

University of Montana

## ScholarWorks at University of Montana

---

Anthropology Papers, 1976-1981

Anthropology

---

1981

### Anthropology Papers, No. 2: Salvage Archaeology and Its Application in Montana

Carling I. Malouf

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.umt.edu/anthropology\\_papers](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/anthropology_papers)

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

---

#### Recommended Citation

Malouf, Carling I., "Anthropology Papers, No. 2: Salvage Archaeology and Its Application in Montana" (1981). *Anthropology Papers, 1976-1981*. 2.

[https://scholarworks.umt.edu/anthropology\\_papers/2](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/anthropology_papers/2)

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Anthropology at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Anthropology Papers, 1976-1981 by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@mso.umt.edu](mailto:scholarworks@mso.umt.edu).

Carling I. Malouf

The history of American archaeology has been traced back at least to Thomas Jefferson (Jefferson, 1781). Salvage archaeology, on the other hand, is mostly applicable to post depression years, and particularly to post World War II times when Americans reckoned with some appreciation for archaic remains, and that they were rapidly disappearing through "progress" through vast construction projects, changes in mechanizing farming and ranching, industry, travel, and even through sheer losses from vandalism. This was not a step toward what has been variously called "Public Archaeology," "Emergency Archaeology," "Rescue Archaeology," "Mitigation Archaeology," "Cultural Resources Management," and a number of other titles. This paper deals with a portion of the history of American archaeology during the early years of the 20th century, and its impact on the history of the

SALVAGE ARCHAEOLOGY AND  
ITS APPLICATION IN MONTANA

... Montana were scarce, and those seldom dealt with prehistoric sites in North America, and even in universities the subject was neglected. There were plenty of amateurs in the subject, and there were many collectors. One of the notable collectors became, "Who were the Great Builders?" Researchers in the Smithsonian Institution, as a government agency, gave notice of the subject of "Great Builders," but they also had many other interests, including ethnological studies, and the subject of American Indian languages.

Carling I. Malouf

William Denison Strong, a pioneer in Plains archaeology, was described by his former student at Columbia University, now John Wesley Powell, the founder and Director of the Bureau of American Ethnology, utilized American interests in "The Grand Canyon" to persuade funds from Congress to study these ancient remains. Actually, according to Strong, the leading scholars of archaeology in America had very good knowledge of the origin and provenance of these people, but Powell used the American public interest which moved Congressmen in Mount Builders to direct funds for the Bureau of American Ethnology, especially for archaeological work, but directed the Bureau of Ethnology to the real interests in ethnology, and the classification of American Indian languages. Nevertheless, considerable funds were also devoted to archaeological studies.

Professional archaeologists were still scarce, and powerless to reduce the number of sites being made on the mountains, on "arrowhead collectors," and their resulting impact also in the American Southwest. During the late 1880's a car load of pottery and other fine specimens from what later became Mesa Verde National Park, were shipped to Sweden with no one to protect. Even original makers were removed from their "ancestral dwellings" and shipped overseas.

Still, it was remarkable that as early as 1906 it was possible to persuade Congress to pass "An Act For The Preservation Of American Antiquities." This Federal law became the basis of protection of archaeological sites on public lands for at least half

## SALVAGE ARCHAEOLOGY AND ITS APPLICATION IN MONTANA

Carling I. Malouf

The history of American archaeology has been traced back at least to Thomas Jefferson. (Jefferson, 1784). Salvage archaeology, on the other hand, is mostly traceable to post depression years, and particularly to post World War II times when Americans awakened with some appreciation for prehistoric remains, and that they were rapidly disappearing through "progress" through vast construction projects, changes in mechanizing farming and ranching, industry, travel, and even through sheer losses from vandalism. This was just a step toward what has been variously called: "Public Archaeology," "Emergency Archaeology," "Rescue Archaeology," "Mitigation Archaeology," "Cultural Resources Management," and a number of other titles. This paper deals with a portion of the history of American archaeology known as "Salvage Archaeology," and emphasizes its impact on the history of the archaeology of Montana.

Early during the last century there was little interest in the study of the prehistory of the country. Museums were scarce, and these seldom dealt with prehistoric man in North America, and even in universities the subject was neglected. There were plenty of amateurs in the subject, and there were many collectors. One of the favorite subjects became, "Who were the Mound Builders?" Researchers in The Smithsonian Institution, as a government branch, took some notice of the subject of "Mound Builders," but they also had many other interests, including ethnological matters, and the subject of American Indian languages.

