Dr. J. M. Adovasio received worldwide acclaim in the 1970s with his excavation of the Meadowcroft Rockshelter near Avella, Pa., 30 miles southwest of Pittsburgh. It is now widely recognized as the oldest well-dated archaeological site in the Northern Hemisphere, with evidence of human occupation extending back to at least 16,000 years.

On October 12, 1492, the soon-to-be-Admiral of the Ocean Sea, Cristoforo Colon (a.k.a. Columbus) waded ashore on the Caribbean island of San Salvador and almost immediately encountered its aboriginal occupants. These Arawak-speaking people who called themselves Taino were assumed by Columbus and his exhausted band of seafarers to be Asians, perhaps from the semi-mythical Spice Islands in the East Indies.

Their actual identity would remain problematic for quite some time (they would soon be decimated) and would become even more vexatious when, on September 15, 1513, Vasco Nuñez de Balboa crossed the Isthmus of Panama and first set European eyes on the Pacific. Though it probably did not occur to Balboa, at least not immediately, this “discovery” would have profound consequences because it conclusively showed that the land mass and off-shore islands “discovered” by Colon and subsequently explored by other Spanish, Portuguese, English, and French adventurers were not part of the Old World, but were instead a new continent, a new land bound by vast oceans on both coasts.
Among the first implications of this geographic epiphany was the realization that the occupants of this terra nova were not Asians, or at least not Asians in the then-recognized lexicon. This revelation led, naturally, to a series of questions which in one form or another have been asked ever since. Who were the original inhabitants of the New World? From where did they come? When did they get here? Despite half a millennium of speculation, intermittent scholarship, and then intensive research, the answers to these seemingly simple questions remain tantalizingly elusive.

Who are they and where do they come from?

Once the full impact of Balboa’s discovery of the Pacific sank into the educated heads of Europe, a whole series of speculations emerged as to the identity of the natives of the New World. Some thought they must be the lost tribes of Israel; others the descendants of Egyptians, Phoenicians, Greeks, or Romans; still others believed them to be at least in part survivors of the cataclysm which destroyed mythical Atlantis. Interestingly, many of the early European explorers noted the similarity in appearance between Indians, as they would be called to this day, and Asians — and one scholar actually theorized correctly as to their original homeland and even offered a guess as to when the first colonists of the New World arrived.

Father José de Acosta was a Spanish Jesuit missionary to Peru who, among his notable credits, was one of the first and most eloquent of the Europeans to speak out in defense of the rights and civil liberties of the natives of the New World. This in itself was remarkable, especially given the low opinion most Europeans had of the native populations.

Perhaps even more remarkably, or at least more presciently, de Acosta correctly identified the original homeland of the Native Americans as northeast Asia. In his Historia Natural y Moral de las Indias which appeared in 1590, de Acosta opined that the ancestors of the Indians arrived here by a slow pedestrian migration from northern Asia. He even offered that this migration may have occurred as early as 2,000 years before the arrival of the Spaniards, or ca. 2450 years B.P. (before the contemporary present, which by convention is A.D. 1950).

De Acosta’s pronouncement is amazing from several perspectives, not least of which was the fact that during his time, Europeans had no notion of the general geography of northeast Asia which they called Tartary on all maps of the time. Nor would anyone be even remotely familiar with the local geography of the Bering Straits for at least another century when its namesake, Vitus Bering, a Dane, penetrated this remote area in the service of the Russian Czar in 1714.

Despite de Acosta’s accurate answer to the first two of Colon’s and others’ questions, his work was not widely read; for the next three centuries, most commentators still preferred more exotic pedigrees and more mysterious homelands for the first colonists to the New World. Space precludes a detailed exposition of the penultimate resolution of the homeland controversy but suffice to say, it was not until the late 1890s — 300 years after de Acosta — that it was commonly accepted that the ancestors of almost all Native Americans originally came from northeast Asia. Paradoxically, as will be discussed below, even this now hoary “truism” is being reinvestigated.
Excavators under cover at the Rockshelter.
When did they arrive?

Though the twin issues of who the Native Americans were and where their ancestors came from proved frustratingly intractable for centuries, when the “First Americans” arrived is still the subject of vitriolic debate. The reasons for this impasse are obtuse and complex, even for professionals and nearly incomprehensible for lay persons.

