myth of scientific rationality was prominent throughout the texts I analyze in this dissertation, but seldom did researchers present their findings poetically, though they often embellished the scene of their field work and their self-portrayals with elaborate imagery. In any case, I view even the most clinical expression of a cultural myth as evidence of a rhetor's enchantment, their expression of a cultural myth also being an expression of conviction in that myth. After all, even so-called clinical language is

connotative. I examine further the relationship between rhetoric and enchantment, prior to expanding upon my understanding of rhetorical enchantment as consistent with dramatism.

Most modern definitions of rhetoric agree on one point: rhetoric is communication that takes place in public, for publics, or with public consequences.[27] This form of publicity assumes a broad audience of potential participants in a political matter, where shared discourse has potential consequences for the livelihood, well-being, or organization of the collective concerned. It is rhetoric's potential to influence publics and worldviews that categorizes it as an enchantment, for it can work a kind of social transformation. It changes minds and defines the world, often in lasting ways.

Rhetoric long has been considered an enchantment. Sophists such as Gorgias regarded it as a powerful lord, akin to medicine or magic in its ability to sway its auditors. Aristotle later categorized this use of rhetoric to sway people in a visceral way as *pathos*, the emotional state called for by the rhetorical act. According to Aristotle, storytelling with detailed, sensory imagery, alongside other modes of appeal, could influence *pathos* and move audiences to agree with a speaker's claims.[28] As this discussion will show, stories told rhetorically—in public, with bias, with consequence—both encourage and illustrate various

---

[27] Carole Blair, Greg Dickinson, and Brian L. Ott, "Introduction: Rhetoric/Memory/Place," in *Places of Public Memory*, ed. Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, and Brian L. Ott (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2010), 1–54; Daniel C. Brouwer and Robert Asen, *Public Modalities*, ed. Daniel C. Brouwer and Robert Asen (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2010).

[28] Aristotle, *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*, ed. and trans. George A. Kennedy (New York: University of Oxford Press, 1991).

modes of enchantment.[29] As I have found, the phenomenon of enchantment is more readily-identified when rhetors use language to craft mythic imagery.

In this dissertation, I view rhetoric as an enchantment in the sense that it can define the world meaningfully while proposing particular social relationships, values, and actions. Specifically, the social actors whose works I analyze here used rhetoric to interpret Southwestern antiquities on behalf of their peers. They decreed that the American Indian people of the past and the present lived a certain way, and were motivated by certain things. They suggested that Southwestern antiquities had value for living people, and they named what those values were. Due to the rhetors' social standing and authority, as well as the densely-connotative language by which they described their understandings of Southwestern antiquities, their definitions had the power to persuade. Given some of the outcomes of Anglo-American preservation advocacy, including the passage of the Antiquities Act of 1906, this rhetoric moved at least some of its audience to adopt a protective demeanor towards Southwestern antiquities.

Kenneth Burke never emphasized enchantment in his development of dramatism, though he theorized rhetoric extensively, alongside its magical, mythical, mysterious, religious, and poetic properties, all of which I understand within the parameters of rhetorical enchantment. For instance, drawing in part from the ancient Greek tradition, Burke suggested that language itself is a kind of magic. Burke posited that the "magical decree is implicit in all language; for the mere act of naming an object or situation decrees that it is to be singled

[29] These attributes of rhetorical discourse stem from the definition of rhetoric outlined by Blair, Dickinson, and Ott, "Introduction."

out as such-and-such rather than as something other."[30] Rhetoric helps to constitute values, relationships, and plans of action, through the act of defining the world and framing it within the symbolic register. Dramatism also depicted rhetoric as a means of producing social hierarchies. Through the "magic" of normalizing class divisions, for example, Burke claimed that rhetoric introduced mystery into social relationships, sometimes even encouraging individuals to act against their own best interests.[31] As Burke interpreted Karl Marx, ideology was enacted in part by the "magic" of language and its divisive qualities.

Rhetoric is an enchantment not just because of the suasory and compelling nature of language, but because it is the public conduit for cultural myths. Burke discussed myth in multiple capacities over the course of his career,[32] and considered myth "a word that ambiguously embraces both 'religion' and 'poetry' (along with certain discarded bits of 'science' now usually called 'magic')."[33] On the whole, Burke considered myths to be broad cultural frames of reference that contextualized, legitimated, and accounted for lived experiences.[34] While he viewed them as related to ideology, he considered myths to represent

---

[30] Kenneth Burke, *The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action*, 3rd ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), 4. While magic and enchantment are not synonyms, using Burke's definition of language-magic in this context is consistent with Burke's overall attitude towards language, enchantment, and mystification.

[31] Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives*, 3rd ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), 174.

[32] Discussed in detail by Laurence Coupe, *Kenneth Burke on Myth* (New York: Routledge, 2005).

[33] Kenneth Burke, *The Rhetoric of Religion: Studies in Logology*, 2nd ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970), 34.

[34] Ibid., 37.

"motivation *beyond* ideas," likely to depend upon powerful imagery in order to hold sway.[35] Myths were evocations of social patterns, which in dramatism always were grounded in symbolic action and organized according to hierarchies, identification, and division.[36] The concept of the myth informs my critical analysis to a great degree.

Dramatism's engagement with mystery and religion also contributes to my understanding of rhetorical enchantment. Burke understood mystery as a consequence of division, which he claimed was a persistent human experience, and illustrated by language—any form of representation being a selection, and partial. Burke viewed social mystery and mystification as products of estrangement, whether from one another, from our natural environment, or from our modes of production.[37] The researchers, advocates, and policymakers whose rhetoric I assess in this dissertation illustrated the social mysteries of their era in several ways. They acknowledged estrangement from American Indian peoples, and even obsessed over how to understand that difference according to their own cultural beliefs. At the same time, they enhanced the mystique of the Other, striving to demystify through the myth of scientific rationality as they re-mystified the Other according to poetic interpretations of indigenous lifeways and Southwestern antiquities. They fixated on their estrangement from the Other, and this demonstrated enchantments that held *them* in sway.

---

[35] Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives*, 200.

[36] Kenneth Burke, *Attitudes toward History* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1961); Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives* (New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1955); Kenneth Burke, *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968); Burke, *Philosophy of Literary Form*; Burke, *Rhetoric of Motives*; Burke, *Rhetoric of Religion*.

[37] Jane Blankenship, "'Magic' and 'Mystery' in the Works of Kenneth Burke," in *The Legacy of Kenneth Burke, ed. Herbert W. Simons and Trevor Melia* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 128–55.

In addition to mystery, religion offered Burke a template for understanding the poetry and magic that he determined were intrinsic to language. Like the authors whose texts I examine in this dissertation, Burke problematically contemplated magical symbolism and religious symbolism as patterns of thought that accompanied pre-industrial social formations, alleging that science with its frequent dearth of poetry had come to supplant both. At the same time, however, Burke considered language both a form of magic and a form of prayer, perhaps two words for similar kinds of symbolic action, and present in every realm of discourse, including scientific language. Similar to the manner in which he considered language both magical and prayerful, Burke merged his discussions of poetry and religion. He viewed them both as "mediating devices" that helped to bridge conflicts "symbolically."[38]

As for poetics, Burke viewed poetic meaning and semantic meaning to be partial representations of one another, but not opposites.[39] To Burke, poetics filled out meanings, whereas semantic descriptions simplified them. Both were on the same semiotic spectrum, distinguished, as I interpret it, by their relative emphases on connotation and denotation. Throughout his works, Burke found that connotative language and tropes performed specialized rhetorical functions. He assigned new semiotic characteristics to metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, and irony, [40] and viewed literature as "equipment for living."[41] A

---

[38] Burke, Attitudes toward History, 28.

[39] Burke, Philosophy of Literary Form, 139.

[40] Kenneth Burke, "Four Master Tropes," *The Kenyon Review* 3, no. 4 (1941): 421–38.

[41] Kenneth Burke, *Attitudes Toward History* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1961), 5, 44, 57, 68, 99; Kenneth Burke, *Counter-Statement* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968), 183, 189; Kenneth Burke, *Permanence and Change: An Anatomy of Purpose*, 3rd ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 212; Kenneth Burke, *The Philosophy of Literary Form*, 61, 304.

dramatistic poetics is one that appreciates the social relationships, incipient actions, and magical perspectives that language evokes. Drawing from such an interpretation of poetics, as well as from Burke's perspectives on cultural myths, I extend my discussion of rhetorical enchantment to address the other key perspectives on myth, modernity, and enchantment that inform my analysis.

Myths, Modernity, and Enchantment

I augment my understanding of myths and the enchantments of language with reference to scholars aside from Burke. For instance, Roland Barthes' thoughts on myth also contribute to this analysis. Barthes stated that "*myth is a type of speech*" that follows a set of particular conditions.[42] Myths are second-order semiotics: symbolic activities that adopt familiar signs and connote ideological positions and cultural values. Myths naturalize new social patterns, even as they mimic existing ones. Barthes viewed myths at work in supporting and producing a variety of cultural norms, ranging from courtship to French imperialism. Barthes proposed that myths hid nothing, but had the capacity to distort what they represented. Furthermore, myths were a form of "interpellant speech," insidious in their reification of cultural norms because of their quick legibility by those who encountered them.[43]

Whereas Barthes viewed advertisements, photographs, words, and any other collection of symbols as possible loci of myth, the myths I identify in this dissertation come primarily through narratives, found in newspaper coverage, professional publications, and

---

[42] Roland Barthes, *Mythologies*, trans. Richard Howard and Annette Lavers (New York: Hill and Wang, 1957), 217.

[43] Ibid., 235.

popular magazines, as well as in federal policies. Each of these tells at least one story that implies values, desired social relationships, and desired futures, while naturalizing its own ethics. In this dissertation, specific iterations of broader cultural myths garner attention. While they are not necessarily proof of the prevalence of cultural attitudes, certainly they are examples of some of the discursive trends often identified as features of modernity. I also consider them evidence of the beliefs of those who expressed them.

Modernity, itself, has come to be understood as a mythic narrative, with numerous other myths, worldviews, and assumptions coming to rest under its mantle. Ironically, the "monumental narrative" of modernity—modernity's most powerful myth—is the "disenchantment of the world: the progressive control of nature through scientific procedures of technology; and the inexorable demystification of enchantments through powerful techniques of reason."[44] Many have been enchanted by the modern myth of disenchantment, which seems natural until it is troubled by detail.[45] The adventurers, archaeologists, and advocates in my analysis all used rhetoric in a way that suggested their own belief in disenchantment, whether viewed positively or negatively.

Likely the most noteworthy articulation of the disenchantment myth came from Max Weber. In view of the increasing industrialization of the Western world that he witnessed in the late nineteenth century, Weber concluded that the modern world was losing its connection to mystery. Weber interpreted increasing reliance on bureaucracies, reason, and

---

[44] Saurabh Dube, "Modernity and Its Enchantments: An Introduction," in *Enchantments of Modernity: Empire, Nation, Globalization*, ed. Saurabh Dube (London: Routledge, 2009), 1.

[45] Jason A. Josephson-Storm, *The Myth of Disenchantment: Magic, Modernity, and the Birth of the Human Sciences* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2017).

ordering structures as inevitable components of modern life, and remarked that such rationalization would result in the "disenchantment of the world," borrowing the phrase from Friedrich Schiller.[46] Weber felt that only so-called traditional societies still were capable of magical thinking, whereas industrialized societies would lose the capacity for such. For industrialized societies, every mystery would become known, and ritual would fade away. As Sara R. Farris and others have noted, "Weber's perspective on religions and politics was closely intertwined with an Orientalist, or Westocentric, *Weltanschauung* [world view]."[47] Weber's narrative has been challenged by many, but the narrative that modernity inspired an increased regimentation of the world remains prevalent, even in theoretical claims that also acknowledge the "enchanting effects of disenchantment itself," on which the myths of modernity rely.[48]

Weber was confident that the rationalization of the industrialized world would proceed unfettered, and that it would result in widespread disenchantment: a demystification of social life. While Weber was ambivalent about the processes of rationalization, Weber's inheritors have turned to the notion of *re*-enchantment to understand how rationalization has been or might be combatted. Such scholars claim that in a world where all things have been categorized, people compensate in various capacities, forming affective attachments to the

---

[46] Max Weber, *From Max Weber*, ed. and trans. H. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976), 155.

[47] Sara R. Farris, *Max Weber's Theory of Personality: Individuation, Politics and Orientalism in the Sociology of Religion* (Boston: Brill, 2013), 210.

[48] Jason A. Josephson-Storm, 154.

materials that remain available to them.[49] Secular rituals spring up to take the place of lost spiritual attachments. At times, critics have found capitalism to profit from this impulse, as individuals pursue enchantment through consumer activities. In such interpretations, individuals displaced by modernity's rationalization choose to consume or possess something that has been marketed as *more*, or magical, or unique.[50]

The re-enchantment literature tacitly accepts that disenchantment happened. It accepts the myth of disenchantment. Among the challenges to the myth of disenchantment, however, are narratives stemming from postcolonial studies, new vitalism, science and technology studies, and religious studies. Representing one viewpoint from postcolonial studies, Saurabh Dube has claimed that the grand narrative of modernity, inclusive of its insistence upon the rationalization of the world, has served to divert attention from the "concatenations of distinct, coeval temporalities and overlapping, heterogeneous histories that variously straddle and scramble the hierarchies and oppositions of modernity."[51] As a monumental narrative—a myth—modernity has prioritized the global north while reifying social hierarchies, naturalizing colonialism, and empowering scientific rationality at the expense of other ways of interpreting the world. This narrative certainly has not eliminated other formulations of the world, however.

---

[49] Joshua Landy and Michael Saler, eds., *The Re-Enchantment of the World: Secular Magic in a Rational Age* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009); Bernard Stiegler, *The Re-Enchantment of the World: The Value of Spirit Against Industrial Populism*, trans. Trevor Arthur (London: Bloomsbury, 2014).

[50] J. N. Erni, "Enchanted: Harry Potter and Magical Capitalism in Urban China," *Chinese Journal of Communication* 1, no. 2 (2008): 140, doi:Doi 10.1080/17544750802287828.

[51] Dube, "Modernity and Its Enchantments," 13.

Modernity comes with its own enchantments, as well. Dube identifies "novel mythologies of nation and empire" among modernity's enchantments, alongside "hierarchical oppositions between myth and history, emotion and reason, ritual and rationality, East and West, and tradition and modernity."[52] Dube refers to these oppositions as the antinomies of modernity, which helped contribute to a prevailing assumption of rupture between past and present, and which worked to support derogatory assumptions about peoples who did not fit well within the Eurocentric model of history. Since the Eurocentric "movement of history . . . was primarily projected as the passage of progress," Others were written into that narrative as though they were misplaced in time, or deviant from the norm and therefore in need of correction.[53]

In the American context, many archaeologists and ethnologists made it their life's work to classify American Indian peoples within an evolutionary framework, inevitably presuming that indigenous people were more primitive than their Anglo-American contemporaries.[54] They based these claims in essentialist interpretations of European cultural development, which constituted a trajectory of "singular progress" from the Stone Age to the Industrial Age. Doreen Massey identified discourses of linear progress as a "characteristic manoeuvre of modernity," in which any social actors who participated in temporal trajectories that contradicted the Western European experience were considered remnants of

---

[52] Ibid., 1.

[53] Ibid., 4. Like Barthes, Dube finds the naturalization of empire to be among the most disturbing attributes of modernity's myths.

[54] Philip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).

another time.[55] This heightened portrayal of cultural and ethnic difference, framed as a failure of progress among indigenous peoples, is part of what enabled the myths of modernity to maintain such a foothold.

Myths like cultural evolution were part of the discursive framework that claimed that modernity represented a rupture with the past. This idea of a rupture with the past and lifeways figuratively placed in the past (i.e., so-called primitive cultures), can be seen in the works of Max Weber and Kenneth Burke, and many other places. Even in theorizing myth, Jean-Luc Nancy supposed that myth was a form of primordial discourse that people in industrialized societies experienced as if interrupted, due to conditions of modernity. Supposedly modern people had lost touch with myth, bereft of something that people in less-industrialized cultures still possessed.[56] I diverge from Nancy's definition of myth, here, in understanding myth as a much more mundane and pervasive sort of discourse. Myths are and always have been as common in industrialized society as they have been in other social formations. Myths are narrative scaffolding, familiar patterns for describing the world around us. Because of their familiarity, they are powerful rhetorical commonplaces. It can be easy to ignore the ramifications of mythic narratives *because* the general storytelling pattern is such a familiar one. As familiar narrative frameworks, myths easily eclipse the specificities of the real situations that they represent.

In specificities, the grand claims of modernity can come undone. Dube observed this in theorizing the enchantments of modernity, and remarking upon how the experiences of

---

[55] Doreen B. Massey, *For Space* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2005), 69.

[56] Jean-Luc Nancy, *The Inoperative Community*, ed. Peter Connor, trans. Peter Connor and Lisa Garbus (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991).

subaltern peoples resisted incorporation into universalizing myths about progress and Empire. Bruno Latour also has rejected the idea of a major rupture with the past, such as that which has taken on mythic proportions in some conceptualizations of modernity. Rather, Latour has urged that there have been only minor differences between collectives, whether judged across time or space. As a corrective to accepting rupture as part of the mythic complex of modernity, Latour suggests that we view problems, change, and social relationality in terms of networks. For example, in challenging drastic narratives about Western technological developments, Latour claims: "When we see them as networks, Western innovations remain recognizable and important, but they no longer suffice as the stuff of saga, a vast saga of radical rupture, fatal destiny, irreversible good or bad fortune."[57] Taking a cue from Dube and Latour, it is my intention in this work to examine myths *through* their texture and specificity. I focus on the locality of the Southwest because of the particular sets of relationships among discourses, peoples, and things/places, and their incremental changes over time. I believe that by showing the myths present in this locality *as myths*, other attributes of these networked relationships will become apparent. The paradoxes within them also will become clear.

Within the texts I analyze in this dissertation, the predominant myths have to do with science, nationalism, and different modes of humanism. Even within the scientific narratives shared by the archaeologists and ethnologists whose rhetoric I study, there are mythic structures that act as "culturetypes." Michael Osborn defines a culturetype as a form of repetitive rhetorical presentation, including common terms or themes that, over time, attract

[57] Bruno Latour, *We Have Never Been Modern*, trans. Catherine Porter (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), Kindle Loc. 1015.

resonant meanings within a cultural context. Osborne offers other names for such culturetypes, including:

> (1) *icons*, a name that suggests the secular sacredness such symbols can acquire, the awe and reverence they can inspire when employed in the communicative commerce of a people; (2) *God-and-devil terms*, which suggests both the sacredness and the sense of dialectical order carried by such symbols; and (3) *ideographs*, which suggests that at least some of these terms express an underlying ideology in which they are grounded and which they constantly express and promote.[58]

Osborne also refers to culturetypes as "icons of culture" that "express complex sets of values . . . sustain us as a group, as a people, and reinforce our sense of community."[59] According to Osborne, stereotypes, metaphors, and familiar cultural figures and forms all may function as culturetypes. Mythic narratives also have that capacity.

Drawing from Osborn, I consider the myths present in the history of Anglo-American preservation advocacy as familiar narrative frameworks, iconic in their legibility. Examples of such resonant and structured narratives varied across the texts that I analyzed in this dissertation. For example, the social actors whom I study sometimes presented themselves as if they were on a quest for knowledge. The hero's journey also appeared in preservation policies, marking the American people as though they were fated for greatness. Progress narratives abounded, particularly in terms of interpreting the Ancestral Puebloan people along the spectrum of cultural evolution, and with claims that the American Indian peoples who lived contemporaneously with the authors whose works I study were, somehow, less

---

[58] Michael Osborn, "Rhetorical Depiction," in *Form, Genre, and the Study of Political Discourse*, ed. Herbert W. Simons and Aram A. Aghazarian, 1986, 79–107. Osborn refers to Richard M. Weaver in his description of God-and-devil terms, and to Michael Calvin McGee in his development of the ideograph.

[59] Michael Osborn, "The Trajectory of My Work with Metaphor," *Southern Communication Journal* 74, no. 1 (2009): 84, doi:10.1080/10417940802559131.

civilized. Clashes of cultures and cultural unity were also among the myths advanced by the rhetors in this study. These are familiar narrative frameworks, filled in with the details of Southwestern antiquities.

The specificities of their context undermined some of the myths these rhetors told. Most strikingly, the astonishment expressed by the rhetors in this dissertation repeatedly challenged the myth of scientific rationality. In this way, the rhetors whose works I analyze are similar to those analyzed by scholar of religious studies, Jason Josephson-Storm, in his own challenge to the disenchantment myth. In examining the works of several Enlightenment thinkers, who were credited with bringing on an age of reason, Josephson-Storm identifies magical thinking coexisting with scientific rationality. Josephson-Storm defines their coexistence as a kind of bimodal thinking, in which, under the guise of rationality, social actors (dis)enchanted the world. They acted under the auspices of reason, but managed to categorize their own enchantment, as well, through practices such as alchemy and by charting the history of magic.[60]

At its outset, societal modernization produced myths that claimed that reason held sway. Yet, cultural modernity found people searching for new experiences, and rejecting the myth of order.[61] In this sense, wonder is a feature of modernity just as much as the assumption of rationality is. Rationalization does not eliminate awe, which is a form of enchantment that has been theorized somewhat apart from myth. For instance, Jane Bennett

---

[60] Josephson-Storm.

[61] Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar, "On Alternative Modernities," in *Alternative Modernities,* ed. Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001). Hailing from rhetorical studies, Gaonkar also has claimed that the notion of the colonial Other was a necessary component in constituting the myths of modernity.

theorizes enchantment as a state of wonder and sensory stimulation, resulting in a transfixed "state of interactive fascination."[62] Bennett associates this phenomenal enchantment with a feeling of being "carried away," outside of a specific time and place following a surprising encounter:

> Contained within this surprise state are (1) a pleasurable feeling of being charmed by the novel and as yet unprocessed encounter and (2) a more *unheimlich* (uncanny) feeling of being disrupted or torn out of one's default sensory-psychic-intellectual disposition. The overall effect of enchantment is a mood of fullness, plenitude, or liveliness, a sense of having had one's nerves or circulation or concentration powers tuned up or recharged—a shot in the arm, a fleeting return to childlike excitement about life.[63]

This wonder-filled enchantment, as Bennett describes it, can come about in many forms, not all of which need to be aesthetically pleasing, and many of which are fairly mundane, secular events. Bennett considers enchantment a prerequisite for ethical comportment towards others and towards alterity. Without feeling, there can be no care.

However, it would be a mistake to think that feeling is equivalent to care, or to ethical comportment. The problem with enchantment, as identified by those who link it to fetishism, is that it can result in desire as well as affection. Objects of desire are always at risk. While Bennett remarks upon the risks of enchantment—namely, the desire to consume or possess the object of fascination—others who use similar reasoning to support humanitarian ethics in heritage contexts fail to comment on the appropriative potential of strong affective response. For example, Alison Landsberg and Jay Winter overstate the emotional impact of heritage sites in their treatments of the Holocaust Memorial Museum and World War I memorials,

---

[62] Jane Bennett, *The Enchantment of Modern Life: Attachments, Crossings, and Ethics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), 5.

[63] Ibid.

respectively, indicating that such memory places produce empathy and heal grief.[64] While memory places may transfix their audiences and give them a sense of ritualistic liminality,[65] such feelings of separation or emotional force may not necessarily bridge difference or console ruptured communities. Yet, according to Bennett, feeling something akin to wonder is a start in moving social narratives in more conscientious directions. At the very least, narratives positing that we live in an enchanted world strike Bennett as more optimistic than the assumption of disenchantment that has held sway.

Contrary to the narrative advanced by Bennett, I do not find any particular relationship between expressions of affective enchantment (wonder) and ethical comportment towards the Other. Bennett self-consciously separates her project from those undertaken by postcolonial scholars. Yet, given the explicit context of settler colonialism in which my project takes place, the two schools of thought need to be blended, here. Poetic language suggests a state of wondrous enchantment. Enchantment with the Other can manifest as fetishism, primitivism, and Orientialism. Enchantment is not a certain path towards ethical comportment.

Furthermore, it would be easy to treat rationalization and wonder as a binary pair, supported by disparate value systems. Yet, it is key to note that rationalization and affective

---

[64] Jay Winter, *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European Cultural History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Alison Landsberg, *Prosthetic Memory: The Transformation of American Remembrance in the Age of Mass Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004).

[65] Della Pollock, *Exceptional Spaces: Essays in Performance and History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998); Kenneth S. Zagacki and Victoria J. Gallagher, "Rhetoric and Materiality in the Museum Park at the North Carolina Museum of Art," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 95, no. 2 (May 2009): 171–91, doi:10.1080/00335630902842087.

enchantment are intertwined. Bennett notes, for example, a number of scientific and secular sites in which a state of wonder can emerge. Phenomena such as the digital sublime, or the rush of scientific discovery, contradict any assumption that industrialized societies are devoid of enchanting potential, even in highly technical arenas. In light of this, I suggest that rationalization may be its own form of enchantment. One way of trying to tame the mysterious, or know the unknowable, is to study it and fit it within a paradigm that one *does* understand—within the paradigm of museum displays or tourism, for example, or within familiar cultural myths. When early archaeologists began digging through and cataloging the ancient places of the world, it was a way of being even more intimately entwined with the materials that spurred feelings of wonder in them. At times, these cataloging activities and others, such as tourism, have played out as a form of cultural consumption. As Bennett notes, this consumptive impulse is one of the primary risks of the mood of wonder.[66] The feeling of enchantment that ancient places inspire can lead to the destruction or misappropriation of the very same sites because of the close relationship between enchantment and desire, and the regulating systems institutions make available for the classification and disciplining of the unknowable.

Given that affective enchantment affects social actors as individuated subjects, and perhaps takes place at a remove from language, it may seem that the states of wonder identified by Bennett have a tenuous relationship to rhetoric. I argue that, just as language is a conduit for myth, so too can it *express* wonder. I identify wonder in utterances of poetic language. The interpretation of such densely-connotative language is subjective, as well. Yet, because many of the texts I study are research documents produced by archaeologists, or

[66] Bennett, *Enchantment of Modern Life*, 32.

legal documents, such as federal preservation policies, I entered this project with the expectation that such works would use relatively clinical language. At times, they do. At other times, they refer to things like ghosts, labyrinths, and spirit. Such surprisingly imaginative language demonstrates an enchanted demeanor towards whatever it is that the texts describe. For the explorers and scientists, this enchantment often had to do with knowledge. For one of the preservation advocates, this had to do with the perception of defeating the odds—an enchantment with the self, and the self's heroism. In national preservation policies, symbolically-charged language usually has been reserved as an attribute of the American people. Though the enchantments differ from text to text, they can be identified consistently with reference to cultural myths and poetic language.

Myths and wonder can both be part of everyday experiences. A risk comes in supposing that they are exceptional, or that they belong exclusively to non-industrialized societies, or to another era, or exclusively within the realm of the religious. While the archaeologists, adventurers, and advocates whose works I study described the ancient indigenous places that they saw within the framework of wonder, they often exoticized the people who had built those sites, or relegated their descendants to a place outside of time. They assumed that myths were a form of primitive religion, not acknowledging that the stories they were telling served the same social function as the older stories they heard from others. Enchantment appeared in these discourses in a fetishistic way, and emphasized difference as a spectacle.

Not only does the magical thinking expressed through rhetorical enchantment help to explain the symbolic actions of the social actors within my study, but identifying that magical thinking helps to restore relativity to the historic record. The archaeologists and

ethnologists of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century caused great ideological harm in identifying myth and magical thinking only with the people whom they viewed as research subjects. There is a kind of harmony in identifying myth and magical thinking in those who failed to find it in themselves, yet who often denigrated those in whom they perceived such phenomena.

Let it be said that the ancient places of the Southwest *are* enchanting. However, they need not be enchanting because they are treated as the stuff of legend, or because they seem exotic. They can be enchanting simply because they were built by people, and because they are beautiful. Through rhetorical enchantment, many people have come to consider Southwestern antiquities worthy of care. It is the kind of care that rhetorical enchantments induce that draws attention to the ethical and political implications of this study. I will discuss some of these implications in further detail in the upcoming description of chapters. Prior to doing so, I shall contextualize my project within the fields of rhetorical criticism, communication studies, public history, critical heritage studies, and archaeology, to highlight its interventions.

Review of Literature

My dissertation participates in ongoing conversations within the field of communication both conceptually and in terms of its topics of analysis. Conceptually, the influence of dramatistic theory on my dissertation extends a decades-long relationship between Kenneth Burke and rhetorical criticism. My dissertation also revisits mythic analysis, which has been a focus of rhetorical criticism periodically. After discussing the conceptual parallels between my dissertation and my field of study, I will outline a number of the works in rhetorical criticism that attend to similar topics.

Conceptual Connections

Dramatism has left an indelible mark on the field of rhetorical criticism, and has inspired the field for well over half a century. Virginia Holland proposed "Burkeian Criticism" as a useful method for understanding rhetoric in 1953,[67] a time during which Burke still was publishing new research and presented himself as a public intellectual. Rhetorical critics such as Marie Hochmuth, Jane Blankenship, Edward Murphy, and Marie Rosenwasser embraced Holland's proposal and Burke's literature increasingly as time went on.[68] Since his introduction to rhetorical criticism, Burke's influence has been celebrated and anthologized,[69] and his wide array of concepts even has been organized into a concordance.[70] Dramatism has been linked to theoretical concerns such as the rhetoric of science,[71] embodiment,[72] and postmodernity.[73] Authors have found Burke helpful in understanding

---

[67] Virginia Holland, "Rhetorical Criticism: A Burkeian Method," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 39, no. 4 (December 1953): 444–50, doi:10.1080/00335635309381911.

[68] Marie Hochmuth, "Burkeian Criticism," *Western Speech*, 1957, 89–95; Jane Blankenship, Edward Murphy, and Marie Rosenwasser, "Pivotal Terms in the Early Works of Kenneth Burke," *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 7, no. 1 (1974): 1–24.

[69] Herbert W. Simons and Trevor Melia, eds., *The Legacy of Kenneth Burke* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989).

[70] Stan A. Lindsay, *A Concise Kenneth Burke Concordance* (Orlando, FL: Say Press, 2004). I am especially grateful to Lindsay for publishing this text.

[71] Herbert W. Simons, "Kenneth Burke and the Rhetoric of the Human Sciences," in *The Legacy of Kenneth Burke*, ed. Herbert W. Simons and Trevor Media (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 3–27.

[72] Debra Hawhee, *Moving Bodies: Kenneth Burke at the Edges of Language* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2009).

[73] Barbara A. Biesecker, Addressing Postmodernity: Kenneth Burke, Rhetoric, and a Theory of Social Change (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1997).

such phenomena as social activism in Harlem during the 1920s and 1930s,[74] religious fundamentalism,[75] tourist landscapes,[76] jazz and its social influence,[77] scientific racism,[78] and of course, speeches.[79]

In my rhetorical analysis of the history of Anglo-American preservation advocacy on behalf of ancient indigenous places in the Southwestern United States, I refer to the dramatistic concepts of the technological psychosis, frames of rejection and acceptance and their poetic categories, and ultimate or god terms. Of the concepts that I draw from in my analysis, Burke's frames of acceptance and rejection appear the most frequently within rhetorical criticism. Notable examples include Brian L. Ott and Eric Aoki's analysis of media coverage of Matthew Shepherd's murder, in which the authors blended media frame analysis with Burke's frames of rejection and acceptance to conclude that the tragic framing of the

---

[74] Gregory Anthony Tillman, *Hoopla in Harlem!* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2009).

[75] Camille Kaminski Lewis, Romancing the Difference: Kenneth Burke, Bob Jones University, and the Rhetoric of Religious Fundamentalism (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007).

[76] Gregory Clark, Rhetorical Landscapes in America: Variations on a Theme from Kenneth Burke (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2004).

[77] Gregory Clark, Civic Jazz: American Music and Kenneth Burke on the Art of Getting Along (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015).

[78] Martha Solomon, "The Rhetoric of Dehumanization : An Analysis of Medical Reports of the Tuskegee Syphilis Project," *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 49, no. 4 (1985): 233–47.

[79] David A. Bobbitt, The Rhetoric of Redemption: Kenneth Burke's Redemption Drama and Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "I Have a Dream" Speech (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2004).

event hindered meaningful political engagement.[80] Whereas the tragic frame has appeared in multiple works of rhetorical criticism,[81] most rhetorical critics who have engaged with Burke's frames of acceptance or rejection have adopted either the burlesque frame or the comic frame as their primary theoretical apparatus. Burke viewed the burlesque as a hyperbolic frame of rejection, which mocked what it represented. Drawing from dramatism, rhetorical scholars have identified public ridicule as the burlesque in political events and popular culture.[82] Most rhetorical critics who engage with the comic frame hold it up as a

---

[80] Brian L. Ott and Eric Aoki, "The Politics of Negotiating Public Tragedy: Media Framing of the Matthew Shepard Murder," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 5, no. 3 (2002): 483–505, doi:10.1353/rap.2002.0060.

[81] Edward C. Appel, "The Rhetoric of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.: Comedy and Context in Tragic Collision," *Western Journal of Communication* 61, no. 4 (1997): 376–402; Michael L. Butterworth, "The Passion of the Tebow: Sports Media and Heroic Language in the Tragic Frame," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 30, no. 1 (March 2013): 17–33, doi:10.1080/15295036.2012.701010; Ross Singer, "Framing of Elite Corruption and Rhetorical Containment of Reform in the Boeing-Air Force Tanker Controversy," *Southern Communication Journal* 76, no. 2 (2011): 97–119, doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/10417940903180167.

[82] Edward C. Appel, "Burlesque Drama as a Rhetorical Genre: The Hudibrastic Ridicule of William F. Buckley, Jr.," *Western Journal of Communication* 60, no. 3 (1996): 269–84, doi:https://doi-org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1080/10570319609374547; Edward C. Appel, "Rush to Judgment: Burlesque, Tragedy, and Hierarchal Alchemy in the Rhetoric of America's Foremost Political Talkshow Host," *Southern Communication Journal* 68, no. 3 (2003): 217–30, doi:https://doi-org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1080/10417940309373262; Beth E. Bonnstetter, "Mel Brooks Meets Kenneth Burke (and Mikhail Bakhtin): Comedy and Burlesque in Satiric Film," *Journal of Film and Video* 63, no. 1 (2011): 18–31, doi:10.5406/jfilmvideo.63.1.0018.; Mark P. Moore, "'The Quayle Quagmire': Political Campaigns in the Poetic Form of Burlesque," *Western Journal of Communication* 56, no. 2 (1992): 108–24, doi:https://doi-org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1080/10570319209374406; Stephen Gencarella Olbrys, "Disciplining the Carnivalesque: Chris Farley's Exotic Dance," *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 3, no. 3 (2006): 240–59; Gary Steven Selby, "Scoffing at the Enemy: The Burlesque Frame in the Rhetoric of Ralph David Abernathy," *Southern Communication Journal* 70, no. 2 (2005): 134–45, doi:https://doi-org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1080/10417940509373319.

nuanced form of political engagement, for Burke interpreted it as a humanizing mode of discourse. Sometimes, rhetorical critics who read texts through the comic frame discuss comedy, itself, as a form of political rhetoric.[83] Its applications are much broader, but usually coincide with discussion of other frames also at work. I have been able to identify only one instance of rhetorical criticism that engages with the epic poetic category as a frame of acceptance. Its authors claim that it is an under-acknowledged category.[84]

In reviewing Burke's appearances within contemporary rhetorical criticism, I have observed that most critics who refer to him make use of the ambivalence of his theories, and often find several of his observations bundled within the same text. For instance, many of the aforementioned pieces of rhetorical criticism that referred to frames of acceptance or rejection found multiples frames operating at once within the same texts. In Chapter Three, I also identify multiple frames coexisting within the same historical situation, and the precedent that other rhetorical critics have set in comparing poetic categories supports my critical approach in that chapter. One other conceptual parallel appears between my dissertation and rhetorical criticism that adopts dramatism, and that has to do with magic, myths, and mystery. Burkean scholars regularly acknowledge the significance of myth and

---

[83] Don J. Waisanen, "A Citizen's Guides to Democracy Inaction: Jon Stewart and Stephen Colbert's Comic Rhetorical Criticism," *Southern Communication Journal* 74, no. 2 (2009): 119–40.

[84] C. Wesley Buerkle, Michael E. Mayer, and Clark D. Olson, "Our Hero the Buffoon: Contradictory and Concurrent Burkean Framing of Arizona Governor Evan Mecham," *Western Journal of Communication* 67, no. 2 (2003): 187–206, doi:https://doi-org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1080/10570310309374766.

mystery within Burke's works.[85] Of note, dramatism also makes an appearance in the majority of mythic criticism.

Mythic criticism emphasizes both social psychology and the presence of ideology within specific iterations of myths. The two emphases overlap considerably within the literature,[86] and authors drawing from both refer routinely to dramatism as a touchstone for their theories. Authors of psychological-mythic criticism typically cite the influence of Jung and Freud, as well as archetypal features of storytelling and the collective unconscious.[87] Those who are more explicitly concerned with the ways in which myths constitute political collectives tend to emphasize the ways in which myths relate to ideologies, instead.[88] Burke

---

[85] Jane Blankenship, "'Magic' and 'Mystery' in the Works of Kenneth Burke," in *The Legacy of Kenneth Burke*, ed. Herbert W. Simons and Trevor Melia (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 128–55; Hawhee, *Moving Bodies;* Michael Steudman, "The Guardian Genius of Democracy: The Myth of the Heroic Teaching in Lyndon B. Johnson's Education Policy Rhetoric, 1964-1966," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 17, no. 3 (2014): 477–510, doi:10.1353/rap.2014.0033; Kyle Jensen and Krista Ratcliffe, "Mythic Historiography: Refiguring Kenneth Burke's Deceitful Woman Trope," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 48, no. 1 (2018): 88–107, doi:10.1080/02773945.2017.1278780.

[86] Janice Hocker Rushing and Thomas S. Frentz, "Integrating Ideology and Archetype in Rhetorical Criticism," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 77, no. 4 (1991): 385–406, doi:10.1080/00335639109383970.

[87] Elizabeth Walker Mechling and Jay Mechling, "The Jung and the Restless: The Mythopoetic Men's Movement," *Southern Communication Journal* 59, no. 2 (1994): 97–111, doi:10.1080/10417949409372929; Thomas S Frentz, "Memory, Myth, and Rhetoric in Plato's Phaedrus," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 36, no. 3 (2006): 243–62, doi:10.1080/02773940500511546; Elizabeth Walker Mechling, "Patricia Hearst: Myth America 1974, 1975, 1976," *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 43, no. 3 (1979): 168–79, doi:10.1080/10570317909373966; Elizabeth Walker Mechling and Jay Mechling, "Sweet Talk: The Moral Rhetoric against Sugar," *Central States Speech Journal* 34, no. 1 (1983): 19–32, doi:10.1080/10510978309368111.

[88] Thomas R. Burkholder, "Kansas Populism, Woman Suffrage, and the Agrarian Myth: A Case Study in the Limits of Mythic Transcendence," *Communication Studies* 40, no. 4 (1989): 292–307, doi:10.1080/10510978909368282; Martha Solomon Watson, "Mary Church Terrell vs. Thomas Nelson Page: Gender, Race, and Class in Anti-Lynching

expressed interest in both types of thinking, and so his appearance in both modes of mythic criticism is unsurprising, as is the intermingling of psychological and ideological theory within mythic criticism.

Among the best-known practitioners of mythic criticism are Janice Rushing and Thomas Frentz, who coauthored a series of analyses in this line of rhetorical scholarship.[89] Rushing and Frentz developed a style of rhetorical analysis that Bruce Gronbeck discusses as "criticism grounded in depth psychology."[90] Even so, they drew from dramatism in developing their mythic analyses. For instance, Rushing and Frentz referred to Burke's "Definition of Man" while discussing "the god of modernism—the 'rational, centered subject,'" whom they considered to be the "heroic ideal" of modernity.[91] They identified

---

Rhetoric," *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 12, no. 1 (2009): 65–89; Martha Watson, "The Issue Is Justice: Martin Luther King Jr.'s Response to the Birmingham Clergy," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 7, no. 1 (2004): 1–22, doi:https://doi.org/10.1353/rap.2004.0032; Kurt W Ritter, "The Myth-Making Functions of the Rhetoric of the American Revolution: Francis Hopkinson as a Case Study," *Communication Quarterly* 23, no. 2 (1975): 25–31, doi:10.1080/01463377509369176.

[89] Janice Hocker Rushing and Thomas S. Frentz, "The Frankenstein Myth in Contemporary Cinema," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 6, no. 1 (1989): 61–80, doi:10.1080/15295038909366731; Thomas S. Frentz and Janice Hocker Rushing, "'Mother Isn't Quite Herself Today:' Myth and Spectacle in The Matrix," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 19, no. 1 (2002): 64–86, doi:10.1080/07393180216551; Janice Hocker Rushing and Thomas S. Frentz, "Singing over the Bones: James Cameron's Titanic," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 17, no. 1 (2000): 1–27, doi:10.1080/15295030009388373.

[90] Bruce E. Gronbeck, "Rushing, Frentz, and the Matter of Psychological Rhetorical Criticism," *Southern Communication Journal* 71, no. 2 (2006): 160, doi:10.1080/10417940600681467.

[91] Janice Hocker Rushing and Thomas S. Frentz, *Projecting the Shadow: The Cyborg Hero in American Film* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 19.

such a hero, though "rotten with perfection,"[92] in science fiction films such as *Blade Runner* and *The Terminator*. Rushing and Frentz situated such heroes *as* myths and *within* frontier myths, while "interpreting . . . films as mythic signs of the American psyche."[93] Whereas Rushing and Frentz discussed "archetypes" in their analyses,[94] emphasizing character transformations within epic frontier stories, I refer to myths in a more general way. Instead of theorizing a relationship among myths, psychology, and archetypes (as Rushing and Frentz did), I interpret myths as densely-connotative narratives with ideological components. To be sure, the narratives in my dissertation often referred both to the American frontier and to the modern hero. My analysis focuses more on the ideologies that underpin such mythic rhetoric, rather than on recurrent narrative forms, per se.

Dramatism provides a substantial basis for understanding myth in relation to ideology. Of course, given that ideology pertains to collective consciousness, ideological-mythic criticism has psychological dimensions. As an example of what I term ideological-mythic criticism, Michael McGee considered dramatism, myth, and ideology together in his conceptualization of the myth of "the people" as a rhetorical commonplace. McGee posited that, though "the people" to whom speakers refer may never exist *in fact*, the rhetorical appeal to an idealized collective nevertheless serves a normative function, and also demonstrates or models collective values. McGee interpreted myths as partial expressions of

---

[92] Burke discussed his "definition of man" in *Language as Symbolic Action*, 16.

[93] Rushing and Frentz, *Projecting the Shadow*, 4-6

[94] Ibid., 34.

collective consciousness.[95] In this dissertation, I also consider myths to be expressions of collective ideals.

Drawing from dramatism and a number of other theoretical influences, Balthrop also developed the relationships among culture, ideology, and myth. Balthrop claimed that "*myth* provides the cultural image of perfection," but that the image provides only "an abstract vision" that guides cultural activity.[96] For Balthrop, myths are "ultimate patterns for attributing significance to human experience, are moralistic and provide guides for action."[97] There are always disconnects between ideals and practice, however, and this circumstance necessitates a symbolic bridge between the two. Balthrop identified ideology as that "bridge between specific events and the cultural myth that seeks to establish order."[98] Ideology steps in to *justify* a cultural ideal, or a dominating myth. At the same time, it "offers an explanation for a culture's illnesses, or strains, and provides the means by which a cure may be effected."[99] Balthrop's concepts clarify a number of ambiguities that dramatism inherited from Burke, who stated that myth and ideology were "mutually exclusive."[100] For Burke,

---

[95] Michael C. McGee, "In Search of 'the People': A Rhetorical Alternative," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61, no. 3 (1975): 235–49.

[96] V. William Balthrop, "Culture, Myth, and Ideology as Public Argument: An Interpretation of the Ascent and Demise of 'Southern Culture,'" *Communication Monographs* 51, no. 4 (1984): 341, doi:10.1080/03637758409390206, emphasis in original.

[97] Ibid.

[98] V. William Balthrop, "Culture, Myth, and Ideology as Public Argument: An Interpretation of the Ascent and Demise of 'Southern Culture,'" *Communication Monographs* 51, no. 4 (1984): 343, doi:10.1080/03637758409390206.

[99] Ibid., 343–44.

[100] Kenneth Burke, "Ideology and Myth," *Accent* 7 (1947): 200.

ideology was akin to rhetoric, and emphasized ideas. Myth was akin to poetry, and emphasized images. Burke found myths to be pre-political, and separate from ideology; I disagree with both assessments. Balthrop's own development of the concepts of myth and ideology helps to bridge the gap that dramatism presented.

Dramatism has had a prevalent and lasting effect on mythic criticism. It is also beneficial to point out that myth has been a persistent feature of rhetorical criticism without full reliance on dramatism. Robert C. Rowland published a noteworthy article "On Mythic Criticism" in 1990, in which he cited Burke but looked to "anthropological research in order to explain the structure of mythic narratives," and in which Rowland roundly critiqued mythic criticism.[101] I can only imagine Rowland's dismay at the way in which I have "stretched the definition of myth far beyond its traditional usage," as developed by anthropologists studying "primitive and modern societies."[102] However, because my dissertation functions largely as a sustained critique of anthropological practice and its role in colonizing indigenous heritage, theorists such as Claude Lévi-Strauss and Bronislaw Malinowski seemed a poor fit with my analysis. I prefer works of mythic criticism such as Leroy G. Dorsey and Rachel M. Harlow's analysis of Theodore Roosevelt's texts, *The Winning of the West*.[103] While those authors drew on a theoretical canon quite apart from Burke *and* from famous anthropologists, they nevertheless relied on myth in order to

---

[101] Robert C Rowland, "On Mythic Criticism," *Communication Studies* 41, no. 2 (1990): 101, doi:10.1080/10510979009368293.

[102] Ibid.

[103] Leroy G. Dorsey and Rachel M. Harlow, "'We Want Americans Pure and Simple': Theodore Roosevelt and the Myth of Americanism," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 6, no. 1 (2003): 55–78, doi:https://doi.org/10.1353/rap.2003.0027.

interpret aggrandizing descriptions of the white American frontier experience, framed according to the narrative structure of the hero's journey.

Overall, my dissertation's reliance on dramatism and theories of myth is consistent with a longstanding tradition within rhetorical criticism. I extend that tradition by developing the concept of rhetorical enchantment, and by applying that theory to the context of Southwestern antiquities and their history of Anglo-American preservation. While antiquities seldom have featured in rhetorical criticism, considerations of frontier myths have been part of rhetorical criticism for some time.[104] Additionally, the rhetoric of science and indigenous rights have been ongoing concerns.

Connections by Subject

In terms of *topics* of rhetorical criticism, my dissertation connects most closely to research concerning the rhetoric of science and indigenous rights. Given its emphasis on places and their role in political life, it also relates to studies in material rhetoric and the rhetoric of space and place, in which two studies have examined ancient indigenous places, as well. While my research does not emphasize the contemporary interpretation of the ancient places in question, it takes seriously the premise that the places' materiality has

[104] Greg Dickinson, Brian L. Ott, and Eric Aoki, "Memory and Myth at the Buffalo Bill Museum," *Western Journal of Communication* 69, no. 2 (April 2005): 85–108, doi:10.1080/10570310500076684; Janice Hocker Rushing, "The Rhetoric of the American Western Myth," *Communication Monographs* 50, no. 1 (1983): 14–32, doi:10.1080/03637758309390151; David C Klope, "Defusing a Foreign Policy Crisis: Myth and Victimage in Reagan's 1983 Lebanon/Grenada Address," *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 50, no. 4 (1986): 37–41; Leah Ceccarelli, *On the Frontier of Science: An American Rhetoric of Exploration and Exploitation*, (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 2013).

influenced the discursive playing field, contributing directly to the enchantments experienced by and produced by the rhetors advocating for preservation.

This project's reference to the rhetoric of science comes from the close historical relationship between Anglo-American archaeologists and preservation advocacy. Most of the social actors whose rhetoric I study presented themselves as researchers, at least to some extent, and used academic authority to support their claims about the necessity of preservation. While archaeology typically has not come under the purview of rhetorical critics, archaeological research functions like other sciences that rhetorical critics have assessed. Like the hard sciences and other human sciences, archaeological research is vested with authority, and maintains a "privileged position" in interpretation and political influence.[105]

Herbert Simons credits dramatism's influence on rhetorical studies for expanding rhetoric's purview to include the sciences.[106] The main challenge for the rhetoric of science, traditionally, has been to demonstrate that the explication of scientific claims always has been rhetorical.[107] Additionally, scholarship in the rhetoric of science has emphasized how scientists persuade other scientists about their claims, or how they might encourage one

---

[105] Laurajane Smith, *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage* (London: Routledge, 2004), 9. Smith is not a rhetorical critic, but a critical heritage scholar and anthropological theorist. She has studied the scientific privilege of anthropology extensively.

[106] Herbert W. Simons, "Kenneth Burke and the Rhetoric of the Human Sciences," in *The Legacy of Kenneth Burke*, eds. Herbert W. Simons and Trevor Media (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989).

[107] Leah Ceccarelli, Shaping Science with Rhetoric: The Cases of Dobzhansky, Schrodinger, and Wilson (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001).

another to undertake new research agendas.[108] Of key interest to my study, research in the rhetoric of science often has challenged the notion of scientific objectivity,[109] which is among the most prevalent of the myths of modernity at play in this analysis.

In a departure from many preceding works in the rhetoric of science, many of the texts in my study never were intended to persuade *within* the scientific community, but were designed for other audiences. While the rhetors whose texts I study certainly addressed themselves to audiences of peers, they also circulated their findings and values to the lay public, often making explicit attempts to influence public opinion and change policy. Just as archaeology blends attributes of the hard sciences and the humanities, so does archaeological rhetoric merge aspects of the technical and public spheres.[110]

The rhetors in my dissertation often acted as academic authorities in one realm or another. Because they studied the deep history of the United States, the topics they studied inevitably concerned American Indian cultures, and archaeologists often transferred their hypotheses about past cultures to contemporary peoples. The conclusions that these rhetors drew had the potential to influence social relationships, biases, and Anglo-American

---

[108] Ceccarelli, *Shaping Science with Rhetoric*, 169. Ceccarelli has called for an increased emphasis on "internal political negotiations" within scientific circles, and further attention to how scientists persuade one another, rather than fixating on the fact that findings *are* rhetorical.

[109] Herbert W. Simons, ed., *Rhetoric in the Human Sciences* (London: SAGE Publications, 1989); John Lyne, "Bio-Rhetorics: Moralizing in the Life Sciences," in *The Rhetorical Turn: Invention and Persuasion in the Conduct of Inquiry* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1990), 37.

[110] G. Thomas Goodnight, "The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres of Argument: A Speculative Inquiry Into the Art of Public Deliberation," *Argumentation and Advocacy* 18, no. Spring (1982): 203. Goodnight wrote that the three-sphere model was ". . . not intended to be the foundation of a taxonomical scheme," but a permeable model.

comportment towards indigenous peoples in the United States. I find that the archaeologists and ethnologists whom I study typically expressed either prejudicial or paternalistic attitudes towards their American Indian contemporaries, and did so backed by scientific authority. These were common attitudes for Anglo-American rhetors in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as rhetorical scholar Jason Edward Black has noted.[111] My study augments an extensive body of literature that addresses representations of indigeneity and the American Indian experience, though it does so primarily by attending to historical Anglo-American perspectives that influenced intercultural communication and the federal management of indigenous heritage.

Most rhetorical studies that pertain to indigenous rights examine rhetoric produced by indigenous social actors. Rhetorical critics have studied the American Indian Movement of the 1960s and 1970s extensively,[112] and have offered more recent analyses of American Indian social movement rhetoric, as well.[113] For example, Catherine Helen Palczewski

---

[111] Jason Edward Black, "Remembrances of Removal: Native Resistance to Allotment and the Unmasking of Paternal Benevolence.," *Southern Communication Journal* 72, no. 2 (2007): 185–203, doi:10.1080/10417940701316690.

[112] Randall A. Lake, "Enacting Red Power: The Consummatory Function in Native American Protest Rhetoric," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 69 (1983): 127–42; John Sanchez and Mary E. Stuckey, "The Rhetoric of American Indian Activism in the 1960s and 1970s," *Communication Quarterly* 48, no. 2 (2000): 120–36, doi:10.1080/01463370009385586; Cynthia Duquette Smith and Teresa Bergman, "You Were on Indian Land: Alcatraz Island as Recalcitrant Memory Space," in *Places of Public Memory*, ed. Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, and Brian Ott (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2010), 160–88.

[113] Patty Loew and Kelly Mella, "Black Ink and the New Red Power: Native American Newspapers and Tribal Sovereignty," *Journalism and Communication Monographs* 7, no. 3 (2005): 99–142; Danielle Endres, "American Indian Activism and Audience: Rhetorical Analysis of Leonard Peltier's Response to Denial of Clemency," *Communication Reports* 24, no. 1 (2011): 1–11, doi:10.1080/08934215.2011.554624; Cory Young, "Contemporary

examines Native opposition to Columbus Day celebrations in the 1990s, as well as Ward Churchill's rhetorical interventions in that moment.[114] Danielle Endres considers Native resistance to the siting of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain in the early 2000s.[115] Additional topics pertaining to indigenous rights, rather than Native rhetorics, include the problematic representations of indigenous people in Anglo-American discourses, as caricatured by mascot designs, distorted in documentary filmmaking, or fetishized in museum spaces.[116]

Much of the literature that concerns Native rhetorics examines court cases in which American Indian social actors challenged federal infringements on Native sovereignty. Rhetorical critics invested in the decolonizing project also critique federal policies as colonizing instruments of the United States government.[117] As an example, Jason Edward

---

Native American Rhetoric : A Narrative Criticism of the Cherokee Rally," *Texas Speech Communication Journal* 29, no. 2 (2005): 131–41.

[114] Catherine Helen Palczewski, "When Times Collide: Ward Churchill's Use of an Epideictic Moment to Ground Forensic Argument," *Argumentation and Advocacy* 41, no. Winter (2005): 123–38; see also Casey Ryan Kelly, "Blood-Speak: Ward Churchill and the Racialization of American Indian Identity," *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 8, no. 3 (2011): 240–265, doi:10.1080/14791420.2011.594070.

[115] Danielle Endres, "The Rhetoric of Nuclear Colonialism: Rhetorical Exclusion of American Indian Arguments in the Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Siting Decision," *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 6, no. 1 (2009): 39–60, doi:10.1080/14791420802632103.

[116] Jason Edward Black, "Native Authenticity, Rhetorical Circulation, and Neocolonial Decay: The Case of Chief Seattle's Controversial Speech," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 15, no. 4 (2012): 635–46; Greg Dickinson, Brian L. Ott, and Eric Aoki, "Spaces of Remembering and Forgetting: The Reverent Eye/I at the Plains Indian Museum," *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 3, no. 1 (March 2006): 27–47, doi:10.1080/14791420500505619; Danielle Endres, "American Indian Permission for Mascots: Resistance or Complicity within Rhetorical Colonialism?," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 18, no. 4 (2015): 649–90.

[117] e.g., Jason Edward Black, "Plenary Rhetoric in Indian Country: The Lone Wolf v. Hitchcock Case of the Codification of a Weakened Native Character," *Advances in the History of Rhetoric* 11–12, no. 1 (2008): 59–80; Margret McCue-Enser, "Ada Deer and the

Black's analysis of the nineteenth-century American Indian removal policy and its Native resistance compares rhetoric produced by federal institutions with the decolonizing rhetorics of the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, and Seminole nations.[118] Black's case study highlights Native resistance to the federal mistreatment of American Indian peoples during the same historical era that I study.

A final parallel between my analysis and rhetorical criticism pertaining to indigenous rights comes in the link between myth and indigeneity that sometimes appears in rhetorical criticism. Randall A. Lake uses the concept of the myth to emphasize different reckonings of time, history, and temporality in Native rhetorics and Euro-American rhetorics. Lake concludes that rhetors of the American Indian Movement referred to a mythic time, whereas white social actors and United States federal institutions measured time in discrete historical units. While I agree with Lake's observation of differential representations of time in many Native discourses as opposed to many Euro-American discourses, I find that his use of myth in this instance risks depicting American Indian social actors in some sort of primeval past.[119] As postcolonial theorists such as Partha Chatterjee note, we all live in the same "dense and heterogeneous time," even if our portrayals of it differ from collective to collective.[120] I have

---

Menominee Restoration: Rethinking Native American Protest Rhetoric," *Argumentation and Advocacy* 53, no. 1 (2017): 59–76.

[118] Jason Edward Black, "Native Resistive Rhetoric and the Decolonization of American Indian Removal Discourse," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 95, no. 1 (2009): 66–88, doi:10.1080/00335630802621052.

[119] Randall A. Lake, "Between Myth and History: Enacting Time in Native American Protest Rhetoric," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 77, no. 77 (1991): 123–51.

[120] Partha Chatterjee, "The Nation in Heterogeneous Time," *Futures* 37 (2005): 928, doi:10.1016/j.futures.2005.01.011.

no interest in portraying Native rhetorics as mythic, but rather, I critique the Anglo-American myths that portray indigeneity as mysterious.

Using a much different tone, Greg Dickinson, Brian L. Ott, and Eric Aoki portray "national (his)tories" *as* myth in their analysis of the Buffalo Bill Museum in Cody, Wyoming.[121] Considering myth as a form of "master narrative," the authors examine Bill Cody's persona, Buffalo Bill, as represented in the museum that honors him.[122] The Buffalo Bill Museum relies on the myth of the American frontier in order to celebrate the Buffalo Bill figure, and in so doing depicts conflict between Native nations and white settlers in a carnivalesque manner. The authors critique the stereotypes that mythic portrayals of a historic situation encourage, in this case. In some ways, the issue of heritage relies on just the confluence of myth and history that Dickinson, Ott, and Aoki outline. Foundational narratives and representations of the past are intrinsic to heritage practices, and all contribute to contemporary understandings of collective identity. I discuss my dissertation's connection to critical heritage studies, public history, and archaeology, next.

Critical Heritage Studies, Public History, and Archaeology

Because of its attention to heritage places like Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon, my project aligns with a number of studies within the realm of critical heritage studies, public history, and archaeology. These fields have interrogated the production of heritage, the formation of national identities, and occupational cultures within the heritage industry, as

---

[121] Greg Dickinson, Brian L. Ott, and Eric Aoki, "Memory and Myth at the Buffalo Bill Museum," *Western Journal of Communication* 69, no. 2 (April 2005): 85, doi:10.1080/10570310500076684.

[122] Ibid., 86.

well as the deep history of the United States. They also often emphasize the policies that govern professional heritage management; this is a topic about which archaeological theorists and critical heritage theorists both publish extensively.

Key texts in public history include Richard Handler and Eric Gable's study of workers' experiences in Colonial Williamsburg, in which the authors compare interviews with workers with their public performances in order to assess the extent of commercial infiltration at that historic site.[123] In an ethnography of heritage practice in Lowell, Massachusetts, Cathy Stanton examines the institutional production of heritage from the insider role, and contrasts heritage practitioners' goals against the public displays produced in Lowell.[124] Writing about archaeological heritage management, specifically, Lisa Breglia examines World Heritage status in Mesoamerican archaeological sites; she emphasizes the role of international and federal regulations and their impacts on worker experiences.[125]

Each of these studies illustrates the relationship between what Erving Goffman would call the *backstage* and *frontstage* institutional practice in heritage contexts, with an eye to the economic and legislative constraints that dictate heritage practice.[126] My project intervenes in this conversation by attending to the preservation policies affecting Southwestern antiquities, and through the methodological practice of interviewing current heritage practitioners within

---

[123] Richard Handler and Eric Gable, *The New History in an Old Museum: Creating the Past at Colonial Williamsburg* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997).

[124] Cathy Stanton, *The Lowell Experiment* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006).

[125] Lisa Breglia, *Monumental Ambivalence: The Politics of Heritage* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2006).

[126] Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (New York: Doubleday Press, [1959] 1990).

the NPS and non-profit organizations in the Southwest to gain a better understanding of the influence of policies on practice. The method of interviewing heritage practitioners about their resources derives from critical heritage studies and public history. Primarily, my dissertation questions how indigenous heritage became a scientific resource in the late nineteenth century, though the lasting implications of that transformation were addressed primarily in "backstage" conversations. I refer to remarks that my interview participants made periodically over the course of this dissertation, and at length in the dissertation's conclusion. Their perspectives informed my analysis of *contemporary* attitudes toward antiquities, and serve as a counterpoint to the historical attitudes that are the focus of Chapters Two and Three.

In addition to aligning with public history and critical heritage studies by discussing the preservation context with current practitioners and analyzing the policies concerning Southwestern antiquities, my dissertation has a bearing on archaeological research and ethics. Indeed, recent trends in archaeological and anthropological theory influenced a number of the decisions that I made when designing this project, and intersect with critical heritage studies, history, and public history.

