**Archaeology Southwest** (formerly the Center for Desert Archaeology) is a private 501 (c) (3) nonprofit organization that explores and protects the places of our past across the American Southwest and Mexican Northwest. We have developed an integrated, conservation-based approach known as Preservation Archaeology.

Although Preservation Archaeology begins with the active protection of archaeological sites, it doesn't end there. We utilize holistic, low-impact investigation methods in order to pursue big-picture questions about what life was like long ago. As a part of our mission to help foster advocacy and appreciation for the special places of our past, we share our discoveries with the public. This free back issue of *Archaeology Southwest Magazine* is one of many ways we connect people with the Southwest’s rich past. **Enjoy!**

**Not yet a member? Join today!**
Membership to Archaeology Southwest includes:

- A **Subscription** to our esteemed, quarterly *Archaeology Southwest Magazine*
- **Updates** from *This Month at Archaeology Southwest*, our monthly e-newsletter
- **25% off purchases** of in-print, in-stock publications through our bookstore
- **Discounted registration fees** for Hands-On Archaeology classes and workshops
- **Free pdf downloads** of *Archaeology Southwest Magazine*, including our current and most recent issues
- Access to our on-site **research library**
- **Invitations** to our annual members’ meeting, as well as other special events and lectures

Join us at [archaeologysouthwest.org/how-to-help](http://archaeologysouthwest.org/how-to-help)

In the meantime, stay informed at our regularly updated [Facebook page](https://www.facebook.com/archaeologysouthwest)!
THE GALISTEO BASIN of northern New Mexico is one of the preeminent archaeological districts in the Greater Southwest. Home to several ruined Pre-Columbian and historic villages of the Tano and Keres peoples, each more than a thousand rooms in size, the basin was also the setting for Nels C. Nelson’s groundbreaking chronological research nearly a century ago that marked a major innovation in American archaeology (see page 2).

If all this is true, why do we know so little about the ancient Galisteo? And why has the region remained obscure compared with neighboring areas such as the Pajarito Plateau or the Salinas missions farther south? Sites like Pueblo San Cristóbal are so vast as to be intimidating, and Nelson cast a long shadow among successive generations of archaeologists. Yet I think that the critical factor in limiting archaeological knowledge about the Galisteo Basin is that—unlike much of the West—there is almost no public land in the region. When Nelson came west from New York in 1912, San Cristóbal and many of the other sites were on the Pankey Ranch—now the Singleton Ranch, but still resolutely private. There are no national monuments, forests, or state parks, and only a few scattered fragments of state and Bureau of Land Management property can be found on the Galisteo map. Archaeologists, like most people, often follow the path of least resistance, and, given the greater ease of working on the public domain, our efforts for much of the twentieth century were directed elsewhere. This lapse of interest in the Galisteo is particularly unfortunate because of its importance in resolving some of the central questions of the Pre-Columbian Southwest. It is thought to have been one of the destinations of Ancestral Pueblo people fleeing the Four Corners at the end of the 1200s, but despite important work by archaeologist Bertha P. Dutton in the 1950s and 1960s, the question has never been satisfactorily resolved.

Several of the Galisteo villages persisted into the historic era, making them ideal places to study the changing circumstances faced by the Tano people under Spanish colonization. A place like Pueblo San Marcos was inhabited for...
In July 1912, the Danish archaeologist Nels C. Nelson arrived at San Cristóbal, an immense ruined pueblo in the heart of the Galisteo Basin, facing a daunting task. Only a few months before, while a graduate student at the University of California, Berkeley, he had come to the attention of Clark Wissler, curator of anthropology at the American Museum of Natural History in New York. Wissler believed that unraveling the chronology of ancient Pueblo sites in the Southwest was a crucial challenge, and tapped Nelson for the job. Over the next four years, Nelson patiently excavated hundreds of rooms in more than a dozen Galisteo locations. Ultimately Nelson focused on midden deposits, developing the concept of “artificial stratigraphy” that is familiar to subsequent generations of archaeologists. By documenting changes in artifact style over time, Nelson solved the “Southwest problem,” thereby revolutionizing field methods and enshrining the Galisteo Basin in the history of American archaeology.

However, along with the Galisteo’s archaeological potential is the opportunity it presents for integrating scholarly research with public involvement and education. Working in the region is impossible without close coordination among archaeologists, landowners, and other interested communities. Although there are no occupied pueblos in the basin today, descendant communities at Santo Domingo, Santa Clara, and Hano take an active role in monitoring cultural resources. This complex landscape, that may have discouraged researchers 50 years ago, may now be an advantage, particularly as archaeologists become increasingly aware that engaging the public is the cornerstone of future success. As archaeological projects proliferate in the twenty-first-century Galisteo Basin, so also do new strategies for building these connections, as well as for strengthening the bonds between the people and the past that surrounds them.

The articles in this issue of Archaeology Southwest look at new research in the Galisteo Basin from a variety of perspectives. Some present vexing archaeological questions, while others address concerns of public policy or reflect points of view that may differ considerably from those of institutionally based archaeologists. All, however, address two themes: first, that the Galisteo is a rich resource for the cultural heritage of the Southwest, and second, that we will never be in a position to understand it better unless the public is a full partner in our work.