As noted, de Acosta suggested that the original colonists to the New World walked here about 500 B.C. An earlier migration was almost inconceivable for a variety of reasons, not the least of which was a widespread and almost all pervasive ignorance of such basic facts as the age of the planet and the antiquity of humankind on it. In de Acosta’s time, and for centuries afterwards, the standard interpretations of the age of the world and all related matters, notably the appearance of humankind, were largely based on theological dogma, not science. Indeed, establishing the antiquity of humans in the Old World would have to precede establishing their arrival in the New.

The year 1859 proved to be pivotal in ways that would have far-reaching consequences. In that fateful year, not only would Darwin publish his Origin of Species with its profound implications for the antiquity of life on earth, but also a more obscure, but equally portentous event occurred. A group of respected British scientists, including John Evans and William Prestwich, visited the excavations of Jacques Boucher de Crèvecouer de Perthes, a French customs inspector and amateur paleoanthropologist (or at least so his ilk would be called today) in the Somme Valley of France near Amiens.

There, de Perthes had been digging since 1837 and had recovered unmistakable, if crude, stone tools and numerous remains of Ice Age animals which he was certain were contemporaneous with the artifacts. The British visitors confirmed the contemporaneity of the artifacts and the animal fossils, thereby simultaneously vindicating the oft-maligned de Perthes and, more importantly, establishing that humans had lived in Europe for untold thousands of years.

News of this sensational discovery and others in France and England ultimately reached North America, setting off a flurry of research activity directed at finding what was then called Glacial Man in the Americas. Amateurs and trained scientists alike were soon scouring the landscape in search of Ice Age Americans.

In 1876, a New Jersey doctor of medicine, Charles Conrad Abbott, published a widely read monograph in which he described Stone Age tools
said to be derived from ancient gravel beds in Trenton, N.J. These discoveries and others by equally eager, if totally untrained, Glacial Man proponents were actively promoted to an excited public and cited as incontrovertible proof that early humans had lived in the New World thousands, if not tens of thousands, of years before de Acosta's estimates.

While the idea of early humans in the Americas was well received by the general public and even some scholars, it did not sit well with the archaeological establishment of the time which included some formidable personalities, such as John Wesley Powell, the director of the Smithsonian Institution's Bureau of Ethnology and the U. S. Geological Survey; William Henry Holmes, a geologist-cum-archaeologist; and a bit later, one of the most daunting personalities to ever grace the American anthropological stage, Alés Hrdlicka.

Powell and, particularly Holmes, shredded Abbott's claims of Glacial Man by showing that the alleged ancient "tools" were not humanly made or anthropogenically altered at all. Instead, they were the products of natural weathering. By debunking the claims of Abbott and others of like mind, Holmes and company dealt Glacial Man a near-fatal blow. The coup de grace, however, was administered by Hrdlicka, a Czech-born scholar, who was trained at two medical schools and, hence, was thoroughly familiar with human anatomy and who also was quite conversant with the paleoanthropology of early humans in Europe. Hired by Holmes in 1903 to head the newly created Division of Physical Anthropology at the Smithsonian's National Museum, Hrdlicka quickly became the ultimate arbiter of all claims ancient in the New World, or at least the northern third of it. Suffice to say, he found none of the cases for Glacial Man credible, and using criteria originally developed by his colleague Holmes, he demolished each new claim with cold scientific logic tempered with a condescending ferocity of withering dimensions.
Interestingly, though Hrdlicka purported to believe that the ancestors of American Indians may have come to the New World as early as 10,000 years ago, he and Holmes found no acceptable evidence that the initial migration was much more than 5,000 to 7,000 years ago. Moreover, if they arrived that recently, they didn’t walk here, but instead came by boat.

While it seems in hindsight that these quintessential “establishment” scholars were professional naysayers, there was much substance to their skepticism. The Washington-based scientists established a set of simple yet powerful criteria whereby the purported antiquity of a site had to be rigorously evaluated. One had to find (1) artifacts of indisputable human manufacture or osteological remains that were unmistakably human; (2) in an indisputable stratigraphic context, that is within a site whose geological layers or strata could be unambiguously interpreted; (3) with appropriate chronological controls such as direct association with the remains of extinct Ice Age beasts.

