

Gathering Hopewell

**Society, Ritual, and
Ritual Interaction**

INTERDISCIPLINARY CONTRIBUTIONS TO ARCHAEOLOGY

Series Editor: Michael Jochim, *University of California, Santa Barbara*

Founding Editor: Roy S. Dickens, Jr., *Late of University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill*

Current Volumes in This Series:

THE ARCHAEOLOGIST'S LABORATORY

The Analysis of Archaeological Data

E. B. Banning

AURIGNACIAN LITHIC ECONOMY

Ecological Perspectives from Southwestern France

Brooke S. Blades

DARWINIAN ARCHAEOLOGIES

Edited by Herbert Donald Graham Maschner

EARLIEST ITALY

An Overview of the Italian Paleolithic and Mesolithic

Margherita Mussi

EMPIRE AND DOMESTIC ECONOMY

Terence N. D'Altroy and Christine A. Hastorf

EUROPEAN PREHISTORY: A SURVEY

Edited by Saurunas Milisauskas

THE EVOLUTION OF COMPLEX HUNTER-GATHERERS

Archaeological Evidence from the North Pacific

Ben Fitzhugh

FAUNAL EXTINCTION IN AN ISLAND SOCIETY

Pygmy Hippotamus Hunters of Cyprus

Alan H. Simmons

A HUNTER-GATHERER LANDSCAPE

Southwest Germany in the Late Paleolithic and Neolithic

Michael A. Jochim

HUNTERS BETWEEN EAST AND WEST

The Paleolithic of Moravia

Jiri Svoboda, Vojen Lozek, and Emanuel Vlcek

GATHERING HOPEWELL

Society, Ritual, and Ritual Interaction

Christopher Carr and D. Troy Case

A Continuation Order Plan is available for this series. A continuation order will bring delivery of each new volume immediately upon publication. Volumes are billed only upon actual shipment. For further information please contact the publisher.

Gathering Hopewell

Society, Ritual, and Ritual Interaction

Edited by

CHRISTOPHER CARR

*Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona*

and

D. TROY CASE

*North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina*

Kluwer Academic / Plenum Publishers

New York Boston London Dordrecht Moscow

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Gathering Hopewell : society, ritual, and ritual interaction / edited by Christopher Carr and D. Troy Case.

p. cm.—(Interdisciplinary contributions to archaeology)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-306-48478-1—ISBN 0-306-48479-X (pbk.)

1. Hopewell culture—Ohio. 2. Indians of North America—Ohio—Rites and ceremonies. 3. Indians of North America—Material culture—Ohio. 4. Indians of North America—Funeral customs and rites—Ohio. 5. Scioto River Valley (Ohio)—Antiquities. 6. Miami River Valley (Ohio)—Antiquities. I. Carr, Christopher, 1952-II. Case, D. Troy. III. Series.

E99.H69G38 2004
977.1'01

2003062064

The cover illustration is part of the painting *A Hopewell Indian Burial Ceremony* ©; reproduced by courtesy of the artist, Louis Glanzman, with our warm thanks. Borders are adapted from Gregory Perino (1968). Cover design by Christopher Carr; technical rendering by Deann Gates and Susanne van Dyne.

ISBN HB: 0-306-48478-1
PB: 0-306-48479-X

© 2005 by Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, New York
233 Spring Street, New York, New York 10013

<http://www.kluweronline.com>

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

A C.I.P record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

All rights reserved

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording, or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

Permissions for books published in Europe: permissions@wkap.nl

Permissions for books published in the United States of America: permissions@wkap.com

Printed in the United States of America

To Stuart Struever

For your vigorous work and well-thought-out vision
in the service of archaeological research and education



Stuart Struever in 1977 at the Koster Site, Illinois.

Contributors

Wesley Bernardini, Assistant Professor. Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Redlands, 1200 E. Colton Avenue, Redlands, California 92373.

Christopher Carr, Professor. Department of Anthropology, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85287-2402.

Gary Carriveau, Ph.D., Former Research Scientist. Detroit Institute of Arts, 5200 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Michigan 48202.

D. Troy Case, Assistant Professor. Department of Sociology and Anthropology, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina 27695-8107.

Douglas K. Charles, Professor. Department of Anthropology, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut 06459.

Stephanie Field, B.A. Department of Anthropology, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85287-2402.

Brian J. Fryer, Professor. Department of Earth Sciences, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario N9B 3P4, Canada.

Anne J. Goldberg, M.A. Department of Anthropology, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85287-2402.

Beau J. Goldstein, M.A. Department of Anthropology, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85287-2402.

Cynthia Keller, M.A. Department of Anthropology, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85287-2402.

Tina Lee, M.A. Graduate Center, City University of New York, New York, New York 10016-4309.

David W. Penney, Ph.D. Vice President and Curator, Detroit Institute of Arts, 5200 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Michigan 48202.

Teresa Rodrigues, A.B.D. Department of Anthropology, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85287-2402.

William F. Romain, Ph.D. 26933 Greenbrooke Drive, Olmstead Township, Ohio 44138.

Bret J. Ruby, Ph.D. Cultural Resource Manager, United States Army, Environment and Natural Resources Division, Box 339500, Fort Lewis, Washington 98433-9500.

Katharine C. Ruhl, M.A. Department of Anthropology, Cleveland Museum of Natural History, 1 Wade Oval Drive, Cleveland, Ohio 44106-1767.

Christine M. Shriner, Assistant Professor. Department of Geological Sciences, and Research Associate in the Department of Classical Studies, Indiana University, 1005 E. 10th Street, Bloomington, Indiana 47405-1403.

Michael W. Spence, Professor and Chair. Department of Anthropology, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada N6A 5C2.

Chad R. Thomas, A.B.D. Department of Anthropology, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85287-2402.

Gina M. Turff, M.A. Department of Anthropology, Trent University, 1600 West Bank Drive, Peterborough, Ontario, Canada, K9J 7B8.

Jaimin D. Weets, Assistant Professor. Department of Anthropology, State University of New York, Potsdam, New York 13676.

Preface

Explaining and appreciating others, as goals of an anthropological archaeology that strives to be, at once, scientific and humanistic in outlook, are reconciled in the detailed study of local peoples in their local and broader cultural and natural contexts. Through the rich description of a local people and their ideas, practices, and environments, the possibility arises for the researcher to come to know those people and their ways in terms of their own self-images, roles, practices, values, and beliefs, rather than his or hers, to glimpse their aspirations and motivations, and to begin to understand them. Detailed, personalized observation of a people, and situating oneself in their midst, lay the groundwork for a deeper experience of them, and open the door to true humanistic appreciation and faithful comparative study and explanation.

In this light, finding the faces, actions, consequences, and motivations of past peoples as individuals, as social persons who constructed and played out varying social roles, and as larger social formations with social *raison d'être*—thickly describing past peoples—is vital to a fully realized archaeology that is scientific and humanistic. This calling is especially salient when an archaeological landscape is richly endowed with culturally expressive material remains at multiple scales, as is true of Hopewellian landscapes over the Eastern Woodlands of North America.