William Duncan Strong, a pioneer in Plains archaeology, once described to his classes at Columbia University, how John Wesley Powell, the founder and Director of the Bureau of American Ethnology, utilized American interests in "The Mound Builders" to inveigle funds from Congress to study these ancient remains. Actually, according to Strong, the budding science of archaeology in America had very good ideas about the origin and provenience of these people, but Powell used the American popular interest (which included Congressmen) in Mound Builders to obtain funds for the Bureau of American Ethnology, ostensibly for archaeological work, but diverted a portion of the funds to his real interests in ethnology, and the classification of American Indian languages. Nevertheless, considerable funds were also devoted to archaeological studies.

Professional archaeologists were still scarce, and powerless to reduce the number of depredations being made on the mounds, on "arrowhead collectors," and men raiding pueblo sites in the American Southwest. During the late 1800's car loads of pottery and other fine specimens from what later became Mesa Verde National Park, were shipped to Sweden with no one to protest. Even original ladders were removed from the "cliff dwellings" and shipped overseas.

Still, it was remarkable that as early as 1906 it was possible to persuade Congress to pass "An Act For The Preservation Of American Antiquities." This Federal law became the basis of protection of archaeological sites on public lands for at least half

a century, and ultimately formed one of the bases for "Salvage Archaeology," and similar projects. Generally, surveillance under the law was through The National Park Service.

By the 1930's, during the depression years, archaeologists used another public interest in employment problems by utilizing the W. P. A. , or Works Progress Administration, to dig archaeological sites. The projects were scheduled in a modest way, at least by present standards, and were scattered throughout the United States. Montana, too, had a few projects involving archaeological digs, although they were conducted with somewhat less than professional standards. Their primary purposes was the employment of men, and not necessarily for the benefit of the study of archaeological problems.

Later during the depression years the impetus for W. P. A. archaeology was stimulated through the efforts of men like Dr. William S. Webb, Chairman of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Tennessee, who made a powerful impression on American archaeology. His interest in the Tennessee Valley Authority (T. V. A. ), and its threat to the destruction of archaeological, and historical sites in the Tennessee River Basin by the construction of dams and related works, helped lead to "The Historical Sites Act, in 1935, and the Park, Parkways, and Recreational Areas Surveys Act of 1936. These acts provided a source of funds for archaeological and historical work in areas slated to be inundated forever by the waters of these great reservoirs. The reasoning for funding archaeology as a recreational matter was that the excavations, and related research could provide museum displays, informational tracts, and other items which the public could enjoy as a part of their recreation. The funds, of course, were still somewhat limited, but the idea of "salvage archaeology" was deeply implanted.

The W. P. A. , as mentioned, was concerned with employment of men during the depression years. In Montana the administrators accepted an archaeological project proposed with Melville Sayre, at the Montana School of Mines, Butte, in charge. Projects were scheduled which would utilize laborers in such places as Billings, Lewistown, Red Lodge, and Glendive and Miles City. In Billings, Pictograph Cave (also called at that time, "Indian Caves," "Inscription Caves") was excavated under the immediate field supervision of a cowboy and rancher, Oscar Lewis. South of Glendive a man named Wahle Phelan supervised the excavation of an earth lodge village, The Hagen Site. Others worked at Red Lodge. Sayre, apparently, failed to exercise adequate supervision over the projects, and later the trust was transferred to the University of Montana, under the direction of Harry Holbert Turney-High. Oscar Lewis, incidently, and Phelan seem to have engaged in jealous squabbles, and the latter was driven into the background. In the meantime, however, the W. P. A. finally hired a real, trained archaeologist to bring the projects into a scientific frame, and William T. Mulloy was hired. Oscar Lewis claimed much of the credit for the successes of the projects up to that time, and even afterwards. At any rate, the results of Mulloy's contributions proved to be paramount in the Northwest Plains.

Work at Pictograph Cave, near Billings, began in 1937, when the land on which it was located was purchased by the Montana State Highway Commission. In July and August of that year work also commenced at Red Lodge. This too was directed by Sayre, with a Mr. Thompson in local charge. Stimulus for such local work had to come through local people. For example someone in Red Lodge had enough interest, and especially influence to instigate the project. But, as was all too often the case of small town projects, when the influential person was gone projects were abandoned, and even the collections often dissipated. County officers could have cared less about archaeology. Even while archaeological work was being conducted local county and community officials complained that too many trucks were "tied up" from doing what they thought were more important jobs - the trucks were being used to transport workers from town to sites, and for carrying equipment. The quarterly W. P. A. reports written by the archaeologist was clear on this difficulty. Later, when the projects ceased, interest was so little that very little care was taken in seeing that the collections would not be lost. Twice in the Billings project the collections were allowed to dissipate into private hands, or through theft. The first time was before Mulloy was hired, and one of his more unpleasent tasks was to determine where the specimens had gone, and to retrieve them. The second time was immediately after World War II commenced when the museum at Pictograph Cave was stripped of its specimens. Items not on display, such as chips, bones, etc. are still in existence at the University of Montana, but the finer items, apparently, are in private hands somewhere. The problem of the disposition of artifacts after a "dig" was a problem then, and is still a vastly underrated matter with modern "Cultural Resources Management" procedures.