None of the sites examined by Holmes or Hrdlicka met these perfectly reasonable criteria, and with each passing year punctuated with more failed Ice Age candidates, a deep antiquity for humans in the New World seemed even less likely. A late arrival for the ancestors of Native Americans became dogma by default.

**Epiphany at Folsom**

The man who would set into motion the events that would shatter the late arrival credo was not a professional scientist but rather a black ranch foreman born into slavery. George McJunkin, drawn to the west after the Civil War, became quite proficient at his new occupation. One day in 1908 while checking fences and searching for strays in a dry wash called appropriately Wild Horse Arroyo near Folsom, N.M., McJunkin noticed some bones eroding out of the wall of the wash. He knew the bones were too big to be cattle and even thought then that they were too large for modern bison. After an incredibly circuitous path, the bones were brought to the attention of Jesse D. Figgins, a paleontologist and the director of the Colorado Museum of Natural History — 18 years after their discovery and four years after McJunkin died! The rest, as the cliché goes, is history … or perhaps better, prehistory.
Figgins initiated excavations in Wild Horse Arroyo and recovered not only additional large animal bones, which he recognized as extinct bison, but also directly associated delicately made stone tools, the undeniable signature of Ice Age humans. With due fanfare, a delegation of prominent pre-historians including the leading field archaeologist of his day, Alfred Vincent Kidder, visited Folsom, examined the evidence, and pronounced it valid and acceptable. Curiously, Hrdlicka never came to take a look for himself nor did he ever publicly or, insofar as it is known privately, accept the Folsom discovery. Indeed, he went to his grave without recanting his late arrival position.

The Folsom discovery, or rather its acceptance, was a genuine watershed event in American and New World archaeology. Indians had been here before the last Ice Age ended, and a new benchmark for a human presence in the New World was fixed at about 10,000 years ago based on the geologically estimated extinction dates for *Bison antiquus*, the species identified at Folsom.

Clovis first?

Shortly thereafter, another discovery in New Mexico, this time near the town of Clovis, revealed even earlier evidence of what appeared to be a mammoth-hunting population that lived in the area before the Folsom bison hunters. Known and named for their trademark fluted lanceolate projectile points called Clovis after the type locality, additional evidence of these “earliest” North Americans began appearing over much of North America — both west and east of the Mississippi.

In addition to their signature points, Clovis folk also made large blades from which other tools could be fashioned: distinctive end scrapers (tools that are beveled on one or both ends that may have been hafted and used for thinning hides before they were tanned); hand-held side scrapers used for various scraping and cutting chores; and gravers (beaked tools used to incise wood and bone). All were usually made of high grade cherts, chaledonies, and jaspers obtained from distant quarries.

Because Clovis artifacts were so widely distributed, and especially because they seemed to be regularly found with and among the bones of mammoths and other extinct fauna, a picture soon took shape of small groups of rapidly moving, highly skilled hunters who systematically preyed on naïve big game animals which had never seen humans. With almost lightning speed, they spread virtually throughout the hemisphere, leaving a trail of carcasses in their wake. Once radiocarbon dating was invented by Willard Libby shortly after World War II, the Clovis horizon was dated to a very narrow time range between about 11,500 and 11,000 years B.P. This short time span correlated well with the notion of rapidly spreading colonists, and by the mid-1950s, Clovis was viewed almost unanimously as the pioneer population in the New World.

During the 1960s, another facet was added to the Clovis-First model. Paul Martin, a paleobotanist at the University of Arizona, suggested that it was no accident that many species of Ice Age animals appeared to become extinct precisely when Clovis groups were spreading across the hemisphere. Rather than simply advantageously preying on the cornucopia of Ice Age fauna, Clovis actually exterminated it in an unprecedented and bloody two-continent-wide blitzkrieg. The image was strangely evocative, and the evidence appeared unequivocal. How exciting, how dramatic … and with the benefit of unfailing hindsight, how dreadfully wrong.
The spectre of pre-Clovis

Between the initial Clovis discoveries in the 1930s through the subsequent refinement of the Clovis-First model in the 1940s and '50s, to its transformation into a dogmatic article of archaeological faith in the late 1960s and early '70s, hundreds of archaeological sites in North and South America were claimed to be older than the sacrosanct Clovis benchmark of 11,500 B.P. Unfortunately for their proponents, most of these localities enjoyed but a brief, all-too-fleeting fame. These sites — which include Sandia Cave, N.M.; Calico Hills, in southern California; and Old Crow in the Yukon to name but a celebrated few — fell for all the same reasons that Holmes and Hrdlicka demolished the sites of Glacial Man. The claimed artifacts weren’t artifacts; the stratigraphy, context, and associations were ambiguous; the chronological controls were wanting.