Archaeology, which we can understand here as the study of ancient human practices, has varied dramatically over the years. The rhetors whose works I study in Chapters Two and Three of this dissertation all practiced an early form of archaeology, and appealed to myths of scientific objectivity while perpetuating scientific racism and the fetishization of American Indian peoples. Their actions were consistent with those of a number of other Anglo-American and European social actors all across the world, who used archaeology in order to

perpetuate a belief in cultural evolution—among other deleterious ideologies.[127] Much of the evidence that these social actors used to support their harmful conclusions came from specious sources, and their intellectual inheritors have attempted to understand and correct their legacy for decades.

Not long after the social actors from Chapters Two and Three ended their careers in archaeology and ethnology in the early 1900s, practitioners in the fields of anthropology and archaeology began to recognize serious problems with turn-of-the-twentieth century scholarship. Archaeology began to develop more properly into a field that prided itself on its attention to empirical research, devoting itself to measuring, categorizing, and classifying ancient materials meticulously—in a departure from the *purported* classificatory systems advanced by early archaeologists. There was a period after World War II during which a detached mode of technological rationality dominated the discipline; this trend in archaeology was dubbed processual archaeology, and was most popular during the 1950s and 1960s.

Following the cultural upheavals of the 1960s and 1970s, archaeologists, like researchers in most other parts of the academy, began to interrogate the assumptions underlying their field. In the case of archaeology, a new *post*-processual trend led to extended questioning of the colonial past of archaeological practices, and undermined the field's prior pretensions to scientific objectivity. While some archaeologists today continue to consider themselves processual archaeologists, deliberation over the most appropriate approaches to

[127] Vine Deloria, *Red Earth, White Lies: Native Americans and the Myth of Scientific Fact* (Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing, 1997).

archaeological research continues in all parts of the field.[128] The field's commitment to the technological rationality has been tempered by growing ethical concerns about the history and practice of archaeology.

The post-processual effort to correct archaeology's harmful legacies appears in both methodological and theoretical decisions that contemporary archaeologists make. For example, during my own training as an archaeologist, I participated in an archaeological field school that was designed to promote *feminist* archaeology. The field director employed members of the local Aymara community in southern Peru to work on the excavation, and she hired indigenous women preferentially. As it happened, all of the students in the field school during the two seasons that I spent working on *Proyecto Cerro Mejía* were women, as well. In addition to highlighting community engagement, the field director chose to study vernacular lifeways instead of elite ones, attempted to identify gendered labor in the archaeological record, and otherwise worked to democratize the record of the deep past.[129] Because I trained under a post-processual archaeologist, I became interested in the politics and ethics of archaeological practice. This interest eventually resulted in my decision to leave the field in order to examine the contemporary political lives of ancient places through rhetorical studies.

---

[128] Smith, *Archaeological Theory*; Bruce G. Trigger, *A History of Archaeological Thought*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

[129] For example, Donna J. Nash, "Household Archaeology in the Andes," *Journal of Archaeological Research* 17, no. 3 (March 27, 2009): 205–61, doi:10.1007/s10814-009-9029-7. I worked with Donna Nash during the 2008 and 2009 field seasons, and went on to complete a master's degree in archaeological science at the University of Cambridge. The archaeological science program was decidedly more processual than the University of Chicago sponsored project run by Dr. Nash.

As elements of my own archaeological experiences have demonstrated, changes to the discipline of archaeology in the last fifty years have been consistent with the "reflexive turn" that the academy experienced, at large, beginning in the 1960s and 1970s.[130] In addition to promoting some of the diversifying approaches to archaeological research that I have described, archaeologists have attempted to attend more carefully to the needs of the local communities alongside whom (and often about whom) they conduct their research.[131] One manifestation of this ethic appears in the field's increasing support for indigenous archaeology.

George P. Nicholas notes that indigenous archaeology shares parallels with various post-processual or reflexive approaches to archaeological practice, though he observes that indigenous archaeology differs from other archaeological methods in key ways.[132] For instance, while archaeological practitioners are increasingly diverse, and while indigenous participation in archaeological research is growing, there remain differences between the dominant Eurocentric or Western paradigm for conducting research and American Indian epistemologies.[133] Nicholas argues that both paradigms deserve places of prominence within archaeological practice, and that indigenous archaeology should never be relegated to a sub-disciplinary status.

---

[130] Michael Asch, "Anthropology, Colonialism and the Reflexive Turn: Finding a Place to Stand," *Anthropologica* 57, no. 2 (2015): 481–89.

[131] Laurajane Smith and Emma Waterton, *Heritage, Communities and Archaeology* (London: Bloomsbury, 2009).

[132] George P. Nicholas, "Seeking the End of Indigenous Archaeology," in *Bridging the Divide: Indigenous Communities and Archaeology into the 21st Century*, ed. Caroline Phillips and Harry Allen (London: Routledge, 2010).

[133] Ibid.; Rodney Harrison, *Heritage: Critical Approaches* (London: Routledge, 2013).

Archaeologists, historians, and anthropologists all have worked to identify and challenge the prejudicial norms that historical practices in those fields produced, and which contemporary practices in archaeology, historiography, and heritage management may perpetuate (whether intentionally or not). I join the "many non-Indigenous scholars" who aspire to make heritage discourses more "representative of . . . Indigenous peoples by challenging the power inequities and other issues that persist" in the realm of archaeological practice, and elsewhere.[134] Sonya Atalay considers such challenges to the discipline of archaeology to be essential, stating:

> It is necessary that contemporary practitioners of the discipline [archaeology] not ignore the effect of past practices by placing the acts in a historical context that works to excuse them. Rather, archaeologists might take a more reflexive approach and contextualize the present situation by tracing archaeologists' . . . current position of power to both colonization and the historical reality of the egregious acts that led to the collections held by museums, universities, and historical societies internationally. The colonial past is not distinct from today's realities and practices, as the precedents that were set continue to define structures for heritage management practices and have powerful continuing implications for Indigenous peoples in North America and elsewhere precisely because they disrupted the self-determination and sovereignty of Indigenous populations with respect to their abilities to govern and practice their own traditional forms of cultural resource management.[135]

Atalay considers a reflexive, critical, and historical approach to understanding archaeology and its colonial legacies vital in the effort to *decolonize* archaeological practices. My dissertation attempts to respond to much of what Atalay urges her archaeological peers to do, in its critiques of Western-centric discourses that privileged a mythic form of science, and in

---

[134] Nicholas, "Seeking the End of Indigenous Archaeology," 238.

[135] Sonya Atalay, "Indigenous Archaeology as Decolonizing Practice," *The American Indian Quarterly* 30, no. 3 (2006): 280, doi:10.1353/aiq.2006.0015.

its attention to the enduring consequences of that dominant discourse as it became embedded in law.

In spite of archaeology's efforts to increase indigenous perspectives and American Indian involvement in its practices, there is "conflict that exists between indigenous populations and archaeologists throughout the world."[136] This stems from the fact that "[r]epresentatives of indigenous populations often perceive archaeologists as people who dig up the cultural and human remains of minority populations out of an inherently racist attitude."[137] In spite of the tensions that remain between and among American Indian peoples and archaeologists who wish to excavate on ancestral indigenous lands, Joe Watson concludes that "American Indian groups and archaeologists share a desire to protect the cultural heritage (regardless of whose it is) from *unnecessary* or unwarranted destruction from all sources."[138] While the common desire to prevent unwarranted destruction of heritage materials forms an uneasy basis for coalitional politics, it *is* the basis that the advocates on behalf of Bears Ears had in common. It may also remain a core feature in preservation advocacy for the foreseeable future, given the intellectual and aesthetic attachments that non-indigenous social actors harbor towards indigenous heritage places, and given the enduring authority of archaeologists in the federal management of indigenous heritage.

In sum, my project owes an intellectual debt to archaeology, history, and critical heritage studies. It attends to historical texts outlining the introduction of Southwestern

---

[136] Joe Watkins, *Indigenous Archaeology: American Indian Values and Scientific Practice* (Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press, 2000), 170.

[137] Ibid., 69.

[138] Ibid., 172, emphasis in original.

antiquities within public discourses, and it problematizes the history of archaeology even as it draws inspiration from anthropological theory. Yet, my project differs from archaeology, history, and critical heritage studies in its emphasis on discourses. While all of these fields of research prioritize primary texts, for example, I analyze them for the sake of understanding the claims they make, and in order to identify lingering components of the narratives that they present as they appear within current practices. My rhetorical analysis attends to the stories and claims within the texts rather than constructing a historical narrative or attempting to correct archaeological practice. The rhetoric of place is another unique contribution of rhetorical studies, which influences my dissertation research.

Rhetoric of Antiquities

In addition to offering analytical tools that are uniquely suited to studying narratives, claims, and social movements, rhetoric offers some precedent for considering representations of indigeneity at ancient places in the United States. To my knowledge, there are just two studies that take on this challenge directly: Thomas Patin's analysis of Chaco Culture National Historical Park (NHP), a place that appears periodically within my dissertation, and Casey Schmitt's study of the effigy mounds throughout the Madison, Wisconsin area.

Patin, an art historian who studies visual rhetoric, takes up Chaco Culture NHP in an examination of the poetics and politics of park design. In his analysis of Chaco Culture NHP, Patin observes that the road design, locations of parking lots, and positions of didactic signs in the park serve to structure the experience of the park in the style of museum displays. Patin suggests that the park conceals its museological paradigm by way of clever design features that mimic the natural and archaeological features of the park. For example, the on-site visitor center and entry signs to the park imitate the ancient masonry visible throughout the

ancient structures. Patin goes on to find that the park's design encourages visitors to adopt a magisterial gaze over the ancient structures visible at Chaco Canyon. According to Patin, this magisterial gaze naturalizes dominion over nature and over indigenous culture, and produces Chaco Canyon as a seamless feature of *American* heritage. Finally, Patin discusses the manner in which the ancient walls of Chaco Canyon are kept in a liminal state between repair and "ruin," producing a present absence that is made to appear inevitable.[139] Patin concludes that Chaco Canyon serves to commemorate and normalize the absence of Chacoan culture. By making the absence of contemporary Chacoans appear inevitable, the park styles European American presence in the region as inevitable, too.

Patin's observations about the gaze cultivated through archaeological tourism are astute, insofar as the museological paradigm certainly structures the placement of observation points and signs. Visitors are meant to look, and visitors are meant to look in a somewhat orderly fashion. Patin draws his assumptions about the magisterial gaze from Albert Boime and Timothy Mitchell, and Patin pairs the magisterial gaze with a discussion of Benedict Anderson's institutions of imperialism (the map, the museum, and the census).[140] Patin claims that the park directs visitors' perspectives towards domination of Pueblo Bonito, one of the park's central structures, while erasing its absent Chacoan architects. Moreover, Patin

---

[139] Thomas Patin, "America in Ruins: Parks, Poetics, and Politics," in *Observation Points: The Visual Poetics of National Parks*, ed. Thomas Patin (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012), 271.

[140] Albert Boime, "George Catlin's Wilderness Utopia," in *Observation Points: The Visual Poetics of National Parks*, ed. Thomas Patin (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012), 207–28; Timothy Mitchell, "Orientalism and the Exhibitionary Order," *in The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology*, ed. Donald Preziosi (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998); Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983), doi:10.1002/9780470670590.wbeog285.

claims that the park masks the ways in which it directs visitors' gazes, which makes its association with domination concerning. Unfortunately, Patin does little to explore the magisterial gaze's counterpart: the reverential gaze, in which materials are looked upon as sacred. This decision on Patin's part seems to contradict the central role of commemoration in other parts of Patin's analysis.

Another surprising feature of Patin's interpretation of Pueblo Bonito comes in his fixation on the absent Chacoans, and the presumed rhetorical effect of what Patin views as a key feature of a site visit. Patin takes the NPS to task for failing to present a single *cause* for the supposedly missing Chacoans. Patin fails to entertain the idea that Chacoan diaspora is overdetermined, and he blames the Park Service for being evasive about the missing Chacoans. Based on the archaeological data available at this time, I find Patin's consternation about the park's ambiguous descriptions of Chacoan diaspora to be overwrought. People once lived and worked in Chaco Canyon. For various reasons, likely having to do with cultural shifts and resource availability, people moved away from Chaco Canyon. Their descendants still live in the Southwest and retain a relationship with the site today. For these members of the Chacoan culture's descendant populations, the site is not at all the "ruin" that Patin calls it. It is a remarkable place that is continuing on a long journey. Chaco Canyon is not abandoned; it is in a different phase of its life. To call Chaco Canyon a ruin, or to suggest that its culture disappeared completely, disregards contemporary Puebloan interpretations of ancient landscape features, as expressed by members of Chaco's descendant populations and acknowledged throughout the park.[141]

---

[141] Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh and T. J. Ferguson, "Memory Pieces and Footprints: Multivocality and the Meanings of Ancient Times and Ancestral Places among the Zuni and

My position as a former archaeologist, and as a fellow observer of Chaco Culture NHP's interpretive materials, is that the NPS does a fair job of representing an unclear set of findings. The NPS resists the temptation to oversimplify Chaco Canyon's history for the sake of rendering a decisive narrative to visitors. Interpreters work with what they have. The representations at Chaco are partial, but they are hardly manipulative. Yet, throughout his analysis, Patin implies that much of what visitors experience at Chaco Canyon is artificial, grafted onto the original site for the sake of supporting a nationalistic agenda. Patin insinuates that the ancient structures, artifacts, petroglyphs and pictographs, all have been staged or falsified for visitor consumption through maintenance or "stabilization" work undertaken by the Park Service.[142] Patin also portrays the NPS in a negative light through its use of a natural rockfall as an observation deck overlooking Pueblo Bonito. He asserts that ascending this large rock, which fell onto the archaeological site in 1941, produces the magisterial gaze and does so wittingly. Yet, turning a disaster for the site into an opportunity for rare perspective may not come with the political implications that Patin presumes. The NPS did not cause the rock to fall; it reacted opportunistically after the fact.

As for falsification through stabilization, it is true that the NPS incorporates masonry repairs and structural supports into the ancient structures at Chaco Canyon and throughout the Southwest regularly,[143] leaving the site in a partially-toppled state. Patin accuses the NPS

Hopi," *American Anthropologist* 108, no. 1 (2006): 148-162, doi: 10.1525/aa.2006.108.1.148; National Park Service, "History & Culture," Chaco Culture National Historical Park, National Park Service, n.d., accessed April 29, 2016. https://www.nps.gov/chcu/learn/historyculture/index.htm.

[142] Patin, 277.

[143] Kathleen Fiero, *Dirt, Water, Stone: A Century of Preserving Mesa Verde* (Durango, Colorado: Durango Herald Small Press, 2006).

of producing the dereliction of the site for the sake of Chaco Canyon's visitors. Again, I find that the state of quasi-repair at the site is more a reaction than a ploy, on the part of the NPS. After entrepreneurs and researchers excavated the site aggressively at the beginning of the twentieth century, the NPS lost the opportunity to conserve the original fabric of Chaco Canyon's structures. Today, there are limited alternatives to the masonry repairs that the NPS funds. Falsified reconstructions would be unacceptable to scholars and the Park Service's mandates, alike. Allowing the exposed elements of the site to deteriorate organically could be construed as negligent, and certainly would close parts of the park to visitors once walls started to fall. Reburying the sites would protect them, but likely would cause uproar from tourists, as well.[144] While we could—and perhaps should—debate whether or not broad audiences today have the *right* to visit the site, it is clear that the NPS perceives only limited options given its mission to keep the site open to the public.

While Patin acknowledges that different visitors will interact with Chaco Canyon in divergent ways, I am skeptical of his stance that a visit to Chaco Canyon acts, predominantly, as a discursively and visually produced instrument of the state. Patin underestimates visitors' ability to absorb complex and enigmatic histories. Patin further underestimates the powerful affect of the ancient place he describes, and the place's ability to produce reverence and awe in its visitors. Museological installations or not, Chaco Canyon is remarkable. The place exerts itself on any person standing within it, regardless of the degree of verifiable authenticity we may find, regardless of the position from which we look, and regardless of

[144] Note that sites that have been excavated in more recent years *have* been reburied to assure their preservation. The only structures that remain exposed are those that archaeologists in the early twentieth century cleared. These open structures have been subjected to tourism for many decades, and it is difficult to imagine that the NPS would cover up any of its most iconic "resources," as the Park Service calls these antiquities.

the discourses pertaining to it. The discourses presented at and by the site *may* politicize it in some of the ways that Patin suggests, and my own analysis certainly demonstrates a variety of political uses of these ancient materials. However, none of the discourses would exist if it were not for the enduring aesthetic magnetism of the site.

Places *act* on persons. Received places, such as the ancient places I discuss, also act on the organizations that present them, playing a role in determining what can and cannot be said, and how or whether the materials will persist into the future. While Patin did not embrace this position in his analysis of Chaco Culture NHP, it is prevalent in research done in the domain of material rhetoric. In referring to received places, I describe those structures or sites that have been repurposed to serve the ends of organizations in the present-day, but which may exist *where* they exist largely by chance and historical circumstance. The heritage places addressed in this study are examples of received materials that have been taken up in the museological paradigm, but which had a different primary function than public educational display. Rhetorical critics have analyzed other received places, like historic home museums[145] and landscapes, such as national parks or abandoned battlefields or cemeteries.[146] Otherwise, most projects in material rhetoric have attended to structures that

---

[145] Michael S. Bowman, "Tracing Mary Queen of Scots," in *Places of Public Memory*, ed. Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, and Brian L. Ott (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2010), 191–215.

[146] Robert M. Bednar, "Being Here, Looking There: Mediating Vistas in the National Parks of the Contemporary American West," in *Observation Points: The Visual Poetics of National Parks*, ed. Thomas Patin (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012), 1–28.; Michael S. Bowman, "Looking for Stonewall's Arm: Tourist Performance as Research Method," in *Opening Acts: Performance In/as Communication and Cultural Studies*, ed. Judith Hamera (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2006), 102–33; Carole Blair, V. W. Balthrop, and Neil Michel, "Mood of the Material: War Memory and Imagining Otherwise," *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies* 13, no. 1 (November 18, 2012): 6–20, doi:10.1177/1532708612464632.

were made-new, built for the specific purpose of commemorating or displaying some part of a national or regional event. Critics attending to new memorials and museums also attend to such places' abilities to inflect visitors' movements and moods.[147]

To date, only one ancient indigenous place has been assessed through the lens of material rhetoric, in Casey Schmitt's comparison of the rhetorical framing of several effigy mounds still standing in and around Madison, Wisconsin.[148] As Schmitt describes them, the effigy mounds are hand-packed earthen structures built in the shape of clan animals. They were constructed originally by Late Woodland peoples hundreds of years ago, and can be found in several public areas throughout the Midwest today. In his analysis, Schmitt compares the appearance of effigy mounds in multi-use parks, nature preserves, and urban environments. In each of these three types of framing environments, Schmitt attends to the material arrangement and invited sensations of each place, as well as the presence or absence of explanatory placards, and the content of those placards. Schmitt focuses on the portrayals of the mounds' ancient architects, as well as discussions or occlusions of contemporary American Indian culture and history. Like Patin, Schmitt identifies the museological paradigm as the prevalent mode of display for Wisconsin's effigy mounds. However, contrary to Patin's observation that the museological paradigm produces the *magisterial* gaze

---

[147] Eric Aoki, Greg Dickinson, and Brian L. Ott, "The Master Naturalist Imagined: Directed Movement and Simulations at the Draper Museum of Natural History," in *Places of Public Memory*, ed. Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, and Brian L. Ott (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2010); Carole Blair and Neil Michel, "Reproducing Civil Rights Tactics: The Rhetorical Performances of the Civil Rights Memorial," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 30, no. 2 (2000): 31–55.

[148] Casey R. Schmitt, "Contours of the Land: Place-as-Rhetoric and Native American Effigy Mounds," *Western Journal of Communication* 79, no. 3 (2015): 307–26, doi:10.1080/10570314.2015.1041651.

in site participants, Schmitt finds that the museological framing of the effigy mounds cultivates reverence and distance, instead.

Schmitt recognizes that symbolic distancing may be a component of any interpretive activity, but writes with concern about the potential consequences of relegating American Indian history to the deep past, or placing American Indian cultural artifacts in seamless conjunction with environmental areas. Schmitt concludes that the effigy mounds' rhetorical framing devices tend to produce alienation for those contemporary social actors who come upon them today. Failing that perception of distance, the mounds may pass without notice, entirely. After all, they resemble natural hills, unless seen from above. Schmitt concludes his analysis by advocating for a more reflexive layering of history to be displayed in the rhetorical framing of ancient places, in order to subvert alienation and neglect, which Schmitt finds as the dominant modes of engaging with such sites. Schmitt observes this reflexive layering of past and present playing out most successfully in a memorial park that abuts an effigy mound, as the site visitors in attendance (at funerals, for example) are likely to enter the space of the effigy mound in an appropriately contemplative mood. This is in contrast to site participants at public parks, for instance, who may prefer to romp over the effigy mounds on their way to a picnic, not realizing what they are stepping upon.

Whereas Patin's primary theoretical inspiration is the gaze, Schmitt's primary theoretical inspiration is Foucauldian regimes of truth. For Schmitt, the casual distancing of American Indian pasts is a part of an oppressive regime of truth, which an intentional, reflexive layering of past and present might interrupt. Schmitt also develops the notion of the "found" monument, to describe places and materials interpreted by later groups who have no clear way of ascertaining the primary use of the site. Schmitt suggests that the concept of the

"found" monument is applicable to the Wisconsin effigy mounds, as well as sites like Machu Picchu and Stonehenge.[149] The key for Schmitt's "found" monuments is that they are interpreted by modern individuals, hence reflecting *modern* regimes of truth.[150] The present, looking at the past, turns ancient places into monuments, whether appropriate to their original use or not. Just as this is true in the present, so was it true over a hundred years ago, in the era during which the rhetors in my study were most active.

I concur with Patin and Schmitt that the *in situ* rhetorical framing of ancient places works in a fashion similar to museological displays. Visitors to ancient places are directed to look at some things, and not others. This way of looking has unclear consequences, based on the interaction between different visitors and the materials they behold. Past and present interface at the ancient places addressed in my study. As Schmitt and Patin indicate, this fusion of horizons has the potential for estrangement. However, as Schmitt asserts, ancient places hold the power to invite reflexive layering and heightened awareness of the time-depth of the place in which one stands. Whether the rhetorical framing devices in these ancient places include American Indian history in a sensitive way, or relegate indigenous groups to nature and the far past, it is also clear that ancient indigenous sites raise questions about American Indian presence, displacement, and relations with members of the settler populations who now visit them. As the above discussion demonstrates, my project takes part in an ongoing conversation in visual and material rhetoric, engaging the material-symbolic production of presence, absence, institutional control, and representational hierarchies, in

---

[149] Ibid., 208.

[150] Ibid., 310.

addition to describing the relationship between preservationist discourses and the ancient sites themselves.

Whether considering contemporary interpretations of ancient places, or the history of Anglo-American advocacy on behalf of indigenous heritage sites, rhetoric makes a unique contribution. Rhetoric is concerned, primarily, with modes of public communication that have the potential to alter political or social conditions. In attending to a variety of material-discursive claims, through myth, didactic signs, public interpretations, or preservation policies, we may see how rhetors attempt to define and change the world around them. Preservation advocacy is a clear target for rhetorical criticism, as it is a realm of deliberation and argumentation, where social actors attempt to convince others that a course of action is necessary and desirable—that it is within the public interest. How these rhetors have gone about convincing others of the values of ancient places demonstrates social mores and hierarchies. My project also historicizes rhetorical tendencies in the realm of preservation advocacy that persist to this day. Through the careful analysis of these discursive tendencies, we may identify new strategies for coalitonal efforts to decolonize indigenous heritage management in the United States.

Because rhetoric emphasizes language to such a great extent, I shall take a brief opportunity to clarify some of my own linguistic choices, as they will appear throughout the text. Thereafter, I will describe the forthcoming chapters in greater detail.

Terminological Clarifications

Throughout the dissertation, I refer to the act of preservation advocacy. In interviews with NPS personnel and participants in a non-profit organization in the American Southwest, my informants problematized both terms. As one archaeologist commented, the term

"preservation" sounds like one is attempting to pickle a place, or put it in formaldehyde. It is an imperfect term, but a legible one. Whereas those who engage in masonry repair refer to a very particular set of technical activities when they describe archaeological preservation,[151] I refer only to the basic attempt to keep ancient places from experiencing fresh harm, caused by humans. In the late nineteenth century, advocates construed this type of harm fairly narrowly as vandalism or pot-hunting, which they defined as the unpermitted removal of artifacts from a site without using proper scientific methods. Most preservation advocates continue to view these types of harm as extremely undesirable, but have expanded preservation advocacy to include environmental concerns, including anti-fracking campaigns or opposition to other forms of mineral mining. NPS personnel whom I interviewed were particularly outspoken about the deleterious effects of climate change on the resources under their care. Tourism at ancient places has caused well over a century of harm at those sites, but typically is low on the list of ills to defeat—though some archaeologists and some Tribal representatives alike would prefer to keep traffic at these heritage sites to a minimum.

By preservation advocacy, I describe the act of speaking on behalf of the issue of preservation, attempting to persuade others that the ongoing ethical care of ancient places is in the public interest. NPS personnel and other contacts within the heritage industry have indicated to me that the term advocacy is off-putting due to its connotation with activism. Because of job precarity and sometimes-hostile political environments, these social actors preferred to avoid any possible connection with a form of activism that might be considered unprofessional. This is somewhat ironic, given that much of the job of NPS interpretive staff is to persuade visitors to treat places like Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon respectfully. They

[151] E.g., Fiero, Dirt, Water, Stone.

are the most obvious advocates of the material site, in some sense. Personnel at the non-profit organization, Crow Canyon Archaeological Center, were free from some of these concerns because they are not federal employees; this organization embraces its advocacy role, even intervening in the Bears Ears controversy in 2016-2017.

I have made the conscious decision to refer to places like Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon primarily as indigenous heritage sites, ancient indigenous places, or Southwestern antiquities. I have chosen these terms in lieu of calling them archaeological sites, which might seem like the more straightforward nomenclature. However, archaeological expertise in matters of indigenous heritage in the United States has been privileged historically, and continues to hold a place of prominence in the law. To emphasize these places as archaeological sites seems to me to perpetuate one of the power imbalances that I seek to alter through my research. By recalling that these places are part of the living cultures of the American Indian peoples of the Southwestern United States, I hope to remind readers that they are heritage, not data.

To refer to Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon as ancient may raise questions, as well. They were certainly in their primary use as housing or administrative structures until the thirteenth century. According to a Eurocentric reckoning of history, this period would equate to the middle ages. It is not antiquity in the Greek sense, where we might date things two and a half millennia before the present. So, referring to Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon as if they are ancient or antiquities is a choice based on precedent, and based on limited options. American antiquities always have included these centuries-old structures in the Southwest, once the Anglo-American public knew about them. Other ways of designating them as old and no longer in use might include calling them prehistoric or Pre-Columbian, but both of

these methods suffer from the same Eurocentrism I attempt to avoid in other choices—though reference to European contact as a major historical event is sometimes unavoidable. Prehistory is a term based on whether or not cultures had a written language, and it is not particularly helpful in talking about actual time depth, since many cultures living contemporaneously will have different ways of sharing their histories, not all of which are written down. To call the sites Pre-Columbian also places America's deep history in the European reckoning of time, though it is technically true that they ceased to hold their primary cultural functions by the time of European contact. Finally, a number of people who are among the descendant populations of the Ancestral Puebloans, as well as journalists and researchers, call places like Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon "ancestral places." Because these are not *my* ancestral places, I have not adopted the term—though it seems to avoid a number of the terminological complications that I have pointed out.[152]

I had a conversation with one of my informants, an American Indian woman working alongside the NPS, in which she expressed frustration with the terminologies that non-American Indian people use to talk about places like Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon. She felt that any charged language encouraged Anglo-American visitors to treat the sites in peculiar ways. Examples of that language included, in particular, calling these places sacred sites—though she felt calling them ancient or special had the same kind of connotation. Examples of mistreatment included spreading cremated remains at the antiquities, or depositing new age crystals as votive offerings. This is to say that charged terminology might be part of the framework that leads social actors unaware of the broader cultural and historical contexts of these places to use them in spiritual or religious ways that run counter

[152] E.g., Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson, throughout article.

to the wishes of descendant populations. This is rhetorical enchantment at work! Although I have retained use of the word ancient, I try to avoid calling Southwestern antiquities sacred in light of this informant's concern about the mistranslation of sanctity into Anglo-American practices. On site, her input sparked quite a lively discussion about better terminologies, and those present deliberated at length without reaching a consensus.

The careful reader already will have observed that I have chosen to capitalize the words "American Indian" and "Native," as well as "Anglo-American." Yet, I have chosen not to capitalize the words "indigenous" "descendant," and "white." The literature is divided on whether or not one should capitalize "indigenous," and I have followed the example of indigenous archaeologist Joe Watkins and others in leaving it lower-case.[153] Other resources concede that "[t]here is no official consensus on when to capitalize certain terms . . . it may not be necessary to capitalize when using the term as an adjective and not in direct reference to a population."[154] As another resource noted, "[c]apitalization is always tricky."[155] As both indigeneity and whiteness are fairly vague identity markers that occur globally, I have not capitalized them; I consider them adjectives that may not refer to *a* population. By contrast, whenever I refer more specifically to regional or ethnic identity, I adopt capitalization (i.e., "American Indian").

---

[153] I imitate Watkins' capitalization style as it appears in *Indigenous Archaeology*.

[154] "Terminology," *Indigenous Foundations*, accessed June 23, 2018, https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/terminology/#capitalize.

[155] Edward C. Valandra, "Convention Style Sheet for Native Subject-Matters," *Living Justice Press*, accessed June 23, 2018, http://www.livingjusticepress.org/index.asp?SEC=B4B4C73A-A47B-45FF-B4EC-5DEBCD176F02&DE=35C447F0-97CA-400E-943C-6011DCE669A2.

Whenever possible, I have attempted to acknowledge the nationality of Native individuals. However, in the interest of protecting the identities of interview participants, it was not always possible to include this information; moreover, sometimes they did not volunteer their nationality, though they *did* identify explicitly as American Indian. In such scenarios (including the anecdote about whether or not to call sites "sacred"), I used the greatest degree of specificity that it seemed ethical to use. The historical record also failed regularly in providing the nationalities of the American Indian people to whom white authors referred, resulting in further generic terminology in the body of the dissertation.

As other terminological ambiguities appear throughout the remainder of the text, I shall address them on an *ad hoc* basis. In general, however, the vocabulary that I have selected has been selected for the sake of foregrounding the role of Southwestern antiquities within American Indian cultures, to decrease the emphasis on archaeological and Eurocentric value systems prevalent in the historical record, and to opt for the clearest terms available while avoiding other connotative pitfalls.

Chapter Descriptions

In the chapters to follow, I examine rhetoric produced by explorers, archaeologists, and advocates, as well as the preservation policies that were the outcome of advocacy campaigns that began in the late nineteenth century. The second chapter takes up the documents produced by a variety of researchers and journalists who partook in early investigations of Southwestern antiquities, from the mid-nineteenth to early twentieth centuries. None of these authors identified as a preservation advocate, but all played a part in introducing Southwestern antiquities to the Anglo-American public. I focus, there, on texts that introduced Mesa Verde to the rest of the country. The third chapter is an examination of

rhetoric produced by the earliest and best-known preservation advocates who operated on behalf of Southwestern antiquities. This includes several works by three social actors, two of whom were researchers, and one of whom was the regent of the Colorado Cliff Dwellings Association, a women's advocacy group. The fourth chapter examines preservation policies written over a hundred years of preservation advocacy, and many of which were the result of lobbying on the part of archaeologists. By concluding with preservation policies and how they have changed over time, the dissertation begins to address how attitudes apparent within the federal preservation of indigenous heritage have shifted, and how some have stayed the same. It also moves some of the findings from earlier chapters from the particular to the general, and from the past to the present.

In more detail, the second chapter of this dissertation examines the introduction of Mesa Verde into public discourse, as it was written about by white scientists and explorers during the second half of the 19th century. These include two articles submitted in the *Bulletin of the U.S. Geological and Geographical Survey of the Territories* by photographer William H. Jackson (1875) and geologist William H. Holmes (1876), as well as *Crest of the Continent*, written by Ernest Ingersoll (1885). All three of these men traveled with a government funded expedition known as the Hayden Survey, and refer intertextually to one another's accounts of Mesa Verde when sharing its attributes with their readership. I also analyze Frederick Chapin's *The Land of the Cliff Dwellers* (1892). Chapin was a well-known mountaineer and celebrated author, and he offered a more colloquial account of his experience at Mesa Verde. I round out this set of texts with the published record of the first methodical excavation of Mesa Verde by Swedish researcher Gustaf Nordenskiöld, translated into English as *The Cliff Dwellers of the Mesa Verde* (1893).

I have limited the scope of the conversation in chapter two to Mesa Verde because, as one archaeologist wrote, "a more weird sight" than Mesa Verde's alcove dwellings was "hardly to be seen in traveling over the known world."[156] The way that Mesa Verde first was situated in Anglo-American discourse is telling of the worldviews of the authors who shared its story with the outside world. I call these worldviews the technological and poetic psychoses, drawing from the dramatistic theory of the occupational psychosis. The technological psychosis appealed to the myth of scientific rationality, and was the professional or scholarly mode of engaging with Mesa Verde. The poetic psychosis appealed to a more literary impulse among the authors whose works I assess in chapter two. At the same time that the authors portrayed Mesa Verde as a scientific specimen, they also imagined it as a romantic ruin, and fantasized about the lives of the people who once lived there. The inter-imbrication of the technological and poetic psychoses demonstrates the irrational within the myth of the rational, or scientific irrationality.

The third chapter of the dissertation continues to interrogate the enchantments of Anglo-American engagement with Southwestern antiquities by analyzing early preservation advocacy on behalf of ancient indigenous places. The first advocate whose publications I study is Adolph Bandelier, who was an early alarmist concerning the state of Southwestern antiquities. In 1881, Bandelier published a report that catalyzed many conversations in Congress about preserving antiquities, though ultimately those deliberations failed to result in a policy enactment. Today, Bandelier is considered by a number of historians of the Southwest to have been something of a pioneer in terms of preservation advocacy,

---

[156] Edgar Lee Hewett, *Ancient Ruins of the Southwest* (Denver: Carson-Harper, 1909), 13.

archaeology, and ethnology, though his legacy is tarnished because of racial prejudice apparent in some of his theoretical claims.[157] I study two of Bandelier's reports, which merge advocacy, archaeology, and ethnology. Another researcher, Edgar Lee Hewett, joins Bandelier in my analysis. Hewett was tasked in 1904 with surveying the extent of vandalism at Southwestern antiquities on behalf of the United States government. As I mentioned already, Hewett later became part of an antiquities bill alliance. The antiquities bill alliance drafted the Antiquities Act of 1906, and promoted the bill until its passage. Some of Hewett's very words are still part of American preservation policy, and for this reason we may consider him among the most influential Anglo-American preservation advocates from these early days of advocacy.

Bandelier and Hewett represent the professional ethnological or archaeological perspectives on preservation advocacy at the turn of the twentieth century. Operating outside of the sciences or politics, per se, there were a number of clubs and organizations who took advocacy upon themselves during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Among these was the Colorado Cliff Dwellings Association, with chapters across the country. This organization's primary focus was to turn Mesa Verde into either a state or national park. It was led by a socialite from the East Coast named Virginia (Donaghé) McClurg. McClurg is a paradoxical figure, for she began her engagement with Mesa Verde with rhetoric similar to the explorers and researchers in the second chapter. She portrayed herself to be on a hero's journey, questing after objects rather than knowledge—though to many of the social actors I study, these were equivalent. Rather than feigning objectivity, however, McClurg

[157] Gordon R. Willey and Jeremy A. Sabloff, *A History of American Archaeology*, 3rd ed. (New York: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1993). These authors discuss Bandelier's emphasis on cultural evolution, and his dismissive attitude towards indigenous cultures.

unabashedly pursued poetic engagement with the site, and won an award for a poem she wrote about the Southwest. Some years after publishing journalistic coverage of her own exploits at Mesa Verde, McClurg founded the Colorado Cliff Dwellings Association, and began to write and speak about her club's efforts as if they were a continuation of her own hero's journey. McClurg ultimately failed to persuade other club members or politicians to tend to Mesa Verde in the manner she proposed, but she stands out as an unusual and well-remembered preservation advocate from this period in history because of her gender, her rhetorical methods, and her large personality.

Whereas McClurg used rhetoric to advance self-serving myths, such as her own quest for success, Bandelier and Hewett emphasized as myths several narratives about a greater good, concern over clashes of culture, and the motion of progress. Differing from all of the other rhetors under discussion, both Bandelier and Hewett adopted a paternalistic attitude towards the American Indian people whom they studied, and expressed these attitudes in relation to their extensive archaeological and ethnological research. Bandelier and Hewett also advocated for the preservation of both antiquities *and* people, in a manner that is unsettling for the contemporary reader. Bandelier claimed that American Indian peoples needed to be urged onto the path of progress towards European-styled civilization, whereas Hewett felt they needed to be protected *from* white people, even going so far as to suggest "human game preserves" to cloister indigenous people from Anglo-American society.[158] While these men supposed that they worked towards the betterment of society, they proposed a number of policies that would have amounted to social engineering, all motivated by myths

[158] Edgar Lee Hewett, *Ancient Life in the American Southwest* (New York: Tudor Publishing Company, 1943), 174–75.

that appealed to American prosperity.

Together, the rhetorics expressed by Bandelier, Hewett, and McClurg demonstrated a variety of values for Southwestern antiquities, and they expressed those values according to the tenets of different poetic categories, as theorized by Burke. Bandelier adopted the tragic frame in describing the Ancestral Puebloans and their descendants, presenting himself as an all-knowing narrator resigned to a sad fate for the Other. McClurg favored the epic frame, in which she situated herself as a hero and described other concerns as somewhat incidental. Hewett typically adopted the comedy when describing Chaco Canyon and contemporary indigenous people. Hewett's version of comedy traveled between critique and adulation, however. At the same time that he derided his archaeological peers for their poor professional practices, Hewett fetishized American Indian people. What drew all three of these social actors together as preservation advocates is that they all *rejected* vandalism and government racism, as they interpreted those phenomena, and included plaints against those trespasses within their works.

Bandelier and Hewett echoed the sentiment of authors in the second chapter in attributing great scientific value to Southwestern antiquities, *as well as* the living American Indian peoples of the American Southwest. All of the preservation advocates valued Southwestern antiquities as uniquely *American* resources, and viewed their preservation in line with American patriotism and advancement. Bandelier and Hewett also felt that any knowledge of America's indigenous peoples, whether in the past or the present, would serve to ameliorate social tensions resulting from living in a settler society, though they used different terminology to discuss it. These early discourses of preservation advocacy illustrated naturalized racism prevalent at the turn of the twentieth century, such that social

actors who understood themselves to be concerned with indigenous rights seldom questioned their own right to meddle in the affairs of others. Most significantly, the advocates' emphasis on data and the character of the nation entered into preservation policy at the turn of the twentieth century, alongside the Anglo-American privilege evident in the advocates' engagement with Southwestern antiquities.

The fourth chapter builds on the second and third chapters by examining the influence of scientific rationality and the ethics of preservation advocacy as both have entered into federal preservation policies concerning Southwestern antiquities. I begin the analysis by assessing the language of federal preservation policies affecting all national heritage sites, after which I assess a collection of site-specific national monument and national park designations concerning the antiquities of the American Southwest. I divide the site-specific park and monument designations by historical period. I analyze all of these preservation policies according to their uses of poetic language in the service of cultural myths, and in the way that preservation policy as a whole appealed to the god term, Science.

In Chapter Four, I assess the rhetoric of preservation policies such as the Antiquities Act (1906), the Organic Act (1916), the Historic Sites Act (1935), the National Historic Preservation Act (1966), the Archeological and Historic Preservation Act (1974), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (1979), and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (1990). For the site-specific preservation policies in the American Southwest, I have divided the texts into two generations: those that were passed before World War II, and those that came after. In the first generation of site-specific monument designations, I examine the proclamation of Casa Grande Ruin (1892), the Mesa Verde National Park bill (1906), and the national monument designations for sites like Montezuma

Castle National Monument in (1906), Chaco Canyon (1907), Gila Cliff Dwellings (1907), and Tonto National Monument (1907). The second generation of site-specific monument designations includes Public Law 101-313, passed during George H.W. Bush's administration, concerning Petroglyph National Monument, Pecos National Historical Park, and Zuni-Cibola National Historical Park (1990); Bill Clinton's proclamations of Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument (1996) and Canyons of the Ancients National Monument (2000); and, finally, Barack Obama's proclamation of Bears Ears National Monument (2016).

While the national preservation policies, the first generation of park and monument designations, and the second generation of monument designations all deferred to the god term Science, these three categories of preservation policy inflected the god term differentially. In national preservation policies, Science appeared within a context of nationalistic myths and a patriotic poetics. In the first generation of park and monument designations specific to the American Southwest, myths of primitivism and a fetishistic poetics about the indigenous peoples of the region transformed Science into a science of indigeneity. In the most recent monument designations in the American Southwest, myths about scientific discovery, universal humanism, and the beauty of the American landscape transformed Science into an overtly enchanted phenomenon, with a poetry of its own.

The fifth and final chapter revisits the major theoretical claims of the dissertation, concerning the rhetorical enchantments of Anglo-American preservation advocacy on behalf of ancient indigenous places in the American Southwest. As contexts for rhetoric, archaeology, advocacy, and policy fulfilled differing generic requirements. The social actors who introduced Mesa Verde to the Anglo-American public enchanted their audiences with

the beauty and supposed mystery of the site, speaking on behalf of their own research and its significance more than on behalf of the preservation of the place. The advocates also used language to persuade their readers and auditors that Southwestern antiquities were remarkable, and sometimes used poetic language to portray indigenous peoples as similarly exotic. Though they defended both antiquities and human rights for American Indian peoples (as they interpreted those rights), these rhetors contributed to myths of primitivism that were prevalent in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Because preservation policies typically have been more general, they have avoided some of the troubling rhetorical tendencies present in the scholarly accounts of Southwestern antiquities. Some of these policies have become argumentative commonplaces for preservation advocates still active in the Southwest, today. Because of its symbolic persistence, the rhetoric of turn-of-the-twentieth century preservation advocacy requires study. Its legacy is addressed in the final chapter, through an overview of the ongoing attempts to assure the preservation of Southwestern antiquities. I also discuss the major challenges for preservation advocacy as people practice it in the twenty-first century, looking to the lessons we can learn from the origins of preservation advocacy on behalf of ancient indigenous places as guidance—both for what is effective in maintaining the material integrity of ancient places, and for what *not* to do in terms of fetishizing the Other or framing human histories as science. With reference to my interviews with heritage practitioners, as well as recent efforts to set aside Southwestern antiquities as protected federal property, I identify both tendencies still at work in contemporary Anglo-American preservation advocacy on behalf of ancient indigenous places.

Summary

Archaeologists, advocates, and policymakers at the turn of the 20th century relied on cultural myths to make sense of a strange-to-them phenomenon, and exhibited cultural prejudice and enchantment as they attempted to persuade others that Southwestern antiquities required ongoing (Anglo-American) care. The manner by which researchers, advocates, and policymakers continue to justify their worldviews, their status, and their actions through their public valuations of ancient indigenous places has not changed much from the earliest Anglo-American rhetoric about ancient indigenous places. This reality illustrates much about politics and patriotism in a settler society, where indigenous heritage can become a vessel used by the state, memory institutions, political collectives, social groups, and individuals, towards different ends, benefitting different parties.

In spite of what the rhetoric of preservation advocacy demonstrates, ancient places can be framed in ways that challenge elitist, commercialized, Eurocentric, and supposedly rationalized forms of relationality. Understanding the history of Anglo-American preservation advocacy on behalf of ancient indigenous places in the United States helps to outline some of the potentialities and problematics of allyship on behalf of indigenous rights in a settler society. Privileged social actors can gain an outsized influence in political environments, and can be effective in changing attitudes, comportment, and policy. What they do with that privilege, and its legacy, is consequential. Southwestern antiquities continue to act as emblems in the lasting fight for indigenous rights, as well as in efforts to promote environmental conservation, social responsibility, and the status of science. Many values are attributed to ancient indigenous places, and the myths told about them demonstrate their current place in society, while reflecting upon the relationships among Native nations and the federal government. This effort to historicize ongoing discursive relationships is an

attempt to show some of the work that remains to be done in decolonizing indigenous heritage management in the United States.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1983. doi:10.1002/9780470670590.wbeog285.

Aoki, Eric, Greg Dickinson, and Brian L. Ott. "The Master Naturalist Imagined: Directed Movement and Simulations at the Draper Museum of Natural History." In *Places of Public Memory*, edited by Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, and Brian L. Ott. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2010.

Appel, Edward C. "Burlesque Drama as a Rhetorical Genre: The Hudibrastic Ridicule of William F. Buckley, Jr." *Western Journal of Communication* 60, no. 3 (1996): 269–84. doi:https://doi-org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1080/10570319609374547.

———. "Rush to Judgment: Burlesque, Tragedy, and Hierarchal Alchemy in the Rhetoric of America's Foremost Political Talkshow Host." *Southern Communication Journal* 68, no. 3 (2003): 217–30. doi:https://doi-org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1080/10417940309373262.

———. "The Rhetoric of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.: Comedy and Context in Tragic Collision." *Western Journal of Communication* 61, no. 4 (1997): 376–402.

Aristotle. *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*. Edited and translated by George A. Kennedy. New York: University of Oxford Press, 1991.

Asch, Michael. "Anthropology, Colonialism and the Reflexive Turn: Finding a Place to Stand." *Anthropologica* 57, no. 2 (2015): 481–89.

Askew, Marc. "The Magic List of Global Status: UNESCO, World Heritage and the Agendas of States." In *Heritage and Globalisation*, edited by Sophia Labadi and Colin Long, 19–44. New York: Routledge, 2010.

Atalay, Sonya. "Indigenous Archaeology as Decolonizing Practice." *The American Indian Quarterly* 30, no. 3 (2006): 280–310. doi:10.1353/aiq.2006.0015.

Balthrop, V. William. "Culture, Myth, and Ideology as Public Argument: An Interpretation of the Ascent and Demise of 'Southern Culture.'" *Communication Monographs* 51, no. 4 (1984): 339–52. doi:10.1080/03637758409390206.

Barthes, Roland. *Mythologies*. Translated by Richard Howard and Annette Lavers. New York: Hill and Wang, 1957.

Bednar, Robert M. "Being Here, Looking There: Mediating Vistas in the National Parks of the Contemporary American West." In *Observation Points: The Visual Poetics of National Parks*, edited by Thomas Patin, 1–28. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012.

Bennett, Jane. *The Enchantment of Modern Life: Attachments, Crossings, and Ethics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Biesecker, Barbara A. *Addressing Postmodernity: Kenneth Burke, Rhetoric, and a Theory of Social Change*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1997.

Black, Jason Edward. "Indigenizing the Rhetoric and Public Address Classroom: Memory as a Native American Discursive Tactic." *Communication Teacher* 27, no. 1 (2012): 21–28. doi:10.1080/17404622.2012.737923.

———. "Native Authenticity, Rhetorical Circulation, and Neocolonial Decay: The Case of Chief Seattle's Controversial Speech." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 15, no. 4 (2012): 635–46.

———. "Native Resistive Rhetoric and the Decolonization of American Indian Removal Discourse." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 95, no. 1 (2009): 66–88. doi:10.1080/00335630802621052.

———. "Remembrances of Removal: Native Resistance to Allotment and the Unmasking of Paternal Benevolence." *Southern Communication Journal* 72, no. 2 (2007): 185–203. doi:10.1080/10417940701316690.

Blair, Carole, V. W. Balthrop, and Neil Michel. "Mood of the Material: War Memory and Imagining Otherwise." *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies* 13, no. 1 (November 18, 2012): 6–20. doi:10.1177/1532708612464632.

Blair, Carole, Greg Dickinson, and Brian L. Ott. "Introduction: Rhetoric/Memory/Place." In *Places of Public Memory*, edited by Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, and Brian L. Ott, 1–54. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2010.

Blair, Carole, and Neil Michel. "Reproducing Civil Rights Tactics: The Rhetorical Performances of the Civil Rights Memorial." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 30, no. 2 (2000): 31–55.

Blankenship, Jane. "'Magic' and 'Mystery' in the Works of Kenneth Burke." In *The Legacy of Kenneth Burke*, edited by Herbert W. Simons and Trevor Melia, 128–55. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.

Blankenship, Jane, Edward Murphy, and Marie Rosenwasser. "Pivotal Terms in the Early Works of Kenneth Burke." *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 7, no. 1 (1974): 1–24.

Bobbitt, David A. *The Rhetoric of Redemption: Kenneth Burke's Redemption Drama and Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "I Have a Dream" Speech*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2004.

Bonnstetter, Beth E. "Mel Brooks Meets Kenneth Burke (and Mikhail Bakhtin): Comedy and Burlesque in Satiric Film." *Journal of Film and Video* 63, no. 1 (2011): 18–31. doi:10.5406/jfilmvideo.63.1.0018.

Boime, Albert. “George Catlin’s Wilderness Utopia.” In *Observation Points: The Visual Poetics of National Parks*, edited by Thomas Patin, 207–28. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012.

Bowman, Michael S. “Looking for Stonewall’s Arm: Tourist Performance as Research Method.” In *Opening Acts: Performance In/as Communication and Cultural Studies*, edited by Judith Hamera, 102–33. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2006.

———. “Tracing Mary Queen of Scots.” In *Places of Public Memory*, edited by Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, and Brian L. Ott, 191–215. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2010.

Brady, Miranda J. “Governmentality and the National Museum of the American Indian: Understanding the Indigenous Museum in a Settler Society.” *Social Identities* 14, no. 6 (November 2008): 763–73. doi:10.1080/13504630802462885.

Breglia, Lisa. *Monumental Ambivalence: The Politics of Heritage*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2006.

Brouwer, Daniel C., and Robert Asen. *Public Modalities*. Edited by Daniel C. Brouwer and Robert Asen. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2010.

Buerkle, C. Wesley, Michael E. Mayer, and Clark D. Olson. “Our Hero the Buffoon: Contradictory and Concurrent Burkean Framing of Arizona Governor Evan Mecham.” *Western Journal of Communication* 67, no. 2 (2003): 187–206. doi:https://doi-org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1080/10570310309374766.

Burke, Kenneth. *Attitudes Toward History*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1961.

———. *Counter-Statement*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.

———. “Four Master Tropes.” *The Kenyon Review* 3, no. 4 (1941): 421–38.

———. *A Grammar of Motives*. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1955.

———. “Ideology and Myth.” *Accent* 7 (1947): 195–205.

———. *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.

———. *Permanence and Change: An Anatomy of Purpose*. 3rd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

———. *The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action*. 3rd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.

———. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. 3rd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

———.*The Rhetoric of Religion: Studies in Logology*. 2nd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970.

Burkholder, Thomas R. "Kansas Populism, Woman Suffrage, and the Agrarian Myth: A Case Study in the Limits of Mythic Transcendence." *Communication Studies* 40, no. 4 (1989): 292–307. doi:10.1080/10510978909368282.

Butterworth, Michael L. "The Passion of the Tebow: Sports Media and Heroic Language in the Tragic Frame." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 30, no. 1 (March 2013): 17–33. doi:10.1080/15295036.2012.701010.

Ceccarelli, Leah. *On the Frontier of Science: An American Rhetoric of Exploration and Exploitation*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 2013.

———. *Shaping Science with Rhetoric: The Cases of Dobzhansky, Schrodinger, and Wilson*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

Chatterjee, Partha. "The Nation in Heterogeneous Time." *Futures* 37 (2005): 925–42. doi:10.1016/j.futures.2005.01.011.

Clark, Gregory. *Civic Jazz: American Music and Kenneth Burke on the Art of Getting Along*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015.

———. *Rhetorical Landscapes in America: Variations on a Theme From Kenneth Burke*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2004.

Clifford, James. "Four Northwest Coast Museums: Travel Reflections." In *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*, 107–45. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip, and T.J. Ferguson. "Memory Pieces and Footprints: Multivocality and the Meanings of Ancient Times and Ancestral Places among the Zuni and Hopi." *American Anthropologist* 108, no. 1 (2006): 148–62. doi:10.1525/aa.2006.108.1.148;

Coupe, Laurence. *Kenneth Burke on Myth*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Dickinson, Greg, Brian L. Ott, and Eric Aoki. "Memory and Myth at the Buffalo Bill Museum." *Western Journal of Communication* 69, no. 2 (April 2005): 85–108. doi:10.1080/10570310500076684.

———. "Spaces of Remembering and Forgetting: The Reverent Eye/I at the Plains Indian Museum." *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 3, no. 1 (March 2006): 27–47. doi:10.1080/14791420500505619.

Deloria, Philip J. *Playing Indian*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Deloria, Vine. *Red Earth, White Lies: Native Americans and the Myth of Scientific Fact.* Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing, 1997.

Dorsey, Leroy G., and Rachel M. Harlow. "'We Want Americans Pure and Simple': Theodore Roosevelt and the Myth of Americanism." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 6, no. 1 (2003): 55–78. doi:https://doi.org/10.1353/rap.2003.0027.

Dube, Saurabh. "Modernity and Its Enchantments: An Introduction." In *Enchantments of Modernity: Empire, Nation, Globalization*, edited by Saurabh Dube, 1–41. London: Routledge, 2009.

Endres, Danielle. "American Indian Activism and Audience: Rhetorical Analysis of Leonard Peltier's Response to Denial of Clemency." *Communication Reports* 24, no. 1 (2011): 1–11. doi:10.1080/08934215.2011.554624.

———. "American Indian Permission for Mascots: Resistance or Complicity within Rhetorical Colonialism?" *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 18, no. 4 (2015): 649–90.

———. "The Rhetoric of Nuclear Colonialism: Rhetorical Exclusion of American Indian Arguments in the Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Siting Decision." *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 6, no. 1 (2009): 39–60. doi:10.1080/14791420802632103.

Erni, J N. "Enchanted: Harry Potter and Magical Capitalism in Urban China." *Chinese Journal of Communication* 1, no. 2 (2008): 138–55. doi:Doi 10.1080/17544750802287828.

Farris, Sara R. *Max Weber's Theory of Personality: Individuation, Politics and Orientalism in the Sociology of Religion*. Boston: Brill, 2013.

Fiero, Kathleen. *Dirt, Water, Stone: A Century of Preserving Mesa Verde*. Durango, Colorado: Durango Herald Small Press, 2006.

Fowler, Don D. *A Laboratory for Anthropology*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000.

Frentz, Thomas S. "Memory, Myth, and Rhetoric in Plato's Phaedrus." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 36, no. 3 (2006): 243–62. doi:10.1080/02773940500511546.

Frentz, Thomas S., and Janice Hocker Rushing. "'Mother Isn't Quite Herself Today:' Myth and Spectacle in The Matrix." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 19, no. 1 (2002): 64–86. doi:10.1080/07393180216551.

Gaonkar, Dilip Parameshwar. "On Alternative Modernities." In *Alternative Modernities*, Gaonkar, D., 1–18. Durham: Duke University Press, 2001.

Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday Press, 1990.

Goodnight, G. Thomas. “The Personal, Technical, and Public Spheres of Argument: A Speculative Inquiry Into the Art of Public Deliberation.” *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 18, no. 4 (1982): 214–27.

Gronbeck, Bruce E. “Rushing, Frentz, and the Matter of Psychological Rhetorical Criticism.” *Southern Communication Journal* 71, no. 2 (2006): 159–63. doi:10.1080/10417940600681467.

Handler, Richard, and Eric Gable. *The New History in an Old Museum: Creating the Past at Colonial Williamsburg*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997.

Harrison, Rodney. *Heritage: Critical Approaches.* London: Routledge, 2013.

Hawhee, Debra. *Moving Bodies: Kenneth Burke at the Edges of Language*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2009.

Hewett, Edgar Lee. *Ancient Life in the American Southwest*. New York: Tudor Publishing Company, 1943.

———. *Ancient Ruins of the Southwest*. Denver: Carson-Harper, 1909.

Hochmuth, Marie. “Burkeian Criticism.” *Western Speech*, 1957, 89–95.

Holland, Virginia. “Rhetorical Criticism: A Burkeian Method.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 39, no. 4 (December 1953): 444–50. doi:10.1080/00335635309381911.

Jensen, Kyle, and Krista Ratcliffe. “Mythic Historiography: Refiguring Kenneth Burke’s Deceitful Woman Trope.” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 48, no. 1 (2018): 88–107. doi:10.1080/02773945.2017.1278780.

Josephson-Storm, Jason A. *The Myth of Disenchantment: Magic, Modernity, and the Birth of the Human Sciences*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2017.

Kelly, Casey Ryan. “Blood-Speak: Ward Churchill and the Racialization of American Indian Identity.” *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 8, no. 3 (2011): 240–265. doi:10.1080/14791420.2011.594070.

Klope, David C. “Defusing a Foreign Policy Crisis: Myth and Victimage in Reagan’s 1983 Lebanon/Grenada Address.” *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 50, no. 4 (1986): 37–41.

Lake, Randall A. “Between Myth and History: Enacting Time in Native American Protest Rhetoric.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 77, no. 77 (1991): 123–51.

———. “Enacting Red Power: The Consummatory Function in Native American Protest Rhetoric.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 69 (1983): 127–42.

Landsberg, Alison. *Prosthetic Memory: The Transformation of American Remembrance in the Age of Mass Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.

Landy, Joshua, and Michael Saler, eds. *The Re-Enchantment of the World: Secular Magic in a Rational Age*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009.

Latour, B. *We Have Never Been Modern*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 2003.

Lewis, Camille Kaminski. *Romancing the Difference: Kenneth Burke, Bob Jones University, and the Rhetoric of Religious Fundamentalism*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007.

Lindsay, Stan A. *A Concise Kenneth Burke Concordance*. Orlando, FL: Say Press, 2004.

Lister, Robert H., and Florence C. Lister. *Those Who Came Before*. 2nd ed. Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press, 1994.

Loew, Patty, and Kelly Mella. "Black Ink and the New Red Power: Native American Newspapers and Tribal Sovereignty." *Journalism and Communication Monographs* 7, no. 3 (2005): 99–142.

Lonetree, Amy. *Decolonizing Museums: Representing Native America in National and Tribal Museums*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2012.

Lyne, John. "Bio-Rhetorics: Moralizing the Life Sciences." In *The Rhetorical Turn: Invention and Persuasion in the Conduct of Inquiry*, edited by Herbert W. Simons, 35–57. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Macdonald, Charlotte J. "Two Peoples, One Museum." In *Contested Histories in Public Space: Memory, Race, and Nation*, edited by Daniel J. Walkowitz and Lisa Maya Knauer. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009.

Marcus, Julie. "The Journey Out to the Centre: The Cultural Appropriation of Ayers Rock." In *Race Matters: Indigenous Australians and "Our" Society*, edited by Gillian Cowlishaw and Barry Morris, 29–52. Canberra, ACT: Aboriginal Studies Press, 1997.

Massey, Doreen B. *For Space*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2005.

McCue-Enser, Margret. "Ada Deer and the Menominee Restoration: Rethinking Native American Protest Rhetoric." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 53, no. 1 (2017): 59–76.

McGee, Michael C. "In Search of 'the People': A Rhetorical Alternative." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61, no. 3 (1975): 235–49.

Mitchell, Timothy. "Orientalism and the Exhibitionary Order." In *The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology*, edited by Donald Preziosi. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Mechling, Elizabeth Walker. “Patricia Hearst: Myth America 1974, 1975, 1976.” *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 43, no. 3 (1979): 168–79. doi:10.1080/10570317909373966.

Mechling, Elizabeth Walker, and Jay Mechling. “Sweet Talk: The Moral Rhetoric against Sugar.” *Central States Speech Journal* 34, no. 1 (1983): 19–32. doi:10.1080/10510978309368111.

———. “The Jung and the Restless: The Mythopoetic Men’s Movement.” *Southern Communication Journal* 59, no. 2 (1994): 97–111. doi:10.1080/10417949409372929.

Moore, Mark P. “‘The Quayle Quagmire’: Political Campaigns in the Poetic Form of Burlesque.” *Western Journal of Communication* 56, no. 2 (1992): 108–24. doi:https://doi-org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1080/10570319209374406.

Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Inoperative Community*. Edited by Peter Connor. Translated by Peter Connor and Lisa Garbus. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991.

Nash, Donna J. “Household Archaeology in the Andes.” *Journal of Archaeological Research* 17, no. 3 (March 27, 2009): 205–61. doi:10.1007/s10814-009-9029-7.

Nicholas, George P. “Seeking the End of Indigenous Archaeology.” In *Bridging the Divide: Indigenous Communities and Archaeology into the 21st Century*, edited by Caroline Phillips and Harry Allen. London: Routledge, 2010.

Patin, Thomas. “America In Ruins: Parks, Poetics, and Politics.” In *Observation Points: The Visual Poetics of National Parks*, edited by Thomas Patin, 267–89. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012.