Suddenly, World War II arrested all of the archseological work in most of the United States. Already, though, the success of the T. V. A. dams had stimulated interests in building huge hydroelectric dams on other river systems, and many projects were planned. Some of these were even authorized for construction just before World War II, but no appropriations were made for funding them until after the war.

After World War II much interest resumed in what was known as "The Pick-Sloan Act" which provided for a number of multi-purpose dams on several great American River systems. Specifically, 589 projects were authorized for construction, and 105 of these were slated for the Missouri River Basin. The dams had been planned by both the U. S. Corps of Engineers, and the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation. It was obvious to archaeologists that the intense interests in the construction of massive reservoir projects would doom thousands of archaeological and historical sites. Some of these dams were designed to inundate the land as much as 150 miles behind the structure, although some were intended to only cover 10 to 15 miles upstream from the dam. For archaeology, all of these together could have represented a disaster.

A "Planning Committee of the Society For American Archaeology" was organized in May, 1945, and the active assistance of other scientific froups was solicited, among these being the Ameerican Anthropological Association, The National Research Council, and the Council of Learned Societies. The committee consisted of leading people

from universities, the government, and museums. It included names such as that of Frank H. H. Roberts, Jr. (Smithsonian), J. O. Brew (Harvard, Peabody Museum), Frederick Johnson (Phillips Andover Academy), and John Corbett (National Park Service,) and others.

It was stressed that it would be impossible, forever, to study the archaeology of these river basins once inundation, erosion, and sedimentation destroyed these evidences. It was emphasized that 80% of all the archaeological materials in the United States was located behind the dams slated for construction (although it was not written how this figure was determined.) In the Missouri Basin, for example, proponents stated that once the dams were completed it would never be possible again to study the history of the movements of the Mandan, Hidatsa, or Arikara, in the Missouri River Basin after the destruction was over.

The committee members stressed that this was not to become another vast W. P. A. type of project. Frederick Johnson wrote that the labor force was to be different this time, and the standards of quality more rigid. (Johnson, 1947, p. 213. Another common statement at that time was that this was a task which was far beyond the personnel capacity for Federal agencies hiring archaeologists to handle alone, particularly the National Park Service, and Smithsonian Institution. All archaeologists' in the country were asked to become involved. Still another policy involved the disposition of artifacts, and specimens recovered were to be deposited in major local or regional centers or museums, except for a sampling which could be reserved for the collections of the U. S. National Museum, or small displays at the damsite. If an excavation or survey was contracted out to, say, a university or museum field party agreements specified that some specimens could be made available for a visitors display or museum at the damsite. This latter measure, of course was the result of the method of funding, dating back to the enactment of the Historic Sites Act of 1935, and the Park, Parkways, and Recreational Areas Surveys Act of 1936. Another new feature of the research was that history, and paleontology were included.

Pesides professionals, support was sought from others as well, and local interest was deemed essential to keep Congressmen interested in the work. Many amateurs responded to the call, and a classic example was the work of the Missouri Archaeological Society.

Finally, in 1945 agreements, or a "Memrandum of Understanding" was made between the several Federal agencies involved, viz., The National Park Service, Smithsonian Institution, The U. S. Corps of Engineers, and the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation. Three of these were within the Department of the Interior while the other was in the War Department. Later, some other agencies were added to the list of those engaged in archaeological salvage work.

An estimated 10% of the budgets of the construction was earmarked for public "recreation," and part of this was set aside for archaeological work. The National Park Service had the role of providing the overall management of the work, its

quality, as well as the dispersal of funds of funds and contracting. Smithsonian Institution handled much of the actual field work for the government by creating The River Basin Surveys, and then dividing these into "projects," such as The Missouri Project, and the Pacific Project. They also made professional recommendations for sites to be contracted to State and local agencies. This was under the direction of Frank H.H. Roberts, jr. Obviously, only a small percentage of the sites discovered could be excavated before inundation made it impossible. Thus, National Park Service and Smithsonian personnel conferred and made decisions which of these had the highest priorities. Then they were assigned to university, museum crews, and other local agencies for excavation. Sometimes, such as in Montana, the University personnel also contracted to do some of the survey work.

