



BOOK OF MORMON CENTRAL

<http://bookofmormoncentral.org/>

Type: Newsletter

U.A.S. Newsletter, no. 18 (February 25, 1954)

Editors(s): Bruce W. Warren and Dee Green

Published by: University Archaeological Society, Brigham Young University

U. A. S. NEWSLETTER

Number 18

February 25, 1954

Published by THE UNIVERSITY ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY
Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah

Editor: Bruce W. Warren

Assistant Editor: Dee Green

-
- 18.0 The Book of Mormon and Late Southwest Archaeology, by Gareth W. Lowe. An article in the February, 1954, issue of Desert magazine entitled "Mystery of the Vanished Gallinas," gives a popular account of the Gallina culture of north-central New Mexico and describes the uniqueness of their fortified towers, violent destruction of the people, and of the abandonment of the area. This has brought us the following questions from an inquirer: "Were these Gallina people possibly a Nephite group pushed northward, making a last stand against the Lamanites? And could not the many fortified and defensive sites of the 'Cliff Dwellers' have been constructed by the Nephites as part of their last great struggle against the Lamanites as described by Mormon?" (Dewey Farnsworth in his most recent volume actually makes this unverified inference.) The answer is an emphatic NO! The approximate dates given in the Desert article indicating occupation from ca. 1000 A.D. to ca. 1300 A.D., based on tree ring chronology, are reliable and can be accepted with little reservation. This eleventh century date is substantiated in professional literature for the beginning of the Gallina settlement. This is likewise the approximate time for the beginning of the Great Pueblo period of the four-corners region of Utah, Arizona, Colorado, and New Mexico in which period the great ruins such as Mesa Verde and others in our national parks and monuments familiar to the public were built. These sites were abandoned at the close of the thirteenth century with the people withdrawing a short distance southward. This movement apparently resulted from a number of causes, among which may have been drought, erosion, epidemic diseases, and--perhaps the most important--warfare between the Pueblo peoples themselves and with hostile nomads from the far north, the Athapascan Navajos and Apaches (see August 10 Newsletter, 14.0) or with the Shoshones. The Gallina settlement does not illustrate a Pueblo culture but rather shows influences both from the Pueblos and from the east, very likely from the Missouri valley. Its destruction may well have resulted from Pueblo attacks; the Pueblo groups had some strong warlike tendencies and have a history of internecine violence not always recognized in view of their passive philosophy in many other respects. (See "Patterns of Aggression and the War Cult in Southwestern Pueblos," by Florence H. Ellis, Southwestern Journal of Anthropology, vol. 7, 1951, pp. 177-201.) Thus it may be seen that the Book of Mormon account of a fourth century destruction can have no direct connection with these later events, far removed from the central scene of Book of Mormon activities in both space and time. The tendency to try to explain all archaeological remains in the New World on the basis of the Book of Mormon narrative, no matter

what the date assigned by scholars or the area involved, is one that should be strongly discouraged! Efforts should be made to become familiar with the true situation. (It should be realized that the Pueblo-Basketmaker, or Anasazi, area of the four-corners region is but one of three major culture areas of the prehistoric Southwest--the other two are the Mogollon in Arizona and New Mexico and the Hohokam of southern Arizona. Apparently all had distinctive developments, at least in part of their life-spans.)

For an understanding of the possible role of Book of Mormon peoples in the Southwest as a whole some knowledge of the general prehistory of the area is necessary. Several suitable texts on this area are available, perhaps the best being the very readable Prehistoric Indians of the Southwest by H. M. Wormington (Colorado Museum of Natural History, Popular Series No. 7, Denver, Colorado, 1947. \$1.50). Other good texts are Southwestern Archaeology by John C. McGregor and Indians Before Columbus by Martin, Quimby, and Collier, pp. 97-228. Briefer resumes are available in a number of other sources. U.A.S. members are urged to secure one or more of these books by purchase or library rental and to familiarize themselves with this Southwestern archaeological area which for most of us is the nearest area of major archaeological interest and which is one of the major archaeological zones in the New World. In addition, members interested in deeper study are urged to avail themselves of recent articles in the professional journals, chief among which are American Antiquity, American Anthropologist, and Southwestern Journal of Anthropology, which should be available in large public libraries or in most university libraries. Many technical reports and papers as listed in the bibliographies of the above texts and periodical articles will be of interest and value to serious students.

In a subsequent Newsletter the possible influence of Book of Mormon peoples in Southwestern archaeology will be dealt with more fully, utilizing the recent evidences for Mexican and Eastern United States contacts noted in the area.

- 18.1 Review of Dewey Farnsworth, Book of Mormon Evidences in Ancient America. The book is a revised version of past Farnsworth picture-books which have enjoyed success on the LDS book market. It purports to be a comparison of the Book of Mormon with Archaeological Evidence from the Scientific World (respectful capitalization is the author's). Such a project has two prerequisites: a thorough, systematic knowledge of the Book of Mormon, and an equally thorough, systematic knowledge of American archaeology. Unfortunately, Farnsworth displays serious deficiencies in both fields.