Pollock, Della. *Exceptional Spaces: Essays in Performance and History*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998.

Olbrys, Stephen Gencarella. “Disciplining the Carnivalesque: Chris Farley’s Exotic Dance.” *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 3, no. 3 (2006): 240–59.

Osborn, Michael. “Rhetorical Depiction.” In *Form, Genre, and the Study of Political Discourse*, edited by Herbert W. Simons and Aram A. Aghazarian, 79–107, 1986.

———. “The Trajectory of My Work with Metaphor.” *Southern Communication Journal* 74, no. 1 (2009): 79–87. doi:10.1080/10417940802559131.

Ott, Brian L., and Eric Aoki. “The Politics of Negotiating Public Tragedy: Media Framing of the Matthew Shepard Murder.” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 5, no. 3 (2002): 483–505. doi:10.1353/rap.2002.0060.

Palczewski, Catherine Helen. “When Times Collide: Ward Churchill’s Use of an Epideictic Moment to Ground Forensic Argument.” *Argumentation and Advocacy* 41, no. Winter (2005): 123–38.

Ritter, Kurt W. “The Myth-Making Functions of the Rhetoric of the American Revolution: Francis Hopkinson as a Case Study.” *Communication Quarterly* 23, no. 2 (1975): 25–31. doi:10.1080/01463377509369176.

Rowland, Robert C. “On Mythic Criticism.” *Communication Studies* 41, no. 2 (1990): 101–16. doi:10.1080/10510979009368293.

Rushing, Janice Hocker. “The Rhetoric of the American Western Myth.” *Communication Monographs* 50, no. 1 (1983): 14–32. doi:10.1080/03637758309390151.

Rushing, Janice Hocker, and Thomas S. Frentz. “Integrating Ideology and Archetype in Rhetorical Criticism.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 77, no. 4 (1991): 385–406. doi:10.1080/00335639109383970.

———. *Projecting the Shadow: The Cyborg Hero in American Film*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

———. “Singing over the Bones: James Cameron’s Titanic.” *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 17, no. 1 (2000): 1–27. doi:10.1080/15295030009388373.

———. “The Frankenstein Myth in Contemporary Cinema.” *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 6, no. 1 (1989): 61–80. doi:10.1080/15295038909366731.

Sanchez, John, and Mary E. Stuckey. “The Rhetoric of American Indian Activism in the 1960s and 1970s.” *Communication Quarterly* 48, no. 2 (2000): 120–36. doi:10.1080/01463370009385586.

Schachner, Gregson. “Ancestral Pueblo Archaeology: The Value of Synthesis.” *Journal of Archaeological Research* 23, no. 1 (2015): 49–113. doi:10.1007/s10814-014-9078-4.

Schmitt, Casey R. “Contours of the Land: Place-as-Rhetoric and Native American Effigy Mounds.” *Western Journal of Communication* 79, no. 3 (2015): 307–26. doi:10.1080/10570314.2015.1041651.

Selby, Gary Steven. “Scoffing at the Enemy: The Burlesque Frame in the Rhetoric of Ralph David Abernathy.” *Southern Communication Journal* 70, no. 2 (2005): 134–45. doi:https://doi-org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1080/10417940509373319.

Simons, Herbert W. “Kenneth Burke and the Rhetoric of the Human Sciences.” In *The Legacy of Kenneth Burke*, edited by Herbert W. Simons and Trevor Media, 3–27. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.

———. , ed. *Rhetoric in the Human Sciences*. London: SAGE Publications, 1989.

Simons, Herbert W., and Trevor Melia, eds. *The Legacy of Kenneth Burke*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.

Singer, Ross. “Framing of Elite Corruption and Rhetorical Containment of Reform in the Boeing-Air Force Tanker Controversy.” *Southern Communication Journal* 76, no. 2 (2011): 97–119. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/10417940903180167.

Smith, Cynthia Duquette, and Teresa Bergman. “You Were on Indian Land: Alcatraz Island as Recalcitrant Memory Space.” In *Places of Public Memory*, edited by Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, and Brian Ott, 160–88. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2010.

Smith, Laurajane. *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

———. *Uses of Heritage*. London: Routledge, 2006.

Smith, Laurajane, and Emma Waterton. Heritage, *Communities and Archaeology*. London: Bloomsbury, 2009.

Solomon, Martha. “The Rhetoric of Dehumanization : An Analysis of Medical Reports of the Tuskegee Syphilis Project.” *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 49, no. 4 (1985): 233–47.

Stanton, Cathy. *The Lowell Experiment*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006.

Steudman, Michael. “The Guardian Genius of Democracy: The Myth of the Heroic Teaching in Lyndon B. Johnson’s Education Policy Rhetoric, 1964-1966.” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 17, no. 3 (2014): 477–510. doi:10.1353/rap.2014.0033.

Stiegler, Bernard. *The Re-Enchantment of the World: The Value of Spirit Against Industrial Populism*. Translated by Trevor Arthur. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.

Tillman, Gregory Anthony. *Hoopla in Harlem!* Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2009.

Trigger, Bruce G. *A History of Archaeological Thought*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

UNESCO. *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention.* Paris: World Heritage Centre, 2017.

Waisanen, Don J. “A Citizen’s Guides to Democracy Inaction: Jon Stewart and Stephen Colbert’s Comic Rhetorical Criticism.” *Southern Communication Journal* 74, no. 2 (2009): 119–40.

Watkins, Joe. *Indigenous Archaeology: American Indian Values and Scientific Practice*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press, 2000.

Watson, Martha. “The Issue Is Justice: Martin Luther King Jr.’s Response to the Birmingham Clergy.” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 7, no. 1 (2004): 1–22. doi:https://doi.org/10.1353/rap.2004.0032.

Watson, Martha Solomon. “Mary Church Terrell vs. Thomas Nelson Page: Gender, Race, and Class in Anti-Lynching Rhetoric.” *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 12, no. 1 (2009): 65–89.

Weber, David J., and William DeBuys. *First Impressions: A Reader’s Journey to Iconic Places of the American Southwest*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017.

Weber, Max. *From Max Weber*. Edited and translated by H. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills. New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Willey, Gordon R., and Jeremy A. Sabloff. *A History of American Archaeology*. 3rd ed. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1993.

Winter, Jay. *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European Cultural History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Young, Cory. “Contemporary Native American Rhetoric : A Narrative Criticism of the Cherokee Rally.” *Texas Speech Communication Journal* 29, no. 2 (2005): 131–41.

Zagacki, Kenneth S., and Victoria J. Gallagher. “Rhetoric and Materiality in the Museum Park at the North Carolina Museum of Art.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 95, no. 2 (May 2009): 171–91. doi:10.1080/00335630902842087.

CHAPTER TWO: THE TECHNOLOGICAL AND POETIC PSYCHOSES IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY ACCOUNTS OF MESA VERDE

In this chapter, I analyze the rhetoric of Mesa Verde's debut in Anglo-American public consciousness. I do so by examining texts produced by a collection of self-described explorers and archaeologists who published broadly about their first encounters with Mesa Verde: William Henry Jackson, William Henry Holmes, Ernest Ingersoll, Frederick Chapin, and Gustaf Nordenskiöld. History does not remember any of these five white men for acting as preservation advocates. Yet, all of them had an outsized influence in shaping the narratives pertaining to Mesa Verde, an exemplary Southwestern antiquity. Moreover, all of these authors played a central role in establishing a particular set of attitudes toward indigenous places of the Southwest, as well as the practice of archaeological research. Their publications on the topic of Mesa Verde were widely-read and well-regarded, and cast that ancient indigenous heritage place as a specimen for the use of researchers, and as a vessel for modern enchantments.

The argument I build in this chapter is that Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld communicated within the technological psychosis, a concept derived from dramatistic theory, which I will discuss shortly. Simultaneously, they adopted a poetic psychosis. The language of the technological psychosis emphasized the scientist as a cultural hero, rationalized destructive research methodologies, and translated into a clinical and dehumanizing comportment towards living indigenous peoples of the American Southwest. Altogether, the technological psychosis validated vandalism of Mesa Verde in the name of science, and supported racially-prejudiced theories like cultural evolution and degeneration.

These theories were modern myths, sustained by language that coded cultural heritage as science.

The technological psychosis also served to deflect attention from a variety of more aesthetic enchantments that were at work in the rhetoric of Mesa Verde's Anglo-American public debut. I consider these as part of the poetic psychosis. Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld all scrutinized Mesa Verde clinically, and *also* embellished the site with tantalizing legends. They turned Mesa Verde into a romantic ruin through their words, and they imagined at length the tragic demise of its architects. Such rich language advanced other myths, such as the vitalism of the place that they were busy disassembling in the name of science, and primitivistic notions about American Indian cultures. Mesa Verde's vitality could not spare it from the actions supported by the technological psychosis, and the authors' primitivistic ideas about the Mesa Verdeans ultimately served to fetishize indigeneity. Yet, the poetics of Mesa Verde's Anglo-American public debut demonstrated that scientific rationality accommodated enchantment, even if it also denied it. These poetic enchantments were far from "recalcitrant fugitives from rationalization," though they were indeed "understood through the categories of the mystical" and undermined by the actions of the adventurers and archaeologists whose rhetoric I analyze in this chapter.[1] Together, the technological and poetic psychoses demonstrated scientific *irrationality* in the practices of the researchers who introduced Mesa Verde to the Anglo-American public.

---

[1] Jane Bennett, *The Enchantment of Modern Life: Attachments, Crossings, and Ethics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), 57. Bennett critiques the narratives of disenchantment that propose that scientific rationalization succeeded in subduing enchantment in the modern era.

Whereas this dissertation addresses rhetorical enchantments throughout the American Southwest, I have chosen to dedicate this chapter solely to Mesa Verde's public debut in Anglo-American discourse. Though many Ancestral Puebloan places were coming into public awareness in the middle of the nineteenth century, Mesa Verde's unique alcove dwellings seemed to inspire an exaggerated mystical tone in the authors who wrote about this location—though this atmosphere of enchantment pervaded (and pervades) descriptions of all Southwestern antiquities. Mesa Verde's later prominence in the discourse of early preservation advocacy also marks it for more sustained analysis, as there are parallels between what the adventurers and archaeologists in this chapter had to say about this site, and what preservation advocates in the following chapter said.

I examine a total of five documents in this analysis of Mesa Verde's entry into Anglo-American public discourse. They are:

- "Ancient Ruins in Southwestern Colorado," in *The Bulletin of the United States Geological and Geographical Survey of the Territories* (1875), written by photographer William H. Jackson
- "A Notice of the Ancient Ruins of Southwestern Colorado, Examined During the Summer of 1875," in *The Bulletin of the United States Geological and Geographical Survey of the Territories* (1876), written by geologist William Henry Holmes.
- "The Antiquities of the Rio San Juan" in *Crest of the Continent: A Summer's Ramble in the Rocky Mountains and Beyond*. (1885), written by journalist Ernest Ingersoll
- *The Land of the Cliff Dwellers* (1892), written by mountaineering personality Frederick Chapin
- *The Cliff Dwellers of the Mesa Verde* (1891; translated into English 1893), written by archaeologist Gustaf Nordenskiöld

As will become plain, this cohort of authors used jarring language to describe Southwestern antiquities and indigenous people, and many of their actions within the ancient structures at

Mesa Verde are frankly appalling to modern sensibilities. Yet, these men did more than *reflect* their times. They played a part in *producing* the norms of their time. Because they were among the first to publish broadly about Mesa Verde, they helped establish customs for the treatment of Mesa Verde and other ancient indigenous sites. By proxy, they also helped to reaffirm derogatory attitudes towards the American Indian peoples whom they encountered in the Four Corners region, as they discussed living peoples as obstacles or as devolved descendants of the Mesa Verdeans, or described them using unfavorable analogies. While readers today will never know all of the motives of the men who first wrote about Mesa Verde, their writings offer some answers to the questions of why they went, what they gained from the experience, and how they valued the sites and their architects. These texts helped form the attitudes to which Anglo-American preservation advocates at the turn of the twentieth century responded.

Before delving into the rhetoric of Mesa Verde's public debut, I present further detail about the theoretical grounding for my rhetorical analysis of Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld's texts. I then discuss the historical moment in which these five authors participated. Thereafter, I undertake a rhetorical analysis of the five documents listed here, in order to demonstrate the technological psychosis and poetic enchantment of those who entered Mesa Verde at the end of the nineteenth century.

Technological and Poetic Psychoses

Over the course of this chapter, I argue that Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld exhibited what Kenneth Burke called the *technological psychosis*. In this section, I explain the technological psychosis in greater detail, referring to some of its

parallel and ancillary terms within dramatistic thought, as well as to the intellectual course Burke took to develop it.

Burke arrived at the concept of the technological psychosis by way of Thorstein Veblen's concept of trained incapacity, John Dewey's concept of occupational psychosis, and through much of his own thinking. Thorstein Veblen coined the phrase "trained incapacity" to describe the ways in which habitual behaviors encouraged habitual patterns of thought. In Veblen's example, he described how businesspeople conducted business with "an eye single to pecuniary gain," neglecting "the industrial consequences, and their bearing on the community's welfare, being matters incidental to the transaction of business."[2] Veblen claimed that the choice to pursue pecuniary gain at any cost to society was due either to a "trained incapacity . . . to appreciate the large and general requirements of the industrial situation," or "to an habitual, and conventionally righteous disregard of other than pecuniary considerations."[3] Erin Wais considers "trained incapacity" and "righteous disregard" traits that "function as two sides of the same coin."[4] Whether because they were unpracticed or oblivious, Veblen concluded that because businesspeople had no habit of considering the broader ramifications of their business decisions, they failed to do so. Much the same could

---

[2] Thorstein Veblen, *The Instinct of Workmanship, and the State of Industrial Arts* (New York: Macmillan, 1914), 351, accessed April 21, 2018, https://archive.org/stream/instinctworkman00veblgoog#page/n9/mode/1up, qtd. by Erin Wais, "Trained Incapacity: Thorstein Veblen and Kenneth Burke," *KB Journal* 2, no. 1 (2005), n. pag., accessed April 21, 2018, http://www.kbjournal.org/wais.

[3] Veblen, The Instinct of Workmanship, and the State of Industrial Arts, 347, qtd. by Wais, n. pag.

[4] Wais, n. pag.

be said of the authors whose works I assess in this chapter. Because they had little habit of considering other than scientific interests, they often failed to do so.

Burke embraced Veblen's concept of the trained incapacity with enthusiasm, appreciating it for its interpretive ambivalence. He felt it was a term that "help[ed] us to observe in the medium of communication simultaneously both the defects of its qualities and the qualities of its defects."[5] Burke observed trained incapacities at work in language use, and tended to enjoy their presence in some contexts, and to ridicule them in others. In Burke's interpretation, a trained incapacity might be a helpful kind of ignorance or inability; it might also be a debilitating one, particularly with regard to societal wellbeing. Burke tended to romanticize the trained incapacities of so-called primitive cultures, while deriding those of modern science. The former critical inclination is part of what I critique in my own analysis of modern thinkers, whereas the latter is a helpful critical tool.

Burke regularly paired his contemplations on the concept of the trained incapacity with his discussions of occupational psychosis, a phrase that he borrowed from John Dewey. In Burke's interpretation of Dewey, an occupational psychosis was a type of mindset that accompanied one's habitual forms of labor. Burke developed a Marxian perspective, claiming that communicative styles and social customs coincided with means of production, and could drift from one realm of practice to another. Whatever one did as labor shaped how one comported oneself in the world. In that way, the "'imaginative transference of principles from one field to another'" characterized occupational psychosis.[6] For instance, if a person

---

[5] Kenneth Burke, *Permanence and Change: An Anatomy of Purpose*, 3rd ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 49.

[6] Kenneth Burke, *Rhetoric of Motives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), 133.

worked as a scientist and habitually scrutinized whatever came in front of him or her as a specimen, that person might also discuss scenery in a clinical way.[7] "[P]atterns of thought" applicable in one arena migrated "into other channels of action or imagery."[8] When considered alongside trained incapacities, Burke understood occupational psychoses to reaffirm habitual patterns of thought while shielding others. Elsewhere in his body of works, Burke called this type of ideological shielding a terministic screen.[9]

Terministic screens are ways of "direct[ing] our attention" towards some things and away from others.[10] Burke emphasized the ways in which scientific discourse, in particular, functioned as a "*reflection* of reality . . . a *selection* of reality; and . . . a *deflection* of reality."[11] The notion of scientific discourse acting as a terministic screen has been helpful to Burke's inheritors, as well. For instance, rhetorical critic Martha Solomon used a dramatistic analysis to observe the ways in which scientific discourse screened scientists participating in the Tuskegee syphilis experiments from understanding their own actions as unethical, and encouraged them to interpret themselves as heroes undertaking a quest for knowledge, instead. All the while, they observed untreated syphilis in African American men over the

---

[7] I use my own example, here, because the example from Dewey that Burke cited relied on quasi-ethnographic information about a supposedly primitive people: if a person hunted for sustenance, then marriage rites might take on the aspect of the chase, and the woman would be prey. Burke, *Permanence and Change,* 38-39.

[8] Kenneth Burke, *Permanence and Change*, 38-39.

[9] Kenneth Burke, *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968), 5, 28, 44-62.

[10] Burke, Language as Symbolic Action, 44.

[11] Ibid., 45, emphasis in original.

course of decades. While these men trusted their doctors to give them the proper treatment for their malady, they never received it.[12] Given that I am also examining the screening functions of scientific discourse, and the portrayal of scientists as heroes, I draw inspiration from Solomon's analysis.

Whereas Solomon looked primarily to Burke's pentad and terministic screens in order to guide her analysis, I look primarily to the concept of the technological psychosis, which blends aspects of all of the concepts discussed up to this point. Burke developed his concept of the technological psychosis in tandem with this thoughts on occupational psychosis. He read the technological psychosis as the prevailing mentality of the modern era, precipitated by industrialization and an epochal infatuation with science. I do not share Burke's certainty about the causal factors contributing to the technological psychosis. Yet, his analysis of scientific discourse, its prevalence, and its traits, facilitates my interpretation of the archaeologists and explorers who made Mesa Verde known to the English-speaking world.

Burke located the origin of the technological psychosis within science, which he defined as "the attempt to control for our purposes the forces of technology, or machinery."[13] Burke's emphasis on machinery is somewhat beside the point in my analysis of archaeological field work in the late nineteenth century. What is more salient in my analysis is Burke's consideration of science as the "great rationalization" of the modern era, for he felt that science shaped social "valuation[s]." In elaborating upon the technological psychosis, Burke had this to say:

---

[12] Martha Solomon, "The Rhetoric of Dehumanization : An Analysis of Medical Reports of the Tuskegee Syphilis Project," *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 49, no. 4 (1985): 233–47.

[13] Burke, Permanence and Change, 44.

> Its genius has been called experimentation, the laboratory method, creative skepticism, organized doubt. It has an occupational morality all its own . . . The doctrine of use, as the prime mover of judgments, formally established the *secular* as the point of reference by which to consider questions of valuation. The transcendental accounts of moral origin . . . now gave way to the notion that considerations of service or interest both *do* shape and *should* shape our religious, ethical, aesthetic, and even cosmological judgments.[14]

Many aspects of this statement warrant further discussion in describing how the concept of the technological psychosis informs my reading of Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld. All of these authors, whether acting as geologists, photographers, or freelance writers, comported themselves towards Mesa Verde with the intention of gleaning information from the site. They wanted to use the site to advance scientific, historical, or perhaps literary interests. The technological psychosis encouraged a "morality all its own," in the sense that each of these authors portrayed himself as a hero on the quest for knowledge, while deflecting the fact that he damaged irrevocably the structures at Mesa Verde, and the graves of deceased Mesa Verdeans. The technological psychosis deflected the harm that these social actors caused at Mesa Verde, and reflected social values that emphasized use value, reason, and clinical analysis. Note, however, that the technological rationality that accompanied science at the turn of the twentieth century did not arise from a necessary relationship with science. Rather, it characterized the way that this historical moment mythologized science.

In addition to exaggerating the utility of Mesa Verde for the advancement of science, the technological psychosis sometimes masked the poetics that Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld also expressed in the face of this Southwestern antiquity. The communicative patterns of the technological psychosis were prevalent throughout these

---

[14] Ibid., 44-45.

authors' texts, which emphasized the knowledge that they collected from Mesa Verde, and their own positions as scientific heroes. Yet, these authors also indicated through their language use various forms of enchantment at Mesa Verde that did not conform well to the technological psychosis. For all that Burke claimed there was a "modern tendency to treat didacticism as anthetical [sic] to poetry,"[15] the adventurers and archaeologists who introduced the English-speaking world to Mesa Verde instructed their audiences as to Mesa Verde's intellectual merits as they enchanted them with the poetics of the site. I refer to enchantment that the technological psychosis reflected and deflected as the poetic psychosis, and treat it as the foil of the scientific rationality that the authors espoused.

The technological and poetic psychoses both pertain to the overarching theme of rhetorical enchantment that I develop throughout this dissertation. Rhetorical enchantment has to do with the myths and poetics of rhetorical acts, and the ways in which rhetors express their simultaneous positions as enchant*ed* and enchant*ers*. The adventurers and archaeologists in this chapter were enchanted by the technological psychosis, as well as by the Southwestern antiquities that they encountered. They expressed this enchantment by framing their experiences in cultural myths common to their era, and by communicating the poetics of Mesa Verde at the same time. Some of their poetics of place reinforced the stereotypes and prejudices that accompanied modern myths, whereas some of them indicated more of a fascination with the site, itself.

The technological psychosis was an expression of the collective poem of modernity, that gathering of myths that demonstrated habitual patterns of thought and value common to social actors at the turn of the twentieth century. These myths included scientific rationality,

[15] Burke, Rhetoric of Motives, 173.

the scientific hero, racial hierarchies, and cultural evolution. Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld expressed these myths with accompanying poetic language, relying on mythic representations of themselves as scientific heroes, sensational accounts of indigenous social actors, and the romance of ruins to emphasize their position towards Southwestern antiquities, and to model that comportment for their audiences.

In the following section of this chapter, I offer more detail about the ways in which these authors intervened in their historical moment, and how they chose to inform the English-speaking public about the supposed wonders that they encountered in the American Southwest. I then examine their expressions of the technological psychosis at Mesa Verde, before describing the poetics of enchantment that the authors also communicated in their published works.

The Historical Moment

Mesa Verde's broad public debut was the result of the Geological and Geographical Survey of the Territories following the American Civil War, and the national news coverage concerned with those events.[16] The Geological and Geographical Survey of the Territories was also known as the Hayden Survey. Ferdinand Hayden was a prominent geologist who launched a number of expeditions into the American West. He also organized the surveys that brought Mesa Verde its first national acclaim. The first two of Hayden's surveys concerned the Yellowstone region, beginning in 1871. Thanks to Hayden's interest in cultivating positive public opinion, he brought painter Thomas Moran and photographer

[16] Florence L. Lister, *Troweling Through Time: The First Century of Mesa Verdean Archaeology* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2004), 4.

William H. Jackson along to document the trip. Their images of Yellowstone were central to the establishment of Yellowstone National Park in 1872.[17] After securing Yellowstone, Hayden moved his attentions to Colorado, where once again, William H. Jackson helped show the rest of the country the wonders of the west through photography. Ernest Ingersoll accompanied Jackson in the Colorado survey of 1874, while working as a correspondent for the *New York Tribune*.[18]

After spending some time probing the San Juan Mountains, Jackson's party encountered ancient structures alongside canyon walls. There, "Jackson took the first [known] photograph of a Mesa Verde cliff dwelling" at a site that Jackson's party named Two Story House.[19] In addition to Jackson's photographs and report on this venture, Ingersoll's correspondence with the *New York Tribune* launched Mesa Verde and its alcove dwellings into public awareness. Ingersoll shared the story of a harrowing discovery with readers on the East Coast shortly thereafter.[20] Some years later he published the full account of his participation in the Geological Surveys and other excursions as *The Crest of the Continent: A Summer's Ramble in the Rocky Mountains and Beyond*.

---

[17] M. Dane Picard, "Revisiting the Life and Scientific Reputation of Ferdinand Vandeever Hayden," *Rocky Mountain Geology* 45, no. 1 (2010): 73–81; Denise D. Meringolo, *Museums, Monuments, and National Parks: Toward a New Genealogy of Public History*, Public History in Historical Perspective (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2012).

[18] Douglas Waitley, *William Henry Jackson: Framing the Frontier* (Missoula, Montana: Mountain Press Publishing Company, 1999).

[19] Lister, 6.

[20] Waitley, 153.

Although Jackson, Ingersoll, and other members of the Hayden expedition never encountered the alcove dwellings for which Mesa Verde National Park is now most famous, the public recounting of their time spent in Two Story house piqued national interest in the Southwest, and set the stage for the additional forays to the ancient sites there.[21] Jackson and party also played an integral part in displaying photographs and findings from the 1874 survey at the Philadelphia Centennial Exposition in 1876, which brought further acclaim and induced even more curiosity for the ancient structures in the Southwest.[22] William H. Jackson and William H. Holmes (another geologist and a member of the Hayden surveys) also worked together to produce "exact scale models of southwestern archaeological sites" for the Exposition, for which they won a bronze medal.[23] According to a newspaper article at the time, "the models of these cliff houses . . . were always the center of a fascinated throng of the most intelligent and cultivated visitors."[24] Jackson and Holmes managed to enchant a public audience with their recreations of Mesa Verde.

The alcove dwellings at Mesa Verde received significantly more attention in the years that followed the Hayden surveys, a condition that intensified when members of a ranching family called the Wetherills came upon some of the more remarkable structures at Mesa Verde. The Wetherill brothers and their brother-in-law, Charlie Mason, attained minor fame in the late 1880s when newspapers at the time covered their encounter with one of the most

---

[21] Ibid., 155.

[22] Ibid., 160.

[23] Duane A. Smith, *Mesa Verde National Park: Shadows of the Centuries*, 2nd ed. (Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado, 2002), 15.

[24] "The Cave Dwellers on the Cliffs of the Mancos Canon," *Colorado Springs Gazette*, June 23, 1877.

picturesque structures at Mesa Verde, which the Wetherills dubbed Cliff Palace. The Wetherills and Mason had been aware of the antiquities on the land neighboring their ranch for some time, though the story of Cliff Palace and its so-called discovery painted the encounter as a surprise. Mimicking other discovery legends common to the era, the story told of the brothers and Mason pursuing lost cattle from the ranch, only to stumble upon an unknown marvel. Depending on whose account one follows, the Wetherills and company might have expected to find structures of this sort during their foray, as they had made a hobby of perusing the canyons near their ranch.[25]

In any event, the Wetherill family used their fame to begin a tourism business, and they removed many objects from the ancient structures at Mesa Verde as part of their trade. They turned artifact recovery into an enterprise, using their ranch in Mancos as a base for the business of hosting and guiding tourists to the region. In addition to collecting and (sometimes) documenting artifacts and other findings from their explorations of the alcove dwellings, the Wetherills wrote to the Smithsonian Institution to request assistance with collections at Mesa Verde.[26] They also traveled with a display of their wares to the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition.[27] Richard Wetherill, one of the brothers, expanded the family business to Chaco Canyon, where he made a homesteading claim on the land

---

[25] William C. Winkler and Duane A. Smith, *Travels and Travails: Tourism at Mesa Verde* (Durango, CO: Durango Herald Small Press, 2005), 6.

[26] David Harrell, "'We Contacted Smithsonian': The Wetherills at Mesa Verde," *New Mexico Historical Review* 62, no. 3 (1987): 229–48; Smith, *Mesa Verde National Park*, 22–42; Duane A. Smith, Karen A. Vendl, and Mark A. Vendl, *Colorado Goes to the Fair: World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago 1893* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2011), 46–47.

[27] Smith et al., *Colorado Goes to the Fair*; Harrell, "'We Contacted Smithsonian.'"

containing the largest and best-preserved structures there, and later earned the ire of preservation advocates working in the region.[28]

The Wetherills' ranch and associated excavation and tourism business failed in 1902, but not before the Wetherills left their mark on the land. For years, the family extracted materials from the ancient sites, and hosted many significant people who redefined the public's relationship to Mesa Verde. Most notably, the Wetherills hosted Swedish scientist Gustaf Nordenskiöld, who conducted the first methodical excavation of the ancient structures in 1891. Indeed, Nordenskiold taught the Wetherills his excavation methods, and employed them in his work. The Wetherills also hosted Frederick Chapin, a writer, mountaineer, and self-styled adventurer. Both Nordenskiöld and Chapin published about their experiences at the Mancos Ranch, home of the Wetherills, and solidified both the alcove dwellings and the names of the Wetherills within public memory. Today, two of the mesas at Mesa Verde National Park are called Wetherill Mesa and Chapin Mesa, indicating the degree of influence these figures had over the terrain.

For all that the Wetherills were influential at Mesa Verde, they appeared primarily in the accounts of others, rather than in their own words. Classism likely had something to do with the way of the historical record, as men of letters like Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld coupled their impressions of Mesa Verde with professional authority that the Wetherills lacked. It is to these authorized accounts of Mesa Verde that I turn next, in the rhetorical analysis of the texts produced by photographer William H.

---

[28] Don D. Fowler, *A Laboratory for Anthropology* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000), 199. Richard Wetherill's activities in Chaco Canyon were especially offensive to a preservation advocate whom I will discuss in chapter three, named Edgar Lee Hewett. Hewett attempted to assure the passage of the Antiquities Act in part to prohibit actions like those undertaken by Wetherill.

Jackson, geologist William H. Holmes, journalist Ernest Ingersoll, mountaineer Frederick Chapin, and archaeologist Gustaf Nordenskiöld. I begin my analysis with the claim that all of these authors communicated within the technological psychosis in a manner that advanced them as scientific heroes, rationalized destructive field methods, and insultingly classified indigenous peoples of the American Southwest within the theory of cultural evolution.

The Technological Psychosis

Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld all presented themselves as researchers reporting on Mesa Verde for the rest of the curious English-speaking public, and recording their findings for posterity. In adopting a scientific demeanor towards Mesa Verde, all of these social actors communicated in a manner consistent with the technological psychosis. All of them presented a primarily scientific rationale for engaging with the site, and valued the ancient structures at Mesa Verde for their use in answering questions about the past, the influence of colonialism, and living indigenous cultures. Their texts illustrate abundant evidence that these authors exhibited the technological psychosis. They presented themselves as scientific heroes, conveyed confidence in research methodologies that were extremely damaging to the site, and attempted to measure cultural advancement according to racialized tenets. They also struggled to contain within the clinical parameters of the technological psychosis the wonder they felt when describing Mesa Verde.

Scientific Heroism

The authors' emphases on their own roles as heroes of science supported their participation in the technological psychosis. Narratives of individualistic discovery and sacrifice in the name of science supported the status of science within the technological psychosis, and also mythologized science in poetic ways. The authors' representations of

themselves as scientific heroes came through in their narrations of derring-do at the alcove dwellings at Mesa Verde. Though these were primarily professional accounts of research excursions, the authors' heroic personae were key to each text. Clearly, generic constraints operated differently in the 19th century than they do today. Nevertheless, the authors seemed to revel in describing how difficult it was for them to arrive at the alcove dwellings and obtain new information in the name of scientific discovery.

Jackson, who produced the first nationally-distributed perspective on the matter, described many privations during his journey to Mesa Verde. While *en route*, he noted difficult river crossings and the awkward conditions in which he operated his photography equipment. While attempting to ferry field equipment up into the alcoves, he recalled how a member of the party had to be "shoved up ahead, over the worst place, with the rope, and, tying it to a tree, the others easily ascended."[29] The travails continued once among the alcove dwellings, where Jackson recounted the "momentary peril of life" experienced by a member of his crew upon ascending the canyon. As the man climbed the canyon walls, "the least mistake would precipitate him down the whole of this dizzy height."[30]

Though Ingersoll remarked upon the relative comfort afforded by the new railroads that hastened his journey to Mesa Verde, he opined that "[r]oughing it" was "the marrow of

---

[29] William Henry Jackson, "Ancient Ruins in Southwestern Colorado," *U.S. Geological and Geographical Survey of the Rocky Mountain Region Bulletin*, no. 1 (1874-1875): 20. Nineteenth Century Collections Online.

[30] Jackson, 24.

this sort of recreation."[31] Indeed, Ingersoll made it seem as if the hardship of reaching Mesa Verde was much of the appeal of going there. In addition to discussing the aridity of the climate, Ingersoll depicted the "smoldering hostility of the Indians" as another obstacle to reaching Mesa Verde.[32] Ingersoll claimed that the "privation of the undertaking" was worthwhile because of the promise of making new "discoveries in anthropology."[33]

Like Ingersoll, Chapin complimented the new railroad for alleviating the hardships of travel, noting that the Southwest once had been *even* more difficult to traverse, where "travelers were exposed to all manner of hardships, were far from a base of supplies, and were at times in danger from hostile Indians."[34] Chapin still managed to experience firsthand many similar hardships, and proceeded to describe them with zeal. For instance, he recounted an incident during which a bucking bronco ruined some of his own camera equipment, and he shared the harrowing story of surviving a rock slide, during which he "narrowly escaped a serious accident."[35] Chapin also continued the racialized commentary of the San Juan Basin established by other authors, offering stories of recalcitrant American Indian individuals whom he solicited for help, and "the hostility of the Utes" who had "rendered it dangerous

---

[31] Ernest Ingersoll, *The Crest of the Continent: A Record of a Summer's Ramble in the Rocky Mountains and Beyond* (Chicago: R. R. Donnelley & Sons, Publishers, 1885), 5. Online Access via HathiTrust.

[32] Ibid., 156.

[33] Ibid.

[34] Frederick H. Chapin, *The Land of the Cliff-Dwellers* (Boston: Appalachian Mountain Club, W. B. Clarke and Company, 1892): Kindle Location 858.

[35] Ibid., Loc. 1017.

for a white man to venture down the Mancos River without military escort."[36] Overall, Chapin exaggerated the valor of his traveling party by setting a scene in which he and his companions had to confront desolation, mystery, and antagonism. Adding to the *mise-en-scène* for his feats, Chapin referred to the Southwest as "a strange land, inhabited by strange people, and containing monuments and relics of yet stranger tribes of an unknown antiquity."[37] Even with all of these hardships and strangeness, Chapin dubbed the San Juan Basin "a most fascinating field for the explorer."[38]

Perhaps in the interest of faithfully recording his research methodology, Nordenskiöld, too, offered detailed examples of the difficulties he went through in his investigation of Mesa Verde and its alcove dwellings. Nordenskiöld, like Ingersoll and Chapin, expressed that "roving bands of Ute Indians rendered travelling dangerous" in the region for many years, until the mining industry arrived and "the Indians were forced to relinquish the land that had belonged to their forefathers."[39] Nordenskiöld also credited the railway with rendering travel easier. However, difficult horseback rides and "break-neck climb[s]" both featured prominently in Nordenskiöld's account.[40]

Together, these authors set a scene in which what they thought of as civilization arrived only slowly in the Southwest, and where the landscape imposed rugged adventures on

---

[36] Chapin, Loc. 1187.

[37] Ibid., Loc. 97.

[38] Ibid., Loc. 144.

[39] Gustaf Nordenskiöld, *The Cliff Dwellers of the Mesa Verde*, Translated by D. Lloyd Morgan (Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt & Soner, 1893), 1.

[40] Nordenskiöld, 66.

those who trespassed within it, before disclosing its mysteries for science. As these authors portrayed their scene, only after enduring opposition from indigenous peoples, threat of death from falling off the sides of the canyon, and other hardships could they contribute to knowledge. Jackson, Ingersoll, Chapin and Nordenskiöld seemed to offer tales from the field as bona fides for their right to comment on the alcove dwellings of the Southwest, and as evidence of their bold personalities. Not only were these descriptions sensational stories for their readers, but they were marks of a certain kind of frontierist credential.

The authors' advancement of themselves as scientific heroes was predicated on the dangerous and alluring scene in which they situated themselves. Though scientific heroism was a feature of the technological psychosis, the mystique that these authors crafted in describing their sacrifices in the name of discovery mythologized science. They described the scene in which they did their field work poetically, and in so doing, melded the technological psychosis' supposed emphasis on measurement and rationality with enchantment. This was an enchantment with science itself, but it relied on the narrative style of an adventure.

Whereas the scientific heroism in these authors' works supported the technological psychosis by magnifying the cultural role of the scientist, the authors' discussion of the research methodology in which they engaged was a truer expression of the technological psychosis. As Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld measured and catalogued the contents of Mesa Verde, they postured towards the site with clinical distance. Troublingly, that clinical distance validated harmful field methods and condescending scholarly conclusions.

Research Methodology

Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld demonstrated their participation in the technological psychosis through their measurements and analyses of Mesa Verde. However, the scientific language that they used in describing Mesa Verde facilitated for them a clinical distancing from the site. The technological psychosis screened these authors from recognizing the irrevocable harm that they caused to Mesa Verde as they studied it, and often seemed at odds with their poetic descriptions of the site.

Each of these authors mentioned the haste with which he made his visit to Mesa Verde, and his regrets about leaving mysteries unanswered upon departure. The authors also gave accounts of the type of activity in which they engaged when within the alcove dwellings, albeit for short periods of time. For instance, Jackson referred to his party's engagement with one alcove dwelling as "such little scratching around as we could do" in the time allowed.[41] Jackson bemoaned the limited time "to admit of the experiment [of excavation], much as we desired the information it might furnish."[42] This information, for Jackson, would have been comprised of "many interesting relics, and possibly some clew to [the] manner of life" of the original occupants of the alcove dwellings.[43] For Jackson, objects and answers were both at the base of his efforts, arguably for the sake of new knowledge pertaining to ancient indigenous peoples.

---

[41] Jackson, 18.

[42] Ibid., 25.

[43] Ibid.

Holmes, for his part, shared that his findings were "the result of such observations and measurements as could be made in a period of time entirely too short for a work of such importance."[44] For his part, Holmes primarily expressed interest in how the various collections of ancient structures could "be classified."[45] He also discussed the shape and size of the majority of the structures he encountered, commenting that "[m]easurements were taken by tape-line in all the more important structures; but in many of the ordinary ruins, where exact dimensions were not considered essential, the distances were estimated. It is to be greatly regretted that extreme haste frequently prevented close and accurate work."[46] While commenting little on his own excavation methods in the alcove dwellings, Holmes demonstrated that measurement and classification were his main concerns, though he admitted that he executed these methods without consistent rigor. Holmes also revealed that Jackson and party, who had preceded him, had left "three names scratched in the soft, thick coat of adobe" they had seen during their own visit of a structure.[47] Evidently, the little scratching around that Jackson could do included leaving a memento of his visit.

Chapin divided his time in describing the methods of the Wetherills and their crew, and describing his own group's efforts to explore the alcove dwellings. When Chapin detailed his party's time within any of the alcove dwellings, typically he inventoried what he

---

[44] William Henry Holmes, "A Notice of the Ancient Ruins of Southwestern Colorado, Examined During the Summer of 1875," *U.S. Geological and Geographical Survey of the Rocky Mountain Region Bulletin*, 2, no. 1 (1876): 11. Nineteenth Century Collections Online.

[45] Ibid., 4.

[46] Ibid., 6.

[47] Ibid., 17.

found while there, referring to some of those procedures as excavations. In one structure, Chapin described his "companions . . . rummaging around the lower rooms," while he and another member of his party removed a beam out of another portion of the house, and used it as a make-shift ladder to ascend further, effectively destroying one part of a site in order to pursue objects in a more difficult-to-reach portion of it.[48] Chapin declared that "after our difficult tussle in scaling the wall, we thought we might be rewarded by finding some rare specimen . . . but, on the contrary, there was an air of desolation around the vacant quarters."[49] For Chapin, the possibility of discovering new objects validated damaging behavior to the site. This attitude even applied in situations where the task of investigating Mesa Verde could not be completed properly. As an example, in another instance, Chapin and crew "had not the time . . . to excavate among the rubbish, but the slightest investigation showed that the place was rich in relics. A little scraping away of the earth revealed human bones, cloths, matting, etc."[50] Chapin admitted that his rummaging and scraping were only perfunctory, and awaited the results of more orderly archaeological investigations with great anticipation.

Chapin's adventure occurred two years prior to Nordenskiöld's own efforts to understand the alcove dwellings at Mesa Verde. Nordenskiöld remarked on his methods in a manner not altogether different from those who came before him, though he alone styled himself as a professional archaeologist. Like the others, Nordenskiöld conducted his work

---

[48] Chapin, Loc. 1482.

[49] Ibid., Loc. 1505.

[50] Ibid., Loc. 1541.

with a crew. Nordenskiöld's work party was composed of at least two of the Wetherill brothers and "two Mexican laborers" who, altogether, *cleared* several of the rooms "of rubbish."[51] Nordenskiöld remarked that "a single push of the spade sent it over the precipice" with great ease.[52] Nordenskiöld noted, however, that "[g]reat inconvenience was caused . . . by the fine dust, which rose in dense clouds at each blow of the spade."[53] Chapin, too, complained that "the alkali dust [was] choking,"[54] though was less forthcoming than Nordenskiöld in discussing the fact that what was not of interest to the search party probably was hurled into the canyon by his crew, too.

The authors I discuss here detailed the ways in which they scraped, scratched, and rummaged around in the alcove dwellings at Mesa Verde, discarding rooms full of fill into the canyon and dismantling portions of the site in order to seek out objects of interest. Their actions were not only detrimental to future archaeologists, as NPS interpretive rangers typically point out during contemporary tours, but also deeply invasive, careless, and disrespectful. Equally disturbing is the fact that these cavalier research methods were undertaken in pursuit of *things*, to be retrieved for display, sale, souvenirs, or all three. Yet, all of these degrading practices were done to the site out of what appears to have been a genuine belief by the authors in their contributions to knowledge.

---

[51] Nordenskiöld, 19-21.

[52] Ibid., 19.

[53] Ibid.

[54] Chapin, Loc. 1833.

The belief that their wanton field methods were beneficial to science was most apparent in Chapin's assessment, in which he repeatedly noted that the "antiquities" he observed were "well worth investigation by the archaeologist."[55] Towards the end of his description of his time at Mesa Verde, Chapin submitted that, if his work could "claim any merit, it [would] be due to the fact that the future antiquary [might] learn from the reproduction of . . . photographs, and their description, the condition of the Mancos ruins in the years 1889 and 1890."[56] Why this information would be useful, we can assume, had to do with a presumed contribution to new knowledge, and a safeguard against the deterioration that Chapin may have guessed would come to the site in intervening years.

Despite Chapin's belief in the utility of his photographs serving as a record of Mesa Verde, we know that these authors took much more than photographs when they entered the alcove dwellings. Like the others, Ingersoll showed great interest in the objects contained within the alcove dwellings. Ingersoll kept close accounts of whether or not "valuable implements and utensils" had been "discovered" in each structure. [57] While Ingersoll considered these implements and utensils among the "glorious discoveries in anthropology" that his party contributed to posterity,[58] simply obtaining items in the first place seems to have been a key motivation for members of Ingersoll's party. For example, upon spying a new structure, and "fired with the hope of getting some valuable relics of household furniture

---

[55] Ibid., Loc. 1444.

[56] Chapin, Loc. 1968.

[57] Ingersoll, 160.

[58] Ibid.

in such a place, one of the gentlemen volunteered to make the attempt" in achieving a particularly daunting ascent.[59] It is likely, then, these social actors attached a monetary value to the objects they recovered from the alcove dwellings, in addition to an intellectual one. Either way, the technological psychosis dominated the discourse, as these Anglo-American social actors expected Mesa Verde's contents to be useful either for learning or for personal gain.

Not only were these individuals interested in objects, but they were interested in a particular class of object: the complete vessel. Throughout his text, it is clear that Chapin was interested primarily in complete vessels, presumably for purposes of collection and display. For example, he assessed whether or not "it would be possible partially to restore" artifacts such as "fragments of large bowls" he observed in his travels.[60] Like Chapin, Nordenskiöld also displayed a fixation on "perfect vessels" for collection and display, regretting that his "collection contain[ed] only a few."[61] On the whole, Nordenskiöld also measured the success of his various excavations in terms of the quantity of objects and bodies removed from each site.

In an unforgivable practice, these authors treated bodies just as they treated objects when they were perusing the alcove dwellings at Mesa Verde. Chapin and Nordenskiöld were the most explicit about discussing their treatment of human remains at Mesa Verde. Chapin offered commentary on several burials that his group disturbed while moving about

---

[59] Ibid.

[60] Chapin, Loc. 1505.

[61] Nordenskiöld, 80.

the alcove dwellings, and revealed a puzzling juxtaposition between admiration and irreverence when discussing the deceased. For instance, after noting that an individual he encountered "had been buried with care," he went on to offer many intimate details of this person's interment, clinically describing the various objects buried with the individual.[62] Chapin was very interested in the human remains present at Mesa Verde but did not respect any right to privacy for those who had been buried there with such care.

Nordenskiöld's discussion of the human remains at Mesa Verde causes the contemporary reader even more discomfort. In one instance, Nordenskiöld and his crew discovered human remains that rats had damaged. Judging that the bodies "were not worth saving," it seems they were discarded along with the other so-called rubbish from the site.[63] Nordenskiöld's book presented list after list of human remains, their locations, and the funerary goods found with them—going quite against standards of decorum now in place thanks to NAGPRA. Detailed photographs accompanied these descriptions, alongside vigorous discussions of the cranial attributes of the original inhabitants of the alcove dwellings. He also expressed frustration that he had not enough evidence to "point out cranial affinities that might exist between the ancient inhabitants of the ruins and the people that now live near those deserted dwellings."[64] Nevertheless, he used ethnological data to arrive at some comparisons between the two.

---

[62] Chapin, Loc. 1833.

[63] Nordenskiöld, 47.

[64] Ibid., 111.

Such commentary illustrates Nordenskiöld's belief in the tenets of phrenology, that post-Enlightenment school of thought most popular in the mid-nineteenth century, which supposed that an individual's attributes and propensities could be measured physically on his or her skull.[65] Nordenskiöld's attachment to phrenology as a research method was consistent with early archaeologists' role in advancing the theory of cultural evolution, in general, and justified to Nordenskiöld the brazen desecration of many graves, for the purpose of collecting the crania of the people interred at Mesa Verde. It also indicates how Chapin and Nordenskiöld believed it no impropriety to disturb the gravesites of the Mesa Verdeans, as they viewed them as curious examples of a lesser form of humanity, and not as equals deserving of respect.

The authors who introduced Mesa Verde to the English-speaking public communicated in a manner consistent with the technological psychosis. They did so by perpetuating the myth of the scientist as a cultural hero, and they did so by rationalizing their destructive actions within Mesa Verde in the name of scientific discovery. Monetary values and personal recognition coincided with the scholarly interests that Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld conveyed. In any case, the technological psychosis appears to have facilitated the alienation of the authors from their research subjects, justifying the desecration of graves and vandalistic research methods at Mesa Verde. The technological psychosis shielded these authors from acknowledging the hypocrisy of presenting Mesa Verde as an enchanting place as they dissected it. The authors' scholarly

---

[65] Stephen Tomlinson, *Head Masters: Phrenology, Secular Education, and Nineteenth-Century Social Thought* (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, Proquest EBook Central, 2014), p://ebookcentral.proquest.com.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/lib/unc/detail.action?docID=1294629.

alienation from Mesa Verde and its architects transposed to their discussions of American Indian cultural traditions, as well. By measuring cultural accomplishments according to a cultural evolutionary *telos*, the authors classified all indigenous cultures as inferior to European cultures, and further rationalized their own interventions at Mesa Verde.

Measuring Cultures through Cultural Evolution

In his discussions of the occupational psychosis, Burke observed that patterns of thought applicable in one realm of practice often transferred into other areas of practice. Such was the case with these authors' interpretations of the Mesa Verdeans. Just as they presented themselves as if they had clinical distance from the site that they cavalierly dismantled in the pursuit of knowledge, they also acted as though they had clinical distance when interpreting peoples of the past. Their primary instrument of measurement for cultures from the past was the theory of cultural evolution, which Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld all adopted as a way of diagnosing the habits and significance of the Mesa Verdeans. As they applied the theory of cultural evolution in their analyses, the technological psychosis translated from the realm of pick and spade to the realm of immediate social consequences.

The theory of cultural evolution began in Europe, and used the Old World archaeological record to declare that movement from the Stone Age to the Industrial Age was the *telos* for all cultures. For cultural evolutionists, the more like modern European society a culture was, the more highly it ranked on its path towards the pinnacle of civilization. Wars propagated by European cultures were forgotten conveniently in these early discussions of the state of European advancement. However, the more or less predictable relationship between time depth and technological materials witnessed in the Old World did not have

evidentiary support in the New World, producing consternation for scholars in the nineteenth century who attempted to fit American Indian peoples into an ill-suited teleology.[66]

In particular, scholars of the day took metalworking and script as clear markers of age and, hence, purported advancement in the Old World. In the absence of those phenomena in much of the New World's archaeological record, the majority of white scholars could not imagine rich, complete lives for the ancient people who made their lives there. Authors submitted demeaning interpretations of the Ancestral Puebloans by studying them through theories like this, which passed as part of the technological psychosis (in spite of the often spurious evidence used to support cultural evolution). In the works of Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld, adherence to the theory of cultural evolution manifested in reliance on phrenology, comparisons between the Mesa Verdeans and contemporary American Indian peoples, and discussion of the presumed brutality of life at Mesa Verde during its prime. Though cultural evolution was a common mode for discussing human cultures at the time, it was this type of theory that supported white culture's displacement and oppression of American Indian peoples and other minorities. However, the technological psychosis screened its rhetors from acknowledging explicitly the racial prejudice inherent in the theory of cultural evolution.

Highlighting the fact that no written documents had been found that were produced by the Mesa Verdeans, Chapin regularly referred to the original occupants of the alcove dwellings as a prehistoric people, adding that by "using the term 'prehistoric' in these pages, I am not implying any great age . . . but maintain that they antedate the coming of the

---

[66] Bruce G. Trigger, *A History of Archaeological Thought*, 2nd ed., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 166–189.

Spaniards, that there are no written records in regard to them, and that traditions are very meagre."[67] Chapin fussed, further, that "[n]ot a scrap or piece of metal [had] been found," concluding that every artifact encountered "must have been laboriously shaped by an almost shapeless stone axe."[68] It is unclear why he presumed the lithic tools would have been shapeless; however, Chapin's editorializing illustrated his low regard for the technologies used by the Mesa Verdeans in their accomplishments. Like Chapin, Nordenskiöld remarked repeatedly on the absence of metal found within Mesa Verde's structures. Nordenskiöld proclaimed that "the cliff-dwellers were *entirely ignorant of the use of metal*," and that while they must have made everything they had using lithic technology, their "stone axes were probably more efficacious as weapons."[69]

As illustrated in the preceding paragraph, Chapin and Nordenskiöld were especially prone to outlining their cultural evolutionary interpretations of the people of Mesa Verde. In their discussions, both men commented at great length on the technology, arts, and presumed state of unrest experienced by the Mesa Verdeans. Both also made regular remarks about the location of the Mesa Verdeans on the trajectory towards civilization. For his interpretation of the archaeological record, Chapin had this to say: "As for the state of civilization of the ancient people, it could not have been far advanced. A community who could huddle together in such small, close, unventilated quarters . . . could not have reached a very high ideal of

[67] Chapin, Loc. 111.

[68] Ibid., Loc. 1945.

[69] Nordenskiöld, 96, emphasis in original.

refinement."[70] Throughout his volume, Chapin commented outlandishly on the cultural ranking of, not just indigenous peoples in the United States, but Creole, Spanish, and Mexican populations, as well.

While observing that "the prehistoric inhabitants were diligent in their exercise of the potter's art" and "had achieved great proficiency" in architecture,[71] Nordenskiöld felt that relying on these accomplishments for an analysis would give a scholar "entirely erroneous conclusions" about the state of civilization of the Mesa Verdeans.[72] Nordenskiöld considered that:

> . . . the former inhabitants of the cliff-dwellings [were] . . . *an agricultural people on the level of the Stone Age*, who had attained a very high rank in the art of making and ornamenting pottery and in the construction of stone buildings, but who at the same time stood comparatively low in other respects.[73]

Nordenskiöld felt that the Mesa Verdeans "ranked higher in some points of culture than the nomadic Indians,"[74] but, "with the exception of the pottery, extremely few [objects found] bear witness to the advanced development of any special industry."[75] For Nordenskiöld, understanding this glitch in what everyone presumed to be true about cultural evolution was a key motivation for scholarly pursuits. As Nordenskiöld admitted, the "contrast between a development so high in one respect and a standpoint . . . so low in another, invests the cliff

---

[70] Chapin, Loc. 1968.

[71] Nordenskiöld, 76-77.

[72] Ibid., 93.

[73] Ibid., 20, emphasis in original.

[74] Ibid., 20.

[75] Ibid., 93.

people with special interest. The explanation thereof may be found in the extraordinary conditions under which this nation struggled for existence."[76] In the absence of a clear story of cultural evolution, Nordenskiöld presumed that environmental factors and a state of constant warfare, rather than human ingenuity, pushed the architects of the alcove dwellings to act as they did. Whether by cultural evolution or by environmental determinism, Nordenskiöld was certain that external forces determined the architects' fate.

Whether discussing their nineteenth-century present or the deep past, the authors demonstrated a fixation on supposed barbarism that clouded their ability to imagine any other sort of life for the Mesa Verdeans or their descendants. To them, a life that required defensive architecture was one that could not have been very far advanced. What is worse, discussions of the state of advancement of the inhabitants of the alcove dwellings often drifted into unfavorable comparisons between those who built the alcove dwellings and the indigenous peoples still present in the San Juan Basin. These comparisons always were prejudiced against the living peoples with whom the authors in this analysis could have interacted, and advanced the theory of degeneration alongside the theory of cultural evolution.

Jackson, for one, felt that the "old ruined houses and towns" of the "southwestern corner of Colorado Territory [displayed] a civilization and intelligence far beyond that of the present inhabitants of this or adjacent territory."[77] Holmes concluded that the San Juan Basin had been occupied previously "by a race totally distinct from the nomadic savages" of his

---

[76] Ibid.

[77] Jackson, 17.

day, and "in every way superior to them."[78] Ingersoll described the area as "occupied by ruins which show an Indian occupation previous to the present savages, and of a different rank if not another race."[79] Nordenskiöld posited that the Mesa Verdeans' superior methods in crafting pottery had been lost over time, and were entirely "unknown" to "the few North American tribes that still [made] pottery" during his studies—further suggesting a degeneration in skills.[80] Altogether, these authors viewed living American Indian people as inferior to those who built Mesa Verde. That the Mesa Verdeans "were the forefathers of certain Pueblo tribes who now occupy lands to the south" was taken as fact by Nordenskiöld, Ingersoll, and Chapin.[81] However, recognizing the Mesa Verdeans as the ancestors of living peoples did nothing to raise living indigenous peoples in the esteem of these authors.

Though casual racism was apparent throughout all of these documents, popular writer Chapin offered the most sensational commentary about the American Indian people whom he encountered in his travels, commenting with a somewhat lecherous degree of detail on the attractiveness of indigenous women, and referring to "raids, ravages, and massacres" as routine occurrences for "these children of the wilderness."[82] Chapin referred to themes of threat and violence, among other "troubles with the natives" with such nonchalance that they

---

[78] Holmes, 3.

[79] Ingersoll, 163.

[80] Nordenskiöld, 80.

[81] Chapin, Loc. 2018.

[82] Ibid., Loc. 1220-1297.

seem to have been a relatively pedestrian feature of Anglo-American attitudes at the time, though something of a source of fascination, as well.[83]

The reason all of these things are worth remarking upon is that the way these men discussed cultural evolution, the characteristics of the Mesa Verdeans, and the characteristics of contemporary indigenous peoples, were intertwined. Furthermore, they adopted stylistic attributes of the technological psychosis to advance self-serving hypotheses. While these authors did not discuss the doctrine of Manifest Destiny explicitly, they analyzed American Indian groups as if they were looking for proof that white Americans had a right to the continent. The more different in lifestyle living American Indian peoples were from the white settlers entering the West, the farther apart from them they were cast on an evolutionary spectrum. Indeed, these authors exaggerated the supposed distance between white culture and indigenous cultures, perhaps to amplify in their narratives their encounters with an Other and their alleged bravery in undertaking their research.

Overall, the technological psychosis appeared in the works of Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin and Nordenskiöld in appeals to the mythic scientific hero, clinical distancing of the authors from the harmful research methods they used at Mesa Verde, and attempts to classify the Mesa Verdeans and other indigenous peoples as lesser "races." The scientific valuations of Mesa Verde translated from one realm of practice to another. Ultimately, the authors' findings at Mesa Verde helped to justify settler colonialism at the same time that they feigned scientific rationality. These aspects of the technological psychosis sometimes appeared in the context of imaginative language, and sometimes in

[83] Ibid., Loc. 201.

more clinical terms. In either case, the technological psychosis supported myths like cultural evolution, white superiority, and the rationality of science.

In the sections that follow, I examine the openly poetic language that appeared alongside the technological psychosis in the works of these authors. While Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, and Chapin vacillated between the use of clinical language and the use of poetic language, all of their discourse supported myths of modernity. In the case of their poetic interludes, these authors tended to promote an infatuation with the past, the Other, and supposedly primitive (and sometimes idyllic) ways of life. These myths were foils to the scientific ones that these authors also advanced, but equally symptomatic of modernity.[84]

Deflected Poetics and Cultural Evolutionary Assessments

Even as Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld adopted clinical language to analyze the level of cultural development of the Mesa Verdeans, they struggled to maintain the technological psychosis. They were enchanted by the place, and poetic interludes in their texts undermined their technological psychosis at nearly every turn. One site where the tension between the technological psychosis and a poetic psychosis was most apparent was in the authors' discussion of the masonry at Mesa Verde. While masonry was the sort of thing whose quality they could measure using such instruments as they had available, their astonishment as to its quality belied their clinical detachment.

[84] Philip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998); Jason A. Josephson-Storm, *The Myth of Disenchantment: Magic, Modernity, and the Birth of the Human Sciences* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2017).

In Jackson's writings, he expressed true regard for the masonry he found there, saying it "was finished with exceptional care."[85] Indeed, to Jackson, "[t]he entire construction of this little human eyrie displayed wonderful perseverance, ingenuity, and some taste."[86] Like Jackson, Holmes could hardly have been more complimentary of the quality of the masonry he observed at Mesa Verde. Holmes also complimented the location of the architecture as "one of unparalleled security, both from enemies and the elements."[87] Holmes, like Jackson, showed some regard for the Mesa Verdeans, remarking that their structures were "built with much skill."[88] Considering a tower he viewed as "a defensive work" Holmes thought it demonstrated "not a little intelligence and forethought on the part of the builders."[89] Altogether, Holmes proclaimed that "when one considers that [building] materials must have been brought from far below by means of ropes, or carried in small quantities up the dangerous stairway, the only wonder is that it was ever brought to its present degree of finish."[90] Here, Holmes offered an expression of wonder, but it was paired with incredulity at the task that the Ancestral Puebloans undertook in crafting Mesa Verde. While these authors suggested that the sturdy "eyries" at Mesa Verde may have been crudely constructed, still they captured the imagination.

---

[85] Jackson, 24.

[86] Ibid., 21.

[87] Holmes, 15.

[88] Ibid., 11.

[89] Ibid.

[90] Ibid., 15.

Writing almost a decade later, though reflecting, perhaps, the time he spent on the Hayden Survey with the others, Ingersoll joined Jackson and Holmes in praising the masonry work in the buildings he encountered, marveling that "all this was done, so far as we can learn, with no other tools than those made of stone."[91] Ingersoll was thoroughly impressed, declaring that "so consummate was [the Mesa Verdeans'] skill in masonry that these abutments still stand . . . the tooth of time had found them hard gnawing."[92] Here, Ingersoll paired the quality of the architecture with the feat of transcending time, rendering his compliments more poetically than his peers.

Chapin, too, chimed in on the building prowess of the Mesa Verdeans, particularly with regard to the defensive position of their structures.[93] However, Chapin's compliments about Mesa Verdean masonry were peppered with negative judgment. For instance, Chapin commented that "the marvel would be greater that a people with only stone and wooden tools could have accomplished such a work" if only the building materials had not been "already at hand, shapen by the elements."[94] At the same time, Chapin provided some editorial comments about what he viewed as the meagre tastes of the Mesa Verdeans. For instance, Chapin regarded many architectural traits as the result of "the eccentricity of the builders,"

---

[91] Ingersoll, 160.

[92] Ibid., 158-159.

[93] Chapin, Loc. 1505.

[94] Ibid., Loc. 1766.

further assuming that "[t]he race of Cliff-Dwellers were not liberal of space when they built their doors."[95] Chapin's compliments were grudging, at best.