In the field a survey of the reservoir basin was made first, usually by a River Basin Survey crew. Initial work began in 1946 with 28 Bureau of Reclamation dams scheduled for construction, and eight for work by the Corps of Engineers. Within a very few years over 15,000 sites were recorded, and over 4,000,000 artifacts found, and the surveys covered dams in 42 States. (Brew, 1961, p. 4) It was expected that only about 10% of the materials and information available at that time could be retrieved. Sometimes earth moving machinery was utilized to hasten the removal of overburden at sites which were entirely underground, and often screening of the soil was eliminated from the digging process in order to save time in excavations.<sup>1</sup>

After a reservoir basin was initially surveyed its sites were sometimes classified into six types according to their estimated importance to archaeology, and their probability of loss. The first was expressed with letters A, B, and C, in decreasing order of importance. The second figure was expressed by numbers 1, 2, and 3, in decreasing order of probability of loss. Thus, a site with the highest priority was assigned an A - 1 classification. Others would be A - 2, A - 3, B - 1, B - 2, B - 3, C - 1, C - 2, C - 3.

Along much of the Missouri River the archaeologists responsible for selecting sites for excavation gave high priority to earth lodge communities, many of them given A - 1 ratings. However, some stratified sites, and a few early man sites were also given this rating. In some respects this is unfortunate since breadth of overall information was sacrificed for details, if not minutiae on earthlodges such as angles of beams and leaners, posts, etc., and considerable emphasis in reports began to be placed on how many cubic meters of dirt was removed during the excavation process - as if the amounts given measured the success of a dig. By reducing or eliminating screening it was possible to remove even more cubic meters of dirt.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Roberts, 1948, p. 3

<sup>2</sup> There have been some studies, such as one in California, which showed that careful troweling, and shoveling can retrieve over 90% of the artifacts in a site without screening. Thus, screening, under some circumstances, may not really be necessary.

Sometimes the State crews were assigned basic survey work such as that which was conducted by the University of Montana during the Summers of 1949, and 1950, in the Canyon Ferry Reservoir Basin, near Helena (Malouf, 1952). In this instance, two hasty (by necessity) earlier surveys had been made by River Basin Survey field crews, but the University parties were allowed much more time to conduct a more thorough study (Hughes and Bliss, 1947; Hughes and Bliss, 1948). The earlier field work here was conducted between August 28, and September 1, 1946, by Jack T. Hughes, and Wesley L. Bliss. The two returned the next year, August 14 to August 24, 1947, with two additional members of the field party, J. M. Shippee, and George Pierce. During these same Summers the River Basin crews also had to investigate other reservoir basins, such as Medicine Lake, and Tiber dam, so their time was limited. In the meantime, the River Basin Surveys acquired a paleontologist, and a historian. Dr. T. E. White devoted a few days to a study of paleontology at Canyon Ferry, and Merrill J. Mattes did an historical study of the area. Now, paleontology and history have been added to the list of items sought by salvage workers. Field survey crews were urged by Dr. Gordon Baldwin, archaeologist for the National Park Service regional office, Omaha, Nebraska, to record cabins, yard structures, layouts, roads - anything of historical value. With this modest beginning, as we shall see, this led to the development of a new field now called HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY.

Curiously, paleontologists still show little concern over "salvage paleontology," some of them feeling that inundation, in relationship to the total deposits of huge fossil beds adjoining, are of little concern. Historians, on the other hand, now share an interest in historic sites archaeology, and the recovery of data and information about them.

One aspect of the agreements between the National Park Service, and the State or local agencies for conducting salvage archaeology field work was the compounding of funding inherent in this arrangement. I understand that Jesse Jennings, an archaeologist with the National Park Service at the time procedures were instigated, introduced the idea to increase the amount of activity accomplished with Federal dollars by having State or other local agencies contribute to the financing of the projects. In negotiating with a University, for example, this institution would pay for the salary of the Field Director, usually a faculty member who was an archaeologist, and they would also furnish vehicles for transportation, equipment for digging, and for camping. The National Park Service funds provided pay or a stipend for the crew members, and costs of transportation. In this way, as an example, the University costs might be, say, \$800 while the National Park Service provided \$4,000. Thus, for \$800 a University could get \$4,800 worth of research to its credit. The National Park Service, in turn, felt that for \$4,000 they obtained \$4,800 worth of work done. By using student labor, moreover, expenses could be kept down since they sought experience as well as money. Often they were offered (at a reduced rate) college credits in addition to a stipend, or a small pay allowance and expenses. This process is mentioned because now, with emphasis on contracts for money, some public officials think the best way to "deal" for agency money is by creating a competitive atmosphere among bidders for a "job." At the University of Utah Jennings



estimated that his university spent \$1.00 for each \$3.00 provided by the Federal agency. Jennings, incidently, preferred to use the word, "emergency" archaeology since the term "salvage" was beginning to imply haste in work.