Within the verdant valleys of the Woodlands, Hopewellian peoples of 2,000 years ago built truly monumental, often complexly designed earthworks for their ritual gatherings and burying their dead, masterfully worked glis-

tening metals and stones acquired from long, dangerous travels afar into elaborately embellished symbolic forms, and honored many of their dead in meaningfully rich and laboriously expensive mortuaries. Multicommunity, earth-enclosed ceremonial grounds of many tens of acres, aligned precisely to the solstices, equinox, and rising moon; ceremonial, three and four-tone panpipes sheathed in silver and copper and sometimes used in rites of passage; smoking pipes sculpted with creatures that provided personal connections to power; figurines of elite, shaman, and commoners in ritual and ordinary-life routines; tombs of oaken logs and cremation basins filled with dozens to hundreds of gifts of copper axes, copper breastplates, quartz crystal points, or galena cubes by community leaders, elite sodality members, and shaman-like diviners or healers—such expressiveness of lives past makes Hopewellian material records among the most socially and personally vocal archaeological remains on the North American continent.

In this book, twenty-one authors in interwoven efforts immerse themselves in this vibrant archaeological record and guide the reader through it in order to richly document Hopewellian life and to develop new, more intricate understandings of Hopewellian peoples, who have intrigued and mystified professional archaeologists and laypersons for now more than two centuries. By assembling and analyzing deep and broad archaeological data on an unprecedented scale, the authors offer detailed views of the practices, ideas, and motivations of Hopewellian peoples in their local and

interregional cultural and natural contexts in eastern North America. It would be possible, instead, to simply imagine how various expressive material remains and practices of Hopewellian peoples might have figured into their lives, or to place them in some generalized, theoretical framework from an outsider's perspective (e.g., ecological, neo-Darwinian, symbolic-structuralist), but these efforts would bring us only a little closer to Hopewellian peoples themselves. Rather, by thickly describing local Hopewellian life, in personalized, contextualized, ethnographic-like detail to the extent archaeologically feasible, the authors here lay a strong foundation for knowing Hopewellian peoples in their own terms, and for appreciating and explaining them and their works in a manner that is sensitive to their voices.

The twenty chapters of this book introduce the reader to many previously unknown aspects of the social, political, and ceremonial lives of local Hopewellian peoples, especially those in the northern Woodlands of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. Diverse leadership roles with sacred and secular bases of power; the development of institutionalized, multicommunity leadership positions from classical shamanism over time; the animal-totemic clans of local societies and their relative wealth, size, networking, and access to leadership positions; the simplicity of social ranking and its low priority for symbolizing; gender distinctions and relationships as seen in the access of the sexes to leadership positions and sodality membership, day-to-day tasks, workload, and health; the possible recognition of a third gender; patrifocal and matrifocal kinship structures; ceremonial societies/sodalities with overlapping membership; earthwork ritual gatherings, their sizes, social-role compositions, foreign participant levels, and functions, and changes in these characteristics over time; intercommunity alliances and their changing means, formality, and size over time; and the correlation between alliance development and leadership form—each of these features of Hopewellian social, political, and ceremonial life is defined empirically for local Hopewellian peoples. Necessarily, these features are also resolved and understood in the context of the ceremonial-spatial organizations of local Hopewellian communities,

including ceremonial sites of differentiated ritual functions, the use of singular ceremonial sites by multiple communities, and the triscalar organization of residential, local symbolic, and demographically sustainable kinds of Hopewellian communities.

In order to come to know local Hopewellian peoples more closely—to personalize and humanize Hopewellian material records—many of the authors of this book emphasize identifying the social and ritual roles of actors: public ceremonial leader, ritual greeter of foreigners, diviner, healer, corpse processor, and such. Roles are cultural models that guide the actions and interactions of persons by defining or suggesting their relative rights, duties, actions, responses, and tasks in a given social context, and are media that facilitate creative social expression of actors. As such, roles are closely associated with the social action of individuals. Roles bring a dynamism to archaeological records that structural studies of social identities, personae, and positions, which have been a mainstay in modern mortuary archaeology, do not. Roles also give a personal quality to archaeological studies, but at a level of abstraction above the individual and more archaeologically resolvable than the individual agent and his or her specific social actions and effects, which are popular yet debated foci in anthropological archaeology today.

It is from the detailed views of the lives of local Hopewellian peoples that their interregional travels, long-distance procurement of materials, far-flung social-ritual interactions, and spread of ceremonial practices, ideas, raw materials, artifact classes, and material styles are understood here in Hopewellian terms. Interregional-scale Hopewellian practices and connections are shown to have been motivated by, and aspects of, local social, political, and ritual practices and foundational beliefs. Once thought to have been a relatively coherent exchange system fueled by local subsistence risk and/or demands for social status markers, interregional Hopewellian connections empirically turn out instead to have been very diverse in form, and commonly spiritually focused. Vision and power questing, pilgrimages to places in nature, the travels of medicine persons and/or patients

for healing, the buying and spreading of religious prerogatives, pilgrimage to a ceremonial center, personal travel to a ceremonial center for tutelage in religious knowledge and ceremony, and occasional cases of long-distance spirit adoption or intermarriage each had a part in creating the web of interregional Hopewellian connections seen archaeologically in widespread shared or analogous practices and material culture. Fundamental religious emphases on transformation, light and darkness, the tripartite universe and its creatures, power, and the acquisition and managing of power, which are revealed here through material-symbolic studies, are found to be among the important local impetuses for long-distance Hopewellian activities.

Writing thick, interwoven descriptions of the lives of local Hopewellian peoples and their interregional ventures—personalized, contextualized, ethnographic-like accounts—was made possible at this time by the convergence of many significant empirical advances in Hopewell archaeology. A number of very large data sets relevant to diverse, specific features of Hopewellian social, political, and ceremonial life were assembled or reconstituted between the mid-1990s and the present: systematized museum data from 19th through early 20th century excavations of Hopewellian sites, detailed laboratory analyses of artifacts and skeletal remains, and new excavations and surveys of habitation sites and earthworks (esp. Romain, Chapter 3, Appendix 3.1; Ruby and Shriner, Chapter 15; Cadiante 1998; Carr and Haas 1996; Carr and King n.d.; Carr and Maslowski 1995; Case and Carr n.d.; Dancey and Pacheco 1997b; Penney and Carriveau 1983; Ruby 1997a–e; Ruhl 1996; Spence and Fryer 1996; Turff 1997; and see summaries in Ruby

et al., Chapter 4). Each potent in its own right, the meeting of these empirical advances gave a special synergy and jump-start to the thinking, analyses, and interpretations of the authors of this book. Also critical to our writing fine-grained descriptions have been recent refinements in archaeological, middle-range theories that are useful for identifying and sorting out the various social and other cultural dimensions reflected in mortuary practices and styles of artifacts, which comprise a good bulk of the information studied here. Finally, recent anthropological, theoretical developments in the study of community organization, shamanism, gender, alliance development, and long-distance journeying for social and religious reasons have aided our efforts to reveal Hopewellian peoples and their ways. These archaeological and ethnological theories are summarized, and in some cases further developed here, as the Hopewellian records to which they are relevant are explored.

Many of the large, raw data sets analyzed here are reproduced in the CD Appendices listed at the back of this book. Some of the interpretive, anthropological potential of these data sets has been brought forward here, but more patterns and insights remain for others to reveal. We hope that these hard data, and the authors' rich, personalized renderings of the practices, ideas, and motivations of Hopewellian peoples in their local and interregional settings, will serve professional archaeologists well in their future strides to know, faithfully explain, and appreciate Hopewellian life.