A surprising lack of understanding of the claims of the Book of Mormon is displayed. On matters of geography, appeal is made to unofficial statements of Church authorities (the Church maintains no official position) instead of turning to the Book itself with its wealth of geographical and cultural detail. Solely on the basis of modern Church tradition the author claims that "the combined races known to us as Indians--be they Inca, Maya, Aztec, Iroquois, Navajo, etc." all are descendants of Book of Mormon peoples. The Book of Mormon nowhere states, implies nor requires any such thing. Lehi's people are said to be described in the Book of Mormon as "wandering in [Egypt] prior to their ocean voyage"; various extravagant details of the "Three Nephites" are compared with tradition and art representations; and other similar

claims made, none of which can be documented from the Book of Mormon itself.

Turning to the author's preparation in archaeology for this work we note the staggering statement that he "has read all the literature and books of both Spanish and English available" on the materials he treats. No competent archaeologist, had he read for 75 years, would make such an impossible claim. Had the author's claims been more humble some of his archaeological sins might be forgiven more readily. A basic point emphasized a number of times in the book is Farnsworth's view that "writer" equals researcher equals expert archaeologist who holds a qualified opinion. We are frequently told that "some of our best writers" believe such and such, yet "best" in this usage turns out to have no sensible meaning. A look at the bibliography (which, incidentally, omits a number of references cited in the text) is enlightening. Of some 95 works cited (from about 65 authors) only 15--a very liberal figure--approach being what could be called primary sources, that is, reports of actual original investigation by the writer of the work. Every one of these has long since been supplemented or superseded by other, uncited sources. Many of these citations are torn from context, left to give an incorrect impression of the author's views or otherwise misused (for example the citations from Vaillant, pp. 76-77). Sixty-seven works in the bibliography are what could be termed non-scientific popularizations. A few of these have some merit but cannot be depended upon. Others are representative of the crackpot fringe of American archaeology, such as the writings of Enock, Lee, Poindexter and Churchwood. Major reliance is placed on DeRoo because he is said to be "the only person on record who had access to the letters and reports from the early priests and missionaries of the Catholic faith." This is false. Actually one could spend years reading the relaciones and letters of the early priests which are now in print and accessible in the original language. One report to Farnsworth is said to have come from the "custodian of Copan!" In another case the eccentric J. Fitzgerald Lee (who derives Egyptian civilization from the Maya!) is cited quoting Montesinos, perhaps the most unreliable of the Peruvian chroniclers. This is something of a depth in "authority." Menarquis Indians, apparently an early Mexican source (intended for Monarquia Indiana of Torquemada?) is cited as the authority for a tradition from the "South Seas." A quote from Ixtlilxochitl is credited only to Bancroft, a secondary source. As a matter of fact, a general rule can be formulated to express Farnsworth's use of authorities: If an original source exists, ignore it and find one that is second or third hand. And if no citation can be produced, the author apparently feels free to make categorical statements himself, as when he makes the undocumented, and I believe undocumentable, statement that "Traders from the early people of California place this war and confusion at 387 A.D." Once in a while Farnsworth gets carried away and forgets to delete contradictory material. Thus we read in a quote from Blom (p. 66) that Maya hieroglyphic writing has no direct connection with Old World writings, a statement every qualified expert would agree to, but which contradicts what that portion of the book has been claiming.

Perhaps the statement of the author that "it has been a little confusing to me at times to follow the writings of some of our modern archaeologists" is a result of the increasing accuracy and complexity

of modern archaeological writing, for we note that less than one-fourth of the works cited date within the last 25 years. This is as important an omission as would be the case of a physician who is ignorant of antibiotics, or of the bacteriologist who doesn't believe immunization will work.

A small pamphlet would be necessary to point out the errors of fact or inference in the text and captions. The most basic is in the chronology. Farnsworth arbitrarily chooses the Spinden over the Goodman-Martinez-Thompson correlation of the Maya calendar (a 260 year difference) despite the abandonment of the former by virtually all Maya calendar experts. Farnsworth does this because the Spinden is "found . . . to be more to my purpose" (p. 5). The Archaic (or Pre-Classic or Pre-Maya) period of Mesoamerican archaeological history would be dated by almost any up-to-date archaeologist at about 2000 B.C. to 300 A.D. The succeeding Classic (or Florescent, Classical Maya, Classical Toltec, etc.) period is almost certainly between 300 A.D. and 1000 A.D., and the final, Militaristic (Toltec-Aztec, Imperialistic, Mixtec-Puebla, etc.), period is historically fixed from around 1000 A.D. to the Spanish conquest. By calling the Classic the Archaic and the Archaic the Classic and having pre-Maya come later than the Maya (!), Farnsworth is able to quote enough authorities, without correcting his chaotic terminology, to attribute any feature to any time. Thus we learn that Jaredites were at Chichen Itza (actually the ruins date after 900 A.D.); while Tikal, a Classic Maya site (300-950 A.D.), is termed the oldest city in Central America; and Tula (900-1200 A.D. according to excavations) is said to be "in harmony with Central America's Golden Age of the Mayas." These are a sample of the many statements which no responsible American archaeologist could support. The errors of dating in Peru, the Eastern United States and the Southwest are equally incredible.