The success of the River Basin surveys proliferated into similar projects involving other government agencies. After all, they too promoted the construction of buildings, highways, airports, communications structures, and other types of earth modifying works. Moreover, they were covered by most of the same, basic legislative acts which developed the archaeological activities with the National Park Service, and various other government agencies in the river basins. Now could be added the Bureau of Public Roads, and the Federal Power Commission. Finally, there has been added others such as the U. S. Bureau of Land Management, the U. S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the U. S. Geological Survey, the U. S. Geodetic Survey, and others.

Even public utilities were not left exempt from the action. Pipeline companies who traversed Federal lands were "persuaded" to fund archaeological surveys before a right-of-way came under construction, or they might be subject to prosecution for violating various congressional acts which covered antiquities. Those who planned for highways, too, were persuaded to fund archaeological surveys before construction commenced.

The Bureau of Public Roads issued a "Policy and Procedure Memorandum," 20-7, August 24, 1959, which implemented salvage archaeology along highways being constructed. At that time major U. S. Highways were funded by "Federal Aid" to States, the Federal paying 90% of the costs while States provided the remaining 10%. Archaeological work, too, had to be funded 90% Federally, and 10% by State sources. The University of Montana was designated by the regional highway salvage officer, Luther C. Cressman, as the State agency to conduct salvage archaeology on highways, and most of the work has continued to be under the aegis of the University. When the Interstate Highway system was commenced, however, the work was fully financed by Federal sources.

In the Northwestern States some archaeologists criticized the highway salvage programs. At an annual meeting of the Northwest Anthropological Conference, May, 1958, for example, there were remarks that the highways were being mostly built above lowlands and bottomlands, where there were few sites. Therefore, it was deemed to be not worth the money or the time to conduct such surveys.<sup>1</sup> In Montana,

---

<sup>1</sup> Stallard, Bruce. Highway Salvage Archaeology In The State of Washington: An Appraisal." Talk given at the Northwest Anthropological Conference, Pullman, Washington. May 9, 1958. From Abstracts of the Conference, p. 3, "The poor results would indicate that a program of this kind is not worthwhile in this state."

however, this view has not been shared, and already several publications have appeared from the University resulting from years of highway salvage field work.<sup>1</sup>

Pipeline companies traversing Federal lands also funded salvage studies before and during the laying of pipes. The results of pipeline archaeology, however, has not been as spectacular as that of other types.

One great personality behind pipeline archaeology was Jesse Nusbaum, of the National Park Service, regional office, Santa Fe, New Mexico. Nusbaum negotiated with the pipeline companies to hire the archaeologists who surveyed the pipeline right of way. One of the most successful pipeline archaeological studies was funded by the El Paso Gas Company along a natural gas line through the American Southwest, primarily across Arizona, New Mexico, and into Texas.<sup>2</sup>

Another pipeline which extended from San Juan County, in southeastern Utah, to the Pacific Northwest, resulted in another archaeological survey. Still another was built for over 300 miles between Green River, Wyoming, and Denver, Colorado. Both utilized archaeologists in surveys along the right of way. The line through Wyoming and Colorado was constructed by the Colorado Interstate Gas Company, and the field work was done by personnel from the University of Montana. The project lasted through two Summers, and resulted in the discovery of 130 sites ranging from tipi rings and occupation sites in high mountain ranges to similar finds in desert areas and in plains east of the Rocky Mountains, along the South Platte River.

If there were critics of the highway salvage and pipeline projects there were also those who felt there were deficiencies in the River Basin surveys. Robert Heizer<sup>3</sup> (Heizer, 1966, pp. 54, 57) of the University of California, for example, was concerned that archaeology had been traditionally oriented on problem solving, and that salvage archaeology "does not provide us with new and important data and because few of its findings are published and available to the professional public..." He was also concerned that funds were being diverted to projects which were not very fruitful, and therefore wasteful of time, personnel, as well as funds. He added, "But not all archaeological data are of equal significance. If we devote too much time and energy (both of these being finite quantities) to the amassing of non-critical data

---

<sup>1</sup> Sharrock, Susan, editor. Collected Papers In Salvage Anthropology, 1971-72. Contributions to Anthropology, No. 4. University of Montana, Missoula. 1974.