CHRISTOPHER CARR
D. TROY CASE

Acknowledgments

Creating this book was a tremendous amount of fun—intellectually and personally. The continuous stream of surprises about Hopewellian life that emerged as we delved into our data, our long talks with colleagues that forged friendships, our trips to museums and private collections that cast our eyes on the wonders of Hopewellian artistry and afforded us opportunities to sample local cuisines, the calming study of artifacts and field notes in the remote corners of museum stacks to the sound of spring rains on the roof, and, of course, the swapping of stories of past field adventures as mythic as any Hopewellian journey—these joys filled our lives for a decade as this book was researched and written.

Our deepest thanks go to the twenty-one authors of this book. They graciously agreed to write on specific facets of Hopewellian life, ensuring the coverage of this book, helped to frame the problems addressed, took on suggested coauthor roles, ventured to play with data and ideas at the edges of their past experience, and reworked their chapters to mesh with others as the book grew organically. Writing this book was truly a team effort, and was done with generous team spirit.

Behind the team of authors were many graduate students and some undergraduates at Arizona State University who did preliminary data analyses and critiqued drafts of the chapters while taking courses in mortuary analysis and Hopewell archaeology taught by Carr from 1998 through 2003. The preliminary data patterns that they uncovered and the interpretations we developed primed the pumps for many of

the more in-depth studies made here. For these efforts, we are thankful to Alma Ader, Elizabeth Alter, Mary Aubin, Francis Black, Jennifer Butts, Susan Campbell, April Cummins, Kristin De Lucia, Alyssa Dion, Sara Dvorak, Kate Faccia, Brent Fare, Stephanie Field, Jennifer Fish, Beau Goldstein, Billy Graves, Karen Gust, Kristen Hartnett, Colleen Hiltz, Mark Howe, James Jacobs, Cynthia Keller, Jesse Kern, Sarah Klandrud, Anna Konstantatos, Christin Lampkowski, Susan Lampson, Joy Meiner, Chris Moryl, Phil Nemeth, Michael Nimtz, Hanna Peck, Justin Perry, Tim Peterson, Wendy Potter, Kitty Rainey, Julien Riel-Salvatore, Anne Rowsey, Dinelle Rudd, Eli Scarborough, Kamille Schmitz, Jill Sears, Daniel Temple, Chad Thomas, Alison Thornton, Denise To, Dacia Tucholke, Jamie Ullinger, Michael Velloff, Brian Villmoare, Angela Watts, Rex Weeks, and Tamrat Wodajo.

Troy Case's steady work over six years to design, code, and enter the database of Ohio Hopewell burials and ceremonial deposits that is analyzed in six of the chapters here was invaluablely aided by Beau Goldstein during the last four years of the task. Ed Ritchie cross-checked the records and entries for Mound City. Ian Robertson programmed the database and helped with its design. Melanie Schwandt programmed numerous statistical analyses for four chapters. Kitty Rainey created GIS maps of Ohio Hopewell sites for six chapters and Deann Gates digitally processed the halftone artwork for the cover, front matter, and two chapters. Marilynn Bubb entered and compiled the composite bibliography. Chad Thomas lent a strong hand in readying the book

for printing and checking the details of the proofs over much of a year. Matt Tocheri formatted all the tables for printing. To each of these persons we send our warmest thanks.

Bret Ruby's and Mark Seeman's open ears and critical thinking during many long conversations with Chris Carr, as the authors and he played with ideas and data, were key to forming the interpretations presented here. Chris is especially thankful to Bret and Mark for their long and close Hopewellian collegueship with him. Michael Nassaney, Jim Stoltman, Bob Mainfort, and Doug Mitchell provided very thoughtful and helpful reviews of the book, and Mike Wiant offered some essential perspectives that helped to orient us in rewriting. Mike also contributed substantially, through discussion, to the process of writing the Dedication to Stuart Struever, for which we are grateful. Chris is also thankful to Mike Wiant and Michael Nassaney for encouraging him to develop the concept to "thick prehistory", its grounding in how Stuart envisioned and did archaeology, and its relationship to contemporary anthropological theory. Mike Jochim, Series Editor, Teresa Krauss, Editor at Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, and Herman Makler, Production Editor at Kluwer, gave much appreciated moral support and guidance through the final writing, review, and production of the book.

Primary data collection, including the study of artifacts, field notes, and accession records, was generously supported by the Ohio Historical Society, Hopewell Culture National Historical Park, Chicago Field Museum of Natural History, Peabody Museum of Ethnology and Archaeology at Harvard University, Kent State University, Ross County Historical Society, Johnson-Humrickhouse Museum, Glenn Black Laboratory at Indiana University, Indiana Department of Transportation, Mr. Robert Harness, Mr. Robert

Converse, and Mr. Charles Lacer. We are grateful to many museum curators and staff who facilitated our work: Elisa Aguilar-Kutza, Jarrod Burks, Penelope Drooker, Scott Fulton, Gloria Greiss, Wil Grewe-Mullins, Jonathan Haas, Cheryl Johnston, Noel Justice, Brad Lepper, Patti Malenke, John Neal, Martha Otto, Jennifer Pederson, Christopher Peebles, William Pickard, Melanie Pratt, Jon Eric Rogers, Bret Ruby, Curtis Tomak, and Deborah Wood.

Grant support for museum work and development of databases was provided by the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research (1996), the Field Museum of Natural History Robert O. Bass Distinguished Visiting Scientist Fellowship (1996), the Eastern National Parks and Monuments Association (1997), The Ohio State University's Provost Research Fund through Dr. Richard Sisson (2000), and the Arizona State University's College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Minigrant Fund (1995, 1997) and Department of Anthropology's Research Incentive Fund (1994, 1996, 1998, 1999, 2000).

Louis Glanzman graciously gave us permission to reproduce his oil painting *A Hopewell Indian Burial Ceremony*, on the cover of this book and in Chapter 5, without cost and with good cheer and encouragement on our project. Glanzman is an epic historical painter whose works have been commissioned regularly by the United States government, the National Geographic Society, and for covers of most American national magazines.

Chris Carr warmly thanks Ken and Mary Kay Henricks, Jarrod and Susie Burks, Cheryl Johnston and John Schweikart, Crystal Reustle, and Dan and Leslie Driscoll for graciously opening their homes to him and extending family-style comfort while he was doing museum work in Columbus and Boston. Their friendship will always be remembered.



Hopewell West: The Saguaro Tradition. Contributors to this book who were in residence at Arizona State University. *Bottom row, left to right:* Katharine D. Rainey, Stephanie Field, Anne J. Goldberg, Tina Lee. *Middle row, left to right:* Jaimin D. Weets, Wesley Bernardini, Christopher Carr, Teresa Rodrigues, Chad R. Thomas. *Top row, left to right:* Beau J. Goldstein, Cynthia Keller, D. Troy Case, Ian Robertson. Special thanks to Deann Gates for photo rendition.