Nels C. Nelson (1875–1964)

In July 1912, the Danish archaeologist Nels C. Nelson arrived at San Cristóbal, an immense ruined pueblo in the heart of the Galisteo Basin, facing a daunting task. Only a few months before, while a graduate student at the University of California, Berkeley, he had come to the attention of Clark Wissler, curator of anthropology at the American Museum of Natural History in New York. Wissler believed that unraveling the chronology of ancient Pueblo sites in the Southwest was a crucial challenge, and tapped Nelson for the job. Over the next four years, Nelson patiently excavated hundreds of rooms in more than a dozen Galisteo locations. Ultimately Nelson focused on midden deposits, developing the concept of “artificial stratigraphy” that is familiar to subsequent generations of archaeologists. By documenting changes in artifact style over time, Nelson solved the “Southwest problem,” thereby revolutionizing field methods and enshrining the Galisteo Basin in the history of American archaeology.
A **once-in-a-lifetime opportunity** exists to save a fabled place. The Galisteo Basin Archaeological Sites Protection Act, passed by Congress and signed into law by President George W. Bush in 2004, provides for “the preservation, protection, and interpretation of the nationally significant archaeological resources in the Galisteo Basin” of New Mexico. Including sites such as San Cristóbal, Pueblo Galisteo, Pueblo Blanco, Pueblo San Marcos, and Arroyo Hondo, the act protects some of the largest and most storied Ancestral Pueblo settlements in North America. All told, the legislation identifies 24 individual “protection sites” ranging from large and small pueblos to spectacular rock art sites and Spanish Colonial settlements. Buried in these sites is an untouched trove of unique artifacts and data spanning five centuries of Southwestern prehistory and history—from the Puebloan settlement of the Rio Grande Valley through Classic period construction of large villages, to Spanish conquest and missionization and the cataclysmic events of the Pueblo Revolt of 1680.

How can we ensure that this irreplaceable resource is protected? Although no funding has been appropriated for the act, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is responsible for its implementation. The BLM has begun working with county, state, and federal agencies—as well as tribal governments, local communities, landowners, developers, and preservationists—to seek input and guidance on how to implement the act’s requirements.

A coordination group representing this diverse partnership has been formed as the result of recommendations provided by participants at an initial stakeholders’ meeting. Four subcommittees, which will perform much of the detailed work of implementing the act, are already beginning their assignments.

Individual meetings with property owners are being scheduled. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Archaeological Conservancy (which owns or holds an easement at) was signed by the BLM in April. MOUs are being drafted with Santa Fe County and the New Mexico State Land Office. A web site, providing information on the Galisteo legislation, the protection sites, and contact information, is currently under construction.

In May, the Archaeological Conservancy sponsored a well-attended site management plan workshop at three sites—La Cieneguilla Pueblo, La Cieneguilla Petroglyphs, and the Camino Real site. The resulting plan will be used by the Archaeological Conservancy to manage its Camino Real site, and the BLM and Santa Fe County will use it to identify issues and opportunities at the two sites they manage. Another site management plan workshop, sponsored by the Archaeological Conservancy, was conducted at Arroyo Hondo in late September.

Also as a result of the act, the New Mexico Historic Preservation Division is considering offering a grant to complete National Register nominations at Galisteo sites. If funded, the grant will offer a way to assess and document 20 of the 24 sites that are not listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

For the first time in three centuries, the Galisteo Basin is teeming with activity. The Galisteo Watershed Partnership, Santa Fe County planning efforts at Petroglyph Hill and in the surrounding Thornton Ranch, James Snead’s excavations at Burnt Corn Pueblo (see page 6), rock art investigations at Pueblo San Cristóbal by Marit Munson, as well as work at Pueblo Galisteo by the Office of Archaeological Studies demonstrate the high level of public and professional interest in the conservation of the Galisteo Basin’s cultural and natural resources. The timing for implementation of the act could not be better.
PUBLIC ARCHAEOLOGY has many manifestations; one of the earliest and most innovative endeavors grew out of a partnership between the Museum of New Mexico and the Girl Scouts of America. For six years, between 1951 and 1956, Bertha P. Dutton, curator of ethnology at the Museum of New Mexico in Santa Fe, conducted a field school for senior Girl Scouts at Pueblo Largo in the Galisteo Basin. Dutton embraced the philosophy of her mentor, Edgar Lee Hewett, who believed that archaeologists associated with museums and institutions of higher learning had an obligation to educate the public about the meaning and preservation of the past. He also was one of the few archaeologists of his generation who encouraged women to conduct their own research.

At the 1947 meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Dutton articulated what sounds like a very modern vision statement for public archaeology. In her address, she described the goals of the program of travel and study she would implement for the Girl Scouts. The project was designed to “widen and sharpen their perspective of the science of man… An enlightened youth will be far less likely to destroy antiquities if he knows their value to society… An important phase of any program would be the stressing of conservation in every possible way; conservation of the land itself, of the products of the land, [and] of past cultural expressions.”

By 1950, the young women who had participated in Dutton’s Girl Scout mobile archaeological program were urging her to develop an excavation project. Their request fit in with her own research questions about the immigration of people from the Mesa Verde region into the Galisteo Basin at the end of the thirteenth century. She wanted to continue the work that Nels C. Nelson had begun in the basin in the early 1900s (see page 2). Dutton selected Pueblo Largo, a Tano (southern Tewa) site on private land with a predominantly Coalition period occupation (A.D. 1150–1325) for her field school.

Several things made the Pueblo Largo excavation an unusual public archaeology project. The fact that a woman designed and managed a dig with an all-female crew was unique for the time; if there was a place for women in archaeology, that place was usually the laboratory, not the field. Although the gender of Pueblo Largo’s principal investigator and crew did not receive much publicity, it was a subtle message to the profession that women did, indeed, belong in the field.