At least passing reference must be made to a few examples of illogicality. Carrying out a migration of three or four thousand miles is for Farnsworth only the matter of a glide of the pencil. Geography, human nature and the Book of Mormon itself are as nothing in the way of obstacles. The LaBrea tarpit animals of 25,000-50,000 years ago (2000 B.C. says Farnsworth, without documentation) are used to explain the presence of the horse among the Jaredites, yet a discussion of the Flood of Noah kills off all those animals before the Jaredites arrive in America. We also are repeatedly shown scenes, said to be of Lehi's group, from "Guatemalan petroglyphs" (petroglyph--writing symbol on stone) which are in reality from an Aztec codex on bark paper, from Mexico, dated historically by its text no earlier than 1200 A.D. (the codex is never identified). What is supposedly a Tree of Life scene shows the tree cut off, apparently subject to death (actually this is a well-known Aztec glyph representing a place name).

Poor taste is exhibited in several attempts by the author to imply some official connection of his work with Church authorities and by his fervent claim of orthodoxy and popular support. Contrast the restraint and satisfactory documentation of most of Franklin S. Harris, Jr's, Book of Mormon Message and Evidences, which recently appeared.

A summary of the book appears on the flap of the dust cover. Of the sixteen points listed there which are said to be supported by archaeological findings, not over four or five, and those so general in nature as to be of little importance, are acceptable to archaeologists. All others are unproved or in error. Instead of feeling chall-

enged by the yet-to-be-proved, the LDS reader of this book is led to a complacent, All-is-well-in-Zion attitude that implies that nothing remains for the Mormon student except becoming a tourist. We are of the opinion that Latter-day Saints ought to be satisfied with the truth and not try to improve upon it by gratuitous "proofs" which are themselves based on untruth.

Credit should be given for the handsome appearance of the book. The photographs are often superb, many of them being Farnsworth's own. One is also led to admire the perception, contrary to popular belief, which led the author to decide that some Jaredite survivors lived after the Ramah battle (although none of the available supporting evidence in the Book of Mormon itself is used for substantiation). If there still exist people to whom "Indian" means no more than savage, the book could have a salutary effect on such by awakening them to the level of culture the ruins demonstrate. There is a distinct need for some book of the kind this one aims to be, but when such appears it should be based on acceptable sources, sound reasoning, and above all, a thorough knowledge of the Book of Mormon itself as well as of American archaeology.

- 18.2 Special Meeting. Gareth W. Lowe, graduate assistant in the Department of Archaeology, attended the Round Table on Teaching Problems in the Field of Latin American Studies held at Albuquerque, New Mexico, January 8th and 9th, 1954. The Round Table, attended by language, history, and social science teachers of the Southwest, was sponsored by the University of New Mexico and the Pan American Union. Great emphasis was placed on the need of studying not only the languages of Latin America but also the archaeology, written history, culture, politics, social problems, etc. The development of Latin American studies should be of vital interest to Book of Mormon students.
- 18.3 Mexico Trip. Dr. M. Wells Jakeman recently left on a trip to Mexico where he hopes to effect the removal of the Izapa Stela 5 from the site in the state of Chiapas, Mexico, to the National Museum in Mexico City where it can be protected and preserved. He will also do reconnaissance work in an effort to locate sites that will be suitable for future excavation by the department.
- 18.4 Malad Talks. Ross T. Christensen, instructor in the BYU department of Archaeology, is scheduled to give a series of lectures in Malad, Idaho, on February 25th, 26th, and 27th. The subject of his talks will be "The Present Status of Book of Mormon Archaeology." They are co-sponsored by the BYU Extension Division and the Seventies Quorum of Malad Stake.
- 18.5 Mexican Archaeologist. Dr. Alberto Ruz, discoverer of the now famous secret tomb at Palenque will present two lectures in which members of the UAS will be interested, on March 16th and 17th. The Assembly Hall in Salt Lake City has been scheduled for Dr. Ruz' March 16th talk. The lecture on the 17th will be held in Provo and will be co-sponsored by the UAS and the Extension Division at BYU. Society members will receive special notification before the talks are delivered.
- 18.6 Tree of Life. Additional copies of the advertising brochure on the Tree of Life, for circulation among your friends, which was recently distributed to all society members and Mission Presidents can be obtained by writing to the BYU Department of Archaeology.