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ANNOUNCEMENTS

WYOMING ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY, INC., 1999 ANNUAL MEETING MINUTES
8:30 a.m.; Sundance High School Auditorium Saturday, April 24, 1999

PRESIDING: Cher Burgess, President
CALL TO ORDER: 8:30 a.m.

ROLL CALL AND CERTIFICATION OF DELEGATES: Secretary/Treasurer Carolyn Buff certified the voting delegates: Absaroka, Barbara and Stewart Keiry; Ancient Trails, Cher Burgess and Alice Tratebas; Casper, John Albanese and Jim Curkendall; Cherokee Trail, Alice and Kenneth Swanson; Cheyenne, Susan Adams and Susan Carlson; Fremont, Don Bailey and Eva Peden; High Plains, Jo and Roy Butler; June Frison, Julie Francis and Paul Joy; Platte, absent; Rawlins, George Brox; Sheridan/Johnson County, absent; and Sweetwater, absent.

Roll call showed nine chapters represented: Absaroka, Ancient Trails, Casper, Cheyenne, Cherokee Trail, Fremont, High Plains, June Frison, and Rawlins. Not represented at the meeting was Platte County, Sheridan/Johnson County, and Sweetwater County.


TREASURER’S REPORT: Secretary/Treasurer Carolyn Buff gave the treasurer’s report showing a total net worth as of March 31, 1999 of $33,158.03, an increase of $4,059.79. Motion by Barbara Keiry, second by Eva Peden to file the treasurer’s report for audit. Carried.

AUDITOR’S REPORT: Julie Francis, Milford Hanson, and Barbara Keiry performed the annual audit and found the accounts in order.

EDITOR’S REPORT: Danny Walker: The fall 1998 issue is at the printer. Anyone can submit a manuscript amateur or professional. Amateur submissions receive editorial review by the editor and submissions by professionals get outside review. Any information of interest is acceptable. Bonnie Johnson resigned as editor and Dewey Baars has agreed to assume the position temporarily. There are currently enough manuscripts for the spring 1999 issue.

LIBRARIAN’S REPORT: Danny Walker reported 11 exchange journals on file in the Wyoming State Archaeologist’s Office and will be sending chapters an updated inventory list of exchange publications for use by chapter members.

SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE: Carolyn Buff announced that the committee would have a lunch meeting at the Log Cabin Restaurant to evaluate the scholarship applications and choose recipients.

SAA/COAS: Due to an accident, Marcel Kornfeld was unavailable to report.

CHAPTER REPORTS: The chapter reports will be printed in The Wyoming Archaeologist if there is enough room. Carried. Chapter reports attached.

STATE ARCHAEOLOGIST’S REPORT: Mark Miller: The fall workshop will be held September 4 (Labor Day Weekend) in Laramie. Announcements will be mailed in July.

There has been a major restructuring and the Office of the Wyoming State Archaeologist and the State Historic Preservation Office are now part of the Department of Parks and Cultural Resources.

The University of Wyoming academic plan has the anthropology department as the only department on campus being recommended for a new PhD program.

OLD BUSINESS: Judy Wolf announced that Wyoming Archaeology Awareness Month posters and brochures were available for distribution. The 1999 theme is “Saga of the Frontier: Archaeology of the West,” with the keynote address being presented by Dr. Ray Wood on Saturday, September 19, at 7:00 p.m. at Western Wyoming Community College, Room 1302, in Rock Springs.

Each chapter was asked to distribute posters and information to the schools in their communities in an attempt to increase membership. Other locations suggested were the colleges, libraries, museums, etc.

The 1998 Wyoming Archaeology Awareness Month poster received first place at the SAA, for the second year in a row.

Wyoming History Day - $100 was awarded to Kandi L Glause from Natrona County High School for her paper on the peopling of the New World. Criteria were developed to forward to the public school teach-
ers. WAS members were also encouraged to volunteer at schools in their communities on History Day and forward the teachers’ names to Ranel Capron, Judy Wolf, or Karen Kempton in Cheyenne in an effort to make the teachers aware of the role of archaeology in history.

WEB PAGE: Dewey Baars and Danny Walker presented the following questions to be considered before final decisions are made for the development of a web site: Where is the server to be located (which computer system)? What is the monthly or annual fee? How large can it be and how many attachments can it have? What type of home page design is wanted? Will this site be an “Archaeology on the Net WEB Ring” owned by the WAS? Do any of the chapters have a web page and can we have a link to them or will they be a part of our web ring (accessible only through our web address)? What links will it have and do we need approval to list to other sites? Who will update the material and how often (two to three months is about the average life of dated material)? Some of the things that may be included and updated are posting of sites, site reports, new projects, employment prospects, volunteer opportunities, lecture schedules, meeting dates and places, and newsletters. We will need a supply of photographs with captions and a short explanation. Will we be able to maintain a supply of these items? Will material be screened for content and correctness or what will be required for a disclaimer? There is a possibility of being approved as an AMAZON.com associate. What does this mean? We could receive 5-15% of all book sales that are initiated from an amazon.com link through our website. Are there other similar opportunities we would want to consider? Who will be the reference point of contact for telephone or e-mail contacts and will they have help? Will the Wyoming Archaeological Society officers list require the addition of an Internet manager? Any other comments or concerns? Comments can be made to Danny, Dewey or Marcel. The consensus was to get answers to the questions before making any decisions.

DONATION POLICY: Motion by Barbara Keiry, second by Julie Francis that priority will be given to those funding requests which benefit the entire society. A letter of application will be submitted to the WAS president prior to the annual meeting. Application must include what the funding will be used for, how the WAS will benefit by the donation, and how the request is consistent with the WAS mission. Carried.

FRIENDS OF THE GEORGE C. FRISON INSTITUTE: Ray Gossett. A meeting was held November 7 in Laramie and three committees were formed: funding, promotions, and speakers. The committee term lengths are 1, 2 or 3 years by random drawing. The mission statement was read.

NEW BUSINESS: President Burgess welcomed the new June Frison Chapter in Laramie. Motion by Barbara Keiry, second by Paul Joy to donate $200 to Wyoming Archaeology Awareness Month. Carried.

GOLDEN TROWEL AWARD CRITERIA: A committee of Carolyn Buff, Mark Miller and Barbara Keiry will produce written criteria for nominations for the award.

E-MAIL ADDRESSES: Cher Burgess requested that we develop a method whereby e-mail addresses are published in the journal. A form will be sent to each member requesting name, address, telephone number, and e-mail address. Anyone not wishing to have the information published will be asked to return the signed form to the secretary/treasurer requesting that we NOT publish the information.

LOBBYING INFORMATION: Todd Thibodeau, president of the Wyoming Association of Professional Historians, proposed that a lobbying group be formed for cultural resources. Motion by Julie Francis, second by Dewey Baars that we appoint someone to this group. Carried. Nick Palmer, Cheyenne, was appointed.

WYOMING ARCHAEOLOGICAL FOUNDATION: Julie Francis announced that the foundation would meet at 8:00 a.m. Sunday at the Aro Restaurant.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS: Dewey Baars announced the following slate of officers: President, Gail Gossett; First Vice-President, Eva Peden; Second Vice-President, Barbara Keiry; Foundation (three-year term), Janice Baars. Motion by Julie Francis, second by Susan Adams to cast a unanimous ballot. Carried.

2000 NOMINATING COMMITTEE: Barbara Keiry, chair, Kerry Lippincott, and Alan Korell.

1999 SUMMER MEETING: Rather than have a specific site for the summer meeting, members were invited to visit or volunteer at any of the sites being worked throughout the summer.

2000 ANNUAL MEETING SITE: Will be in Cody with the Absaroka Chapter hosting.

INTRODUCTION OF OFFICERS: President Gail Gossett; 1st Vice President Eva Peden; 2nd Vice President Barbara Keiry; Wyoming Archaeological
ANNOUNCEMENTS: Carolyn Buff mentioned that membership cards and brochures are available.

Following a field trip to the Vore site and Sand Creek, the banquet was held at Ranch A. The field trip to the McKean site will begin at 10:00 a.m., Sunday, with members meeting in the high school parking lot.

The need for current names, address, phone numbers, and e-mail addresses from chapters was reiterated.

ADJOURN: 10:00 a.m.

BANQUET: Dr. Ken Karsmizki, whose program was titled “On the Trail of Lewis and Clark,” presented the banquet address

GOLDEN TROWEL AWARD: Dave McKee.

/s/ Carolyn M. Buff
Carolyn M. Buff Executive Secretary/Treasurer

/s/ Cher Burgess
Cher Burgess President

WYOMING ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY, INC. SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE MINUTES
April 24, 1999

PRESIDING: Carolyn Buff, Chair

PRESENT: Carolyn Buff, Cher Burgess, George Frison, Gail Gossett, Mark Miller, with guests Jim Buff and June Frison.

Motion by Mark Miller, second by Cher Burgess to award the Frison Scholarship to Michael Peterson, the Mulloy Scholarship to Nicole Proacci, and a WAS scholarship to Alan Bartholomew, all in the amount of $400. Carried.

/s/ Carolyn M. Buff
Carolyn M. Buff Scholarship Committee Chair

MEMBERSHIP SUMMARY
Total memberships as of March 31, 1999 - 388
(up from 318 in 1998, an increase of 50)
Absaroka = 9 family, 6 single
Ancient Trails = 4 family, 3 single
State Archaeologist = 2
Associate = 47
Casper = 10 family, 14 single
Chapters = 12
Cheyenne = 7 family, 6 single
Cherokee Trail = 16 family, 9 single
Department of Commerce = 3
Exchange = 10
Family = 0
Fremont County = 7 family, 10 single
Honorary = 13
High Plains = 43 family, 33 single
Institutional = 39
June Frison = 7 family, 14 single
Platte County = 0
Rawlins = 4 family, 9 single
Sheridan = 5 single Single = 0
Sweetwater County = 3 family, 23 single
Of Chapters:  Single = 118 Family = 103

CHAPTER OFFICERS

ABSAROKA Philip Anthony, President; Barbara Keiry (Nahas), Vice President; JoAnn Harris, Secretary/Treasurer
ANCIENT TRAILS Cher Burgess, President; Angie Cregger, Vice President; Mary Capps, Secretary; Carol Martel, Treasurer
CASPER Kerry Lippincott, President; Cathy Lantis, Secretary; Gloria Boyce, Treasurer
CHEYENNE Susan Carlson, President; Susan Adams, Vice President; Donna Durako, Secretary; Dick Lappe, Treasurer
CHEROKEE TRAIL Merle Starr, President; Don Tomsen, Vice President; Joyce Evans, Secretary/Treasurer
FREMONT COUNTY Ray Gossett, President; Don Bailey, Vice President; Helen Krause, Secretary; Bill Porter, Treasurer
HIGH PLAINS Jim Hageman, President; Jim Blevins, Vice President; Geri Zeimens, Secretary; Sharon Humberson, Treasurer
JUNE FRISON Dewey Baars, President; Margot Joy, Secretary; Paul Joy, Treasurer
PLATTE COUNTY unknown
RAWLINS William Scoggin, President; Sandy Meyers, Secretary
SHERIDAN Rick Dowdy, President; Carl Bender, Vice President; Orvella Burris, Secretary/Treasurer; Bessie Brewer, Contact Person
SWEETWATER COUNTY Russ Tanner, President;
Kevin Thompson, Vice President; David Johnson, Secretary/Treasurer

**WYOMING ARCHAEOLOGICAL FOUNDATION**

Julie Francis, President; Milford Hanson, Secretary/Treasurer; Robin Perdue, Immediate Past President WAS; George Frison, Member; Rich Adams, Member; Mary Lou Larson, ex officio; Mark Miller, ex officio

---

**1999 WAS CHAPTER REPORTS**

**ABSAROKA**

Field Trips: Red Gulch, Dinosaur Tracks, Big Horn Mountains

Public Education: Public awareness with raffle and bake sale at Wal-Mart; handed out flyers and answered questions.

Work With Other Organizations: Big Horn Canyon cataloging at Northwest Community College and National Park to complete strategic planning for year 2005.

Programs Presented: Mike Williams, Preparation for Excavations; Bud Kjincheloe, Soapstone Pipe and Pipe-Making; Mark Miller, Wagon Box Fight and Fort Fred Steele; Phyllis Preator, The History of the Pony Express; Jerry Ward, Workshop on Artifact Research; Cher Burgess, Muhlbauer Site in the Black Hills; Julie Francis, Rock Art.

**ANCIENT TRAILS**

Programs: Danny Walker, Mayan Ruins at Tulum and other Mayan site in the Yucatan and Puerto Rico; Danny Walker, 1998 Efforts at Fort Laramie to locate the site of old Fort William. Some members of the chapter worked on this project.

Public Education: During Wyoming Archaeology Awareness Month, the chapter invited the public to a trek along the portion of the Cheyenne-Deadwood Stage Trail north from Jenney Station to the Wyoming/South Dakota state line. The chapter is working to develop an informational brochure and to mark the stage route in Weston and Niobrara counties with several signs.

Education: The chapter held several work meetings to complete signs for the Cheyenne-Deadwood Stage project, and identify and catalog artifacts from the Muhlbauer site.

Work With Other Organizations: Island in the Plains in Rapid City in January.

Survey/Testing/Excavation: Cher Burgess directed the PIT project at the Kate Reynolds homestead site in Spearfish Canyon.

Other: Chapter membership continues to be a problem. Attendance at programs and special events is good, but attendance at regular meetings is dismal. It is difficult to get people to serve as officers. Plans were made for the annual meeting in Sundance.

**CASPER**


Testing/Excavation: Fort Caspar testing and excavation was conducted by Danny Walker from the Office of the State Archaeologist.

Vandalism Report: During severe October storms a contractor drove through the middle of July’s excavation area at Fort Caspar, leaving major ruts.

Programs Presented: Mike Miller, special agent, BLM Enforcement Section, presented on ARPA regarding permits, valuation, vandalism, and consequences of violating the act; Dr Tom Dillehay presented the Wyoming Archaeology Awareness Month keynote address at Casper College, entitled, “Mysteries of the Past: The Earliest Americans; Dr Kerry Lippincott presented the “Galactic Importance of Freshwater Mussels in Great Plains Archaeology”; Mavis Greer gave a presentation on Rock Art of Montana; Dr. Danny Walker presented an update on the search for Fort William; and John Albanese presented “Climatic Changes in the Rocky Mountain Region for the Last Three Thousand Years.”

**CHEROKEE TRAIL**

Public Education: Coverage on local paper on meetings/programs: Cher Burgess, Youth and Archaeology and WAS around the state; Marcel Kornfeld, North Park; Danny Walker, Sand Draw Dump Site and Old Fort William; Mark Setright, the old Penitentiary at Rawlins; and Marcel Kornfeld, Black Mountain.

**CHEYENNE**

Public Education: Excavations at Fort Laramie; worked with 54 sixth-graders from Afflerbach Elementary on a two-day historic archaeology dig at Terry Bison Ranch; presentation of archaeological methods to two classes at Afflerbach Elementary; Pine Springs excavation with Bob Kelly.

Programs Presented: George Durako, Archaeoastronomy of Hovenweep and Chaco Canyon; Larry Adams, Petroglyphs of Shay Canyon, Utah; Ray and Gail Gossett, Peru; and Sandra Reher, Amazon River Trip.
Other: Field trip to Shirley Basin to Shoshoni Winter Camp and pit houses.

**FREMONT COUNTY**

Survey/Testing/Excavation: Participation in three sites: Miners Delight mining camp, search for Fort William at Fort Laramie, and the KMPF site. One member worked at the Four Corners area and one couple did some research in Guatemala.

Public Education: Posters were distributed throughout Fremont County to the libraries and schools commemorating Wyoming Archaeology Awareness Month.


Programs Presented: Danny Walker, excavation of Sand Draw dump and the Baldwin Cabin; videos on Cahokia Mounds of Indiana, Ancient Arizona, Chaco Canyon Phenomena, Ancient Culture of Northern Arizona, Bison and the Vore Buffalo Jump.

Other: The Gossetts attended the affair honoring George Frison at the University.

**JUNE FRISON**

Paul Joy stabilized and put together a hearth for display.

Public Education: Fall workshop in Laramie in November with the Anthropology Club.

Programs Presented: Julie Francis, Recent Rock Art Research in Wyoming; Roxanne Cattaneo, Early Prehistory of Peopling of South America; Andres Dario Izeta, Prehistory of the Andes; David Rapson, Reconsidering the Hudson-Meng; George Gill, Human Osteology.

**HIGH PLAINS**

Survey: Several excursions to various areas to review and evaluate sites which were reported.


Public Education: EE youth program, lectures at museum, Western History Center, school presentations, field school, interpretive educational displays at Center.

Work With Other Organizations: Western Plains Historic Preservation Association, Goshen County Chamber, Old Fort Laramie Historic Site, Fort Laramie Historic Society, Wyoming Tourism, Department of Labor, Department of Family Services.

Publications/Reports: Korell Site, Maneater Cave, Pitmon Burial, summary of sites in area.

Programs Presented: Pete Gardner, T-Rex and the Crater of Doom (video); Julie Francis, Rock Art, Alan Keimig, Fossil Site south of Torrington; Fred Dapra, Early Mining in the Area; Mary Ann Koons, Fort Laramie excavations; Louis Redmond, Hudson-Meng Site.

Other: Oral histories, photograph private collections, site tours, participation in parades, local fairs, and hosting community activities.

---

**AUDITING COMMITTEE REPORT**

March 31, 1999 In compliance with the bylaws, the Auditing Committee has reviewed the Treasurer’s books and records for the Wyoming Archaeological Society, Inc. for fiscal 1998.

**AUDITING COMMITTEE SUMMARY**

March 31, 1999 The Wyoming Archaeological Society, Inc. checking account number is 7141005-75, the savings account number is 7141005-01, the money market account number is 7141005-60, and the certificate of deposit account number is 7141005-38 at the Natrona County School Employees Federal Credit Union, 900 Werner Ct, #100, Casper WY 82601.

Balance on hand March 31, 1998 - $29,098.90

Receipts: Interest Earned - $1,702.60
Deposits - $5,981.00

Disbursements - $3,624.47

Balance on hand March 31, 1999 - $33,158.03

Includes 0 outstanding check(s) for $ ____ to ____

Audited and found correct.