Despite decades of setbacks, however, a core of staunch pre-Clovis proponents insisted that the Clovis-First model was shot through with fatal flaws. First, no such rapid peopling event could be documented for any other part of the planet. Second, the evidence for human involvement in Ice Age extinctions was actually quite meager. Third, there were areas of North and South America where Clovis groups apparently never went, but early and different cultural traditions clearly existed there. Fourth — and to many, most damning — so much diversity existed in North and South America by 11,000 B.P. that Clovis could not be the parent complex of all these daughter cultures. Or at least so said the late Alex Krieger and Richard Stockton “Scotty” MacNeish, and the still very much alive Alan Bryan and Ruth Gruhn, as well as a handful of others. But where was the elusive proof? The repeated failure to locate pre-Clovis sites had, not surprisingly, cemented the Clovis-First position even further and the vast majority of American and Canadian archaeologists fully subscribed to this model.

Enter Meadowcroft

In the spring of 1972, another chain of events about as unlikely as the Folsom saga was initiated when I was approached by the University of Pittsburgh about a position in its anthropology department. They wanted someone to develop, or more accurately, resurrect, their moribund North American archaeology program and to teach the multidisciplinary techniques of modern field archaeology. I couldn’t join the faculty til the fall of 1973 as I had research commitments on Cyprus, but I got the appointment anyway.

Before leaving for the Mediterranean, I circulated the word that I would like to find a place suitable for a field school the following summer that met various criteria: it should be in an area within about 35 miles of Pittsburgh for logistical reasons; it should have received little or no previous archaeological
attention so that the students would be uncovering new information about the prehistory of the area as they learned to dig; and it should be a cave or rockshelter as these were the kinds of sites with which I was most familiar. Such sites also present formidable excavation challenges and hence constitute excellent outdoor "laboratories" in which to teach and learn field methods.

Somehow, in the spring of 1973, the late Phil Jack, a historian at California State College in California, Pa., heard about my quest and contacted me about a site on the property of a foundation created by a local landowner and enthusiastic student of history and prehistory, Albert Miller, and his brother Delvin, an illustrious harness racer. The site and surrounding property was called Meadowcroft; as soon as I saw it later that spring, I knew it was ideal for my purposes. Like Albert Miller — who suspected its potential as a child and who deserves all the credit for discovering the site and ensuring that it was never despoiled or damaged — I knew that generations of people through history and prehistory would have seen it as we did, a perfect place to camp for a night or two or even a couple of weeks.

Meadowcroft Rockshelter is a large south-facing overhang of sandstone which sits about 50 feet above Cross Creek, a small tributary of the Ohio River. Permanent springs which still provide potable water are available east and west of the site and, of course, prehistorically, drinking water was available from the creek itself. Within the overhang, which stands about 40 feet above the modern surface of the site, there is ample dry living space (about 600 square feet) for a group of 6 – 8 visitors, and the smoke from any fires in the interior is efficiently ventilated by the prevailing wind which blows from west to east across the mouth of the site. Because the Rockshelter faces south, it has a more equable micro-climate in the spring and fall of the year than the adjacent hilltops or valley bottoms. Finally, even today, edible wild fauna and flora are abundant and would have been much more plentiful in the past; in short, a perfect campsite.

Contrary to most archaeological scenarios, the excavations which began at Meadowcroft in June 1973, and which have continued intermittently since, have been very heavily funded, initially by the University of Pittsburgh, the Meadowcroft Foundation, and John and Edward Boyle of Oil City, Pa., then subsequently by the National Science Foundation, the National Geographic Society, the Buhl and Alcoa Foundations, and many private donors. This support, plus a multidisciplinary staff that included geologists, geoarchaeologists, sedimentologists, climatologists, prehistoric and modern plant and animal specialists from the University of Pittsburgh, and dozens of cooperating institutions, the excavations and attendant analyses at Meadowcroft were, and remain — according to the hundreds of
archaeologists and other scholars who have visited the site — "the state of the art."