Similar to Chapin's knock about the small doors at Mesa Verde, Nordenskiöld remarked that "[t]he inhabitants must have had no great pretensions as regards light and air."[96] Nordenskiöld also furnished a backhanded compliment about the quality of the masonry, noting that a tower, for instance, "in its construction bears undeniable witness to the great skill of the builders, especially when we remember the rude implements with which their work was executed."[97] In discussing the manner by which the Mesa Verdeans ascended the canyon walls, Nordenskiöld remarked that the "perilous climbs that formed a part of their daily life, had inured them to difficult pathways. A few pegs in the walls . . . were certainly enough to satisfy their primitive wants in this respect."[98] Nordenskiöld concluded that because these people were supposedly primitive, they were more tolerant of unpleasant architectural features than he was. Even with all of his complaints about the masonry at Mesa Verde, Nordenskiöld confided to his his readers: "I cannot refrain from once more laying stress on the skill to which the walls of the Cliff Palace in general bear witness, and the stability and strength with which has been supplied to them by the careful dressing of the blocks and the chinking of the interstices with small chips of stone."[99] Nordenskiöld's rhetoric demonstrated a dialectic of contempt and attraction, indicating the fascination that

---

[95] Chapin, Loc. 1505.

[96] Nordenskiöld, 54.

[97] Ibid., 56.

[98] Ibid., 67.

[99] Ibid., 64.

crept out from beneath the terministic screen of the technological psychosis. The technological psychosis urged these authors to interpret the masonry in cultural-evolutionary terms, but their own astonishment as to the workmanship undermined their disdain for the builders of Mesa Verde.

The tension between the technological psychosis and the poetic psychosis also showed itself in expressions of consternation that the authors declared, when attempting to come to terms with what they experienced at Mesa Verde. For instance, Holmes proclaimed, "What could have induced people to build and dwell in such a locality it is useless to surmise," though of course, he did make several guesses as to the motives of the Mesa Verdeans.[100] Chapin couched his own questions in terms of racial descriptors *and* mystery, wondering "How long since human foot had trod those sandstone floors? Surely not since the forgotten prehistoric race had deserted the caves. Certainly no white man had ever entered these walls before."[101] Nordenskiöld shared in the bewilderment his peers felt, asking "What can have induced a people to have recourse to dwelling-places so incommodious?"[102] He asked further, "What can have induced an agricultural people to prefer desolate cañons and dry sandy plains to fertile mountain slopes . . . Another of the many riddles which confront the student of the prehistoric inhabitants of these tracts!"[103] Mesa Verde filled these authors with questions, and withheld the answers.

---

[100] Holmes, 7.

[101] Chapin, Loc. 1505.

[102] Nordenskiöld, 45.

[103] Ibid., 121.

Though the authors bemoaned the inscrutability of Mesa Verde when discussing their interpretations, their use of poetic language in describing the site suggests that they enjoyed their time there, and found pleasure in Mesa Verde's mystique, as they saw it. They added to the narrative of wonder by talking about riddles, abandonment, and mystery, sensationalizing their accounts. Through their use of language, they demonstrated to their readers the fascination they felt for the ancient site. They may have intended to enchant their readers, as well, at least by convincing them that Mesa Verde was a wondrous place.

The example of the authors' commentary on the masonry at Mesa Verde demonstrated the tension between the technological psychosis and poetic enchantment that Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin and Nordenskiöld conveyed in the presence of this Southwestern antiquity. In the following discussion, I describe unabashed expressions of poetry at Mesa Verde, which the technological psychosis deflected and reflected by turns.

The Poetic Psychosis

I identify as evidence of the poetic psychosis any profession to wonder, awe, or mystery in these authors' texts. In this discussion of the poetic psychosis, it is key to note the authors' technological psychosis shaped the way they expressed wonder in the face of Southwestern antiquities. The myths to which they ascribed also inflected their poetic expressions of wonder at Mesa Verde. For whatever astonishment or awe these authors claimed to feel while walking in Mesa Verde, they also felt entitled to do as they wished with the walls, objects, and buried individuals that they encountered there. They also used the sites in order to advance a number of deleterious claims about America's indigenous peoples.

Thus far, I have described the ways in which the technological psychosis shaped the communication of the adventurers and archaeologists who made Mesa Verde known to the

Anglo-American public. However, it is key to note that all of the men whose works I discuss described a combination of professional and more enigmatic reasons for entering the alcove dwellings. References to mystery and wonder are signs of the poetic psychosis that accompanied the technological one. Holmes remarked that he had been "assigned the very agreeable task of making examinations of . . . ancient remains" while he satisfied his "duties" as a government geologist.[104] Jackson, the photographer, said that he was on a "quest for the picturesque," a fitting mission for a person tasked with capturing the beauty of the west in order to promote the Hayden survey.[105] As Ingersoll, the journalist, told his story some years later, his party had been drawn to the region after having "vaguely heard of marvelous relics of a bygone civilization unequaled by anything short of the splendid ruins of Central America and the land of the Incas."[106] For Ingersoll, finding the truth in a rumor and witnessing the marvelous seemed to be major motivations. Chapin, the mountaineer, admitted that the "[t]he spires of the San Juan ranges had exercised a powerful fascination upon [him]," which only intensified once he encountered the ancient structures therein.[107] For the scholar, Nordenskiöld, simply learning about the alcove dwellings from Richard Wetherill was enough to inspire curiosity, and later, excavations. Nordenskiöld claimed that his "first ride along Mancos Canyon" with Wetherill "inspired [him] with a strong desire to examine [the ancient structures] more closely."[108]

---

[104] Holmes, 3.

[105] Jackson, 30.

[106] Ingersoll, 156.

[107] Chapin, Loc. 871.

[108] Nordenskiöld, 14.

For these authors, the combination of mystery, beauty, and the promise of new discovery "inspired" their subsequent actions within the alcove dwellings at Mesa Verde. They expressed their enchantment with Mesa Verde primarily through their poetic renderings of it as a romantic ruin, and through their fanciful interpretations of American Indian culture, which fetishized indigenous heritage at the same time that it rendered it poetically. While the poetic psychosis accompanied the technological psychosis, typically it supported cultural myths that fit poorly within that more rationalistic discourse. The poetic psychosis appealed primarily to myths of romantic ruins and primitivism, expressed through the assumption of tragedy for the Other.

Romantic Ruins

The alcove dwellings at Mesa Verde, and other aged structures throughout the American Southwest, never were called "ruins" until non-American Indian travelers encountered them and wrote about them. Yet, the authors in this chapter discussed Southwestern antiquities as ruins all the time, and routinely used language to frame them as such. For these learned men of European descent, we may assume a certain influence from Romanticism, the 18th and 19th century literary trend that emphasized transcendence, tragedy, and—yes, ruins. Whereas Wordsworth, Shelley, and Coleridge dwelled poetically on abbeys, Pompeii, and the like,[109] the authors under discussion here surveyed different terrain. Yet, through the communication style of the poetic psychosis, Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld turned Mesa Verde into a place with the aspect of a literary

[109] Thomas McFarland, Romanticism and the Forms of Ruin: Wordsworth, Coleridge, and the Modalities of Fragmentation (Princeton: Princeton Legacy Library, 2004).

"ruin." Their frequent reference to the structures in Mesa Verde as ruins certainly emphasized this effect.

All of the authors discussed in this chapter diminished the wonder of Mesa Verde through their actions and their professional interpretations, even as they crafted its wonder rhetorically for their readership. None of these authors escaped Mesa Verde's appeal, however. In this way, they turned Mesa Verde from a specimen for the technological psychosis into a literary ruin, described through the poetic psychosis. For instance, though typically a fairly dry writer, geologist Holmes offered a poetic interlude in his report on Mesa Verde. Talking about the experiences of a person encountering Mesa Verde for the first time, Holmes wrote:

> In one place in particular, a picturesque outstanding promontory has been full of dwellings, literally honeycombed by this earth-burrowing race, and as one from below views the ragged, window-pierced crags, he is unconsciously led to wonder if they are not the ruins of some ancient castle, behind whose moldering walls are hidden the dread secrets of a long-forgotten people.[110]

In this narrative, Holmes assumed the subject position of a discoverer, and invited his readers to do the same. He added mystique to his narrative by rendering the Mesa Verdeans as dramatically Other, describing them as a long-forgotten, earth-burrowing race in possession of dread secrets. While this was an exotic rendering, with problematic representational features, it was a short-lived fancy for Holmes. No sooner did he paint this picture than he belittled the sense of wonder he had just cultivated, defining the architecture as a simple stronghold, and filled with only modest goods. Even so, the poetic register appeared in Holmes' wandering description of the picturesque at Mesa Verde.

---

[110] Holmes, 9.

In contrast to Holmes' aesthetic, the journalist Ingersoll favored analogies between the Mesa Verdeans and their contemporaneous Old World counterparts. Towards the end of the account of his time at Mesa Verde, Ingersoll implored future travelers to the region never to "forget how populous was this dry and garish valley during those bygone days, when the Crusaders were waking up in Europe, and all that was known of America was that the Basque fishermen went to the fog-banks of an icy western coast to catch codfish."[111] By emphasizing all that was unknown about Mesa Verde until the Hayden survey, Ingersoll made it sound like part of a New World, indeed. Ingersoll, further, was the only one of these authors to include *actual* poetry in his discussion of Mesa Verde. Ingersoll concluded his chapter on the ancient architecture of the San Juan Basin by quoting a poem written by an acquaintance, "in Swinburnian measure."[112]

The poem Ingersoll included in his account, written by Stanley Wood, described a collection of ancient structures in a nearby region, overlooking a river named Hovenweep. Wood described the antiquities' setting as a desolate land "Beloved of the sun, and bereft of the rain" in which the "wild winds" blew "o'er the plains of the dead." As in Holmes' interlude, Wood portrayed the ancient structures as castles, "like the nest of a swallow" where no one dared to go. The poet wrote of shrines and altars, and silence interrupted only by cries of birds. In the final stanza of the poem, Wood personified the remaining structures at Hovenweep, and described them as sentries:

> Dismantled towers, and turrets broken,
> Like grim and war-worn braves who keep

---

[111] Ingersoll,164.

[112] Ibid., 165.

> A silent guard, with grief unspoken,
> Watch o'er the graves by the Hoven-weep.
> The nameless graves of a race forgotten;
> Whose deeds, whose words, whose fate are one
> With the mist, long ages past begotten,
> Of the Sun.[113]

Though offered in more florid language than the authors' prose, Wood's poem contained many of the same cultural biases of the scientists, journalist, and adventurer whose texts I assess here. For instance, describing the towers "[l]ike grim and war-worn braves" certainly evoked the trope of the noble savage. Meanwhile, as Wood pondered upon the romances of the "maidens loved, and lovers daunted," a dreamy tone also emerged as a fashion of the epoch. Finally, Wood's emphasis on the mystique of the ancient structures of the Southwest emphasized the aesthetic of fascination that the other authors put forth as well.[114]

Chapin was a man of words more than a man of science, much like Ingersoll and his poet friend, Wood. Accordingly, Chapin presented many poetic descriptions of Mesa Verde. Given Chapin's fame as a mountaineer, his conviction that the setting of Mesa Verde added to the allure of his time there is fitting:

> Perhaps these same ruins, if placed on a plain or in a quiet valley, would not appeal so strongly to our sense of the marvelous; here, in a remote cañon, far from the river, far from water of any kind, with high frowning walls upon three sides, and an untracked ravine below it, one wonders why the lost tribes should have selected such a place for their home.[115]

Chapin explicitly referred to the "sense of the marvelous" that drew him to Mesa Verde, and referenced wonder, as well. Though a problematic figure in many regards, Chapin was very

---

[113] Stanley Wood, "Homes of the Cliff-Dwellers," quoted by Ingersoll, 165.

[114] Ibid.

[115] Chapin, Loc. 1766.

open to the quality of fascination that operated in the discourse of Mesa Verde, and even accentuated it in his own writings. He remarked on the "beauty and magnitude" of Cliff Palace and other locales in great detail, though favored the contrast between the beauty of the mountains and the alcove dwellings and what he perceived as the desolate surroundings for both.[116]

Nordenskiöld also used poetic language to describe the alcove dwellings at Mesa Verde. He found them to possess "an aspect at once singular and imposing . . . perched like an eagle's eyrie half-way up the most inaccessible precipices."[117] He referred to the path towards the mesa as "a perfect labyrinth to the uninitiated."[118] When discussing his findings, Nordenskiöld admitted that the "still scanty information of the cliff-dwellers [could not] lift the veil of obscurity" covering the site.[119] Imposing eyries, labyrinths requiring initiation in order to pass, and veils of obscurity–these read like the stuff of magic. Nordenskiöld joined the other authors in writing about Mesa Verde as if it were otherworldly.

The preceding poetic descriptions of Mesa Verde portrayed the place as strange and enchanting. Each of the authors communicated picturesque and dramatic elements of the alcove dwellings at Mesa Verde, often relying on stereotypes about American Indian people in order to portray the mystique of the site. Such stereotypes were evidence of the myths of primitivism and white superiority that were prevalent in the nineteenth century. Though much of the authors' poetic writing about the Mesa Verdeans and their descendants

---

[116] Ibid., Loc. 1594.

[117] Nordenskiöld, 6.

[118] Ibid., 59-60.

[119] Ibid., 66.

emphasized their alterity, there were occasional gestures to assume the perspective of the alcove dwellings' architects. These humanizing commentaries typically adopted poetic language, as well.

More than the other authors, Chapin attempted to imagine himself in the subject position of the Mesa Verdeans. For example, he described viewing the same panoramas that the Mesa Verdeans had seen. He found "hewn steps on the face of the cliff, and descending by them, as members of the tribe must have done, --as perhaps their ferocious adversaries may have done also," he reached his destination in a contemplative mood.[120] It is intriguing that Chapin identified both with the Mesa Verdeans and with their "ferocious adversaries" when taking the steps into the gorge; however, his reflection on the bodily position of the Mesa Verdeans suggests a willingness to sympathize with those people. Yet, Chapin's perceived connection with the Mesa Verdeans did *not* translate into more compassionate regard for their descendants, nor for any other minority group. Chapin held his racial biases and his fellow-feeling towards the Mesa Verdeans at the same time. He comingled the technological and poetic psychoses, but always adhered to modern myths that disparaged non-white social actors.

The recognition of humanity in the Mesa Verdeans showed in one other marked way in these writings, in a fascinating parallel across most of these authors' works. Jackson, Holmes, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld all commented on the fact that the fingermarks of the Mesa Verdean masons still could be seen in the mortar of their buildings. Holmes noted that "impressions of the minute markings of the cuticle of the fingers" were evident in the

[120] Chapin, Loc. 1482.

mortar.[121] Nordenskiöld, though disagreeing with Jackson's technical assessment of the masonry work, remarked that "the finger marks of the masons still [could] be traced in the mortar."[122] In tours today, NPS interpretive rangers still draw visitor attention to the enduring fingerprints of the Mesa Verdeans. This, like other attributes of the site, attracts contemporary visitors as much as it once charmed the nineteenth century authors who interacted with Mesa Verde. Such humanizing depictions evinced the poetic psychosis, rather than the technological one.

From this discussion of these authors' expressions of wonder at Mesa Verde, we may conclude that Mesa Verde "exercised a powerful fascination" on Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld.[123] Yet, it is difficult to attribute a positive ethic to the quality of fascination that appeared so prominently in these authors' texts. While admiration was one component of what these authors expressed, it was coupled with fetishism and the regular assertion of the authors' own cultural superiority. The sensational way in which these authors engaged with Mesa Verde served to distance them from the Mesa Verdeans. Given the authors' references to cultural evolution, and hence, a belief in their own racial superiority, any effort to Other the Mesa Verdeans connected ideologically to the tenets of cultural evolution and other prevalent cultural myths of their time. In such a configuration, if the Mesa Verdeans were interesting or peculiar, it was due, in part, to their lesser ranking on an evolutionary scale. Through the poetic language these authors used, their impressions of the

---

[121] Holmes, 13.

[122] Nordenskiöld, 64.

[123] To borrow a phrase from Chapin, Loc. 871.

Mesa Verdeans as curiosities overshadowed their occasional attempts to regard the Mesa Verdeans as complete, complex people.

Tragic Fates

As the preceding discussion illustrated, Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld demonstrated a poetic psychosis when they described Mesa Verde to their readers. Imaginative depictions of Mesa Verde as a literary ruin illustrated the poetic psychosis, and that psychosis also appeared in the authors' occasional attempts to humanize the Mesa Verdeans. They exhibited wonder in the presence of Mesa Verde, and they exhibited it through the use of poetic language. These authors also adopted charged language to describe the Mesa Verdeans, themselves, as well as the American Indian people whom they encountered over the course of their field work. Whereas their infatuation with place demonstrated a form of esteem, their poetic psychosis towards the Mesa Verdeans and their descendants tended to fetishize those people, typically by framing them as tragic figures out of legend.

All of the authors hazarded a few guesses about what life must have been like for the Mesa Verdeans. All of the authors, further, assumed that life was nasty, brutish, and short, at least insofar as violence was a foregone conclusion for Mesa Verdeans, in the minds of these nineteenth-century authors. Typically, though, Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld depicted the supposedly violent lives of the Mesa Verdeans with relish, and painted a tragic tale about those people in great detail. The poetic psychosis informed their interpretations of the Mesa Verdeans at least as much as the technological psychosis did.

Holmes was the most succinct of these authors, in his interpretations of the alcove dwellings and their architects. He imagined "that no ordinary circumstances could have

driven a people" to build within the alcoves, but rather, the threat of war must have done it.[124] Jackson, for his part, was also modest in his interpretive claims about the Mesa Verdeans, saying it did "not seem worth while . . . to advance any theories" about them.[125] He did, however, quote at length from a *New York Tribune* article published earlier in the year by Ingersoll, recounting a story about Mesa Verde told to them by their local guide. In this story, "troublesome neighbors—ancestors of the present Utes—began to forage upon [the Mesa Verdeans], and, at last, to massacre them and devastate their farms; so, to save their lives at least, they built houses high upon the cliffs."[126] After the "long fight," the story held that those who survived moved to Arizona and became the "Moquis . . . preserving more carefully and purely the history and veneration of their forefathers than their skill or wisdom."[127] In Jackson's telling, the move into the alcoves was an act of desperation, because a nomadic group was thought to have preyed on an agricultural group. When settlers and their government witnessed the descendants of the surviving agricultural people, they considered them a lesser version of the Mesa Verdeans.

In his full text, Ingersoll added to his earlier newspaper coverage, portraying the Mesa Verdeans as "gentle shepherds and husbandmen (but no less brave warriors)."[128] He used the architecture he observed to develop an argument about how "sharp and incessant

---

[124] Holmes, 17.

[125] Jackson, 30.

[126] Ibid., 28.

[127] Ibid., 29.

[128] Ingersoll, 164.

was the lookout [the alcove communities] kept against well-mounted and savage nomadic tribes, the prehistoric Utes and Apaches and Navajos, who were to them as the Scythians and the Vandals and Goths to the weakened empire of effeminate Rome."[129] Though Ingersoll meant to do the Mesa Verdeans a credit, one supposes, in comparing them to an effeminate Rome, nevertheless he cast aspersions upon the nomadic groups of the Southwest. Ingersoll romanticized the duress of war more than Jackson and Holmes before him, but arrived at many of the same conclusions about the lifestyle and motivations of the Mesa Verdeans.

Chapin imagined conflict with still more vigor than Ingersoll displayed, telling his readers that throughout Mesa Verde there was "evidence" that "savage warriors once struggled and battled for the possession of the land."[130] Like the others, Chapin concluded that "the inhabitants lived in fear of attack from outside enemies."[131] Chapin agreed with Holmes' assessment that the alcove dwellings were undesirable places in which to live, commenting upon "[w]hat a dark and gloomy place did these mysterious people select for their home, their fortress, whichever name we may give to it! A stronghold surely it was . . . and the vertical cliffs could not be scaled when rocks were being hurled from battlement and tower above."[132] It is Chapin's evocation of rock-flinging, in particular, that indicates the more imaginative narrative he presented of the Mesa Verdeans, compared to his peers. In general, though, his conclusions were consistent with those of the other authors.

---

[129] Ibid.

[130] Chapin, Loc. 132.

[131] Ibid., 759.

[132] Ibid., 1571.

Like the rest, Nordenskiöld assumed that life for the Mesa Verdeans centered on defense, considering it "and fortification of the dwelling [to be] uppermost in the mind of its builders."[133] Nordenskiöld concurred with the other authors in presuming "that the immigrants, constantly menaced by their enemies, first took refuge in caves and recesses fortified by the hand of nature and offering a safe retreat."[134] Nordenskiöld commented on the defensive position of several of the dwellings with which he interacted, and whether or not the inhabitants of particular dwellings "succumbed to their enemies."[135]

Current archaeologists concur with some of what these nineteenth-century authors concluded, agreeing that the architecture at Mesa Verde indicates that defense was one of the factors that the architects of the alcove dwellings considered when they chose to build their homes in canyon walls. Current archaeologists do suggest that a combination of activities resulted in the early demise of some of the people who once lived at Mesa Verde.[136] However, much of what distinguishes the current era of anthropological writing from the nineteenth-century interpretations is the effort to regard the actions of those in the past within a framework of cultural relativism, and with the assumption of agency on the part of the social actors who participated in various practices. Further, in light of the influence of post-modernism, anthropological writing today typically resists the assumption that anything

---

[133] Nordenskiöld, 58.

[134] Ibid.,168.

[135] Ibid., 29.

[136] Debra L. Martin, "Hard Times in Dry Lands: Making Meaning of Violence in the Ancient Southwest," *Journal of Anthropological Research* 72, no. 1 (2016): 1–23, doi:10.1086/685281.

people do is inherent to their nature, culture, or upbringing.[137] By contrast, Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin and Nordenskiöld treated violence as an intrinsic part of life for *all* indigenous peoples of the Americas, and as evidence of some evolutionary shortcoming, as well. Even so, they enjoyed describing that violence, and it provoked some of their most poetic language. It was no iteration of the technological psychosis to dwell on the tragic fates of the Mesa Verdeans, but an allusion to other cultural myths prevalent at the end of the nineteenth century. Namely, these authors appealed to myths of primitivism and the noble savage, alongside racial stereotypes that presumed indigenous people were doomed to lives of violence.

In summary, the authors who introduced Mesa Verde to the Anglo-American public communicated both the poetic psychosis and the technological psychosis. They communicated the influence of the poetic psychosis through their transmogrification of ancient structures into literary ruins, and in their fetishizing rhetoric about the Mesa Verdeans and their supposedly tragic fate. Both the technological psychosis and the poetic psychosis informed the authors' discussions of the state of preservation at Mesa Verde, though both forms of communicative engagement with Mesa Verde screened the damage that the authors caused to that ancient place.

Preservation Advocacy

As Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld discussed their time in Mesa Verde, the technological and poetic psychoses overlapped. The authors emphasized the romance and mystique of Mesa Verde at the same time that they classified and scrutinized

[137] Trigger.

the site through their research methods. They admired the works of the Mesa Verdeans at the same time that they worked to establish Mesa Verdean inferiority. They imagined themselves looking at the same vistas the Mesa Verdeans saw, at the same time that they looked down on contemporary indigenous peoples. Based on their texts, it seems that these authors found nothing incongruous about their joint fascination and scholarly detachment, with its accompanying belittlement. Similarly, they did not describe it as dissonant that they damaged Mesa Verde while examining it, nor that they made declarations about archaeological preservation and allied social issues while exacerbating the need for both.

History does not remember any of these authors as preservation advocates; they were not. However, some of the authors discussed here did offer opinions about the state of preservation at Mesa Verde, and about related issues. Though most were impressed by the endurance of the site, Jackson, for one, bemoaned the fact that a collection of rooms he and his party located "had all been despoiled" prior to their arrival.[138] Given that Jackson's group had entered the room with the intention of despoiling it themselves, this could hardly be called preservation advocacy. Nordenskiöld, for his part, also commented on the state of preservation of various parts of the site that he had occasion to excavate. On the whole, Nordenskiöld felt that he "should have preferred to investigate places that had not been touched before."[139] Like Jackson, Nordenskiöld wished that others had not taken objects out of Mesa Verde before him. Both authors mostly expressed their disgruntlement as the result of having been denied a more pristine hunting ground for themselves. In this, Jackson and Nordenskiöld exhibited the technological psychosis.

---

[138] Jackson, 19.

[139] Nordenskiöld, 22.

In terms of archaeological ethics, surprisingly, it was the mountaineer and outspoken cultural evolutionist Frederick Chapin who spoke with the most prescience about the future of Mesa Verde. Though he saw "no reason why, if unmolested, the walls [at Mesa Verde] should not stand a thousand years as we now see them," Chapin expressed his ardent wish that only people with the correct qualifications conduct work on the site.[140] Chapin hoped:

> . . . that any work which may be done here in the future will be carried on under competent supervision, and that the walls will not be damaged in any way. Collectors, so far, have been very thoughtful. With a suitable appropriation, this structure could be so arranged that it could be converted into a museum, and be filled with relics of the lost people, and become one of the attractions of southern Colorado.[141]

I hesitate to call this an example of preservation advocacy for three reasons. First, Chapin eagerly wished for archaeological work to continue at Mesa Verde, and archaeological work was and is inherently destructive. Second, Chapin wanted Mesa Verde to become an "attraction," which is another purpose for the site that is inherently destructive. Finally, Chapin viewed the damages to the site prior to his visit as the results of time or of inconsiderate collectors, and not of individuals we would now consider as pot-hunters or overly aggressive archaeologists. Even taking Chapin's cultural context into account, the fact remains that the people who had preceded him had altered the site dramatically and irrevocably. In expressing his hopes for preservation, however, Chapin illustrated dimensions of the poetic psychosis.

In terms of allied social issues, Chapin, though laudatory about the ease with which one could take the train into the Southwest, mourned the presence of industry in the mountain

---

[140] Chapin, Loc. 1945.

[141] Ibid., Loc. 1664.

ranges, indicating that mineral extraction disrupted his enjoyment of the outdoors. While traveling in the proximity of a mine, for example, Chapin said he felt he was "not in a very wild country, [having been] preceded by many."[142] Chapin regretted the deforestation of the mountain ranges as well, saying that in a town close to Mesa Verde "the axe [was] already at work, and the town-folk [needed to] look out for the future, before it [was] too late to preserve the forests."[143] Chapin's conservationist remarks were situated within a conversation about adventure and the picturesque. It was apparently for these reasons, rather than environmental responsibility, that Chapin opined about the negative effects of industry and deforestation. Notably, the technological psychosis was not a factor in Chapin's conservationist attitude. Indeed, he opposed the overuse of the forests.

Nordenskiöld alone commented on the quality of life of the American Indian peoples near Mesa Verde. Nordenskiöld fell short of advocating for indigenous rights, as such, but recorded frank remarks about life for the Ute Indians, noting that they, like most other American Indian peoples, were "rapidly dying out, and form[ed] but the last remnant of a once great and powerful nation."[144] While this comment seemed to be tinged with some regret, and appeared to recognize indigenous sovereignty, referring to the extinction of a group of people dehumanized the people in question. In a similar line of thought, Nordenskiöld brought up a proposal that would have offered "the surviving Ute Indians . . . another territory in some part of Utah where the hunting [was] said to be more productive,

---

[142] Ibid., Loc. 936.

[143] Ibid., Loc. 959.

[144] Nordenskiöld, 3.

and the pasturage better, and where, above all, no white neighbours as yet dispute[d] the possession of the soil."[145] Nordenskiöld seemed to critique the fact that the proposal had been "mooted," though critiqued its rejection obliquely, at best.[146] Nordenskiöld also seemed to recognize the white settlers' threat to the American Indian people in the Southwest, tacitly acknowledging that American Indian people were likely to suffer losses in land disputes with white settlers. On the whole, though, Nordenskiöld's commentary on the well-being of the Ute he encountered served as context for his study, rather than a key focus for it. The distance with which he referred to tense intercultural relationships in the American Southwest was most consistent with the technological psychosis.

The opinions that Chapin and Nordenskiöld gave on matters related to preservation advocacy demonstrate that, even in the nineteenth century, observers connected the well-being of Mesa Verde with environmental preservation, the presence or absence of industry, archaeological practice, tourism, and the federal government's treatment of contemporary American Indian peoples. Yet, the authors discussed here entered the ancient structures with motivated self-interest, building their reputations through tales of grandeur, and defending the ideologically-destructive tenets of cultural evolution through biased interpretations of the Mesa Verdeans. While they may have expressed fascination with what they observed at Mesa Verde, their remarks of respect for Mesa Verdeans were sparse and often grudging. Their wishes for the ongoing treatment of Mesa Verde reflected their valuation of the site as a domain for archaeologists and a resource for personal enjoyment.

---

[145] Ibid., 4.

[146] Ibid.

Conclusion

Over the course of this chapter, I have claimed that the authors who introduced Mesa Verde to the English-speaking public demonstrated aspects of both the technological psychosis and the poetic psychosis. Drawing from dramatism, I have defined the communication pattern of the technological psychosis as one typical of researchers and modernity, which advances the myth of the scientific hero, the rationality of science, and various modes of classification, while emphasizing the use value of various resources above other considerations. When Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin and Nordenskiöld applied the technological psychosis towards their interpretations of indigenous peoples, they classified American Indian cultures according to the condescending theory of cultural evolution. The purported objectivity of the technological psychosis obfuscated the racial prejudice that these authors advanced in the name of science, and deflected attention from the destructiveness of their field methods.

I have developed the poetic psychosis as the foil and companion to the technological psychosis. As I understand it, the poetic psychosis is evident in a communicative style that embraces wonder, awe, and enchantment. The authors whose texts I study in this chapter demonstrated the poetic psychosis in their astonishment at the feats of the Mesa Verdeans, their poetic transformation of an ancient place into a literary ruin, and their obsession with the tragic fate of the Mesa Verdeans. Whereas narratives in the technological psychosis emphasized myths about reason and racial superiority, language reflecting the poetic psychosis romanticized the Other, advancing myths like primitivism and the noble savage, instead. Both of these psychoses screened rhetorically the physical and social damage that these authors encouraged through their interpretations of Mesa Verde.

Whereas Burke enjoyed Veblen's concept of the trained incapacity because of its ambivalence for critical analysis, I intend for the term "psychosis" to be understood ambivalently, as well. I do not intend for the term to imply that these authors displayed mental illness, nor do I necessarily intend for the term to intimate that the authors used language pathologically. Rather, they used language to shape facts in a manner that reflected reality selectively. The technological and poetic psychoses were mindsets, certainly, in the manner by which Dewey and Burke described them. They also encouraged selective renderings of the phenomena that the explorers and archaeologists in this chapter encountered, and perpetuated cultural myths that reaffirmed the professions and social positions of those who exhibited those psychoses. All rhetoric is but a partial representation; these were especially focused partialities.

My joint analysis of the technological and poetic psychoses that shaped Mesa Verde's Anglo-American public debut calls to mind other scholarship pertaining to the era in which Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld practiced their trades, and the eras preceding it. For instance, Jason Josephson-Storm has identified bimodal thinking in the works of noteworthy Enlightenment thinkers, where magical thinking and scientific rationality coexisted with, co-constituted, and challenged one another.[147] Josephson-Storm claims that such an entanglement between enchantment and myths of disenchantment formed a major component of the discourses of modernity. Jane Bennett, like Josephson-Storm, has proposed that expressions of rationality during the modern era never diminished enchantment, though narratives such as those stemming from the technological psychosis

[147] Josephson-Storm, 41.

proposed that disenchantment was a *fait accompli*. Bennett, too, has observed that narratives of both rationality and enchantment often coincide.

Within the context of settler colonialism, the bimodal thinking that the technological and poetic psychoses indicate often assumes a prejudicial form. Saurabh Dube has noted competing myths of modernity, particularly in contexts of settler colonialism, where subaltern peoples historically have received mystical descriptions in contrast to the supposedly rationalistic and advanced categorizations for colonial powers and their institutions. Colonial agencies described subaltern peoples as referents of a pre-modern or pre-industrial time, enchanting and inferior by turns, and radically different from dominant social formations. The difference itself was enchanting, and so was the myth of that difference. In the United States, specifically, Philip Deloria has studied the ways in which racism and primitivism were the two primary interpretive modes that white social actors used to understand the American Indian people about whom they communicated during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. By my own understanding, the technological psychosis encouraged scientifically-supported racism through cultural evolutionary thinking, whereas the poetic psychosis encouraged the fetishization and romanticism that accompanied the myth of primitivism.

This chapter enters into these conversations by reinforcing such researchers' premises. It supports the claim that disenchantment is an enchantment, albeit a mythic one rather than a poetic one, and expressed primarily through the myth of scientific rationality. It finds that the rhetoric of reason and the rhetoric of enchantment often appear in tandem, coupled together in expressions of scientific *irrationality*. It concludes that scientific racism

and fetishization of the Other are two complementary expressions of racial prejudice. This chapter also makes its own interventions.

To begin with, this analysis indicates that scientism and romanticism both were present in discourse about Southwestern antiquities from their entry into Anglo-American public consciousness. The thrills of intellectual discovery and phenomenal encounter both featured early on as values for Southwestern antiquities. Whereas social actors like those whom I studied in this chapter often found Southwestern antiquities (and sometimes their architects) to be praiseworthy, researchers shaped their findings about these sites to fit mainstream attitudes. Both the technological and poetic psychoses valued the materiality of Mesa Verde, whether for research or romanticism. Both also appropriated the site for Anglo-American uses, while amplifying the alterity of American Indian peoples through scientific distance or fetishistic narratives.

As a basis for preservation advocacy, Mesa Verde's introduction to the English-speaking public may have encouraged technological and poetic curiosities, and care for the site of Mesa Verde on those grounds. The preservation advocates whose works I analyze in the next chapter certainly demonstrated both. They also introduced the well-being of their American Indian contemporaries as a pressing social issue that accompanied their advocacy on behalf of ancient indigenous places in the American Southwest. Both the technological and poetic psychoses continued to inform Anglo-American comportment towards indigenous heritage, while the advocates diverged in their poetic forms during their attempts to safeguard ancient places—and indigenous people.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bennett, Jane. *The Enchantment of Modern Life: Attachments, Crossings, and Ethics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Burke, Kenneth. *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.

———. *Permanence and Change: An Anatomy of Purpose*. 3rd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

———. *The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action*. 3rd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.

———. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. 3rd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

Chapin, Frederick H. *The Land of the Cliff-Dwellers*. Boston: Appalachian Mountain Club, W. B. Clarke and Company, 1892. Online Access via Kindle.

Correspondence of the Office of Indian Affairs, et al., 1891-1925. M082 Mesa Verde Printed Materials Collection. Fort Lewis College Center of Southwest Studies.

Deloria, Philip J. *Playing Indian*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Dube, Saurabh. "Modernity and Its Enchantments: An Introduction." In *Enchantments of Modernity: Empire, Nation, Globalization*, edited by Saurabh Dube, 1–41. London: Routledge, 2009.

Fowler, Don D. *A Laboratory for Anthropology.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000.

Harrell, David. "'We Contacted Smithsonian': The Wetherills at Mesa Verde." *New Mexico Historical Review* 62, no. 3 (1987): 229–48.

Holmes, William Henry. "A Notice of the Ancient Ruins of Southwestern Colorado, Examined During the Summer of 1875." *U.S. Geological and Geographical Survey of the Rocky Mountain Region Bulletin*, 2, no. 1 (1876): 3-25. Nineteenth Century Collections Online.

Ingersoll, Ernest. *The Crest of the Continent: A Record of a Summer's Ramble in the Rocky Mountains and Beyond.* Chicago: R. R. Donnelley & Sons, Publishers, 1885. Online Access via HathiTrust.

Jackson, William Henry. "Ancient Ruins in Southwestern Colorado." *U.S. Geological and Geographical Survey of the Rocky Mountain Region Bulletin*, no. 1 (1874-1875): 17-30. Nineteenth Century Collections Online.

Josephson-Storm, Jason A. *The Myth of Disenchantment: Magic, Modernity, and the Birth of*

the Human Sciences. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2017.

Lister, Florence L. *Troweling Through Time: The First Century of Mesa Verdean Archaeology*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2004.

Martin, Debra L. "Hard Times in Dry Lands: Making Meaning of Violence in the Ancient Southwest." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 72, no. 1 (2016): 1–23. doi:10.1086/685281.

McFarland, Thomas. *Romanticism and the Forms of Ruin: Wordsworth, Coleridge, the Modalities of Fragmentation*. Princeton: Princeton Legacy Library, 2004.

Meringolo, Denise D. *Museums, Monuments, and National Parks: Toward a New Genealogy of Public History*. Public History in Historical Perspective. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2012.

Nordenskiold, Gustaf. *The Cliff Dwellers of the Mesa Verde*. Translated by D. Lloyd Morgan. Stockholm: P. A. Norstedt & Soner, 1893.

Picard, M. Dane. "Revisiting the Life and Scientific Reputation of Ferdinand Vandeever Hayden." *Rocky Mountain Geology* 45, no. 1 (2010): 73–81.

Smith, Duane A. *Mesa Verde National Park: Shadows of the Centuries*. 2nd ed. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado, 2002.

Smith, Duane A., Karen A. Vendl, and Mark A. Vendl. *Colorado Goes to the Fair: World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago 1893*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2011.

Solomon, Martha. "The Rhetoric of Dehumanization : An Analysis of Medical Reports of the Tuskegee Syphilis Project." *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 49, no. 4 (1985): 233–47.

Tomlinson, Stephen. *Head Masters: Phrenology, Secular Education, and Nineteenth-Century Social Thought*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, Proquest EBook Central, 2014. p://ebookcentral.proquest.com.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/lib/unc/detail.action?docID=1294629.

Trigger, Bruce G. *A History of Archaeological Thought*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Veblen, Thorstein. *The Instinct of Workmanship, and the State of Industrial Arts.* New York: Macmillan, 1914. https://archive.org/stream/instinctworkman00veblgoog#page/n9/mode/1up

Waitley, Douglas. *William Henry Jackson: Framing the Frontier*. Missoula, Montana: Mountain Press Publishing Company, 1999.

Wais, Erin. “Trained Incapacity: Thorstein Veblen and Kenneth Burke.” *KB Journal* 2, no. 1 (2005), n. pag. http://www.kbjournal.org/wais.

CHAPTER THREE: ATTITUDES TOWARD PRESERVATION ADVOCACY AT THE TURN OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

The previous chapter detailed the ways in which self-described adventurers and archaeologists introduced Mesa Verde to the Anglo-American public at the end of the nineteenth century. In this chapter, I examine the rhetoric of three representative preservation advocates who both combatted and reaffirmed many of the rhetorical tendencies of individuals like Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld. Those adventurers and archaeologists, alongside newspapers, early tourists, other researchers, and the ranching family of Wetherills, brought increased attention to Mesa Verde and other ancient structures in the American Southwest. Events such as the 1876 Centennial Exposition and the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893 solidified the antiquities of the Southwest as wonders of the American West. At those events, fabulous images, scale-models, and displays of artifacts made Mesa Verde accessible to the American public as never before. With increasing renown came increasing damage to the structures at Mesa Verde, and growing public sentiment that something had to be done to safeguard alcove dwellings and other antiquities before they were destroyed.

The preservation advocates whose works I explore in this chapter are Adolph Bandelier (1840-1914), Virginia (Donaghé) McClurg (1857-1931), and Edgar Lee Hewett (1865-1946). All three of these historical figures participated in excavations in the American Southwest, and also worked to preserve Southwestern antiquities. Bandelier was an ethnologist and sometime- archaeologist. He is noteworthy as the first scholar to raise alarm over vandalism to an indigenous heritage place in the American Southwest. McClurg was a

socialite who visited Mesa Verde as a freelance journalist as a young woman, and later founded the Colorado Cliff Dwellings Association in order to set aside Mesa Verde as a protected park. Hewett was an archaeologist with political connections in Washington, DC. Hewett spent most of his career studying Chaco Canyon, and he helped draft the Antiquities Act of 1906. These three advocates are representative of the early days of preservation advocacy in the United States. All three were elite, well-traveled, and white. All valued what they could learn from ancient indigenous places. They all coupled their advocacy on behalf of ancient indigenous places with commentary on the United States government's failings towards contemporary indigenous people, and blended the poetics of place with a poetics of people, often fetishizing both in their narrative framings. These advocates advanced myths like primitivism, cultural evolution, and paternal benevolence, while they added to the luster of places like Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon through their enchanted rhetorics of place.

For all of their similarities, these three advocates expressed their values and concerns in somewhat divergent ways. They described their historical situation differently, and the roles they adopted with reference to it. In order to assess the divergent frames of preservation advocacy at the turn of the twentieth century, I refer to dramatism, its frames of rejection and acceptance, and the three poetic categories that constituted the primary frames of acceptance: the tragedy, the epic, and the comedy. With the aid of those theoretical insights, I examine three approaches to advocacy on behalf of ancient indigenous heritage and living American Indian peoples practiced near the turn of the twentieth century. I conclude that the way these advocates framed their political engagement supported prevalent features of the mythology or collective poem of their time, in spite of differences in framing.

In this chapter, I expand upon my interpretation of Burke's frames and poetic categories, and their relation to rhetorical enchantments. I describe the historical moment in which Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett intervened, before discussing the role of rhetorical rejection in these three authors' works with reference to their advocacy on behalf of ancient indigenous places and the rights of American Indian contemporaries. Then I undertake a sustained analysis of each author's preferred frame of acceptance, claiming that Bandelier favored tragedy, McClurg favored the epic, and Hewett favored comedy. I conclude the chapter with a brief comparison of the authors' rhetorical strategies. The discussion of this chapter's theoretical orientation is next.

Frames, Poetic Categories, and Rhetorical Enchantments

I draw from dramatism in my analysis of the rhetoric of three representative preservation advocates from the turn of the twentieth century. Specifically, I refer to Kenneth Burke's *frames* and *attitudes* in my analysis. I adopt these concepts with reference to the theme of rhetorical enchantment that runs across all of the chapters of this dissertation. Through their inclusion of myths and poetics, Burke's narrative frames offer another perspective on the workings of rhetorical enchantment. Specifically, the narrative frames that I identify within the works of these preservation advocates were poetic engagements with myths. Given that each of the advocates whom I discuss described their historical circumstances by way of conspicuous literary styles, Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett all worked *to mythologize* their efforts in archaeology, ethnology, and preservation advocacy. These rhetors used language to enhance the grandeur of their actions, demonstrating their own enchantment with what they did, and their intent to enchant their audiences.

Burke approached the concept of the frame from multiple directions. For one thing, Burke claimed that historical eras each had their own frames, and that such epochal framing would always eventually fail, only to be replaced by another frame that better fit the historical moment. In broad strokes, the modern framing that I have outlined in the previous chapter applies in my analysis of the preservation advocates in this chapter.[1] The modern frame accepted hierarchies in race, class, sex, and gender, privileged reason and scientific inquiry, and naturalized empire and colonialism. As I have claimed previously, this type of framing was a collection of myths. While the myths of the modern frame may not have represented the world as it was, they served to set agendas, define circumstances, and normalize many social actions.

Dramatism implies that narrative frames are rhetorical, and can encourage attitudes in their audiences.[2] Burke defined an attitude as an "incipient program of action,"[3] which narrative frames helped to define. Framing was also a way of defining a rhetor's role within a historical moment, and indicating his or her proposed course of action and the myths that accompanied that action. When the authors discussed in the previous chapter framed themselves as heroes on an epic journey of discovery, they normalized their destructive behavior within the alcove dwellings at Mesa Verde. Their self-representation—their framing of themselves—indicated they had few qualms about pursuing new knowledge at any cost. Simultaneously, they mythologized the pursuit of knowledge. In this chapter, Bandelier's framing of Puebloans within the narrative of a tragedy, for instance, indicated his basis for

---

[1] By "modern framing" I refer to a framing *of* modernity.

[2] Kenneth Burke, *Attitudes Toward History* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1961), 40.

[3] Ibid., 20.

interfering paternalistically in their affairs. The myths he appealed to, and the literary style of his rhetoric, demonstrated his inclinations towards a program of action.

In addition to referring to frames as features of historical epochs, or carriers of attitudes, Burke also examined frames as poetic categories. This, alongside their pertinence to cultural myths, is their closest connection to the dissertation's overarching theme of rhetorical enchantment and its emphasis on poetics. Burke referred to poetic categories such as the epic, the tragedy, and the comedy as framing devices "whereby the mind equip[ped] itself to name and confront its situation."[4] Frames could become "'collective poems,' the total frames of thought and action"[5] that defined an era, or they might operate on a more granular level. In any event, "the individual's frame [was] built of materials from the collective frame."[6] Frames were a narrativization of a moment, crafted by individuals and appealing to collective attitudes, which enabled social actors to make sense of their own place in history while encouraging the norms of their epoch.

For the purposes of this analysis, I consider a frame a kind of literary device that social actors might apply in defining their real situation, or a type of storytelling that might be endemic to a particular historical situation. Since frames may assume the form of a "collective poem," they can contain the kind of mythology that I attend to in my discussions of the myths of modernity. Frames might also appear in less generalized iterations, related as parts to a whole. The preservation advocates whose rhetoric I assess in this chapter wrote in reference to the collective poems of their day, and also used individualized literary framing

---

[4] Ibid., 99.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid., 111.

of their own moment in order to intervene in history. All of them, even as they accepted many prevailing norms within the collective poem of modernity, attempted to change norms through rejections of vandalism at Southwestern antiquities, and by rejecting the government's comportment towards indigeneity

Indeed, Burke theorized narrative frames in terms of whether they *accepted* or *rejected* the conditions of a historical moment. Burke claimed, by "'frames of acceptance' we mean the more or less organized system of meaning by which a thinking man gauges the historical situation and adopts a role with relation to it."[7] Burke claimed that the poetic categories of the tragedy, the epic, and the comedy accepted circumstances, whether through resignation to failure, identification with a hero, or through levity and critique in the face of tragedy. Burke considered frames of rejection more narrowly, and listed poetic categories such as "the plaint or elegy, satire, burlesque and the grotesque" as frames of rejection.[8] These were frames of rejection in the sense that they rejected particular historical circumstances, often through accusation, lament, mockery, or caricature. Rejection and acceptance were two parts of a whole, however, and any frame that rejected one condition likely accepted another—and vice versa. Because of the complementarity of acceptance and rejection within dramatistic theory, I address both in the forthcoming discussion.

Rhetorical critics who engage with dramatism today have observed inconsistencies in Burke's assignations of poetic categories, their specific functions, and whether or not they encourage or inhibit political action. For instance, they have observed ambiguities in the ways that Burke, himself, defined the various poetic frames. In my own engagement with

---

[7] Ibid., 5.

[8] Ibid., 44.

frames of acceptance and rejection and their accompanying poetic categories, I have adapted dramatism to accommodate the kinds of discourse forwarded by Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett. For my purposes, frames of rejection are poetic styles that resist circumstances (through condemnation or mockery), and frames of acceptance are poetic styles that condone or at least forebear circumstances (through resignation, praise, or measured critique). The binary of rejection/acceptance is of less interest to me than the ways in which preservation advocates at the turn of the twentieth century turned to diverse poetic framing techniques in order to advance a variety of myths and social causes, and the ways in which they situated themselves within the task of preservation advocacy.

Burke's thoughts on the topic of poetic categories as rhetorical framing devices are helpful in my ongoing investigation of rhetorical enchantments because of their relation to myth and poetics. Collective poems are mythologies; frames relate to myths, in that they offer a narrative style that naturalizes a set of attitudes contained within a frame. Usually the attitudes that frames naturalize *are* myths or have mythic components. In the preservation advocates' rhetoric, Bandelier's framing of himself as a narrator to another culture's tragic demise naturalized Bandelier's belief in the superiority of white culture. McClurg's framing of herself as a trailblazing hero in an epic about adventure and advocacy naturalized her belief in her right to intervene in indigenous heritage management, and also normalized white pioneer culture and myths of the Western frontier at the turn of the twentieth century. Hewett's adoption of the comic frame to critique his archaeologist peers and to elevate the Ancestral Puebloans and their descendants promoted myths about universal humanism—and also continued to naturalize belief in the theory of cultural evolution as well as the myth of antimodern primitivism. All of these authors adopted divergent poetic categories in order to

make sense of their own situation, and yet all of them at one point or another appealed to the collective poems—the modern mythology—of their era.

Burke's frames of acceptance and rejection relate to the poetic aspect of rhetorical enchantment by virtue of their status as *poetic categories*. Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett all indicated their infatuation with their sites of research, work, and advocacy through their uses of language. The fact that their rhetoric conspicuously took on narrative styles such as the tragedy, the epic, and the comedy indicates how deeply entranced they were with their topics of engagement. Their narrative styles emphasized the enchantment they felt in the presence of antiquities as well as, at times, in the presence of indigenous people. The poetics of preservation advocacy, meanwhile, encouraged acceptance of a variety of cultural myths—some novel to these preservation advocates, and some reiterative of the archaeologists and adventurers from the previous chapter. Whereas the authors often expressed their enchantment with indigenous heritage through densely-connotative and fantastical language, the majority of this chapter focuses on the ways in which their rhetoric aligned with particular poetic categories, rather than on the poeticism of their language, itself. This is a departure from the previous chapter, in which I attempted to establish the scientific *irrationality* of those who introduced Mesa Verde to the Anglo-American public. The same emphasis on the poetics of place that the authors in chapter two demonstrated endured, and even increased, in the works of the preservation advocates.

Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett all chose to express themselves poetically when they advocated on behalf of Southwestern antiquities—and on behalf of indigenous peoples. Their choices in narrative style amplified the romance of the historical moment, and their roles within it. The stories that Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett told when defending indigenous

heritage illustrated their own enchantment with antiquities and indigeneity, and worked to enchant audiences by way of attractive stories couched in familiar cultural myths—and in familiar literary forms.

Before discussing how Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett poetically oriented themselves towards their historical situation, I describe their historical context and advocacy interventions in more detail. What is most striking about these preservation advocates, and sets them apart from their contemporaries and forebears, is their articulation of advocacy on behalf of antiquities with advocacy on behalf of living indigenous peoples. Unfortunately, their advocacy on behalf of American Indian people often assumed the myths of cultural evolution and paternal benevolence, and it was tainted by racial prejudice. I will return to these claims later in the chapter. Additionally, I will expand upon Burke's theorization of the poetic categories of the tragedy, the epic, and comedy as I discuss Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett, respectively.

The Historical Moment

In outlining their historical moment, I offer additional justification for selecting Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett as representative preservation advocates from the turn of the twentieth century. While they shared similarities in terms of their social positions, each also played a unique and memorable role in initiating preservation advocacy on behalf of Southwestern antiquities. Their actions in history inform my interpretation of their frames of acceptance and rejection within that context.

Adolph Bandelier was a Swiss-American scholar who received his education in Europe. Bandelier trained as a geologist prior to turning his attentions to archaeology and ethnology. He received much of his archaeological and ethnological experience while

traveling in Mesoamerica alongside Lewis Henry Morgan. Morgan was a noteworthy Darwinian, and applied the theory of evolution to human cultures. Morgan was one of the first and most enthusiastic supporters of the theory of cultural evolution.[9] Bandelier remained dedicated to his mentor and the theory of cultural evolution when he moved his career to the American Southwest.

Bandelier performed field work in the Southwest from 1880-1885, working in affiliation with the Peabody Museum at Harvard and at the behest of the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA).[10] I consider three of Bandelier's publications in order to understand his position as a preservation advocate on behalf of indigenous heritage in the Southwest. I examine Bandelier's initial contribution to the AIA's *American Series*, which contained both a "Report on the Ruins of the Pueblo of Pecos" and a "Historical Introduction to Studies among the Sedentary Indians of New Mexico." I refer to this text as the Bandelier Report, in common with histories that treat the subject of preservation of American antiquities.[11] I also analyze another publication in the *American Series* entitled "Final Report of Investigations among the Indians of the Southwestern United States, Carried on Mainly in the Years from 1880 to 1885," published in 1890. The "Final Report" was more of an ethnological text, describing contemporary Puebloan cultures, rather than archaeological

---

[9] Gordon R. Willey and Jeremy A. Sabloff, *A History of American Archaeology*, 3rd ed. (New York: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1993), 73–74.

[10] Denise D. Meringolo, *Museums, Monuments, and National Parks: Toward a New Genealogy of Public History*, *Public History in Historical Perspective* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2012), 43.

[11] Ronald F. Lee, "The Origins of the Antiquities Act," in *The Antiquities Act: A Century of American Archaeology, Historic Preservation, and Nature Conservation*, ed. David Harmon, Francis P. McManamon, and Dwight T. Pitcaithley (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 2006), 15–34.

data. In it, Bandelier expressed concern about the government's treatment of living indigenous people, but focused little on antiquities. Finally, I discuss a novel written by Bandelier called *The Delight Makers*. *The Delight Makers* combined Bandelier's ethnographic, geological, and archaeological investigations of the Southwest into a pedagogical narrative, written in the style of a romance. *The Delight Makers* was published in 1890 and shared close rhetorical similarities to the "Final Report," though the texts represented different genres.

Historians of the American Southwest credit the Bandelier Report of 1881 with initiating broader interest in the preservation of Southwestern antiquities.[12] The Bandelier Report led to a petition in Congress to preserve the antiquities of the Southwest. Senator George F. Hoar of Massachusetts raised this petition in 1882; it failed, as did several subsequent efforts to protect the archaeological resources of the Southwest and the United States at large. Even so, by 1886, word was spreading. At least one journalist that year had called for the preservation of the "Mancos Ruins," urging for Congressional action providing for the preservation of ancient structures and the establishment of an infrastructure for tourists. This opinion piece was published in the Denver *Tribune-Republican* a full two years before the Wetherill family advertised their so-called discovery of Mesa Verde's most famous structure, which they named Cliff Palace.[13]

By the 1900s, the public viewed the Wetherills with increasing suspicion. A newspaper article in 1901 blamed "a family of ranchmen living in the vicinity" for using

---

[12] e.g., Lee, "The Origins of the Antiquities Act;" Meringolo, *Museums, Monuments, and National Parks.*

[13] "The Mancos Ruins," *Tribune-Republican* (Denver, CO), Dec. 12 1886, 12.

Mesa Verde "as a source of revenue from tourists and as a mine for archaeological collections," and raised concern over the fact that "[m]any of the ruins ha[d] been completely gutted in the search for specimens."[14] The same article praised the efforts of a Colorado Cliff Ruins Association for liaising with the local Ute people in order to secure a treaty to preserve and protect Mesa Verde. Though the article referred to the Colorado Cliff Ruins Association, it is likely that the author referred, in fact, to the Colorado Cliff Dwellings Association, founded by Virginia (Donaghé) McClurg.

McClurg has been referred to as a "one-woman crusade" working on behalf of the alcove dwellings at Mesa Verde.[15] McClurg interacted with Mesa Verde starting in the early 1880s, and presented herself as an expert on the alcove dwellings for the rest of her life. Before her marriage to Gilbert McClurg, Virginia (then) Donaghé had earned a reputation for herself as a poet and a newspaper correspondent. Her newspaper work included reporting on journeys to the alcove dwellings, in a period of her life that I term her exploration years. During her exploration years, McClurg wrote about Mesa Verde in much the same manner as the explorers and scientists described in the previous chapter. To understand the rhetoric she used at that time, I examine a serial narrative called "Cliff Climbing in Colorado" that McClurg published in 1889 in a magazine entitled *The Great Divide*.

In "Cliff Climbing in Colorado," McClurg offered a semi-autobiographical sketch of an 1886 excursion to the Mancos Valley. The cast of characters about whom McClurg wrote included a guide and his wife, whom she referred to as Rip and "Mrs." Van Winkle. The Van

---

[14] "A Cliff Ruin Park in the Mesa Verde," *The New York Times*, March 31, 1901.

[15] Duane A. Smith, *Mesa Verde National Park: Shadows of the Centuries*, 2nd ed. (Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado, 2002), 45.

Winkles were joined by a man with a greatly-admired mustache, whom McClurg referred to only as "My lord." Finally, McClurg referred to her own proxy as "the Enthusiast." McClurg wrote "Cliff Climbing in Colorado" in a humorous style, poking fun at the Van Winkles as slow-witted and coarse, at "My lord" for his pompousness, and at herself for her prissiness. Certainly, "Cliff Climbing" relied on the stereotypes of mainstream culture for its humor. Yet, McClurg's accounts of wayward ponies and luncheons on precipices still seem funny today. For as much amusement as we might take from McClurg's zippy writing, her anecdotes sometimes demonstrated an irreverence towards the alcove dwellings. She shared this disregard with Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld.

Roughly ten years after she published her "Cliff Climbing in Colorado" narrative, McClurg took it upon herself to begin a preservation advocacy campaign on behalf of the alcove dwellings at Mesa Verde. In 1899, McClurg attempted to negotiate a lease with the Ute community most affected by the increasing number of tourists, on whose reservation part of Mesa Verde resided. In 1900, McClurg and her associate Lucy Peabody established the Colorado Cliff Dwellings Association (CCDA), positioning themselves as Regent and First Vice-Regent, respectively.[16] To attend to McClurg's rhetoric as an advocate, I take up "Two Annual Addresses" that McClurg delivered to the CCDA in 1903 and 1904. These addresses were circulated as a booklet, presumably to the members of the CCDA who were unable to attend the annual meetings. In considering McClurg's advocacy years, I examine, also, an

[16] Smith, *Mesa Verde*, 49.

award-winning poem that McClurg publicized nationally, and to which she referred at length in her 1904 address: the "Ode to Irrigation."[17]

McClurg and associates spent a considerable amount of time writing letters and raising funds to set aside Mesa Verde as a park, and requesting politicians to champion the cause on their behalf. In this, they joined the ranks of many other women's organizations that were operating at the time. The primary objectives of the CCDA were to turn the region of the alcove dwellings into a protected park area, to develop a tourism infrastructure within the region of the alcove dwellings, to create treaties with the Ute leaders in possession of the alcove dwelling territory, and to educate the public about the antiquities of the Mancos Valley through tours of Mesa Verde and off-site speaking events.[18]

The CCDA played a major role in bringing forward Mesa Verde's preservation as a political issue. However, the CCDA struggled to gain recognition in Washington, DC. The Secretary of the Interior declined to recognize the treaties that the CCDA negotiated with the Ute people, asserting that the CCDA had no authority to make such treaties.[19] To compound the CCDA's problems, in time, the two women heading it disagreed about the best kind of organization for the proposed Mesa Verde Park. While McClurg hoped that the alcove

---

[17] McClurg also distributed the "Ode to Irrigation" within the pamphlet containing her "Two Annual Addresses." Virginia McClurg, "Two Annual Addresses by the Regent of the Colorado Cliff Dwellings Association, by the Regent of the Colorado Cliff Dwellings Association, Pueblo, 1903, Denver, 1904; compliments of Mrs. Gilbert McClurg" (Denver, CO: n. pub., 1904), n. pag. Tutt Library Special Collections at Colorado College. Call number F782.M52 D6 1904.

[18] Florence L. Lister, *Troweling Through Time: The First Century of Mesa Verdean Archaeology* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2004), 8.

[19] Smith, *Mesa Verde*, 51.

dwellings would become a state park over which she could maintain considerable influence, Peabody advocated for the dwellings to become a national park. Newspapers at the time reviewed negatively the standpoints of both women and the perceived pettiness of their disagreement. Eventually, Peabody's desire to see the alcove dwellings become a national park became the reality. Meanwhile McClurg retreated to Colorado Springs and built a reproduction of Mesa Verde's most renowned sites out of pieces of a lesser-known antiquity in the Southwest. She called the reproduction the Manitou Cliff Dwellings.[20] Under Peabody's direction, the reorganized advocacy campaign continued to strive for the creation of a national park at Mesa Verde. In June 1906, the Mesa Verde National Park bill passed.[21]

At the same time that the CCDA worked to have Mesa Verde set aside, other political actors were trying to address the broader issue of archaeological, historical, and scientific preservation in the United States. The American West was central to conversations in Congress and elsewhere that eventually led to the passage of the Antiquities Act in 1906—twenty one days before the Mesa Verde Park Bill was passed. Edgar Lee Hewett was extremely influential in gaining the passage of the Antiquities Act in 1906. Early in his career, the Secretary of the Interior sent Hewett to investigate Mesa Verde and other Southwestern antiquities, to comment on their historic value "in view of the preservation and protection of the ruins."[22] Starting in 1904, Hewett published extensively about the

---

[20] Polly Welts Kaufman, *National Parks and the Woman's Voice: A History* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2006), 28-9; Smith, *Mesa Verde*, 49-51.

[21] Smith, *Mesa Verde*, 60-66. The CCDA was not directly responsible for the passage of the Mesa Verde Park Bill, though they were prominent in newspaper coverage at the time and appeared in hearings about the proposed park bill.

[22] Edgar Lee Hewett, *Les Communautés Anciennes Dans Le Désert Américain : Recherches Archéologiques Sur La Distribution et L'organisation Sociale Des Anciennes Populations Au*

government's existing protocols towards the preservation of Southwestern antiquities, and what he viewed as the need for more formal measures in this regard. He distributed his appeals about preservation through the General Land Office and through professional organizations, reaching an audience of politicians, archaeologists and ethnologists.

Hewett eventually took part in an "antiquities bill alliance," which coordinated the archaeological community with the Department of the Interior and the Smithsonian Institution.[23] Hewett worked with friend and colleague John F. Lacey to pull together a draft bill that would please all parties involved. The Antiquities Act of 1906 was the successful outcome of the antiquities bill alliance, and a subject for the next chapter. After the Antiquities Act and Mesa Verde Park Bill were passed, Hewett continued his career in archaeology, focusing later publications on Chaco Canyon, where he did the bulk of his academic work. For my analysis of Hewett's overall rhetorical profile, I examine nine of his publications, ranging from 1904-1943, on topics such as "The Government Supervision of Historic and Prehistoric Ruins," "Ethnic Factors in Education," and "The Southwest: Yesterday and Tomorrow."

While Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett were not alone in their decisions to advocate on behalf of ancient indigenous places in the American Southwest, they were among the most noteworthy preservation advocates at the turn of the twentieth century. Together, their attitudes toward advocacy capture many of the epistemic ebbs and flows of their era, and

---

Sud-Ouest Des États-Unis et Au Nord Du Mexico (Geneva: Librairie Kundig, 1908), 52, translation by author.

[23] Raymond Harris Thompson, "Edgar Lee Hewett and the Politics of Archaeology," in *The Antiquities Act: A Century of American Archaeology, Historic Preservation, and Nature Conservation*, ed. David Harmon, Francis P. McManamon, and Dwight T. Pitcaithley (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 2006), 38.

demonstrate parallels between the practice of destroying Southwestern antiquities in the pursuit of knowledge and the desire to safeguard them—often for the same reason. Of further interest is the manner in which all three of these advocates rejected both vandalism *and* what they viewed as the mistreatment of indigenous peoples by the United States federal government. The ways in which Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett articulated advocacy for place and past to advocacy on behalf of living people was their greatest innovation. It is also an area of concern for contemporary advocates looking back on the past, since the ways in which these three representative advocates framed their historical situation remained deleterious to the sovereignty of American Indian people and their place in United States society.

In the following section, I examine in detail the rhetorical rejections of vandalism and the mistreatment of American Indian people that Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett expressed in their published works. I adopt Burke's theory of the frame of rejection to examine how Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett attempted to intervene in their collective poem, and to reject myths common to their era. I also examine how their rejections implied acceptance of other cultural attitudes of their day, speaking in a poetic register of preservation advocacy. While these three advocates used rhetorical enchantments of myth and poetry to influence their audiences, they demonstrated their own states of enchantment as well.

Plaints against Vandalism and Government Relations with American Indian Peoples

I begin my discussion of the representative advocates' attitudes by analyzing their rejections of vandalism and the federal government's harmful relations with indigenous contemporaries. The ways in which Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett framed these phenomena within their works is the reason that they were advocates at all. Their discussions

of vandalism and indigenous rights (or welfare) were rejections of aspects of the collective poem of modernity, and among their clearest attempts to intervene in their historical situation.

I refer to the following excerpts from these three advocates' works as plaints against vandalism and the government, in conversation with Burke's discussion of poetic categories as rhetorical framing devices, but also extending dramatism's conceptualization of the plaint. In *Attitudes Toward History,* Burke defined plaints as frames of rejection. Like other frames, plaints had the potential to act as "equipment" in negotiating an individual's position to a historical circumstance that the individual opposed. While Burke supposed that plaints did "not properly gauge the situation," still they could be a refined means of making sense of the world.[24] Plaints protected their rhetors from elements in their situation by allowing them to attack symbolically that which caused discomfort. As Burke theorized the category of the plaint, it was a way of being "*content* with pessimism."[25] Rather than offering solutions to problems posed by the historical moment, plaints elevated the art of condemning the situation.

Apart from these insights, dramatism provides relatively little guidance for defining the poetic category of the plaint. Moreover, my observations somewhat contradict the parameters of the plaint outlined by Burke, and cohere more closely to a general definition of a plaint: "a complaint or lamentation," or "a statement in writing of grounds of complaint

[24] Burke, Attitudes Toward History, 44.

[25] Ibid.

made to a court of law and asking for redress of the grievance."[26] The preservation advocates identified problems, assigned blame, and occasionally described the forms of redress that would ameliorate the problem they identified. Their plaints were forms of rejection in the sense that they condemned vandals and the government for their poor behavior, and problematized their historical situation. These plaints also acted as frames of rejection because, in their advocacy work, Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett relished their pessimism. Though these authors sometimes offered solutions to the problems that they identified, they lingered much more enthusiastically on the topic of how *others* were failing. They asked for redress of numerous grievances, which they described with zeal.

In the next section, I describe the accusations that all three advocates brought against vandals in the American Southwest, before describing the ways in which they translated their concern for place into a concern for indigenous people. All of these rejections also accepted myths prevalent in their day, such as the inevitability of cultural conflicts and the dominance of white culture. They also advanced new myths that relied on the poetics of place in the American Southwest.

Note that the plaints that these authors presented were secondary to the frames of acceptance that each advocate cultivated independently. While the advocates shared elements of a political agenda, they did so by *accepting* several divergent cultural myths, as expressed by way of distinctive poetic categories. I shall discuss how the advocates differed poetically and mythically after my analysis of the advocates' shared plaints.

---

[26] "Plaint," Collins Dictionary Online, *https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/plaint*, accessed May 21, 2018.

Plaints against Vandalism

Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett all described acts of vandalism at Southwestern heritage places within frames of rejection. Bandelier and McClurg rejected graffiti at Puebloan and Ancestral Puebloan places, and both critiqued those who would pursue "immortality" by carving their names into aged structures.[27] Bandelier and Hewett framed amateur collecting as insults to scientific inquiry. Hewett rejected careless scientists, as well, framing them alongside amateur pot-hunters. All of the frames of rejection utilized by these rhetors accepted the beauty of Southwestern heritage places and the structures' right to endure unmolested (by amateurs). For Bandelier and Hewett, the rejection of amateur engagement with antiquities also implied acceptance of scientific ideals and an elitist approach to research. All of these advocates accepted Southwestern antiquities as treasures, even when they rejected the treasure-hunting committed by others. In doing so, they all tacitly accepted that commercial valuations of antiquities existed, as well.

Bandelier offered the first published diatribe against the careless treatment of indigenous heritage places in the American Southwest. Bandelier exhibited a passionate response to the destruction that he witnessed on his first survey of that territory. In describing a structure at the Pecos Pueblo, he declared:

> In general, the vandalism committed in this venerable relic of antiquity defies all description. It is only equaled by the foolishness of such as, having no other means to secure immortality, have cut out the ornaments from the sculptured beams in order to obtain a surface suitable to carve their euphonious names. All the beams of the old structure are quaintly, but still not tastelessly, carved . . . Most of [the scroll-work

[27] Virginia Donaghé, "Cliff Climbing in Colorado," *The Great Divide*, March-Nov. 1889, 28-29. Special Collections at the Center of Southwest Studies (M082, Box 5, "The Great Divide"), Fort Lewis College, Durango, CO. See also Adolph Francis Bandelier, *Report on the Ruins of the Pueblo of Pecos* (Boston, MA: A. Williams and Co., 1881), 42, for definition of vandals as those who had "no other means to secure immortality."

> ornamentation on the beams] was taken away, chipped into uncouth boxes, and sold, to be scattered everywhere. Not content with this, treasure-hunters, inconsiderate amateurs, have recklessly and ruthlessly disturbed the abodes of the dead. . . . These dead have been scattered over the surface, to become the prey of relic-hunters.[28]

Bandelier adopted a harsh tone to describe what he observed at the Pecos Pueblo. What historians of preservation advocacy in the Southwest fail to emphasize is the fact that the "relic of antiquity" about which Bandelier professed deep concern was a Catholic church, and the work of Spanish missionaries who had converted members of the Pecos Pueblo to Christianity. The disturbed graves that Bandelier mourned were presumably those of Christians, and Bandelier's indignation at the disrespectful treatment of those deceased individuals had something to do with their creed. As I will discuss later in the chapter, Bandelier admired the Spanish colonization of the Southwest, and this influenced his advocacy activities.

McClurg shared Bandelier's disdain for graffiti at Southwestern heritage places, but she lacked some of Bandelier's ire on the topic. Primarily, McClurg derided individuals whom she thought of as reckless or uneducated, who sought "undeserved immortality" by marking their names on historic or ancient structures.[29] McClurg expressed her consternation at the presence of "no less than half a dozen names . . . cut in the living rock" of the back wall of an alcove dwelling at Mesa Verde. She felt that "John Smith, Tom Jones and that ilk" were "[s]criblers and scrawlers" who had trespassed on that place.[30] She wished to turn Mesa

---

[28] Bandelier, *Report on the Ruins of the Pueblo of Pecos*, 42.

[29] Donaghé, "Cliff Climbing," 28-29. See also Bandelier, *Report on the Ruins of the Pueblo of Pecos*, 42.

[30] Donaghé, "Cliff Climbing," 28-29.

Verde into a state park so as to protect it from "the ravages of the ignorant treasure-seekers and iconoclastic relic-hunters."[31] McClurg asserted that in order to "punish depredators, to preserve the ruins, control must be assumed."[32] At the same time that McClurg rejected graffiti and pot-hunting, she accepted that places like Mesa Verde needed to be managed and controlled. She presented herself and her advocacy organization as the best possible stewards of Mesa Verde.

Hewett shared McClurg's conviction that Southwestern antiquities needed care, though he differed from McClurg in that he supported the federal oversight of ancient indigenous places, rather than state or local care. Hewett presented himself as "a citizen of New Mexico who . . . watched with deep concern the loss of many of the incomparable treasures of the southwest."[33] Hewett defined commerce as the primary threat to the enduring safety of Southwestern antiquities. In a 1904 circular distributed by the Department of the Interior, Hewett said:

> It is well known that during recent years an extensive traffic has arisen in relics from [Southwestern] ruins. In securing these, buildings, mounds, etc., have been destroyed. These relics are priceless when secured by proper scientific methods and of comparatively little value when scattered about either in museums or private collections without accompanying records. No scientific man is true to the highest ideals of science who does not protest against this destructive work, and it will be a lasting reproach upon our Government if it does not use its power to restrain it.[34]

---

[31] McClurg, "Two Annual Addresses."

[32] Ibid.

[33] Edgar Lee Hewett, *Government Supervision of Historic and Prehistoric Ruins* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1904), 1.

[34] Edgar Lee Hewett, *Circular Relating to Historic and Prehistoric Ruins of the Southwest and Their Preservation* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1904), 4, emphasis added.

Hewett emphasized the exceptional status of science when he paired federal preservation initiatives with its highest ideals. Later in his career, however, Hewett observed that archaeology was the cause of a "new problem in conservation" for Southwestern antiquities.[35] He expressed dismay that so many ancient structures had been "wrecked in the path of progress—even in the name of science," blaming the "pot-hunter, both scientific and commercial" for irreversible damages.[36] In this way, Hewett pointed out deficiencies in the "ideal of science," which he both promoted and critiqued.[37]

These plaints against vandalism at Southwestern heritage places rejected ignorance, greed, and carelessness. Bandelier decried the damage to the Pecos Church, mourned the disturbance to the Pecos graves, and spurned others' motives as they pertained to money, comfort, and legacy. McClurg had a narrower frame of rejection than Bandelier demonstrated, and opposed careless vandalism in pursuit of unearned immortality. McClurg also rejected ignorance in her discussions of vandalism at Southwestern antiquities, indicating her elitist attitude towards engaging with those sites. Hewett framed carelessness and commerce negatively, but accused fellow scientists of the recklessness that he viewed in amateur collectors, as well. These frames of rejection indicated acceptance of the authors' motives, even as they disparaged so-called vandals. Bandelier accepted a scientific engagement with heritage sites. McClurg accepted *deserved* pursuits of immortality, such as writing, research, and advocacy—activities in which she engaged. Hewett accepted careful

---

[35] Edgar Lee Hewett, *Ancient Life in the American Southwest* (New York: Tudor Publishing Company, 1943), 187.

[36] Ibid., 188–89.

[37] Hewett, *Circular Relating to Historic and Prehistoric Ruins of the Southwest and Their Preservation*, 4.

scientific engagement. All of these advocates accepted an inherent value to Southwestern antiquities. Additionally, all of these preservation advocates viewed the preservation of Southwestern antiquities within the context of their contemporary political environment, particularly in terms of the federal government's comportment towards American Indian people.

Plaints against the Government

Bandelier spent the majority of his career performing ethnological, rather than archaeological, work. He specialized in studying the Puebloan peoples of the American Southwest, and he felt that the United States government failed in its duties to those collectives. Unfortunately, Bandelier rejected the United States' harsh treatment of indigenous populations because he viewed them as childlike wards. He rejected violent policies and accepted the infantilization of American Indian peoples alongside modern myths like cultural evolution, paternal benevolence, primitivism, and scientific rationality.

Bandelier viewed teleological cultural change as inevitable, but expressed concern over the path that cultural evolution would take in indigenous populations. In Bandelier's view, there was a "wide gap between Indian culture and European civilization" that "could not be filled; the aborigines had to be led across it gradually" rather than "at once."[38] He looked to Spanish colonialism for guidance in how to prompt the cultural evolution of American Indian people without causing them undue harm—though he alleged that force was sometimes necessary, as parents might need to use the "corrective rod" on wayward

[38] Adolph Francis Bandelier, *Final Report of Investigations among the Indians of the Southwestern United States, Carried on Mainly in the Years from 1880 to 1885* (Cambridge, MA: John Wilson and Son, 1890), 197-98.

children.[39] Bandelier joined other authors of his era in repeatedly referring to American Indian people as if they were children.[40] To him, indigenous cultures were stuck in the infancy of cultural evolution. He felt it was up to the supposedly more mature European cultures to bring American Indian people forward without trauma.

Bandelier was firm in his belief that that "the Indian, as Indian, must disappear" in the wake of inevitable cultural-evolutionary progress. However, he felt that any attempt at "violent extirpation" of social organization or creed would be harmful to "the purely human part" of indigenous culture.[41] He argued that the purely human part of American Indian people was:

> . . . entitled, and above all from our national standpoint, by the formal declaration 'that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' To enable the Indian to enjoy these rights with a view to his progressive culture, patience on the part of those who have this progress in trust is above all required. We must have patience with him and his ways.[42]

While Bandelier preached patience, his thoughts on how "to reconcile the advancement of the Indian with his preservation" were tempered by "the discouraging theorem, if it takes twenty-one years in the eyes of the law to make a man out of a child, how much time will it take for thousands of men, born and bred in organized childhood for unknown centuries, to develop into independent manhood?"[43] While Bandelier used a patriotic argument to defend

---

[39] Ibid., 147.

[40] Philip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).

[41] Bandelier, *Final Report*, 316.

[42] Ibid., 316-7.

[43] Ibid., 222.

the rights of American Indian people, he simultaneously infantilized them. He expressed a paternalistic view towards American Indian people, and he urged the government to view these people as childlike wards, rather than as peers with a full range of rights. While Bandelier may have said that he respected the humanity in American Indian people, he did not believe they were capable of taking care of themselves. His plaint against the government included praise for racially-biased myths.

In addition to Bandelier's meddlesome recommendations for encouraging the supposed cultural evolution of American Indian people, Bandelier always retained a scientific rationale for the forms of cultural conservation that he proposed. Because Bandelier viewed indigenous cultures as the closest living link to pre-Columbian history, he felt that their study was vital for understanding cultural development and the consequences of European colonialism. Though Bandelier seems to have favored the cultural changes wrought by European cultures, he felt that working with the descendants of the Ancestral Puebloans was the primary "task of the practical ethnologist" in the region, so as to fill in gaps in knowledge of the deep past. Colonialism and its legacy threatened that knowledge. Bandelier's scientific interests contributed to his choice to critique the United States government's treatment of American Indian people, as he felt that "researches" into the course of human cultural evolution would be "richly rewarded," but could not succeed if the government imposed too many changes on indigenous people too quickly.[44] Bandelier's rejection of the violent or harsh treatment of American Indian people *accepted* the supposed inferiority of those people. It also accepted the necessity of ethnological research and paternal benevolence.

---

[44] Ibid., 100.

McClurg shared Bandelier's conviction in the theory of cultural evolution, and it influenced her comportment towards American Indian people, as well. Whereas Bandelier offered subtle recommendations for the government's relationships with American Indian people, McClurg's commentary took the dramatistic form of a plaint more singularly. She condemned the government's ineptitude without offering much in the way of a corrective. Even so, both Bandelier and McClurg seemed content in their pessimism, and condemned others for their infringement on the values that each advocate held.

During McClurg's advocacy years, she demonstrated concern about relations between the Anglo-American government and the American Indian peoples of the Southwest. McClurg linked her organization's failed efforts to preserve Mesa Verde with the unresolved "government policy of the Indian question!" More specifically, McClurg complained of the joint ownership of Mesa Verde by the government and the Weeminuche Utes, remarking upon it as a nearly insurmountable problem. McClurg felt that the government misunderstood how to liaise with Weeminuche Ute leaders and that it worked slowly and bureaucratically. Meanwhile, McClurg griped that the Weeminuche Ute leaders and other American Indian stakeholders were difficult business partners. Without much in the way of preamble, McClurg interjected in one of her addresses to the CCDA that "[a]n Indian is an anomalous landlord. He comes up bright and smiling with every new moon, to suggest an entire change in demands and mutual relations." She carried on, describing other frustrations or anomalies she observed when attempting to secure land from the Weeminuche Ute representatives, but always described recalcitrant Ute leaders with more sympathy than she described the government.

Although McClurg expressed that their way of doing business was annoying, she presented herself as superior to government officials who, she said, imagined that the Weeminuche Ute leaders sat "at ease in their agency, pens and blotting paper at hand, ready to sign leases." Without an overhaul in its conduct towards the Weeminuche Ute people, as well as a major legislative change, McClurg thought it was unlikely that the government could "make Mesa Verde a National Park, because it [did] not belong to the government; nor could it be bought."[45] McClurg recognized that it belonged, instead, to the Weeminuche Ute people on whose land it resided. Not only did McClurg doubt that the government *could* obtain control of Mesa Verde, but she expressed mistrust of the government regarding its conduct towards American Indian people. She blamed the government for the difficulty with which she, herself, liaised with the Weeminuche Ute leaders, claiming that they were rarely available because they spent "most of the time out foraging for the scanty subsistence denied them by the government." She remarked upon the inadequate "work of Cabinets and Presidents and all the Departments of the Interior, and the United States army, which has guarded or fought the red man by turns." With all of those forces combined, McClurg concluded that the "Indian [was] not set right yet."[46]

It is unclear to what extent McClurg self-identified as an advocate on behalf of indigenous rights in conjunction with her work at Mesa Verde. For instance, she seemed to regard a national organization called "Friends of the Indian" as ineffectual, for she felt that they "wept and prayed and debated over the righting of Indian wrongs" but accomplished little. Yet, she maintained that whether Mesa Verde passed to "national or state control, its

---

[45] McClurg, "Two Annual Addresses."

[46] Ibid.

value and status [needed to] be accurately defined by its Indian owners." She recognized Weeminuche Ute sovereignty over their reservation land and over the meaning of Mesa Verde, at the same time that she hoped to convince them to cede "certain rights in Mesa Verde" to the CCDA. Certainly, McClurg's investment in improving relations with the Weeminuche Utes coincided with her desire to assume authority over Mesa Verde. It was primarily Mesa Verde's location that made it "a part of this tremendous, pressing perplexity of our national common weal" (government relations with American Indian collectives), rather than its cultural importance to many American Indian peoples. In the end, McClurg simply admitted that the "Indian" problem was a "hard nut to crack—even for a Denver Club-woman."[47]

In McClurg's rejection of the government's policies towards American Indian constituencies, she accepted that the Weeminuche Ute people had a different way of life than the people who governed them, and she accepted that they had rights to the land and to the interpretation of their own heritage. At the same time, McClurg described the indigenous persons with whom she liaised as peculiar, and promoted her own right to possess their land. McClurg recognized indigenous individuals as social actors with rights, and she avoided prescriptive recommendations about how the government should address the rights and wellbeing of American Indian political collectives.

Hewett showed no such compunction against offering recommendations to the government in its treatment of American Indian people. Hewett paired his advocacy on behalf of antiquities explicitly with his advocacy on behalf of indigenous people, sometimes in disturbing ways. Throughout his body of works, Hewett condemned the European

[47] Ibid.

colonization of the New World, bemoaned the march of industry, and romanticized indigenous peoples and their heritage in the extreme. Like Bandelier, Hewett's rejection of the government's treatment of American Indian people accepted paternal benevolence as a preferred policy, and accepted that there were significant biological differences between indigenous people and their European counterparts. Hewett lauded indigeneity in a fetishistic way, and critiqued whiteness for its infringements on a romanticized Other.

Hewett was outspoken in his admiration of indigenous culture throughout his professional career. The topics of his admiration ranged from the ingenuity of the Ancestral Puebloans to the resilience of their descendants. What he rejected was anything that white settlers or the United States government did to damage indigenous people and their heritage. For instance, Hewett lamented that few representatives of the "Indian race" remained to "maintain its sacred fires," and blamed "alien conquerors" for the "disposition . . . to put [American Indian people] out rather than to preserve them."[48] The notion of *preserving* a people for the alleged betterment of society was a major theme in Hewett's later works. All the while, Hewett rejected the ills of colonialism and accepted the purported mystique of indigenous cultures.

At times, Hewett's complimentary demeanor towards indigenous people had a distinctly eugenic bent to it. For example, Hewett defined American Indian people as a "race of splendid works and noble characteristics . . . who, in spite of the appalling adversities of the last four centuries, may by blending with its conquerors and at the same time preserving its own arts look forward to a future on the high plane of its ancient traditions."[49] Not just for

---

[48] Hewett, *Ancient Life in the American Southwest*, 28.

[49] Ibid.

the sake of the conservation of indigenous culture, but also for the benefit of white culture, Hewett expressed his hope that "somewhere the blood, language, and cultural potentialities of these remarkable people [the Ancestral Puebloans] surviv[ed] to become available in the evolution of the American race, for it was a virile stock." Though Hewett urged that American Indian people should not be forced to join European American culture, nevertheless he hoped that over time the two would blend together, and compensate for one another's supposed shortcomings. Hewett rejected conquest but accepted a framework in which the peoples who had endured conquest contributed to a new "American race."[50]

Hewett's demeanor towards indigenous culture took an especially appalling turn when, in 1943, he argued that American society needed "specialists in human conservation" to help address the "Pueblo problems" of the era. Comparing Puebloans to "disappearing buffalo," he proposed that the creation of "human game preserves" would allow those people to live their lives unmolested by the federal government. Like the buffalo, they would flourish again, and become available for the kind of eugenic program that Hewett tacitly proposed.[51] In this way, Hewett went beyond "playing Indian"[52] and wrote with optimism about a biologically-constituted unity with American Indian culture.

Hewett's comparison between Puebloan people and the buffalo strikes the contemporary reader as ghastly. It is evidence, however, of Hewett's deeply-held conviction that white culture was detrimental to American Indian cultures, and that American Indian

---

[50] Edgar Lee Hewett, *The Chaco Canyon and Its Monuments* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1936), 11.

[51] Hewett, *Ancient Life in the American Southwest*, 174–75.

[52] Deloria, *Playing Indian*.

people needed to be protected *from* white culture. While he marveled at the many resources that white culture had taken from indigenous cultures, he said that the "gifts of the white man" were suspect: "firearms, fire-water and other agencies that kill, such as tuberculosis, syphilis, and numerous other scourges; a new style of costume which has proved to be less sanitary . . . a religion which seems rather barren . . . and a system of education that seems devoid of . . . essentials."[53] Hewett's belief that American Indian people had been subjected to "too much white man's medicine" supported his "plan . . . to leave [the American Indian individual] alone in most of his personal affairs, merely giving him the opportunity to select and adapt what we [white people] have to offer under the guidance of his own judgment."[54]

Overall, Hewett advocated for a *laissez-faire* approach to assimilation so as to avoid unnecessary discomfort for members of a "race . . . in its childhood," as he believed American Indian people were.[55] This attitude appeared in his chilling proposal about human game preserves, and it appeared in his discussion of the Indian Schools of the early twentieth century, as well. On the whole, Hewett expressed paranoia about the deleterious effects of American imperialism on its various subjects, viewing whiteness as a contamination of the Other. In the same rhetorical move, however, he defined the Other in a state of primitive idealism, and therefore fetishized people dissimilar from himself. He accepted radical difference among ethnicities as a fact, and his advocacy was predicated on that belief.

---

[53] Hewett, *Ancient Life in the American Southwest*, 171–72.

[54] Ibid., 169.

[55] Edgar Lee Hewett, *Ethnic Factors in Education* (Lancaster, PA: New Era Printing Company, 1905), 10.

Alone among the preservation advocates discussed in this chapter, Hewett was outspoken about what he viewed as the shortcomings of white culture, particularly with regard to colonialism and the Indian Schools imposed on American Indian people. He resented efforts to force white culture on American Indian people, but his resentment was based in mythic notions about biological difference, and a pronounced fetishization of American Indian culture, some features of which he hoped to preserve. Indeed, at the same time that Hewett emphasized perceived racial differences, he intimated that he wished to merge with indigenous people. This was fetishism at an extreme.

The advocates' condemnations of vandalism and the government were attempts to expose the flaws of prevalent cultural myths. Bandelier and McClurg attempted to counteract the supposed glory of carving names onto the walls of ancient structures, and attempted to sap such harmful acts of their mythic quality by accusing vandals of pursuing immortality without earning it. Bandelier and Hewett attempted to counteract the myths of profit at Southwestern antiquities, by using densely-connotative language to reinforce the profligacy of *selling science*. All three of these advocates attempted to expose the ill-informed racism and bigotry against American Indian peoples as harmful cultural myths, as well. Though they advanced attitudes that privileged scientific racism and paternalism towards a childlike Other, they were united in their opposition to violent disrespect of their American Indian contemporaries, and of indigenous heritage places.

In their plaints against vandalism and the mistreatment of American Indian peoples, Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett demonstrated the cultural myths that motivated their advocacy, and they indicated aspects of their frames of acceptance for the historical moment in which they participated. All three of these advocates believed in the value of Southwestern

antiquities, and perpetuated myths of majesty and primitivism when discussing indigenous pasts. All three of them accepted ethnic and racial differences as a key problematic of modernity, and endorsed the myth of cultural evolution when considering that problem. These advocates paired their concern for ancient indigenous heritage places with a concern for American Indian peoples, but they referred to those collectives in a condescending way. Even in the frames of acceptance of the tragedy, the epic, and the comedy, elements of these advocates' condescension infringed on their tone, claims, and recommendations. I shall discuss each advocate's unique poetic style next.

Tragedy, Epic, and Comedy in Preservation Advocacy at the Turn of the Twentieth Century

For the remainder of this chapter, I outline the ways in which Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett favored the poetic categories of the tragedy, the epic, and the comedy, respectively. I have assigned each of them their narrative framing device based on the manner in which each most regularly situated himself or herself in relation to the historical situation. All of the authors exhibited pronounced poetic engagement with Southwestern antiquities, and with the descendants of those who built them. What varied was the literary style each preferred when defining those phenomena, and the cultural myths that they appealed to through their divergent poetic categories.

Bandelier favored the tragedy. McClurg favored the epic. Hewett favored the comedy. According to dramatism, all of these were frames of acceptance. Furthermore, when Burke defined these three poetic categories as frames of acceptance, he described a number of overlapping characteristics across these frames, such as magnification, exaggeration, and whether or not they were well-rounded (none of these terms were well-defined). The origin of these poetic categories in dramatism helps to account for a significant degree of ambiguity

and overlap across the three frames of acceptance that I discuss. For instance, Bandelier and McClurg both referred to the Ancestral Puebloans in language that emphasized what those authors found peculiar or exotic about them, though I interpret Bandelier in the tragic frame and McClurg in the epic. Both McClurg and Hewett offered intensely admiring commentary about the Ancestral Puebloans, as well, and again, I consider McClurg's texts as examples of the epic frame, while I find that Hewett operated within the comic frame. My rationale for assigning the frames as I did is this: I chose each advocate's dominant frame according to the primary way in which the author positioned himself or herself vis-à-vis the historical situation.

Focusing on the way the rhetors cast themselves within poetic narratives helped to illustrate the types and intensities of enchantment that each experienced or promoted in the context of Southwestern antiquities. For instance, Bandelier positioned himself as an all-knowing narrator in the Other's tragedy. In so doing, he attempted to distance himself from the enchantments of his context, yet demonstrated conviction in the myth of scientific rationality. By asserting that he had a clinical perspective, he illustrated that he was susceptible to the myth of disenchantment. By contrast, McClurg admitted to her own enchantment in the American Southwest when she portrayed herself as a heroine undergoing a variety of crucibles, and coming through them transformed. When McClurg appealed to colorful imagery, she enriched the scene in which she undertook her adventures, and added lyricism to the narrative of her heroism. Her own position, as the center of a sensational story, solidified my choice to define her primary frame as the epic. Meanwhile, her magnification of her actions and the scene in which she undertook them advanced myths about the inevitability of white cultural success on the Western frontier. Hewett also admitted

to his own enchantment. As he spoke of *himself*, his field of research, and the government, he adopted the critical or iconoclastic component of the comic frame, as defined by dramatism.[56] Yet, Hewett also proselytized as to the merits of the Ancestral Puebloans, the Puebloans, and the antiquities of the American Southwest. It seems as if his ability to critique archaeology was predicated on his reverent attitude towards indigeneity. His self-positioning as a comedic-critic stemmed from his overwhelming enchantment by the peoples and places of the Southwest, which he expressed regularly by way of hagiography that bordered on the fetishistic. The uneven relationship between critique and reverence in Hewett's texts challenges the viability of the comic frame as a tool for social change, insofar *as dramatism theorized it.* While Burke never would have suggested that the comic frame was unbiased, he understood it as a frame that acknowledged its own biases and promoted humanism. Hewett certainly acknowledged his reverence, and so perhaps performed a comic frame in as near a form as could be expected reasonably. The frames varied in terms of the comportment towards indigeneity that each supported, and the comic frame, though imperfect, offered the greatest challenge to prejudicial attitudes that were prevalent during the historical moment in which these advocates operated. I begin my discussion of each author's poetic framing with commentary on Bandelier's use of the tragedy.

Bandelier: Tragedy and the All-Knowing Narrator

Bandelier adopted the tragic frame throughout his writings in order to describe the indigenous people of the American Southwest, their heritage, their relationship to the

[56] Recall that I have assigned the dominant frame for each author on the basis of his or her relation to the historical moment, and not exclusively on the basis of the various poetic devices that each author adopted in his or her works.

environment, and their relationship with white culture. Within the tragic frame, Bandelier presented himself as the all-knowing narrator, aware of dramatic ironies and causal factors, but regarding the subjects of his narrative at a distance. In Burke's description of tragedy as a poetic category, he acknowledged that the tone of resignation was its most pervasive feature. Burke also identified "magical patterns of fatality, magnification, and humility" within the tragic frame.[57] Bandelier exhibited all of these rhetorical tendencies as he painted a picture of the denizens of the Southwest and the forces that affected them. Bandelier's enchantment with the places and peoples of the Southwest augmented his tragic framing of the subjects of his writings.

Bandelier tended to suppress his sense of wonder and poetry in his scholarly works, operating under the guise of scientific rationality. He was more open with the captivating qualities of Southwestern antiquities in his novel, *The Delight Makers.* Bandelier set his story in the canyon of the Rito de los Frijoles in New Mexico. He described the setting as "a beautiful spot, lovely in its solitude, picturesque and grand. About its ruins there hovers a charm which binds man to the place where untold centuries ago man lived, loved, suffered, and died as present generations live, suffer, and die in the course of human history."[58] The charm of the Rito de los Frijoles contributed to Bandelier's choice to set his romantic story there, while his emphasis on suffering cued his attraction to the tragic frame.

---

[57] Burke, *Attitudes Toward History*, 37. Note that Burke also theorized the tragic frame in *A Grammar of Motives* (New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1955). I have confined my discussion of tragedy and the tragic frame to *Attitudes Toward History*.

[58] Adolph Francis Bandelier, *The Delight Makers* (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1890), 436. It is true that he omitted "love" as an activity for present generations.

Meanwhile, Bandelier demonstrated a fixation on Native peoples. Whereas Bandelier's admiration for the ancient structures of the Southwest was profound, his commentary about Native peoples tended towards the prurient. The *Delight Makers* was a rather sudsy melodrama, tantamount to an Ancestral Puebloan Romeo and Juliet story. Bandelier described the characters with great (and sometimes lecherous) detail, and also emphasized the stereotype of the noble savage while building the tragic style of the tale. For instance, in Bandelier's first description of the Romeo figure, named Okoya, he described the "youth" as "a statue of light-coloured bronze decked with scanty drapery, and adorned with crude trinkets, holding a bow . . . outlined against the shrubbery, immovable above the running brook."[59] When Bandelier introduced his facsimile for Juliet, named Mitsha, she entered the scene as part of a group of "buxom lasses, rather short, thick-waisted, full-chested, with flat faces, prominent cheek-bones, and bright eyes."[60] In his scholarly works, he quoted *another* researcher's observations about the bust size of Puebloan women in one of his ethnographic reports, and did not stoop to comment personally.[61]

Bandelier wrote *The Delight Makers* in an attempt to make Puebloan culture known to the Anglo-American public, presumably for the purpose of instilling interest and goodwill in Bandelier's readers, as well as educating his readers about his scholarly conclusions. As Bandelier wrote, he:

> . . . was prompted to perform the work by a conviction that however scientific works may tell the truth about the Indian, they exercise always a limited influence upon the general public . . . By clothing sober facts in the garb of romance I have hoped to

---

[59] Bandelier, The Delight Makers, 6.

[60] Ibid., 22.

[61] Bandelier, *Final Report*, 232.

> make the 'Truth about the Pueblo Indians' more accessible and perhaps more acceptable to the public in general.[62]

Bandelier viewed it as his mission to share everything he knew of Puebloan culture with his peers. Unfortunately, what Bandelier thought of as the "Truth" was denigrating. Moreover, his position that he knew and could share the "Truth" emphasized his position as an omniscient narrator, describing the tragic fate of the Other.

Throughout *The Delight Makers*, Bandelier portrayed the Ancestral Puebloan characters as if they were driven by nature and by their cosmology to engage in actions that had disastrous outcomes. While none of the characters behaved irrationally according to the system of beliefs Bandelier described, Bandelier's authorial voice made clear his opinion that his characters were prisoners of their belief system. The story encouraged acceptance of Bandelier's fatalistic interpretation of the past, and of a similar interpretation of the contemporary Puebloan people whom Bandelier studied. The enchantments that Bandelier advanced towards people in his ethnographic texts also objectified them, and also distanced them from Bandelier as he continued to assume the voice of an all-knowing narrator. The presence of rhetorical enchantments throughout Bandelier's works amplified his use of the poetic frame of the tragedy, and also supported his position as a distant, though not disinterested, spectator.

Bandelier's relation to the tragic frame as an all-knowing narrator appeared in his scholarly works, as well. For instance, Bandelier was convinced that the Southwestern environment had left an indelible mark on the Puebloan people. He referred to the desert setting in vivid language, magnifying its influence over the trajectories of the people who

---

[62] Adolph Francis Bandelier, *The Delight Makers* (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1890), iiv.

lived in it. Bandelier observed in the Southwest "a stillness prevailing which produce[d] a feeling of quiet and solemnity," and which acted as a defining force in the cultural development of the people who lived there for centuries.[63] The wide expanses, impressive natural phenomena, and overall atmosphere led Bandelier to conclude that there was "a certain harmony between all the kingdoms of Nature in the Southwest. They compose[d] everywhere a picture, not lovely, but very striking; attractive through . . . originality rather than through beauty."[64] Bandelier seldom admitted to being struck by the beauty of the Southwest, even though he considered the Southwestern landscape "so striking that over primitive man it . . . wielded power in every sense."[65] When talking about himself, Bandelier described more moderate "pleasure and quiet enjoyment" gleaned from the environment.[66] The combination of sensational descriptions of Puebloans in thrall to nature, and his own removed enjoyment, further demonstrated Bandelier's relation as distant narrator to a tragic frame.

Bandelier's assumptions about the forces that influenced Puebloan culture demonstrated a tragic framing of those people, and exposed Bandelier's commitments to cultural evolution and scientific rationality. His stance as an omniscient narrator often emphasized his expertise, and he grounded his conclusions about the fates of the Puebloans in his authority as a researcher. Nowhere was this more evident than in Bandelier's

---

[63] Bandelier, *Final Report*, 25.

[64] Ibid., 26.

[65] Ibid.

[66] Bandelier, *Report on the Ruins of the Pueblo of Pecos*, 103.

overarching statements about "the Indian." Though Bandelier recommended caution when attempting to make claims "concerning the Indian's arts, habits, and creed," he made many assertions of his own regarding what "the Indian" believed, did, or needed.[67] Bandelier concluded that "the Indian" was reticent, superstitious, and lazy. Because of the prominent role of religion in the cultural practices that Bandelier witnessed, he concluded that "the Indian" was "the merest, most abject slave" to cultural institutions and religious belief, and a sufferer of "an inflexible despotism of thought" that allegedly accompanied those beliefs.[68] Religious organization among the Puebloan peoples, thought Bandelier, "more than anything else contributed to retard the advance of the Indian on the path of progress," and furthermore, "caused a constant clash with the European element."[69] This was another tragedy that Bandelier depicted in his narratives: the inevitability of conflict with a supposedly more-advanced culture. He was so resigned to this tragic frame that he dedicated much of his career to advocacy that would adapt to it, rather than advocacy that might reject it.

On the whole, Bandelier's tragic frame included resignation to ethnic difference, cross-cultural conflict, and cultural evolution. Bandelier's own role within that frame, as the narrator who kept his characters at a distance, reinforced myths of scientific rationality and primitivism. The sometimes mysterious language that Bandelier used typically served to make the scene of his narrative seem exotic, alongside the cosmology and customs of the people whom he studied. By casting Puebloans as a doomed people with self-damaging tendencies, he presented them in caricature. This magnification of personality traits, physical

---

[67] Bandelier, *Final Report*, 263.

[68] Ibid., 295.

[69] Ibid., 147.

appearance, and so on, helped to increase the grandeur of the narratives that Bandelier shared, making their tragic outcomes all the more poignant.

Virginia McClurg shared some of Bandelier's framing devices, in that she, too, tended towards caricature in her descriptions of Ancestral Puebloan peoples. She often turned that caricature towards narratives in which she starred, as well. Whereas Bandelier offered himself a position as narrator of a tragedy, McClurg cast herself as the hero of several epics in the American Southwest. In both cases, literary magnifications served to enhance the poeticism of the stories that these preservation advocates told. Whether sharing tragedies or epics, these preservation advocates enchanted their publics with scope of their tales.

McClurg: Epic and the Trailblazer

Virginia McClurg shared certain cultural assumptions with Bandelier. Like Bandelier, McClurg took the theory of cultural evolution as a fact. For instance, McClurg attempted to classify the level of artistic development of the Mesa Verdeans according to sequential "steps," which she understood as "representative, symbolic, and phonetic" forms of "picture writing." She believed that the Mesa Verdeans were "verging on the second" step in what she viewed as a teleological progression in writing habits.[70] Like Bandelier, McClurg acknowledged the power and strangeness of the American Southwest, commenting, for instance, on the "far and desolate cliffs" in which the Mesa Verdeans made their homes.[71] Like Bandelier, McClurg often interpreted the Ancestral Puebloan people with a certain degree of distance, as if she were an all-knowing narrator in someone else's tragedy. As an

[70] Donaghé, "Cliff Climbing," 4.

[71] Ibid., 44.

example, McClurg once described the Mesa Verdeans as a "feeble folk . . . perched in eagle-like eyries."[72] Indeed, McClurg's interpretation of the Ancestral Puebloans was often tragic. She assumed that the people who built Mesa Verde were a "gentle, industrious race" who were "harassed and exterminated by a nomadic and cruel people—the red men."[73] For all of her similarities with Bandelier, however, McClurg most often adopted the poetic category of the epic when she narrated her own actions in the American Southwest, and her engagement with preservation advocacy. She related to her historical situation by narrating herself as a heroine in a frontier epic. Her attitude in this regard is best captured by the motto that she chose for the Colorado Cliff Dwellings Association: "Dux Femina Facti." [74] *A woman led the exploit*.

When Kenneth Burke theorized the poetic category of the epic, he supposed that it was a literary style most appropriate for accepting purportedly primitive conditions, in a long ago time during which collectives were pitted against one another in a constant struggle for survival. While I find this essentializing aspect of his theory unhelpful, Burke identified a number of rhetorical traits within the epic poetic category that support my analysis of McClurg's works. Burke concluded that the epic category was designed for conflict, and "accept[ed]" such conflict and "the rigors of war . . . by magnifying the role of the warlike

---

[72] Ibid., 16.

[73] Ibid., 4. Like other authors of her era, McClurg distinguished between sedentary and nomadic indigenous groups. Cultural evolutionists concluded that sedentary or agricultural peoples were more civilized than nomadic peoples.

[74] A more precise translation found at "Dux femina facti," The Eve Adler Department of Classics and the Program in Classical Studies, *Middlebury*, http://www.middlebury.edu/academics/clas/resources/challenge/node/155561, accessed May 26, 2018.

hero." He claimed that the rhetorical magnification of the hero's feats lent "dignity to the necessities of existence, 'advertising' courage and individual for group advantage."[75] Epic tales normalized conflict and emphasized the *ethos* of the hero, all the while offering the hero to the epic's audience as a person with whom the audience should identify. Burke argued that the epic poetic category and its accompanying heroic frame encouraged acceptance by "making the hero's character as great as the situation he confront[ed]." However, he noted that the heroic frame did not provide a particularly "well-rounded . . . frame of acceptance" because it tended "to gauge the situation falsely."[76] Burke seemed to hold this opinion of most frames, aside from the comedy. In any case, dramatism claimed that epics glorified both the conditions they described and the hero who intervened in those conditions. As rhetoric, epics encouraged their audiences to accept undesirable cultural conditions and to identify with their heroes. They also encouraged audiences to accept the cultural myths that they advanced, through stylized grandeur. Both the hero and the situation became magnificent through the telling of the epic.

McClurg's adoption of the epic frame was apparent in her "Cliff Climbing in Colorado" narrative, as well as in the two annual addresses that she delivered to the CCDA. In the former narrative, she presented herself as a plucky young woman, or "the Enthusiast," undertaking an adventure in a dangerous and alluring scene. This story echoed the discovery tales that individuals like Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld advanced. Like those men had done, McClurg advanced her professional reputation through tales of derring-do. Her tendency to emphasize her own perseverance continued in her advocacy

---

[75] Burke, *Attitudes toward History*, 35-36.

[76] Ibid., 43.

years, during which she presented herself as an enterprising leader, battling the odds to save Mesa Verde. In both cases, McClurg was the center of her own stories. McClurg framed herself as an epic hero in a frontier saga in a variety of ways. First, she described the spectacular scene in which she undertook her work as an adventurer and advocate, often describing the Ancestral Puebloan people and other Native peoples as remarkable features of that scene. Second, she detailed a variety of hardships that she endured as both an adventurer and advocate. Finally, she detailed the forms of glory that she achieved through her exploits. I describe McClurg's epic framing of both her adventures and her advocacy next.

McClurg appealed to rhetorical enchantment regularly when she described the magnificent (or, per dramatism, *magnified*) scene in which she undertook her heroic activities. She portrayed the alcove dwellings at Mesa Verde vividly, and both aggrandized and fetishized the Ancestral Puebloans as she wove them into a narrative with epic proportions. She used densely-connotative language and a number of ready cultural commonplaces in order to relay her story in mythic form. In so doing, she also mythologized herself. The legendary way in which she framed her experiences also promoted a number of myths, having to do with cultural conflict on the frontier, a woman's place in society, and the mystique of the Other.

When McClurg described the poetics of place at Mesa Verde, her linguistic choices echoed some of the stylistic tendencies of the authors in the previous chapter. Like them, McClurg advanced a romance of ruins, speaking in terms of both beauty and the exotic in order to enrich her epic narrative. In terms of the beauty of Mesa Verde, and its splendor, McClurg described the structures there as "palatial stone pueblos."[77] Like the authors of the

[77] Donaghé, "Cliff Climbing," 79.

previous chapter, McClurg marveled that "here and there and everywhere [were] the marks of the busy fingers which had laid [the plaster] on and which have been dust for so many centuries."[78] Like Chapin, McClurg pondered upon "the cloud-swept sky, below; the precipice and the tree-tops," and admired how "the ancient cliff builders must often have viewed the same prospect."[79] Though McClurg had a number of outlandish things to say about Mesa Verde, she posited that its "simple reality" was "wonder enough" to inspire any visitor.[80]

McClurg illustrated the charm of Mesa Verde through allusions to Old World heritage places, as well as through speculation over whether or not Mesa Verde was haunted. In one instance, McClurg compared the alcove dwellings to Egyptian temples and Shakespeare's birthplace, lamenting that both places had fallen victim to vandalism, and fearing that "haunt of the cliff dwellers" could not "escape" that fate.[81] Elsewhere, she described alcove dwellings at Mesa Verde as "haunted . . . "war-worn and alone."[82] The specter of the "ghostly cliff dwellers" was "uncanny" to McClurg, and also a sensational attribute of her storytelling.[83] Such descriptions of Mesa Verde added to the glamor of McClurg's epic narrative, by enriching the scene of her story with familiar cultural figures and tropes—in this case, ghostly American Indian people dwelling within haunted ruins.

---

[78] Ibid., 15-16.

[79] Ibid., 44.

[80] Ibid., 79.

[81] Ibid., 28-29.

[82] Ibid., 28-29.

[83] Ibid., 108.

There were a number of peculiar theories that McClurg advanced about Mesa Verde, which also served to magnify the scene in which she made her supposed discoveries. McClurg offered a summary of the existing "theories of race origin and development on the American continent," refusing to disregard any of the following as geneses for the Mesa Verdeans: the "Autochthonic theory, or that of separate creation or evolution of man on the American continent;" "The Ten Lost Tribes of Israel;" "The survivors of the lost continent, Atlantis;" "The Phoenicians;" "The Carthaginians or other Mediterranean border nations;" "The Greeks;" "The Chinese, in 458 A.D.;" and "The Mongols under a son of Kubla Khan in the thirteenth century."[84] As this example indicates, much of how McClurg magnified the scene of her epic narrative had to do with the other characters who appeared there, and their own theatrical appeal for the purpose of her story.

Indeed, the Ancestral Puebloans themselves often featured as dramatic components in the scene of McClurg's epic tale. Given that the Ancestral Puebloans were always absent from the scene about which McClurg wrote, they became background features in *her* story of discovery. Her descriptions of the Ancestral Puebloans swung from complimentary and aggrandizing to demeaning and fetishistic. At both extremes, McClurg's descriptions of the Other served to enhance the impressiveness of the epic's scene, and the size of the heroine's feats therein. They also advanced myths of primitivism, supposed savagery, and fetishistic engagement with the Other, demonstrating a form of enchantment predicated on the presumed exoticism of the Other.[85]

---

[84] Ibid., 79.

[85] Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), offers an extensive commentary on the dominant culture's fascination with alterity, albeit in a very different cultural context.

McClurg aggrandized the Ancestral Puebloans and their works, according to metrics that had value in her contemporary moment. As I mentioned previously, McClurg emphasized the grandeur of Mesa Verde by bringing it into an analogous relationship with Old World legends and timelines. Egypt, with its pyramids, was a consistent touchstone for comparison throughout her narrative, but she referenced other ancient cultures with regularity. For example, at the beginning of her "Cliff Climbing" narrative, McClurg introduced her readers to Mesa Verde by noting that "centuries ere the Genoese sailed forth on the 'Sea of Darkness,' to a world explorers erroneously supposed to be new—there was civilization in Colorado."[86] The juxtaposition of cultural assumptions with McClurg's findings about Mesa Verde also served to expand the scope of McClurg's heroic narrative.

McClurg also compared the Mesa Verdeans to contemporary Americans, and imagined them to be part of a primordial American identity. In reflecting upon the Mesa Verdeans' relationship to other ancient indigenous peoples of the Americas, McClurg wondered whether or not the "Mound Builders, Colhuans, Toltecs, Aztecs, Pueblos or Cliff Dwellers . . . [formed] one primeval American brotherhood."[87] When artwork that McClurg and her party found in the alcove dwellings at Mesa Verde vaguely resembled the American flag, McClurg joked that "My lord" was "anxious to patent this discovery and dispose of it to the Fourth of July orators."[88] Though McClurg jested about "My lord's" patriotism, still she entertained the idea that there was continuity in American identity from the time of the Mesa Verdeans to the present. This commentary elevated Mesa Verdeans at the same time that it

---

[86] Donaghé, "Cliff Climbing," 4.

[87] Ibid., 28-29.

[88] Ibid., 16.

advanced nationalistic valuations for indigenous heritage places—another myth in this context.

In addition to casting the Mesa Verdeans as "primeval" Americans, McClurg and company sometimes portrayed the Mesa Verdeans humanistically. Such commentary appeared extensively in a conversation "The Enthusiast," "My lord" and the Van Winkles had at their campfire in McClurg's "Cliff Climbing in Colorado" narrative. As the four characters reflected on the sum of their knowledge of the Mesa Verdeans, they attempted to imagine what life would have been like for a typical Mesa Verdean, from cradle to grave. The quartet turned their conjectures to the typical manner of dress, occupation, and food culture for a Mesa Verdean. The conversation included ponderings on the arts and leisure activities of the Mesa Verdeans, with Rip Van Winkle declaring that "the cliff dweller had work and play . . . or he would have been a dull boy." [89] In another excerpt of "Cliff Climbing in Colorado," the character of "My lord" found a flute and thereafter insisted that an "enamoured, cliff-dwelling troubadour had strolled beneath [a] scarped precipice, and serenaded his Dulcinea on the heights."[90] These somewhat whimsical interludes humanized the Mesa Verdeans through a holistic consideration of their quotidian lives. Yet, inevitably, McClurg returned to peculiar aspects of the Mesa Verdeans when she described them, and never could resist romance or humor, either. All of these descriptors created interest and ambience for the story of McClurg's transformation in the crucible of "Cliff Climbing."

Even when McClurg attempted to understand the lifeways of the Mesa Verdeans, she spoke about them in ways that *amplified* the scene of her own saga. For instance, McClurg

---

[89] Donaghé, "Cliff Climbing," 108.

[90] Ibid., 4.

remarked that she had "hobnobbed with [the Mesa Verdeans,] so to speak; . . . visited their houses, fingered their china, employed their tools, profaned their temples, and probably inhaled their very dust!"[91] Although McClurg humanized the Mesa Verdeans by talking of their pottery, pastimes, and religious ways, she spoke of them in such a way as to make them somewhat preposterous. While this interlude served to create poetic interest in the scene of McClurg's activities, it also emphasized McClurg's actions and the peril that she undertook when completing her adventures. The Mesa Verdeans were a topic of conversation, but only McClurg was an agent in this scene.

While McClurg had complimentary things to say of the Ancestral Puebloans, she also described them in ways that would make them seem exotic, strange, or even somewhat frightening. Whatever compliments she proffered were tempered by her biased interpretations of the Ancestral Puebloans and their descendants. Through the rhetorical enchantments of exoticizing descriptions, McClurg advanced myths about white superiority. For example, McClurg drew on some of the same tropes as the authors from the previous chapter in order to enhance a strange aesthetic for the Mesa Verdeans, considering them a "mysteriously harassed" people.[92] McClurg detailed what she thought was grotesque about the Mesa Verdeans by commenting at length upon the practice of skull-flattening, defining it as "something abnormal and horrible."[93] Though she suspected that the Mesa Verdeans had a

---

[91] Ibid., 60.

[92] Ibid., 16.

[93] Ibid. Rather than being something abnormal and horrible, archaeologists Greg C. Nelson and Felicia C. Madimenos have found that "[c]ranial deformation [was] ubiquitous among Ancestral Puebloan peoples." The Ancestral Puebloans used cradleboards, which caused the backs of their heads to take on a flattened appearance in infancy. They retained the morphological effect of that early age cranial modification throughout their lives. See Greg

robust spiritual life, she considered indigenous religious beliefs, from past or present, fascinating "superstition[s]."[94]

McClurg also employed exoticizing descriptions of American Indian people from her own moment in history to add texture to her tale. Throughout her "Cliff Climbing in Colorado" narrative, she indicated her belief in the theory of degeneration: a loss of cultural advancement and integrity between past and present indigenous peoples. She considered the Mesa Verdeans to be members of "a race unique in its development, a nation which, as such, has quite passed away and is known to us, if at all, but a diminished and degenerate remnant."[95] While McClurg declared that the Puebloans were certain descendants of the Mesa Verdeans, she claimed that:

> It should not detract from the romantic interest of the lost life of the cliffs, even if we may still see, in [Puebloans'] squalid homes, the most diminished, degenerate and far-off descendants of the builders who reared palaces and scaled precipices. Romulus and Remus . . . have lost none of their traditional charm, because the Italian organ-grinder may be droning at our gates.[96]

Although the above quotation illustrates that McClurg's use of ethnic slurs was not limited to indigenous peoples, it certainly shows McClurg's racial bias against American Indian people, which was present throughout her works. Her insulting descriptions of indigeneity supported a heroic narrative about white settler colonialism, rather than humanizing non-white social actors with whom she interacted. I will expand on this topic, next.

C. Nelson and Felicia C. Madimenos, "Obelionic Cranial Deformation in the Puebloan Southwest," *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 143, no. 3 (2010): 465, doi:10.1002/ajpa.21353.

[94] Donaghé, "Cliff Climbing," 16.

[95] Ibid., 60.

[96] Ibid., 92.

Several excerpts from "Cliff Climbing in Colorado" framed tense relationships with American Indian groups as dangerous hardships to be overcome by the epic's heroine. She appealed to a myth of enduring and inevitable cultural conflict in order to enchant her audience with her own bravery. For instance, McClurg noted that during her first visit to Mesa Verde the San Juan Basin was practically impossible to visit. Such it was that "government expeditions alone [had] been enabled to conduct systematic explorations . . . to find means to surmount the drawbacks of pathless wastes, insufficient pasturage, water and food, and the dangers from predatory or hostile Indians."[97] Indeed, McClurg only gained access to Mesa Verde at that time thanks to a military escort. In reference to her later visit to Mesa Verde, detailed in "Cliff Climbing in Colorado," McClurg advised that in "Indian country one must either have a party large enough to defy savage annoyances or sufficiently small to elude observation."[98] By portraying "hostile Indians" as a feature of the scene of her exploits, McClurg supported myths of racial prejudice.

McClurg's "Cliff Climbing" story also normalized strained intercultural relationships in the American Southwest. For instance, while McClurg and company were *en route* to Mesa Verde, they trespassed onto the Weeminuche Ute reservation. She expressed concern that they might encounter danger while camped on the edge of the reservation for an evening, and admitted that she and her companions "had no right to be [there, and] the red man was '*dans ses droits*' to remove them."[99] She expressed dismay on another occasion, when she

---

[97] Ibid., 4.

[98] Ibid., 15-16.

[99] Ibid., 28.

encountered a couple of gruff cowboys who informed McClurg and company that they were on their way "to reclaim some horses 'stolen' by the Utes."[100] McClurg was frightened when the men "proposed to 'ventilate the blamed redskins' and toyed suggestively with their pistols" before riding away.[101] The dangers posed by encountering members of the local Native nation, or by being on the wrong side of the white Westerners, became sensational features of McClurg's epic saga. Yet, she also accepted them as unavoidable features of her crucible.[102] While McClurg aggrandized herself for enduring the dangers of trespassing on Ute territory and encountering armed cowboys, she encouraged her readers to accept the myth that conflict would be inevitable.

Other hardships joined intercultural conflict as epic ordeals for McClurg, the heroine, to overcome. McClurg emphasized the physical discomforts of camping in the open air, climbing up into the alcoves, and breathing in the dust of the ancients as she and her companions rummaged about in the alcove dwellings. McClurg wrote that her "first night spent out of doors [was] an epoch," though would have been much improved had she only thought to bring a hammock instead of a bedroll.[103] She mocked herself for being so spoiled by modern mattresses and other "superfluities,"[104] but described the unpleasantness of camp

---

[100] Ibid., 28-29.

[101] Ibid.

[102] The language of the frontier as a crucible comes from Leroy G. Dorsey and Rachel M. Harlow, "'We Want Americans Pure and Simple': Theodore Roosevelt and the Myth of Americanism," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 6, no. 1 (2003): 55–78, doi:https://doi.org/10.1353/rap.2003.0027.

[103] Donaghé, "Cliff Climbing," 28-29.

[104] Ibid., 15.

life routinely, complaining of the foul-tasting water she and her party drank and the monotonous and dwindling culinary fare. When she went on her field excursions to Mesa Verde, she described "slipping, stumbling, crouching, crawling" to uncover the secrets of that place.[105] While authors from the previous chapter discussed the choking dust in the alcove dwellings, McClurg went further. She remarked that it was "dry work rambling in the dust of ages. Every object . . . was covered with fine, gray dust, ankle deep . . . We breathed it and were covered with it. It had a charnel-house flavor, as if it had been disintegrated from generations of cliff-dwellers."[106] Thankfully for McClurg's party, they had brought claret punch with them on their expedition, and to their "dust-dried throats it was nectar."[107] McClurg often added humor to the descriptions of her ordeals, and so strove to present herself as a character with whom her readers might identify easily, though laughing as they did.

Even McClurg's victories in excavating came with their own hardships to overcome. On one occasion, McClurg remarked at length on how she endured a badly-stubbed toe when a stone vandalized with the name "Paddy Boyle" fell upon her foot.[108] She overcame this hardship and continued in her pursuit of objects at Mesa Verde, and in this way illustrated a strength of character to her readers. McClurg's "Enthusiast" character "forgot her ailing,

---

[105] Ibid., 60.

[106] Ibid., 28-29.

[107] Ibid., 28-29.

[108] McClurg also commented that "The Enthusiast" and Mrs. Van hoped that Paddy Boyle had been a man, or else they could no longer rest assured that they were the first two white women to encounter that particular alcove dwelling. "Cliff Climbing," 44.

aching body, like a sick soldier in a moment of action. She [rose, reeled, staggered] over to Mrs. Van's corner, and throwing herself down by the rubbish pile essay[ed] to dig."[109] Indeed, McClurg's supposed strength of character received a reward when McClurg found a perfect vessel, and a number of other objects. By the end of their journey, McClurg and company had found so many artifacts that the party's pack animals could not carry everything that they excavated back to town. This became an ordeal in McClurg's epic tale, as well. McClurg remarked that suddenly, she and her companions "began faintly to approximate the emotions of those who fling away gold and silver in the hour of a shipwreck."[110] McClurg had found her Scylla and Charybdis. In the face of an almost impossible decision (apparently), she salvaged her perfect vessel and bade farewell to the remaining objects.

On the whole, McClurg's emphasis on her "Herculean" effort to ascend into the alcove dwellings advanced the glory of her undertaking, building up her reputation in a manner similar to the other cadre of explorers already discussed.[111] She portrayed herself as a bold woman daring to venture where no one else had dared to go before, always against insurmountable odds, and always in the middle of conflict—and peril. McClurg embraced the preposterous in the telling of her epic saga, but conveyed her pride in being able to endure circumstances that she described as arduous.

McClurg's pride in her accomplishments supported the narrative's epic form, as she wrote of her various victories as glories or rewards. The rewards that McClurg listed for the

---

[109] Ibid., 44.

[110] Ibid., 60.

[111] Ibid., 44.

heroine of "Cliff Climbing in Colorado" included those excavations in which she found souvenirs. The epic heroine's rewards also included more cerebral benefits, as well as prestige. As other visitors to Mesa Verde had done, McClurg described the hardship of arriving at the alcove dwellings as commensurate with the reward of seeing them. For instance, after completing a "hazardous climb over loosened rocks and slippery ledges, eager expectation smothering all thought of danger, . . . 'The Enthusiast' [was] *first* to stand face to face with the *finest cliff dwelling we saw* during our hasty trip."[112] A moral of McClurg's story was that one who dared won.

McClurg's hyperbolic account of the struggle of excavation, and the prestige that came as a reward, continued in her account of the slab carved "Paddy Boyle" falling on her foot. When McClurg triumphed and found a perfect jar in spite of her pain and hardship, she declared that she and Mrs. Van, "a couple of neophytes" had done better in a day than two men more accustomed to digging at Mesa Verde would have done in a fortnight.[113] Indeed, to McClurg, it was as if "lightning [had struck] twice in the same place" when both she and her companion left the alcove dwelling with excellent specimens of pottery, and this situation was all the more remarkable because two untrained women had bested professional men.[114] McClurg considered the indented jar that she found, following her foot injury, to be the "pride and glory" of the expedition.[115]

---

[112] Ibid., 44, emphasis added.

[113] Ibid., 44.

[114] Ibid.

[115] Ibid., 134.

"The Enthusiast" and her companions had entered the alcove dwellings at Mesa Verde in pursuit of "novelty or glory," and they found both.[116] A final reward that McClurg and her companions received had to do with a kind of spiritual transformation that each experienced at the end of their joint quest. Towards the end of the "Cliff Climbing in Colorado" narrative, McClurg recounted the mood that swept over the "Enthusiast" and her party as they prepared to leave Mesa Verde at the end of their trip. McClurg wrote that she "saw deepening in 'My lord's' world-weary eyes a wide, far-reaching gaze; a restful perception of the without and beyond. With Rip and Mrs. Van it was a placid, almost bovine content."[117] Going further, McClurg wrote that "[t]he charm of the sylvan life, so ineffably peaceful, so shadowlessly sunny, gained on us. We craved its indefinite continuance; the thought of the workaday world jarred. It was a true place of transfiguration, but needed not that human hands should rear its tabernacles."[118] The glory that McClurg and company experienced was their reward for enduring the hardships of excavating. Such an emphasis on rewards and adversity contributed to the epic dimensions of McClurg's tale.