While today’s students have many opportunities to participate in excavations, the Pueblo Largo project was a milestone because its field crew was composed of high school, rather than college, students. Dutton put together a program that was the equivalent of an introductory college-level course in anthropology and Southwestern archaeology, plus an undergraduate field school season, at a time when excavations were being conducted by crews of undergraduates, local laborers, and graduate students. The young women moved immense amounts of dirt, operated a meticulous field laboratory, and learned to keep detailed records of the artifacts collected.

Several young women who worked at Pueblo Largo obtained advanced degrees in anthropology. Most went on to careers in other fields but have retained a lifelong interest in Southwestern archaeology. The rigor and camaraderie of the field school were life-changing events for many of the Girl Scouts. One digger, who returned to the Museum of New Mexico in October of 2004, summed up the significance of Dutton’s project when she said, “She taught us to be bold.”

Dirty Diggers meet with Laboratory of Anthropology staff, October 2004.
AT LEAST 30,000 PETROGLYPHS can be found in the Galisteo Basin, and the Archaeological Society of New Mexico (ASNM) has been instrumental in recording them. ASNM is a volunteer organization of avocational and professional archaeologists that began recording rock art about 30 years before the organization came to the Galisteo Basin. Initially led by Colonel James Bain, ASNM held an annual summer Rock Art Recording Field School at different locations in New Mexico. During the 1990s, however, the summer field school was replaced by year-round recording directed by Jay and Helen Crotty, who had succeeded Bain, most notably in collaboration with the National Park Service at Albuquerque’s Petroglyph National Monument. Simultaneously, the Rock Art Recording Program (RARP) began assisting ASNM affiliate societies in developing local recording activities.

After recording approximately 300 petroglyphs on a sandstone escarpment near the site of Pueblo Blanco, RARP turned its attention in 1996 to an almost four-mile-long igneous outcrop called the Creston Dike, which is the southern boundary of the Galisteo Basin. Creston’s 5,000 petroglyphs were not recorded completely until 2004, about a year after the Crottys retired. RARP then moved its activities a few miles north to the seven-mile-long Galisteo Dike, where work continues. Early in 2005, RARP began another project at La Cieneguilla, technically outside the Galisteo Basin but still mandated by the Galisteo Basin Archaeological Resources Protection Act.

Other studies of petroglyphs in the Galisteo Basin have recently begun, such as the work conducted by Marit Munson of Trent University (Ontario) at Petroglyph Hill (see page 10). Collectively, the locations may have as many as 20,000 petroglyphs, mostly made by Pueblo people during the Rio Grande Coalition and Classic periods but also representative of more ancient and more recent Puebloan, Archaic, Plains, Athabaskan, Hispanic, and Anglo peoples. Since 1995, perhaps 100 individuals associated with at least eight different heritage or research organizations have volunteered their time and their skills to record those images, working under separately negotiated agreements on lands owned by no fewer than 17 private and four public landowners.

The goal is to build a comprehensive, flexible, researcher-friendly database of Galisteo Basin rock art that will be deposited in the archaeological archives of the State of New Mexico. At Creston, RARP developed a digital database that linked to a Geographic Information System program developed by Milford Fletcher for Petroglyph National Monument. While being made accessible to future investigators, those data must also be treated as confidential to protect the privacy of the landowners and the integrity of the images. After another 10 or 20 years of work by RARP and others, most rock art of the Galisteo Basin will have been surveyed and recorded. We will then have a resource of tens of thousands of images that form a kind of collective self-portrait made by those who have lived for eight millennia in this starkly beautiful landscape.
ONE OF THE GREAT ARCHAEOLOGICAL PUZZLES in the Southwest concerns the origins of the Ancestral Pueblo population of the Galisteo Basin. In the Colonial period, the documents tell us, the Galisteo was home to large, thriving villages, most inhabited by Tewa-speaking “Tano” people. Yet in archaeological terms this occupation was brief, since we have little evidence for large populations in the basin prior to the thirteenth century A.D. This is in sharp contrast to the surrounding valleys, where continuous occupations going far back in time are well documented. Where did the Tano people come from? And what happened once they arrived?

Archaeologists have pondered the question of Tano origins for nearly a century. One correlation noted early on was that the appearance of large villages in the Galisteo Basin in the late 1200s dovetailed neatly with the abandonment of the Colorado Plateau. Were these the new homes of people who were born in Cliff Palace or Sand Canyon? Archaeologist Bertha P. Dutton spent much of the 1950s and 1960s driving the ranch roads of the Galisteo, trying to understand migration in archaeological contexts. Her work at Pueblo Largo (see page 4) was intended to tackle the issue, as were her subsequent investigations at Las Madres. Yet answers proved elusive. Certainly the pottery types looked similar, but why were the sites so different?

I first came face to face with the issue of Tano origins in 1999, when I headed down a trail to Burnt Corn Pueblo in the company of Paul Williams, an archaeologist with the Bureau of Land Management, and Buck Dant, a local landowner. Burnt Corn Pueblo was an early village like those Dutton had studied, and yet because of its isolation from the roads and the prominence of its later neighbor, Pueblo San Marcos, it had never been formally studied. Particularly promising was the fact that all of the nine roomblocks present at the site had been destroyed by fire, making it likely that datable wood would be present.

For Williams and Dant, the significance of Burnt Corn Pueblo was its location within one of the few substantial tracts of public land in the Galisteo, making it the potential centerpiece of an archaeological landscape that could be protected from development. For me, the site represented a window on a critical era of Ancestral Pueblo history. As we planned the project, it quickly became clear that these goals were complementary, but that satisfying all priorities would require careful planning. To understand Burnt Corn Pueblo we would need to collect information about its present as well as its past. This work would not take place in isolation, but instead in a modern context in which landowners, public land managers, nonprofit organizations, and other interested parties played direct roles.