Contents

Dedication to Stuart Struever	1
<i>Christopher Carr</i>	
 I. GENERAL INTRODUCTION	
1. The Gathering of Hopewell	19
<i>Christopher Carr and D. Troy Case</i>	
2. Historical Insight into the Directions and Limitations of Recent Research on Hopewell	51
<i>Christopher Carr</i>	
 II. SOCIAL AND POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS OF NORTHERN HOPEWELLIAN PEOPLES	
3. Salient Issues in the Social and Political Organizations of Northern Hopewellian Peoples: Contextualizing, Personalizing, and Generating Hopewell	73
<i>Christopher Carr</i>	
4. Community Organizations in the Scioto, Mann, and Havana Hopewellian Regions: A Comparative Perspective	119
<i>Bret J. Ruby, Christopher Carr, and Douglas K. Charles</i>	
5. The Nature of Leadership in Ohio Hopewellian Societies: Role Segregation and the Transformation from Shamanism	177
<i>Christopher Carr and D. Troy Case</i>	

6. **The Question of Ranking in Havana Hopewellian Societies: A Retrospective in Light of Multi-cemetery Ceremonial Organization** 238
Christopher Carr
7. **The Tripartite Ceremonial Alliance among Scioto Hopewellian Communities and the Question of Social Ranking** 258
Christopher Carr
8. **Animal-Totemic Clans of Ohio Hopewellian Peoples** 339
Chad R. Thomas, Christopher Carr, and Cynthia Keller
9. **Gender, Status, and Ethnicity in the Scioto, Miami, and Northeastern Ohio Hopewellian Regions, as Evidenced by Mortuary Practices** 386
Stephanie Field, Anne Goldberg, and Tina Lee
10. **Gender and Social Differentiation within the Turner Population, Ohio, as Evidenced by Activity-Induced Musculoskeletal Stress Markers** 405
Teresa Rodrigues
11. **Gender, Role, Prestige, and Ritual Interaction across the Ohio, Mann, and Havana Hopewellian Regions, as Evidenced by Ceramic Figurines** 428
Cynthia Keller and Christopher Carr
- III. RITUAL GATHERINGS OF NORTHERN HOPEWELLIAN PEOPLES**
12. **Scioto Hopewell Ritual Gatherings: A Review and Discussion of Previous Interpretations and Data** 463
Christopher Carr
13. **Estimating the Sizes and Social Compositions of Mortuary-Related Gatherings at Scioto Hopewell Earthwork–Mound Sites** 480
Christopher Carr, Beau J. Goldstein, and Jaimin Weets
14. **Smoking Pipe Compositions and Styles as Evidence of the Social Affiliations of Mortuary Ritual Participants at the Tremper Site, Ohio** 533
Jaimin Weets, Christopher Carr, David Penney, and Gary Carriveau
15. **Ceramic Vessel Compositions and Styles as Evidence of the Local and Nonlocal Social Affiliations of Ritual Participants at the Mann Site, Indiana** 553
Bret J. Ruby and Christine M. Shriner

IV. HOPEWELLIAN RITUAL CONNECTIONS ACROSS EASTERN NORTH AMERICA

16. Rethinking Interregional Hopewellian “Interaction”	575
<i>Christopher Carr</i>	
17. Hopewellian Copper Celts from Eastern North America: Their Social and Symbolic Significance	624
<i>Wesley Bernadini and Christopher Carr</i>	
18. Hopewellian Panpipes from Eastern North America: Their Social, Ritual, and Symbolic Significance	648
<i>Gina Turff and Christopher Carr</i>	
19. Hopewellian Copper Earspools from Eastern North America: The Social, Ritual, and Symbolic Significance of Their Contexts and Distribution	696
<i>Katharine C. Ruhl</i>	
20. Hopewellian Silver and Silver Artifacts from Eastern North America: Their Sources, Procurement, Distribution, and Meanings	714
<i>Michael W. Spence and Brian J. Fryer</i>	
References	735
List of Tables	779
List of Figures	783
List of Appendices on Compact Disk	787
Index	791
Compact Disk of Appendices	Inside Cover

Dedication to Stuart Struever

On a lazy, flowing Illinois River, in a country valley nestled in a quiet, wispy fog of early morning and then drenched in sparkling dew as the sun grows higher, a ferry from times gone by passengers vehicles of archaeologists and students across the waters toward their day's adventures in an earthen past. Hopewell burial mounds plentifully dot the bluff crests above, reminding the crews of a long-gone yet present humanized landscape, of a valley community of Hopewellian peoples, whom the archaeologists hope to come to know a little better by the end of the day. Kampsville, 1960–2002: a simple and pleasing scene, yet in that garden was planted and grew and ripened one of the most critical, successful, and complex experiments in modern American archaeology—the formalizing of multidisciplinary, regional-scale archaeological research as an academic and economic institution.

Organization building is a phrase easily associated with Stuart Struever for those who know him even remotely. Nearly all of his life, from his 22nd year to the present, at age 72, he has been laying the fiscal and interpersonal foundations for realizing deep, rich, regional-scale archaeological research and education. He has personally raised more than \$40 million in support of archaeology and built two multidecade archaeological research and education centers: the well-known Center for American Archaeology in Illinois and the Crow Canyon Center in Colorado. And archaeological work through these centers has pivotally changed our knowledge and views of Archaic, Woodland, and Mississippian peoples from 7200 B.C. to A.D. 1400 in the eastern

United States and of Puebloan peoples from A.D. 500 to A.D. 1300 in the Four Corners area of the American Southwest.

What is not so well understood is Stuart's broader vision of archaeology as a mature, scientific, anthropologically targeted, multidisciplinary intellectual endeavor, his commitment as a prehistorian and theorist to fine-grained, locally focused research at the scale of past human societies, and how he saw archaeological institution building as fundamental to realizing these potentials. Also not recognized are his broader intellectual impacts evident in the scores of now professional archaeologists and literally tens of thousands of high schoolers, undergraduates, graduate students, elementary and high school teachers, and laypersons who were trained through his programs in Illinois and Colorado.

Indeed, it is within the expanse of Stuart's vision and passion for a multidisciplinary, fine-grained, locally focused anthropological archaeology that the most basic cornerstones of this book are laid. The close, long-term, team efforts of the authors to interweave their research, and the emphasis here on humanizing the past by richly documenting local peoples, their ideas, practices, and cultural and natural environments, with diverse and deep data—what I call *thick prehistory*—have their roots in Stuart's training ground. For five field seasons and a winter in Kampsville, from 1972 through 1977, I was immersed in archaeological research with and for the center that Stuart constructed, where these views and ways of doing archaeology were instilled through classes, long-night talks, and

practice. My interest in Hopewellian peoples also sprang from those days and the solid foundation of research on Hopewell that Stuart and his colleagues had laid during the previous two decades in the Illinois valley: it was Stuart who selected a Middle Woodland habitation site for me to explore in my doctoral dissertation.

This dedication is written, with much thanks, from my experiences in Kampsville and from a six hour, in-person interview and a half-dozen long telephone conversations with Stuart from spring through autumn 2003. It also benefits from several long discussions with Mike Wiant, of the Illinois State Museum, who was a student and employee of Stuart's and has had a long-standing relationship with him. Mike also helpfully wrote down many thoughts that added to this dedication.