Most of McClurg's "Cliff Climbing in Colorado" narrative helped to illustrate the transfiguring qualities of the scene in which she, the heroine, accomplished great things. Her use of rhetorical enchantment added alluring detail to the places and people whom she described, sometimes in flattering ways, and sometimes in demeaning ones. Either way, through her epic framing of adventuring through Mesa Verde, McClurg rendered her scene poetically. All of this, however, supported cultural myths about cultural difference, white

---

[116] Ibid., 15.

[117] Ibid., 28-29.

[118] Ibid., 29.

superiority, cultural evolution, and the rights of researchers and tourists to impede on Southwestern antiquities, sometimes even for profit. While McClurg's narrative of conflict in the American Southwest framed her situation so that her audience might accept conflict as inevitable, it also accepted that white social actors *like McClurg* were the future of the American Southwest. In her "Cliff Climbing" narrative, she concluded that the "yielding" of the nomadic peoples to what she termed "the dominant white race" was inevitable.[119] Not only did McClurg imagine that white settlers would come to possess the West, but that the desert itself would "rejoice and blossom as the rose" when that happened.[120] In this way, McClurg presented herself as an epic hero of the dominant white race. Her own success in the West was indicative of white success in the West. She framed herself as a hero of the white people.

Far into her years as an advocate, McClurg maintained the belief that white people would take possession of the land, as if it were necessary and right for them to do so. The "Ode to Irrigation" that she shared in her 1904 address to the Colorado Cliff Dwellings Association (CCDA) exemplified this aspect of McClurg's rhetoric. The "Ode to Irrigation" primarily detailed the "March of Races" across the Southwestern desert. The ode's "March of Races" began with the "peaceful" Ancestral Puebloans cultivating the land, moving on to violent "red men" on an "ensanguined war-path," and concluding with Mormon pioneers, divinely favored in their effort to turn the desert into a land of "green fields, honey bees, and gold sun!"[121] While McClurg did not contribute new data to the theory of cultural evolution,

---

[119] Ibid., 4.

[120] Ibid.

[121] McClurg, "Two Annual Addresses," 1903 address.

she naturalized it in her rhetoric. This attitude may have supported McClurg's own feelings of entitlement in terms of attempting to gain ownership over Mesa Verde. Certainly, she articulated her personal success to the success of white settlers in the Southwest. In that way, she presented herself as a hero *of* white settlers, and her narrative served to normalize the conflicts caused by appropriating land belonging to indigenous peoples. Even her ode became epic, for it aggrandized the perceived heroism of white pioneers in the West.

While McClurg's rhetorical style was engaging during her time as a freelance journalist, it took on more overt political force when she started the CCDA. McClurg's epic framing remained during her advocacy years, in spite of the decreased risk of falling from the side of a ravine. One example of the incongruous juxtaposition between a task and its degree of difficulty came in McClurg's description of a rummage sale the CCDA held in Pueblo in 1902, which she described in her 1903 presidential address to the organization. McClurg called the rummage sale the "magnum opus" of the CCDA's efforts that year, and "an undertaking which demand[ed] more heroism than a Boston tea party, and more endurance than an anthracite coal strike."[122] In the same address, she assured her audience that the CCDA was "not discouraged by . . . troublous things," though they had become "daily meat and drink." Here, McClurg presented herself once again as the bold leader of a group that faced difficult challenges—daily!

McClurg described the organization's struggles as a way of galvanizing her audience, and orienting them towards their shared goal. She rallied her audience with the declaration that "Difficulties do not daunt us and we propose to fight it out on this line—or any other

[122] Ibid.

vexatious line that may arise."[123] Again, McClurg paired challenges with their rewards, claiming that "[i]t were easy for us to write and read papers; to get up debates and concerts, but our work demands sterner stuff, and I never doubt—not for a moment—that our reward will be correspondingly great."[124] McClurg was explicit in setting goals for the CCDA, and in defining the rewards of her organization's endeavors. She told her listeners that they would "live to see Mesa Verde Park the cynosure of the nation: unique, unrivalled," and that they would "hear those who scoffed admit that not in her mines, scenery, agriculture, or health values, lie Colorado's greatest interest and wealth—but in her Cliff Dwelling Park." McClurg urged her audience that they *must* believe in that, and work to that end. She used poetic language to stress how difficult the task of preserving Mesa Verde was, and used the scale of the feat to present herself (and the CCDA) as dauntless heroes.

In her advocacy work, McClurg often expressed her conviction that difficulty and glory were intertwined, continuing her epic framing of her activities in the American Southwest. Just as she did in her 1903 address, in her 1904 address she once again claimed that the CCDA faced dramatic challenges, and that the organization would succeed with McClurg at the helm. She told the audience of her 1904 presidential address to "[b]e of good courage" in spite of the difficulties that they faced. She declared that the CCDA had "a future whose power for wisdom and good [was] as yet unreckoned—and therefore its difficulties . . . proportionately greater." She ended this line of reasoning with the remark that "Great is the glory, for the strife is hard!"[125] After assuring her listeners that the CCDA would not "be

---

[123] Ibid.

[124] Ibid.

[125] Ibid., 1904 address.

found lacking" in the face of its many challenges, she recounted a story that she had heard from a fellow member of the Daughters of the American Revolution. The story followed two frogs "swept up by accident into a churn" of milk. "One frog was drowned; the other was perched triumphantly on a cake of butter, which his struggling legs had churned for his safety and his triumph." McClurg proclaimed that if "members of the [CCDA were] batrachians, they would surely belong to the class of butter-making frogs." Once again, McClurg situated herself in the midst of a conflict, and asked her audience to accept to struggle alongside her on her exploits.[126]

Although McClurg was oriented towards the success of her organization when she was the president of the CCDA, she often made comments that reinforced her unique position as its leader. For instance, during her 1904 address, McClurg reported on the great success of her "Ode to Irrigation." McClurg shared with her audience that she won "a prize of $50 offered by the National Irrigation Congress for an Irrigation Ode." She also shared that her ode appeared in several newspapers and journals, and had a distribution of eleven thousand copies. McClurg noted that she had collected "copies of it from more than 100 newspapers. So here our Cliff Dweller obtained a wide recognition."[127] Of course, so had McClurg. In this way and others, she solidified her position as leader of the exploit.

During her advocacy years, McClurg emphasized her position as a "Denver club-woman,"[128] caught between ignorant Westerners and apathetic politicians, and struggling to secure the alcove dwellings at Mesa Verde with the help of her companions in the CCDA.

---

[126] Ibid.

[127] Ibid.

[128] Ibid.

She never explained why she was invested in securing the alcove dwellings, but accepted that it was her quest to do so. The epic framing that she used in her advocacy years was consistent with the rhetorical choices she made during her adventurous youth, as well. McClurg presented herself as the epic hero in most of the narratives that she told. She magnified a number of her own characteristics as she detailed her exploits in the Southwestern United States, and she situated herself as a trailblazer on the frontier. The way that McClurg expressed her enchantment with the antiquities of the Southwest supported her idealistic portrayal of the scene in which she practiced her heroism, and served to magnify her situation in the manner that dramatism suggests is consistent with the poetic category of the epic. Her epic rendering of both excavations and advocacy helped to naturalize myths about white settler culture in the Southwest. Whereas McClurg sought to aggrandize the role of the white woman on the Western frontier, Hewett hoped to diminish the ill effects of settler colonialism—through the comic frame.

Hewett: Comedy and the Reverent Critic

While McClurg was a freelance journalist, a socialite, and a clubwoman, Hewett was a scholar for most of his life. Hewett differed significantly from the other scholars and enthusiasts whom I have discussed in this dissertation, for he was the most outspoken advocate on behalf of Southwestern antiquities and indigenous rights, and because he embedded many of his attitudes in federal law.

To be sure, Hewett advocated for the status of science, as well as for appalling modes of government intervention in the lives of American Indian peoples and other minorities,

through his proposed "human game preserves"[129] and his thoughts on "race pedagogy."[130] Yet, he also helped to secure government intervention in preserving indigenous heritage places, and often he advocated for the human dignity of indigenous people and their cultures. Hewett shared with Bandelier a belief in paternal benevolence, and this myth oriented almost all that Hewett did. Whereas Bandelier framed the myth of paternal benevolence as a necessary intervention because of what he viewed as the inevitable tragic fate of American Indian peoples, Hewett primarily defended paternal benevolence on the grounds that indigenous culture was spectacular, and merited protection. Hewett's overly worshipful language when he spoke of American Indian peoples, however, indicated the zealousness with which he hoped to "care" for indigenous people and their heritage, and also indicated the key problematic within his rhetoric: the tension between care and control.

Hewett was also distinctive from other preservation advocates because typically he adopted the comic frame when he discussed his profession. Note, while Hewett oriented *himself* towards his historical situation as though it was comedy, his frequent and extreme praise for indigenous heritage sometimes made his frame less "well-rounded" than dramatism's ideal of the comic frame, which would have "involve[d] constant discrimination" on every topic. Because of Hewett's constant discrimination of his own actions, those of his archaeologist peers, and those of his government, however, clearly he considered himself and Anglo-American culture within the comic frame.

Dramatism defines the comic frame as the most humanistic frame of acceptance, in which symbol-users pair praise and criticism dialectically in order to arrive at a measured

---

[129] Hewett, *Ancient Life in the American Southwest*, 174–75.

[130] Hewett, *Ethnic Factors in Education*, 2-3.

view of their circumstances. Burke further noted that the comic frame was a critical demeanor, and one in which the critic himself or herself would express a realistic understanding of his or her own relationship to the frame. In offering the definition of the comic frame that is most useful for my analysis, Burke called the comic frame one in which a symbol-user swung between "'iconoclasm'" and "'hagiography.'"[131] Burke further described the comic frame as "charitable, but at the same time . . . not gullible,"[132] later referring to it as "sour grapes plus."[133] It was a somewhat skeptical way of describing circumstances, but skepticism with hope. For Burke, the comic frame emphasized "humanism" without aggrandizing it or critiquing it unfairly; the former (avoiding aggrandizement) was an aspect of the comic frame that Hewett sometimes failed to exemplify in his rhetoric.[134]

As I interpret dramatism, the comic frame attended to foibles and victories in human action, and above all else, offered measured judgment of those actions. Hewett humanized the characters in his situation through two different rhetorical methods: diminishing the status of scientists and Anglo-American cultural values, and enhancing the status of Ancestral Puebloans and indigenous expertise. He reserved his iconoclasm for social actors like himself, and his hagiography for the Other. In both instances, he compensated for mainstream attitudes by offering contrary ones. In this, Hewett performed the role of the comic frame's gadfly-critic perfectly. His rhetorical enchantment, however, appeared

---

[131] Burke, *Attitudes Toward History*, 107, appears in extensive footnote.

[132] Ibid., 107.

[133] Ibid., 337.

[134] Ibid., 237.

primarily in his hagiographic descriptions of the Other, and indicated a clear bias in his attempts to mythologize peoples like the Puebloans and places like Chaco Canyon.

Iconoclasm is half of the dialectical pairing that dramatism defines as indicative of the comic frame. For the purpose of this analysis, I consider iconoclasm as "[t]he action of attacking or assertively rejecting cherished beliefs and institutions or established values and practices."[135] Hewett regularly assumed the role of an iconoclast in that he regularly critiqued his field of research, the status of science, and the government's interventions in the lives of American Indian people, discussed already. In so doing, Hewett attempted to disenchant his audience of myths having to do with the status of science and the righteousness of government action, while using poetics in order to support myths of universal humanism and antimodern primitivism, instead.

In his most explicit displays of iconoclasm against the institution of the academy, Hewett was often skeptical of the good intentions of his archaeological peers. For Hewett, best practice in archaeology included careful excavation, consistent preservation, and restrained scholarly conclusions; Hewett was critical that his peers failed to perform these actions in the manner he envisioned. Hewett told his readers that the "archaeologist, like other historians, best serve[d] his science by recovering, describing, and preserving unaltered the evidences of human activity, calling attention to possible interpretations of the evidence, and allowing it to teach what it will."[136] He informed his readers that American archaeology

---

[135] "Iconoclasm," *Oxford Living Dictionaries (English)*, https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/iconoclasm, accessed May 25, 2018.

[136] Hewett, *Ancient Life in the American Southwest*, 192.

had participated in "much tall guessing," requiring "much discreet hedging" after the fact.[137] He was concerned about archaeology's tendencies towards "conjecture and unwarranted conclusions," and he felt that the matter of interpretation never could be final.[138] Hewett regularly situated himself within the professional community of archaeologists while noting its "foibles," and in that way demonstrated aspects of a comic frame of interpretation.[139]

Hewett wrote as an iconoclast when he addressed the theory of cultural evolution, as well. Like the other authors of his era, Hewett accepted the popular premise that Europeans were "a stronger people" than the American Indian people whom they were displacing, and more technologically-advanced.[140] While Hewett took it as a foregone conclusion that white culture had the most advanced technology on the planet, he felt that white culture was deficient in aesthetic and spiritual matters, and thus he expressed cutting criticism of dearly-held cultural beliefs and institutions. Hewett also bemoaned technological changes that he witnessed, arguing that humanity "would probably be content without rapid movement, instantaneous communication, the measurement of time into fractions of seconds, the incessant shock of machinery, political campaigns, class hatreds, industrial revolutions, and world wars."[141] Hewett seems to have resented the fact that "the evolution of modern society" had alienated American Indian people, for he felt that their "ages of experience" had

---

[137] Hewett, *The Chaco Canyon and Its Monuments*, 128.

[138] Ibid., 54.

[139] Burke, *Attitudes toward History*, 171.

[140] Hewett, *Ancient Life in the American Southwest*, 174–75.

[141] Hewett, *The Chaco Canyon and Its Monuments*, 13.

prepared them for a different—more peaceful—form of life.[142] While Hewett used the comic frame to critique the myth of cultural evolution as a social good, he simultaneously advanced the myth of antimodern primitivism.

Hewett also criticized the academy for succumbing to the enchantments of "pick and spade." As he said, the "pick and spade of the archaeologist coupled with the imagination of the artist have recreated a history of an almost perfect adaptation to environment, a story as fascinating, as glamorous as that of any race on earth [that of the Ancestral Puebloans at Chaco Canyon]."[143] He appreciated the findings of diligent archaeologists, but felt that "the study of the surviving peoples [had] fallen behind" the work of pick and spade (referring to ethnography).[144] He critiqued scientists for failing to speak with "the living informant," such as Puebloan people, who could give more certainty to topics otherwise subject to mere conjecture by archaeologists.[145] Yet, Hewett admitted that "the specimens of human handiwork that [had] lain buried for ages [had] a charm for both scientist and layman that [could] not be found in the note-books of the ethnologist."[146] While Hewett wanted archaeologists and ethnologists to admit to the allure that biased their research, he never denied that it existed, nor that he, himself, was enchanted by it.

---

[142] Hewett, *Ancient Life in the American Southwest*, 174–75.

[143] Ibid., preface.

[144] Ibid., 185.

[145] Ibid.

[146] Ibid., 185–86.

Hewett recognized that many of his attitudes were in tension with one another, and performed the reflexivity that Burke defined as a component of the comic frame. Hewett also appealed to as many perspectives as he could when he advocated on behalf of Southwestern antiquities. When Hewett described his goals, he offered both practical reasons for setting aside antiquities, as well as humanistic and aesthetic reasons for doing so. He vacillated between the supposedly rational and what Burke called "the irrational and the non-rational" purposes for undertaking his work, presenting all as a cohesive "rationale,"[147] To be sure, Hewett was adamant about the value of "scientific research."[148] Yet, he also acknowledged an "educational value" [149] and even an "economic"[150] benefit for keeping Southwestern antiquities intact. Finally, Hewett marveled at the "esthetic and spiritual values" of the Ancestral Puebloan culture.[151] Hewett thought Southwestern antiquities were nearly universally valuable; they had something to offer everyone, and this justified their preservation, as well as the government's intervention in assuring that.

Hewett never shied away from discussing the aesthetic allure that he felt in the presence of Southwestern antiquities, rhetorically acknowledging the enchantment that he felt in places like Chaco Canyon. While this frequently pushed his frame towards veneration, at other times he tempered his enthusiasm for antiquities with mild cynicism or critique. For

---

[147] Burke, *Attitudes Toward History,* 171.

[148] Ibid., 187.

[149] Hewett, *Circular Relating to Historic and Prehistoric Ruins of the Southwest and Their Preservation*, 4; Hewett, *Ancient Life in the American Southwest*, 187.

[150] Hewett, *Ancient Life in the American Southwest*, 187.

[151] Ibid., 51.

instance, when discussing Southwestern antiquities, Hewett commented on the strange and beautiful atmosphere in which they sat, and concluded that their "unusual situations" made them susceptible to "countless stories and theories, romantic and absurd."[152] While this passage indicated a tongue-in-cheek comportment towards the popular narratives of the Southwest, Hewett often related to the landscape lyrically, himself. Hewett imagined the "majesty of silence and space" at Chaco Canyon as suggestive of "the vastness in which the Eternal Mind organize[d] the energies of the universe,"[153] and he urged that this unique atmosphere be preserved alongside the antiquities themselves. His mild cynicism arose again, however, when Hewett explained that he had "no objection to tourists" coming to learn at Chaco Canyon. He merely asked that "some elements of modern civilization," such as roads and hotels, "be left outside these sacred precincts," for "Chaco Canyon, with its mysteries, [was] nowhere else on earth."[154]

Hewett's hagiographic demeanor towards antiquities and indigenous peoples sometimes overshadowed the roles of iconoclasm and reflexivity within his works. For the purpose of this analysis, I define hagiography by its common usage, as "a description of someone that represents the person as perfect or much better than they really are, or the activity of writing about someone in this way."[155] Whereas hagiography has the more specialized meaning of being a biography of a saint or holy person, by any definition, it is a

---

[152] Hewett, *Ancient Ruins of the Southwest*, 13.

[153] Hewett, *The Chaco Canyon and Its Monuments*, 13.

[154] Ibid., 215.

[155] "Hagiography," Cambridge Dictionary, https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/hagiography, accessed May 26, 2018.

form of writing *about people* that praises them as transcendental, somehow. Hewett reserved his hagiography for occasions when he wrote the stories of ancient or contemporary indigenous people, and he used his veneration of the Other to advance the myth of universal humanism. These gestures supported Hewett's participation in the comic frame insofar as that frame also emphasized humanism.

Hewett's works contained many examples of hagiographic humanism. As one such example, he defined preservation as an effort to maintain "the fruits of the human spirit as they came from the hands and minds of the men and women who made and cherished them."[156] He abhorred vandals because they "put out the torch that ha[d] been kept burning by human devotion for a thousand years."[157] The mistreatment of ancient places damaged the humanity within them, and Hewett portrayed this as unethical in the extreme. In perhaps his most explicit indication of the humanistic reason for preserving Southwestern antiquities, and his laudatory comportment towards the same, Hewett stated in 1936:

> Ruins are important because they were the abodes of human beings, because they tell of the lives of people, who, like us, found themselves living in a world of nature which they strove to understand, found themselves possessed of aspirations which they tried to realize, who, therefore, wrought ceaselessly with hands and minds during their stay on earth; perhaps not knowing why, but faithfully performing the function of human life—to create, to actualize existence, to do what no other creature can do, consciously hold the achievements of each generation and add thereto the fruits of new endeavors. Ruins likewise remind us that human society struggles, achieves, rises, declines, perhaps recovers, but ultimately passes into oblivion.[158]

Hewett recognized himself and his contemporaries in the human pursuits of the Ancestral Puebloans, and accordingly felt that their craftsmanship deserved to be maintained in the

---

[156] Hewett, *The Chaco Canyon and Its Monuments*, 51.

[157] Ibid.

[158] Ibid., 134.

state in which it was found. Hewett combined mythic humanism with his desire for new knowledge, in referring to antiquities as if they were nearly sacred. To Hewett, "[a] great ruin [was] an object of veneration and . . . a never-ending source of knowledge." It contained "the spirit of its builders, to which is due whatever greatness it ever had."[159] While this set of passages appealed to the myth of universal humanism, it surely did so through hagiography.

Hewett's sirenic descriptions of humanity translated, at times, to his descriptions of his field of research. While he often critiqued archaeology—and archaeologists—he also claimed that archaeology had a "high purpose," which was to "inspire . . . striving, to guide human aspiration to new inquiry, to new achievement, to harmony with the way of nature, to the freedom of mind that is the measure of manhood."[160] Alongside the other "business of the archaeologist" that Hewett described at length, he also found that the archaeologist's "richest finds [were] those that were created [by past people] for the pure pleasure of it" on the grounds that "[e]veryone of every race is able to find [beauty] wherever he goes, for he carries it in his own soul."[161] The aesthetic of archaeology, and particularly the panhuman quest for beauty, was part and parcel of Hewett's conceptualization of his work. While Hewett may have pursued objects, it was the humanism and beauty that they evoked that he found most valuable. Yet, while Hewett did attempt to portray the Ancestral Puebloans as complete, complex people, he also adopted fetishizing rhetoric when he discussed the

---

[159] Ibid., 54.

[160] Edgar Lee Hewett, *From Cave Dwelling to Mount Olympus* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1943), 143.

[161] Ibid., 52.

Ancestral Puebloans. In this way, Hewett succumbed to the stylistic tendencies of hagiographic writing, for he described his subjects as though they were nearly divine.

Like McClurg, Hewett's aggrandizement of the Ancestral Puebloans appeared in comparisons with famous Old World cultures, descriptions of an ancient American patriotism, and in other capacities. The two authors differed, however, in the sense that McClurg's aggrandizement of the Ancestral Puebloans served to make her story more thrilling, whereas Hewett's emphasis on the grandeur of the Ancestral Puebloans served as an attempt to convince his audience that these humans deserved praise. As did McClurg, Hewett wrote that the Ancestral Puebloans had rivaled "Egypt and Mesopotamia and Asia Minor and Middle America" in their architecture; given the epoch in which he operated, this Old World comparison was intended to impress.[162] It was a further aggrandizement for Hewett to Americanize the Ancestral Puebloans. He emphasized them as "a free people of the first, the only real *American* race."[163] He admired "their genius for successful republican government; their love of beauty, their mastery of construction and design; their physical superiority; their dominating love of the home and the beautiful imagery of their folk-lore and their ceremonial religion."[164] He called the Puebloan culture a "noble heritage" that had come down "from the long past of America." Moreover, he concluded that studying the descendants of the Ancestral Puebloans through ethnological work was "the finest aspect of the conservation movement—an attempt to rescue and preserve the life-history of a great division of the

---

[162] Hewett, *The Chaco Canyon and Its Monuments*, 13.

[163] Hewett, *Ancient Life in the American Southwest*, Preface, emphasis added.

[164] Ibid., Preface.

human species."[165] Hewett was thoroughly impressed by these ancient people, and wrote in such a way as to convince his readers to be impressed, too.

For all that Hewett's hagiographic descriptions of the Ancestral Puebloans and their descendants elevated those social actors rhetorically, Hewett's narrative framing had political dimensions. Hewett expressed a belief that so-called traditional cultures complemented the progress-oriented European cultures of the world, and had "qualities . . . priceless to human society." He believed in his work as an ethnologist and archaeologist because he thought that white culture could find its "soundest insurance against spiritual decline and extinction by way of our own violence" through "the discovery, recognition and cultivation of the special abilities in the less powerful races." Hewett thought that the Puebloans and "long-lived races of the East" had managed to withstand the tests of time, whereas "European nations . . . enjoyed rapid material development and suffered early disintegration."[166] Though Hewett concluded that indigenous culture was biologically-fixed, and radically-different from white culture, he looked to living Puebloans as part of the solution for resolving white culture's problems.

Hewett's stated desire to assist in the perpetuation of indigenous culture was not entirely altruistic, for he believed that there were both social and scholarly benefits in attempting so-called cultural conservation. Troublingly, while Hewett depicted American Indian people as humans with agency and rich cultural traditions, even lauding them hagiographically, he also regarded them as specimens for inquiry. Hewett viewed American

---

[165] Ibid., 32.

[166] Ibid., 53.

Indian people as "an invaluable aid in American archaeological research" because their "minds [ran] in the same racial channels" as their forebears.[167] Hewett expressed optimism that truths about the deep past would come to light "through modern psychoanalytical methods, from the crannies of the living Indian brain, where ancestral memories sleep."[168] These demeaning attitudes, alongside Hewett's comparisons of Puebloan people with buffaloes and his oblique eugenics program, cast a pall on Hewett's *ethos* as an advocate for indigenous rights. They also demonstrate that the blending of iconoclasm and hagiography in Hewett's comic frame failed to result in comprehensive reflexivity, nor in comprehensive humanism. The comic frame was not a path to ethical comportment, though the dialectic that it demonstrated showed a number of the stakes of preservation advocacy at the beginning of the twentieth century. It also showcased a number of competing myths and narratives that pertained to this discursive context.

Conclusion

Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett were united as preservation advocates because of what they all stood *against*. Framing their condemnations of the status quo as plaints, all three of these social actors opposed the vandalism of Southwestern antiquities, and all three of them opposed the United States government's comportment towards American Indian people in their historical moment. Yet, what each of these advocates stood *for* differed, and their values emerged through each advocate's preferred frame of acceptance, and the myths they each expressed poetically. Bandelier's rejection of vandalism at the Pecos Pueblo

---

[167] Hewett, *The Chaco Canyon and Its Monuments*, 56.

[168] Hewett, *Ancient Life in the American Southwest*, Preface.

stemmed from his esteem for the myth of scientific rationality, and even from a certain degree of esteem for Spanish colonialism and the Christianity that it brought. After all, the Pecos Pueblo was a relic of that moment in history. While McClurg rejected unearned attempts to gain immortality by marking walls, she supported her own trailblazing pursuit of novelty and glory. She also offered her own stories of adventure in the American West as synecdoche for white settlers on the frontier, with herself positioned as a hero. Hewett rejected vandalism and carelessness at Southwestern antiquities because he revered both proper science and humanity. He expressed repeatedly his conviction that humanity had noble traits, that those traits were preserved in antiquities and in living cultures, and that both required dignity and scrutiny. His idealism pushed him towards appalling extremes when he applied it towards proposed government intervention in the lives of the Puebloans with whom he worked. Yet, his rejection of vandalism stemmed from his veneration of the human.

All of these preservation advocates accepted that Southwestern antiquities were valuable, and all of them even framed them as treasures like those in Old World legends. Whereas Bandelier and Hewett understood that value partially within the realm of research, each of these advocates urged their audiences to accept the inherent and humanistic value of Southwestern antiquities, as well. Bandelier offered the most incomplete effort to humanize the Ancestral Puebloans and their descendants, because he presented himself as the all-knowing narrator in the tragedy of the Other. Whereas he endeavored to make Puebloan culture more comprehensible to his audience, simultaneously he advanced myths of scientific rationality, cultural evolution, and primitivism. His poetic engagement with Southwestern antiquities and with the people who built them resulted in a demeaning and fetishistic representation of both, while keeping him at a scholarly remove from the narrative he told.

McClurg's adoption of the epic frame situated her, as a character, in the middle of the enchantments that she wove. Ultimately, Southwestern antiquities became part of a scene for her narrative of white conquest over the Southwestern frontier. In spite of this, she offered herself as a sympathetic figure because she acknowledged tensions of settler colonialism even as she promoted herself as the best possible steward of indigenous heritage sites. McClurg's emphasis on her own heroism eclipsed other elements of her scene, and cast the Ancestral Puebloans and the Weeminuche Ute people as background characters in her story. Her descriptions of both tended towards aggrandizement or exoticizing descriptors, and in both cases these poetic distortions served to emphasize the extent of her own heroism.

Hewett's poetic demeanor towards Southwestern antiquities and indigenous cultures differed from Bandelier and McClurg's tendencies. Hewett used the comic frame to critique and reflect upon the role of science in political affairs. Varying between iconoclasm and hagiography, Hewett sometimes attacked the myth of scientific rationality while frequently advancing the myth of antimodern primitivism. Hewett's combined works come across as a humanistic hagiography, in which he attempted to make the Ancestral Puebloans and the Puebloans more legible to his white audience. Yet, through the hagiographic component of the comic frame, Hewett often fetishized indigeneity. Indeed, by the end of his career, Hewett turned to Puebloan culture as the last great hope for modern civilization, which he believed that European cultures had doomed. In regarding Puebloan culture as the balm to white culture's problems, Hewett understood indigenous heritage in terms of how Anglo-American culture could use it.

The accepting frames of the tragedy, the epic, and the comedy performed ideological harm in insidious ways, which the advocates likely never realized, enchanted as they were by

the myths of modernity. The tragedy allowed Bandelier to assume clinical distance when he interpreted Puebloan culture, and so instantiated his belief that Puebloans required the supposed benevolence of the federal government. McClurg's adoption of the epic poetic category enlisted the scene of the American West and the Native nations who resided there as aspects in her own quest for self-actualization. By relegating indigenous stakeholders to an ancillary role in the narrative of indigenous heritage preservation, McClurg made the interests of white settlers like herself paramount throughout her works. Hewett's comic frame emphasized humanism to a great extent, which made it the most satisfactory framing device in the context of white advocacy on behalf of indigenous heritage and rights. However, it was flawed in the sense that the dialectic of iconoclasm and hagiography often failed to reach a synthesis of comprehensive and reflexive critique. Hewett, alone, was able to discern myths within his professional context, but he advanced fetishistic interpretations of the Other and the success of white culture even as he challenged overt racism and some forms of scientific rationality.

All of the frames that Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett adopted were both rhetorical enchantments and evidence of rhetorical enchantment. They were rhetorical enchantments because they attempted to influence publics through language, they appealed to myths, and they proceeded by way of poetic language—even, in this case, through engaging narrative styles like the tragedy, the epic, and the comedy. These frames were also evidence of rhetorical enchantment because of the expressions of collective poetry that they contained. Myths of modernity, like cultural evolution, scientific rationality, and acceptance of colonialism, characterized the narratives that these preservation advocates told. Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett were infatuated with the places and people of the American Southwest,

and could only express that infatuation through poetic equipment that they had available to them in their day.

Many of the problems that I have identified in the early practice of preservation advocacy in the American Southwest carried over into the earliest policies that affected the federal management of indigenous heritage places throughout the United States. The myths of scientific rationality and paternal benevolence gained an early and enduring foothold in preservation policy concerning Southwestern antiquities. The enchantment of the Other also carried through in those texts. Only lately have preservation policies concerning Southwestern antiquities attempted to renegotiate enchantment, scientism, and humanism in the context of the American Southwest. I discuss these and other features of preservation policy in the following chapter.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bandelier, Adolph Francis. *The Delight Makers*. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1890.

———. *Final Report of Investigations among the Indians of the Southwestern United States, Carried on Mainly in the Years from 1880 to 1885.* Cambridge, MA: John Wilson and Son, 1890.

———. *Report on the Ruins of the Pueblo of Pecos*. Boston, MA: A. Williams and Co., 1881.

Burke, Kenneth. *Attitudes toward History*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1961.

———. *A Grammar of Motives*. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1955.

Deloria, Philip J. *Playing Indian*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Donaghé, Virginia. "Cliff Climbing in Colorado." *The Great Divide*. March-Nov. 1889, 28-29. Special Collections at the Center of Southwest Studies (M082, Box 5, "The Great Divide"), Fort Lewis College, Durango, CO.

Dorsey, Leroy G., and Rachel M. Harlow. "'We Want Americans Pure and Simple': Theodore Roosevelt and the Myth of Americanism." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 6, no. 1 (2003): 55–78. doi:https://doi.org/10.1353/rap.2003.0027.

Hewett, Edgar Lee. *Ancient Life in the American Southwest*. New York: Tudor Publishing Company, 1943.

———. *Ancient Ruins of the Southwest*. Denver: Carson-Harper, 1909.

———. *Circular Relating to Historic and Prehistoric Ruins of the Southwest and Their Preservation*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1904.

———. *Ethnic Factors in Education*. Lancaster, PA: New Era Printing Company, 1905.

———. *From Cave Dwelling to Mount Olympus*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1943.

———. *Government Supervision of Historic and Prehistoric Ruins*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1904.

———. *Les Communautés Anciennes Dans Le Désert Américain : Recherches Archéologiques Sur La Distribution et L'organisation Sociale Des Anciennes Populations Au Sud-Ouest Des États-Unis et Au Nord Du Mexico*. Geneva: Librairie Kundig, 1908.

———. *The Chaco Canyon and Its Monuments*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1936.

———. "The Southwest: Yesterday and Tomorrow." *Papers of the School of American Research* 2 (1921): 3–8.

Kaufman, Polly Welts. *National Parks and the Woman's Voice*. 2nd ed. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2006.

Lee, Ronald F. "The Origins of the Antiquities Act." In *The Antiquities Act: A Century of American Archaeology, Historic Preservation, and Nature Conservation*, edited by David Harmon, Francis P. McManamon, and Dwight T. Pitcaithley, 15–34. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 2006.

Lister, Florence L. *Troweling Through Time: The First Century of Mesa Verdean Archaeology*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2004.

McClurg, Virginia. "Two Annual Addresses by the Regent of the Colorado Cliff Dwellings Association, by the Regent of the Colorado Cliff Dwellings Association, Pueblo, 1903, Denver, 1904; compliments of Mrs. Gilbert McClurg. Denver, CO: n. pub., 1904. Tutt Library Special Collections at Colorado College. Call number F782.M52 D6 1904.

Meringolo, Denise D. *Museums, Monuments, and National Parks: Toward a New Genealogy of Public History*. Public History in Historical Perspective. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2012.

Nelson, Greg C., and Felicia C. Madimenos. "Obelionic Cranial Deformation in the Puebloan Southwest." *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 143, no. 3 (2010): 465–72. doi:10.1002/ajpa.21353.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.

Smith, Duane A. *Mesa Verde National Park: Shadows of the Centuries*. 2nd ed. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado, 2002.

Thompson, Raymond Harris. "Edgar Lee Hewett and the Politics of Archaeology." In *The Antiquities Act: A Century of American Archaeology, Historic Preservation, and Nature Conservation*, edited by David Harmon, Francis P. McManamon, and Dwight T. Pitcaithley, 35–47. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 2006.

Willey, Gordon R., and Jeremy A. Sabloff. *A History of American Archaeology*. 3rd ed. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1993.

CHAPTER FOUR: SCIENCE AS THE GOD TERM OF PRESERVATION POLICY IN THE AMERICAN SOUTHWEST

> . . . 'what hands have built hands can destroy,' and these ruins, which have endured through many ages, are now in danger of destruction. Unless something is done to protect them, the vandals of modern civilization will destroy them. It is for this reason that Congress should provide for their preservation, or else turn them over to the State in order that it may preserve them.[1]

The preservation advocates whose works I analyzed in the preceding chapter were part of a growing movement among the Anglo-American public to protect Southwestern antiquities. The culmination of the advocates' efforts was the passage of a variety of preservation policies that criminalized amateur collecting at ancient places, while regulating and encouraging scientific inquiry as never before. The Antiquities Act of 1906 was the most significant victory for preservation advocates at the turn of the twentieth century. It enabled the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, and War to guard ancient indigenous heritage places, to grant permits to authorized educational institutions for the study of those places, and to prosecute social actors who trespassed against antiquities on public lands. It also set precedents for over one hundred years of federal policy affecting Southwestern antiquities. These policies, often the result of advocacy campaigns, are the focus of this chapter.

Federal preservation policies demonstrated rhetorical enchantment by calling upon cultural myths and appealing to wonder through poetic language, all while making claims that bore on the public interest. Rhetorical enchantments appeared somewhat differently in policy than in the accounts of excavations or interpretations of the Ancestral Puebloans

---

[1] "The Mancos Ruins." *Denver Tribune-Republican.* 12 December 1886. pp. 12.

addressed heretofore. Even so, all of these government interventions demonstrated some of the same valuations of the past that the adventurers and archaeologists expressed, and they envisioned the purpose of preservation in similar ways. Like all of the texts that I have examined so far, these policies valued the preservation and pursuit of knowledge, typically described as some type of scientific inquiry.

In this chapter, I analyze key themes within three categories of preservation policies, as well as the appearance of Science, the god term that orients the rhetoric of preservation policy as a whole. The three categories of preservation policies that I analyze are as follows: general federal preservation policies, which affect heritage management in the country at large; early twentieth century national park and monument designations for places like Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon, which comprise the first generation site-specific policies; and late twentieth and early twenty-first century national monument designations for places like Bears Ears National Monument and Canyons of the Ancients, which comprise the second generation site-specific policies.

There are many parallels between the nationwide and site-specific policies, as well as between the first and second generation of park and monument designations. The predominant similarity across these three categories of policies is that all are subject to the god term Science. By identifying the similarities between federal preservation policies and their specific iterations in the Southwest, the particularities of Southwestern antiquities, their management, and their preservation, can be viewed within a national context. The rhetorical analysis of preservation policies also brings the historical origins of preservation advocacy into conversation with its enduring implications. My thematic analysis of each category of preservation policy also demonstrates that there are stark differences among federal

preservation policies, first generation park and monument designations, and second generation monument designations. The themes present in each category differ dramatically, and orient towards Science differentially. Indeed, the various thematic contexts point towards different iterations of Science. This is significant for understanding how to advocate on behalf of ancient indigenous places in the present, given the scientific racism that often defined archaeology and advocacy on behalf of Southwestern antiquities historically. Contemporary site-specific policies attempt to disarticulate Science from racism, and advance new cultural myths in the process.

The general federal preservation policies that I assess span from 1906 to 1990, and include: the Antiquities Act of 1906, the Organic Act of 1916, the Historic Sites Act of 1935, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Archeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990. Whereas the Antiquities Act emerged from lengthy discussions concerning the fate of Southwestern antiquities in particular, many of the other federal policies reflected public concern regarding Anglo-American historic sites, and those affected the federal management of antiquities in a more incidental way. Policies that emphasized indigenous heritage appealed to Science more often and more explicitly than those that prioritized Anglo-American heritage.

Following my discussion of the poetics and myths present in the rhetoric of federal preservation policies, and the ways in which these orient towards the god term Science, I assess the language of several national monument or park designations on behalf of Southwestern antiquities, beginning in the late nineteenth century and ending in 2016. I have

identified twenty documents establishing Southwestern antiquities as new federally-protected locales.[2] The majority of the documents I assess here are presidential proclamations, with the additional inclusion of a bill passed by Congress or implemented as an executive order. I have focused my analysis on the initial designation of each site as a protected territory, and I have divided my analysis into two broad historical periods: the first generation of site-specific park and monument designations, ranging from 1892-1939, and the second generation of Southwestern national monument designations, ranging from 1990-2016.

In the first generation of site-specific preservation policies particular to the American Southwest, I analyze Benjamin Harrison's executive order "For the Protection of Casa Grande Ruin" (1892); the "Act Creating the Mesa Verde National Park" (1906); Theodore Roosevelt's presidential proclamations in support of Montezuma Castle National Monument (1906), El Morro National Monument (1906), Chaco Canyon National Monument (1907), Gila Cliff-Dwellings National Monument (1907), and Tonto National Monument (1907); William Howard Taft's proclamations in support of Navajo National Monument (1909) and Gran Quivira National Monument (1909); Woodrow Wilson's proclamations of Walnut Canyon National Monument (1915) and Bandelier National Monument (1916); Warren G. Harding's proclamations of Aztec Ruins National Monument (1923) and Hovenweep National Monument (1923); Calvin Coolidge's proclamation on behalf of Wupatki National Monument (1924); Herbert Hoover's proclamation of Canyon de Chelly National Monument (1931); and Franklin D. Roosevelt's proclamation of Tuzigoot National Monument (1939).

[2] There have been numerous boundary adjustments and bureaucratic realignments concerning these twenty sites over the years. I did not include those documents in my analysis.

In my analysis of the second generation of preservation policies affecting Southwestern antiquities, I examine Public Law 101-313, passed during George H.W. Bush's administration, concerning Petroglyph National Monument, Pecos National Historical Park, and Zuni-Cibola National Historical Park (1990); Bill Clinton's proclamations of Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument (1996) and Canyons of the Ancients National Monument (2000); and, finally, Barack Obama's proclamation of Bears Ears National Monument (2016).

I adopt the dramatistic concept of the god term in order to analyze the ways in which these collections of texts intersected, and how, together, they valued Science as the primary rationale for setting aside public lands containing antiquities. Often, these policies promoted human sciences and history, but did so in a way that spoke to scientific rationality—a mythic mode of Science, rather than a denotative one. Yet, Science never appeared alone in these preservation policies; it appeared within discursive contexts that shifted the meaning of the god term, and indicated different valuations of heritage and antiquities. These contexts were the accompanying terms, myths, and poetics that pointed towards Science, and they varied among the federal preservation policies, the first generation of site-specific designations, and the second generation of site-specific designations.

General federal policies discussed Science in terms of its service to the American people. Such policies appealed to the myth of benevolent paternalism routinely. General federal policies reinforced their emphasis on nationalism by describing it with vivid language, whereas Science appeared within less picturesque portions of these texts. The first generation of site-specific park and monument designations in the American Southwest paired Science with the idea of the Other. Indeed, these policies promoted a Science *of* the

Other, as they valued highly fields like ethnology and archaeology—and the supposed secrets about humanity and cross-cultural relationships that those fields of research would unlock. In those texts, references to the idea of the Other garnered the most colorful descriptions. The myth of scientific rationality persisted in these texts, and the myth of primitivism joined it. The second generation of site-specific park and monument designations in the American Southwest elevated Science within the discursive context of reverence for the environment and reverence for humanity. In a noteworthy difference from the other collections of texts, three out of four of these second-generation documents tended to adopt captivating language towards Science as well as towards different iterations of the American people and their landscape. While Science was the term-of-terms in preservation policy affecting Southwestern antiquities, the network of myths and poetics in which Science appeared was variable.

Next, I expand upon the theory of the god term and its relation to rhetorical enchantments, before demonstrating the reign of Science in the federal preservation policies affecting Southwestern antiquities.

God Terms and Rhetorical Enchantments

Throughout this chapter, I build the argument that Science is the god term of preservation policies affecting Southwestern antiquities. Kenneth Burke's god terms were the inspiration for my theoretical approach, though Richard Weaver also developed the theoretical concept.[3] Weaver defined god terms as expressions "about which all other

[3] Richard L. Johannesen, "Richard M. Weaver's Uses of Kenneth Burke," *The Southern Speech Communication Journal* 52, no. 2 (1987): 312-30. This article notes that Burke used the phrase "god term" in his *Grammar of Motives*, prior to Weaver's publications on the topic. Furthermore, Weaver attended one of Burke's seminars in 1949, during which Burke

expressions [were] ranked as subordinate and serving dominations and powers."[4] God terms granted force to the "ancillary terms" alongside which they appeared. Weaver identified the god term of the modern age as "progress" for its ability to "validate almost anything" rhetorically, and he located deference to progress in the discursive habits of his contemporaries.[5] My findings are consistent with Weaver's theory in the sense that the god term, Science, appeared repeatedly as a justification for government action. Science also appeared in a web of accompanying or ancillary terms with which it shared a power relationship. Throughout this chapter, I refer to the terms and themes that accompanied Science as the god term's discursive context. In some of the texts that I address in this chapter, the networks of terms that accompanied Science characterized it according to the technological rationality that authors like Holmes and Nordenskiöld advanced; at other times, Science appeared among ancillary terms that reflected the academy's reflexive turn, and which exhibited a rejection of scientific objectivity. By examining Science as a god term, its malleable meanings and associated values become clear.

Both Richard Weaver and Kenneth Burke considered god terms as symbols that presided over the discourses in which they appeared. However, Burke discussed god terms less in the context of power, and more in the realm of symbolic transcendence. For Burke, a

---

theorized the god term. Johannesen argues that Weaver failed to attribute the term to Burke properly, though was influenced by him substantially.

[4] Richard M. Weaver, *The Ethics of Rhetoric* (Chicago: H. Regnery Co., 1953), 212, accessed March 13, 2018, Hathitrust Digital Library.

[5] Ibid.

god term was a "secular summarizing term,"[6] or a "title of titles."[7] A god term was an orienting symbol, or the "universal title or all-inclusive epithet to which any less generalized terms would be related as parts to whole."[8] In a reductive sense, one might say that Burke's god terms were descriptive categories into which the all of the main themes of a text might be clustered. However, such a summation would overlook the mythic capacities of god terms for Burke. In addition to categorizing discourses, Burke's god terms contained worlds within themselves. God terms are a helpful lens for examining policies because, by their very design, policies nearly always contain such terms.

Although Science dominated preservation policies affecting Southwestern antiquities, it always appeared within a discursive context that contained other themes and values. Most notably, preservation policies also appealed to themes of nationalism, indigeneity, and wonder. Weaver might have considered these the ancillary terms that accompanied Science in this discursive field, yet these terms also altered the *meaning* of Science when they appeared alongside it. For one thing, preservation policies appealed to nationalism, indigeneity, and wonder, with densely-connotative, poetic language. Science, though the god term of preservation policy, tended to rely on its discursive context for its poetry. It often appeared without the trappings of fanciful language. Whereas Science typically evoked the cultural myths of scientific rationality or the wonder of scientific discovery, the themes that bolstered Science appealed to a much broader range of cultural myths, including American

---

[6] Kenneth Burke, *The Rhetoric of Religion: Studies in Logology*, 2nd ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970), 25.

[7] Ibid., 33.

[8] Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives* (New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1955), 73.

exceptionalism, the primitivism of the Other, and the poetry of place in the American Southwest.

The discursive contexts in which the god term, Science, appears are among the many sites of rhetorical enchantment I address in this dissertation, since the symbolic fields in which Science appears indicate the other myths that accompany and characterize the god term. To adapt somewhat liberally from Burke, myths are "less generalized terms" than god terms, but are "related as parts to whole" to the terms alongside which they appear.[9] Cultural narratives about the quest for knowledge, or the power of reason, or the thrill of discovery are mythic parts of the whole of Science. These are also among the myths of modernity that researchers and advocates from the previous two chapters promoted through their rhetoric. Meanwhile, references to exotic or vanished peoples hailed the modern myth of primitivism, that belief that Native peoples existed outside of time and differed from Anglo-American populations in the extreme. Such myths defined the *kind* of Science that the first generation of national monument designations upheld as a god term. Language about the government caring for its people spoke in the myth of benevolent paternalism, and, when contextualizing Science, asserted that Science should only be practiced for the public benefit. All of the myths that I identify in federal preservation policies defined Science through a dense context of cultural myths, even as they oriented *towards* Science in the process.

Notably, the sentences in which Science appeared often were devoid of poetry. The broader discursive contexts of the preservation policies compensated for Science's lack. References to the nation spoke of enlightenment and trajectory for a unique people; references to indigeneity often appealed to the exotic; references to the landscape painted a

[9] Burke, A Grammar of Motives, 73.

strange and beautiful scene in the Southwestern United States. Whereas Science persisted as a defining term across nearly all of the preservation policies affecting Southwestern antiquities, the accompanying terms—and their poetics—skewed Science in multiple directions. Science was a nearly-hollow term, filled in or inflected with the values of its adjuncts. I shall elaborate upon these findings in the succeeding sections.

Federal Preservation Policies

In my rhetorical analysis of federal preservation policies, I refer to the Antiquities Act of 1906, the Organic Act of 1916, the Historic Sites Act of 1935, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Archeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990. I offer a brief summary of each of these acts before discussing the way in which their contextual emphasis on nationalism characterized the nature of the god term, Science.

The Antiquities Act of 1906 was the first federal policy to grapple with the issue of historic or archaeological preservation. As such, it was the first inroad for establishing a formal rhetoric of preservation, as practiced by the federal government. It set up punitive measures against persons caught damaging or removing "historic or prehistoric" resources from federal lands: fines of not more than $500 and/or up to ninety days in prison.[10] It enabled the president to establish new national monuments, and it provided that the tracts of land set aside were of "historic or scientific interest" and "the smallest area compatible with proper care and management" of the academically-relevant materials thereon. The act also

[10] *Antiquities Act of 1906*, Public Law 59-209, 34 Stat. 225, 54 U.S. Code §§ 320301–320303, enacted June 8, 1906.

positioned the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, and War as the permit-granting authorities for the scholarly excavation or removal of objects from federal lands, supervising "reputable museums, universities, colleges, or other recognized scientific or educational institutions" as they engaged in study, and stipulating that the outcomes of such study be preserved and displayed for the public benefit.[11]

The Organic Act of 1916 established the National Park Service (NPS), and reorganized the management of protected federal lands within the United States, granting the Secretary of the Interior more authority in that arena and decreasing the involvement of the Secretaries of Agriculture and War. The Organic Act affected the institutional oversight of national parks monuments, including many Southwestern antiquities. However, its focus was not on research.

The Historic Sites Act of 1935 (HSA) clarified some existing administrative protocols concerning the preservation of historic or archaeological sites in the United States and offered a governmental policy about the purpose of preservation. It established guidelines for attending to significant properties that were not under federal jurisdiction. Additionally, it expanded the Historic American Buildings Survey and created pathways for public participation in the designation of nationally-significant sites.[12]

---

[11] Antiquities Act of 1906.

[12] Michael Kammen, *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture* (New York: Vintage Books, 1993), 471. Francis P. McManamon, "The Foundation for American Public Archaeology: Section 3 of the Antiquities Act of 1906," in *The Antiquities Act: A Century of American Archaeology, Historic Preservation, and Nature Conservation*, ed. David Harmon, Francis P. McManamon, and Dwight T. Pitcaithley (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 2006), 168; Jerry L. Rogers, "The Antiquities Act and Historic Preservation," in *The Antiquities Act: A Century of American Archaeology, Historic Preservation, and Nature Conservation*, ed. David Harmon, Francis P.

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) helped to resolve some administrative problems that arose for the NPS in the wake of the HSA.[13] In response to the ungainly growth of the Historic American Buildings Survey, and in light of increased demand for non-federally owned sites to receive national recognition, the NHPA established "a register of culturally significant sites at local, State and national levels," known as the National Register of Historic Places.[14] It also created the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and established State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs). Later amendments to the NHPA built upon the organizational networks created by the act, to encourage grassroots preservation projects recognized by the federal government. Later amendments also facilitated American Indian participation in historic preservation, with the establishment of Tribal Historic Preservation Offices (THPOs), though these were not part of the original NHPA.[15]

Similar to the manner in which the HSA established a federal policy towards historic sites, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 established such a policy regarding the nation's obligations towards the environment. NEPA was significant for the preservation of

---

McManamon, and Dwight T. Pitcaithley (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 2006), 178.

[13] Thomas F. King, *Cultural Resource Laws and Practice*, 3rd ed. (Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press, 2008), 388.

[14] Laurajane Smith, Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage (New York: Routledge, 2004), 132.

[15] Joe E. Watkins, "The Antiquities Act at One Hundred Years: A Native American Perspective," in *The Antiquities Act: A Century of American Archaeology, Historic Preservation, and Nature Conservation*, ed. David Harmon, Francis P. McManamon, and Dwight T. Pitcaithley (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Arizona Press, 2006), 196.

antiquities because it obligated all federal agencies to complete environmental impact statements prior to engaging in new construction or repair work. Because of NEPA, archaeologists working in cultural resource management joined interdisciplinary teams responsible for completing environmental impact statements, thus assuring that archaeological surveys would be completed prior to federal construction projects.[16]

Although archaeologists working in cultural resource management had new authority to *record* sites of interest to them, professional archaeological associations pointed out that the NHPA and NEPA were not drafted to account for archaeological preservation, per se. Accordingly, the archaeological lobby campaigned for new legislation that would meet the needs of archaeologists, specifically. Archaeologists drafted the Archeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (AHPA)[17] to encourage the "preservation of scientific and archaeological data" amending earlier legislation in the process.[18]

The Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 expanded further upon the new protections offered by the AHPA. While the AHPA increased awareness of archaeological resources that lay in the path of federal development projects, the Antiquities Act of 1906 remained the primary line of defense against vandalism, looting, and other inappropriate conduct at ancient sites on federal land. Yet, as time passed, the Antiquities Act's fines of not more than $500 were a decreasingly effective deterrent against pot-hunting, and advocates

---

[16] Smith, Archaeological Theory, 132; Kathleen Sue Fine-Dare, *Grave Injustice: The American Indian Repatriation Movement and* NAGPRA (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002), 72.

[17] In the United States context, "archeology" and "archaeology" are both accepted spellings for the term. "Archeology" is more common in the context of cultural resource management.

[18] Smith, Archaeological Theory, 133.

felt that something had to be done to "correc[t] more than seven decades of inadequate protection for archaeological sites and objects."[19] Archaeological organizations, still active following the passage of the AHPA, banded together once again to lobby for a change.[20] The product of this lobbying was the enactment of the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (ARPA). ARPA's greatest practical contributions to preservation policy were its clearer definitions of the archaeological resources to be protected, and its more stringent policies regarding punishments for acts of vandalism or theft.

ARPA was the first federal preservation policy to consider American Indian stakeholders in management decisions regarding ancient indigenous places. For instance, ARPA obligated researchers to obtain consent from Tribal governments prior to engaging in excavations on Tribal lands. However, ARPA went forward without any input from American Indian stakeholders, and it received criticism for "offering lip service only to American Indian concerns."[21] By comparison, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (NAGPRA) resulted directly from lobbying on the part of American Indian political collectives. Together with "museum professionals, archaeologists, and anthropologists," American Indian representatives brought public attention to a number of problems with the ways in which American Indian cultural materials and human remains were treated by the federal government.[22] For example, the Smithsonian Institution had in its

---

[19] Lary M. Dilsaver, ed., *America's National Park System: The Critical Documents* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1994), 372.

[20] Smith, Archaeological Theory, 135.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Ibid., 139.

collections many human remains, including the bodies and skulls of American Indian people, presumably gathered by the American Bureau of Ethnology during the nineteenth century.[23] Indigenous rights movements were successful in drawing this problematic condition to public attention, though the Smithsonian escaped a number of NAGPRA's stipulations. Even so, NAGPRA asserted indigenous authority over indigenous heritage management, and heightened the requirements for consultation and consent among researchers, federal government agencies, and indigenous stakeholders.

Because each of these acts accomplished different tasks within the legal environment, the rhetoric varied from document to document. In general, these acts presented nationalistic rationales for protecting Science (and scientific materials) in the United States. The myths that accompanied these were the modern narratives promoting scientific rationality and the sanctity and benevolence of the nation-state. The poetics of federal preservation policy were reserved, primarily, for the narratives of nation that appeared in these texts. I begin my discussion of federal preservation policy with reference to the presence of Science within nationwide policies affecting Southwestern antiquities. Then I discuss the nationalistic themes that inflected Science's presence within all of these national policies, prior to commenting on the degree of consideration that these policies possessed with regard to indigenous rights.

A Nationalistic Science in Federal Preservation Policies

The Antiquities Act initiated federal preservation policy with reference to Science. The Antiquities Act was the first federal preservation policy that offered blanket protection

[23] Ibid.

for places like Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon, but it did so because it defined ancient indigenous heritage places as "objects of historic or scientific interest." The act favored academic approaches to national heritage places explicitly, with particular emphasis on the "examination of ruins, the excavation of archaeological sites, and the gathering of objects of antiquity . . . for the benefit of reputable museums, universities, colleges, or other recognized scientific or educational institutions." The purpose of said research, according the Antiquities Act, was "increasing . . . knowledge."[24] In this phrase, the Antiquities Act appealed to the myths of scientific discovery and the quest for new knowledge, while establishing a power dynamic that favored institutionally-sanctioned researchers. This act's precedent has continued to inform contemporary legislation on the issue, not least of all because the Antiquities Act continues to enable presidents to declare new national monuments via executive order.

The HSA picked up some of the themes that the Antiquities Act established by promoting "investigations and researches" in pursuit of "true and accurate . . . facts" about United States historic and archaeological properties. The act encouraged the Secretary of the Interior to liaise with "educational or scientific institution[s]," and obligated the Secretary of the Interior to manage the information content of historic and archaeological properties through formal documentation (surveys, photographs, drawings, maps), while managing and storing the results of such documentation in an appropriate manner. The act compelled the Secretary of the Interior to "[s]ecure, collate, and preserve . . . data" as an integral part of

[24] Antiquities Act of 1906.

preserving historic and archaeological sites.[25] The HSA, like the Antiquities Act before it, valued heritage places on the basis of the knowledge content they contained.

The AHPA, for which professional archaeological organizations lobbied, was transparent in its elevation of knowledge content. The AHPA paired Science with data, and was clear in its purpose to prevent "irreparable loss or destruction of significant scientific, prehistorical, historical, or archeological data." The act emphasized the "recovery, protection, and preservation of such data" as might be threatened by the activities of federal agencies, and included "relics and specimens" among the "data" that federally-licensed activities might jeopardize.[26] The AHPA demonstrated a regard for the objects that might emerge from ancient places, without demonstrating care for the places, themselves, or the contemporary cultural landscapes in which they were situated. Instead, the AHPA continued the precedents set by the researchers and advocates whom I have discussed already, in its emphasis on material possession. Moreover, it defined the materials at Southwestern antiquities *as* data, and so appealed to Science in the process.

The Antiquities Act, the HSA, and the AHPA appealed to myths of scientific rationality and the value of new knowledge, but used relatively little poetic language in order to call upon those myths. That trend continued in ARPA, with the notable exception that ARPA recognized the "*wealth* of archaeological information" that private individuals might be able to offer "professional archaeologists and institutions."[27] Notably, the faint glimmer of

---

[25] *Historic Sites Act of 1935*, Ch. 593, 49 Stat. 666, enacted August 21, 1935.

[26] *The Archeological and Historic Preservation Act*, Public Law 93-291, U.S. Code 469-469c, enacted May 24, 1974.

[27] *The Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979*, Public Law 96-95, 93 Stat. 721, 16 U.S. Code §§ 470aa–470mm, enacted October 31, 1979, emphasis added.

lively language in ARPA, the "wealth" of knowledge, referred to use-value and scientific use simultaneously. ARPA's emphasis on research continued when, like the Antiquities Act before it, ARPA privileged "suitable universities, museums, or other scientific or educational institutions." Like the Antiquities Act, ARPA was intent on "furthering archaeological knowledge in the public interest." Like the AHPA, ARPA also referred to the "data" that antiquities contained. ARPA focused on the careful treatment of "lands . . . likely to contain the most scientifically valuable archaeological resources," and in so doing, continued to illustrate the values that the act promoted.[28] While ARPA depicted knowledge and data as treasures, of a sort, the act shared its predecessors' orientation towards scientific rationality, and therefore, towards Science.

NAGPRA differed from the acts discussed so far in the sense that it referred to indigenous worldviews, specifically, and attempted to acknowledge indigenous collectives' religious and cultural claims to cultural objects that other policies had viewed as data. NAGPRA's focus on repatriation also set it apart from the other preservation policies, since, in many cases, the repatriation of materials to a Tribal government might result in the organic deterioration of those same materials upon reburial. Even so, NAGPRA acknowledged the power of Science, even in its efforts to sanction scientific behavior. For instance, the act clarified that it was not to be "construed as an authorization for . . . the initiation of new scientific studies," and that it did not intend to encourage "other means of acquiring or preserving additional scientific information" from human remains and funerary objects. Even with its correctives to scientific comportment towards indigenous heritage, NAGPRA did continue to define the academic community as experts on indigenous heritage management,

[28] The Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979.

and offered the "scientific community" a variety of concessions. For instance, NAGPRA demanded the return of human remains and funerary objects from museums and educational institutions, *unless* "such items [were] indispensable for completion of a specific scientific study," in which case, the items had to be returned to their rightful owners "no later than 90 days after the date on which the scientific study [was] completed." NAGPRA raised the standard for engagement between the scientific community and American Indian constituencies, yet it maintained a privileged role for the Anglo-American scientific community. It recognized the reign of Science, even as it attempted to curtail scientific privileges.

Among the policy texts that I analyze, NAGPRA was unique in its defense of American Indian peoples and their claims on indigenous heritage places and objects. In general, though, federal preservation policies demonstrated a Western-centric, materialistic approach to preservation and the management of indigenous heritage, viewing ancient places and their contents as a kind of property that could be owned and disputed.[29] This attitude has informed federal preservation policy since before the passage of the Antiquities Act. In Senate hearings leading up to the passage of that act, advocates defined antiquities as the government's property, and considered the Antiquities Act a part of the nation's effort to look after its own things.[30] Those collectors who were busy profiting from the ceramics that

---

[29] Rodney Harrison describes the Western-centric emphasis on collecting material possessions in *Heritage: Critical Approaches* (London: Routledge, 2013).