/s/ Julie Francis

/s/ Milford Hanson
CHECKING ACCOUNT - NC SCHOOL EMPLOYEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>$2,097.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,361.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Earned</td>
<td></td>
<td>$41.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INCOME - CHECKING</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,499.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENSES

- Casper College - Postage: $32.00
- Kandi Glauser - History Day Award: $100.00
- Builder’s Mart - Trowel: $9.49
- Merback Awards - Trowel Engraving: $20.81
- Rahel Graphic Design - WAAW: $480.00
- Wyoming Archaeological Foundation - Annual Dues Payment: $362.00
- Nicole Waguespack - Scholarship: $400.00
- Beth Ann Camp - Scholarship: $400.00
- Montana Archaeological Society - Donation: $150.00
- Cheyenne Chapter - Kapron Dues: $7.50
- Casper College - Postage: $32.00
- Casper College - Petty Cash: $100.00
- Kindo’s - WAAW Printing: $43.90
- USPS - Bulk Permit: $18.65
- Tom Killehay - WAAM Keynoter: $764.00
- Casper College - Postage: $32.00
- Casper Journal - WAAM: $96.00
- Laramie Newspapers - Archaeology Awareness Month: $147.60
- Society for American Archaeology - Dues: $30.00
- Casper Star Tribune - Archaeology Awareness Month: $162.12
- Casper College - Postage: $32.00
- USPS - Bulk Permit: $85.00
- Sheridan Chapter - Overpayment of Dues: $23.50
- Casper College - Postage: $45.40
- Secretary of State - Incorporation Fees: $10.00
- High Plains Chapter - Overpayment of Dues: $15.00
- Builder’s Mart - Trowel: $9.17
- Merback Awards - Trowel Engraving: $16.33
- TOTAL EXPENSES: $3,624.47
- ENDING BALANCE: $1,875.27

SAVINGS ACCOUNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BEGINNING BALANCE</th>
<th>ENDING BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEGINNING BALANCE</td>
<td>$109.05</td>
<td>$111.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Earned</td>
<td>$2.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MONEY MARKET ACCOUNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BEGINNING BALANCE</th>
<th>ENDING BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEGINNING BALANCE</td>
<td>$3,301.24</td>
<td>$6,062.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td>$2,620.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Earned</td>
<td>$141.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CERTIFICATE OF DEPOSIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BEGINNING BALANCE</th>
<th>ENDING BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEGINNING BALANCE</td>
<td>$23,590.94</td>
<td>$25,108.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Earned</td>
<td>$1,517.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Ending balance: $1,875.27
- Beginning balance: $109.05
- Deposit: $2,620.00
- Interest earned: $2.47
- Ending balance: $111.52
- Beginning balance: $3,301.24
- Deposit: $2,620.00
- Interest earned: $141.64
- Ending balance: $6,062.88
- Beginning balance: $23,590.94
- Deposit: $1,517.42
- Interest earned: $25,108.36
George C. Frison receives award for being Paleoarchaeologist of the Century from C. Vance Haynes (Photo courtesy of R.J. Fruits).

/s/ Barbara Keiry
Executive Secretary/Treasurer

GEORGE C. FRISON RECEIVES AWARD IN SANTA FE
George C. Frison, professor emeritus at the Department of Anthropology, University of Wyoming, received an award at the “Clovis and Beyond” conference held between October 28 and 31, in Santa Fe, New Mexico. The conference, the first of its kind in over 50 years on the topic of the First Americans was attended by the top scholars in the field as well as by a large number of professional and amateur archaeologists and the public. The conference covered biological and archaeological evidence for the first appearance of people in the western hemisphere. Over 100 presentations, including plenary papers, short contributions, posters, and exhibits constituted the conference. George Frison received the “Paleoarchaeologist of the Century” award from the conference organizers for his...
contribution to the study of the First Americans. The award was presented by Dr. C. Vance Haynes, Regents Professor Emeritus, from the University of Arizona. Haynes received the same award from the conference organizers the next day at the banquet. The plaque on the award contains a point cast from the Fenn Cache and reads:

Clovis and Beyond Conference-1999
Paleoarchaeologist of the Century

Presented to
GEORGE C. FRISON
In Recognition of His Accomplishments & Contributions in Paleoarchaeology

SAMUEL KNIGHT IS WYOMING’S CITIZEN OF THE CENTURY
Oct. 30, 1999 (University of Wyoming)

Legendary Wyoming geologist Samuel H. “Doc” Knight, who served as a University of Wyoming professor for five decades, today (Saturday) was named Wyoming’s Citizen of the Century. The announcement at UW culminated a program launched in 1995 by Sen. Alan Simpson, Gov. Jim Geringer, and Win Hickey, former state senator from Laramie County. Knight was one of nearly 200 individuals nominated in the Citizen of the Century program, sponsored by the UW American Heritage Center. Statewide committees solicited nominations to select individuals in different professions who have made the greatest contributions to Wyoming history during the past century. Last January, the committees selected finalists in 11 categories.

Knight was the winner in the health care, science and technology category. He also was a finalist in three other categories, education; minerals oil and gas; and fine and performing arts. In their recent biography, “Samuel Howell ‘Doc’ Knight: Mr. Wyoming University,” JoAnn and Fred Reckling describe Knight as a “Renaissance man — a master teacher, scientist, administrator, poet, philosopher, humorist, cartographer, photographer, soldier, carpenter, mechanic, humanitarian, confidant, athletic advocate, university ambassador, artist and sculptor.” Knight was a second-generation geologist. His father, Wilbur, worked as a territorial geologist, an assayer, a mine superintendent and a UW professor.

Knight (1892-1975) was designated “Mr. Wyoming University” by Time magazine in 1963, at the time of his retirement. He began his career at UW in 1916 as an assistant professor and curator of the geological museum. During his tenure at UW, he taught the introductory geology course to more than 15,000 undergraduate students, including both geology and non-geology majors.

“We received many passionate letters from his former students telling us about his extraordinary teaching abilities,” said Victoria Murphy, Citizen of the Century Program executive director. “Sam Knight
touched the lives of many people.”

Knight was at the forefront in the use of interpretive studies within the field of geology. His research on the rock formations of southeastern Wyoming is still considered groundbreaking. Knight was instrumental in establishing the University of Wyoming Department of Geology and Geophysics as among the best in the nation. He started the summer science camp that drew students from throughout the United States and world; and served as head of the geology department until his retirement in 1963. The legacy of Knight’s work remains visible to visitors to the university. He painted the large murals in the University’s Geological Museum and mounted the *Apatosaurus* that remains among the museum’s most important displays. He constructed a campus landmark, the large, copper-plated *Tyrannosaurus rex* that guards the museum.

Knight’s daughter, Eleanor Knight Keefer, accepted the award on behalf of her family. Other finalists for the Citizen of the Century Award were H.A. “Dave” True, agriculture and business, represented by son Hank True; Olaus and Margaret Murie, community service, represented by Peter Jorgensen of Jackson; George C. Frison, education; Margaret Simson Curry, fine and performing arts, represented by son Michael Curry; Alan K. Simpson, government and public service; Gen. Rhodolph L. Esmay, military, represented by son John Esmay; John S. Wold, minerals, oil and gas; Rev. John Roberts, religion, represented by grandson David Roberts; and Milward L. Simpson, sports, represented by son Pete Simpson.

---

**PUTTING THE BITE ON CRIME**

**U.S. Attorney Finds Creative Recompense for Ill-informed Field Trip**

A unique settlement has been reached between the U.S. Attorney’s Office for the District of Utah and David Dose, a sixth-grade teacher who took his students on a well-intentioned but damaging field trip to Arizona’s Glen Canyon National Recreation Area in 1994. Under a pretrial diversion agreement — an alternative to prosecution where an offender performs compensatory services — the Park Service will recover money for the damage and the incident will be used as an educational opportunity.

Dose conducted the trip as part of “Digging the Past,” a curriculum he developed at Kellogg Middle School in Idaho. Students digging under his direction damaged Crumbling Kiva Ruin, a dwelling occupied about A.D. 1200, removing artifacts such as ancient corn cobs. NPS investigator Jim Houseman determined that neither Dose nor anyone associated with the school district sought guidance on preservation laws, though it was readily available.

The U.S. Attorney’s Office determined that, given the nature of the offense and Dose’s reputable background, justice would best be served by the agreement. Dose agreed to write an article about the mistakes he made and the lessons learned, which he must submit to several prominent publications including Social Education, the journal of the National Council for the Social Studies. Before publication, the article must be approved by the NPS archaeology and ethnography program. Dose must also speak at the council’s annual conference and at meetings of area middle school associations. He agreed to pay $1,079 in damages to Glen Canyon NRA; under a civil settlement, the school district will pay NPS $1,065 for investigative expenses.

Assistant U.S. Attorney Wayne Dance, the prosecutor, developed the agreement. Complementing the constructive resolution of the case, Utah U.S. Attorney Paul Warner said, “A vital part of our job is in educating the public and preventing the damage from occurring in the first place.” (Common Ground, Summer 1999, pages 9-10).

**********

**Landowner Pays $35,000**

The Forest Service has collected a $35,000 settlement from a landowner who bulldozed an archaeological site, destroying rare, 12,000-year-old evidence of Paleoindians.

In 1991, Weldon Branch of Midvale Idaho, purchased the right to log land in Payette National Forest, which surrounds his property. When an archaeological site was discovered, the deal was canceled, says Elise Foster, a federal attorney in the case.

Two years later, a forest archaeologist found that a two-track road had been graded by a bulldozer, cutting a swath through the site and exposing hundreds of artifacts, including one from the Clovis period. Further damage was inflicted by someone pulling a stuck vehicle out of a wet meadow. A pile of projectile point fragments, probably discarded as commercially undesirable, was also discovered. Raw material for the
points, in all the styles of the Archaic period — 8,000 to 1,000 B.C. — originated from what is called the Timber Butte obsidian source, 50 miles south. Year after year, Indians brought them to the site, an open area above a salmon run with abundant roots and berries.

Branch admitted grading the road to log his parcel. But investigators found he also felled timber from the area he was originally interested in. This too damaged the site, exposing artifacts.

The Forest Service pursued a civil penalty. Eventually the parties agreed to mediate; Branch will pay about $11,000 for the timber violation, with the rest going to restore the site.

Foster praised the exemplary work of forest archaeologist Larry Kinsbury and Forest Service Law enforcement officer Rob Bryant in helping close the case (Common Ground, Summer 1999, page 10).

**********

Dealer Ordered to Forfeit Rare Document: Manuscript Returned to Mexico

A rare manuscript stolen from the Mexican National Archives has been returned under the Cultural Property Implementation Act of 1983. The 1778 manuscript, which bears the signature of missionary and soldier Fray Junipero Sera, was seen in a Sotheby's catalog by a Los Angeles collector, who notified Mexican authorities. Mexico requested assistance; the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York and the Customs Service investigated.

In 1992, Duane Douglas, a dealer, purchased the manuscript for $300 at a Mexico City flea market. According to testimony, he did not inquire about the manuscript's provenance. He brought it to his daughter's Los Angeles home without declaring it, keeping it in a safe. In 1996, Chicago antiquities collector Dana Toft purchased the manuscript for $16,000 in cash. According to Toft, Douglas said he acquired the manuscript from a private collection in Mexico that had been dispersed in the early 1970's.

Toft had Sotheby's New York auction the manuscript. Expected to go for between $20,000 and $30,000, it failed to meet its minimum bid, remaining on consignment in the catalog. After the collector saw it, the archives determined that at some point the manuscript had been removed from a bound volume of documents relating to California.

The United States filed a civil complaint in U.S. District Court in Manhattan to have the manuscript returned. The court ruled that the document was stolen, that Toft failed to prove he was unaware of it, and that under the Cultural Property Implementation Act, he was not entitled to compensation.

Assistant U.S. Attorney Evan T. Barr handled the case, with the investigation led by Bonnie Goldblatt of the Customs Service. (Common Ground, Summer 1999, page 11).

**********

U.S. Seizes Peruvian Antiquities: Treasures Likely Plundered From Ancient Tombs in Sipan Region

In a routine check of a crate marked “Peruvian Handicrafts,” customs inspectors at Miami International Airport discovered human remains and artifacts probably taken from tombs in the archaeologically rich Sipan region. The 572-pound crate — found in a Lufthansa Airlines warehouse on its way to Switzerland — contained a gold rattle, a gold-filled fox head, and other items along with a woman's mummified head wrapped in a wool turban and a human arm with a blue tattoo. The contents, whose worth is estimated in the millions of dollars, were described on a manifest as handicrafts valued at $2,764. Peruvian authorities issued a warrant for Rolando Rivas-Rivadeneyra, who they believe shipped the goods.

Customs seized the crate under the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 2601-2613), which prohibits the import of cultural artifacts without a permit. The act is intended to carry out the 1970 UNESCO convention prohibiting the illegal export and sale of cultural property. Officials at Peru's National Institute of Culture estimate that about $800 million a year is made on the sale of stolen artifacts, particularly from the Sipan region, where international demands drives rampant looting. In June 1997, the United States and Peru signed an agreement to step up the efforts to stop the trafficking.

Although most of the seized materials were returned to Peru, some — with permission — were used to dramatize the trafficking problem in “Empires of Mystery,” a temporary exhibit on South American civilizations at St. Petersburg's Florida International Museum. The objects appear in a diorama of the Lufthansa warehouse.

In a related development, FBI agents seized three gold artifacts from an exhibit at the Museum of New
Mexico’s Place of the Governors in Santa Fe. A pair of earrings and two gold pendants inlaid with turquoise and shell — also believed to be from Peruvian tombs— were on loan from an anonymous collector. Tom Chavez, director of the Palace of the Governors, had notified the lender that Peru might demand the return of the objects. The collector is cooperating with the FBI. (Common Ground, Winter 1998/Spring 1999, page 8-9).

**********

Grave Looter’s Appeal Denied

The California Court of Appeals has upheld the conviction of Brian Krantz, a former hunting guide convicted for looting Chumash graves at Channel Islands National Park (see spring 1997 and spring 1998 Common Ground). In 1997, after a three-week jury trial in Superior Court, Krantz was found guilty on a felony count of violating a state law that prohibits removing remains from a Native American grave. He was also found guilty of injuring an archaeological object, a misdemeanor.

Krantz was sentenced to perform 250 hours of community service, given three years probation, and fined $200. (Common Ground, Winter 1998/Spring 1999, page 9).

**********

National Park Looters Convicted; U.S. Attorney’s Office Pursues Attempt Charges

In a series of incidents, Assistant U.S. Attorney Dennis Kennedy of Virginia’s Eastern District has employed ARPA’s underused provision making attempted violations a crime. His district is the only one in the nation to use the provision (second violations of ARPA are automatically felonies). In August, Gerald Williams was convicted of possessing a metal detector at Manassas Battlefield. The next month Park Police caught him again at Alexandria’s Jones Point. He pled guilty to attempt, receiving a year’s probation and a $250 fine. He forfeited his metal detector and was banned from parks in the district for a year. In November, three people caught digging at the battlefield were prosecuted for attempt because of the nature of the evidence. Adam Breen and Craig MacMurray pled guilty; the latter’s wife, Chizura, pled guilty to attempting as well as to possessing a metal detector and not paying the entrance fee. They forfeited equipment, paid nearly $800 for repairs, and were banned from parks in the district for a year. In January, Donald Rogers pled guilty to attempt after being caught with a metal detector in Prince William Forest Park, whose piedmont forest ecosystem — one of the few remaining in the park system — has been inhabited since 8800 B.C. Rogers’ is the park’s first ARPA prosecution; sentencing is set for April 6.


**********

Seven Plead Guilty to Looting National Forest

When Assistant U.S. Attorney Beverly Mitchell went to examine looted archaeological sites in north Georgia’s Rich Mountain Wilderness Area, it became clear to her how someone could come and go undetected in the U.S. Forest Service preserve. The old road was little more than a track, washed out and barely negotiable in places even with a four-wheel drive vehicle.

The prosecutor’s destination — a place between two creeks near the mountain’s crest — looked like a mining operation. It was all that was left of a pair of 3,000-year-old archaeological sites. Looters had made the treacherous, three-mile ascent at night, using all-terrain vehicles. They dug by lantern. Authorities found them camped out after one of their many illicit excavations between January and September 1997.

After being indicted by a federal grand jury in Atlanta last March, all seven pled guilty to digging illegally on Forest Service land. Two pled guilty to felony violations of the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, the rest to misdemeanors. John Searcy, 39, was sentenced to 10 months in federal prison. The others — nearly all from the nearby town of Blue Ridge — were ordered to serve terms of probation and community service and pay $7,900 restitution and fines totaling $14,800.

This group might not be entirely responsible for the $35,000 damage as determined by Forest archaeologist Jack Wynn. Looting is a pastime in the region, says Mitchell. She sums up the looter’s attitude toward being charged: “Some people hunt and fish. This is what we do up here in north George.” Agents from
the Forest Service and the Gilmer County Sheriff’s Department handled the case investigation. (Common Ground, Winter 1998/Spring 1999, page 10).

Utah Supreme Court rules desecration law applied to prehistoric bones
SALT LAKE CITY (AP) -- The bones of prehistoric Indians were as protected by Utah’s laws against desecration as the remains in any emetery, the Utah Supreme Court has ruled.

the court ruled tuesday that 7th District Judge Lyle Anderson erred when he dismissed felony counts against a Blanding physician and his wife who are accused of grave robbing.

James and Jeanne Redd now will stand trial on misdemeanor trespassing charges and on felony charges of disinterring a body without permission and removing a body without reporting it to law-enforcement authorities.

“Certainly, these remains deserve protection, and we conclude the Legislature intended to grant it,” Justice Michael Zimmerman wrote in the unanimous opinion. “We agree with the state that the magistrate erred in his interpretation of the statute by concluding the facts alleged did not constitute a violation and in dismissing the charges.”

In the wake of the questions raised over the desecration law, the Legislature this year enacted a measure that clarified that the law applied to prehistoric human remains on both state and private lands. The law also made any vandalism of an archaeological site a third-degree felony, on pari with penalties for looting burial sites on federal lands.

Tuesday’s opinion focused on the original statute and determined that it was indeed sufficient in protecting all buried human remains from intentional excavation by looters.

Nearly four years have passed since a San Juan County sheriff’s deputy allegedly discovered the Redds digging in Cottonwood Wash near Bluff in an area known to have ruins of the Anasazi people, who inhabited the Four Corners region from 550 A.D. to 1200.

The Redds attorney has maintained they “vehemently deny having been the looters” and that evidence to be produced at trial will prove their innocence.

Many of the previous pronouncements from the bench in the Redd case have fueled resentment among Indian tribes, who believed the courts were saying that

the dead ancestors of Utah’s native peoples were not to be afforded the same respect as the remains of settlers buried in cemeteries.

Anderson, who sits as both magistrate and 7th District judge in Monticello, first dismissed felony counts against the Redds in 1997.

He declared state law was meant to deter mutilation of “recently deceased persons,” and was “to keep people from digging around in graveyards.”

Anderson contended the Legislature never “intended to prohibit or impose felony penalties for virtually all unauthorized excavations (of human remains) on state and private lands” because the Anasazi remains are “scattered all over this part of the country.”

The new opinion contradicts that interpretation.

“It may be that reading this statute as protecting partial remains of a thousand-year-old Anasazi will not accord with the expectations of some persons, as the trial judge noted,” Zimmerman wrote. “But a moment’s reflection should demonstrate the soundness of the broader public policy our interpretation advances. It will

protect the partial remains of many with whom people today can readily identify, such as pioneers buried long ago in crude graves, or of war dead, or of victims of horrendous accidents, or crimes.”

The high court also found Anderson mistakenly dismissed a felony charge against the Redds of removing, concealing or failing to report the finding of a body to a local law enforcement agency.