Thus, the “Tano Origins Project” was born, and over the course of three field seasons we have learned a great deal about the troubled times of the late 1200s in the Galisteo. We do not yet know where they came from, but we have learned that the inhabitants of Burnt Corn Pueblo built a community that extended for nearly a kilometer along an intermittent stream. Evidence that they used the neighboring uplands for farming and ritual purposes comes from Petroglyph Hill, only three kilometers to the east (see pages 8-10). We also know that the pueblo itself was built over a remarkably short period—between A.D.
1290 and 1302—and that it was destroyed within a generation. That “destruction” continues to pose questions for our research team: while the widespread distribution of fire suggests an attack, the surprisingly “clean” nature of the excavated rooms and the fact that at least one of these rooms may have been ritually closed now leads me to wonder whether the community was demolished by its own residents, for purposes as yet unknown. It is interesting to note that Burnt Corn Pueblo was not the only Galisteo community abandoned at the beginning of the 1300s, suggesting that whatever happened there was not an isolated event.

We have also made progress in presenting Burnt Corn Pueblo as a case study for the preservation of archaeological landscapes. The intact archaeological deposits at the site, despite considerable looting in the past decades, have enhanced public perceptions of its importance and need for protection. Through our survey work we are also making the case that the more ephemeral sites and distribution of artifacts in the surrounding countryside are also resources worth preserving. The fact that the fieldwork at Burnt Corn Pueblo and Petroglyph Hill has been conducted by students and local volunteers from the area increases its visibility and its educational significance. The project may have been planned in a university and cogitated over in federal offices, but it has truly been implemented by the local community.

In the early evening of the last day of fieldwork at Burnt Corn Pueblo in 2005, I joined Monica Smith, who directed the excavations, in some final record keeping at the site. As the sun set, I noticed a few more lights coming on in the surrounding countryside than in previous years, evidence that the development of the region continues. However, in other directions there were only the shadows lengthening in the wooded hills, in much the same way as they had for hundreds of years. As fieldwork continues and analyses are completed we will undoubtedly learn more about Tano origins, as we had hoped. But we will also all be particularly satisfied if a part of the legacy of our work at Burnt Corn Pueblo is the preservation of a landscape we have come to know well and to appreciate deeply.

Chronology

One of the ironies of archaeology in the Galisteo Basin is that, even though Pecos Pueblo is only a few miles away, the famous Pecos Chronology (Pueblo I, II, III, IV) widely employed by Southwest archaeologists is not actually used there. In fact, a regional sequence developed for the northern Rio Grande by archaeologists Fred Wendorf and Erik Reed in the 1950s is much more common. Modified over the years, the sequence is typically described as follows:


Each period is typically subdivided into early, middle and late.

The historic era in the Galisteo itself began in A.D. 1540, when Francisco Vázquez de Coronado traversed the area in search of Gran Quivira. Coronado’s chroniclers mention passing abandoned villages in the Galisteo, possibly a sign of conflict, but they quickly moved on to Pecos Pueblo and thence out onto the Plains.
The richness of the archaeological heritage of the Galisteo Basin means that many sites that would be considered impressive monuments elsewhere remain overlooked next to the dramatic remains of Pueblo San Marcos or the Creston Dike. Petroglyph Hill is a rarely noticed eminence in the western basin known for decades to only a few rock art experts. For much of that time, the site was in the middle of a private ranch, making even brief visits difficult to arrange.

Petroglyph Hill also provides a model for the type of creative partnership between land managers, archaeologists, and the public that will be needed in the coming decades. The site, and more than 1,200 acres of surrounding countryside, was purchased by Santa Fe County in 2000 as part of the open-space program that also obtained the Cerrillos Hills Park. Such forward-thinking acquisitions came in the context of spreading residential development in the region and had broad public support.

After the lands had been transferred, however, managers faced a second challenge—overseeing their new domain. It is unusual for local governments to maintain archaeological parks, particularly at this scale, and the county has only a handful of staff members to tackle the myriad responsibilities required. Their job was made more complicated by the fact that the archaeological resources of these new areas were largely unknown. In the case of the Cerrillos Hills, as Leslie Cohen points out (see page 13), an active neighborhood coalition lobbied for funding for archaeological documentation of the mining district, built trails and shelters, and continues to serve as an advocate for the entire project.

Petroglyph Hill presented a different problem. The petroglyphs themselves represented a significant—albeit undocumented—resource, but information about the surrounding countryside was nonexistent. In rural surroundings halfway between San Marcos and Galisteo, the property had attracted less public attention but was centrally located in the expanding network of county open spaces. Doing the right thing at Petroglyph Hill was going to be a challenging proposition.

It happened that the Tano Origins Project team at Burnt Corn Pueblo was also becoming interested in Petroglyph Hill (see page 6). The summit dominates the eastern horizon from the site and is only a few kilometers away. Our small-scale surveys had documented numerous sites away from the later Ancestral Pueblo villages was an additional incentive. When we found out about the Petroglyph Hill purchase, we immediately began wondering whether we could arrange to conduct work there.