[30] U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee On Public Lands, Hearing before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands of the United States Senate, Consisting of Senators Fulton (Charman), Bard, and Newlands, on the Bill (S. 4127) for the Preservation of Aboriginal Monuments, Ruins, and Other Antiquities, and for Other Purposes, 58th Cong., 2nd sess., April 20, 1904, 1-30.

they scavenged from ancient indigenous places were robbing the United States federal government, and the academic and political elite at the time opposed pot-hunting on proprietary grounds as well as academic ones. This idea of ownership persisted for over seventy years, as ARPA echoed the Antiquities Act and its founding in its impetus to protect the "property of the United States."[31] Both the Antiquities Act and ARPA sought to suppress commercial trade in antiquities, in favor of a public benefit. In those acts, the public benefited through the pursuit of knowledge, and knowledge existed in material possessions. Science oriented the discourse. Nationalism motivated it.

Although many of the federal preservation policies prioritized scientific rationality in their justificatory rhetoric, several of these policies discussed the value of heritage places in terms of their national significance, as well. Such patriotic rhetoric informed the broader discursive context in which the appeals to Science intervened. Indeed, sometimes these policies depicted research as auxiliary to national identity formation. Whereas the appeals to the importance of research seldom drifted into inspiring language, references to the American people often adopted a rousing tone. For instance, occasional references to the spirit and future of the nation illustrated the potency of the thematic context in which the god term of Science appeared. The presence of patriotic myths and nationalistic commonplaces throughout federal preservation policies transformed the kind of Science that those policies promoted into something uniquely American.

The Antiquities Act had little explicit language about the character of the nation, though the hearings leading up to its passage included dramatic nationalistic rhetoric. However, the Antiquities Act did appeal to the myth of paternal benevolence, which had

[31] The Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979.

nationalistic dimensions. The Antiquities Act advanced the conviction that only the "Government" could provide "proper management and care" for the objects of scientific interest that the act set aside. Meanwhile, though the Antiquities Act granted new authority to academic institutions and their researchers, such institutional actors nevertheless had to seek permission from government agencies to perform their research. Furthermore, whatever research the Antiquities Act supported, it was "for permanent preservation in public museums," and in some sense, for the public benefit. [32]

A decade after the passage of the Antiquities Act, the Organic Act folded explicitly nationalistic ideals into federal preservation policy for the first time. The Organic Act, which founded the NPS, was the first of the policies that I discuss here that used poignant language to talk specifically about the ways in which the American public would benefit from federal preservation initiatives. The very purpose of the Organic Act was "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects . . . and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as [to] leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."[33] By referring to scenery, enjoyment, and posterity, the Organic Act illustrated a different mode of engagement with American heritage than those policies that prioritized scientific rationality. Instead, the Organic Act depicted a nation that was invested in pleasure and legacy. It defended "natural curiosities, wonder, [and] objects of interest," and "free access to them by the public."[34]

---

[32] The Antiquities Act of 1906.

[33] *An Act to Establish a National Park Service, and For Other Purposes* (Organic Act), Public Law 64-235, H.R. 15522, 39 Stat. 535, enacted August 25, 1916.

[34] The Organic Act of 1916.

The HSA appealed to both research and national identity, offering patriotic context for its appeals to Science. The purpose statement of the HSA asserted that it was "a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings, and objects of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States."[35] The HSA ranked properties that possessed "exceptional value as commemorating or illustrating the history of the United States" as the most important sites to preserve, and instructed caretakers of such properties to mark and interpret each site for the edification of the public. With phrases like these, the HSA established that American heritage should enrich the lives of the American people. In fact, it could inspire them. The information content that "scientific institution[s]" contributed to their country enriched the lives of its citizens.[36]

The HSA spoke to guided commemorative practices at least as much as it referred to more academic modes of cataloguing and learning. The commemorative practices instilled by the HSA had political force, as well. Writing in support of the HSA's passage, President Franklin D. Roosevelt showed his support for the bill by claiming that the "preservation of historic sites for the public benefit . . . tend[ed] to enhance the respect or love of the citizen for the institutions of his country, as well as strengthen[ed] his resolution to defend unselfishly the hallowed traditions and high ideals of America."[37] The structure and rhetoric of the HSA encouraged national pride as the United States moved from the crisis of the Great Depression and braced for a new world war. The national pride that the HSA cultivated was strategic.

---

[35] Historic Sites Act of 1935.

[36] Ibid.

[37] Franklin D. Roosevelt, qtd. by Kammen, *Mystic Chords,* 460.

A little more than thirty years after the passage of the HSA, and in a much different sociohistorical context, the NHPA appealed to some of the same nationalistic commonplaces that the HSA utilized. The NHPA built upon the HSA in content and in tone, but intervened in an era of Civil Rights protests and other dramatic cultural changes. The HSA began with the claim that "the spirit and direction of the Nation [were] founded upon and reflected in its historic past," and it went on to state "that the historical and cultural foundations of the Nation should be preserved as a living part of our community life and development in order to give a sense of orientation to the American people."[38] In these statements, the NHPA made the tacit argument that the nation's greatest strengths were its traditions. It also suggested that the nation was losing its way, and needed tools to find its original path again. The traditionalist tone of the NHPA continued in that act's assertion that existing preservation programs were "inadequate to insure future generations a genuine opportunity to appreciate and enjoy the rich heritage of our Nation" because "ever-increasing" change threatened to erode that heritage.[39] While the NHPA referred to federal development projects as the kind of change most detrimental to the preservation of heritage sites, the NHPA responded to cultural change—in general—by claiming that the future depended on the past. The NHPA was vague about the American past that it defended—or rather, *whose* past(s). The United States' deep history was not the focus of this policy, though the NHPA's stipulations provided for a wide array of heritage sites.

---

[38] An Act to establish a program for the preservation of additional historical properties through-out the Nation, and for other purposes (National Historic Preservation Act), Public Law 89-665, 80 Stat. 915, 16 U.S. Code Ch. 1A, Subch. II § 470 et seq., enacted October 15, 1966.

[39] National Historic Preservation Act.

Three years after the NHPA's passage, NEPA also appealed to the needs of future generations of Americans as a basis for protecting both natural and cultural resources. NEPA prioritized the natural environment—and "science-based" research methods therein—as well as the nation's enduring dependence on the flora and fauna of the United States. Like many of the acts that came before it, NEPA focused on posterity as a rationale for tending well to the natural and cultural resources of the country. The act expressed concern over the "requirements of present and future generations of Americans," and named each generation "trustee of the environment for succeeding generations."[40] NEPA drew on lofty language by referring to the myths of legacy, and by acknowledging the importance of having "pleasing" surroundings for the nation's people. Of all of the preservation policies that I assess here, NEPA offered the most holistic description of the various public benefits of preservation. NEPA attempted to promote behavior and regulations that would be "conscious of and responsive to the scientific, economic, social, esthetic, and cultural needs and interests of the nation." NEPA offered a comprehensive list of the reasons that the government might engage in preservation, and acknowledged Science within a diverse suite of American values.

A decade later, ARPA returned federal preservation policy to a predominantly scientific rationale. The 1979 act defined archaeological resources as "an accessible and irreplaceable part of the Nation's heritage." Like many of the federal preservation policies before it, ARPA referred to the importance of posterity, and acknowledged its part in securing "for the present and future benefit of the American people, the protection of

[40] *The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969*, Public Law 91-190, 83 Stat. 852, 42 U.S. Code § 4321 et seq, enacted January 1, 1970.

archaeological resources and sites which are on public lands and Indian lands."[41] ARPA depicted a future in which the ongoing study of American antiquities would continue to enrich the nation's people. In a novel way, ARPA defined archaeology *as* heritage. This maneuver blended scientific and humanistic values somewhat, while adopting nationalistic poetics.

NAGPRA added diversity into American identities and deprioritized Anglo-American learning or enjoyment in its rhetoric. NAGPRA was distinct from the other preservation policies analyzed here because it was a corrective to precedent, rather than a continuation of it. Yet, even NAGPRA, which strove to define indigenous heritage places and materials as culturally-significant, returned to scientific or quasi-scientific definitions of indigenous heritage items through its emphasis on archaeology. As a general rule, federal preservation policies often neglected to include indigenous heritage places as *national* heritage, and considered them artifacts for study, instead. In NAGPRA, the avoidance of nationalism read more as a curtailing of United States imperialism than as a dismissal of indigenous cultures.

In general, the nationalistic context for the god term of Science evoked the myths of scientific rationality and American exceptionalism. Strikingly, those federal preservation policies that pertained specifically to archaeological resources, rather than more generally to natural, historic, or Anglo-American cultural resources, were those that emphasized Science most extensively. The tensions among scientific rationality, Anglo-American national identity, and indigenous national identities also appeared in preservation policies that pertained specifically to Southwestern antiquities. Whereas many of the federal preservation policies could omit mention of indigenous peoples and their heritage when portraying

[41] The Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979.

national identity, the national park and monument designations specific to Southwestern antiquities had to account more directly for the strange role of the federal government in stewarding indigenous histories. The first generation of site-specific policies, written from 1892 to 1939, tended to depict indigenous histories as scientific artifacts and curiosities. These policies depicted the god term Science within a fetishistic discursive context that demonstrated a fascination with alterity. The second generation of site-specific policies, written from 1990 to 2016, imbued the landscape of the American Southwest with power as none of the other policies had, described an enchanted mode of scientific engagement, and offered textured descriptions of human histories. The second generation of site-specific policies contextualized Science within a scene of wonder and humanism, and differed dramatically from the other two collections of texts in this chapter.

National Park and National Monument Designations for Southwestern Antiquities

The preceding discussion of the nationalistic discursive context for Science in federal preservation policies serves as a background upon which to discuss the site-specific park and monument designations that have reserved portions of the Southwestern landscape as federally-protected areas. Federal preservation policies criminalized pot-hunting and vandalism while elevating academic engagement with ancient and historic places, and tied that scientific comportment to an expression of Anglo-American national identity. Themes about national identity and the value of knowledge emerged in site-specific park and monument designations, as well. However, unlike the majority of the federal policies concerning antiquities, park and monument designations specific to Southwestern antiquities also introduced indigeneity as a concept. In the first generation of site-specific policies, references to indigeneity influenced the kind of Science towards which those policies

oriented. The second generation of site-specific policies contextualized Science in the Southwest as a humanistic pursuit, rather than a fetishistic one.

I have divided the national park and monument designations involving Southwestern antiquities into two historical periods: those that were written before World War II, and those that were written after. Between 1939 and 1990, there were no noteworthy designations of Southwestern antiquities, though there were several boundary adjustments. I do not claim any sort of causal relationship between World War II and national park/monument designations. It is simply the case that the four designations that were enacted between 1990 and 2016 adopted a significantly different rhetorical tone than the sixteen that were enacted between 1892 and 1939. I discuss the basic structure and claims of each collection of park and monument designations, along with their appeals to Science, alongside the other myths and poetics that contextualized the god term and inflected its meaning.

First Generation Park and Monument Designations in the American Southwest

The first generation of designations pertaining to Southwestern antiquities emphasized the need to protect Southwestern antiquities on the basis that it was in the public interest to do so, or that it would promote the public good. The key claim that these texts made was that antiquities were valuable, and most valuable when controlled and preserved by the government. They were valuable as data, as exemplars, and as American artifacts. These texts also defined Southwestern antiquities as inherently valuable, in some sense, because they belonged to the government. As such, the government had the right to secure them. These documents lingered on the various forms of harm that might come to Southwestern antiquities, and detailed the punitive measures that the government could take

against trespassers. They shared these attributes with early federal preservation policies affecting the country at large.

The sixteen texts I analyze as the first generation of park and monument designations concerning Southwestern antiquities outlined the territories to be protected by the federal government, and the behaviors that would not be tolerated therein. In most cases, the documents themselves seldom contained more content than the boundaries of the new park or monument, a brief comment on the rationale for preserving the antiquities, and a list of newly-prohibited activities. Park and monument designations gave warning "not to appropriate, injure, or destroy"[42] antiquities, or not to "willfully remove, disturb, destroy, or molest any of the ruins, mounds, buildings, graves, relics, or other evidences of an ancient civilization or other property" on the grounds.[43] Certainly, the new prohibitions were intended "for the protection of the ruin[s]."[44] Additionally, the first generation of park and monument designations also declared the values of those places and objects in the eyes of the government. They were valuable not just as Science, but as a Science of indigeneity.

Most Southwestern antiquities were set aside for their ability to contribute to academic inquiries, and sometimes for their status as exemplary or unique. In general, the imaginative language within the first generation of park and monument designations

---

[42] Theodore Roosevelt, Proclamation, "Gila Cliff-Dwellings National Monument, N. Mex.," (November 16, 1907): 3123, 3126; Theodore Roosevelt, Proclamation, "Tonto National Monument, Ariz.," (December 19, 1907).

[43] *An Act Creating the Mesa Verde National Park*, Public Law 353, 59th Cong., 1st sess., Ch. 3607, enacted June 29, 1906, 616.

[44] Benjamin Harrison, Executive Order 28-A, "Reserving Land in Arizona for Protection of the Casa Grande Ruin," in A. Berle Clemensen, *Casa Grande Ruins National Monument, Arizona: A Centennial History of the First Prehistoric Reserve 1892-1992* (Casa Grande Ruins National Monument, AZ: U.S. Department of the Interior, 1992), 201.

reflected an infatuation with research, and a fascination with Native peoples. These references to phenomenal enchantment, in turn, alluded to the myths of scientific rationality and primitivism that were prevalent during the era that produced these park and monument designations. Next, I describe the poetic language evident in the first sixteen national park and monument designations concerning Southwestern antiquities, while elaborating on the ways in which these texts supported the cultural myths just identified.

Nearly every park and monument designation from the first fifty years of preserving Southwestern antiquities remarked that the preservation of those sites and artifacts promoted the public interest. In spite of the repeated emphasis on the public good, the nation itself figured relatively little in the texts concerning specific Southwestern sites. The relative absence of idealistic language concerning the nation or national identity differed from my early guesses regarding these texts, because I assumed that the park and monument designations would contain much of the same rhetorical tone as the hearings and reports that often culminated in government action and the federal policies that affected American heritage sites in general. One notable exception to the missing poetics of the nation was the proclamation of Aztec Ruin National Monument. In it, the text noted that the land and its structures had been donated "with a view to the preservation of said ruin for the enlightenment and culture of the nation."[45] The proclamation did not specify whether this goal was part of the donor's vision, or whether it was crafted in Washington, DC. Though the other texts were not explicit in their references to the enlightenment and culture of the nation, the ideals of enlightenment and culture were somewhat implicit in the other park and

[45] Warren G. Harding, Proclamation, "Establishing the Aztec Ruin National Monument, New Mexico, Proclamation 1650," (January 24, 1923).

monument designations. They appeared as a devotion to academic pursuits and a fixation on indigenous culture.

The grandiose language that appeared within the first generation of park and monument designations typically referred to superlative qualities of the structures found within the park or monument boundaries, and often paired a discussion of the unique or exemplary status of those structures with reference to the people who had built them.[46] Science also appeared within the majority of these pairings, whereas much of the alluring language that appeared in these texts occurred within the descriptions of the Ancestral Puebloan people. There are many examples of this pairing of the superlative (and its bearing on Science) with commentary on Native peoples. The Chaco Canyon designation posited that the site held "extraordinary interest" because of the "number and . . . great size" of the structures there, "and because of [its] innumerable and valuable relics of a prehistoric people."[47] The Gila Cliff Dwellings proclamation called that site "the best representative of the Cliff-Dwellers' remains" in the region in which they were found, and concluded that they were "of exceptional scientific and educational interest."[48] The text protecting Navajo National Monument said that the site's "prehistoric cliff dwellings and pueblo ruins" were "of the very greatest ethnological, scientific, and educational interest," and that the site

---

[46] Sophia Labadi identified superlatives in World Heritage dossiers, as well. In designation rhetoric, any superlative aspect of a site is likely to receive mention. See Sophia Labadi, *UNESCO, Cultural Heritage, and Outstanding Universal Value: Value-Based Analyses of World Heritage and Intangible Cultural Heritage Conventions* (Lanham, MD, MD: AltaMira, 2013).

[47] Theodore Roosevelt, Proclamation, "Chaco Canyon National Monument, N. Mex.," (March 11, 1907).

[48] Roosevelt, "Gila Cliff-Dwellings National Monument, N. Mex."

possessed "extraordinary ruins of an unknown people."[49] Bandelier National Monument, meanwhile, held "unusual ethnologic, scientific, and educational interest," and its proclamation defined it as worthy of protection because of its "relics of a vanished people."[50] The monument designation for Bandelier National Monument borrowed much of its language from the Tonto National Monument designation, passed seven years earlier.[51] All of these monument designations expressed wonder about the Ancestral Puebloans or the structures that they built, and simultaneously cast those people and their material culture as outstanding specimens within the scientific paradigm.

As these examples demonstrate, the notions of mystery and disappearance were prevalent in these texts' descriptions of the Ancestral Puebloan peoples. The poetic references to relics and vanished people appealed to the cultural myth of primitivism that was popular during the nineteenth century, and which obviously persisted well past that era.[52] In the presidential proclamation for Wupatki National Monument, the idealized descriptors of past peoples were paired with those of contemporaries. That text lauded the region of the new monument for its "prehistoric ruins built by the ancestors of a most picturesque tribe of Indians still surviving in the United States, the Hopi or People of Peace."[53] In this example,

---

[49] William Howard Taft, Proclamation, "Establishment of the Navajo National Monument, Arizona, Proclamation 873," (March 20, 1909).

[50] Woodrow Wilson, Proclamation, "Bandelier National Monument, New Mexico, Proclamation 1322," (February 11, 1916).

[51] Roosevelt, "Tonto National Monument, Ariz."

[52] Philip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).

[53] Calvin Coolidge, Proclamation, "Establishing the Wupatki National Monument, Arizona, Proclamation 1721," (December 9, 1924).

the remark that the Hopi were "still surviving" subtly suggested a temporal displacement. Placed in its historical context alongside contemporaneous ethnological scholarship, this phrase suggested the idea that living indigenous peoples were remnants of a bygone era, rather than active participants in the present.

The flamboyant language that park and monument designations used to describe American Indian peoples, whether in history or in contemporary times, essentialized them. Such descriptions focused on romantic notions of disappearance or the picturesque. In spite of these mythic portrayals of the Ancestral Puebloans and their descendants, the first generation of site-specific designations sometimes granted agency to contemporary indigenous collectives. In these monument and park descriptions, American Indian stakeholders appeared as treaty holders, and these texts made explicit Native "consent" to the establishment of new parks and monuments when the boundaries intersected with reservation lands.[54] Whether the consent was enthusiastic or not, the monument and park designations bore witness to negotiations that took place between the federal and Tribal governments.

In addition to their appearances as social actors with legal rights, indigenous peoples, their histories, and their heritage, appeared in these texts as academically-valuable. This was the final way in which American Indian peoples appeared in the park and monument designations from the first fifty years of preserving Southwestern antiquities. As indicated previously, there was a marked correlation between magnifying language and the realm of science and research. The poetics of academia typically were limited to the unique, unusual, or interesting qualities of each Southwestern site, and the language appealing to the myth of

[54] Herbert Hoover, Proclamation, "Canyon de Chelly National Monument, Proclamation 1945," (April 1, 1931). See also *An Act Creating the Mesa Verde National Park*.

scientific rationality and the pursuit of knowledge was more subdued than the language that referred to Native peoples. Indeed, the research topic of indigenous cultures or histories seems to have imbued the appeals to scientific rationality in these texts with a glamorous quality that was absent in the references to Science in general preservation policy.

In addition to expressing myths through poetic language, the park and monument designations adopted commonplaces about the academic value or values of the lands that they set aside. The exact configuration of academic values varied from text to text. For instance, the proclamation of Montezuma Castle National Monument proposed that the site was "of the greatest ethnological value and scientific interest."[55] In other texts, "educational"[56] and "archaeological"[57] interests joined these rationales, whereas others promoted the "historical" value or interest of Southwestern antiquities.[58] However the park and monument designations defined the value(s) of Southwestern antiquities, they were sure to name what those values were. Throughout, the god term Science made frequent appearances, with some variation of "scientific interest" appearing as an explicit rationale for preservation in the following designations: Mesa Verde National Park, Montezuma Castle National Monument, Gila Cliff-Dwellings National Monument, Tonto National Monument,

---

[55] Theodore Roosevelt, Proclamation, "Montezuma Castle National Monument, Arizona," (December 8, 1906).

[56] Theodore Roosevelt, "Tonto National Monument, Ariz."

[57] Hoover "Canyon de Chelly National Monument, Proclamation 1945," emphasis added.

[58] Theodore Roosevelt, Proclamation, "El Morro National Monument, New Mexico," (December 8, 1906); Warren G. Harding, Proclamation, "Establishing the Aztec Ruin National Monument, New Mexico, Proclamation 1650," (January 24, 1923). Both designations included American Indian pasts within the histories preserved at each site, at least tacitly.

Navajo National Monument, Walnut Canyon National Monument, and Bandelier National Monument. In the absence of the exact phrase, “scientific interest,” ancillary terms such as archaeology or ethnology indicated that all of these park and monument designations advanced a scientific valuation for antiquities.

Whether referencing science, ethnology, archaeology, or history, the notion that the Southwestern antiquities would contribute to knowledge was prevalent throughout these texts. For the most part, the texts implied that contributing to knowledge was the main reason for antiquities to be preserved. In some instances, the designations also concluded that the lands to be protected were useless for anything but study. For example, in some of the park and monument designations from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the authors of those texts clarified that the preservation of park and monument lands would not interfere with any more-pragmatic use of the territories. If the lands could not be used for grazing or farming, their apparent uselessness in that regard appeared in the monument designation. Often, protected lands remained open to use for timber extraction or other utilitarian purposes. In this way, their academic value did not interfere with their other uses. In the nation’s hierarchy of needs, knowledge and culture were ranked beneath activities more closely related to subsistence or profit.

References to the use value of the park and monument lands, in addition to the acknowledgement of treaties with Native nations, showed that there were checks on the establishment of new preserves. The park and monument designations also demonstrated the privilege of the academy in preservation decisions. Broadly, these texts defined researchers as distinct from the general public, and permitted them to influence and benefit from park and monument designations. For example, Benjamin Harrison’s administration pursued the

protection of Casa Grande Ruin in 1892 at the behest of the Director of the Bureau of Ethnology, who "request[ed] that the reservation be made."[59] In 1906, the bill establishing Mesa Verde National Park prohibited the usual injury and appropriation that other preservation policies prohibited. It also allowed the Secretary of the Interior to grant permits for:

> . . . examinations, excavations, and other gathering of objects of interest within said park by any person or persons whom he may deem properly qualified to conduct such examinations . . .
>
> Provided always, that the examinations . . . are undertaken only for the benefit of some reputable museum, university, college, or other recognized scientific or educational institution, with a view to increasing the knowledge of such objects and aiding the general advancement of archaeological science.[60]

In the Mesa Verde National Park bill, social actors from academic institutions were the exception to rules that otherwise affected the general population. They alone could trespass against Southwestern antiquities, provided that they advanced archaeological *science* in the process. Not all of the park and monument designations following the establishment of Mesa Verde National Park were as explicit as that bill in authorizing scientists to pursue their research on public lands, though the passage of the Antiquities Act on June 8, 1906 would have rendered such specifications somewhat superfluous. Notably, the Mesa Verde Park Bill and the Antiquities Act shared nearly identical language, as they shared advocates and authors, as well.

Together, the first generation of park and monument designations concerning Southwestern antiquities spanned nearly fifty years and many topics. Although there was

---

[59] Harrison, "Reserving Land in Arizona for Protection of the Casa Grande Ruin."

[60] An Act Creating the Mesa Verde National Park.

variety from one text to the next, the majority of these documents made the case that the public good would be promoted through the preservation of ancient indigenous structures. These texts defined ancient indigenous structures by virtue of their academic values, and occasionally on account of the mysteries they contained. Some of the differences among these texts had to do with academic focus. For instance, after 1916, ethnological interest ceased to appear in park and monument designations, perhaps reflecting changes in the incipient field of anthropology, moving away from the study of ethnic minorities and beginning a study of cultures defined more broadly.[61] Historic interest and regard for contemporary American Indian peoples began to emerge more prominently within preservation texts following World War I, suggesting an increasing interest in heritage in addition to Science. On the whole, all of these directives were short, businesslike texts that held little charismatic language, which was usually reserved for the supposedly vanished people who had left Southwestern antiquities behind.

Science appeared as the term of terms in most of these texts, and the discursive context of the first generation park and monument designations demonstrated a persistent valuation of indigenous heritage places in their capacity to serve scientific interests. The designations' references to various modes of study, examination, and measurement indicated the presence of the myth of scientific rationality, and oriented towards the god term, Science. The poetics of Science, and its pursuit, emphasized the value of learning and the superlative qualities of the sites that these designations preserved. The superlative qualities paired well with the myth of scientific rationality, because in recognizing the oldest, largest, or most

[61] Bruce G. Trigger, *A History of Archaeological Thought*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

unique elements of ancient indigenous places, these texts appealed to something that could be measured or recorded.

Whereas the nationwide policies affecting heritage preservation contextualized Science within a nationalistic mythos, the first generation of site-specific preservation policies contextualized Science within references to primitivism and difference. The first generation of park and monument designations in the American Southwest depicted not just Science, but a Science of indigeneity. When these texts discussed vanished races and peaceful peoples, they were appealing to biased Anglo-American notions about American Indian cultures. These policies relied on myths of primitivism for their poetics, which added mystique to the places that these texts preserved, and demonstrated an enchantment towards the idea of the Other. This trait marked the most significant difference between the first generation of site-specific policies and the nationwide federal policies that also affected Southwestern antiquities. It also indicated some recognition of the fact that Southwestern antiquities represented indigenous heritage, as well as Anglo-American Science. The second generation of site-specific policies developed the status of Southwestern antiquities *as heritage* more fully, and offered a third discursive context for the god term, Science.

Second Generation Monument Designations in the American Southwest

In this portion of my analysis, I assess four monument designations that were enacted between 1990 and 2016. These were Public Law 101-313 (PL 101-313), which was the Petroglyph National Monument Act of 1990, Bill Clinton's presidential proclamations establishing Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument (1996) and Canyons of the Ancients National Monument (2000), and Barack Obama's proclamation of Bears Ears National Monument (2016).

The second generation of monument and park designations differed from the first generation texts. All of the designations between 1990 and 2016 were lengthier by far than any of the first generation texts, and each of them detailed the aesthetic, academic, and cultural merits of the sites that the designations affected. Science was conspicuous in the designations for Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, Canyons of the Ancients National Monument, Bears Ears National Monument, though apparent only in ancillary terms in the designation of Petroglyph National Monument. In general, the primary loci of poetic language in these texts were the scene of the American West, the research that people could undertake in the Southwest, and the people who made their lives there. These poetic expressions pointed to the myths of the Western frontier, which I interpret as a form of nationalism, as well as the myths of scientific discovery and universal humanism. I describe some of the differences among these four texts prior to discussing the poetry and myth of the second generation of national monument designations in fuller detail.

In general, the bill establishing Petroglyph National Monument contained less poetic language than the other three national monument designations in the second generation of texts. Additionally, of these four texts, the Petroglyph National Monument Act of 1990 offered rationales for its passage the most frequently. Given that George H. W. Bush did not use his executive authority simply to declare Petroglyph National Monument, and instead cautiously presided over the designation as a public law, I conclude that the difference in tone had something to do with the conservative administration's effort not to alienate its constituencies.[62] Conservative stakeholders often oppose national monument designations, as

[62] In fact, George H. W. Bush chose not to declare *any* national monuments. He, Richard Nixon, and Ronald Reagan were the only three presidents (whose terms were complete prior

they remove federal lands from most forms of commercial development.[63] PL 101-313 included rationales in defense of its existence, allaying the concerns that its conservative opponents might have raised. The text of PL 101-313 emphasized that the new monument filled a need that the government had not yet addressed, by creating a dedicated setting for the study and preservation of rock art—a nod to Science, though not an explicit appeal to it. The bill for Petroglyph National Monument also claimed that the site possessed "national significance." It added urgency to the national monument designation by suggesting that "urbanization and vandalism" threatened the site.[64] Eliminating threats and benefiting the nation were the primary rationales that the Petroglyph National Monument Act of 1990 presented, with scientific gain more of a subsidiary goal. While the preservation of Petroglyph National Monument would "facilitate research activities," it was not the entire purpose of preservation.[65] PL 101-313 echoed federal preservation policies more than it imitated the first generation of site-specific designations.

---

to the writing of this dissertation) who did not use the Antiquities Act of 1906 to set aside public land. See Jimmy Tobias, "Trump's Day of Doom for National Monuments Approaches," *The Guardian* (August 20 2017), accessed March 21, 2018, https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2017/aug/20/national-monuments-review-may-limit-environment-protection-. The fact that the bill also modified or created national historical parks also necessitated Congressional intervention.

[63] Hal Rothman, "Showdown at Jackson Hole: A Monumental Backlash against the Antiquities Act," in *The Antiquities Act: A Century of American Archaeology, Historic Preservation, and Nature Conservation*, ed. David Harmon, Francis P. McManamon, and Dwight T. Pitcaithley (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Arizona Press, 2006), 81–92.

[64] *Petroglyph National Monument Establishment Act of 1990,* Public Law 101-313, 16 U.S. Code § 431, 104 Stat. 272 (1990), https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/STATUTE-104/pdf/STATUTE-104-Pg272.pdf.

[65] Ibid.

Like the Petroglyph National Monument Act of 1990, Obama's proclamation of Bears Ears National Monument contained explicit rationale statements defending the new monument. Once again, the rationale statements seemed like a rhetorical strategy to counter criticism from conservative opponents. Bears Ears' designation was extremely controversial, and conservative pundits and politicians lambasted Obama for removing so much land in Utah from commercial development. Yet, the Bears Ears National Monument proclamation echoed much of the language of a conservative draft bill that Republican congressmen presented on behalf of the Bears Ears landscape shortly prior to Obama's proclamation.

Both the Bears Ears proclamation and the draft bill considered Bears Ears culturally and naturally significant, though the Bears Ears proclamation emphasized the intellectual worth of the site to a much greater degree than the draft bill did. The Bears Ears proclamation noted that the site's protection would "preserve its cultural, prehistoric, and historic legacy and maintain its diverse array of natural and scientific resources, ensuring that the prehistoric, historic, and scientific values of this area [would] remain for the benefit of all Americans."[66] The Bears Ears proclamation acknowledged that the site should be used for its resources, and appealed to patriotism in doing so. Yet, the Bears Ears proclamation defined the site's resources as natural, scenic, and *scientific*. By contrast, the conservative draft bill expressed interest in mineral resources and other extractive commercial uses of the land. Rather than offering up the site for uranium mining, as many of its conservative stakeholders would have preferred, Obama's proclamation of Bears Ears as a national monument suggested that economic gain could come from tourism, instead. Obama's proclamation

[66] Barack Obama, Proclamation, "Establishment of the Bears Ears National Monument, Proclamation 9558," *Federal Register* 82, no. 38 (December 28, 2016): 1139, https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/DCPD-201600875/pdf/DCPD-201600875.pdf.

emphasized the *use* of the site, and its adherence to the qualities for national monuments that the Antiquities Act established in 1906. Emphasizing use, profit, and conformity with a historic law should have made the Bears Ears designation more palatable to conservative opponents, but this rhetorical strategy failed to mollify the monument's detractors.

The Petroglyph National Monument Establishment Act of 1990 and Obama's presidential proclamation establishing Bears Ears National Monument both made explicit statements about the rationales for preserving public lands, and the values that would be upheld through that preservation. Both of Clinton's proclamations of new national monuments in the American Southwest expressed their rationales through implication more than through clear claims. The declarations for Clinton's monuments defended the monuments' preservation primarily for their ability to contribute to knowledge, and on the basis of the cultural and natural phenomena of the Southwest. Demonstrating its deference to Science, the proclamation of Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument acknowledged the "spectacular array of scientific and historic resources," "scientific interest," and "significant scientific and historic value" of the new monument.[67] The proclamation for Canyons of the Ancients National Monument offered similar language, emphasizing "the protection of [the monument's] scientific and historic objects," and "scientific interest."[68] The enchanting language of Clinton's two proclamations supported the god term, Science, often demonstrating an infatuation with knowledge and learning. In this way, Clinton's

[67] William J. Clinton, Proclamation, "Establishment of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, Proclamation 6920," (September 18, 1996).

[68] William J. Clinton, Proclamation, "Establishment of the Canyons of the Ancients National Monument, Proclamation 7317," *Federal Register* 65 (June 9, 2000): 37241-37247.

proclamations appealed to an elite and predominantly liberal constituency. I discuss the poetic language in all four of these national monument designations, next.

The second generation of monument designations in the American Southwest differed significantly from the first generation texts by their inclusion of the Southwestern landscape as a powerful entity that influenced history, humanity, and research activities. In this way, the discursive context for Science also emphasized the spatial context of Southwestern antiquities: the scene of the American southwest, and its poetry. I refer to the Southwest as a "scene" in the Burkean sense, "the background of the act, the situation in which it occurred," in order to underline the fact that these monument designations occasionally gave the scene of the Southwest a deterministic power over the people who participated in that environment, whether Ancestral Puebloans, Mormon settlers, or Anglo-American archaeologists.[69] Although the second generation of monument designations avoided the trap of environmental determinism that authors such as Bandelier fell into, still the "scene-agent ratio" sometimes favored the power of the scene, and imposed decisions on the agents in the Southwest.[70] Whatever individuals accomplished in the Southwest, according to these designations, it was in spite of the environment's challenges, or in response to its force. In these texts, all of the people of the Southwest, whether Ancestral Puebloans or Mormon settlers, had to respond to the challenges that the scene posed. Meanwhile, the policies defending them demonstrated their authors' enchantment with those scenes, as well.

The proclamations' portrayals of the scene of the American West imbued the landscape with force. This scene acted on people, in the present, past, and distant past. For

---

[69] Burke, A Grammar of Motives, xv.

[70] Ibid., 7-9.

instance, in the Canyons of the Ancients proclamation, the "natural resources and spectacular land forms of the monument help[ed] explain why past and present cultures [had] chosen to live in the area." [71] These people responded to an invitation given to them by the environment. The Grand Staircase-Escalante proclamation described the site's "relict areas" as "witnesses to the past" that could serve as a "baseline" against which to measure "human activity."[72] In general, these declarations spoke of the rugged aridity of the Southwest, and the interrelationships between the people and their environment. While the people were remarkable for succeeding in their scene, they were portrayed as products of it, as well.

The scene of the Western frontier featured dramatically within the monument designations written on behalf of Grand Staircase-Escalante and Bears Ears. Both of these proclamations lingered on the diverse or spectacular "array" of natural and cultural phenomena within the monument boundaries, unique to the American Southwest. The Bears Ears proclamation called the landscape "a milieu of the accessible and observable together with the inaccessible and hidden."[73] In what I consider the most picturesque description in any of these monument designations, the Bears Ears proclamation claimed:

> From earth to sky, the region is unsurpassed in wonders. The star-filled nights and natural quiet of the Bears Ears area transport visitors to an earlier eon. Against an absolutely black night sky, our galaxy and others more distant leap into view. . . . Bears Ears has that rare and arresting quality of deafening silence.[74]

---

[71] Clinton, "Establishment of the Canyons of the Ancients National Monument."

[72] William J. Clinton, Proclamation, "Establishment of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, Proclamation 6920," (September 18, 1996).

[73] "Establishment of the Bears Ears National Monument, Proclamation 9558."

[74] Ibid.

The Bears Ears proclamation expressed an explicit appeal to wonder, and portrayed the landscape in nearly spiritual terms. The depth and magnitude of the night sky, its transportation of visitors through time, and the region's apparent remoteness from civilization all cast the Bears Ears landscape within the poetic realm. These sentences were an attempt to enchant their audience with the magic of the Bears Ears landscape. These contributed to a discursive context that focused on wonder, and shifted the meaning of Science when it appeared in this text—away from rationality, and into enchantments of its own.

In addition to offering appealing descriptions of the landscape, sometimes these monument designations enhanced the splendor of Southwestern antiquities through allusion to their place within the nation's story. The Petroglyph National Monument Establishment Act of 1990 called the protected territory "nationally significant," and claimed that the protection, preservation, and interpretation of the site was "for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations."[75] In this, the Petroglyph National Monument designation referenced the Organic Act of 1916, and called upon some of the same patriotic commonplaces established in that text and in other federal preservation policies.

Clinton's monument designations also paid some deference to the patriotic rationales for setting aside land, but only when paired with the wonder of the West, itself. For instance, the Grand Staircase-Escalante proclamation called the area to be preserved a "vast and austere landscape," and the "last place in the continental United States to be mapped."[76] Clinton's proclamation evoked the myth of the Western frontier more than American

---

[75] Petroglyph National Monument Establishment Act of 1990.

[76] "Establishment of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, Proclamation 6920."

identity. Even the somewhat more subdued proclamation for Canyons of the Ancients National Monument declared that the site's geology "evoke[d] the very essence of the American Southwest."[77] In these quotations, the monument declarations emphasized that the unique territories that the monument designations set aside were American. The second generation of national monument designations brought the myth of the Western frontier together with myths pertaining to national identity and American ingenuity.

Science intertwined with the Southwestern landscape in many of the texts' descriptions of the resources they would preserve. Indeed, the second generation of national monument proclamations often discussed the striking qualities of the new national monuments as part of their ability to contribute to Science. For instance, the Grand Staircase-Escalante proclamation called that site "an outstanding biological resource."[78] The Grand Staircase-Escalante designation linked the natural features of the monument with its utility for research purposes, noting that the "unspoiled natural area remain[ed] a frontier, a quality that greatly enhance[d] the monument's value for scientific study."[79] The proclamation for Grand Staircase-Escalante called it a "geologic treasure" with "world class paleontological sites," which presented "exemplary opportunities for geologists, paleontologists, archaeologists, historians, and biologists."[80] The Bears Ears National Monument proclamation also paired research and poetry extensively. The proclamation claimed that

---

[77] "Establishment of the Canyons of the Ancients National Monument, Proclamation 7317."

[78] "Establishment of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, Proclamation 6920."

[79] Ibid.

[80] Ibid.

"[t]he area's stunning geology, from sharp pinnacles to broad mesas, labyrinthine canyons to solitary hoodoos, and verdant hanging gardens . . . , provide[d] vital insights to geologists." Bears Ears had "among the richest and most significant" paleontological resources in the United States, and its "protection . . . [would] provide important opportunities for further archaeological and paleontological study."[81] Based on these tandem appeals to wonder and to research affordances, I conclude that the poetry of these national monument proclamations often supported the myth of scientific discovery—though not rationality. They also placed poetry of place in service to Science. A noteworthy distinction between the first and second generation of site-specific monument designations is that the Science in these later designations minimized human sciences, and emphasized natural ones.

As these examples have shown, the descriptions of the natural resources in the American Southwest evoked an infatuation with Science. The writer(s) of the Petroglyph National Monument Act of 1990 resisted this tendency, and addressed the research benefits of the national monument primarily through discussions of the new Rock Art Research Center established concurrently with the national monument. That text avoided poetic adjectives and adverbs, and described fairly clinically that the Center would "provide for a broad program of research including ethnographic studies, resource management techniques, and comparative studies of rock art forms and styles."[82] Whereas the national monument proclamations that liberal presidents advanced used expressive language in a manner that elevated Science, the Petroglyph National Monument Act favored national gain and the protection of the government's property in its few powerful phrases.

---

[81] "Establishment of the Bears Ears National Monument, Proclamation 9558."

[82] Petroglyph National Monument Establishment Act of 1990

In the preceding discussion of the scientific attributes of the Southwestern antiquities that gained federal protection between 1990 and 2016, both archaeology and history appeared as modes of research that were relevant to each site. These texts valued archaeological and historical knowledge alongside paleontology, geology, and other research fields, and used all of these types of research to validate the preservation of Southwestern antiquities. As in the first generation of monument designations, the fields of archaeology and history mediated between the scientific interest of Southwestern antiquities and their human interest. Both scientific discovery and humanism were focal points for impassioned language within these monument designations. Humanism joined the scene of the American Southwest as a powerful element of Science's discursive context. Together, humanism and the landscape inflected the Science of the second generation of national monument designations with wonder and poetic enchantment in a manner that was absent from the other categories of preservation policy.

In general, the second generation of monument designations in the American Southwest omitted the kind of fetishistic language about American Indian peoples that I identified in the first generation of designations. Yet, the second generation of designations maintained poetic symbolism regarding humanity. The poetic language that these designations applied to human history pointed towards a myth of universal humanism. For instance, these texts spoke of a general human history, or human ingenuity, without tying these traits to a particular cultural tradition. As one example, the Grand Staircase-Escalante designation portrayed the American West as a place in which "nature shape[d] human endeavors . . . where distance and aridity ha[d] been pitted against our dreams and

courage."[83] The "our" of this passage implied all of humanity, or at least, all United States Americans.

Some of these monument designations expressed an interest in the Anglo-American occupation of the lands, as well. In so doing, they incorporated all of the peoples of the Southwest into a universal American people, somewhat disconnected from time, and largely disconnected from conflicting cultural traditions. The Canyons of the Ancients designation interpellated "Ancestral Puebloan farmers . . . the Ute, Navajo, and European settlers whose descendants" continued to live in the region into one collective. In the language of this designation, all of these diverse peoples claimed the landscapes as "home." These were *all* the people to whom the landscape belonged, who had endured its trials.[84]

Continuing the attention to Anglo-American histories, both the Bears Ears designation and the Grand Staircase-Escalante designation lingered on the history of the Mormon people who entered Utah in the nineteenth century. Whereas the Bears Ears text held the "Mormon settlers" up for historical scrutiny, alongside "ranchers, prospectors, and early archaeologists,"[85] the Grand Staircase-Escalante text wrote of the "Mormon pioneers" and their "epic colonization efforts."[86] The Bears Ears designation made Mormon settlers into historical case studies; the Grand Staircase-Escalante designation aggrandized them. Both of these texts blurred distinctions among the long Native presence in the Four Corners region and the later, sometimes hostile, occupation of the land by Anglo-Americans. This

---

[83] "Establishment of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, Proclamation 6920."

[84] "Establishment of the Canyons of the Ancients National Monument, Proclamation 7317."

[85] "Establishment of the Bears Ears National Monument, Proclamation 9558."

[86] "Establishment of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, Proclamation 6920."

was a universalizing maneuver. It avoided the primitivism that the first generation of texts expressed towards American Indian peoples, but it elided the more enduring relationships that many American Indian peoples had and have with areas that were set aside as monuments.

The proclamation of Bears Ears National Monument differed from the others by acknowledging Native knowledge of the Bears Ears landscape in a variety of ways, emphasizing both cultural and ecological expertise. First, the proclamation listed the Native names for Bears Ears prominently. Throughout the text, the proclamation referred to the "area's cultural importance to Native American tribes," their extensive knowledge of the land and its resources, and the importance of the Bears Ears landscape within oral histories and as the location of "sacred sites."[87] In the Bears Ears National Monument proclamation, the text humanized the Ancestral Puebloans and their descendants by putting their histories in a more equitable relationship with Western knowledge. The text also encouraged readers to think about "the story of the people who lived" at Bears Ears, and the "early people's ingenuity and perseverance."[88] Stories of human ingenuity and perseverance in the Bears Ears proclamation differed in tone from the supposedly-vanished and mysterious people who featured in the first generation of monument designations. The Bears Ears designation emphasized the Ancestral Puebloans as people, rather than as research subjects or spectacles.

On the whole, the second generation of monument designations in the American Southwest avoided some of the fetishistic language of the first generation of texts, though maintained an infatuation with Science. Science garnered poetic enchantment in the second

---

[87] "Establishment of the Bears Ears National Monument, Proclamation 9558."

[88] Ibid.

generation of national monument designations largely by virtue of the majestic scene in which it was practiced, and its capacity to enlighten humankind. Meanwhile, the poetic humanism that these texts displayed emphasized human ingenuity and talent, rather than difference. However, avoiding recognition of difference sometimes resulted in the promotion of a generic American identity.

The representations of American Indian people within these texts were much more nuanced than those in the preceding national monument designations. The political representation of American Indian stakeholders in guiding the management and care of each national monument also increased substantially in the second generation of monument designations. For instance, both the Petroglyph National Monument Act and the Bears Ears National Monument proclamation explicitly established consulting positions within their advisory boards for American Indian representatives. Scientists and landowners maintained their influence, but Native perspectives were considered more fully than before. The inflections of landscape and humanism oriented Science in new and meaningfully-different directions in the second generation of national monument designations.

In the second generation of site-specific policies, poetic ideals about the landscape, learning, and humanity intermingled. This final body of texts alluded to an ineffable quality of the new national monuments, which contributed to the rationale for preserving them. The land became vital. Science became majestic. Humanity gained dignity. Enchantment became a reason for preservation. The second generation of monument designations acknowledged the myths and poetics of preservation, and the final three policies began to detach themselves from myths of modernity that motivated the other texts.

Conclusion

Overall, Science has appeared as the god term of preservation policy for over a century. This may come as little surprise, given the emphasis on "objects of . . . scientific interest" in the Antiquities Act, and given *that* policy's enduring influence on the federal management of indigenous heritage places across the country. Since all presidentially-declared national monument designations draw on the Antiquities Act for their authority, the rhetorical inheritance of Science as a god term is understandable. The way in which Science's variable discursive contexts alter the meaning of the god term is of more interest. This chapter has demonstrated that Science can be proposed in service to the nation, can fetishize difference, and can admit to its own enchantments. The god term relies on myths and poetics for its meaning.

The myths and poetics that have accompanied Science have shown shifting values over time and over political scope. The federal policies concerning the preservation of ancient and historic sites emphasized nationalism as they advanced the Science of heritage management. Narratives about the quest for knowledge and the inherent value of scientific inquiry were the myths that supported the ideal of Science. The prominence of researchers in decision-making also indicated the importance of Science for this body of texts. Yet, these were joined by myths of American exceptionalism and benevolent paternalism. These texts promoted a nationalistic Science as they sought to care for the nation's people and its resources. In these federal preservation policies, the nation was the site for poetic language, and it influenced the value and purpose of Science in these texts. The nationalistic poetics in the general federal preservation policies included extensive references to the future of the American people, their inspiration, and their enlightenment, all of which were to be provided by the government for its people, through the preservation of American heritage. Federal

policies reserved their poetic enchantment for the people, while perpetuating myths of modernity that promoted both reason and the nation-state.

The first generation of site-specific monument designations also oriented towards Science as a god term. Once again, references to research and a variety of intellectual "interests" attracted little in the way of dramatic language. References to the Ancestral Puebloans and their descendants offered the most beguiling language in these policies, with discussion of their supposed vanishing, their supposed mysteries, and their supposed character. The first generation of monument designations drew on the myths of scientific rationality and primitivism. Once again, both of these were myths of modernity. Whereas the former resisted poetic enchantment—except when identifying superlative qualities of parks and monuments—the latter garnered it. Early park and monument designations oriented towards an exemplary Science of indigeneity.

The second generation of monument designations concerning Southwestern antiquities were unique in the sense that the god term, Science, attracted its own poetic language in the majority of these texts. The majestic scenery of the West particularly inflected the texts' descriptions of both research and humanity. The texts that Clinton and Obama signed were far more titillating than the public law over which George H. W. Bush presided. Whereas the Petroglyph National Monument Act offered little in the way of poetic enchantment, the other three texts, concerning Grand Staircase-Escalante, Canyons of the Ancients, and Bears Ears, contained powerful imagery and mythic descriptions of their subjects throughout. These texts admitted to an enchantment with the American Southwest and humanity in a way that informed and influenced the Science that each text promoted. These texts were more transparent than any others in the various enchantments with which

they engaged. Science oriented towards myths of knowledge and learning, less than to scientific rationality. The West was enchanting on its own, and the landscape gained recognition as never before, through its appearance as a force with which people had relationships. All of humanity garnered interest, not as scientific curiosities, but simply for being human and having endured various challenges in an environment.

Clinton and Obama's national monument proclamations were imperfect texts, but indicated productive paths forward for the rhetoric of preservation advocacy. Science is unlikely to lose its role as an orienting term in federal preservation policy, but its articulation to myths like the beauty and wonder of the natural world, rather than primitivism or scientific rationality, is an important ideological shift, and consistent with the reflexive turn that influenced the entirety of academy beginning, roughly, in the 1970s. The self-conscious enchantment of Science also seems like an equalizing rhetorical maneuver, for if Science is openly enchanted, then it does not claim the absolute authority that modern myths once attributed to it. The deference to the scene in which Science takes place, in Clinton and Obama's national monument proclamations, also comes across as an important change in tone. Instead of emphasizing Anglo-Ameican national identity, these three monument designations prioritized places that had witnessed the histories of several nations. Praising the shared locality of diverse histories is more inclusive than promoting a universal history of an American people, as some of the earlier policies attempted to do. Finally, the emphasis on humanism in the Clinton and Obama monument designations marked a parsing of Science and indigeneity, which minimized the authority of archaeologists and anthropologists over indigenous histories. It also offered guidance in how to shift the conversation away from spectacle and into shared concerns. Universal humanism, certainly, is a cultural myth.

However, of all of the myths that preservation policy promoted, it might tell the kindest story.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

An Act Creating the Mesa Verde National Park. Public Law 353, 59th Cong., 1st sess., Ch. 3607, enacted June 29, 1906, 616.

An Act to Establish a National Park Service, and For Other Purposes (Organic Act). Public Law 64-235, H.R. 15522, 39 Stat. 535, enacted August 25, 1916.

An Act to establish a program for the preservation of additional historical properties through-out the Nation, and for other purposes (National Historic Preservation Act). Public Law 89-665, 80 Stat. 915, 16 U.S. Code Ch. 1A, Subch. II § 470 et seq., enacted October 15, 1966.

An Act to Provide for the Protection of Native American Graves, and for Other Purposes (Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act). Public Law 101-601, 104 Stat. 3048, 25 U.S. Code Ch. 32 § 3001 et seq., enacted November 16, 1990.

Antiquities Act of 1906. Public Law 59-209. 34 Stat. 225, 54 U.S. Code §§ 320301–320303, enacted June 8, 1906.

The Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979. Public Law 96-95, 93 Stat. 721, 16 U.S. Code §§ 470aa–470mm, enacted October 31, 1979.

The Archeological and Historic Preservation Act. Public Law 93-291, U.S. Code 469-469c, enacted May 24, 1974.

Burke, Kenneth. *A Grammar of Motives*. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1955.

———. *The Rhetoric of Religion: Studies in Logology*. 2nd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970.

Clinton, William J. Presidential Proclamation. "Establishment of the Canyons of the Ancients National Monument, Proclamation 7317," *Federal Register* 65 (June 9, 2000): 37241-37247.

———. Presidential Proclamation. "Establishment of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, Proclamation 6920," (September 18, 1996).

Coolidge, Calvin. Presidential Proclamation. "Establishing the Wupatki National Monument, Arizona, Proclamation 1721," (December 9, 1924).

Deloria, Philip J. *Playing Indian*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Dilsaver, Lary M., ed. *America's National Park System: The Critical Documents*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1994.

Fine-Dare, Kathleen Sue. *Grave Injustice: The American Indian Repatriation Movement and NAGPRA*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002.

Harding, Warren G. Presidential Proclamation. "Establishing the Aztec Ruin National Monument, New Mexico, Proclamation 1650," (January 24, 1923).

Harrison, Benjamin. Executive Order 28-A. "Reserving Land in Arizona for Protection of the Casa Grande Ruin," in A. Berle Clemensen, *Casa Grande Ruins National Monument, Arizona: A Centennial History of the First Prehistoric Reserve 1892-1992.* Casa Grande Ruins National Monument, AZ: U.S. Department of the Interior, 1992.

Harrison, Rodney. *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. London: Routledge, 2013.

Historic Sites Act of 1935. Ch. 593, 49 Stat. 666, enacted August 21, 1935.

Hoover, Herbert. Presidential Proclamation, "Canyon de Chelly National Monument, Proclamation 1945," (April 1, 1931).

Johannesen, Richard L. "Richard M. Weaver's Uses of Kenneth Burke." *The Southern Speech Communication Journal* 52, no. 2 (1987): 312–30.

Kammen, Michael. Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.

King, Thomas F. *Cultural Resource Laws and Practice*. 3rd ed. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press, 2008.

Labadi, Sophia. UNESCO, Cultural Heritage, and Outstanding Universal Value: Value-Based Analyses of World Heritage and Intangible Cultural Heritage Conventions. Lanham, MD, MD: AltaMira, 2013.

McManamon, Francis P. "The Foundation for American Public Archaeology: Section 3 of the Antiquities Act of 1906." In *The Antiquities Act: A Century of American Archaeology, Historic Preservation, and Nature Conservation*, edited by David Harmon, Francis P. McManamon, and Dwight T. Pitcaithley, 153–75. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 2006.

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. Public Law 91-190, 83 Stat. 852, 42 U.S. Code § 4321 *et seq*, enacted January 1, 1970.

Obama, Barack. Presidential Proclamation, "Establishment of the Bears Ears National Monument, Proclamation 9558," *Federal Register* 82, no. 38 (December 28, 2016): 1139, https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/DCPD-201600875/pdf/DCPD-201600875.pdf.

Petroglyph National Monument Establishment Act of 1990. Public Law 101-313, 16 U.S. Code § 431, 104 Stat. 272 (1990), https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/STATUTE-104/pdf/STATUTE-104-Pg272.pdf.

Rogers, Jerry L. "The Antiquities Act and Historic Preservation." In *The Antiquities Act: A Century of American Archaeology, Historic Preservation, and Nature Conservation*,

edited by David Harmon, Francis P. McManamon, and Dwight T. Pitcaithley, 176–86. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 2006.

Roosevelt, Theodore. Presidential Proclamation, "Chaco Canyon National Monument, N. Mex.," (March 11, 1907).

———. Presidential Proclamation, "Tonto National Monument, Ariz.," (December 19, 1907).

———. Presidential Proclamation. "Chaco Canyon National Monument, N. Mex.," (March 11, 1907).

———. Presidential Proclamation. "El Morro National Monument, New Mexico," (December 8, 1906).

———. Presidential Proclamation. "Montezuma Castle National Monument, Arizona," (December 8, 1906).

———. Presidential Proclamation."Gila Cliff-Dwellings National Monument, N. Mex.," (November 16, 1907): 3123, 3126.

Rothman, Hal. "Showdown at Jackson Hole: A Monumental Backlash Against the Antiquities Act." In *The Antiquities Act: A Century of American Archaeology, Historic Preservation, and Nature Conservation*, edited by David Harmon, Francis P. McManamon, and Dwight T. Pitcaithley, 81–92. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Arizona Press, 2006.

Smith, Laurajane. *Uses of Heritage*. London: Routledge, 2006.

Taft, William Howard. Presidential Proclamation. "Establishment of the Navajo National Monument, Arizona, Proclamation 873," (March 20, 1909).

Trigger, Bruce G. *A History of Archaeological Thought*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Watkins, Joe E. "The Antiquities Act at One Hundred Years: A Native American Perspective." In *The Antiquities Act: A Century of American Archaeology, Historic Preservation, and Nature Conservation*, edited by David Harmon, Francis P. McManamon, and Dwight T. Pitcaithley, 187–98. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Arizona Press, 2006.

Weaver, Richard M. *The Ethics of Rhetoric*. Chicago: H. Regnery Col, 1953. Hathitrust Digital Library.

Wilson, Woodrow. Presidential Proclamation. "Bandelier National Monument, New Mexico, Proclamation 1322," (February 11, 1916).

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

> A forwardlooking people can know the way forward only by being intelligently backwardlooking. There is no other light upon the future, save that of history, and the future can only reap from what was planted in the past.[1]

Over the course of this dissertation, I have claimed that the history of preservation advocacy on behalf of Southwestern antiquities demonstrates the communication patterns of rhetorical enchantment. I have defined rhetorical enchantment as an appeal to a cultural myth, often indicated or enhanced by the presence of poetic language. The main myths that rhetors in my study prevailed upon in their works were myths of modernity such as scientific rationality, the theory of cultural evolution, white superiority, and primitivism. Other, more literary myths also appeared in the rhetoric of the adventurers, archaeologists, advocates, and policymakers whose works I analyzed. For instance, these rhetors painted the American Southwest as a magical, beautiful, bleak landscape, with a vitality of its own. They elevated the disused structures that they found there to the status of New World ruins. They attempted, often clumsily, to humanize the people who once built places like Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon. In these ways, they advanced myths about the poetry of place and the ingenuity of humankind. While these more poetic myths often articulated to the myths of modernity that I have critiqued throughout this dissertation, they demonstrated a capacity for alternative, less utilitarian modes of thinking about Southwestern antiquities than the narratives that portrayed those sites as primarily scientific specimens.

---

[1] Edgar Lee Hewett, "The Southwest: Yesterday and Tomorrow," *Papers of the School of American Research* 2 (1921): 3.

In this concluding chapter, I overview the major claims that I advanced in this study. I then examine this dissertation's contributions to rhetorical criticism and humanistic research. In the overview of this dissertation's main claims, I integrate elements of my interviews with contemporary heritage practitioners of the American Southwest. In this way, I comment upon some similarities in the rhetoric of preservation advocacy during the turn of the twentieth century, and contemporary discourse about protecting ancient indigenous places. I close the chapter by discussing enduring threats to the ongoing, ethical care of ancient indigenous places in the Southwestern United States, and the ways in which rhetorical enchantment may continue to influence that endeavor.

Primary Claims

Chapters Two through Four of this dissertation demonstrated how non-American Indian social actors determined the uses and values of ancient indigenous places, and framed Southwestern antiquities within mythic narratives. The proposed uses of ancient structures typically had to do with intellectual pursuits, whereas their values ranged from their utility for learning to the ways in which people enjoyed being co-present with them.

The authors whose works I studied in Chapter Two used language in ways that demonstrated both the technological and poetic psychoses. While these psychoses coexisted, they complicated one another. Speaking from the vantage of the technological psychosis, Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld appealed to the myth of scientific rationality, and other myths about the status of science. These rhetorical traits appeared in the authors' works through their classifications of all that they saw, and by their self-representations as scientific heroes. Their conviction in the myths of science turned everything they observed into a specimen for study, including contemporary American

Indian people. The technological psychosis also screened these adventurers and archaeologists from a full understanding, or at least acknowledgement, of their actions, obfuscating the extent of the physical harm they caused to Mesa Verde. To them, all of the damage was in the name of advancing knowledge, and not worthy of reform. Their belief in myths that privileged scientific inquiry at the expense of all other considerations encouraged in these five authors a sense of entitlement to the materials that they scrutinized at Mesa Verde. Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld presumed that they had the right to damage Mesa Verde in the name of science. Their attitude of presumption to the *materials* at Mesa Verde transformed into presumptuous interpretations about the living Native peoples, which displayed their prejudicial beliefs.

At the same time that they dehumanized Native peoples through their research practices, Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld described a vitality of place at Mesa Verde. Through the poetic psychosis, they turned heritage into fantasy, and they cast old walls as romantic ruins. Once again, the authors' disposition towards the place within a literary imaginary skewed the ways in which they described indigeneity. Either American Indian people, past or present, were specimens (per the technological psychosis), or they were tragic figures out of legend (per the poetic psychosis). Both attitudes dehumanized American Indian people. The technological psychosis reduced them to data, and the poetic psychosis displaced them into the realm of fantasy. Both interpretations were steeped exclusively in Anglo-American cultural mores.

My rhetorical analysis of the adventurers and archaeologists in Chapter Two extends both Philip Deloria's conclusions about social actors at the turn of the twentieth century and Jason Josephson-Storm's claims about the myths of disenchantment. Deloria suggests that

white public figures in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries often advanced *either* racist theories *or* "antimodern primitivism."[2] Deloria identifies romanticism and racism as two polar features of modernity, and the people who advocated for each position as ideological foils. What differs in my argument is that the same social actors who expressed antimodern primitivism *also* advanced claims pertaining to scientific racism. While the technological psychosis featured prominently throughout the works of these adventurers and archaeologists, the presence of the poetic psychosis undermined the authors' claims to objectivity. This echoes Josephson-Storm's observations about Enlightenment thinkers who used their version of reason in order to discuss magic, alchemy, and other mysteries.[3]

Just as Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld blended poetry and science, so too did the advocates from Chapter Three rationalize their actions through poetic framing, marking a continued relationship between reason and reverence in nineteenth and early twentieth century Anglo-American discourse about Southwestern antiquities. Whereas Bandelier and Hewett considered themselves to be professional anthropological researchers, McClurg pursued knowledge for its own sake, as well as for the glory that accompanied adventure and advocacy. What most distinguished these early preservation advocates from the authors considered in Chapter Two was the way in which they mingled their defense of ancient indigenous places with defenses of indigeneity. They did so in a manner that favored the intellectual utility of both, and in a manner that privileged white social actors and the

---

[2] Philip Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 102.

[3] Jason A. Josephson-Storm, The Myth of Disenchantment: Magic, Modernity, and the Birth of the Human Sciences (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2017).

United States government, while infantilizing contemporary indigenous people and fetishizing the Ancestral Puebloans.

Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett all rejected vandalism and profit-driven pot-hunting at and among Southwestern antiquities. Whereas they accepted the pursuit of knowledge and its incidental damage to antiquities, they all chastised individuals who went about engaging with Southwestern antiquities in ways they deemed to be inappropriate. Bandelier and McClurg both abhorred vandals who pursued immortality by carving their names onto the walls of Southwestern antiquities. Pot-hunting for profit was the issue Hewett most strongly opposed. Hewett, alone, critiqued fellow researchers for their destruction of antiquities.