Stuart's career is an inseparable interweaving of several passions that he has pursued with sustained focus for now more than five decades: prehistory; team-based, multidisciplinary archaeological research at the regional scale in response to the demands of theoretical and methodological developments in post-1960 Americanist archaeology; building and funding of organizations to provide a stable fiscal and personnel basis for such expensive and lengthy research; and education of the public both as an engine for funding research and for humanitarian reasons. In Stuart's clear, self-knowing words,

There are three things I see myself as having that, together, other archaeologists seldom have: first, a vision to do archaeology on a bigger, different level, through a different organizational way, as I laid out in 1965 [Streuver 1968d]; second, my immense passion to achieve the goal I set. This passion was caught by others from whom I sought funds and made me a successful fund-raiser for archaeology. The ability to light the imaginations of others is essential to be a successful fund-raiser; and third, endurance—an unwillingness to be turned aside by things that might discourage many individuals. I would not be put off by persons who did not understand the vital linkage between deep archaeological research and institution building.

With these unique personal qualities and visions, Stuart remade and is remaking significant sectors of American archaeology in its understandings of prehistory, its form of intellectual interaction and work, and its service to society.

Born in the rural, upstate Illinois town of Peru, and the son of a local industrialist of means, Stuart was surrounded from birth by the curiosities of the archaeological record and the know-how of leaders of large-scale organizations. This environment, his natural, precocious attraction to the archaeological past, and his strong intuition for how to go about archaeology set the direction of his life career. Stuart's passion for archaeology was sparked by his first find of a projectile point on a neighbor's farm at the age of nine on Easter Sunday, 1940. Holding the point in his hand, he was mesmerized by the thought of what it might tell him about some unknown person of antiquity. Soon after, he discovered that his family's farm on the Vermilion River had artifacts. He surveyed it, finding several habitation sites, and meticulously picked up all the artifacts, charcoal, and burned clay he could find, keeping the remains from different habitations and even concentrations within them separate from each other. Thereafter, he expanded his research to neighboring farms and, after getting his drivers license, made a total, systematic survey of a four-mile stretch of the lower Vermilion River valley, numbering and naming sites, mapping them on U.S. Geological Service (USGS) quads and plat books, curating the remains by site, and displaying them in a little museum that he made on his grandparents' sunporch—all without instruction.

After entering Dartmouth and meeting his first professional archaeologist, Elmer Harp, Stuart, at age 19, began his formal instruction in fieldwork, his forging of lifelong colleagueships with key Illinois archaeologists, and his 30-year career in Illinois valley prehistory. He dug at the French fort in Starved Rock State Park under Richard Hagen in 1950, near his natal home, along with James Brown, with whom Stuart later would come to teach for many years at Northwestern University and the Center for American Archeology, and to jointly explore Illinois valley prehistory. After a field school in New Mexico,

Stuart excavated and field supervised at an 18th-Century Illiniwek village at the mouth of the Kaskaskia and across the river from Modoc rock shelter. There, he met Melvin Fowler, who directed excavations at both sites, and Howard Winters, who was a field supervisor at Modoc. Stuart and Howard tented together that summer of 1952, brainstorming about Illinois archaeology, and became close friends, with Howard to have continuing influences on Stuart's anthropological thinking for much of their lives. Earlier, in June, on his way to Illiniwek from Dartmouth, Stuart made an impromptu visit to Ann Arbor to visit James B. Griffin, whose article on Illinois Woodland ceramic typology and chronology (Griffin 1952a), and especially the Hopewellian materials, had caught Stuart's eye. There, at the Ceramic Repository in the Museum of Anthropology, Griffin graciously gave Stuart a personal, hands-on seminar on Illinois ceramics for four or five days and greatly impressed him with the need to understand ceramic chronology in depth to culturally order archaeological records. "That was the first time I touched Hopewell artifacts" and also "built a close relationship between Jimmy Griffin and myself, which carried on for most of our lives."

Stuart graduated from Dartmouth in 1953 and, after a brief year of graduate school in anthropology at Harvard University, was drafted for the Korean War and then released in early 1955. Uncertain about what to do with his life, and loving archaeology, he turned to excavating a Middle Woodland habitation site, Kuhne, in the upper Illinois valley near the town of Henry for three summers, with the help of high school students. To support himself and the excavations, and to find volunteer diggers, he gave public lectures on archaeology at high schools and colleges. He gave his first in March of 1955, and soon realized that he was a strong public speaker. Within a year, Stuart was lecturing in a six-state area and had hired a booking agent for his business. Also, in order to attract tax-deductible donations from the local wealthy—and on the advice of his father, Carl, and with his help—Stuart established a not-for-profit foundation, Archaeological Research, Inc. Thus at age 24 began Stuart's long career combination of archaeological field

research, lectures to the public to fund it, training of laypersons in the field, and archaeological organization building. The venture was successful. Archaeological Research, Inc. later became the Foundation for Illinois Archaeology, and then the Center for American Archaeology—a major, national research and education institution.

Realizing through his work at Kuhne that he did not know how to analyze archaeological remains and draw inferences solidly in an anthropological way, Stuart applied for graduate school in anthropology at Northwestern University in 1958. His plan to focus there on African archaeology was short-lived. In May, 1958, Stuart's fascination with Hopewell was broadened and his work in the lower portion of the Illinois valley was initiated by serendipity when, driving through the area, he saw Kamp Mound 9—a flood plain Hopewellian burial mound—beginning to be bulldozed by the curious landowner, Pete Kamp, the grandson of the founder of Kampsville. Stuart felt compelled to rescue the mound, and Mr. Kamp agreed that he would leave it alone if Stuart would excavate it professionally, which he did, beginning in August, with the help of high school students from the Chicago area, undergraduates from several colleges, and graduate students from Northwestern.

The Kamp Mound 9 excavations set in motion a number of events that solidified Stuart's career as a Hopewell archaeologist and his investment in the lower Illinois valley. The excavation became the subject of his master's thesis and his first detailed, anthropological archaeological analysis. Kamp 9 also fascinated Howard Winters, who came to visit Stuart many times over the two years of its excavation, deepening their friendship and colleagueship. Brainstorming sessions between the two archaeologists widened Stuart's perspective on Illinois Hopewell, especially relative to the Ohio Hopewellian record, and ultimately led him to write his 1965 *American Antiquity* article on the subject—still one of the few systematic comparisons of the two regional traditions. Likewise, Stuart's Kamp 9 excavations attracted the attention of Joseph Caldwell, Curator of Anthropology at the Illinois State Museum, who played

an especially important role in Stuart's intellectual development. Specifically, Stuart's Kamp 9 work and master's thesis were conceptualized in the single-site, normative perspective popular at the time. Caldwell forcefully encouraged Stuart to instead widen his perspective and reconsider Illinois Hopewell using Caldwell's concept of the "Interaction Sphere." In 1959, while Stuart was visiting Caldwell at his excavations at Dickson Mounds, he asked Stuart to prepare a paper on his Kamp 9 work from this new Interaction Sphere vantage for presentation at in A. R. Kelly's organized session at the 1961 American Anthropology Association meeting in Philadelphia. Stuart undertook the challenge and spoke about his work, but just as significantly, he intently absorbed much new information that was surfacing on Hopewellian traditions elsewhere in the Eastern Woodlands through the research of Don Dragoo, Olaf Prufer, James Brown, and Edward McMichael. The insights that Stuart gained resulted in his seminal 1964 article, "The Hopewell Interaction Sphere in Riverine–Western Great Lakes Culture History," in which he linked areas of Hopewellian development to specific climatic and geomorphological conditions that were optimal for growing Eastern Agricultural Complex cultigens. Stuart's argument for the development of Hopewellian cultures in the area was at once ecological, demographic, and social—lines of thought he learned from Robert Braidwood and Lewis Binford (see below), and a major change from his earlier, normative thinking. In the article, Stuart also laid out his "mud-flat horticulture hypothesis" of the independent origins of agriculture in the Riverine–Great Lakes area, initiating a decade-long period of his career when he would publish and become well-known for his contributions to thought and data on the origins of agriculture, generally (Struever 1971; Struever and Vickery 1973).