Several conversations with Paul Olafson, the director of Santa Fe County’s Open Space Program, identified mutual interests and challenges, and a plan of action gradually took shape. In exchange for logistical and Geographic Information System (GIS) support, we agreed to conduct...
an intensive archaeological survey of the Petroglyph Hill tract and provide that survey information to the county and the group that had been selected to prepare a management plan for the property. The team, as a part of the Tano Origins Project under the direction of Genevieve Head, would consist of students and volunteers, providing educational outreach in addition to collecting scientific data. Ultimately this evidence would be integrated with what we were collecting on adjacent jurisdictions, providing both a large-scale look at a unique cultural landscape and a concept for an integrated archaeological effort.

Almost everything we learned at Petroglyph Hill over the next two years was a surprise. While Marit Munson worked on the site itself, making a detailed record of the petroglyphs (see page 10), our emphasis was on the surrounding ridges and valleys. Ultimately more than 185 sites were found, dating from the Archaic period through the twentieth century, a remarkable record of human activity in what had seemed an “open” landscape. The countryside had been heavily used during the era of Burnt Corn Pueblo, with one outlying hamlet perhaps representing the nearest neighbors of the larger community. But people were present long after Burnt Corn Pueblo was destroyed, leaving enigmatic scatters of glazeware pottery behind. The overlap between earlier and later Ancestral Pueblo sites is limited, leaving us to wonder whether the way that the land was used had changed over time. One of the final sites recorded by the team may be a farmstead from the early Colonial period, providing a rare look at life in the countryside during that traumatic era.

Petroglyphs are actually quite rare in the study area, making the concentration on Petroglyph Hill all the more remarkable. There is some supporting evidence suggesting the sanctity of this place. Viewed from the modern road, the hill itself seems unremarkable, but we soon realized that it could be seen from throughout the Galisteo, visible on the horizon from as far away as Pueblo San Cristóbal on the far side of the basin. We are only beginning to grasp the significance of these associations, although further GIS analysis of the information collected from Petroglyph Hill will clarify matters.

With the completion of the survey, attention will shift to the team preparing the management plan. Access presents a particularly thorny issue. Besides petroglyphs, few of the sites we recorded would be obvious to passersby, raising the possibility of a network of trails that would allow hikers to enjoy the wooded hills and broad vistas. Yet while these sites are obscure, they are also vulnerable, and the repeated removal of just a few potsherds as souvenirs could obliterate them entirely. As the survey progressed, we pondered the significance of such landscapes, largely unrecognized by the public. As knowledge spreads about the fragile nature of environmental resources, such as stream banks beaten down by cattle or cryptogamic soils (i.e., mosses, lichens, fungi, or algae) destroyed by idle footsteps, is there room for public awareness of cultural landscapes incorporating far more than large sites and obvious features? Or, since such a broad definition of critical resources would undoubtedly generate further restrictions, would this step prevent people from experiencing such landscapes firsthand and thus understanding their value? And what does this all imply for further development in the Galisteo Basin, where such landscapes are undoubtedly the rule?

As this process continues, all of us—county managers, university professors, private consultants, local landowners—will grapple with these issues. What is clear now, however, is that such partnerships are not only inevitable but desirable. Distinctions between research, policy, and management now seem quaint, relics of an era when it was possible to remain disengaged. We hope that one of the legacies of Petroglyph Hill will be the value of partnership.
I TOOK MY FAVORITE PHOTOGRAPH from Petroglyph Hill early one morning shortly after I began conducting fieldwork there last June. From the petroglyph of a hand in the foreground to the glorious view to the distant mountains, it encompasses the human past and the natural landscape. And, unwittingly, it also includes the human present, in the form of my shadow in the lower right-hand corner. The same elements are what drew me to work in the Galisteo Basin. As a researcher interested in rock art, I am fascinated by the region’s petroglyphs and their place in the ancient Pueblo landscape. As a member of the archaeological community, I am concerned about the sites’ present condition.

I recorded Petroglyph Hill in 2004, with the help of archaeologists and trained volunteers. The hill is actually two smaller hills, connected by a low saddle; the petroglyphs spread across the small south-facing cliffs and the exposed bedrock on the peaks. Over the span of a month, we photographed, drew, measured, and mapped more than 1,860 petroglyphs—an amount that proved to be almost three times more than I had initially anticipated.

My main research goal was to collect information that would help date the rock art, using clues such as variation in the color of the rock surface (patination), and superpositioning (overlap of multiple images). By combining this evidence with the subject matter and style of the petroglyphs, we were able to identify petroglyphs ranging from many different time periods—from the heavily patinated geometric shapes of the Archaic period to a freshly pecked windmill from the twenty-first century. The Coalition period is well represented by pictures of deer, deer tracks, and hunters, while Classic period petroglyphs include Classic Rio Grande-style images of macaws and horned serpents. Despite some similarities to Classic Rio Grande rock art sites, Petroglyph Hill lacks the large-scale warriors, shield bearers, and masked figures that are so prominent at other Galisteo rock art sites. In addition to these prehistoric images, nearly 40 percent of the rock art on the hill dates to the Historic period; signatures and dates show that men from nearby ranches and villages often visited the site in the 1920s and 1930s.

My second research goal was to document the condition of the site. Petroglyph Hill has a long history of use and, unfortunately, abuse. During our time on the hill, we found only a handful of artifacts—a half-dozen black-on-white sherds from the Coalition period and a few dozen glazeware sherds from the early Classic period, along with some projectile points and flaked stone flakes. The dates of these artifacts fit well with the dates we see for the rock art itself. However, these small and hard-to-see artifacts are all that remain because previous visitors have taken all of the larger ones. The amount of vandalism at the site has increased since the 1960s, and indeed, in recent years, thieves have removed entire rock art panels from the site, and in so doing have broken adjacent panels. Even well-meaning visitors have unintentionally impacted the rock art by walking or scrambling over petroglyphs and by causing erosion on the southern face of the hills.