Sharrock, Susan R. Compiler. Collected Papers In Highway Salvage Archaeology 1972-74. Contributions to Anthropology, No. 5. University of Montana, Missoula. 1975.

<sup>2</sup> Wendorf, Fred; Nancy Fox, and Brian L. Lewis, editors. Pipeline Archaeology, Laboratory of Anthropology, Santa Fe, New Mexico, and Museum of Northern Arizona, Flagstaff, Arizona. 1956.

<sup>3</sup> Heizer, Robert F. "Salvage and Other Archaeology," The Masterkey, Southwest Museum, Los Angeles, California, Vol. 40, No. 2, 1966. pp. 54, 57.

and thereby allow the collection of critical information to lapse we shall each of us have been an accessory to a kind of directed research which has beguiled us away from our central responsibility as professional American archaeologists." (Heizer, 1966, p. 57). Jesse Jennings responded to this criticism by pointing out that "emergency archaeology" (he preferred this name) required work at all sites which could be discovered in any given area affected by a project - all sites, not just a selected site or two. "Sites and their contents, by their mere presence, have equal importance and must be given the same conscientious attention." (Jennings, 1963) Another advantage, he felt, was the large collections which could be obtained. "I would prefer to dig ten sites of a given culture with all possible speed than to devote the same time to tedious and sometimes spurious eroding away of one such site with a whisk broom. In short, my preference is to get 95% of the data from ten sites instead of 99% from one." (Jennings, 1963, p. 283).

Clearly, by the 1960's, the idea of "salvage archaeology" or "emergency archaeology," had started to force some changes in the way professionals worked, and thought. There was a move away from strict, narrow "problem oriented" excavations and extended laboratory work to a more massive, but broader approach. Time had become a critical matter, and there were new ideas about the use of field labor. It changed the relationships between colleagues, and it brought about more serious thinking about the relationships between professionals and amateurs. It introduced the use of more sophisticated machinery into excavations, and it started a movement toward a greater interest in Historic Archaeology.

Archaeological work within the National Parks and Monuments was stimulated by the general atmosphere of the movement in salvage archaeology. For two Summers the University of Montana had a contract to locate and map sites in Yellowstone National Park.<sup>1</sup> Another survey was made in Glacier National Park when an important new roadway was built on the west side.<sup>2</sup> Since 1965 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has contracted with the University for a survey of the National Bison Range, in western Montana, and the Grants-Kohrs Ranch National Historic Site, in the Deerlodge Valley. Leslie Davis, of Montana State University has made surveys of Federal lands along the banks in the Missouri River basin, central Montana.

The movement also influenced water power generating plants, especially in reservoir basins behind dams. In 1955 the Federal District Attorney (Dalton [ierson]) assisted the University of Montana in acquiring grants from the Washington Water Power Company for a salvage archaeological survey of their new reservoir basin behind Noxon Dam, along the Lower Clark Fork River, in western Montana. The company not only provided funds for archaeology, but also supported research in geology, history, sociology, botany, and zoology.

Some State officers, too, became "salvage" conscious, and in Montana The State

---

<sup>1</sup> The work was commenced by C. Malouf (1958) and Dee C. Taylor (1959)

<sup>2</sup> C. Malouf, in 1963. The field supervisor was Allen Carmichael.

Land Board required an archaeological study of deposits below a buffalo "jump" near Ulm, Montana. Here a fertilizer packaging firm wanted to bulldoze out the jump deposits to sell as potting soil. The Montana State Highway Commission, and later the State Fish and Game Commission have provided funds to help excavations at Fort Owen State Monument. Excavations of this site have extended over a period of at least twenty years.

Historic Archaeology: The modest beginnings in historic archaeology by River Basin salvage crews began to make researchers aware that not all the story of our own recent ancestors in North America, scarcely six generations back, is told by history alone. Of course, Americans were interested in classical finds, and even in spectacular historical sites, such as Jamestown, or Williamsburg, but to not single cabins, common old homesteads, etc. seemed ridiculous to most archaeologists. Documentary evidences too often had a tendency to stress political matters, or economic conditions or activities, or unusual events were recorded. Everyday matters were usually overlooked. Historic archaeology began to prove of value since it broadened our knowledge of the lifeways of the American settlers. At Fort Owen, for example, archaeologists from the University of Montana were able to add much data on the everyday life of the people who lived there between 1852 and 1916 -- data that was not recorded in journals, newspapers, letters or similar sources.