During a preliminary hearing last year, Anderson said, “the most that can be said is that they may have moved as many as 17 bones a few feet. This is not removal, concealment or destruction.”

Citing Webster’s Third New International Dictionary definition of “remove” as “to move by lifting, pushing aside or taking away or off,” Zimmerman concluded: “It seems clear that when the Redds took the bones out of the ground and moved them to the back dimaples, they ‘removed’ them within the plain meaning of the statute.”
Salt Lake City, UT - ARPA Case Conclusion

Based on an investigation that began in August 1996, Special Agents in the State of Utah have finally concluded the seizure of 316 historic and prehistoric Native American artifacts from the Nevada State Museum. Multiple looters were identified; however, the criminal statute of limitations had run out prior to the conclusion of the investigation. The only known suspect was deceased when the investigation began. Three other looters were associated with the illegal digging of the artifacts while other looters in the Wendover, Utah, and Nevada area were identified through the investigation. The final judgement was signed June 9, 1999, by the U.S. District Court Federal Judge in Salt Lake City, Utah. The Nevada State Museum assisted BLM in the investigation and therefore will be allowed to care for and display the artifacts for a period of time. The collection may, at some point in time, be relocated back to Utah for display. (from the BLM weekly law enforcement report; Tuesday, June 15, 1999)

*********

Utah Supreme Court rules desecration law applied to prehistoric bones

SALT LAKE CITY (AP) - The bones of prehistoric Indians were as protected by Utah’s laws against desecration as the remains in any cemetery, the Utah Supreme Court has ruled.

The court ruled Tuesday that 7th District Judge Lyle Anderson erred when he dismissed felony counts against a Blanding physician and his wife who are accused of grave-robbing.

James and Jeanne Redd now will stand trial on misdemeanor trespassing charges and on felony charges of disinterring a body without permission and removing a body without reporting it to law-enforcement authorities.

“Certainly, these remains deserve protection, and ceased when the investigation began. Three other looters were associated with the illegal digging of the artifacts while other looters in the Wendover, Utah, and Nevada area were identified through the investigation. The final judgement was signed June 9, 1999, by the U.S. District Court Federal Judge in Salt Lake City, Utah. The Nevada State Museum assisted BLM in the investigation and therefore will be allowed to care for and display the artifacts for a period of time. The collection may, at some point in time, be relocated back to Utah for display. (from the BLM weekly law enforcement report; Tuesday, June 15, 1999).

CHAPTER PROGRAMS AVAILABLE

Each year several requests come into the Wyoming State Archaeologist’s Office regarding possible programs for monthly chapter meetings. This year we have prepared a list of some of the current research topics that various people are working on, which your membership may be interested in, although it is not an exhaustive list of what may be available from Laramie. These presentations generally include slides and last from 45-60 minutes.

If your chapter is interested in a particular program for an upcoming meeting, please call one of these presenters at the phone number provided. Please also be prepared to discuss any arrangements for audio-visual equipment and funding or travel expenses. Some of these presenters are students with limited resources and often they have no financial support for their research. It is anticipated that you will make all necessary arrangements with the presenter during your phone conversation.

Thank you for your continued interest in the research activities in Laramie. Best of luck with your meeting schedule for 1999-2000.


Cher Burgess “Looking at Settlers of African Descent in the Black Hills.” Phone (307) 742-6417 or (307) 283-1154.

Judy A. Brown “Archaeological Curation at the University of Wyoming Repository.” Phone (307)766-5301.

Dan Eakin “Archaeological Investigations on the North Fork of the Shoshone River.” Phone (307)766-5301.

Dr. George Gill “The Emerging Picture of Prehistoric Easter Island: Statues, Bones and Burials.” Phone (307) 766-6282.

Dr. George Gill “Archaic and Paleoamerican Skeletal Traits: How Caucasian were the Clovis Hunters and Why?” Phone (307) 766-6382.

Dr. George Gill “Skeletal Injuries Among Frontier Whites.” Phone (307) 766-6382.

Dr. George Gill “Changes in Longevity, Violence and Skeletal Biology from the Wyoming Archaic through..."
the Late Prehistoric.” Phone (307) 766-6382.
Dr. Robert Kelly “Ethnoarchaeology Among Mikea
Hunter-Gatherers of Madagascar.” Phone (307)766-
3135.
Dr. Marcel Kornfeld “Paleoindian in the High Country:
Middle Park, Colorado.” Phone (307) 766-5348.
Dr. Marcel Kornfeld “Hell Gap Revisited: Paleoindian
Cultural Chronology and Other Problems.” Phone
(307) 766-5348.
Dr. Marcel Kornfeld “Rockshelters and Chipped Stone
Raw Material Procurement of the Bighorns.” Phone
(307) 766-5348.

Dr. Mark E. Miller “Archeology, History and the
Wagon Box Fight of August 1867.” Phone (307)766-
5564.
Dr. Mark E. Miller “Early Archaic Pronghorn Hunting
in the Upper Green River Basin, Wyoming.” Phone
(307)766-5564.
Dr. Danny N. Walker “Archaeological Looting in
Wyoming.” Phone (307)766-5565.
Dr. Danny N. Walker “Searching for Fort William on
the Laramie.” Phone (307)766-5565.
Dr. Danny N. Walker “1999 excavations Miner’s De-
light Townsite.” Phone (307)766-5565.
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________________________
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PAMPLIN PIPES IN WYOMING

by
James J. Stewart

Several white, cream, tan, red, brown, gray, and black clay (terra cotta) elbow pipes or pipe fragments representative of the exploratory, fur trading, westward immigration, and pioneer homesteading periods have been found in Wyoming (Table 1). Information to identify the origins, models, and dates of those 19th Century clay trade pipes is relatively unavailable. However, Raymond C. Dickerson, owner of the Pamplin Pipe Factory, Pamplin, Virginia, has shared a great deal of information about elbow clay trade pipes created in Virginia (Dickerson 1983; personal communications 1996-1997). Dickerson also graciously supplied 41 different Pamplin Pipes for a comparative study (Table 2), and the result is this report. Dickerson began collecting clay trade pipes in 1966, following the discovery while rabbit hunting of some pipes by a boy from his Sunday school class. His interest in clay pipes grew until he bought the defunct Pamplin Pipe Factory in 1976, and reopened it in 1978 as a museum, producing a limited amount of handmade pipes for the public and historic pipes for researchers. Under Dickerson’s management, the factory was listed as a National Historic Place about 1983.

The Pamplin Pipe Factory was initially at Akron, Ohio. White Ohio clays proved very usable by American entrepreneurs in competing with the European long stemmed “white ball clay pipe” manufacturers of England, Ireland, Scotland, France, and Holland. Several factors, including customs duties on foreign goods, allowed the emerging American pipe business to expand rapidly. Before the 1820s, European white ball clay pipes were the only trade pipes used in the Plains areas and the Northwest. However, because of custom fees and other factors, the Hudson Bay Trading Company and the U.S. Military began buying American-made pipes in bulk for their customers. The American-made pipes became so popular that archaeologists currently expect about an even site yield of European-made to American-made clay pipes at historic military and former Hudson Bay Company

sites in the Plains areas dating after the 1840s. The Northwest still liked the European white ball pipes, which continued to dominate, with a 90 to 100 percent ratio currently expected at archaeological sites in the Northwest (Pfeiffer 1982:213, 264-65).

The popularity of American elbow pipes allowed for the expansion. The Pamplin Factory established a sub-factory in Appomattox County, Virginia, to take advantage of the red, tan, gray, and brown clays found there. In other parts of the United States, the Point Pleasant, Ohio Pipe Factory (33CT256) produced pipes from the 1840s until about 1890. The John Taber Pottery Factory of East Alton, New Hampshire, produced pipes from about 1864-72 (Pfeiffer 1982:48). By 1859, the Pamplin Pipe Factory was operational in Virginia, as depicted by a factory seal marked with that year. The seal depicts the first kilns and chimneys at Pamplin, Virginia, however, the exact location of those buildings is not known. Several building foundations that appear to predate the identifiable 1880 foundation are on the Pamplin Factory grounds, and possibly represent the 1859 factory, according to Dickerson. He said local oral tradition has the factory periodically burned down, and buildings and accompanying paper work normally associated with such businesses destroyed. This makes research on pipe styles, dates, sales, locations, etc., nearly impossible. According to Dickerson, the current factory building was built in 1929, on the 1880 foundation, after the former building burnt down. One limited record available is the preserved artifacts from the 1865 sinking of the Steamboat Bertrand, which was carrying a case of red and brown clay trade pipes in a wooden case marked “The Celebrated Virginia, J. R. Franklin & Co., Sole Agents For The Manufacturers, Pamplin Depot, Appomattox County.” The box of pipes was destined for the Vivian & Simpson firm, of Virginia City, Montana (Pfeiffer 1982:211-12).

The Virginia clay pipe cottage industry was made up of local residents hand creating and firing pipes at their homes, using local red, brown, tan, and off-white
Some of the same styles evolved into Pamplin Pipes and continued through 1880 when the Pamplin Pipe Factory replaced the family cottage industry. These earlier pipes tend to be made of porous red, orange, and gray clays. The porosity of the clays with these earlier pipes tends to lead toward thicker bowls, which makes for heavier and bulkier pipes. Pamplin Pipes Models No. 1 and No. 2 have been identified as some of the earliest Appomattox County handmade cottage industry pipes.

Sometime between 1859 and 1880, the Pamplin, Virginia operation became a sub-plant of the Pamplin Operation of Akron, Ohio, with two kilns and chimneys measuring about 20-30 feet in diameter. Initially Native Americans (the Powhatan Tribe) made red clay pipes in Appomattox County, Virginia, and taught their trade to Euro-Americans by circa 1739. These Native American pipes often have a “bough motif” (Figure 1) imprinted in them that has also been found on local Native American pottery. The “bough motif” appears to have also been used, along with pipe making skills, by Virginia slaves at a historic slave camp, where examples of hand carved soap stone pipes have been found exhibiting the same motif.

From 1739 to 1880, Appomattox County clay pipes were made by several families, possibly operating in clan fashion at their homes. These families apparently competed against each other, selling their products to the earlier Pamplin Pipe Factory for distribution. Some of the best handmade, home industry pipes, were made by Mrs. Betty Price, with her choice of clays and pipes styles being directly related to her success. Besides the Price Family, other known historic Appomattox County cottage industry producers included the Davis, Brown, Rogers, Franklin, Ford, and Jones families. Currently, there are only two home industry clay pipe producers in Virginia, the Dickerson Family and the pipe makers at historic Williamsburg. Of the historic Virginia pipes, the Price Family produced Pipe Nos. 1, 2, and 20; the Davis Family produced pipe Nos. 2, 4, and 5; the Brown Family produced pipe No. 62; the Ford Family produced pipe No. 38; the Jones Family produced No. 60. Currently the Dickerson Family produces the “Robert E. Lee Pipe,” of unknown origin.

The numbering sequence for cataloging the Pamplin Pipes is a combination of assigning numbers by Dickerson to the sequence of Henry and Jean Hamilton’s report “Clay Pipes From Pamplin” for the first 38 pipes, and then Dickerson’s own system which evolved from the order in which he found pipes. The cottage industry went from a maximum of an estimated

---

Table 1: Inventory of Pamplin Pipes from Wyoming and surrounding region examined in study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION OF ELBOW PIPE</th>
<th>PAMPLIN PIPE NUMBER</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Laramie, WY</td>
<td>5, 19, 20, 51</td>
<td>Wilson 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon, WY</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Wilson 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanna, WY</td>
<td>32  [x3]</td>
<td>Thomson Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Rawlins, WY</td>
<td>T1  [b]</td>
<td>Graham Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laramie, WY</td>
<td>?a, 59</td>
<td>Wilson 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Sanders, WY</td>
<td>20, 24, 34</td>
<td>Meyer Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Laramie, WY</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Wilson 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Stambaugh (South Pass)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spriggs Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pass, WY</td>
<td>24, 25, 32, 33, 48x</td>
<td>Wilde Berry Estate, Casper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casper, WY</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Phil Kearney, WY</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Wilson 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Trail, South Pass, WY</td>
<td>two Point Pleasant Punctate Pipes</td>
<td>No. Taft Hill Estate, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Sully, SD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wilson 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins, CO</td>
<td>32, 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia City, NV</td>
<td>Tc</td>
<td>Graham Collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Figure 1: Native American pipe bough motif.
75 pipes per day to 20,000 a day when the factory was fully operational. Currently, 75 “Pamplin Pipes” styles have been identified by Dickerson. He estimates 34-36 of those styles represent handmade, cottage industry pipes, and 32 styles being definitely factory manufactured pipes. There is some overlap between the two groups, with many of the successful handmade pipes evolving into being factory productions after 1880. Of the early pipes, most of the known molds for casting the pipes were made by local craftsman Tas Harvey, with some original molds still in existence. Molds were made of wood, brass, and lead-zinc, with most of the
later molds being lead-zinc. Dickerson still has some original molds at Pamplin, however, the Williamsburg molds also originated at Pamplin, as did the mold set on display at the Smithsonian Institution.

The less porous clays used by the factory for producing pipes from 1880 through the 1940s were usually glazed. This made them less prone to break, allowed for thicker bowl walls, and consequently lighter weight pipes. White clays were imported from West Virginia and Kentucky in the later years of the factory’s operation (Hamilton 1972:3) and blended with the red and brown Appomattox County clays. Even though the dark red clays dominate in Appomattox County, pipes made from “almost yellow, to salmon, to light brown” also exist (Hamilton 1972:3). Although there were glazed European and American clay pipes at earlier dates, about 1880 to 1890 the use of glazing became prevalent with clay pipes. Dickerson said he had never seen a glazed colored clay pipe from the United States that was not from Virginia. Around the turn-of-the-century, some glazings of European-made pipes ranged from simple overall tones to, at times, very bright multiple hand colored colors, including blues, reds, greens, and yellows. For example, a turn of the century elaborately painted example of a turbaned head Dublin style pipe with painted facial features was among the pipes form the Fort Collins, Colorado, North Taft Hill Ranch Estate. The Pamplin Pipe Factory, however, tended to stay with simple red, tan, and brown “earth tone” pipes with the glazes involving the whole pipe. Dickerson said there are several Pamplin pipe models that have black patinas, with those patinas appearing to be painted on, rather than glazed; i.e., pipes numbered 4 and 51. Rex Wilson’s 1971 report on Fort Laramie clay pipes shows what may be a homemade black Pamplin No. 51 “Hayati Pipe” found at Fort Laramie that most likely predates 1880 and the factory-made Pamplin pipes. Wilson (1971) also shows a handmade Pamplin No. 20 “Zuuve Pipe” with a black top. However, it is hard to determine from the photograph if that blackened bowl area is a patina or some sort of fire charring. The Hamiltons reported that salt was vaporized by pouring it down a hole in the top of the kiln where it combined with the silica in “the clay to form a glassy or silicate glaze” on the pipes (Hamilton 1972:12). Two probable examples of this process are the Arkansas/Missouri Pamplin Nos. 25 and 34 pipes that are both well glazed. The Stone Family historical account dates their original use to the turn of the century.

The reeds for the Pamplin Pipes were collected from the Great Dismal Swamp, also located in Appomattox County, Virginia. Of three unprepared Dismal Swamp reeds supplied by Dickerson, all measured between 60 and 75 mm in diameter. This is similar to stem hole diameters for most of the 41 sample Pamplin pipes and the Pamplin pipes found in Wyoming. Overall variations with pipe stem hole diameters range from six mm through nine mm for about 70% of the pipes, with most being close to seven mm. The Wilde Berry Pipe (Casper) stem inserted into the pipe measures 8.1 cm long, with a six mm stem outside diameter at the bowl end, and a seven mm stem outside diameter at the mouth end. There are several handmade/home cottage industry pipes having larger stem holes, such as the No. 1 (127 mm in diameter), the No. 4 “Homemade Black” (120 mm in diameter), the No. 20 (140 mm in diameter), and the No. 47 (125 mm in diameter). The replica Robert E. Lee pipes currently being made by Dickerson from old molds has a stem hole diameter of 86-87 mm. Several factory pipes have much smaller stem hole diameters such as the No. 16 (55 mm in diameter) and the No. 12 (35 mm in diameter). With both these pipes, the manufacturers were apparently trying to reduce the total pipe weight.

Dickerson said Pipe Nos. 12 and 28 were deliberately designed not to use reed stems. Rather, they had a brass ferrule that slide over the end of the extended clay stem shank and connected to a more modern plastic/rubber type stem. This joining system is similar to how stems currently associated with modern briar pipes are connected. The size differences between the Pamplin Pipes, with reed stems, and the “Dublin Style Pipes,” where the stem is molded with the bowl, may be viewed as a diagnostic tool in differentiating the two pipe styles. Where the Pamplin Pipes usually have stem hole diameters variances between six and nine mm, Dublin pipes typically have a 4/64 inch (25 mm) stem hole diameter.

Thus, Pamplin Pipe stem hole diameters are easily two to three times that diameter. The Dublin pipes vary between 3/64 and 5/64 inch (two to three mm), with the 4/64 inch (25 mm) becoming standardized about 1778 and later (Eckles 1985:75).

An interesting application of the stem hole diameter as a diagnostic tool is evident with a pipe found as a surface find west of Rawlins along the Union Pacific Railroad. The bowl is round with a short squared off
stem, beveled around the stem edges, and looks like a Pamplin No. 43 or No. 50. However, the bowl’s spur had been carefully removed and sanded down, which at a quick glance was not evident. The predominant diagnostic feature for determining the bowl is not a Pamplin Pipe was the stem hole size measuring at 26 mm (4/64 inch). Where this diagnostic tool gets difficult is with pipe bowls such as the Rawlins Tan Glazed pipe that has a 48 mm stem hole diameter. The measurement is at the point where the stem was broken from the pipe, and not the stem shank end. The bowl is definitely not a Dublin style, but it also does not attain the stem end diameter size expected with most Pamplin Pipes. However, in looking at select Pamplin Pipes, most Pamplin stem holes evidently taper, getting smaller toward the bowl. Thus, this broken pipe bowl could still prove to be a Pamplin Pipe.

The unglazed Pamplin Pipes found at historic sites in Wyoming are most likely handmade, cottage industry pipes, predating the Pamplin Factory of 1880, according to Dickerson. These earlier handmade pipes are most likely made with more porous clays, resulting in heavier and thicker walled pipe bowls when compared with the later factory produced pipes. The pipes from South Pass, Wyoming, and Fort Collins, Colorado, that I studied support this contention. Common sense suggests there should be some pipe size and weight variations in the pre-factory period Pamplin pipes due to minor clay and kilning variations. Besides the porosity of the clay, such variations can also be attributed to differences in the molds, clays coming from various Virginia locations, moisture levels of the clay varying from batch to batch, and varying kilning times and heats creating different shrink rates particular from pipe batch to batch. This range of variants is consistent with expecting the earlier pipes to differ more in size from the same molds, and have less than slight differences between similar molds of the same pipe “models.” Some differences can be noted between pre-1880 handmade (cottage industry) and post-1880 Pamplin Factory pipes, as seen by Pamplin Pipes Nos. 48, 25, and 32.