The damage that I saw during last summer’s fieldwork disturbs me greatly. It should serve as a call to action for an engaged archaeology that unites research interests with the practicalities of site monitoring and protection. I am hopeful that the archaeology being carried out in the Galisteo Basin will be a positive model for combining an interest in the past with the concerns and challenges of the present.

The view from atop Petroglyph Hill reveals the past, in the form of rock art, and the present, denoted by the photographer’s shadow.
Mission Archaeology in the Galisteo Basin

Cordelia Snow, New Mexico Historic Preservation Division

The Franciscan mission complexes in the Galisteo Basin—at Galisteo, San Lázaro, San Cristóbal, and San Marcos—remained little known until the latter part of the twentieth century, even though they were visited, described, and mapped by archaeologist Adolph F. Bandelier in 1882. Even today, these missions have received only the most cursory attention from researchers interested in the historic archaeology and ethnology of the area. In his 1914 report on the area, archaeologist Nels C. Nelson speculated about why the missions had been so little studied. Although Nelson inferred that this lack of study was based on the missions’ “relative modernity and also their less picturesque and romantic setting as compared with the cliff-dwellings,” it is ironic that he, too, focused his work on the prehistoric pueblos associated with the missions, and not the missions themselves.

Nelson also believed that because anthropologists like Herbert Spinden and others had already published a “very considerable amount of . . . ethnologic data on the Southwest and investigations of the present Pueblos,” little remained to be learned about mission archaeology or the effect of the Spanish settlement in New Mexico. Nelson did excavate test trenches at some of the mission sites, but he generally dismissed the results because he found “nothing” or the results were not germane to his studies.

Between the founding of the Galisteo mission in 1610 and the abandonment of the area during or shortly after the Pueblo Revolt in August 1680, these four missions represent almost the entire era of Franciscan missions in New Mexico. The former residents of Galisteo, San Marcos, and its visita, Cienega, were among the first Pueblo people to attack Santa Fe, and they later moved into the Spanish casas reales, or royal buildings, in the villa after the Spaniards fled to El Paso del Norte. Natives from San Cristóbal and San Lázaro moved to adjacent pueblos at Santa Cruz, near present-day Española. Eventually, displaced by the return of the Spaniards after 1692–1693, at least some of them moved to the Hopi village of Hano, where their descendants live today. Of all the missions in the Galisteo Basin, only the Pueblo of Galisteo was reoccupied during the eighteenth century and the mission rebuilt. Both the pueblo and the mission were abandoned in 1782.

In many respects, Nelson’s lack of interest in historic archaeology in the Galisteo Basin may prove to be a boon to researchers in the twenty-first century because, although tested and occasionally pothunted, large portions of the mission complexes remain relatively undisturbed and unstudied, unlike other such structures in New Mexico. In contrast, beginning in 1915—while Nelson was working at San Marcos—and for several decades thereafter, Edgar Lee Hewett of the Museum of New Mexico employed a number of individuals to excavate and restore the mission complexes at Pecos Pueblo, the Jemez site of Giusewa, and the Piro Pueblos of Abo and Quarai. Because much of Hewett’s work was underfunded and done in haste, a great deal of information was destroyed, or simply not gathered, during those excavations.

It has only been in recent decades that researchers such as James E. Ivey and Frances Levine, among others, have produced studies of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century architecture and ethnohistory of mission pueblos. Nevertheless, considerable work remains to be done.
THE YEAR 2005 marked the tenth season of the University of Chicago’s research at Paa-ko Pueblo, which is situated on a well-watered floodplain, adjacent to springs and timber, and at the crossroads between the Rio Grande, the Plains, the Galisteo Basin, and the Estancia Valley. It includes some 26 room blocks arranged in eight plaza groups.

Over the past 90 years, there have been several large-scale research projects at Paa-ko, including the work of Nels C. Nelson in 1914, the Museum of New Mexico in the 1930s, and the University of New Mexico in the late 1940s and 1950s.

Between the late 1200s and early 1400s, Paa-ko was a densely settled Ancestral Pueblo community. Like other villages in the Rio Grande Valley, Paa-ko was abandoned in the 1400s as people moved to the floodplains of the Rio Grande and its tributaries. A much-smaller occupation began in the late 1500s or early 1600s, when four single-story masonry room blocks were superimposed over older structures in a single plaza group. This resettlement—which is the current focus of our work—became Mission San Pedro during the Spanish Colonial period.

Features associated with this Colonial period occupation include soil- and water-control facilities, corrals, and metalworking facilities. Despite these material investments and accomplishments, this occupation of Paa-ko was short-lived, lasting only to the 1660s. Our research at Paa-ko began with a program of mapping, surface documentation, and test excavations. Over the last several years, we have excavated seventeenth-century plaza surfaces and their associated features, as well as facilities associated with metal working.

Recent excavations have exposed the foundation walls of a large adobe structure superimposed over a filled kiva in the southwest quarter of the Colonial period plaza. We believe that this structure is a small chapel associated with the visita of San Pedro. It was built on the last occupied seventeenth-century plaza surface and may have burned and collapsed sometime during the Colonial period.

The corral and enclosure systems that dominate the southern third of the plaza may have initially been built in association with this chapel; however, they were expanded and used long after the chapel fell into ruins. Later reconstructions and additions to the corrals were built on a more recent surface than the chapel. These walls may represent the final stage of Paa-ko’s occupation, as it shifted from a year-round village to a periodically visited sheep camp.