The period between 1959 and 1964 for Stuart was a rich and continuous stream of teachers and anthropological theoretical ideas, deep discussions with colleagues, and immersion in the Hopewellian archaeological record of the lower Illinois valley, all of which congealed in his research there. During the fall quarter of his second year at Northwestern, in 1959, Stuart

participated in a joint University of Chicago–Northwestern University graduate seminar on subsistence and settlement patterns offered by Robert Braidwood and Creighton Gabel. Braidwood's concept of the subsistence-settlement cultural domain and his ideas about ecology and the origins of agriculture absolutely fascinated Stuart, as did Braidwood's views on multidisciplinary research. Stuart had begun to systematically survey the lower 70 miles of the Illinois valley, from Meridosa to Grafton, in 1958, and readily saw Braidwood's subsistence-settlement view of landscapes manifested in the lower Illinois as he continued surveying there from 1959 through 1961. After completing his master's degree on Kamp Mound 9 (Struever 1960), Stuart transferred to the doctoral program in anthropology at the University of Chicago in the summer of 1960, to work with Braidwood. With the intellectual foundation laid by Braidwood, and Stuart's now-deepening view of the lower Illinois valley archaeological landscape, Stuart was well prepared to absorb the ideas of Lewis Binford, who taught at Chicago from 1961 through 1964 and became Stuart's mentor. Through Binford, Stuart learned the theoretical frameworks of cultural evolution and systems notions of ecology, the goal of elucidating cultural process in contrast to culture history, the distinction between subsistence and settlement patterns, on one hand, and subsistence-settlement systems on the other, the question of how subsistence and settlement change systemically over time, the ideas of activity areas and tool kits, and sampling excavation strategies. Through the classroom, informal gatherings of U of C students with Binford in Stuart's apartment kitchen in Hyde Park, and Binford's trips from Carlyle Reservoir to visit Stuart in the field, Binford played an active role in cementing the ideas of the soon-to-become New Archaeology into Stuart's Hopewell research, especially the analysis of subsistence-settlement systems. Stuart notes, "Binford was constantly provoking me to try to develop a typology of sites of differentiated function and from that to try to evolve an interpretation of what kind of cultural system was going on" in the lower Illinois during the Middle Woodland. At the same time, at the Illinois State Museum in Springfield, Stuart was also mulling

over Illinois Hopewell and Hopewell across the Woodlands in broader terms with Joseph Caldwell, Robert Hall, Howard Winters, and James Brown, with Binford's ideas liberally salted in. Winters and Brown were finishing their degrees at Chicago, and Caldwell, Hall, Winters, and Brown all had offices at the museum at various times during the period. Finally, Stuart's conception of the Havana Hopewellian record was much enriched by years of discussions in the field with Gregory Perino, who excavated Middle and Late Woodland burial mounds in the lower Illinois for the Gilcrease Foundation, Tulsa, Oklahoma, from the early 1950s through the late 1960s, and then for the Center for American Archaeology from 1971 through 1976. Perino knew the archaeology of the lower Illinois valley better than any amateur or professional archaeologist, having grown up in the area, and naturally thought about it in regional-scale, cultural terms. He helped Stuart greatly in learning the geographic distributions, internal spatial structures, and contents of Hopewellian mortuary and habitation sites throughout the lower valley. Stuart and Perino first met when he paid Stuart a visit at his Kuhne site excavations in 1955, and they came to cement a long professional relationship and friendship as Stuart dug Kamp Mound 9 and surface surveyed the lower Illinois valley. One substantial result of all of this synergy was Stuart's (1968a) article on "Woodland Subsistence-Settlement Systems in the Lower Illinois Valley," in *New Perspectives in Archaeology*, which yet stands largely correct as a model of Early Woodland Black Sand and Middle Woodland Havana Hopewellian subsistence-settlement systems in the lower valley. The article realized Binford's urging: it documented both of the systems in terms of sets of differentiated settlement types defined by their microenvironmental locations, sizes, forms, and internal structures, artifact contents, and deduced functions; mobility patterns among sites were also inferred. Stuart also integrated Caldwell's lead that the development of primary forest efficiency over the Woodlands continued in certain ecologically favored, restricted locations, and proposed in the article a model for Early to Middle Woodland subsistence-settlement change that involved the development of "intensive harvest col-

lecting" of select, high-yielding natural foods, including members of the Eastern Agricultural Complex, at such locales. The rise of Havana Hopewell social complexity was linked by Stuart to increases in economic productivity and population. This model, empirically well supported, came to replace Griffin's earlier projection that Hopewellian cultural florescences were based in maize agriculture.

From 1962 through 1967, in order to document such subsistence-settlement change and for the completion of his dissertation, and continuing in 1968, Stuart intensively excavated Middle Woodland habitation sites and an Early Woodland site in the lower Illinois valley: Apple Creek, Snyders, Macoupin, Peisker, and others. This work, in turn, led to three lines of innovation to which Stuart made absolutely critical contributions to Americanist archaeology: first, multidisciplinary cultural-ecological research anchored in the natural sciences; second, the conceptualization of rich, detailed archaeological work on local cultural systems within a defined research universe; and third, the building of independent archaeological research and education centers. Each of these three contributions is now considered.

Stuart was highly impressed with the multidisciplinary team of natural scientists that Braidwood had assembled to tackle the issue of the origins of agriculture in Iraq and Iran, and had some experience with the approach himself. Early in his career, while excavating the Kuhne site, Stuart had enlisted one vertebrate biologist, Paul Parmalee, of the Illinois State Museum, to identify faunal remains and had found the documented species very insightful: he could determine in a general sense the microenvironments around Kuhne that its inhabitants had exploited for food. For his Apple Creek work, and later his Macoupin excavations, Stuart cast his net wider, to include Parmalee, fisheries biologist Andreas Paloumpis, mammalogist Robert Weigel, and herpetologist Alan Holman, the latter three from the biology department at Illinois State Normal University. Paloumpis, in particular, gave Stuart fine-grained information on the microenvironmental zones that Middle Woodland peoples were using and affirmed for him the

utility of the multidisciplinary team approach to an ecologically oriented, cultural–processual archaeology. It was also at Apple Creek that Stuart and his wife Alice developed water separation and chemical flotation methods for freeing and capturing small faunal and floral remains from soils (Struever 1968c), augmenting the need for botany and malacology experts on archaeological teams. Stuart nurtured these developments, also recognizing that they antiquated the lone-scientist model of archaeological research and placed new demands on team building.