Some minor differences can be noted between pre-1880 handmade (cottage industry) pipes found at South Pass and post-1880 Pamplin Pipes from Virginia locations found in the post-1950s. This is particularly true with Pamplin Pipe Number 48, but that might be attributable to a mold difference. Thus the South Pass No. 48 might really be a different Pamplin than any recorded by Dickerson or the Hamiltons. The Hamiltons researched the concept and found the older pipes would be larger and have a higher weight.

In a size-weight comparison between handmade and factory-made Pamplin Pipes, using pipes that had become landfill buried in Virginia, and Pamplin pipes found in Wyoming at South Pass, Laramie, and Old Dana (Hanna area) by collectors, the Wyoming pipes are generally unglazed and sometimes larger.

The greatest difference in sizes and clay colors was noted with the “Ohio Style” No. 48 pipes (Figure 2A, 2B, 2C). A tan clay Pamplin No. 48 from Fort Collins, Colorado, was nearly an exact match with a tan clay factory-made No. 48 found on the grounds of the Pamplin Pipe Factory by Dickerson. In contrast to those two tan factory pipes, about a dozen unglazed red to light red clay pipes found in the South Pass, Wyoming area are larger overall, measuring taller, wider, and longer than the factory pipes. The South Pass pipes have more pronounced smooth bands at the stem and bowl, and more rounded diagonal flutes. The larger South Pass pipes are designated in this report as No. 48x pipes, and have the characteristics expected for handmade pipes. The South Pass No. 48x pipes consequently weigh more than the later Pamplin Factory and Fort Collins No. 48 pipes.

The Hamiltons initially made the same assumption that cottage industry pipes would most likely be larger than the factory pipes, however, after researching 4,451 pipes, they concluded no significant differences existed. Their study, to differentiate between cottage industry and factory pipes, relied entirely on pipes found at different locales in Virginia. They noted a great overlapping of cottage industry and factory models, and concluded that when the Ohio operation moved to Appomattox County, it might have brought along several Akron pipe models. Overall, the operation integrated a large number of handmade Virginia style pipes (Hamilton 1972:21-23).

The South Pass pipes were collected in the 1950-60s and most likely found in the abandoned “garbage dumps” or buildings of the defunct mining district of South Pass representing Atlantic City, South Pass City, and Camp Stambaugh. The gold boom town/mining camp period ranges from 1868-1890s, and Camp Stambaugh was an operational military post from 1870-1878. The collector remembers finding the pipes, but cannot identify specific pipes to specific locations, with some added puzzlement about pipes found at Fort
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Sanders, Wyoming during that same time. If any of the collector’s pipes were from Fort Sanders, then the “113 Pipe” (Pamplin No. 24) most likely fits the style of pipes Wilson records from there. Wilson does not record any Pamplin Pipes Nos. 25, 34, or 32 found at Fort Sanders or Fort Laramie. The similar near-perfect and unsmoked condition of the South Pass Numbers 25, 34, and 32 pipes, and the large numbers of them, would lead one to expect collectors of Fort Sanders artifacts during the 1950-60s to have similar pipes in their collections. Those would have been recorded by Wilson in his 1971 report. The absence of the Pamplin Nos. 25, 48, and 32 pipes from those other collections reported by Wilson suggests the South Pass collector most likely found his pipes at South Pass. The near-perfect condition of the pipes probably suggests they were hoarded or disposed of as a group —feasibly from a defunct store.

Most pipes found by the Hanna/Rawlins collector were “Dublins,” also called “White Clay Ball Pipes,” “Irish,” and “English” pipes. These surface finds usually were found along the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way east and west of Rawlins, Wyoming, which often coincides with the Overland Trail and early railroad construction and military camps dating from circa 1868. In his findings, the Hanna/Rawlins collector found three tan glazed Pamplin “Ohio Style” No. 32 pipes at Old Dana, Wyoming (Figure 2D). Old Dana was the first Black mining community in Wyoming. It was surveyed in 1888, became operational in 1889, and

Figure 2: Pamplin pipes from Wyoming and other locations.
closed down in 1891. The Black miners were brought in from the Southern states by the Union Pacific Coal Company and housed in a tent city for three winters. The few Black miners who did not quit because of the cold moved and worked in the Hanna mines following the closing of the Old Dana Mine in 1891 (Union Pacific Coal Company 1940:120-122). The three Pamplin pipes appear to have been unsmoked, and were possibly dumped after being broken in transit. The cleanliness of the pipe fragments however might have been created by natural scourging by seasonal rain, wind, snow, and sun exposure. Dating of the site circa 1890 coincides with the first known glazing of pipes by the Pamplin Pipe Factory. Several similar unsmoked, but unglazed, light red “Ohio Style” No. 32 pipes were found by the South Pass collector in near mint condition at South Pass along with the red Pamplin No. 48x and white No. 25’s discussed elsewhere in this article.

The red clay/unglazed condition of these Pamplin No. 32 South Pass pipes probably indicates they are older and home made/cottage industry pipes, when compared to the Old Dana No. 32 glazed pipes, which are evidently factory pipes created after 1880/1890. Also very similar to the South Pass No. 32’s is a red clay/unglazed No. 32 pipe from Fort Collins, Colorado. The Fort Collins pipe is well smoked with remnants of tobacco still present, which possibly indicates it was used through the homestead/ranching historic period. This sort of date comparing is also evident when compared with two gray clay No. 59 pipes, one collected in Laramie, Wyoming (Figure 3A), and the other from a burned mercantile in Virginia City, Nevada. The No. 59s are factory-made pipes, and probably represent manufacture after 1890, according to Dickerson. The two No. 59s were both unglazed and represent poor workmanship with the pipe maker not making any attempt to smooth the mold seams on the pipe bowls, nor the stem hole area on one pipe. The two pipes are so alike they could have come from the same casting and shipment west.

The South Pass collector also found several white Pamplin No. 25 pipes (Figure 2H), which Dickerson calls “Wigwam Shaker Pipes.” The No. 25 pipes were made in two sizes and both glazed and unglazed. The half dozen South Pass No. 25 pipes are all unglazed. Wilson (1971) lists a No. 25 being found at the now nonexistent town of Carbon, Wyoming, a mining town along the Union Pacific Railroad line dating from 1868-1902 (Wilson 1971: 65, 27, Figure F). A No. 25 pipe with an intact stem was auctioned in Rawlins. That pipe however, was a contemporary transplant moving to Rawlins within the past 10 years. Historically, it represents turn-of-the-century use by the Beatrice Stone Family as the family moved between Little Rock, Arkansas and Missouri in a covered wagon, according to a family member. The stem on that pipe, in place, measured 10.2 cm long, making the overall pipe length to be 14.0 cm. This was a well smoked glazed cream-colored pipe, and much darker than the unsmoked unglazed Pamplin No. 25s from South Pass. It was also darker than the glazed light cream colored No. 25 from the Pamplin Factory, supplied by Dickerson. This darkening of the glaze on a well-smoked pipe likewise occurred with a No. 34 “Powwow Shaker Pipe”

![Figure 3: Selected clay pipes from Wyoming and other localities.](image-url)
also from the same Stone Family estate, having been transported from Arkansas to Missouri. The two pipes suggest the possibility that extensive smoking of clay pipes created darker bowl tones or patinas, as occurs with German meerschaum pipes. A further possibility for the darkened patina or glazing was the pipe user may have rubbed wax or another coating on the pipe. The Hamiltons state that bees wax and mutton tallow were rubbed into pre-factory Pamplin pipes and then polished with woolen cloths (Hamilton 1972:8). The use of wax coatings, particularly before glazes, is historically recognized with Dublin (English) style pipes. Pipes were also dunked in rum or other alcoholic beverages to add taste and most likely to sterilize common “pub pipes.” Those “Dublin” pipes were commonly shared by patrons in the lower class English and Irish pubs, with the user snapping off the end of the stem as a sanitary habit (Hacker 1989). We can assume the beverage dunking of pipes, just for the taste, might have carried over to other style pipes such as the reed stemmed Pamplins.

Several Pamplin No. 34 factory pipes, also called “Powwow Shaker Pipes,” were listed by Wilson as having been found at Fort Sanders, possibly dating between 1868-82 (Wilson 1971:77; Figure 32E-F; 45; 79, Figure 35A; 48). A No. 34 “Powwow Shaker Pipes” from the Casper, Wyoming, pioneer/ranching Wilde Berry Family estate (Figure 2I) had the stem still intact. The glazed light grey clay pipe was in mint condition with all of the appearances of what one should expect from a thin walled factory pipe being purchased right off the shelf. The condition of the pipe and other articles from that estate centered around items most likely created or acquired during the first 20-30 years of the Twentieth Century. The stem measured 8.1 cm long, just shorter than the reed stem for the Arkansas/Missouri No. 25, making the overall length of the Casper pipe 13.2 cm. If the stems were intact, both pipes are reasonably the same overall length.

According to Dickerson, the Pamplin No. 24 with the embossed “113” pipe is a hard-to-find factory model. What surprised him was that two No. 24s have been found at two historic Wyoming sites, meaning that model pipe was probably created before the Pamplin Pipe Factory existed, suggesting they were homemade/cottage industry pipes. The pipe is distinguished by the number “113” embossed on the left side of the stem. The pipe otherwise is barrel shaped with a rounded bottom, and two smooth bands on the bowl. Wilson lists a No. 24 being found at Fort Sanders, thus dating it approximately 1866-82 (Wilson 1971: 46, 77, Figure 32G). A second No. 24 was found by the South Pass collector (Figure 3A). However, the South Pass collector had a hard time remembering just where he had collected it, with some possibility that he found his example also at Fort Sanders.

The finding of a tan Pamplin No. 33 or Diamond Pipe at South Pass (Figure 2J) also surprised Dickerson. Again, he considered this model pipe to have been only a factory-made pipe. He supplied me with red/tan and grey/white factory-made models for comparing to the Wyoming pipe. The factory pipes differed slightly in size, but were still quite similar, with the grey/white being the larger of the two. Interestingly, the glazed red/tan factory pipe nearly matched the tan South Pass Diamond Pipe. Since the South Pass area was still being used after the Pamplin Pipe Factory opened in 1880, there is the possibility a batch of factory pipes did make it to the South Pass gold mining camps of Wyoming. However, there is also the possibility the South Pass Diamond Pipe, like the No. 24, is older and a handmade cottage industry pipe, but glazed. That could possibly suggest the Pamplin Factory did glazings before 1890. Evidently, the Point Pleasant Ohio Pipe Factory was glazing pipes circa 1850-1860 (Pfeiffer 1982).

The fact that Pamplin pipes were trade goods to Whites and Native Americans alike in the Rocky Mountain West is evidenced by the raised diamond pattern and smooth bowl band of a Pamplin Diamond No. 33 pipe clearly depicted in the 1905-06 photograph of an Assiniboine/Gros Ventre Fool Dancer. This dancer is smoking a pipe while taking a rest from dancing, at the Fort Belknap Reservation, Montana (Sumner W. Matteson photograph; from Fleming and Luskey 1993:69).

The Pamplin No. 1 pipes (Figure 2K) were the original handmade/cottage industry pipes, which carried on to being factory pipes. Dickerson refers to these red clay pipes as “Trader Pipes,” being made in as many as 12 sizes from 1739-1880. They are marked “Original” on right side of the stem flange. Wilson lists a Pamplin No. 1 having been found at Fort Stambaugh (South Pass). That fort was established in 1870 and abandoned in 1878. (Wilson 1971: 80, Figure 38 E-F; 50-51, Figure 40 A).

Pamplin No. 5 pipes were handmade/cottage industry pipes associated with the Davis Family in Virginia.
before 1900. The red clay pipes were produced in two sizes, but the same model style. They are similar to Pamplin No. 4 pipes, with a smooth bowl rim and band, a crosshatch diamond bowl motif, and a diagonal band where the bowl and stem intersect. Wilson lists one of these pipes being found at Fort Laramie (Wilson 1971:61, Figure 5B).

Also found in Wyoming were Pamplin No. 19 pipes, which were both homemade and factory-made pipes. I do not have a comparison pipe for this example, but Wilson’s example might be red clay. Dickerson states this pipe is considered quite rare. It was made in two sizes, but the same style. The pipes are smooth, with a narrower stem than most of the earlier Pamplin pipes. Wilson lists one of these pipes as found at Fort Laramie, Wyoming (Wilson 1971: 61, Figure 5A).

The Pamplin No. 20 homemade “Zuvee Pipe,” appears to have been popular with early western military personnel, civilian employees at the forts, or visitors to military camps. Examples of these large/heavy Virginian pipes were found at Wyoming forts along the Oregon, Bozeman, and Overland Trails. The white clay pipes are a very simple rounded “L” bowl and stem design manufactured in five sizes, according to Dickerson. Wilson lists Zuvee Pipes being found at Fort Phil Kearney, dating between 1866-68 (Wilson 1971:69, 33, Figure 22). Four pipes were found at Fort Sanders (Figure 2B), dating them possibly between 1868-82 (Wilson 1971: 45,77, Figure 32 A-D). One Zuvee Pipe was found at Fort Laramie (Wilson 1971: 59, Figure G; 61, Figure 5). The problem with exact dating of the pipes without supporting data such as where, how, and accompanying items, leaves the researcher only looking at when the dates of the forts were known to exist. That however, creates problems in that civilians most often occupied those locations before and after the military occupied the sites.

The Pamplin No. 51 was created both as a homemade and factory-made pipe. From the photo/illustration in Wilson’s report, it appears to have had a black patina. Dickerson states it was made in two sizes, but the same style. It is a smooth pipe, with a band around the stem end, with “Hayiti” stamped on the right side of the stem. In many ways, it is similar to the Pamplin No. 17 pipe according to Dickerson. Wilson lists such a pipe as having been found at Fort Laramie (Wilson 1971: 61, Figure 5C).

Besides the identifiable Pamplin Pipes, several elbow pipes are somewhat similar to Pamplin pipes. A white clay pipe (Figure 3C), probably found in the Laramie, Wyoming area, has an extended stem much like a Pamplin Nos. 12, 43, and 50. The pipe measures 58 mm long, 36 mm high and has an outside bowl diameter of 27 mm, a inside bowl diameter of 21 mm and an inside stem hole diameter of four mm. The mold seam extends across the stem hole end, suggesting the pipe was cast deliberately with this size and shape stem, i.e., the pipe is not a broken Dublin style pipe. Most likely this pipe would have been fitted with a brass ferrule and a black hard rubber/plastic molded stem, such as is found with the Pamplin Pipe No. 12 created during the 1920s. Thus the current accompanying black painted, lathe shaped, wooden stem is not a stock item, but something added later. The stem measures eight cm long, 140 mm pipe end stem outside diameter, and has a 95 mm diameter at the mouth end.

A probable Virginia/Ohio Pipe (my listing, ?b) is a tan glazed pipe made from a gray clay, suggesting a pipe, if Pamplin, possibly made about 1890 or newer. If this is a Taber or Point Pleasant pipe, then the glazing could be consistent with some older 1850/60s pipes. The bowl is intact, but the upward angled stem is broken very close to the bowl. The bowl is oval with the width slightly more than the length. The broken stem makes length measurements impossible, but measures 3.8 cm high, 3.7 cm wide, 2.7 cm bowl outside diameter, and a stem hole diameter of four mm at the break. The stem hole diameter is quite small for most Pamplin pipes, which usually range from six to seven mm, to fit the reeds found in Virginia. The pipe was collected along the Union Pacific Railroad/Overland Trail west of Rawlins as a surface find.

Two glazed “Knobby” type pipes were viewed during this research. One was collected as a surface find west of Rawlins along the Overland Trail/Union Pacific Railroad (Figure 2L). The second was collected in Virginia City, Nevada, possibly at the site of an old mercantile building that burned down. The Rawlins pipe is light tan while the Nevada pipe is dark brown. Both have shiny glazes and many raised bumps around the pipe bowl. The bowl is round with a smooth bowl rim band. The stem is horizontal, with a round knob “spur” at the bottom of the bowl. The two pipes have stem holes of 62 mm and 70 mm, consistent with the reed stem sizes associated with those collected from the Great Dismal Swamp of Appomattox County, Virginia. However, these pipes were manufactured in New Hampshire, by a John Taber. It is interesting
that no listed Pamplin Pipe has a spur, and it appears that Taber was glazing his pipes circa 1850-1860, well before Pamplin Pipes began glazing circa 1890.

The Rawlins Light Tan Taber Knobby measures: 4.0 cm high, 3.8 cm long, bowl outside diameter is 2.7 cm, 2.11 cm inside bowl diameter, and has a 6.2 mm stem hole inside diameter. The Virginia City Dark Brown Taber Knobby bowl measures 4.0 cm high, 3.8 cm long, with a 2.6 cm bowl outside diameter, a 2.0 cm bowl inside diameter, and a 7.0 mm stem hole inside diameter, and was collected by G. Graham from Virginia City, Nevada.

### CATALOG OF PIPES FROM APPOMATTOX COUNTY, VIRGINIA

**Pamplin No. 1 Handmade, Original Homemade, and Factory Pipe** (Figure 4A)

Trader Pipes, three pipes, many styles Original Powhatan Homemade Pipe. The larger pipe model, and two smaller models from Dickerson. Manufacture dates on the No. 1 “Original” handmade pipes range from 1739-1880. All should be marked “Original” on right side stem flange, however, Pfeiffer does not describe inscriptions on the large number of No. 1, No. 2, or No. 54 pipes found with the 1865 sinking of the Steamboat Bertrand, which was carrying a case of red and brown clay trade pipes in a wooden case marked “The Celebrated Virginia. J.R. Franklin & Co., Sole Agents For The Manufacturers, Pamplin Depot, Appomattox County.” (Pfeiffer 1982:211-12).

**Large Red Pamplin No. 1a** 5.0 cm high; 5.54 cm long; 3.31 cm wide; 2.43 cm diameter bowl throat; 1.27 cm stem hole. “V” shaped pipe with 70-75 degree stem angle, 48.0 grams weight, and smooth bowl. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

**Red Pamplin No. 1b** (Figure 4B) 4.23 cm high; 4.70 cm long; 2.73 cm wide; 1.94 cm diameter bowl throat; 1.09 cm stem hole. “V” shaped pipe with 65 degree stem angle, 27.0 grams weight, and smooth bowl. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

**Red Pamplin No. 1c** (Figure 4C) 4.15 cm high; 4.41 cm long; 2.39 cm wide; 2.24 cm diameter bowl throat; 0.77 cm stem hole. “V” shaped pipe with 80 degree stem angle, 27.4 grams weight, and smooth bowl. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

**Pamplin No. 2 Handmade Original Pipe** (Figure 4H)

Trader Pipes, similar to No. 1. Made in 12 styles. V shaped pipe, with smooth bowl, smooth stem, bowl slightly shorter than Pipe No. 1. Date on this “Original” handmade pipes go from 1739-1880. Marked “Original” on right side stem flange.