With the publication of the first suite of radiocarbon dates from Meadowcroft in 1974, the site became, unarguably, the most controversial (if not notorious) North American locality advanced for early occupation of the New World since Abbott’s excavation in the Trenton gravels of New Jersey. As David Meltzer, an eminent scholar of all things Clovis and pre-Clovis, has observed, it has remained in the vortex of controversy to the present day.

The reasons for this enervating role are rather straightforward. Despite the fact that the final report has not yet appeared, Meadowcroft is the most intensively studied, the most extensively written about, and with its 52 radiocarbon assays, the most thoroughly dated of all the putative pre-Clovis sites in North America. Moreover, unlike all previous tilers at the pre-Clovis bar, it has decidedly not faded into oblivion.

The 11 strata identified at Meadowcroft have produced more than 20,000 artifacts, nearly a million animal bones, and almost 1.5 million plant remains from the longest aboriginal occupation sequence in eastern North America. With the notable exception of two other pre-Clovis claimants (Pendejo Cave in New Mexico and Pedra Furada in Brazil), it is also the longest record of human visitation to one spot on the landscape in the entire New World. The upper strata of the site (Upper Stratum Ia to Stratum XI) span the entire Holocene, or most recent geological period, while the lower culture bearing strata (Middle and Lower Stratum Ia) extend well back into
the Pleistocene, or last Ice Age. The most recent aboriginal and early historic use of the site is fixed at A.D. 1775 ± 50 or just before the start of the Revolutionary War, while the earliest visitation is more problematic.

Applying the most conservative interpretation of the early radiocarbon dates, I and my associates have concluded that if only the youngest date from Upper Middle Stratum IIa is valid, the *minimum* age for the presence of humans in this part of Pennsylvania is on the order of 12,000 – 10,600 radiocarbon years old, well within and even slightly beyond the upper Clovis limit which current data fixes at ca. 11,300 B.P. If the six deepest dates with cultural material are averaged, then humans were definitely present at this site sometime between 13,955 and 14,955 years ago — 2,655 to 3,255 years before Clovis!

If the dates were deeply disturbing to the Clovis lobby — especially its principal spokesman, C. Vance Haynes, a geoarchaeologist and colleague of Paul Martin at the University of Arizona — the contents of the oldest layers were equally disconcerting in a number of ways: (1) the tools definitely had clear anthropogenic signatures; (2) they occurred in what even the critics called unimpeachable stratigraphic context under rigid chronological control; (3) they were not obviously related to Clovis, but rather they consisted predominantly of small blade tools made from polyhedral blade cores more at home in ancient northeastern China than anywhere in the New World; (4) there were no Clovis points, only a much resharpened, unfluted lanceolate point which we gratefully named after Albert Miller; and (5) the associated plants and animals included no extinct Ice Age beasts but rather forms like white-tailed deer and smaller creatures which, with scant plant remains like hackberries and assorted nuts, collectively suggested a very different and much more generalized lifeway than the one posited for Clovis. Needless to say, all of this was very troubling.

As is usually the case, when a received theoretical perspective is challenged, the counter-attack was swift and oddly vicious. Though no one, or at least no one with any credibility, questioned the stratigraphy, context, or associations of the early materials or the excavation methods, the dates were attacked repeatedly with the accusation that *all* the dates older than the semi-mystical Clovis benchmark of 11,300 (or 11,500 B.P.) *must be wrong*, somehow contaminated with bits of coal
(which does occur within one mile of the site) or, more likely, by dissolving coal into groundwater which then percolated only into the deep layers, rendering only those layers artificially ancient. Once raised, the contamination issue cast a pall over the site despite the fact that four different radiocarbon labs, including the Oxford Accelerator Dating Facility in England, failed to find any indication of contamination whatsoever.

The contamination issue was finally laid to rest, at least for all but the most staunch spear carriers of the Clovis faith, only recently by a highly detailed study of the entire Meadowcroft stratigraphic sequence undertaken by Paul Goldberg and Trina Arpin at Boston University. Their research concluded that there was absolutely no evidence for intrusive coal particulates and, more to the point, no evidence for any groundwater movement, thus effectively slamming the door on any dissolved contaminants.