A considerable amount of the earlier excavations in historic archaeology resulted from archaeological projects which were aimed primarily at work in prehistoric sites, and materials in them doomed by construction work. Thus, the excavations were primarily intended for prehistoric sites, and far too often the ordinary historic remains were simply studied because they were there. It consisted mostly of simple records of building layouts, and general comments on artifacts found at the site. Historic references were also quoted if the materials was readily available. The classification of artifacts (guns and ammunition excepted) was rudimentary - mainly consisting of a bare listing of artifacts by names and numbers or quantity. The archaeologists schooled in prehistory, and taught to classify by bone, stone, antler, pottery, etc. could not use this system with historic goods of glass, iron, and many other materials. So a simple list was made.

The necessity of being both a competent historian and archaeologist in order to more properly prepare data for publication has contributed to the slowness of the development of this subfield, and the scarcity of publications. Nevertheless, information began to increase on the subject, and occasionally papers were presented during the 1960's in connection with more standard anthropological meetings. During the decade the Society for American Archaeology scheduled a single session on "Historic Sites Archaeology," and in 1966 the Northwest Anthropological Conference (At Banff, Alberta, 1966) devoted a morning session to this topic. Still, it was regarded by most American archaeologists as a sort of "step child." Yet, by now, (1981) there is a Society For Historic Archaeology, a journal called *Historic Archaeology*, annual meetings, dues, officers - "the works." Relating history and archaeology

is becoming a refined subfield, and new systems of classification of artifacts, and structures have come into being.

Salvage archaeology has grown into "Cultural Resources Management," an increase in expenditures for archaeology has made field work more extensive although it is also more complex in organization and operation. Various government agencies now have a number of their own archaeologists, and private companies of research personnel have been organized to profit from the field work. It has changed the manner of collecting artifacts which, in turn, has placed the laboratory work which followed the field work in older days in jeopardy. There are more serious questions about the quality of the post field work relating to geological, biological, and historical analysis. If the emphasis seems to be on field work for profit for companies, or salaries and compensation for faculty and students in academia. *Maybe Robert Helzer was prophetic in some of his views of "salvage archaeology."*

## REFERENCES

- Anonymous. River Basin Archaeology: A Race Against Time. National Council For Historic Sites and Buildings. Washington D C. (Photo Section prepared by Dr. John M. Corbett, National Park Service.) 1949. Reprinted from: 'Planning and Civic Comment, " American Planning and Civil Association, Washington D C. 1949.
- Bliss, Wesley L. Preliminary Appraisal of the Archaeological And Paleontological Resources Of Tiber Reservoir, Toole and Liberty Counties, Montana. Prepared by Missouri Valley Project, River Basin Surveys, Smithsonian Institution. FCR: Missouri Basin Recreation Survey, Region 2, National Park Service. Lincoln, Nebraska. June, 1947.
- Bliss, Wesley L. Preliminary Appraisal of the Archaeological and Paleontological Resources of Medicine Lake Reservoir, Montana. Prepared by Missouri Valley Project, River Basin Surveys, Smithsonian Institution. FCR: Missouri River Basin Recreation Survey, Region 2, National Park Service. Lincoln, Nebraska. July, 1947.
- Brew, J. C. "Symposium On River Valley Archaeology." American Antiquity, Vol. 12, No. 4. 1947. pp. 209-225.
- Brew, J. C. "Emergency Archaeology: Salvage In Advance of Technological Progress." Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society. Vol. 105, No. 1. 1961. pp. 1-10.
- Brew, J. C. "Saving The Past From The Present." The Nation. August, 1966. pp. 117-120.
- Caldwell, Joseph R. "The Archaeological Survey at the Allatoona Reservoir. Georgia." In, "Symposium On River Valley Archaeology," edited by J. C. Brew, American Antiquity, Vol. 12, No. 4. 1947.
- Champe, John L. "The University of Nebraska and the Missouri Valley Project." In, "Symposium On River Valley Archaeology," edited by J. C. Brew, American Antiquity, Vol. 12, No. 4, 1947.
- Corbett, John M. Symposium On Salvage Archaeology. (Held under the auspices of The Society For American Archaeology, and The Committee For The Recovery of Archaeological Remains.) Bloomington, Indiana, 1955. Department of the Interior, National Park Service Report. 1947
- Fenenga, Franklin. Appraisal of the Archaeological and Paleontological Resources of Sun River Basin, Montana. Prepared by Missouri Valley Project, River Basin Surveys, Smithsonian Institution. FOR, Missouri River Basin Recreation Survey, Region 2, National Park Service. Lincoln, Nebraska. 1951.