**Red Pamplin No. 2** 4.48 cm high; 5.04 cm long; 3.32 cm wide; 2.15 cm diameter bowl throat; 0.84 cm stem hole. “V” shaped pipe with 70-75 degree stem angle, 41.4 grams weight, and smooth bowl. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

**Pamplin No. 4 Black and Red** (Figure 4G)

Homemade Black, circa 1900 AD, two sizes same style. L-shaped pipe, black clay with cross hatch pattern on bowl, with smooth bowl lip, smooth bowl band, and smooth band around stem end.

**Black Coat on Red Clay Pamplin No. 4** 4.63 cm high; 4.8 cm long; 2.93 cm wide; 2.14 cm diameter bowl throat; 1.2 cm stem hole. “V” shaped pipe with 75-80 degree stem angle and 30.5 grams weight. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

**Pamplin No. 7 Factory Pipe** (Figure 4F)

Common Pipe machine made pipe produced from 1880-1947, two sizes same style. L shaped pipe, diagonal ribbed bowl, with smooth bowl rim, smooth stem band, smooth stem end. Diagonal ribs angle forward on stem and backwards on the bowl.

**Light Red Pamplin No. 7** 4.05 cm high; 4.02 cm long; 2.71 cm wide; 1.98 cm diameter bowl throat; 0.7 cm stem hole. “L” shaped pipe with 90 degree stem angle and 20 grams weight. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

**Pamplin No. 9 Factory Pipe** (Figure 4E)

Virginia Shaker Pipes, machine made pipe, white or red, five sizes same style. L shaped pipe, curved ribbed bowl, with smooth bowl rim, smooth bowl band, and smooth band at stem end. Curved ribs have second joint on stem.
Red/Tan Pamplin No. 9 4.27 cm high; 4.45 cm long; 2.71 cm wide; 2.0 cm diameter bowl throat; 0.65 cm stem hole. “L” shaped pipe with 90 degree stem angle and 20 grams weight. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

White No. 9, unglazed, with stem, a contemporary REPLICA pipe purchased from Cache la Poudre Rifle Works, Fort Collins, Colorado, 1995 — JJS No. 29 measures: 3.7 cm h; 4.3 cm long; 2.7 cm w, 2.0 cm throat diameter; 0.8 stem hole diameter. “L” shaped pipe with 90 degree stem angle and 26 grams weight.

Pamplin No. 10 Factory Pipe (Figure 4D)
Large curved ribbed bowl, V shape pipe, machine made pipe, with smooth bowl rim, smooth bowl band, and smooth band at stem end. 4 sizes same style.

Large Red Clay Pamplin No. 10, measures: 4.0 cm high; 5.5 cm long; 3.0 cm wide; 2.4 cm diameter bowl throat; 0.8 cm stem hole. “V” shaped pipe with 60 degree stem angle and 32 grams weight. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.
Pamplin No. 12 Factory Pipe (Figure 4I)

Smooth L shaped pipe, much like English style pipe, but short stem, machine made pipe, one size, one style. RD comment: This pipe was designed for a brass ferrule that slip over the end of the clay stem and held a reed or other stem.

**Tan Pamplin No. 12**
4.1 cm high; 5.71 cm long; 2.7 cm wide; 2.03 cm diameter bowl throat; 0.35 cm stem hole. “Extended V” shaped pipe with 105 degree stem angle and 22.4 grams weight. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

Pamplin No. 13 Factory and Homemade Pipe (Figure 4J)

Three sizes same style. “Original,” (some not marked). V shaped pipe, with four angled stem, but smooth barrel bowl. Has smooth band on stem end. Date on these “Original” handmade pipes go from 1739-1880. Marked “Original on right side stem flange.” From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

**Tan Pamplin No. 13**
4.47 cm high; 5.15 cm long; 2.91 cm wide; 2.22 cm diameter bowl throat; 1.02 cm stem hole. “V” shaped pipe with 55-60 degree stem angle and 31.3 grams weight.

Pamplin No. 14 Factory Pipe (Figure 4K)

One size, one style. V shaped pipe, with four angled stem, but smooth band and top end of bowl. Has smooth band on stem end. Bowl is shorter than No. 13. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

**Tan Pamplin No. x**
4.0 cm high; 3.86 cm long; oval bowl is wider than long; 2.00 cm wide; 1.80 cm bowl ID front to back; stem broken giving wrong reading for stem hole. “V” shaped pipe with 60 degree stem angle and no weight due to being broken.

Pamplin No. 16 Factory and Homemade Pipe (Figure 4L)

Two sizes same style. Ladies pipe believed to have been called “Lady Legs.” Extended L shaped pipe with smooth sides. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

**Red Pamplin No. 16**
3.89 cm high; 4.00 cm long; 2.05 cm wide; 1.80 cm diameter bowl throat; 0.55 cm stem hole. “Extended V” shaped pipe with 100 degree stem angle and 12.5 grams weight.

Pamplin No. 20 Homemade Pipe (Figure 4M)

Zuvee Pipe, five sizes, same style. Somewhat like No. 1 and No. 2. L shaped pipe, with smooth barrel like bowl, and smooth stem. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

**Light Red Clay, Possibly Black Patina Pamplin No. 20**
4.98 cm high; 4.41 cm long; 2.82 cm wide; 1.96 cm diameter bowl throat; 1.4 cm stem hole. “V” shaped pipe with 80 degree stem angle and 28.3 grams weight.

Fort Phil Kearney (1866-68) unglazed, undecorated pipe (Wilson 1971: p. 69 Figure No. 22; p. 33).

Fort Sanders 1868-82 (Laramie, WY) (Wilson 1971: p. 77 Figure 32 A-D; p. 45)

Fort Laramie, (Wilson 1971: p. 59 Figure G; p. 61, Figure 5)

Pamplin No. 22 Factory Pipe (Figure 4R)

One size, one style. Slightly V shaped pipe, with very wide curved ribbed bowl, with smooth bowl band down from rim of bowl. Rib extend to stem end. 

**Rough Red Clay Pamplin No. 22**
4.44 cm high; broken length wise = no measurement; 2.90 cm wide; 2.0 cm diameter bowl throat; 0.63 cm stem hole. “V” shaped pipe with 75-80 degree stem angle and no weight due to being broken. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

Pamplin No. 24 Factory Pipe (Figure 4Q)

113 Pipe, marked with number 113, one size. Smooth L shaped pipe, with double smooth bands on bowl.

**Red 113 Pamplin No. 24**
3.95 cm high; 3.61 cm long; 2.61 cm wide; 1.85 cm diameter bowl throat; 0.70 cm stem hole. “L” shaped pipe with 90 degree stem angle and 18 grams weight. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

**Light Tan Clay Smooth “113” Trade Pipe.**
Bowl only. Round stem, smooth bowl, with two raised round bands encircling bowl. “113” raised on left side of stem hole area. Measures: 3.9 cm H x 2.5 cm W x 3.4 cm long; 1.8 cm diameter throat, and 0.7 cm stem hole. “L” shaped pipe with 90 degree stem angle and 19.0 grams weight. Fire burned on right side of whole bowl as if pipe fell into ashes and laid there a while.
Found at South Pass.

Fort Sanders 1868-82 (Laramie, WY) (Wilson 1971: p. 77 Figure 32 G; p. 46).

**Pamplin No. 25 Homemade and Factory Pipe** (Figure 4P)
Glazed, Wigwam Shaker Pipe, two sizes, one style. Vertical fluted V shaped bowl with smooth bowl rim, and smooth band just below rim. Six sided stem, with smooth band at stem end. Similar pipes were produced by pipe factories in Point Pleasant, Ohio. The Ohio pipes however, usually have the letter “M” somewhere embossed or stamped into them. None of the South Pass pipes have that characteristic. Murphey (1908) lists this style as also being created by the Akron Smoking Pipe Company, at its Mogadore, Summit County, Ohio Factory, with a number of variants. This was the Mogadore Hexagonal Stemmed Milled Chesterfield Elbo Pipe.

**Unglazed White Pamplin No. 25** 3.93 cm high; 2.96 cm wide; 4.94 cm long; with 2.06 cm diameter throat, and 0.76 cm stem hole. “V” shaped pipe with 55 degree stem angle, broken so no weight.

**Glazed White Pamplin No. 25** “V” shaped pipe with 55 degree stem angle, no weight recorded. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

**Pamplin No. 26 probably homemade Pipe** (Figure 4O)
Unglazed, “CATLINS Pipe,” one style. L shaped bowl with smooth bowl rim, and smooth band just below rim and above the word “CATLINS which is on both sides. The stem end is six sided with a round knob end. There is a small raised squarish circle in the bottom of the bowl. A large fragment of an unglazed red Pamplin No. 26 was excavated by collectors from a West Laramie outhouse sink, dating circa 1890. The outhouse represented a private residence of most likely a railroad employee.

**Unglazed Red CATLINS Pamplin No. 26** 4.9 long; 4.0 cm wide; 4.0cm high; with 2.5 cm outside diameter throat; 2.0 cm inside diameter bowl; and 0.7 cm stem hole. “L” shaped pipe with 90 degree stem angle. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

**Pamplin No. 27 Factory Pipe** (Figure 4N)
Ten sided Barrel or Bucket Pipe, marked “103,” one size, one style. V shaped pipe, with wide vertical ribs, and ribbed band down from bowl rim.

**Red Pamplin No. 27** 3.74 cm high; 4.44 cm long; 2.53 cm wide; 1.74 cm diameter bowl throat; 0.70 cm stem hole. “V” shaped pipe with 45 degree stem angle and 18.5 grams weight. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

**Pamplin No. 28 Factory Pipe** (Figure 4S)
106 Pipe, marked with number 106, one size, one style.

**Tan Pamplin No. 28** 3.55 cm high; 4.02 cm long; 2.40 cm wide; 1.7 cm diameter bowl throat; 0.54 cm stem hole. “Extended V” shaped pipe with 95 degree stem angle and not weighed. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

**Pamplin No. 31 Factory Pipe** (Figure 4T)
Ohio Style Pipe, One style, two sizes. L shaped pipe, curved ribbed bowl, with smooth bowl rim, smooth bowl band, and smooth band at stem end. Curved ribs extend to stem band.

**Red Pamplin No. 31** 4.56 cm high; 3.96 cm long; 2.58 cm wide; 1.82 cm diameter bowl throat; 0.7 cm stem hole. “L” shaped pipe with 90 degree stem angle, broken so not weighed. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

**Pamplin No. 32 Factory Pipe** (Figure 4U)
Fine Line Pipe. Curved ribbed bowl, V shape pipe,
machine made pipe, with smooth bowl rim, smooth bowl band, and smooth band at stem end. Similar model pipes were made at pipe factories at Point Pleasant, Ohio.

Tan Pamplin No. 32 3.89 cm high; 4.73 cm long; 2.13 cm wide; 2.06 cm diameter bowl throat; 0.75 cm stem hole. “V” shaped pipe with 55 degree stem angle and 24.8 grams weight. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

Tan Pamplin No. 32 found at South Pass. Curved ribbed bowl, with one raised round band encircling bowl rim, and double raised bands encircling pipe stem area. JJS/WS No. 28 measures: 3.80 cm H x 2.50 cm W x 4.8 cm long; with 1.8 cm diameter throat, and 0.7 cm stem hole. Chip in back of bowl top. “V” shaped pipe with 55 degree stem angle and 22.2 grams weight.

Red Pamplin No. 32 clay pipe fragments (3 pipes) Old Dana, Wyoming (48CR-6521). Largest bowl fragment measures 4.71 cm L x 3.24 cm H x 2.82 cm W/thick. .662 cm stem hole diameter. “V” shaped pipe with 55 degree stem angle, broken so no weight recorded. D. Thomson surface finds west of Hanna, Wyoming, at Old Dana.

Tan Pamplin No. 32 tan clay pipe from ranch estate of North Taft Hill area Ft. Collins, Colorado, purchased estate items through Never Open Antiques. measures: 3.93 cm H; 4.86 cm L; 2.7 cm bowl OD; 2.02 bowl ID; 0.72 stem hole ID. “V” shaped pipe with 55 degree stem angle and 25.5 grams weight.

Pamplin No. 33 Factory Pipe (Figure 4V)
Diamond Pipes, one red and one white/gray, one size, one style. L shaped pipe, with raised diamond pattern on bowl, to stem area where diagonal ribs extend to smooth band at end of stem. Murphey (1908) lists this style as also being created by the Akron Smoking Pipe Company, at its Mogadore, Summit County, Ohio Factory, as a Mogadore Diamond Stamped Elbo Pipe.

Red Pamplin Diamond Pipe No. 33 Measures: 3.83 cm high; 4.17 cm long; 2.5 cm wide; 1.8 cm diameter bowl throat; 0.66 cm stem hole. “L” shaped pipe with 90 degree stem angle and 21.8 grams weight.

Gray/Black Diamond Pipe No. 33 Measures: 4.23 cm high; 4.4 cm long; 2.73 cm wide; 1.92 cm diameter bowl throat; 0.7 cm stem hole. “L” shaped pipe with 90 degree stem angle and 21.9 grams weight. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

Tan Diamond No. 33 pipe found at South Pass, WY, (WS No. 21). Measures: 3.9 cm h; 2.6 cm w; 4.1 cm long; 1.8 cm throat diameter; 0.8 cm stem hole diameter. “L” shaped pipe with 90 degree stem angle and 21.0 grams weight.

Pamplin No. 34 Factory Pipe (Figure 4W)
Powwow Shaker Pipe, red or white, one size, one style. Smooth L shaped pipe, with double smooth bands at top of bowl. Smooth band at stem end. Murphey (1908) lists this style as also being created by the Akron Smoking Pipe Company, at its Mogadore, Summit County, Ohio Factory, as a Mogadore Ringed Elbo Pipe.

Glazed Tan Pamplin No. 34 3.82 cm high; stem broken off; 2.82 cm wide; 1.96 cm diameter bowl throat; 1.4 cm stem hole. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

Powwow Shaker Pipe with reed stem from Wilde Berry Estate, Casper, purchased through Dennis Knopick, 1995, JJS No. 14 measures: 3.9 cm h; 2.5 cm w; 4.7 cm long; 1.8 cm throat diameter; 0.7 cm stem hole diameter.

Fort Sanders 1868-82 (Laramie, WY) (Wilson 1971: p. 77 Figure 32 E-F; p. 45)

Pamplin No. 35 Factory Pipe (Figure5A)
1833-1833 Century of Progress Chicago Pipe, (1833-1933), Indian head with single feather on one side, century of progress on reverse. Smooth band around stem end. One size, one style.

Red Pamplin No. 35 5.50 cm high; Oval bowl, far end broken off, 1.46 wide; 0.73 cm stem hole. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

Pamplin No. 36 Factory Pipe (Figure 5B)
Tomahawk Pipe, two sizes, same style. This pipe bowl bottom is broken.

Red Pamplin No. 36 5.3 cm long; Oval bowl, 1.42 cm bowl ID wide, 3.2 bowl ID length; 0.62 cm stem hole. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

Pamplin No. 37 Factory Pipe (Figure 5C)
Powhatan/George Washington Pipe, or Appomattox Indian Pipe or Apo-mat-tuke Pipe Indian with Full...
Headdress Bowl Pipe, contemporary Replica.

**Red Pamplin No. 37** 5.3 cm high; 2.23 cm long; 1.42 cm wide ID; 3.2 cm bowl length ID; 0.62 cm stem hole. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

**Pamplin No.46 Homemade and Factory Pipe** (Figure 5I)

"Unmarked" Blackstone Angular Pipe red or white clay, one size, one style. This pipe was made for the tobacco industry, particularly the Blackstone Guana Company, of Blackstone, Virginia.

**White Light Tan Pamplin No. 46** 4.75 cm high; 5.0 cm long; 3.35 cm wide; 1.89 cm diameter bowl throat; 0.60 cm stem hole. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

**Pamplin No. 47 Homemade and Factory Pipe** (Figure 5E)

Large Bowl Pipe, one size, one style.

**Tan Pamplin No. 47** 4.92 cm high; 5.05 cm long; 3.18 cm wide; 2.44 cm diameter bowl throat; 1.19 cm stem hole. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

**Pamplin No. 48 Factory Pipe** (Figure 5J)

Tan diagonally ribbed pipe, one size, one style. Single raised smooth band slightly below bowl rim, bowl rim also smooth, smooth raised band at stem end. Somewhat similar model pipes were made at Point Pleasant, Ohio.

**Red Pamplin No. 48** 4.12 cm high; 4.03 cm long; 2.33 cm wide; 1.65 cm diameter bowl throat; 0.75 cm stem hole. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

**Pamplin No. 48x Light Red Diagonally Ribbed Clay Trade Pipe**. OLD: ca. 1870s. Bowl only. Diagonally ribbed bowl, with one raised round band encircl-
ing bowl. 4 cm H x 2.5 cm W x 4.2 cm long; with 1.9 cm diameter throat, and 0.9 cm stem hole. Slight fire burn on rear and upper inside portions of bowl. At least seven examples found at South Pass, possibly Fort Stambaugh, (1870-78). There is the possibility the differences between the No. 48x pipes found at South Pass, and those No. 48 pipes from Pamplin through Dickerson, are due to different Pamplin molds, or their having been created at Point Pleasant, Ohio.

Pamplin No. 48  Matches pipe from Virginia; diagonally ribbed pipe from Fort Collins, North Taft Hill area ranch estate, through antique store: measures 3.58 cm high; 4.15 cm long; 2.5 cm wide; 1.78 cm diameter bowl throat; 0.62 cm stem hole.

Pamplin No. 54 Factory Pipe (Figure 5N)
  D.A. Gree Pipe, one size, one style. This is a smooth clay pipe barrel style bowl, with 8 sided straight stem. “Original” imprinted on right stem flange.

Red Clay Pamplin No. 54  4.78 cm high; 4.86 cm long; 2.94 cm wide; 2.04 cm diameter bowl throat; 1.16 cm stem hole. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

Pamplin No. 55 Factory Pipe (Figure 5H)
  Long Neck Zoo Pipe, two sizes, one style. This is a smooth clay pipe barrel style bowl, with 6 sided flanged stem. “Original” imprinted on right stem flange.

Red Pamplin No. 55  4.20 cm high; 4.90 cm long; 2.75 cm wide; 2.06 cm diameter bowl throat; 0.63 cm stem hole. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

Pamplin No. 57 Factory Pipe (Figure 5G)
  Flare Mouth Original Pipe, one size, one style. This is a smooth clay pipe barrel style bowl, with 6 sided flanged stem. “Original” imprinted on right stem flange.

Red Pamplin No. 57  4.08 cm high; 4.87 cm long; 2.76 cm wide; 1.94 cm diameter bowl throat; 0.90 cm stem hole. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

Pamplin No. 59 Factory Fine Line Pipe (Figure 5F)
  One size, small version of a No. 10, somewhat akin to a No. 32 in size, etc. Two examples from Graham Collection, one from Virginia City, Nevada, the other from Laramie, Wyoming. Both examples are gray clay, and the workman at the factory did not smooth out the mold seam. The Laramie example has a black painted round wooden stem that appears to have been turned on a lathe. There appears to have some tar residue in the stem, but the pipe bowl is unused, leading to speculating the stem was originally used with a different pipe. Due to similarities between the Pamplin No 59 and similar looking pipes made at Point Pleasant, Ohio, the two listed gray pipes were possibly made at Point Pleasant, Ohio, rather than at Pamplin, VA.