As his ecological orientation deepened through the 1960s, Stuart came to formally define a 2,800-square mile, 70 × 40-mile research universe encompassing the lower Illinois valley and its upland surroundings, and an “Illinois Valley Archaeological Program” dedicated to its archaeological and ecological study. The area was mapped botanically, and later geomorphologically, and changes in vegetation and landforms over prehistory were reconstructed. A focus on revealing the rich details of local cultures in their local environments emerged—a theme carried forward in this book. Stuart, like I, was strongly influenced by Walter Taylor’s (1948) emphasis on establishing context in detail as a basis for reconstructing a past culture.

Stuart’s central insight about the necessity for fiscally independent, long-term, multidisciplinary archaeological research institutions emerged early during his graduate studies and became stronger as his own research in the lower Illinois valley became theoretically and analytically more complicated. In Room 310 of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, in 1961 and 1962, Stuart would gather for lunch with his fellow graduate students, Frank Hole, James Brown, Patty Jo Watson, Kent Flannery, and others, and, along with Braidwood, talk about their research. There, Stuart had the opportunity to see Braidwood repeatedly express his frustrations in trying to continuously fund his archaeological work in Kurdistan. Stuart observed that although Braidwood was a world-famous archaeologist and was receiving some of the largest grants awarded by the National Science Foundation at the time, they were nevertheless not enough and not regular enough to fund his long-

term, multidisciplinary project, and required him to run around to wealthy Chicagoans to piece together sufficient support. Stuart saw the growing disparity between the increasing scientific demands of anthropological archaeology and its organizational structure. In particular, he came to understand within a few years that the shift in theory to a concern for cultural process and ecology, the regional-systems scale of research that theory required, the paleo-environmental reconstructions and three-phase excavations at multiple sites that were integral to detailed, locally contextualizing analysis, the concomitant physical and natural scientific analyses of the excavated remains, and the multidisciplinary teams of researchers required to achieve these tasks greatly exceeded in cost the amount of funding available to any American archaeologist. He also saw that the continually expanding array of physical, chemical, and biological techniques applied to archaeological research were too costly to be used with regularity. Thus, although theory, problems, and methods had become more sophisticated in American archaeology, their potentials were seldom being realized. On this basis, Stuart argued that single-investigator-focused departments of anthropology at universities and museums lacked the institutionalized organizational means for expanding archaeology’s horizons, and that independently funded centers dedicated to the long-term fiscal and personnel requirements of archaeology were needed. This message Stuart first delivered in 1964 at a meeting of the Anthropological Society of Washington, by invitation from Kent Flannery, then at the Smithsonian, and subsequently published (Struever 1968d).

Once Stuart’s vision of an ideal organizational infrastructure for archaeology and its theoretical and methodological justification was clear to him, he acted on it boldly. In 1964, after Lewis Binford left the University of Chicago, Stuart was invited to serve as lecturer in Binford’s place. Braidwood liked the work on subsistence-settlement systems that Stuart was doing in the Illinois valley. However, when Stuart discussed with Braidwood the matter of developing an institute of archaeology at Chicago in order to facilitate work in the Illinois valley, Braidwood

was discouraging. He had seen the financial difficulties that James Henry Breasted had had in maintaining the Oriental Institute, and that Faye Cooper-Cole had had in running his central Illinois valley archaeological program at the University of Chicago, and feared the same plight for a lower Illinois valley center. Determined in his vision, in 1965, Stuart left his plush academic job at Chicago—a hotbed of archaeological development for several decades—to take a position at Northwestern University, which was removed from the mainstream of academic archaeology. There, to Stuart’s liking, Paul Bohannon, who led the hiring, and other faculty in the department, expressed no resistance to Stuart’s idea of building an institute of archaeology. The department was small, was not entrenched in archaeology, and had no preconceptions about how archaeology ought to be done or organized.

In 1968, after completing his dissertation at Chicago, on Hopewell in Eastern North America (Struever 1968b), Stuart began building a permanent field research and teaching center in Kampsville, an old river town on the banks of the Illinois River, to house his now long-term, regional, multidisciplinary Illinois Valley Archaeological Program. His efforts began modestly, with the securing of a donation of \$4,000 to purchase the old hardware store he had been renting in Kampsville as a field laboratory and the renaming of Archaeological Research, Inc., as the Foundation for Illinois Archaeology, in order to emphasize its Illinois focus. By 1981, the center had expanded to 39 buildings and had an annual operating budget of over two million dollars. During its height in the 1970s and early 1980s, the center came to continuously support scholars from eight academic disciplines. It had dedicated laboratories for zoology, botany, malacology, geomorphology, human osteology, artifact analysis, flotation, central data processing of field records, and computer analysis. Out-of-town specialists in pollen analysis, phytolith analysis, geology, and geomorphology completed the multidisciplinary team of collaborating scientists. The remote computer lab was humidity, temperature, and dust insulated, and truly novel for its time. A research library, exceptional biological comparative collections,

extensive housing and dining facilities and personnel that could provide for up to 100 students and staff, a fleet of field vehicles, a supply warehouse, a public museum, and, eventually, a collections facility filled out the research center. In any given field season, typically multiple excavations were in progress at once, producing huge quantities of data, often collected with pioneering technologies and analytical designs. The flotation laboratory alone processed hundreds of half-bush sediment samples per day, the carbonized plant remains and small animal bones from which were analyzed by the botany and zoology laboratories. Innovation in archaeological methods, with technology and information transfer from the physical and natural sciences, was a regular part of Kampsville archaeological life and a defined mission of the center.

Kampsville during the summer-through-fall field season was as intellectually vigorous as any graduate school—“an unparalleled, extraordinary milieu of discovery, expertise, information, and opportunity that influenced a generation of archaeologists, many of whom are widely recognized in the profession today” (M. Wiant, personal communication). With large numbers of professional archaeologists and members of supporting disciplines in town, as well as visiting scholars, there were many long nights of intellectual discussions to be had by the academically curious. More than a dozen college courses were taught on-site, in laboratories and the field, with credit offered through Northwestern University. Lectures were regularly given two or more nights of the week by resident professors, natural science laboratory directors, and professional staff, who were at the cutting edges of the field: David Asch, James Brown, Jane Buikstra, Bruce McMillan, Bonnie Styles, Joseph Tainter, Michael Wiant, and others. Students and faculty were frequently given unique vistas of contemporary archaeological thought and research through the guest lectures given by archaeologists who visited the operations. The most current of Americanist archaeology was debated on the lecture hall floor. Binford gave his seminal “Willow Smoke and Dog’s Tails” article seven years before it appeared in print (Binford 1980), and in greater scope. Griffin disagreed with Struever

and Houart's (1972) economic formalization of the Hopewell Interaction Sphere and spoke about the latest understandings of Hopewellian obsidian procurement. Lectures by Karl Butzer, Robert Whallon, Frank Hole, Charles McGimsey, Dan Morse, Patrick Munson, Howard Winters, Gregory Perino, and other senior academicians, as well as by researchers who were innovatively applying techniques and methods from the physical and natural sciences, provided a forward-thinking and creative milieu for the ongoing research at Kampsville. Through all this daily, rich intellectual interaction, Kampsville became a honing ground for new visions of archaeology, theories, and laboratory and field techniques, for resident and visiting scholars alike. The Foundation for Illinois Archaeology, later renamed the Center for American Archaeology, also sponsored three special think-tank retreat-seminars on current topics in anthropological theory, archaeological theory, and regional prehistory for professionals, and maintained a substantial publication stream of monographs, books, and well-prepared contract survey and excavation reports, in joint efforts with the Illinois State Museum or Northwestern University, and independently.