This site offers a unique opportunity to extend our current understanding of the Colonial period in the Middle Rio Grande. We expect that our continued research will greatly expand our understanding of seventeenth-century mission settings. These studies of metallurgy, plant and animal use, spatial organization, and material culture will enhance current understanding of Colonial period technologies and practices at Paa-ko, as well as throughout the greater Rio Grande Valley.
THE INVOLVEMENT OF COMMUNITY GROUPS in the preservation of cultural resources has a long and distinguished history in this country. In today’s political landscape of reduced government services, these groups raise money, lobby elected officials, monitor archaeological sites, and provide interpretive programs. The Cerrillos Hills Park Coalition, a nonprofit corporation in Santa Fe County, New Mexico, exemplifies the effect that communities can have on government decisions regarding the purchase, development, and preservation of land containing significant cultural resources. The coalition manages the Cerrillos Hills Historic Park for the landowner, the County of Santa Fe. Its mission is to provide “broad-based educational and recreational opportunities for Santa Fe County through the acquisition, preservation and protection of the Cerrillos Hills and the establishment, enhancement and support of a regional park providing low-impact public access to the unique natural, historical, archaeological, cultural, and recreational resources of the Hills.”

The 1,100-acre Cerrillos Hills Historic Park lies on the western edge of the Galisteo Basin, 25 miles south of Santa Fe. It is part of the Cerrillos Mining District, a 30-square-mile tract that was placed on New Mexico’s Registry of Cultural Properties in 1973. Ownership within the district is a patchwork of state, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), county, and private holdings. It contains prehistoric turquoise and lead mines and the remains of historic turquoise, lead, gold, and silver exploration and extraction activities. The New York-based firm of Tiffany and Company created the late-nineteenth-century vogue for turquoise jewelry using stones from the Cerrillos Hills, and there is some evidence suggesting that the turquoise found in several rich graves at the prehistoric site of Pueblo Bonito came from Cerrillos.

Residents of the village of Cerrillos and neighboring communities came together in 1997 to create a plan that would address community concerns about residential and industrial development (gravel mines) that threatened the natural and historical character of the area. Then, in 1998, Santa Fe County voters passed a bond initiative creating a fund from a gross receipts tax to purchase private land for public use. Because Santa Fe County includes the Galisteo Basin, it quickly became apparent that planning for lands purchased with public recreation in mind would also have to address issues of cultural preservation. The Cerrillos planning group became the Cerrillos Hills Park Coalition in 1999 and began working with the county to purchase two large parcels of land near Cerrillos Village. The lands were purchased in 2000. Shortly afterward, a survey by Southwest Archaeological Consultants revealed that the county was the new owner of land containing 52 archaeological sites. Former Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall formally opened the park in 2003.

The coalition’s diverse membership, which includes local business owners, archaeologists, several historians, a professional photographer, and conservation-minded citizens, has provided Santa Fe County with a wide spectrum of resources. Coalition members have donated thousands of hours of labor toward the development of trails, signs, a web site, and an information kiosk. Most of the archival research about the historic mines of the area has been produced by these volunteers.

This private/public partnership has received assistance and grants from various sources: the National Park Service’s Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance Technical Program, the New Mexico Department of Tourism, the New Mexico Abandoned Mine Land Bureau, and the Kodak Corporation. The organization rallies the community to address long-term preservation issues, such as industrial and residential development, that would have a negative impact on the park, as well as promote positive projects, such as a trail system linking BLM and park property and the purchase of Mount Chalchihuitl.

Visit the Coalition’s website at www.cerrilloshills.org
Since its founding in 1979, the Archaeological Conservancy has emphasized the preservation of sites in the Galisteo Basin. In the early 1980s, with the acquisition of a portion of Pueblo San Marcos, we established our first Galisteo Basin preserve. The Pueblo San Marcos land grant, then a large ranch, was first subdivided in the 1960s. At the time, although the land developer recognized the importance of the massive thirteenth- to seventeenth-century site, there was no organization to accept and manage the land and no county laws had yet been enacted to protect it. The subdivision left the pueblo on three 20-acre lots.

Through a bargain-sale-to-charity transaction with the landowners, we were able to purchase a 20-acre portion of Pueblo San Marcos in 1981, the organization’s first major acquisition. In partnership with the State of New Mexico and with the help of a federal grant and generous contributions from Cochiti Pueblo and the site’s landowners, the remaining two parcels were acquired in 1997 and 1998. With help from local site stewards, the Conservancy has sponsored public tours at the preserve since the mid-1990s. At least five archaeological research projects have also been undertaken at the site by institutions across the country.

Recognizing public education as the key to archaeological preservation, the Conservancy seeks to directly engage communities in local preservation efforts. For each preserve, the Conservancy assembles a management committee of community members, agency representatives, Native Americans, and archaeologists, who make recommendations about how the preserve should look and be used. Local communities also participate in Conservancy preservation efforts as site stewards, docents, and with research and site stabilization projects, such as the recent collaborative mapping and stabilization project at Galisteo Pueblo.

Because most of the archaeological sites in the Galisteo Basin are privately owned, landowner involvement is critical for project success. Many of the area’s landowners are excellent land stewards; however, future owners may not be as concerned about preservation. The Conservancy therefore considers all sites on private land to be endangered, and works with landowners to help manage their sites or to arrange bequests. At Pueblo Galisteo, by holding a conservation easement on the site, the Conservancy has assisted with the creation of a management plan, fencing, and bank stabilization, while artists Bruce Nauman and Susan Rothenberg continue to own the property and use the site as open space.