Gray Pamplin No. 59 Laramie, WY  Unglazed, unsmoked, mold seam not smoothed during manufacturing: 3.6 cm high; 4.6 cm long; 2.1 cm bowl OD; 2.05 bowl ID; 0.70 cm stem hole.

Gray Pamplin No. 59 Virginia City, NV  Unglazed, unsmoked, mold seam not smoothed during manufacture: 3.9 cm high; 4.3 cm long; 2.65 cm bowl OD; 2.0 bowl ID; 0.65 cm stem hole.

Pamplin No. 60 Homemade Pipe (Figure 5K)
  Acorn Pipe, two sizes, one style.

Acorn Pamplin No. 60-short  4.00 cm high; 4.00 cm long; 2.00 cm wide; 2.00 cm diameter bowl throat; 0.70 cm stem hole. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

Pamplin No. 60 Factory Pipe (Figure 5L)
  Acorn Pipe REPLICA, made from original mold.

Acorn Pamplin No. 60-tall  4.00 cm high; 4.00 cm long; 2.00 cm wide; 2.00 cm diameter bowl throat; 0.70 cm stem hole. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

Pamplin No. A Zoo Pipe (Figure 5M)
  Red clay, smooth barrel like pipe. “Zoo” on right side of stem. Stem broken off. At first glance this looks like number 160, but under magnification reads as ZOO.

Red Zoo Pamplin No. A  3.80 cm high; oval bowl front to back 2.78 cm long, 2.54 cm wide; 1.7 cm stem hole. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

Pamplin No. B Pipe (Figure 5Q)
  White clay smooth oval pipe, with flanged stem, reasonably straight barrel like bowl. Right side of bowl broken.

No Number/Name Pamplin No. B  3.95 cm high;
oval bowl, front to back 2.67 cm; 0.70 cm stem hole. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

Pamplin No. C1 Factory Pipe (Figure 5O)

Robert E. Lee Pipe, white, same size, contemporary casting from older mold.

Robert E. Lee White Pamplin Pipe 5.04 cm high; 5.4 cm long; 4 cm wide; 2.21 cm diameter bowl throat; 1.85 cm stem hole. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

Pamplin No. C1

Robert E. Lee Pamplin Pipe contemporary cast from older mold. 5.04 cm high; 5.4 cm long; 4 cm wide; 2.21 cm diameter bowl throat; 1.85 cm stem hole. From: Raymond Dickerson, Pamplin Pipe Factory/Museum Pamplin, Virginia.

Possible Pamplin Pipe No. 12, most likely a Factory Pipe (Figure 5P)

A white clay pipe with extended stem much like a No. 12, 43 or 50. Measures: 5.8 cm L; 3.6 cm h; 2.7 cm bowl OD; 2.1 cm bowl ID; 0.4 cm stem hole ID. If a No. 12, it would have a brass ferrel between the bowl and stem, according to Dickerson. Accompanying this specific pipe was a black painted lathe shaped wooden stem which is most likely not a stock item, but something added later. The stem measures 8 cm L; 1.4 cm stem OD at pipe end; 0.95 cm diameter at mouth end. G. Graham Collection, Laramie, Wyoming. Most likely collected from that area by his father.

Ohio/Virginia Type Pipe (Figure 5Q)

This is a tan glazed, but gray clay, broken pipe bowl with an upward angled stem. The bowl is oval with the width slightly more than the bowl length. The tan glazing indicates a date from ca. 1890 or younger. The stem is broken making length measurements impossible. Measures: 3.8 cm high; 3.7 cm wide; 2.7 cm bowl OD width. D. Thomson Collection, collected west of Rawlins at possible circa 1868 Union Pacific Railroad construction —U.S. Army Escort camp site as a surface find.

Knobby Pipe (Figure 5R)

Two glazed “Knobby” type pipes were viewed during this research. One was collected by D. Thomson as a surface find west of Rawlins along the Overland Trail/Union Pacific Railroad. The second was collected in Virginia City, Nevada. The Rawlins’ pipe is light tan and the Nevada one dark brown. Both have very shiny glazes and numerous raised bumps around the pipe bowl. The bowl is round with a smooth bowl rim band. The stem is horizontal, and there is a round knob “spur” at the bottom of the bowl. The two pipes have stem holes of 0.62 cm and 0.7 cm, which is consistent with the reed stem sizes associated with those collected from the Great Dismal Swamp of Appomattox County, Virginia. However, these pipes were manufactured in New Hampshire, by a John Taber. It is interesting that no listed Pamplin Pipe has a spur, and even though these pipes are glazed, it appears that Taber was glazing his pipes circa 1850-1860, well before Pamplin Pipes glazed their pipes circa 1890.

The Light Tan Taber Knobby, collected by D. Thomson measures: 4 cm high; 3.8 cm long; 2.7 cm bowl OD; width; 2.11 cm bowl ID; and a 0.62 cm stem hole ID. The Dark Brown Taber Knobby bowl measures: 4 cm high; 3.8 cm long; 2.6 cm bowl OD; 2.0 cm bowl ID; and a 0.7 cm stem hole ID., and was collected by G. Graham from Virginia City, Nevada, where it possibly originally was found at the site of an old mercantile building that burned down.
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James J. Stewart
780 Scott Drive
Lander, Wyoming  82520
The topic of Archaeology Awareness Month “Who Owns the Past?” is most perplexing. As an archaeologist, I have been trained to respect the past, both by trying to explore it through archaeological research and to protect it from the depredations of looting, construction and other forces that destroy its remains. Like many of my colleagues, I have understood the archaeological past to be a public heritage, one that no one could own.

However, through a quarter-century professional career in archaeology on the Great Plains, I have come to find many who are not archaeologists simply do not accept these professional beliefs. Certainly, this point has been made no more clear than with the issues of repatriation and reburial of human remains, but there have been many challenges to other aspects of what I do as an archaeologist. Some have surprised me in their vehemence, but all have caused me to reflect on the reasons for these challenges.

What I would like to do here is to explore these reasons. This exploration will be a bit circuitous, I suppose. I will hit several major themes. Among them, I will talk about what it is archaeology does as a science and why it is hard for people to understand. I will also look at my personal views about why the results of archaeology are so hard for Native Americans to accept. I’ll also look at the repercussions of our work and express some concerns regarding archaeological attitudes toward Indian people and our responsibilities.

WHAT ARCHAEOLOGY DOES AS A SCIENCE

In some ways archaeology is very simple. It takes the material remains people leave behind, along with their contexts the relationship of the objects to each other and builds a story about a culture’s life around them. We archaeologists have goals that are straightforward. We want to reconstruct the who, was where, when, and with what part of the story. We want to reconstruct the lifeways of the culture. We want to understand the processes of how the culture adjusted to changes in both its natural and social environment in the hope we will discover general principles for how all cultures operate. Some of us want to reconstruct cultural meanings. We have developed or applied sophisticated methods and technologies to get at these answers. We have proposed, debated and synthesized sophisticated theories to help frame our understandings.

Most archaeologists, and many members of the general public, would call archaeology a science, though certainly it is still a small science. Its concepts are weakly developed, and many just consider us science-like. And, it is an historical science in which the past can never really be “proved.” Yet, because some quest for connections to the past seems almost to be a universal, many find our stories fascinating, if not compelling. Because of this in the United States, non-archaeologists are even willing to fund our research, up to a point. The past is powerful, an integral part of identity, and a tool that has social uses.

Yet archaeologists do what they do with mere fragments of whole cultures. You may have noticed I did not use the word people very much in my description of archaeology, only culture and lifeways. Certainly people are implied in what I said, but they are not really there. In that sense what archaeology does is very peculiar. Real people, the creators and users of the objects we find, seem to be left out of the equation or

EDITOR’S NOTE: This article by Larry Zimmerman and the following article by Roger Echo-Hawk were originally presented as the Keynote Talks for the 1997 Wyoming Archaeology Month Activities. The two speakers have graciously made them available for The Wyoming Archaeologist.
at very least are shoved to the background. Because people aren’t actually present, archaeologists are forced to deal with norms, that is, physical expressions of what most of the people in the culture were probably doing at any one time. We rarely even see evidences of the individual in artifacts, a fingerprint on a pot perhaps. To archaeologists, even human skeletal remains can seem distant from individual, real people.

I think most people simply do not understand this sort of limit to our work. They want us to be able to say more. Even we would like to say more, but we cannot. Even more limiting, our science is supposed to be objective. People can actually get in the way of that, but having to push them to the background is bothersome and obviously disturbs some of us. A stunningly clear example appeared in an issue of Archaeology. Archaeologist John Whittaker (1992:56-58) discussed the archaeology of the Sinagua, a prehistoric complex of the American Southwest that may be related to Anasazi. He wrote: “Few of us would bother with archaeology if we weren’t emotionally involved with the past. We don’t dig for dry bones and dusty potsherds, but for people” (Whittaker 1992:56). In that sentence he has instantly sought to say he is not “objectifying” the past, but rather, he is personalizing it. He is speaking for the people of the past. As he continues:

> It pains me to learn the Sinagua were probably not as happy as I would like them to have been, although I know that is irrational. I still admire their skills and knowledge, even though they probably didn’t bathe and had rotten teeth that stank. I’m sure like the rest of us, they could be mean and stupid, loving and kind. I am certain I would like to meet them and talk to them, touch their battered, calloused hand. God forbid I should ever have to live their life, but the Sinagua are real people to me, and I care about them and want to tell their story. [Whittaker 1992:58]

Whittaker is the rare one among us who would admit such emotional connections. And in truth, he is right. We do dig for dry bones and dusty potsherds. We do objectify the past, because we must. The people simply aren’t visible to us.

Another example comes in the form of novels about the ancient past of this continent. Many know the work of the Gears in their extremely successful, now multivolume, “people of the just about everywhere and everything” series. They are archaeologists and terrific story tellers, yet more than once I’ve heard colleagues praise their stories but nay-say their reconstructions, and decry their oversimplification, which, by the way, we tend to do with most of our colleagues who write for the public.

In one sense, we “take the life out of” our archaeological stories. Focusing all our attention on interpreting the objects we find, we become fetishists of a sort. This causes us to fail to see the real people behind the objects and somehow, we believe, the past resides in the objects. We thus consider the past as “dead” unless archaeology is done. As Geoffrey Clark (1996:3) commented in a recent SAA Bulletin: “It is simply a fact that knowledge of most pre-contact aboriginal cultures of the New World would have vanished without a trace were it not for archaeology.” In that same piece, he comments “we are all the losers if for reasons of political expediency, Native Americans rebury their pasts.” Clark would probably be typical of archaeologists who apparently think all Indians are dead, as Randy McGuire has noted (1997).

This may offer a clue as to why we get into trouble with Indian people. Let’s turn more directly to that issue.

**INDIANS AND THE PAST**

Perhaps archaeologists should consider the idea Indians view the past differently from archaeologists. A close examination of transcripts from several reburial meetings shows many Indian people do just that.

Esther Stutzman, a Coos Indian, characterizes the differences in how the past becomes known: “The past is obvious to the Indian people, but it does not appear to be obvious to the white man” (Ross and Stutzman 1985:6).

In one of the earliest Indian/anthropologist sessions on reburial in Iowa, Prairie Potawatomi Chick Hale commented:

> My people did not cross the Bering Strait. We know much about our past through oral traditions. Why do archaeologists study the past? Are they trying to disprove our religion? We do not have to study our origins. I don’t question my teachings. I don’t need proof in order to have faith. (Anderson et al. 1980:12-13)

Cecil Antone of the Gila River Indian Tribes at the Society for American Archaeology/Society of Profes-
sional Archaeologists conference elaborated:

My ancestors, relatives, grandmother so on down the line, they tell you about the history of our people and it’s passed on and basically, what I’m trying to say, I guess, is that archaeology don’t mean nothing. We just accept it, not accept archaeology, but accept the way our past has been established and just keep on trying to live the same old style, however old it is. (Quick 1985:103)

For many Indian people, the past is never gone; it is always present and alive. To some, what archaeologists call artifacts, such as human remains, Indian people consider to be people, still present and alive. To objectify them, that is, to dehumanize the remains for study, shows disrespect.

If Indian people accept the past as archaeologists construct it, they must admit the past of their oral traditions is inaccurate and incomplete at best, or just plain wrong. To admit that is to have an underpinning of their identity as Pawnee, Lakota, or Ho-Chunk removed. If the past lives in the present for Indians and does not exist as a separate entity, archaeologists stating the past is gone or extinct or can be reburied send a strong, though unintentional, message to the Native Americans they are themselves extinct. Acceptance of the past as archaeologists construct it would actually destroy the present for Indians. By accepting the archaeologists’ view of the past, Indians would have to die to continue living.

RESPONSIBILITY OF ARCHAEOLOGISTS

Many archaeologists don’t recognize the potential impacts of their constructions of the past on contemporary Indian people. Let me give two harsh examples so there is no uncertainty about my point.

Tim White’s work on Mancos, an Anasazi site, seems to provide firm osteological evidence of cannibalism (White 1992). White’s expertise is such I have no doubt his evidence is good. White, William Ahrens and others continue to debate whether cannibalism happened there (Osborne 1997). When initial reports surfaced in the late 1980s, the media reported it widely, and it caused havoc for the Hopi, people who claim to be descended from Anasazi. The idea of cannibalism is so repugnant to most people that a common way of dehumanizing an enemy is to label them as cannibals. I was at a Society for American Archaeology session in Phoenix at which the Hopi Tribal Chairman asked us to please be more cautious in how we report our research. In their disputes with the Navajo, coal companies and on other issues, the hypothesized cannibalism became “truth” and made life for the Hopi difficult. He told us an Arizona legislator had asked his colleagues why they should be concerned about the Hopi because they were just a bunch of cannibals. He did not dispute the cannibalism nor ask the archaeologists to change their opinion. He simply pleaded for us to be more cautious in our use of archaeological data and to consider the consequences of it for the modern Hopi.

In another case in Iowa, a state generally recognized for sensitivity to Indian concerns about archaeology, a physical anthropologist, Dr. Alton Fisher, reported to the Des Moines Register he had found evidence of treponemal disease in skeletons in a prehistoric burial mound. Treponemal diseases could be evidence of a variety of yaws-like diseases, one of them syphilis. The origin of syphilis has long been a matter of debate as to whether it went from the New World to the Old or vice versa. It is a very difficult disease to diagnose skeletally, and without specific tests, almost impossible to tell from similar diseases. After Fisher announced it could be syphilis, a firestorm broke loose. In several schools in Iowa where there were Indian children, non-Indian children, no doubt based on the news and the way their parents translated it to them, were heard saying to Indian children: “Your mothers are whores!”

Few of us here can probably imagine what that kind of attack feels like. If you have any doubt about the power of the past or its possible uses, put yourself in the place of those children.

Were archaeologists directly at fault in these incidents? It would certainly seem not, but did they bear responsibility? I think so. I don’t believe archaeologists should change their findings because of the possibility of misuse by others. But, they might be cautious about the release of information, they might give it more complete context, and more importantly, they might consider asking some Indian people what they think the effect of this information might be.

Certainly, we can come right out and say the results of our findings, but we must be aware of their power and their potential impacts. Archaeologist Ronald Mason (1997) contends that science, by its very nature must challenge, not respect, or acknowledge as valid, such folk renditions of the past because traditional knowledge has produced
I wonder if he considers the impact of such challenges on people, especially those whose very existence as a people is threatened by his brand of science. I doubt it.

Should archaeologists project their own fears about the possible demise of their profession onto Indians? Must they make such silly, arrogant and ethnocentric statements about how archaeology possesses the truth as opposed to the beliefs of an Indian “demon-haunted world?” I don’t think so.

Does all this mean archaeology and its constructions have no use to Indian people? Again, I don’t think so.

But I do think those attitudes will hasten the demise of archaeology, not somehow strengthen it as scholars like Clark and Mason seem to think. If archaeology is to be useful for Indian people, it must have their active involvement and be under their control. Indians may even need to set the agenda and limits for research.

It can take a long time to get to the point where you understand this. I’ve been working on figuring it out for nearly a quarter century. Perhaps a few examples from my own work will enlighten you about how I got to where I am on the matter. Beware! Not much of what happened to me was in any way planned either.

THE ACCIDENTAL EDUCATION OF ONE PLAINS ARCHAEOLOGIST

The Crow Creek Massacre is a Plains Village tradition, Initial Coalescent site in central South Dakota along the Missouri River just south of Ft. Thompson, the agency town for the Crow Creek Sioux Reservation. As Initial Coalescent, that puts the site in the 12th to 14th centuries and culturally ancestral to the Arikara. Following up some erosion and looting at the site in 1978, my crew happened onto a large number of human remains at the eroded end of the fortification ditch along one side of the site. As it happened, the Corps of Engineers had jurisdiction at the site, but the land was on the reservation. The Corps contracted with the University of South Dakota Archaeology Laboratory to remove the remains so the bank could be protected. What followed was among the most amazing archaeological experiences of my life, with nearly 500 skeletons eventually unearthed, the people having been killed in a massacre and mutilated sometime in the early 1300s.

There was no doubt the site would change the way we looked at prehistoric Plains warfare and the information offered by detailed study of the remains would be phenomenal. But almost immediately, the people at Crow Creek reservation raised objections for a whole range of reasons from land control issues, to concerns about vengeance from the spirits of their slain Arikara enemies, to what many saw as disrespect for the dead by archaeologists. USD and the Corps immediately tried to deal with the problems. Bargaining went on for some time, with it eventually being agreed the remains could not leave the state and had to be returned after six months of study, not of it to be destructive. Certainly this was not enough time to do anything close to complete analysis of 500 skeletons, but it was the best deal we could get. We have been chastised for this in the literature, and in no uncertain terms.

At the same time, as we moved toward early Fall, rumors began to fly on the reservation we were throwing skulls around and otherwise acting disrespectful. To counter this, we hired local people to work with us. When the crews’ lives were threatened by militants, I pulled the crew until the Corps agreed to provide additional workers capable of guarding us and the site. Both of these actions helped ease the suspicions about us. To complicate the matter, several elders got sick and died at the Ft. Thompson with the claim that it was the wanagi, the sometimes malevolent spirits who guard graves, exacting the vengeance about which many had been concerned. We asked that a holy man come to the site. He did, and during a sweat in which he took two of the skulls into the lodge with him, the spirits told him the “wanagi was gone” so the dig could proceed. Almost all expressed concerns quickly evaporated.

I learned first hand about the impact of our archaeological interpretations on Indian people when I initially discussed with newspaper reporters all the mutilations done to the massacre victims. I was shocked at how quickly this information was used to bolster already existing stereotypes in South Dakota about Indian savagery. Our team usually managed to downplay that part of our findings after that, or at least to put it in better context. It was still not without some costs due to bad reporting by us and the writers in the early newspaper releases. For example, the tribal
chairman on the Crow Creek reservation had made many pronouncements the remains were the result of the last big battle between the Arikara and the Sioux. As word of scalping and other mutilations leaked out, he was quickly forced to change his story for fear the Sioux would again be vilified.