But, of course, this was not the end. The Clovis-First proponents asked, if Meadowcroft is really that old, where are the other Meadowcrofts? While this is contrary to the expectations of science in which the exception — like Folsom or de Perthes' excavations on the Somme — disproves the rule, the critics insisted on replicability: give us more Meadowcrofts!

**More Meadowcrofts**

Other Meadowcrofts have since appeared, the most spectacular of which, Monte Verde, is located in south-central Chile. Situated on the banks of Chinchihuapi Creek, a tributary of the Maullin River, Monte Verde is located about nine miles northeast of the Gulf of Ancud, an embayment of the Pacific Ocean. Since 1976, the site has been under intensive investigation by a multi-disciplinary, multi-national group directed by Tom Dillehay of the University of Kentucky. Like Meadowcroft, Monte Verde is the subject of a vast literature which includes a massive two-volume final report. Space constraints prevent a full exposition of this spectacular site which has been called the Folsom of South America, but a few details are warranted.

Two cultural components have been reported from Monte Verde: the most extensive of these called Monte Verde II consists of two "clusters" of stream-side dwellings which includes several different kinds of simple buildings. The larger cluster is composed of a series of separate rectangular, apartment-style rooms produced with a foundation of logs and branches and probably vertical walls sided and reinforced with animal hides. The smaller cluster exhibits a prepared wishbone-shaped clay foundation with vertical posts which also was probably hide covered.
Scattered in and among these structures were a few stone tools very different from Clovis (or Meadowcroft!) and a host of wood and fiber artifacts and extensive plant remains which again reflect a generalized lifestyle profoundly different from the one long posited for Clovis. Strikingly, the MVII occupation is securely dated to 13,000 B.P., a full 1,500 – 1,700 years older than Clovis! Despite even more relentless and vicious attacks than those directed at Meadowcroft, Monte Verde is now almost universally seen as the site which broke the back of Clovis-First. A delegation of leading scholars who visited Monte Verde in 1997 unanimously, if in some cases reluctantly, confirmed its claimed antiquity. And though two of them, notably including Vance Haynes, have since recanted, the acceptance of the Monte Verde excavations coupled with the Meadowcroft discoveries and other ongoing excavations at Cactus Hill and Saltville, Va., Topper in South Carolina, and numerous sites in South America, have collectively led to several inescapable conclusions.

End Game

Mortally wounded by Meadowcroft, Monte Verde, and now other pre-Clovis sites, the 70-year-old Clovis-First model for the peopling of the New World is finished. While a few disciples still preach of its validity, these voices are widely seen as its death throes.

However, with the collapse of Clovis-First, other questions emerge, some of which are nearly the same as those posed by Colon — our Columbus — in 1492. While we know generally that the ancestors of Native Americans came from northeast Asia, we do not know precisely where their homeland was, or more likely, where their homelands were, nor do we know how many times they crossed the Bering Straits. It now appears that many “pulses” of migration occurred, some of which undoubtedly failed, leaving no progeny.

We may also confidently speculate that at least some of the colonizing populations came by boat and traveled down the coast of western North America without ever substantially penetrating the interior. Of course, it is clear that others may have been
exclusively, or nearly exclusively, pedestrian, moving down between the vast ice sheets concurrently with those traveling down the coasts. Of course, their lifestyles may also have been quite different and not at all like that once imagined for Clovis.

Interestingly, in the post-Clovis-First collapse, a few have speculated that some groups could have entered the New World by venturing across the North Atlantic during the height of the last glacial period: Iberia, not Siberia!

If archaeologists still struggle with who they are and where they came from, the issue of chronology — when did they come — remains as elusive as ever. If Clovis is not first, who was? We may never know, but what is certain is that the initial colonization of the New World was the last great continent-wide expansion of the human species; indeed, the last great large-scale peopling episode of our kind until we might leave this planet to colonize other worlds. As such, tracking the first Americans continues to be a great adventure without parallel in contemporary New World archaeology. Thanks to Meadowcroft and Monte Verde, old simplistic images have been shattered and new ones are budding.

As it’s been said by Mike Collins, an archaeologist who worked at Monte Verde, and who is now excavating a vast Clovis site called Gault in central Texas, it’s a great time to be an archaeologist.
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