In addition to their critiques of vandals and pot-hunters, Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett all complained of the federal government's inadequate treatment and respect for American Indian people. Bandelier and Hewett both favored a paternalistic approach to liaising with American Indian peoples. McClurg judged the United States' bureaucracy a preposterous vehicle for negotiating with the Weeminuche Ute people with whom she engaged. The advocacy on behalf of indigenous rights that these three individuals advanced had elements of self-interest, pertaining to professional success and personal glory. Bandelier and Hewett wanted to learn from and about Puebloan peoples, whom Bandelier portrayed as children and whom Hewett wanted to place on human game preserves. McClurg wanted to purchase Mesa Verde from the Weeminuche Ute people, and seemed perturbed that it was so difficult to buy it. In spite of their skewed interpretations of the appropriate ways in which to interact with American Indian people, it is significant that Bandelier, Hewett, and McClurg paired the protection of Southwestern antiquities with the well-being of the American Indian people who later lived on the same lands. They demonstrated some comprehension that

Southwestern antiquities were indigenous heritage places in addition to being the spectacular remnants of America's deep past that they painted them to be.

The advocacy that Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett advanced on behalf of Southwestern antiquities and indigenous rights exhibited modern myths, such as scientific rationality, scientific heroism, the theory of cultural evolution, and primitivism. Like the adventurers and archaeologists of chapter two, the advocates in chapter three expressed an infatuation with the antiquities and peoples with whom they engaged. For all of their similarities, however, Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett adopted diverse framing techniques to approach the same historical situation. Bandelier positioned himself as an all-knowing narrator, describing the tragic fate of America's indigenous peoples. McClurg positioned herself as the trailblazing heroine in an epic frontier saga, charting her personal success alongside the success of white settlers in the American Southwest. Hewett presented himself as a sharp critic of his professional peers, and an acolyte of the Ancestral Puebloan people, demonstrating an iteration of the comic frame. All of these frames of acceptance portrayed Anglo-American culture as exceptional, and portrayed Native cultures as radically Other.

Fetishization and racism were two intertwined aspects of Anglo-American engagement with indigenous culture at the turn of the twentieth century. In interviews with heritage practitioners in the Four Corners region of the United States in the spring of 2017, I came to the conclusion that these themes remain prevalent features of the cross-cultural exchanges that happen in and about places like Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon. Park rangers whom I interviewed referred to the questions that members of the public asked them as evidence of persistent racism and ill-informed reverence. Interview participants commented wryly on the prejudice of site visitors who marveled "that Indians had built something so

incredible," or on the inappropriate fetishization of those who fixated on "ritual functions" of various aspects of Ancestral Puebloan architecture. Heritage practitioners working at a non-profit organization involved with preservation advocacy described ongoing scientific racism among some archaeologists in the Southwest, including continued attachment to teleological thinking when considering technologies, and an insistence on excavating in ancestral places in a manner that most Native peoples consider a form of desecration. Based on the content of these interviews, it appears that the communication patterns that social actors like those in Chapters Two and Three established, along with their cultural myths and poetic tendencies, persist even now.

Preservation policies affecting Southwestern antiquities also display a number of myths that were prevalent in the early history of Anglo-American comportment towards indigenous heritage. In Chapter Four, I identified the influence of early preservation advocacy on preservation policy, and some of the ways in which the rhetoric of preservation policy has shifted over time. The general federal policies concerning Southwestern antiquities, such as the Antiquities Act and the Historic Sites Act, typically focused on the value of the sites to the American people and their edification, privileging scientists as authorities or intermediaries who might render decisions about American heritage sites. The first generation of site-specific park and monument designations in the American Southwest, such as the national monument declaration on behalf of Chaco Canyon, minimized the significance of patriotism, which had been a prevalent theme in general federal policies. Rather, site-specific texts emphasized Native cultures and their unique "interests" for various forms of science, including ethnology. The second generation of site-specific national monument designations also emphasized indigeneity and research, though distinguished

between the two more carefully. Instead of discussing a science *of* indigeneity, the second generation of site-specific monument designations appealed to research interests in paleontology, geology, and ecology, while more clearly recognizing the Ancestral Puebloan structures—and the landscape—as enduring elements of contemporary indigenous heritage practices.

The majority of the preservation policies affecting Southwestern antiquities oriented towards Science as their god term. Yet, the discursive contexts in which Science appeared varied over time and according to their focus. These variable discursive networks imbued Science with meanings that were context-specific. In the general federal policies concerning preservation, Science appeared as the primary rationale of the Antiquities Act of 1906, an organizing feature of the Historic Sites Act of 1935, and even a mediating force in the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990. General federal policies *also* hailed myths such as the spirit and direction of the American people. The Science that nationwide preservation policies promoted was a nationalistic one. Meanwhile, the first generation of site-specific park and monument designations in the American Southwest advanced a version of Science that emphasized indigeneity as both specimen and spectacle. These designations claimed tacitly that studying American Indian people and their pasts would benefit the Anglo-American public. Finally, the second generation of monument designations for Southwestern antiquities largely disarticulated indigeneity from science. Instead, the most recent national monument designations concerning Southwestern antiquities have portrayed an openly-enchanted form of Science, contextualizing scientific practices within the realm of awe and beauty. The power relationships established in the nineteenth century, typically placing Anglo-American scientists as stewards of ancient

indigenous places, remain. Yet, these texts suggest that the myths surrounding Science have changed somewhat over time.

Altogether, this dissertation demonstrates that science, indigeneity, and enchantment have been persistent themes within Anglo-American preservation advocacy since it was first practiced on behalf of ancient structures in the American Southwest, and in the general practices of archaeology and exploration that laid the foundation for advocacy, as well. These three themes animated one another in these collections of texts, as adventurers, advocates, and policymakers attempted to rationalize Anglo-American engagement with Ancestral Puebloan pasts. For the adventurers of Chapter Two, technological and poetic interests intertwined, in regard to structures and the Other alike. For the advocates of Chapter Three, poetic language was a rhetorical device, used in the attempt to enchant others into believing that Ancestral Puebloan structures—and the people descended from those who built them—deserved to be preserved. Yet, the advocates demonstrated a commitment to scientific inquiry and the United States federal government, at the same time that they promoted the success of white settlers in the American Southwest. Preservation policies varied in their attention to a science of indigeneity, and in their recognition of indigenous heritage as heritage. They demonstrated infatuation with American Indian peoples and pasts, as well as a reverence for *the* American people, and the American landscape. The enchantments that I identified in these three collections of texts varied in the myths that they promoted, sometimes presenting indigeneity as a spectacle, and sometimes humanizing the experiences of American Indian social actors, but always attuned to the ways in which members of the Anglo-American public might *use* Southwestern antiquities. Enchantment and utility formed the main dialectic

of Anglo-American preservation advocacy on behalf of ancient indigenous places in the American Southwest, beginning in the nineteenth century.

I proceed, next, with a discussion of rhetorical enchantment and the theoretical contributions of this study, before examining the necessity of an intentional form of rhetorical enchantment within the context of preservation advocacy on behalf of ancient indigenous places in the American Southwest.

Contributions

This dissertation contributes to rhetorical theory by developing the concept of rhetorical enchantment. Rhetorical enchantment is the public, persuasive, and often poetic expression of cultural myth. By communicating densely-connotative narratives about the values and experiences associated with Southwestern antiquities, the adventurers, advocates, and policymakers whose texts I studied in this dissertation demonstrated their own enchantment with the places of the Southwest and with the cultural myths pertaining to them. They also had the potential to enchant their publics with the same stories and phenomena.

I developed the concept of rhetorical enchantment by attending to the texts themselves, and the Southwestern antiquities to which they referred. I also drew inspiration from a variety of concepts derived from dramatism, particularly the technological psychosis, poetic categories, frames of rejection and acceptance, and god terms. Dramatism's steady engagement with myth, magic, and mystery in language use also shaped my theory.

Although dramatism inspired many features of my analysis, I extended Burke's concepts in order to adapt to the particular rhetorical contexts that I studied. In Chapter Two, I paired the technological psychosis with the poetic psychosis. Typically, Burke portrayed science or technology as antithetical to poetry. Burke's position contradicted my observations

in Chapter Two, which is why I introduced the notion of a poetic psychosis as a counterpart to the technological psychosis. The authors in Chapter Two wrote in alternating tones of scrutiny and awe. While the two psychoses were common aspects of modern thinking, the appearance of both within the same texts contradicted my expectations about the rhetoric of social actors like Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld. Chapter Two illustrated how the rhetoric of science, as practiced in the nineteenth century, could be both persuasive *and* poetic while upholding generic conventions.

Chapter Three's most significant revision of dramatism had to do with a variety of definitions that I advanced for the poetic categories about which Burke wrote. For instance, in *Attitudes Toward History*, Burke left the category of the plaint nearly undefined. I interpreted the plaint as a formal critique, in which rhetors might offer suggestions to remedy that which they find unacceptable. Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett all rejected what they viewed as the government's inadequate oversight of antiquities, and its inept or damaging treatment of Native peoples. These plaints called attention to a social problem, and sometimes listed the ways in which the problems could be rectified. The authors' expressions of rejection were subsumed within their variable frames of acceptance, however. Bandelier's tragedy of the Other demonstrated the resignation that dramatism supposes to be present within such a poetic category. McClurg's use of the epic illustrated that poetic category's applicability in many conflict-ridden situations, not just the supposedly primitive era that Burke theorized. Hewett's iteration of the comic frame paired iconoclasm and hagiography, but failed to resolve into a humanistic synthesis, as Burke theorized such a dialectic might. These poetic expressions of cultural myths demonstrated the interplay between form and content, and the appearance of many of the same cultural myths across poetic frames.

In Chapter Four, I identified Science as the god term of preservation policy as a whole, and examined a broad collection of texts in order to arrive at that claim. I divided preservation policies according to the discursive contexts in which they appeared, and concluded that the contexts informed—and nearly constituted—the meaning of Science. While the term-of-terms itself connoted a number of cultural myths, the poetry that contextualized it imbued it with its historical moment, its politics, and its ethics. Importantly, the meaning of the god term changed over time. The worlds within Science are not static, and recent preservation policies suggest that Science is open to acknowledging its own enchantments.

For all that my analysis owes an intellectual debt to dramatism, its emphasis on the relationships among cultural myths, enchanting experiences, and poetic language is novel. The places about which the rhetors in my study spoke necessitated such a novel critical approach. Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon, among other antiquities of the Southwestern United States, inspire wonder. They provoke discourse. They challenged ready placement within existing cultural narratives when they were encountered initially, and new conventions sprang up to meet the rhetorical problem posed by Southwestern antiquities. For the rhetors in my dissertation, familiar cultural myths served as one solution to integrating Southwestern antiquities into public discourse, and these myths gained power through the poetry by which they were expressed. The rhetoric of preservation advocacy on behalf of ancient indigenous places in the American Southwest always reminded its audiences of the enchanting character of those places. Through myths and imagery, the adventurers, advocates, and policymakers who publicized and secured the ancient places of the Southwest also succeeded in enchanting others, while establishing that those places had value. In the midst of that enchantment, they

established what the primary values of Southwestern antiquities were: a means to enlightenment, either through scientific engagement or through communion with the past and the landscape. As these values were framed typically through an Anglo-American rendering of the myths of modernity, the adventurers, advocates, and policymakers whose rhetoric I evaluated throughout this dissertation often appropriated that which they found enchanting.

In addition to this dissertation's unique engagement with enchantments, poetic language, and cultural myth, the project makes other contributions to humanistic research. My dissertation differs from most rhetorical projects of which I am aware because of its focus on antiquities and the rhetoric pertaining to them, because it primarily concerns a historical period, and because it examines preservation policies as rhetorical texts. Additionally, through archival work and interviews, the dissertation pieces together a rhetorical history of a social problem and its previous remedies. The approach that I used when crafting this dissertation enabled me to highlight a number of the lasting consequences of a historical discourse.

As I discussed in the introduction to this dissertation, there have been two pieces of rhetorical criticism to date that have addressed the rhetoric of ancient places in the United States. These are Thomas Patin's analysis of a visit to Chaco Culture National Historical Park and Casey Schmitt's examination of Native American Effigy Mounds near Madison, Wisconsin.[4] My project is a contribution to the field because it increases the body of literature that addresses the rhetoricity of ancient places in the United States. All of these

[4] Thomas Patin, "America in Ruins: Parks, Poetics, and Politics," in *Observation Points: The Visual Poetics of National Parks*, ed. Thomas Patin (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012), 267–89; Casey R. Schmitt, "Contours of the Land: Place-as-Rhetoric and Native American Effigy Mounds," *Western Journal of Communication* 79, no. 3 (2015): 307–26, doi:10.1080/10570314.2015.1041651.

projects, including my dissertation, take seriously the premise that ancient places *are* rhetorical, and that their rhetorical framing illustrates problematics that are prevalent in settler societies. Whereas Patin and Schmitt were concerned with the on-site framing devices produced by heritage practitioners, my dissertation engaged with the ways in which enthusiasts of places like Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon conveyed their impressions in public discourse. Schmitt and Patin examined didactic signs and the atmospheres of their respective field sites. I examined books, magazine and journal articles, speeches, and policies as elements of public discourse.

Numerous projects in material rhetoric or the rhetorics of place and space engage with the poetry of place, as I have referred to the imaginative and connotative descriptions of Southwestern antiquities that appeared regularly in my dissertation. Acknowledgements of the poetry of place include Schmitt and Patin's analyses, which offered rich descriptions of the antiquities each author considered, and detailed analyses of the didactic signs that accompanied and framed them. Indeed, Patin referred to poetics explicitly in his interpretation of Chaco Culture NHP. There are also several works of rhetorical criticism that examine what I consider to be mythic representations of Anglo-American national identity as it appears in museum spaces and at other heritage sites. Rhetorical critics have observed that museums such as those at the Buffalo Bill Historical Center in Cody, Wyoming,[5] or the

[5] Brian L. Ott, Eric Aoki, and Greg Dickinson, "Ways of (Not) Seeing Guns: Presence and Absence at the Cody Firearms Museum," *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 8, no. March 2015 (2011): 215–39, doi:10.1080/14791420.2011.594068; Greg Dickinson, Brian L. Ott, and Eric Aoki, "Spaces of Remembering and Forgetting: The Reverent Eye/I at the Plains Indian Museum," *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 3, no. 1 (March 2006): 27–47, doi:10.1080/14791420500505619; Greg Dickinson, Brian L. Ott, and Eric Aoki, "Memory and Myth at the Buffalo Bill Museum," *Western Journal of Communication* 69, no. 2 (April 2005): 85–108, doi:10.1080/10570310500076684.

Homestead National Monument of America in Beatrice, Nebraska,[6] tend to mythologize settler identities and the conquest of the West, rather than troubling them. The compelling symbols within and pertaining to such places, alongside the powerful experience of physical embodiment at and within such memory places, support the myths that such heritage places advance. I observed that poetic descriptions could energize cultural myths in the texts that I analyzed in this dissertation; rhetorical critics who attend explicitly to the experiences of place have observed the power of embodied poetics.

While I do not describe the rhetorical experience of a site-visit at length, the experience of place featured prominently in the rhetoric of the adventurers and advocates whose works I assessed. Following examples set by other rhetorical critics, I understood the rhetors in my study as both *influenced* and *influential*, as both "audience" and "speaker." The accounts of the adventurers, archaeologists, and advocates who populated Chapters Two and Three were records of enchantment, as well as of the poetry of place *as they understood it.* There is a precedent within rhetorical criticism for understanding reactions to texts as, themselves, rhetorical, and for attempting to understand a wide range of effects of rhetoric on its audiences.[7] Ceccarelli, for example, observed that audiences make meanings

---

[6] Joshua Ewalt, "A Colonialist Celebration of National <Heritage>: Verbal, Visual, and Landscape Ideographs at Homestead National Monument of America.," *Western Journal of Communication* 75, no. 4 (2011): 367–85, doi:10.1080/10570314.2011.586970.

[7] Roger C. Aden et al., "Re-Collection: A Proposal for Refining the Study of Collective Memory and Its Places," *Communication Theory* 19, no. 3 (August 2009): 311–36, doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.2009.01345.x; Amos Kiewe and Davis W. Houck, eds., *The Effects of Rhetoric and the Rhetoric of Effects: Past, Present, Future* (Columbia, SC: The University of South Carolina Press, 2015).

differentially, sometimes engaging in "resistive reading."[8] In developing that argument, Ceccarelli identified examples of resistive reading in the newspaper coverage following Abraham Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address. She studied journalistic responses to the address as a metric by which rhetorical scholars might understand polysemy, polyvalent interpretations of a text, and audience responses to a text. I engaged in a parallel sort of analysis by examining how adventurers, researchers, and advocates framed their own responses to Southwestern antiquities. Obviously, the rhetors whose works I examined in my dissertation were not wholly representative of the era in which they wrote. Yet, they offered a glimpse of the poetry of place through their words, and presented evidence of audience response to Southwestern antiquities. Contemporary visitors to places like Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon likely would recognize some of these rhetors' expressions of wonder in their own astonishment at the scale and beauty of such places.

In addition to its recognition of the poetry of place, and its attempt to acknowledge the active rhetorical practices of rhetoric's audiences, my dissertation offers new insights about rhetorics of and about indigeneity.[9] The dissertation is a contribution to inquiries in Native rhetorics and rhetoric pertaining to indigenous rights because of its emphasis on the enduring political implications of North America's deep past, its attention to disputes over the uses and ownership of public lands, and its critique of numerous federal interventions in

---

[8] Leah Ceccarelli, "Polysemy: Multiple Meanings in Rhetorical Criticism," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 84 (1998): 396, doi: 10.1080/00335639809384229.

[9] E.g., Jason Edward Black, "Remembrances of Removal: Native Resistance to Allotment and the Unmasking of Paternal Benevolence.," *Southern Communication Journal* 72, no. 2 (2007): 185–203, doi:10.1080/10417940701316690; e.g., John Sanchez and Mary E. Stuckey, "The Rhetoric of American Indian Activism in the 1960s and 1970s," *Communication Quarterly* 48, no. 2 (2000): 120–36, doi:10.1080/01463370009385586.

the management of indigenous heritage, with an emphasis on institutions such as the NPS and legislation such as the Antiquities Act of 1906. The project's unique emphasis on indigenous heritage as a disputed cultural artifact differs somewhat from efforts to understand representations of indigeneity in museum spaces, because it attends to the ownership and appropriation of, not just images and stories, but vast cultural landscapes. It raises new questions about rhetoric's role in establishing and eroding indigenous sovereignty, because some of the rhetoric in this study had the material effect of transforming Native landscapes into national monuments.

My dissertation's focus on the politicization of indigenous heritage places also makes the analysis relevant to scholars concerned with anthropological or archaeological ethics in settler societies, such as those working within the realm of critical heritage studies.[10] Throughout this dissertation, I have problematized the Anglo-American tendency to view Southwestern antiquities as data *instead of* as heritage, and I have also problematized more recent attempts to gloss over indigenous heritage places as national heritage. Contention over the definition of heritage, the appropriate applications for heritage materials, and the appropriate stewards for various forms of heritage, marked this analysis. There are no easy resolutions to these matters, but there are numerous valuable perspectives from the academy on the issues of archaeological ethics and representations of indigeneity in settler societies.[11]

---

[10] Rodney Harrison, *Heritage: Critical Approaches* (London: Routledge, 2013); Laurajane Smith, *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage* (New York: Routledge, 2004).

[11] Miranda J. Brady, "Subjectivity Through Self-Education: Media and the Multicultural Citizen at the National Museum of the American Indian," *Television & New Media* 12, no. 5 (December 31, 2010): 441–59, doi:10.1177/1527476410385478; Roberta Chevrette and Aaron Hess, "Unearthing the Native Past: Citizen Archaeology and Modern (Non)Belonging at the Pueblo Grande Museum," *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 12, no. 2

My dissertation challenges many aspects of the federal management of indigenous heritage, particularly through its focus on federal policies and the enduring authority of white anthropological researchers in the realm of indigenous heritage management. By examining how researchers in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries used rhetoric in order to establish themselves as modern heroes, I have exposed the mutability of scientific reputations and the ways in which institutional structures continue to maintain a privileged status for anthropologists in the particular context of the Southwest. In this, I have joined Leah Ceccarelli in another capacity, as she examines representations of scientists as mythic heroes of the American frontier in the early twentieth-century.[12] I have joined, also, rhetoricians such as Marsha Solomon, who examine other contexts of rhetorically-produced scientific heroism as it dovetails with scientific racism.[13] Although I do not seek to undermine the value of research, I do seek to demonstrate how research is enchanted, biased, and politically influential.

My dissertation has addressed a number of enduring concerns within the humanities. Through rhetorical analysis, this dissertation has probed the values and rationales of modernity, and the contradictory ways in which various features of modernity have been expressed. The status of science, the poetics of reason, and the consequences of colonialism

---

(2015): 139–58, doi:10.1080/14791420.2015.1012214; Lisa Slater, "Enchantment and Disenchantment : Indigenous Australian Cultural Festivals and an Ethics of Uncertainty," *At the Interface / Probing the Boundaries* 73 (2010): 87–107.

[12] Leah Ceccarelli, On the Frontier of Science: An American Rhetoric of Exploration and Exploitation, (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 2013).

[13] Martha Solomon, "The Rhetoric of Dehumanization : An Analysis of Medical Reports of the Tuskegee Syphilis Project," *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 49, no. 4 (1985): 233–47.

all have featured in my examination of the history of preservation advocacy on behalf of Southwestern antiquities. The questions of what to do with Southwestern antiquities, and how to value them, have appeared within Anglo-American public discourse since the end of the nineteenth century. Whereas the conclusion to treat them like scholarly artifacts once satisfied the majority of the Anglo-American public, this attitude has shifted in the last thirty years. For the better, American Indian social actors have more power to participate in the definition and treatment of indigenous heritage than ever before. Of course, the fact remains that the *federal* management of American Indian heritage is likely to fall short of decolonizing places like Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon.[14] This dissertation has examined the historical conditions that gave rise to a number of enduring challenges to indigenous sovereignty in the United States. It also raises questions about the ways in which social actors in the twenty-first century continue to grapple with the myths of modernity and the unjust social structures that those myths promoted. Namely, in what ways are social actors today perpetuating the racial biases that characterized nineteenth and twentieth century advocacy on behalf of indigenous heritage? What are the politics of enchantment?

Because of the questions that it poses, this dissertation has the potential to affect preservation advocacy as it is practiced in the future. The fate of places like Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon increasingly connects to concerns regarding indigenous rights, environmental conservation, resource extraction, and the legislation of business practices. Advocates would do well to deploy cultural myths to their advantage, provided that they avoid some of the ideological missteps that their forebears exhibited. Anglo-American advocates, in particular,

[14] I draw my understanding of decolonial studies from Walter D. Mignolo, *The Darker Side of Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options,* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011).

should avoid fetishizing indigeneity, and should accept that archaeologists and anthropologists do not have a *right* to examine indigenous heritage. In the future, it is worth asking, as well, whether or not the public has a right to access places like Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon.

These concerns are important. They are important, particularly, because they have the potential to influence a number of the political issues that continue to affect the ongoing, ethical care of ancient indigenous places in the American Southwest adversely. Rhetorical enchantment—practiced in a way that avoids the dehumanizing tendencies that I found in the *history* of preservation advocacy on behalf of Ancestral Puebloan places—will remain an important part of the strategy for protecting places like Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon from harm. These harms, also, bear further scrutiny, for their sources are many.

Current Problems

Despite the historical bent of this dissertation, its contributions are pertinent to the contemporary moment. Members of the public, as well as politicians, are in the midst of redefining the values of places like Mesa Verde, Chaco Canyon, and Bears Ears. In every instance, the ways in which contemporary social actors attempt to reevaluate these ancient places reflect the federal government's attitude towards contemporary American Indian peoples and their sovereignty. The way that the federal government manages places like Mesa Verde, Chaco Canyon, and Bears Ears is analogous to the way that the federal government treats indigenous peoples. At a minimum, treating indigenous heritage places better would be a gesture of good faith towards recognizing indigenous sovereignty more fully. Yet, the preservation concerns at Mesa Verde, Chaco Canyon, and Bears Ears

demonstrate many of the mismatches in values between Anglo-American cultural practices and the heritage management policies currently proposed by American Indian social actors.

At Mesa Verde National Park, there are three issues that negatively affect the ongoing material preservation of the ancient structures contained within the park. These are the threat of wildfires, the harm caused by tourist traffic, and the imminent collapse of one of the site's most famous alcove dwellings. Park management at Mesa Verde defines fire as a threat to "park infrastructure, cultural and natural resources, and human safety," and in interviews, park personnel identified climate change as a factor that contributes to increased fire risk.[15] Park personnel also acknowledged the harm to "resources" caused by tourist traffic, and various strategies for mitigating the degradation of the site caused by the wear and tear of being open to the public. While some park personnel proposed closing more of the site to the public, interview participants generally viewed such a move as unlikely due to the National Park Service's mandates, which were established by the Organic Act. While park rangers were aware of the paradox of protecting resources and providing for the enjoyment of the same, most viewed some loss of the site as collateral damage, and worthwhile because of the educational benefits provided to the public. In some sense, they claimed that the cultural and natural resources were meant to be *used*. They justified the damage to parts of the site with the knowledge that the vast majority of Mesa Verde National Park remained closed to public access.

Mismatches between Anglo-American attitudes towards antiquities and the attitudes of the Tribes and Pueblos affiliated with Mesa Verde came to the fore in 2015. At that time,

---

[15] NPS, "Fire Management," *Mesa Verde National Park*, https://www.nps.gov/meve/learn/management/firemanagement.htm, accessed May 14, 2018.

the "third largest and best preserved cliff dwelling in the park," called Spruce Tree House, experienced a rock fall. While no one was injured by the collapse, management at Mesa Verde National Park decided to close the Spruce Tree House to foot traffic for reasons of safety. Park management held a Tribal Consultation Meeting in April 2016 in order to consult with Tribal representatives about the best course of action. Tribal representatives were divided about whether or not to conduct repairs to the structure. Those in favor of doing the repairs acknowledged that Spruce Tree House was an effective teaching tool for sharing Ancestral Puebloan culture with site visitors. Those opposed to repairing Spruce Tree House felt that nature should be allowed to take its course, no matter the effect on the architecture below.

While most of the participants at the meeting agreed that the collapsing arch at Spruce Tree House posed a risk to the safety of people in the park, the Tribal representatives expressed mistrust about the NPS's next courses of action. In particular, individuals at the meeting raised concern that the NPS would excavate a *new* site in order to replace the lost tourist experience at Spruce Tree House. As a representative from the Santa Clara Pueblo put it, "There is a lack of respect at sites that are open[,] and maybe that is why they are deteriorating."[16] The implication of this statement, in context, was that Spruce Tree House *sought* to be closed, and that the rock fall was an indication of this wish.

While the NPS never proposed to excavate a new site in order to compensate for the park's putative loss of Spruce Tree House, the Tribal representatives' shared concern that the

[16] Ben Chavarria (Santa Clara Pueblo), "AZRU, CHCU, MEVE Tribal Consultation Meeting Notes," San Juan County Fire Department, Aztec, NM, April 6, 2016, notes recorded by Lori S. Reed and Dana Hawkins, acquired via e-mail correspondence with Mesa Verde park personnel.

NPS *might* do something so disagreeable demonstrated their ongoing mistrust of the federal management of indigenous heritage. No Tribal representatives supported the idea of further excavations within the park for the sake of tourism. Mesa Verde's management practices raised concern for Tribal representatives at the Tribal Consultation Meeting in April 2016. Mesa Verde faces the risk of fire damage, exacerbated by climate change, as well as deterioration caused by tourism and natural geological processes. While Mesa Verde suffers from longstanding problems and processes, the concerns at Chaco Canyon and at Bears Ears are of a more pressing variety, and pertain to industrial mineral extraction.

At Chaco Culture National Historical Park, the ancient structures' far remove from roads and development largely protects them from sudden destruction. However, the problem of tourist foot-traffic exists at Chaco Canyon, as well, where decades of curious onlookers have worn away at material features of the site, and numerous individuals have marked their names upon the ancient structures. Other problems also confront the site. First, non-American Indian social actors have taken to scattering both new age crystals and cremated human remains at the site. These are actions that some of the affiliated Tribes and Pueblos view as a defilement of ancestral places.[17] Second, hydraulic fracturing approaches towards the park boundaries.

Chaco Culture National Historical Park is safe from oil and gas drilling within the park boundaries. However, the Chacoan culture existed throughout a much broader

[17] Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh and T.J. Ferguson, "Memory Pieces and Footprints: Multivocality and the Meanings of Ancient Times and Ancestral Places among the Zuni and Hopi," *American Anthropologist* 108, no. 1 (2006): 148–62, doi:10.1525/aa.2006.108.1.148; C Finn, "'Leaving More than Footprints': Modern Votive Offerings at Chaco Canyon Prehistoric Site," *Antiquity* 71, no. 271 (1997): 169–78; information also obtained through interviews.

geographical region than that which the park designation protects. There is an extensive culturally-significant landscape at risk in recent decisions that have enabled leasing close to the park boundaries, and throughout the Four Corners region. Indigenous activists have been central to a recent movement against oil and gas drilling near Chaco Canyon, and these activists were urged to action following a dramatic fire near "newly drilled oil wells" in the "Greater Chaco Region."[18]

A coalition of the Diné Citizens Against Ruining Our Environment, the San Juan Citizens Alliance, WildEarth Guardians, and the Natural Resources Defense Council submitted a lawsuit against the Bureau of Land Management's decision to lease land surrounding Chaco Canyon for oil and gas drilling.[19] As of April 2018, United States District Court Judge James Browning ruled that drilling could proceed, provided that the Bureau of Land Management constructed a barrier around the cultural resources in the path of the drilling. When justifying this decision, Browning remarked that there were two concerns that affected his decision: Whether there would be "irreparable harm or even serious harm to the historic property," and whether or not "individuals who visit . . . historic sites might be inconvenienced." Ultimately, Browning found that those forms of "harm [did] not outweigh the potential hundreds of thousands to millions of dollars of economic harm the operators

---

[18] Jonathan Thompson, "Resistance to Drilling Grows on the Navajo Nation," *High Country News*, March 2, 2018, https://www.hcn.org/issues/50.4/tribal-affairs-resistance-to-drilling-grows-on-the-navajo-nation, accessed May 14, 2018.

[19] Paul Rauber, "Legal Setback for Defenders of Chaco," *Sierra*, April 28, 2018, n. pag., https://www.sierraclub.org/sierra/legal-setback-for-defenders-chaco, accessed May 14, 2018. *Sierra*, the publication of the Sierra Club, is admittedly a biased source. However, the Sierra Club is a key example of a largely Anglo-American advocacy group that works on behalf of the preservation of the Southwestern landscape.

[would] endure" if drilling were not allowed.[20] Nowhere in Browning's decision was the cultural importance of the Chacoan landscape to descendant populations taken into account. Browning's primary concern was the loss of revenue for drilling companies.

In spite of Browning's frustrating decision in favor of oil and gas development in the Greater Chaco Region, Secretary of the Interior Ryan Zinke, declared a deferral of leasing activity in the Chaco region until further "exploration" could take place about the cultural resources outside of the park boundaries. Zinke claimed that the decision to postpone leases and sales was the result of input from "tribes, [Democratic] Senators Udall and Heinrich, historic preservation experts and other stakeholders."[21] While Zinke acted on behalf of the Chaco landscape in this instance, his actions on behalf of Bears Ears National Monument—which I will discuss shortly—were not similarly conscientious. Indeed, Chaco may have benefited temporarily from a public backlash against Zinke's earlier mishandling of Bears Ears. In his role as the Secretary of the Interior, Zinke is the new face of stewardship for America's public lands. This is cause for concern, postponements of leases or not.

Of relevance to this dissertation, many of the twenty-first century non-American Indian advocates on behalf of Chaco Canyon appealed to some of the same cultural myths that social actors at the turn of the twentieth century used. *The New York Time* remarked that Chaco Canyon's "treasures" were "threatened by drilling," and that the region had "mysteries

---

[20] Judge James Browning, quoted by Rauber, "Legal Setback," n. pag.

[21] Juliet Eilperin, "Zinke Abruptly Postpones Lease Sale Near New Mexico's Chaco Canyon," *The Washington Post*, March 2, 2018, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2018/03/02/zinke-abruptly-postpones-lease-sale-near-new-mexicos-chaco-canyon/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.492aeb5f1124, accessed May 14, 2018.

. . . waiting to be revealed."[22] *The Guardian* called Chaco Canyon "as close as the US gets to Egypt's pyramids and Peru's Machu Picchu," while asserting that "developments could spell the end of a myriad of clues archaeologists and anthropologists are still unraveling about Chacoans' way of life."[23] Throughout the publications that opposed oil and gas drilling in the Greater Chaco Region, rhetors spoke of the intellectual and recreational enjoyments of the landscape. While these argumentative commonplaces likely resonated with the Anglo-American readership they were designed to influence, they obfuscated the cultural toll borne disproportionately by the Tribes and Pueblos affiliated with Chaco Canyon. Given the pollution, fires, and other risks associated with oil and gas drilling, there are bodily risks to which these populations are exposed disproportionately. The environmental racism that advocates have been opposing at Chaco Canyon is also at play in recent decisions regarding the boundaries and leasing rights available in the Bears Ears landscape, in Utah, and across the United States.

Beginning in the 1930s, Anglo-American social actors campaigned to set aside Bears Ears as a protected landscape. While many parcels of the landscape gained protection as holdings of the United States Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, the landscape as a whole remained neglected by the federal government, and suffered from its lack of adequate protection. Like Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon, Bears Ears was subject to

---

[22] Richard Moe, "The Treasures of Chaco Canyon are Threatened by Drilling," *The New York Times,* December 1, 2017, https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/01/opinion/chaco-canyon-new-mexico-drilling.html, accessed May 15, 2018.

[23] Elizabeth Miller, "'As Close as the US Gets to Egypt's Pyramids': How Chaco Canyon is Endangered by Drilling," *The Guardian,* November 8, 2017, https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2017/nov/08/chaco-canyon-national-park-new-mexico-drilling, accessed May 15, 2018.

graffiti and pot-hunting. Like Chaco Canyon, Bears Ears also has been in the path of so-called progress, in the form of mineral extraction.

The Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition (BEITC), representing the Hopi Tribe, the Navajo Nation, the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, the Pueblo of Zuni, and the Ute Indian Tribe, formed in 2015 in order to petition for the Bears Ears landscape to gain national monument status. Only as a national park or monument could Bears Ears gain the highest level of protection available to a heritage site in the United States, helping to assure that the land would not be used for industrial foresting, mineral extraction, or other deleterious industrial practices. The BEITC addressed a version of their petition to President Barack Obama in the fall of 2016. With a month left in office, Obama designated Bears Ears a national monument 1.35 million acres in size.

There were a number of disappointing aspects of Obama's proclamation of Bears Ears National Monument (BENM). Rhetorically, the BENM proclamation also fell short of fulfilling its lauded role as a victory for indigenous rights. Recall from chapter four that Obama's presidential proclamation on behalf of the new monument appealed to many modern commonplaces. The proclamation of BENM privileged Science, foregrounding the ways in which paleontologists, geologists and ecologists could learn from the protected landscape. While Obama's proclamation paid deference to indigenous histories of Bears Ears, it incorporated indigenous pasts and Anglo-American pasts into a homogenizing narrative about American identity. Furthermore, the monument that Obama designated was smaller than the 1.9 million acres that the BEITC requested, and failed to protect a uranium-rich parcel of land known as Red Canyon. Obama's proclamation for BENM also failed to

establish a true collaboration between federal agencies and Tribal governments, which had been a significant component of the BEITC proposal.

In their proposal of the BENM, the BEITC requested full participation in all management considerations concerning Bears Ears. Instead, Obama's BENM proclamation created a Bears Ears Commission consisting of "one elected officer each from the Hopi Nation, Navajo Nation, Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah Ouray, and Zuni Tribe." The Commission would "partner with . . . Federal agencies by making continuing contributions to inform decisions regarding the management of the Monument." While the agencies were instructed to "meaningfully engage the Commission," they were not required to adhere to the Commission's counsel. Though the agencies were advised to "carefully and fully consider integrating the traditional and historical knowledge and special expertise of the Commission" they could choose not to do so. The only guard against such a decision was that, in the event the federal agencies might ignore the Commission's wishes, the federal managers of Bears Ears would need to "provide the Commission . . . with a written explanation of their reasoning." This was the extent of the "meaningful engagement" that Obama's BENM proclamation required, beyond general adherence to federal laws such as the National Environmental Policy Act, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, and the Native American Religious Freedom Act.[24]

From this discussion, it is clear that Obama's proclamation of BENM failed to realign problematic power dynamics that have been present for decades in the federal management

[24] Barack Obama, Proclamation, "Establishment of the Bears Ears National Monument, Proclamation 9558," 82 Fed. Reg. 1139 (December 28, 2016), https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/DCPD-201600875/pdf/DCPD-201600875.pdf.

of indigenous heritage in the American Southwest. However, the flaws in Obama's proclamation of BENM seemed acceptable to many at the time of the monument's establishment. At long last, most of the Bears Ears landscape seemed as if it was safe from commercial development. Moreover, as the authors of the BEITC stated in the proposal that they addressed to Obama, requesting the monument, "no action under the Antiquities Act [had] ever been overturned by the courts."[25] The majority of the Bears Ears landscape finally should have been safe from uranium mining. However, the Trump administration did not wait for any court's permission before dismantling Obama's protection of the new national monument. If there is a lesson to be taken from Bears Ears' reduction, perhaps it is this: Allies are imperfect, but adversaries are worse. Furthermore, while Science has a poor history of representing indigenous interests well, industry appears to disregard them completely.

Whereas Obama's proclamation of BENM praised Science, the landscape, and Native histories, Trump's presidential discourse pertaining to Bears Ears never wavered from its praise for capital. Shortly after entering office, Trump issued an executive order in which he called for a review of the national monuments that his three presidential predecessors established. Trump's executive order held up "American workers and the American economy" as victims of executive overreach and misuse of the Antiquities Act. According to Trump's executive order, expansionist uses of the Antiquities Act—such as the Obama's designation of BENM, said the document—could "create barriers to achieving energy

[25] BEITC, "Proposal to President Barack Obama for the Creation of Bears Ears National Monument" (Utah Diné Bikéyah, October 15, 2015), 23, http://utahdinebikeyah.org//wp-content/documents/Bears-Ears-Inter-Tribal-Coalition-Proposal-10-15-15.pdf.

independence, restrict public access to and use of Federal lands, burden State, tribal, and local governments, and otherwise curtail economic growth."[26] Using economic commonplaces and a partisan representation of American identity, Trump claimed that Bears Ears was a financial burden. Seven months after ordering a review of monument designations, the Trump administration released a presidential proclamation in which it presented Bears Ears' new, reduced boundaries, an eighty-five percent reduction from the original 1.35 million acres that Obama designated.

Trump's presidential proclamation redefined many of the ambiguous terms of the Antiquities Act, in every instance reshaping them in favor of the economy, and accusing Obama of using the Antiquities Act inappropriately. The proclamation claimed that Bears Ears' reduction was necessary on the grounds that Obama failed to confine the monument "to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects of historic or scientific interest to be protected." The presidential proclamation asserted that the majority of Bears Ears was *not* "of significant scientific or historic interest," was no longer "under threat of damage or destruction," and was "already being managed" adequately. Furthermore, said this presidential proclamation, other laws already provided "specific protection for archaeological, historic, cultural, paleontological, and plant and animal resources." The proclamation willfully ignored the symbolic power of the vast Bears Ears region for the

[26] Donald Trump, Exec. Order no. 13792, "Review of Designations Under the Antiquities Act," 82 Fed. Reg. 20429 (April 26, 2017), https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2017-05-01/pdf/2017-08908.pdf

Tribal governments who requested its protection, and fractured the landscape by deeming only part of it worthy of protection.[27]

Preservation advocacy on behalf of Southwestern antiquities is in the midst of a new moment of crisis, confronting not vandalism, but the federal government itself. The example of Bears Ears, with which I began this dissertation, serves as an emblem of the most concerning problems facing preservation advocacy on behalf of Ancestral Puebloan places, today. It demonstrates the bureaucratic and ideological shortcomings of progressive allies, and the significant material threats posed by both industry and reactionary politics. While science and industry both make *use* of ancestral landscapes, the latter is a much more pressing concern—both for preservation advocacy, and for its allied social issues, such as indigenous rights and environmental conservation.

Limitations, Biases, and Further Enchantments

On the whole, this dissertation has attended to occlusions and injustices present in the historical discourses of archaeologists and preservation advocates, as well as the power imbalances that persist in contemporary preservation policies as a result of the actions of these historical figures. Because of my dissertation's emphasis on these imbalances, it is fitting to comment on the ways in which numerous choices that I made throughout the research process biased this project, as well. After all, the ways in which "we as researchers

[27] Donald J. Trump, Proclamation, "Modifying the Bears Ears National Monument," 82 Fed. Reg. 58081 (December 4, 2017), https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2017-12-08/pdf/2017-26709.pdf.

create our texts" reflect the politics and ethics of our own positionality towards that which we study.[28]

Some of the choices that I made foreclosed the possibilities for "open[ing] new frames for intellectual and political theory and practice," because the project focused explicitly on the various dominant frames (poetic and otherwise) that have become sedimented in the context of preservation advocacy on behalf of Southwestern antiquities.[29] My choices produced a conspicuous absence in terms representing the views of the indigenous social actors to whom Southwestern antiquities most rightly belong. While the dissertation cites indigenous scholarship and refers occasionally to a variety of indigenous perspectives, at base, this is a study of whiteness and its institutions.

In terms of methodological choices, I focused my research on the narratives of white social actors, retrieved a number of their narratives from both digital and brick-and-mortar archives, and interviewed thirty heritage practitioners in the American Southwest, only three of whom self-identified as possessing American Indian heritage, and twenty-seven of whom worked for the National Park Service. I selected Jackson, Holmes, Ingersoll, Chapin, and Nordenskiöld for study because of their influence in establishing Anglo-American discourses about Southwestern Antiquities. I selected Bandelier, McClurg, and Hewett for study because of their participation in the same discourses, and because of the ways in which their attitudes were embedded in law. I selected federal policies governing Southwestern antiquities for

---

[28] Michelle Fine, "Dis-Stance and Other Stances: Negotiations of Power Inside Feminist Research," in *Power and Method: Political Activism and Educational Research*, ed. Andrew Gitlin (Routledge, 1994), 14.

[29] Fine, 23.

study because of their influence on the management and care of the same places. *Influence* was the rationale for the choices that I made, but this resulted in "studying up," or examining the production of power, rather than challenges to it.[30]

There are benefits to examining the production of power. For one thing, it enables those who wish to challenge current power dynamics to understand what it is that they confront, its history, and its methods. When studies of power avoid hagiography, they can critique and subvert the authority that those in power traditionally have possessed. Yet, in studying discursive colonization, I have not adopted a decolonizing methodology consistently. Linda Tuhiwai Smith considers a decolonizing methodology one that emphasizes indigenous agendas, integrates "political and international frameworks[s]," and demonstrates a willingness "to upset the status quo."[31] While I sought to include dimensions of Smith's recommendations in my dissertation, still I participated in some of the scholarly traditions that decolonizing methodologies seek to disrupt.

While I troubled unjust power dynamics as they stand now, and as they came to be, I relied on the Western canon. I interviewed individuals who work within a state apparatus that maintains federal and Anglo-American control over indigenous heritage. I depended on archives, which are sites at which scholars like myself *produce knowledge*, and sites that traditionally have acted as instruments of colonial power. Archives are political, and the materials that arrive in archives most often reflect and perpetuate dominant perspectives.

---

[30] Laura Nader, "Up the Anthropologist," *ERIC*, 1972, 1, https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED065375.pdf.

[31] Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (Zed Books, 2013), 343–44.

Bias present within the archives to which we have access is little excuse for failing to pursue alternate sources that would tell histories *other* than those we have come to expect.[32] While a study about the production and maintenance of power has useful attributes, it comes at the expense of other projects that would privilege indigenous voices instead of amplifying the voices of white historical figures and policymakers, who already have been heard well. My hope is that this study of power and its production can complement and serve future work that will honor Native perspectives, instead.

On the topic of voice and representation, I acknowledge that I am speaking from a privileged position as a white Anglo-American who is rather familiar with archaeological practices, having completed a master's degree in archaeological science at the University of Cambridge, and having learned initially about Southwestern antiquities through archaeological coursework. While I have rejected or problematized much of what white social actors like myself have done in the Southwestern United States historically, still I take part in the appropriation of ancient indigenous heritage. For instance, I benefit from indigenous heritage simply by virtue of writing a dissertation about it. Indeed, I have written about Southwestern antiquities within the poetic valence, in the attempt to inspire enchantment in my readers. I have advanced the myths of universal humanism and coalitional politics, among others. I have identified as a preservation advocate, and I have proposed that a rhetorical history of preservation advocacy can influence coalitional politics positively now and in the future. This implies that white social actors like myself can have a place in advocating on behalf of indigenous heritage, and perhaps risks the perpetuation of

[32] Ann Stoler, "Colonial Archives and the Art of Governance," *Archival Science*, no. 2 (2002): 87–109; Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1995).

the appropriative discourses that I have challenged throughout this work. Yet, my privilege also allows me to educate would-be Anglo-American allies about "our" history of appropriation and ignorance in the context of preservation advocacy on behalf of indigenous heritage.

Preservation advocacy on behalf of indigenous heritage places often has been dominated by white social actors. While indigenous advocates gained a greater platform through the American Indian Movement in the 1960s and 1970s, and more recently, through social movements such as #NoDAPL, white social actors who advocate on behalf of indigenous rights in any of these movements have not always performed well as appropriate allies. This dissertation seeks, in part, to educate non-indigenous allies about the history of appropriation of indigenous heritage by its white advocates. When I suggest that this rhetorical history can influence coalitional politics (and specifically, social movements that include Native and non-Native participants) on behalf of indigenous rights, environmental justice, and the ongoing, ethical care of ancient indigenous places, I mean to say that these social issues always *should* be coalitional, *rather than the domain of white social actors*, and that they can be coalitional *without* white social actors, as well. Historically, white archaeologists, preservation advocates, and policymakers representing the United States federal government have made decisions *for* Native nations, and have imposed values on indigenous peoples and their heritage sites that have undermined Native sovereignty. If white social actors can play a part, at all, it should be a subordinate one, or at least an equitable one, rather than the paternalistic role that the social actors in this dissertation assumed most regularly. This dissertation demonstrated how discourse helped to naturalize the Anglo-American control of Southwestern antiquities. By showing the rhetorical contrivances in the

status quo, I hope to illustrate that it, too, is an enchantment, and it need not be a permanent one. In this, I mean to attach "what is" to "what could be."[33]

Discourse is a realm in which all people invested in supporting indigenous sovereignty, advancing environmental justice, and respecting indigenous heritage places may begin to reframe the century-old tradition of Anglo-American control over indigenous heritage places. As this dissertation has shown, discourses have the potential to influence both policy and comportment, now and in the future. In addition to problematizing teleological thinking, fetishistic descriptions of indigeneity, and the pervasive utilitarian rationality towards indigenous heritage places, allies can propose new narratives that subvert the power imbalances that persist in the federal management of indigenous heritage.

As a parting thought, I wish to propose a new narrative that might disrupt the naturalization of Anglo-American dominance over indigenous heritage. It is this: Going to the American Southwest is a form of international travel. The Southwestern United States is host to many Native nations, including the Navajo Nation in Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico; the Hopi Tribe in Arizona; the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe in Colorado; the Southern Ute in Colorado; the Northern Ute in Utah; the Jicarilla Apache Nation in New Mexico; the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo in Texas; and nineteen Pueblos in New Mexico, including Taos, Picuris, Isleta, Ohkay Owingeh, Santa Clara, San Ildefonso, Nambe, Tesuque, Jemez, Cochiti, Pojoaque, Santo Domingo, San Felipe, Santa Ana, Zia, Laguna, Acoma, and Zuni.[34] Each of these Native nations has its own government, its own land, its own traditions, and its

---

[33] Fine, 26.

[34] "The 26 Associated Tribes of Mesa Verde," *National Park Service*, accessed June 21, 2018, https://www.nps.gov/meve/learn/historyculture/upload/26meve_associated_tribes_508.pdf.

own investments in the representation and management of Southwestern antiquities. If Anglo-American social actors could learn to recognize the sovereignty of these Native nations more fully (for instance, by calling movement across the Southwest "international travel," or through other novel discursive habits), then perhaps the necessity of true government-to-government negotiations between Native nations and the United States federal government would be clearer. The need to respect the sovereignty and expertise of these Native nations when visiting their land also would be clearer. This is but one suggestion for disrupting the injustices that persist in the American Southwest. Consider it a proposed enchantment.

Because the United States has so established its position as steward of Southwestern antiquities, it is sensible for the United States government to join negotiations with the twenty-six other governments who have an investment in Ancestral Puebloan places. It is not sensible for the United States government to dominate those negotiations, nor to seek "consultation" from Tribal and Pueblo governments in lieu of "consent" when determining the management, care, and *ownership* of Ancestral Puebloan places. The United States government currently holds Ancestral Puebloan places in trust on behalf of other governments, but it is necessary for the United States to seek ongoing consent from the governments on whose behalf it purports to act, and to accept a subsidiary and service-oriented role instead of a dominant one.

Future Directions

This dissertation charted key moments in the historical development of Anglo-American discourses of preservation advocacy on behalf of ancient indigenous places in the American Southwest. It focused primarily on the works of adventurers, archaeologists, and

advocates who were active in the American Southwest between the 1870s and the 1930s. It examined legislation that Anglo-American social actors advanced during roughly the same historical period, and it also assessed four more recent examples of preservation policy affecting Southwestern antiquities. These were the boundaries of my dissertation, and they indicated to me a number of beneficial directions in which to move forward, while attempting to understand better the federal management of indigenous heritage places in the United States, the status of science, and the rhetoric of antiquities.

Over the course of writing this dissertation, I collected archival materials from the Tutt Library Special Collections at Colorado College in Colorado Springs, Colorado; the Chaco Culture National Historical Park archives housed at the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque; the Mesa Verde National Park archives located on-site in Cortez, Colorado; and the Fort Lewis College Center for Southwestern Studies archives in Durango, Colorado. While some of the information that I learned at these archives made its way into the dissertation, I have now in my possession a substantial body of archival content regarding the founding, management, and presentation of Mesa Verde National Park and Chaco Culture National Historical Park. I plan to integrate these materials into future projects that examine the organization of heritage practice within the National Park Service, and the decision-making that goes into public displays in parks like these.

I also had the opportunity to interview thirty heritage practitioners working in the Four Corners region of the United States. The majority of these individuals worked within the National Park Service, stationed either at Mesa Verde or at Chaco Canyon, though some worked with a non-profit organization called Crow Canyon Archaeological Center. In moving forward with this area of research, I plan to examine more closely the views of

heritage practitioners who interact with Southwestern antiquities. Interview participants shared their perspectives on issues such as the proper role of the federal government in stewarding ancient indigenous places, the impact of new technologies on park management, the Trump administration, white guilt, climate change, and enlightenment through communing with nature. These interviews deserve a manuscript to themselves, so that the perspectives of my collaborators can receive their due credit, in addition to informing this rhetorical history of preservation advocacy.

Finally, while the dissertation demonstrated links between historical precedents and contemporary practices, I plan to focus more extensively on contemporary preservation advocacy on behalf of indigenous heritage places in future research. This project serves as a necessary foundation for understanding how the contemporary discourse came to be as it is, and will enrich my future engagement with the study of preservation advocacy, as it is practiced in the present moment.

Summary

The primary claim in my dissertation is that scientific authority always has dominated Anglo-American engagement with ancient indigenous places in the Southwestern United States. In spite of Anglo-American social actors' outspoken deference to Science, this rhetorical history of exploration, archaeology, advocacy, and policy demonstrates that researchers, advocates, and policymakers always have exhibited a poetic demeanor towards Southwestern antiquities, as well. Scientific rationality always has been accompanied by the supposedly irrational in this context.

The presence of poetry within rhetorical appeals to scientific rationality helps to emphasize that scientific rationality is a myth. It is one of several myths of modernity that

writers, researchers, advocates, and policymakers expressed in the rhetoric about Southwestern antiquities. Other myths that rhetors in my study advanced related to the tensions present within a settler society at the turn of the twentieth century. Explorers, researchers, and advocates understood indigeneity primarily through the lens of Science, the exotic, or paternal benevolence. Their interpretations of the Ancestral Puebloans were influenced by and influenced their understandings of contemporary intercultural relationships with American Indian peoples. Because of the high social standing of many of the rhetors whose works I have studied, their attitudes towards indigeneity also likely had an effect on the attitudes of their readerships, and entered into preservation policy in enduring ways. The Anglo-American individuals whose rhetoric I study also understood indigeneity through myths of difference, primitivism, and the exotic, which romanticized American Indian people from the past or present. Often, the adventurers and advocates who wrote about the American Southwest portrayed indigenous people as childlike, peculiar, or noble. While the claims that American Indian people were noble certainly were more flattering than the claims that scrutinized the Other as a scientific specimen, all of these attitudes caricaturized indigeneity.

In addition to advancing Science as an orienting force in society, and using Science to support racist policies and actions, the adventurers, advocates, and policymakers whose rhetoric I studied in this dissertation exhibited evidence of enchantment—not just with cultural myths, but with the places, *themselves*. Places like Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon are, indeed, enchanting. The striking impression that these places make on the people who observe them contributes to the fact that myths and wonder always have been part of Anglo-American engagement with Southwestern antiquities, and likely will remain in that discursive context. The question that I would urge any would-be advocate to ask of himself

or herself is simply this: By what, precisely, are you enchanted? The answer to this question demonstrates the rationale for one's engagement with an ancient place, and may reveal whether or not there are problematic cultural myths also at play.

When standing in front of a massive sandstone alcove with a steep drop into a ravine behind you, looking up at Mesa Verdean architecture and artwork, it is difficult not to feel awe. When feeling the wind whipping across the plains as you stand within a town in Chaco Canyon that no one has lived in permanently for over seven hundred years, it is expected for one to feel inspired. Places like Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon encourage a contemplative mood. They provoke comparisons between past and present, and between the way you or I do things, and the way the Ancestral Puebloans did things. They prompt admiration at the ingenuity that the Ancestral Puebloans possessed, and perhaps relief that many of us do not require the skills that once were necessary to thrive in the American Southwest, as the Ancestral Puebloans did. These types of enchantment, these stirrings of emotion and existential thinking, likely will endure as long as places like Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon still stand. I would not wish for these enchantments to go away.

Yet, such sensory and cerebral enchantments catalyze myth, and the myths that we choose to tell about Southwestern antiquities are what is at stake in this dissertation. We may not be able to choose whether or not we feel enchanted, but certainly we can make intentional choices about the language we use to convey that enchantment. Social norms produce the cultural myths that are most accessible when we confront things that are new, or strange, or interesting. It is comfortable to appeal to such myths when we describe what we find enchanting to those who have not yet seen it, or who do not yet care. Those same myths advance *new* social norms, and new ideologies. They are rhetorical, and have the potential to

influence public attitudes in enduring ways. The myths that white social actors have told about places like Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon historically have elevated science, white superiority, the fantastical nature of indigenous culture, and the Anglo-American *right* to interact with indigenous heritage. However, it is unnecessary to express enchantment by way of these myths. While no myth can reflect reality accurately, we can *select* narratives that are closer to the reality that we desire. Unabashedly, this is a rhetorical maneuver—yet why *not* select our myths intentionally?

Within contemporary discourses in favor of the preservation of Southwestern antiquities, there are new myths that promote humanism, the value of contemplation, and the vitalism of the landscape. Such myths appeared in the most recent national monument designation on behalf of a Southwestern antiquity, Bears Ears National Monument. Such myths are novel alternatives to those that I have critiqued over the course of this dissertation. I choose to be enchanted by myths such as these, partial though they are. I also choose to *enchant* with myths such as these, for the ongoing, ethical care of Southwestern antiquities is far from secure. Defining what that ethical care looks like, and how to ensure it, are problems that preservation advocates operating today must consider. Understanding rhetorical enchantment in this discursive context may be key to resolving some of the enduring tensions contained in efforts to preserve knowledge of the deep past in this settler society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aden, Roger C., Min Wha Han, Stephanie Norander, Michael E. Pfahl, Timothy P. Pollock, and Stephanie L. Young. "Re-Collection: A Proposal for Refining the Study of Collective Memory and Its Places." *Communication Theory* 19, no. 3 (August 2009): 311–36. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.2009.01345.x.

Black, Jason Edward. "Remembrances of Removal: Native Resistance to Allotment and the Unmasking of Paternal Benevolence." *Southern Communication Journal* 72, no. 2 (2007): 185–203. doi:10.1080/10417940701316690.

Brady, Miranda J. "Subjectivity Through Self-Education: Media and the Multicultural Citizen at the National Museum of the American Indian." *Television & New Media* 12, no. 5 (December 31, 2010): 441–59. doi:10.1177/1527476410385478.

Ceccarelli, Leah. *On the Frontier of Science: An American Rhetoric of Exploration and Exploitation*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Pres, 2013.

———. "Polysemy: Multiple Meanings in Rhetorical Criticism." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 84, no. 4 (1998): 395–415. doi:10.1080/00335639809384229.

Chevrette, Roberta, and Aaron Hess. "Unearthing the Native Past: Citizen Archaeology and Modern (Non)Belonging at the Pueblo Grande Museum." *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 12, no. 2 (2015): 139–58. doi:10.1080/14791420.2015.1012214.

Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip, and T.J. Ferguson. "Memory Pieces and Footprints: Multivocality and the Meanings of Ancient Times and Ancestral Places among the Zuni and Hopi." *American Anthropologist* 108, no. 1 (2006): 148–62. doi:10.1525/aa.2006.108.1.148;

Deloria, Philip J. *Playing Indian*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Dickinson, Greg, Brian L. Ott, and Eric Aoki. "Memory and Myth at the Buffalo Bill Museum." *Western Journal of Communication* 69, no. 2 (April 2005): 85–108. doi:10.1080/10570310500076684.

———. "Spaces of Remembering and Forgetting: The Reverent Eye/I at the Plains Indian Museum." *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 3, no. 1 (March 2006): 27–47. doi:10.1080/14791420500505619.

Fine, Michelle. "Dis-Stance and Other Stances: Negotiations of Power Inside Feminist Research." In *Power and Method: Political Activism and Educational Research*, edited by Andrew Gitlin, 13–35. Routledge, 1994.

Finn, C. "'Leaving More than Footprints': Modern Votive Offerings at Chaco Canyon Prehistoric Site." *Antiquity* 71, no. 271 (1997): 169–78.

Harrison, Rodney. *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. London: Routledge, 2013.

Hewett, Edgar Lee. "The Southwest: Yesterday and Tomorrow." *Papers of the School of American Research* 2 (1921): 3–8.

Josephson-Storm, Jason A. *The Myth of Disenchantment: Magic, Modernity, and the Birth of the Human Sciences*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2017.

Kiewe, Amos, and Davis W. Houck, eds. *The Effects of Rhetoric and the Rhetoric of Effects: Past, Present, Future*. Columbia, SC: The University of South Carolina Press, 2015.

Mignolo, Walter D. *The Darker Side of Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011.

Nader, Laura. "Up the Anthropologist." *ERIC*, 1972, 1–29. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED065375.pdf.

Ott, Brian L., Eric Aoki, and Greg Dickinson. "Ways of (Not) Seeing Guns: Presence and Absence at the Cody Firearms Museum." *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 8, no. March 2015 (2011): 215–39. doi:10.1080/14791420.2011.594068.

Patin, Thomas. "America In Ruins: Parks, Poetics, and Politics." In *Observation Points: The Visual Poetics of National Parks*, edited by Thomas Patin, 267–89. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012.

Sanchez, John, and Mary E. Stuckey. "The Rhetoric of American Indian Activism in the 1960s and 1970s." *Communication Quarterly* 48, no. 2 (2000): 120–36. doi:10.1080/01463370009385586.

Schmitt, Casey R. "Contours of the Land: Place-as-Rhetoric and Native American Effigy Mounds." *Western Journal of Communication* 79, no. 3 (2015): 307–26. doi:10.1080/10570314.2015.1041651.

Slater, Lisa. "Enchantment and Disenchantment : Indigenous Australian Cultural Festivals and an Ethics of Uncertainty." *At the Interface / Probing the Boundaries* 73 (2010): 87–107.

Smith, Laurajane. *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Solomon, Martha. "The Rhetoric of Dehumanization : An Analysis of Medical Reports of the Tuskegee Syphilis Project." *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 49, no. 4 (1985): 233–47.

Stoler, Ann. "Colonial Archives and the Art of Governance." *Archival Science*, no. 2 (2002): 87–109.

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Boston, Ma: Beacon Press, 1995.

Tuhiwai Smith, Linda. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Zed Books, 2013.