For me, Crow Creek showed it was good to engage concerned Indian people in projects and to let them in on setting the agenda. We didn’t do a very good job though, and in fact, I think we got pretty lucky in the way things turned out. The reburial of the remains was completed in 1981.

YELLOW THUNDER

My next experience was more planned and certainly more a political use of archaeology, much of it in direct conjunction with Indian people. In early April of 1981, on the advice of holy men, a group of American Indian Movement, primarily Lakota, activists and their supporters established a camp on United States Forest Service land in the Black Hills outside Rapid City, South Dakota. Called the Yellow Thunder Camp, the Indians filed claim for the 800 acre tract, but were denied by the Black Hills National Forest. A protracted legal struggle followed.

The camp occupants remained on site and actually built several structures. Federal marshals tried to evict the Indians, and participated in planning a government attack on the camp. Several harassing arrests of Indians on minor charges angered camp residents, and someone eventually killed a non-Indian near the camp. The case went to federal court in late November of 1982 and dragged on until 1985 when the presiding judge ruled in the camp’s favor. Archaeology played a key role in the case.

One of the main issues raised by the government attorneys in the case related to the date of the presence of the Sioux in the Black Hills and their view of the sacredness of their Paha Sapa. Using the known archaeological record and historical documentation, an expert witness for the government contended the Sioux had no claim to the Black Hills because they did not discover the Black Hills until the late 1770s. He also claimed the Hills were not sacred in traditional Lakota religion until the concept of holiness of the Black Hills was invented by tourism promoters shortly after World War 1. The consultant, James Hanson, noted that, “For 900 years, roughly, the Lakota practiced their religion without any reference to the Black Hills” (Sioux Falls Argus Leader 1982:Cl). The government also developed a case the Black Hills had been little used by any groups in prehistoric times.

These contentions infuriated the Lakota, even many who did not support Yellow Thunder Camp. Their oral history contended the Black Hills were the center of the universe. In the Black Hills, they had come from the underground, and several elders and holy men believed the precise location to be near Yellow Thunder Camp.

Examination of their oral history does suggest they came from underground, “in the region of the pines” (Powers 1977:55, 79). This might be interpreted as the Black Hills. Other stories, however, suggest the event happened near a great sea far to the east, a place some might interpret to be the Carolinas (South Dakota Writers Project 1981:47-48). Moreover, little was known about the archaeology of the Black Hills until the intensive cultural resources surveys required in the 1970s. The prevailing belief in the period before the 1970s was the Hills had never been used except on the outer edges. With more intensive survey, however, archaeologists began to recognize a long habitation of the Black Hills back to at least late Paleoindian times. Lakota oral history and archaeology began to coalesce.

In the nearly three years that passed between the time the government finished its case and the defense was able to present theirs, the Yellow Thunder Camp attorneys built a substantial case to counter the contentions about Sioux origins and beliefs regarding the Black Hills. They also used other tactics. Among the first approaches taken was to join with the archaeologists in their charge the BHFN was not doing an adequate job of identifying and protecting the cultural resources of the Black Hills. The BHFN had done two cultural resources surveys in the Yellow Thunder Camp area using paraprofessionals as part of the Victoria and Commissary-Balser Timber Sales. The Yellow Thunder Camp attorneys asked for two independent professional assessments of these surveys and both found them to be inadequate, noting they were done by paraprofessionals and that fewer sites were found than might be expected on the tract. When the BHFN received these reviews, they did commission a professional survey of the Yellow Thunder 800 acres (Cassells 1982).

During the survey of the camp, Plano Associates located two substantial sites and five isolated prehistoric
finds, as well as a number of historic sites missed by the paraprofessionals. One site, 39PN540, contained a substantial quantity of lithic material including a projectile point estimated by Cassells (1982:24) to be from A.D. 200-1750. 39PN542 was another lithic scatter of undetermined age. One of the isolated finds was a Duncan projectile point dating to the Middle Archaic, 3000 to 5000 B.P. (Cassells 1982:32). Although these finds were limited, they were nonetheless important. For the Sioux, they were a vindication of the notion they had been in the Black Hills for millennia.

Several archaeologists testified the understanding the Sioux crossed the Missouri after 1750 was based solely on historical accounts by non-Indians who had only seen the Sioux after that date. Given that the first White incursion into South Dakota had only occurred a few years before, it was feasible the Lakota could have been present in the Black Hills at an earlier, unknown date. Also, they testified there was substantial human habitation in the Hills at a very early date and they could not give the tribes a “name, only an archaeological taxonomic label.” They could not deny the groups might have been ancestral to the Lakota. Note there was no scientific proof the early remains in the Hills were Lakota nor did the archaeologists make that claim.

The attorneys used oral tradition to provide additional evidence. In particular, Lakota tribal historian Charlotte Black Elk testified about Lakota star lore to document a long Lakota presence in the Hills. Specifically, she testified that Lakota legend about certain positions of the stars must have seen the Lakota in the Black Hills near the Harney Peak area nearly 7,000 years ago.

Neither testimony could be refuted by the government, though all realized that neither by any means proved the Lakota had been in the Black Hills earlier than A.D. 1750. What the testimony did accomplish was to link evidence in such a way as to say the notion was feasible, though not proven. The Lakota were happy their oral tradition was corroborated, however minimally.

THE NORTHERN CHEYENNE BREAKOUT

The most compelling case for directly working with Indians on an archaeological research project came in a project with the Northern Cheyenne. The story of Dull Knife and the Northern Cheyenne outbreak is a classic of American Indian resistance. Military pressures forced many Cheyenne to surrender following the Little Big Horn battle in 1876, Dull Knife and his band included. Forced from the Powder River country of Wyoming and Montana, they arrived sick and weak at Darlington Agency in Oklahoma. During the 1877-78 winter many died of starvation and poor medical attention. Two-thirds of the survivors eventually fell ill from fever and plague. These unbearable pressures led to action. In September of 1878 Dull Knife and his people fled north toward the homeland (see Sandoz 1953 for a fictionalized account; Ashabranner 1982, Grinnell 1915, and Stands In Timber 1967 contain additional accounts).

Little Wolf and his people accompanied Dull Knife. The two groups separated while in Nebraska. In October, the cavalry overtook Dull Knife, forcing him again to surrender. This time the captors locked the little band in a barracks at Fort Robinson, Nebraska, pending their return to Oklahoma. Preferring instead to die, Dull Knife’s people flatly refused to go. As a consequence, the commanding officer deprived the inmates of heat, food and water. After five days, on the evening of January 9, 1879, Dull Knife’s band had enough. They broke out in a running fight. For eleven days soldiers pursued, finally catching the fugitives in a buffalo wallow 25 miles from the fort. Only a handful survived.

Wishing to commemorate this important event in their past, the Northern Cheyenne Tribe, now finally home in Montana, acquired a 365 acre tract near Fort Robinson. Their oral tradition related Dull Knife’s escape took place over this acreage. The Cheyenne planned an interpretive pathway along parts of the escape route, and perhaps a visitor center. But in 1987, the exact escape route remained, at it has for years, a point of contention. White accounts described an alternate route (Board of Indian Commissioners 1880). The Tribe faced a dilemma. Hoping archaeology might shed some light on controversy, the Northern Cheyenne collaborated with the University of South Dakota Archaeology Laboratory to assess the contending routes.

Military accounts, local interpretations, and even a roadside marker all present the escape route as a long, barren ridge crest north and west of the fort. Cheyenne tradition, however, relates the fugitives ran to White River, forded it and then headed upstream. About 2.5 miles west of the fort, they recrossed the stream and struck out for nearby sandstone bluffs. Passing through
one of two cracks in the bluffs that would admit passage, the people reached the top. Those who survived eventually reached the buffalo wallow. For the Cheyenne, the military stories call into question Dull Knife’s intelligence as a strategist. Why would he, they ask, if he were skilled enough to evade the military all the way from Oklahoma, use an escape route from the fort that would expose his people to great danger? Their tradition says only a few Dog Soldiers went that way to decoy the military, an excellent strategy. In essence, white history debases Dull Knife who has become a Northern Cheyenne culture hero.

The Tribal purchase encompasses the route from stream to bluff. Fieldwork on this tract involved coordination between representatives from USD, the Northern Cheyenne Cultural Committee and Dull Knife Memorial College. After Bill Tall Bull and Ted Rising Sun spent two week on our field school near Vermillion, they announced they wanted us to work on their project. Once at Ft. Robinson, the project included prayer and story-telling to insure maintenance of the spiritual integrity of the setting. This included special reverence for the land and artifacts recovered there, a practice that satisfied all parties.

The running fight during the escape involved firearm discharge. In anticipation of bullets and spent cartridges, fieldwork relied principally on the use of metal detectors. Doug MacDonald and his colleagues (1991) used metal detectors to survey the 365-acre Tribal parcel in a systematic manner. Selected areas along the alternate ridge crest route were also metal detected. Results included recovery of numerous balls, bullets and cartridge cases in areas supported by Cheyenne oral tradition. On the other hand, areas identified as the escape route on the basis of military accounts yielded no battle-related artifacts. Though other factors could account for presence/absence in the areas surveyed, results at least showed the feasibility of the Cheyenne version of the past. The important concern for the Cheyenne in this case is that the primacy of their oral tradition, a story of nearly mythic stature, found validity. The Cheyenne were quite satisfied with survey results, and felt their version of history had been substantiated.

ETHNOCRITICAL ARCHAEOLOGY
The three cases outlined here brought me to the point of understanding that even though Indians “process” the past in ways very different from archaeologists, there can be ways of combining approaches that can be mutually beneficial. An ethnocritical archaeology is what is involved here, where there is active engagement of Indian people in the process of doing archaeology. In it, archaeologists who become involved will be working at the boundaries of science in their profession. Indian people who work with archaeologists will be doing the same, but on the edge of their cultural traditions. None of this means there need be no method or that the logic of the work can’t be made explicit but, the result will be an archaeology that is more modest in its claims to science.

To accomplish this, archaeologists and Indians will need to establish methodologies that are acceptable to both. Even with some of the good work in the Southwest, the archaeology programs of the Hopi, Zuni and Navajo aren’t there yet. At least in those cases, archaeology is under the direct control of Indian people, though frequently applied by non-Indian archaeologists.

There will be problems. What should happen, for example, when the findings of archaeology disagree with Indian oral tradition? There will certainly be such cases. My answer is that responses to these conditions can be negotiated ahead of time, a task made easier when power is shared and negotiations move out of mutual respect.

Do archaeologists have to believe the results of ethnocritical archaeology? No. I certainly don’t believe the Lakota came out of the ground in the Black Hills. I don’t believe we scientifically demonstrated Dull Knife’s actual escape route. But I can respect the way the Lakota and Northern Cheyenne process the past and their need to maintain the truth of their stories. I only do them harm if I choose to challenge them.

Do archaeologists have to stop doing their own research? No, as long as they do it respectfully. Most of the archaeologists I’ve talked with in North America and Australia who work closely with indigenous people have been able to pursue their own projects. Most have said their access has actually increased, and several have told me their view of the archaeological record has changed profoundly.

If archaeologists pursue their own projects, they must learn they cannot say what they construct is “the” past or “the” truth about the past. Rather, they must understand and say theirs is one interpretation of the material evidence. Archaeologists have a right to keep doing things as they now are, and to keep saying scien-
Scientific archaeology provides the closest thing to the truth. But if they do, they should realize their kind of archaeology will become increasingly marginalized. Maybe we need to recognize there can be different kinds of archaeological science and the practice of each will be different. Scientific archaeology is an important way of knowing, but it has costs, it has impacts on people whose story it seeks to tell, and it has limitations in its quest for truth.

For me it is all summed up by Jacob Bronowski in his Ascent of Man chapter entitled “Knowledge or Certainty?” He says:

Science is a very human form of knowledge. We are always at the brink of the known, we always feel forward for what is to be hoped. Every judgement in science stands on the edge of error and is personal.

Does all this answer the question, “Who Owns the past?” I sincerely doubt it, but it may give perspective on what I see as archaeology’s role. The recent challenges to archaeology posed by indigenous people, if we respond to them properly, will change archaeology profoundly, and for the better.
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A dynamic landscape of relations exists between Native Americans and the American academic community, and as the final days of the 20th century approach, it is important for us to contemplate the legacy of relationships we will pass along to our successors. The topic of repatriation has played a prominent role in shaping this legacy in recent years particularly for archaeologists. Repatriation presents us with an enormously complex issue rooted in historical circumstances that have often been obscured by the debate over its immediate implications for the academic world.

In the disciplines of history and anthropology, scholars throughout the 20th century scrambled to record what they viewed as an ever-vanishing Native America. With this perspective at the forefront of academic minds, it is ironic Indians have sustained a continuing presence in American scholarship. Poised upon the vast interface of history and anthropology, ethnohistorians at mid-century began to make academic inquiry into Native America a multi-disciplinary endeavor, and in the decades that followed, Indian history became established as a viable enclave in academic history. Indians have always held a prominent role in American anthropology as informants and occasionally as scholars, but the one-way mirror of American anthropology became a two-way window during the 1970s as a result of Vine Deloria, Jr.’s scathing critique of the profession. Archaeology also fell under the spotlight of this scrutiny, and archaeologists trained to investigate extinct cultures found themselves, increasingly, excavating the heritage of living — not dead — societies.

The civil rights movement in the United States created an atmosphere of social change for African-Americans, and it inspired Indians to address a variety of human rights issues. They spoke out against the codified practice of treating Indian burials and human remains as archaeological resources subject to excavation, scientific study, and permanent curation in museums. State laws carefully regulated the treatment of non-Indian cemeteries, and these laws accommodated the rights and sensibilities of the non-Indian American public, but archaeologists routinely excavated Indian skeletons and funerary objects for permanent service to science with little or no regard for the rights and sensibilities of interested Native communities.

Many archaeologists and most physical anthropologists focused very quickly on the religious perspectives that figured so prominently and consistently in the objections of Indian leaders, and the issue was framed as one of science versus religion. This focus encouraged many archaeologists and physical anthropologists to overlook or minimize the important issues of cultural oppression and the exclusion of Indians from social control over funerary settings. Since the academic community rejects the idea religious protests should dictate the content of scientific research, many scholars relied upon the principle of academic freedom to emancipate them from any sense of connection to the historical circumstances under which Indians lost control of ancestral cemeteries. For scholars, the establishment and curation of collections of Indian skeletons could symbolize the exercise of academic freedom, while for Indians, such collections signified a continuing history of oppressive dispossession.

Living Indians participated in various realms of scholarship throughout the 20th century, particularly
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as informants, but their persistence in American society and their expanding engagement with academic America has introduced new changes in the disciplines of anthropology and history. In the 1980s, the architects of the New West opened the door for historians to recognize Indians as a continuing presence in the American world. As this recognition gained strength in the field of history, archaeologists of the time were confronted with Indians advocating the reburial of Native American human remains. Throughout the academic community, Indians were no longer expected to vanish, but scholars had long scrambled to subject disappearing Indians to the scrutiny of science, and now the academics themselves were being scrutinized by living Indians.

Responding to decades of pressure from Native Americans, Congress passed the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (NAGPRA). Under NAGPRA, Native Americans assume a greater administrative presence in the practice of archaeology, and Native communities have greater power to reestablish authority over culturally affiliated human remains, funerary objects, and other items held by American museums and universities. In essence, the law has aided in the continuing process of recognizing and accommodating the active presence of Indians in American society.

While some observers view NAGPRA as an important factor in bringing about a needed adjustment of relations toward greater accountability to living Indians, others have openly resented the loss of un-scrutinized authority and unfettered inquiry, and they worry about infringements upon academic freedom. NAGPRA does not incorporate any statutory impediments to academic freedom, but the impact of the law upon the ability of scholars to advance historical knowledge is a matter of great interest — as well as a topic of much debate — throughout the academic community.

Observers in the archaeological community vary in characterizing the impact of NAGPRA on their world. Borrowing an ideological framework from geology, those who see NAGPRA as a logical and necessary development of relations with Indians might be said to have a “uniformitarian” perspective, while “catastrophism” offers a useful paradigm for those scholars most fearful of its impact on science and archaeology. Thus, in a recent issue of the Society for American Archaeology Bulletin, Terence Fifield reports favorably on the “truly gratifying spirit of cooperation” between Indians and scientists in dealing under NAGPRA with the discovery of ancient human remains, while G.A. Clark of Arizona State University informs the editor of the Bulletin “NAGPRA is an unmitigated disaster for archaeologists, bioarchaeologists, and other physical anthropologists concerned with the study of human skeletal remains.”

In contrast to this spectrum of academic opinions, few Indians are worried about the impact of NAGPRA on scholarly endeavors. Opinions among Native Americans reflect a strong interest in successfully implementing the law as well as open suspicion it merely serves a firmly entrenched non-Indian system that remains fundamentally opposed to the cultural values of Indian communities. For some Indian leaders, the denunciation of academic scholarship is based, in part, upon a rejection of science, while for others, a critical perspective on the academic world coexists with recognition that important purposes are served by scholarship. In fact, successful implementation of NAGPRA is highly dependent upon access to reliable scholarship.

Few Indian repatriation programs have adequately accommodated the reliance of the law upon the expertise of historians, archaeologists, and other scholars. Though tribal historians are sometimes placed in charge of tribal repatriation programs or are asked to serve as advisors, the title of “tribal historian” is often an honorific that does not come with any salaried institutional appointment designed to support research projects on tribal history. Some tribal historians are well-versed in the esoteric details of religious and cultural lifeways but have little or no experience with the skills required to investigate provenience information, to study ethnographies for evidence about the historical character of tribal laws, and to research the cultural affiliations of past societies. Of the many tribal historians who do have these skills, few have the personal resources to support research projects in these critical areas, and Indian tribes typically have limited resources to support research needed for repatriation claims. It would therefore be the height of cynicism for scholars and their institutions to refuse to work in partnership with tribes and then to proclaim NAGPRA a failed concept.

With regard to the treatment of human remains, the American academic system has a rather dismal record in attending to the concerns of Native American communities, but non-Indian Americans expect to hold science accountable for actions that offend
public sensibilities. During the late 1780s in New York, for example, when white Americans discovered medical students were appropriating human remains from their cemetery, the citizens rioted. As a result of the Anti-Dissection Riots, science learned to live with limitations on the use of the remains of white Americans for bona fide research of unquestionable benefit to living people. The passage of Anatomy Acts at both state and federal levels ensured interested researchers would not ignore public sensibilities in their professional conduct.

Meanwhile, Thomas Jefferson, the founding father of American archaeology, helped to create an important and enduring double standard when he neglected to consult any Indians in conducting his excavation of an Indian cemetery mound at Monticello. But there were no riots in Virginia. Over the next two centuries, scholars would faithfully adhere to this standard. In the Anti-Dissection Riots, doctors throughout New York City fled for their lives and took refuge in the jails; by contrast, Indians today have been, for the most part, remarkably civil in calling for change and seeking legislative solutions to the circumstances of scholarly interest in their dead.