- Fenenga, Franklin. Appraisal Of The Archaeological and Paleontological Resources Of The Jefferson River Basin, Montana. Prepared by Missouri Valley Project, River Basin Surveys, Smithsonian Institution. FCR, Missouri Valley Basin Recreation Survey, Region 2. National Park Service. Lincoln, Nebraska. 1951.
- Heizer, Robert "Salvage and Other Archaeology." The Masterkey, Southwest Museum, Vol. 40, No. 2. Los Angeles, California. 1966. pp. 54-60.
- Hughes, Jack T. and Wesley L. Bliss. Preliminary Appraisal of the Archaeological and Paleontological Resources of Canyon Ferry Reservoir, Montana. Prepared by the Missouri Valley Project, River Basin Surveys, Smithsonian Institution, FCR: Missouri River Basin Recreation Survey, Region 2, National Park Service. Lincoln, Nebraska. 1947.
- Hughes, Jack T. and Wesley L. Bliss. Preliminary Appraisal of the Archaeological and Paleontological Resources of Yellowtail Reservoir, Montana and Wyoming. Prepared by the Missouri Valley Project, River Basin Surveys, Smithsonian Institution. FCR, Missouri River Basin Recreation Survey, Region 2, National Park Service. Lincoln, Nebraska. 1947.
- Hughes, Jack T. and Wesley L. Bliss. Supplementary Appraisal Of The Archaeological and Paleontological Resources of Canyon Ferry Reservoir, Lewis and Clark and Broadwater Counties, Montana. Prepared For Missouri Valley Project, River Basin Surveys, Smithsonian Institution. FCR, Missouri River Basin Recreation Survey, Region 2, National Park Service. Lincoln, Nebraska. March, 1948.
- Hughes, Jack T. and Wesley L. Bliss. Supplementary Appraisal of the Archaeological and Paleontological Resources of Tiber Reservoir, Toole and Liberty Counties, Montana. Prepared by Missouri Valley Project, River Basin Surveys, Smithsonian Institution, FCR Missouri River Basin Recreation Survey, Region 2, National Park Service. Lincoln, Nebraska, March 1948.
- Jefferson, Thomas. Notes On Virginia Paris, 1784 (dated 1782). Reprinted in: The Life And Selected Writings Of Thomas Jefferson. The Modern Library, Random House, New York. 1944. pp. 221-224.
- Jennings, Jesse D. "Administration of Contract Emergency Archaeological Programs." American Antiquity, Vol. 28, No. 3. 1963. pp. 282-285.
- Johnson, Frederick. "The Work Of The Committee For The Recovery of Archaeological Remains, Aims, History, and Activities To Date." American Antiquity, Vol. 12, No. 4. 1947.
- Kahler, Herbert E. "The Role Of The National Park Service In River Basin Archaeology With Particular Reference to Inter-Bureau Agreements." In, Symposium On River Valley Archaeology, edited by J. C. Brew. American Antiquity, Vol. 12, No. 4. 1947.

- Malouf, Carling I. The Archaeology of the Canyon Ferry Region, Montana.  
Anthropology and Sociology Papers, No. II. University of Montana, Missoula.  
1952.
- Mattes, Merrill J. "New Reservoir To Cover Prehistoric Indian Sites, Old Mining  
Camps." Montana Parade, Great Falls Tribune, July 3, 1949. pp. 6-9.
- Roberts, Frank H. H., Jr. "The Head Office In The Smithsonian Institution and  
Cooperation With State And Local Institutions." In, "Symposium On River  
Valley Archaeology." Edited by J. C. Nrew. American Antiquity, Vol. 12,  
No. 4, 1947.
- Roberts, Frank H. H. jr. "A Crisis In U. S. Archaeology." Scientific American,  
December, 1948. pp. 2-7.
- Shiner, Joel. Archaeological Resources In The Libby and Katka Reservoirs,  
Northern Idaho and Northwestern Montana. Columbia River Project, River  
Basin Surveys, Columbia Project. 1950.
- Strong, William Duncan. "The Coordinated River Approach - A World Problem."  
In, "Symposium On River Valley Archaeology," edited by J. C. Brew.  
American Antiquity, Vol. 12, No. 4. 1947.
- Wedel, Waldo R. Prehistory And The Missouri Valley Development Program:  
Summary Report On The Missouri River Basin Archaeological Survey In 1946.  
Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections, Vol. 107, No. 6. Washington D. C.  
1947.
- Wedel, Waldo R. Prehistory And The Missouri Valley Development Program:  
Summary Report On The Missouri River Basin Archaeological Survey in 1947.  
Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections, Vol. 111, No. 2. Washington D C 1948.
- Wedel, Waldo R. "The Missouri River Basin Archaeological Survey in 1946." In,  
"Symposium On River Valley Archaeology," edited by J. C. Brew, American  
Antiquity, Vol. 12, No. 4. 1947.