Private ownership of Galisteo Basin sites has also made research and visitation very difficult to pursue. By establishing sites as archaeological and educational preserves, they are made accessible, often for the first time, to qualified researchers and Native Americans and for controlled public visitation. More than a dozen research projects have been conducted at Conservancy preserves in the Galisteo Basin since the 1980s, contributing to a better understanding of the basin’s unique cultural heritage.

We are hopeful that the Galisteo Basin Archaeological Sites Protection Act will increase public awareness about the importance and fragility of these sites and that it will inspire greater involvement in the preservation process by the public, as well as by agencies and organizations, enabling us to work together to meet common preservation goals for the area.
Site Stewardship at Pueblo San Marcos

Bill Baxter

Early one morning several years ago I arrived to find that the portable toilet at Pueblo San Marcos site had been knocked over. This was at a time when two archaeological projects being conducted by the University of New Mexico and the American Museum of Natural History were both underway, and a number of people and cars were at the site. Was one of our neighbors in this otherwise quiet, rural neighborhood expressing displeasure? The damage was negligible, but to create a record against possible future mischief, I, as site steward, called the sheriff and filed a report, the first of two reports I have filed during my eight years as site steward at San Marcos Pueblo.

I moved to the Galisteo Basin in 1997. Some months after I arrived, seeing people on what I knew to be the San Marcos site, I walked over and introduced myself. Mark Michel and James Walker, president and regional director of the Archaeological Conservancy, were there because the Conservancy had just acquired the largest part of the site (see page 14). Because I lived nearby and was newly retired, there was the possibility they could use me. How would I like to steward the place? It was that easy.

Pueblo San Marcos is at risk because it is adjacent to a major highway, it is widely known, and the population in the area is growing rapidly. Although the site is fenced on three sides, its southern border, an arroyo, is mostly open.

When curious people have entered the property, I have generally received a telephone call from a neighbor. My method is to approach the trespassers while a partner with a cell phone, often my wife, is visible in the distance. Early on, I received about one call a month reporting “strange people” on the site, but lately, I have received no calls.

Most local people have learned that not only is the “old Indian place” fenced and posted, but that it is overseen by a live person. And they have learned that the best way to see the site is to take a free tour offered by the Archaeological Conservancy. A significant portion of the money the Conservancy used to purchase the site was in the form of transportation enhancement funds administered by the State of New Mexico. Along with those state funds came a condition: some kind of public access. So, in addition to keeping an eye on the site, I now serve as a tour guide.

During my tenure at Pueblo San Marcos there has been research of some sort nearly every summer, from Ann Ramenofsky’s mapping and surface survey, to David Hurst Thomas’s excavations at the Spanish mission, to the recent geophysical near-surface remote sensing projects of Scott Baldridge. And for all of these I have been present, nearly every day. This has been a field school to die for and source of fodder for my walks with the visitors.

My only other sheriff’s report came about because one winter’s night in late 1999 someone had come onto the property. With the dawning of the new year, I found three new looting pits in one of the middens. Because it happened on my watch, I take it personally. Since then, surveillance around New Year’s Day is heightened, as I expect that looter, a local person, will be back. I would be very pleased if, during my career as Pueblo San Marcos site steward, my third sheriff’s report would reveal his identity.
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Back Sight

PRIVATE PROPERTY IS A KEY FACTOR in understanding the history of both research and preservation in the Galisteo Basin. James Snead notes that many archaeologists have chosen to work elsewhere on public land, with the result that most archaeological research in the Galisteo was conducted long ago. Private landowners have helped in many cases to ensure preservation of key sites, and citizens’ concerns for property rights have clearly shaped the creative preservation legislation that was passed by Congress in 2004.

The tension between private citizens with strong property rights concerns and government agencies can create opportunities for private organizations to play a constructive role in finding a middle ground. The Archaeological Conservancy has certainly played such an important role in the Galisteo Basin Archaeological Sites Protection Act. Over many long years the Conservancy worked with private landowners and many government agencies to make this act a reality. By purchasing sites and accepting conservation easements, the Conservancy helped to create momentum toward larger scale preservation. It is a difficult role to play, but it is an increasingly important one.

The Center has encountered similar opportunities and challenges in the process of working to create new National Heritage Areas (NHAs) in the Santa Cruz and Little Colorado river valleys. In our experience, building consensus among community members and government agencies has been made easier by the forethought that the National Park Service has put into the heritage area concept. NHAs do not create any new regulations over private property, nor can a heritage area use federal funds to purchase private property.

A critical challenge is to gain the funding needed to support creative federal-private partnerships once they are established. There is an important role that Center members and Archaeology Southwest readers can play by writing their congressional representatives. Let them know that there is widespread support for NHAs and that the Galisteo Basin Archaeological Sites Protection Act needs funding in order to implement the wise initial actions of Congress.

The Center’s homepage (www.cdarc.org) has a link to background information and contact suggestions for those willing to write letters or emails regarding these vital issues. In addition, while you are on the Center’s homepage, consider signing up for our free email service called “Southwest Archaeology Today.” We search the internet for the diversity of articles in newspapers across the country and around the globe that deal with archaeology. We sift through extraneous material and offer you a concise set of current news. Just a few minutes a day can keep you much better informed.

Dozens of archaeological sites in the Galisteo Basin could benefit from the creative preservation opportunities that are in need of congressional funding. Help out by writing Congress or the Bureau of Land Management. Go to www.cdarc.org for more information.

William H. Doelle, President & CEO
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