Historians such as Robert Bieder, Orlan Svingen, and James Riding, have carefully researched the history of academic interest in Indian human remains. It is important for academic institutions to encourage self-review on this topic, and, more generally, they need to promote an ongoing process of internal inspection of the state of overall relations with Native American communities. The images we see in the mirror of NAGPRA may or may not flatter institutions that depend on public goodwill for support, but goodwill should never be lacking for institutions willing to gamble on intellectual integrity over a polished public relations image. Historians can continue to play a critical role in this self-review process.

In New York, for example, the American Museum of Natural History provides us with an important opportunity to reflect upon the mirror of NAGPRA. The museum recently made the remains of Qisuk, a Greenland Eskimo, available for burial. Kenn Harper has written a compelling account of Qisuk’s death a century ago, describing the deception perpetrated upon his young son, Minik. For Minik’s benefit, the staff of the American Museum pretended to bury Qisuk, but actually kept his skeleton for science. Minik discovered the truth, however, when he visited the museum as an adult and found his father’s skeleton on exhibit. His subsequent efforts to gain custody of these remains were unsuccessful, but with the burial of Qisuk in 1993, an important sign of change emerged from the American Museum. Reviewing the broader picture of this museum’s accomplishments, we ought to take pride in this museum that has contributed so much to the quality of American life through public education, but this pride should expect accountability, and it should prefer that accurate self-review provides a basis for setting the academic agenda for the future. Under NAGPRA, little chance exists the story of Qisuk and Minik will be repeated.

In Colorado, the quest to establish and maintain the dominion of the United States affected both living and dead Indians. One hundred years ago, in July 1897, a woman named Mrs. M. E. Crowley visited the State Historical and Natural History Society -- the predecessor of the present-day Colorado Historical Society -- and made a rather gruesome donation. A tag attached to the object recorded the donation as the “[s]kull of a Ute Woman who was killed on the western slope of Colorado in the year 1885.” Research mandated by NAGPRA tells a tragic story that might never have been told without this law. In June 1885, two Ute families camping near Dolores, Colorado were attacked by local whites in an incident known as the Beaver Creek Massacre, and it is likely the skull collected by the ghoulish Mrs. Crowley came from one of the victims of this unprovoked slaughter. For the founding fathers of the Colorado Historical Society, this donation signified a contribution to science. They had a sense of purpose that did not reflect any inclination to form partnerships with Indians; in fact, to the vast majority of white Coloradans of the time, Indian people were simply obstacles to be overcome, dispossessed, and controlled. It was a minor leap from the idea of controlling living Indians for the convenience of white settlers, to the idea of controlling dead Indians for the convenience of science and scholarship.

The Ute skull was examined in 1981 by James Hummert, a PhD candidate in physical anthropology at the University of Colorado, and he concluded the skull was a “[c]hild about 12 years old.” The circumstances of Hummert’s research project reveal much about the academic attitudes that ultimately gave rise to the need for NAGPRA. In response to what was termed “[m]inority political activism,” CHS funded a study of their human remains in order to underscore
the significance of this collection for scholars, and Hummert was hired to conduct this research. The contract was deliberately prepared as an un-advertised project due to fears it would attract “untoward activist activity.” Hummert wrote in his final report the collection of human remains held great value in terms of “educational and research potential.” Ironically — given the secretive nature of the study — he also offered the hope skeletal research might someday be appreciated by Indian people. Indeed, his research proved extremely helpful to CHS in preparing reports required by NAGPRA. Nevertheless, as with the story of Minik, the conduct of this study emphasizes the fact the academic community in the United States has felt free, as a matter of convenience, to actively exclude living Indians.

Opponents of NAGPRA fear the law may hamper the progress of science, but the law was designed to bring Indians into the picture in order to discourage unrestrained trampling of Indian rights and sensibilities in the name of research. The law was not designed to thwart legitimate scholarship. Too often, NAGPRA-phobes seem blissfully unaware of the history of deliberate exclusion of Indians from academic endeavors, and we are given the impression the choice we face is one of enslavement to the whims of anti-science Indians versus a return to the good old days of conquest anthropology.

Unlike their colleagues in the medical profession, physical anthropologists and archaeologists have had little accountability to the people who are most directly interested in the human remains they collect and study, and so they have been free to pursue unfettered research. The Anatomy Acts did not put an end to the legitimate interest of the medical profession in the study of dead bodies, and we have little reason to believe NAGPRA will put an end to the need for physical anthropology as an important field of study. More than ever, in fact, Native American communities need the services of skeletal biologists and physical anthropologists. In my opinion, the ideal Native American repatriation program would involve administrators with expertise on NAGPRA, religious leaders, and tribal historians, as well as professional academic historians, archaeologists, physical anthropologists, and other scholars.

While physical anthropologists as a group choose to indulge an unproductive resentment toward Indian repatriation efforts, it will be difficult for them, under such circumstances, to assist tribes when their expertise is essential to clarifying the identity and cultural affiliations of the dead. Physical anthropologists often point out their knowledge could benefit Indian people, but such words sound hollow when they are not accompanied by efforts at dialogue with Indians, and when they are uttered primarily for the edification of journalists intent on embarrassing proponents of repatriation.

Under NAGPRA, Indian communities have a new relationship with academic institutions, and the character of this relationship can affect the ability of legitimate researchers to conduct important investigations. Physical anthropologists, for example, have legitimate interests in conducting research many Indians find objectionable. As a result of NAGPRA, if any of these interests are threatened, it is because scholars have consistently failed to earn the support of Indians. Thus, science would best be served if scholars have a relationship of mutual respect with Native Americans -- a relationship in which the interests of science can be articulated by researchers and endorsed by tribes.

Such relations would also constructively reflect the concern felt by many physical anthropologists. Indian people can benefit from access to meaningful information about long-dead ancestors. It will take time to overcome the powerful legacy of distrust that tends to dominate present-day interactions, but in the long run, skeletal biologists can best serve the future heirs of their profession — that is, beginning to include both Indians and non-Indians — by embracing a clear commitment to developing partnerships, rather than lawsuits, with Indian tribes today.

The national press has given impressive coverage to the discovery in 1996 of human remains dubbed “Kennewick Man” in the state of Washington. Inspection of the skull revealed the presence of “caucasoid” characteristics, and a radiocarbon test performed on a finger bone indicated the person died about 8,400 years ago. In addition, a projectile point from a time period of about 4,000 to 9,000 years ago was found imbedded in one bone. These circumstances attracted the interest of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, who filed a claim with the United States Army Corps of Engineers for the repatriation of the remains under NAGPRA. As the Corps moved to comply, following NAGPRA guidelines, a group of leading American anthropologists hired lawyers and intervened in the situation, asking a court to postpone the repatriation to allow additional scientific study.
This strategy of adversarial confrontation, however, maximizes the opportunity for mutual alienation and minimizes any chance to build meaningful relations with interested Native American communities. One might suppose, therefore, little common ground exists between these parties.

In a statement authored by a religious leader and issued by the claimant tribes, the hostile tone of several remarks about scientists implies extreme polarization is also the favored Indian position. It is notable, however, that the Umatilla Reservation hosts a well-established tribal archaeology program that has provided hands-on experience in archaeology for a number of reservation residents. In fact, one graduate of this program, Philip Minthorn, is employed by the Repatriation Office of the National Museum of Natural History — the Smithsonian museum that employs several of the scholars who intervened to halt the repatriation. In essence, the parties have not successfully made effective use of an excellent opportunity to build mutual goodwill by developing a cooperative program of some sort.

In the initial opinion of the Army Corps of Engineers, the claimant tribes did not need to demonstrate any cultural affiliation in order to obtain custody of the Kennewick human remains under NAGPRA, but the situation has changed as a result of more careful evaluation of map boundaries, and it is now important for the claimant tribes to show a cultural affiliation. Any demonstration of cultural affiliation must consider and accommodate anthropological evidence, and since the position paper of the claimant tribes asserts an affiliation on the basis of oral traditions, this assertion must also be considered. Most scholars doubt oral traditions can contribute legitimate evidence pertaining to historical settings of such antiquity, but the contribution of oral traditions to scholarship on ancient Native America presents an unanswered mystery of increasing interest to researchers. In the case of Kennewick Man, however, we are left to wonder whether or not it is possible to connect the anthropological evidence with evidence from Indian oral traditions. It should be a matter of interest, for example, that at least some archaeological evidence has been interpreted to suggest great time depth for cultural continuity in the region. The comparison of oral traditions and archaeological information might yield unexpected congruities — but this possibility is dependent upon a commitment to dialogue based on mutual respect.

Direct dialogue will create solutions to important challenges faced by Indians and archaeologists who wish to work together. Some Indians and archaeologists will not wish to work together; the paradigm of science versus religion — embraced by both groups — will continue to act as a polarizing force. Considering Kennewick Man, an annoyed Victor Mair portrayed Native Americans in a 1997 issue of the Anthropology Newsletter as “[doing] their utmost to prevent scientific investigations on ancient human remains[.]” Summarizing his research on “caucasoid” human remains in western China, Mair holds forth the Chinese government as a model of accommodation to science, in contrast to the situation in the United States. Mair seemingly would prefer American Indians have no say in what happens with their dead. Nevertheless, he advocates standards for archaeologists and physical anthropologists that would find great favor among many Indians.

Mair spent two years negotiating with the Chinese government for permission to conduct his investigations, and, according to his account, the local ethnic population that claims descent from the subjects of his study also supports his work. Mair lauds this support as the inherent right of science, but he spent two years negotiating the terms of his research with a government controlled by an ethnic group with no significant biological connection to the caucasoid subjects of his study, and he is properly cognizant of the interests of one group that claims actual descent from the population in question.

It is difficult to understand why Mair takes a partnership approach in China and then articulates another standard for the United States — a standard of professional conduct that would reject any need for a meaningful dialogue with Indians. If ancient caucasoid human remains in China can be controlled by a non-caucasoid Chinese government, and if Mair can acknowledge the existence of a complex web of interests at work in China, then the picture in the United States can be expected to display no less complexity. Using Mair’s example, it would be to the benefit of scholarship in the United States for American researchers to conduct sustained negotiations with interested parties, such as Indian tribes, and scholars should seek to accommodate applicable national interests — as expressed in laws like NAGPRA — before proceeding with research plans. It is reasonable to expect scholars to expend some effort toward the development of mutually beneficial relationships with Indian tribes.
If American archaeologists are willing to embrace cooperative partnership as a desirable relationship with interested parties in China, then such standards should also apply closer to home in the United States.

Viewing academic America in the mirror of NAGPRA, a diverse collage of images appears. Universities, historical societies, and museums must acknowledge the images their own experts see in that mirror, whether the images are admirable or embarrassing, and scholars should expect their peers to adhere to a standard of professional conduct in which Indian tribes and Native Americans have real access to accurate data and scholarly knowledge. It is reasonable to expect scholars to devote some energy toward earning the trust and support of Indian tribes in order to pursue research goals that will create useful data, lead to reliable interpretations, and generate interesting ideas. Cooperation with Indian tribes does not necessarily mean academic scholarship must forego the opportunity to contribute to the complex, ongoing heritage of human intellectual endeavors. It can be an extremely fruitful investment of energy in which both groups participate as partners in a dialogue.

Indians also need to acknowledge NAGPRA will only be as worthwhile as the scholarship that implements it. It provides a real opportunity to subject the American academic community to scrutiny for ongoing insensitivity toward Indians, and scholars must endure the criticism of a newly empowered constituency toward whom they have historically felt little accountability. Native Americans have wielded minimal direct influence within the institutions of academic America, but NAGPRA has changed the rules. Tracing some of the circumstances that led to this change, we glimpse a world of deeply entrenched racist agendas, an American double standard over the graves of the dead, a scientific community freed by the processes of conquest to indulge unfettered interests, a vast legacy of images in time. Among the many ideas we will bequeath to our heirs in the next millennium, the idea of “partnership” offers an essential concept for shaping the shared fixture of our human past.

Roger Echo-Hawk
Denver Art Museum
100 West 14th Avenue Parkway
Denver, Colorado 80204
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This long awaited compilation of articles about Archaic-aged archaeological sites in the Northwest Plains and Rocky Mountain Region is one of those rare efforts to synthesize work mostly conducted within the framework of cultural resource management. As such, it provides a myriad of information not easily obtained otherwise. Unfortunately, with the demise of the University of South Dakota Press it is going to be difficult to obtain a copy of this book.

The volume contains 14 chapters as well as a preface, titled “Changing the Plains Archaic,” by Jack Hofman, which places issues discussed in the volume within the greater Plains regional context.

The Introduction, by Larson and Francis, is an excellent discussion of the term ‘archaic’ and its’ use as an academic construct. They describe the changing approaches to consideration of this several millennia long period of time within the history of anthropological thought. And it’s not a pretty picture. Long virtually ignored by many renowned scholars, including Jesse Jennings; the Archaic, as Larson and Francis point out is in fact a critical period of culture change over a vast region of the American west. A time and place deserving of much better treatment than it has so far enjoyed.

Chapter 2, by Douglas Bamforth considers the change from PaleoIndian to what most now call the Archaic Period. Bamforth points out the critical importance of regional variation, probably as a response to localized ecological and climatic conditions, in considerations of the transition from Paleoindian to an Archaic lifeways.

The volume includes several regionally specific considerations of Archaic lifeways in chapters by Marcel Kornfeld, George C. Frison, Michael D. Metcalf and Kevin Black, Steven D. Creasman and Kevin W. Thompson looking respectively at the Western Black Hills, Rocky Mountains Foothills-Mountain Zones, Colorado Plateau and Green River Basin regions.

Larson, in Chapter 5, re-examines the Early Archaic in light of recent discoveries and presents a model for Early Archaic adaptation.

Chapter 6, by William Eckerle considers geoarchaeology in the Wyoming Basin where a rich record of Archaic-aged manifestations has become known in the past twenty years. Eckerle beings the science of geomorphology to bear on the archaeological record in fruitful ways.

Francis presents finding concerning stone material used for chipped stone tool making during the archaic in chapter 8. She points out that much can be gleaned from the sources of stone materials and how these material come to be scattered across the landscape as the archaeological record.

Finally, several chapters concern site specific treatments. These papers mostly concern housepit features that have been found at various places, and from varying temporal components within the broader Archaic Period. The tremendous diversity in these papers by Brian Waitkus and David Eckles; Lynn Harrell, Ted Hoefer and Scott McKern, Mark Miller and David McGuire; Daniel Eakin, Francis and Larson, and Danny Walker, Kornfeld and Eric Ingbar all prove the premise of the volume, eg. that the Archaic is a much more complex time than previously recognized.

The Archaic Period in the Plains region is a very complex issue. Rather than being a catch-all period when little new happened the Archaic is shown to be a dynamic time with great variation from place and time to time. Perhaps, with increasing study the broad several thousand year archaic period will on day receive it’s due in comparison with studies of PaleoIndian Cultures and Late Prehistoric Lifeways.

Russel L. Tanner
U. S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Rock Spring Field Office
Rock Springs, Wyoming

Archaeology on the Great Plains. W. Raymond wood,
Touted as the successor of Waldo Wedel’s Prehistoric Man on the Great Plains, this collection of essays summarizes the state of the art of archaeological science across the Great Plains region. The book consists of 14 chapters concerning regional and temporal variation in Plains archaeology, each written by an acknowledged authority on the specific topic.

The first chapter is an enlightening introduction by editor Dr. Ray Wood, from the University of Missouri. Wood presents an overview placing Plains archaeology in a framework relative to some of the seminal works of American anthropology. He also sets the stage for future chapters by describing the inter-relationship between ecology and cultures specifically relative to the Plains region.

The second chapter is a detailed discussion of Plains ecology written by Marvin Kay. The chapter begins with a discussion of the changing Plains climate over many millennia, then discusses the complexities of Plains physiography and concludes with a brief review of prehistoric agricultural adaptations in the region.

Arguably, one of the most interesting chapters in the volume is Richard Krause’s historical overview of Plains archaeology as a discipline. Krause’s review is very thorough (despite his apologies to the contrary), and delightful to read. With characters like William Duncan Strong, Waldo R. Wedel, John L Champe and many, many equally charismatic personages this is a memorable read. The photograph of the 1950s, “High Plains Conference,” on page 59 and discussion of the evolution of the Plains Anthropological Conference is most interesting. I found the chapter one of the best in the entire volume.

Jack L. Hofman and Russell W. Graham provide an extensive overview of PaleoIndian Cultures on the Plains in the fourth chapter. Given the large amount of work having been done on Paleo sites in the region, the overview is remarkably comprehensive. The subchapter on ‘Paleo-Indian Lifeways,’ beginning on page 116 is especially valuable as it brings together the variety of Paleo evidence from across the broad Plains region.

George C. Frison discusses archaic traditions in the fifth paper. The chapter is a good overview of a large chunk of the archaeological record that is not well understood. The information presented is mostly the same Frison presented earlier in Prehistoric Hunters of the High Plains, but is worth reviewing here if one does not have access to the earlier treatment.

Chapters 6 through 12 deal with specific regions of the eastern and southern plains, and especially with the agricultural cultures that inhabited those areas. Although Wyoming readers may find these chapters somewhat outside their primary interest, they are very interesting and bear more on what happened prehistorically in Wyoming, (especially along the Platte River) than one might realize. One should not skip over these chapters.

Jeffrey R. Hanson describes proto-historic high plains hunters in the chapter titled, ‘The Late High Plains Hunters.’ Hanson, discusses the variation among the several ethnic groups known to have inhabited the Plains region at the time of contact with EuroAmericans. His treatment is more ethnological than archaeological but valuable nonetheless. Perhaps, another chapter dealing more with the archaeological record of these cultures would have been a worthwhile addition.

Finally, Douglas D. Scott addresses historical archaeology, or Euro-American Archaeology, in the Plains region. Scott’s discussion is a good overview of this fastest growing aspect of Plains archaeology. His discussion of theoretical issues in historical archaeology is especially pertinent.

Dr. Wood brought together many of the acknowledged leaders in Plains archaeology scholarship to present an admirable treatment. One general criticism of Wood’s volume is that some of the writers could have looked more intensively at the vast ‘grey-literature’ now available from cultural resource management (CRM). This criticism can be leveled at nearly all regional synthesis in American archaeology.

The usual rubric, that CRM work is of limited value because it is done without research design is simply no longer accurate. However, access to this information remains a problem and requires considerable effort if one attempts to look at materials produced under the auspice of the various state and federal agencies charged with preserving cultural resources under the National Historic Preservation Act. Of course, it is beyond the scope of this, or any publication, but there is desperate need for a solution to this problem of access.

For new readers of Plain anthropology, Archaeol-
ogy of the Great Plains, provides an excellent introduction. For veteran Plains archaeologists it provides a fresh look at developments in portions, or temporal periods that one may not have concentrated on in recent years. In both cases the volume is a must for anyone interested in Plains archaeology. It should rest on your library shelf next to Frison’s Prehistoric Hunters of the High Plains.

Russel L. Tanner  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management  
Rock Springs Field Office  
Rock Springs, Wyoming