Stuart's realization of archaeology's structural need for multidisciplinary, stable, financially independent research centers and his founding of one at Kampsville depended closely on concepts and insights he had obtained from Braidwood and Binford, and on putting those ideas into practice with his intensive Middle Woodland archaeological research in the lower Illinois valley. The success of the center at Kampsville came, in part, from the intersection of Stuart's upbringing and the fortuitous discovery of the Koster site at just the right time in his career trajectory.

Stuart's upbringing gave him two strong qualities that were critical ingredients to building Kampsville: an understanding of using teamwork among specialists to efficiently create a product, and the confidence to take financial and career risks. Regarding the first, between the ages of 5 and 12 or so, on Sunday mornings, Stuart would tour his family's industrial plant in Peru with his father.

"He'd tell me how the production of his company was the result of many specialists in product development, sales, advertising, purchasing—all the different elements of a manufacturing corporation. By all those specialized elements working together, a valuable product could be made efficiently, at a profit. The key was that each of the persons in the different departments had to work as a team So I learned the idea of specialists being brought together in integrated research teams, integrated production teams if you want to call them that, when I was a boy."

And Stuart did know how to organize and motivate the Kampsville team and make it run. The field and laboratory components of the Koster project in the 1970s operated like a production line, from the removal of artifacts and ecofacts at the site, to their washing and gross inventory, to their detailed analysis by specialists. Even within the excavation, screened back dirt was brought by conveyor belt out of the block excavation to a holding location.

Significantly, Stuart's conception of teamwork in archaeology was not limited to fieldwork, as often was the case then, with individual specialists and laboratories producing their own reports. Teamwork to Stuart extended to the entire research spectrum, including organized, think-tank dynamism before, during, and after fieldwork, through analysis and publication. I recall Stuart saying many times that the most difficult aspect of multidisciplinary research is not the gathering of specialists and crews and the collection of data, but the integrated analysis, write-up, and publication of the data. The latter can involve both personal and financial challenges, including the sometimes conflicting ideas and egos of specialists and the paucity of fiscal support in the governmental and private sectors for the unglamorous tasks of writing and publication. This commitment to full-spectrum, multidisciplinary research Stuart impressed on me in the early 1970s and is represented in this book of richly coauthored chapters, as well as by publications from the Kampsville seminar series (Farnsworth and Emerson 1986; Whallon and Brown 1982).

Stuart's upbringing gave him not only an understanding of teamwork by integrated

specialists, but also a strong confidence in setting a course into uncharted fiscal and professional territory. Growing up in a wealthy family with great economic stability, Stuart did not worry about taking risks with money. "I never worried about money . . . it just seemed deep in my soul that there would always be enough to take care of me, even though I was a kid during the Depression . . . I was reared with a mentality that's quite ready to take risk . . . I have always been able to risk. And that allowed me to try new ways of organizing archaeology without apprehension." The career risks that Stuart took when he left the University of Chicago for Northwestern to start an archaeological institute, and later when he resigned from Northwestern to build the Crow Canyon Archaeological Center, reflect the confident outlook that his family instilled in him.

The opportunity for Stuart to take Kampsville to a much larger scale came after a heavy night's rain, when Alec Helton, a local farmer, paid his usual visit to Stuart and Frank Rackerby at their excavation of the Macoupin site in the lower Illinois valley. Laying a dozen and a half whole and broken projectile points on the hood of his pickup, Mr. Helton said, "Look what I found after the storm." The points dated all the way from Middle Archaic through Mississippian times, and seeing that, Stuart knew a special find was in the making. He accompanied Mr. Helton to a cornfield in a small creek valley on the farm of Theodore Koster and located the site of Koster. Initially, Stuart's attraction to the site came from its largely pure early Late Woodland Whitehall surface component, which offered the opportunity to extend his study of the origins of agriculture from Early and Middle Woodland times into subsequent centuries. Few purely Whitehall features had been excavated at the time; substantial Whitehall habitation remains at Apple Creek were mixed with Hopewellian ones. After digging test pits into Koster in summer 1969 and finding it to be deeply stratified, Stuart at once recognized the greater value of the site: for exploring the origins of agriculture and culture process in the Midwest on a long time scale, and for serving as a centerpiece for expanding the nascent, multidisciplinary research institute

at Kampsville. Here, Stuart's archaeological interests incited by Braidwood and Binford and his family-rooted intuition for and rapport with matters of finance coincided. For the entire next decade while Koster was excavated, Stuart's life was dominated by the twin anthropological and institution-building opportunities it afforded.

The spectacular nature of Koster was essential to Stuart's obtaining sufficient private funds to build the archaeological center in Kampsville into the incredible research and education program it became. Koster drew publicity in a way that the center itself could not and did not previously, and opened doors to donors. Stuart became masterful at harnessing the media. He was interviewed on the *Today* show in New York and a dozen other programs on NBC, ABC, and CBS, and had major stories on Koster published in *Time* magazine, *Newsweek*, *The New York Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *Reader's Digest*, *Smithsonian* magazine, *Natural History*, and many more serials. This massive media campaign resulted in contributions by more than 80 corporations to help the Koster project and the Kampsville infrastructure, and made the dynamic academic life in Kampsville possible.

Stuart attributes much of his success as an organization builder during that era to Robert Lemon, then CEO of NBC's Chicago radio and television network, and to Gaylord Freeman, chairman and CEO of the First National Bank of Chicago, both of whom befriended Stuart and took him on as a protégé in developing the Kampsville center. Prior to meeting them, Stuart had never known an institution builder. He knew from his family business how a corporation should operate, but not how to build one. Lemon taught Stuart the power of the press and arranged for his appearance on the *Today* show and other programs. Freeman taught Stuart the culture of philanthropy among the elite of Chicago and continuously gave Stuart feedback on his philanthropic strategies and work.

In 1972, Stuart saw that he no longer could play the roles of field archaeologist and institution builder well simultaneously. He hired Bruce McMillan to run the day-to-day field operations of the Koster dig and set full pace toward developing the research, education, and facilities

components of the Kampsville center. This shift was a difficult one for him, he said, given his, by then, 32 year passion for archaeology, but had its rewards through the students who were funded by him and carried on his Hopewellian and other research programs. Though I doubt he knew it at the time, many of the graduate students from Northwestern University and elsewhere who were supported by his philanthropic efforts fondly, and in awe, called him “Uncle Stuart.” My own methodological experimentation with resistivity surveying at the Hopewellian Crane site during 1974 and 1975, which became the basis for my doctoral dissertation, was fully supported by Stuart to the cost of several tens of thousands of dollars when we could not obtain substantial grant support for the project, given my beginning Master’s student status. For Stuart’s help I will always be thankful, and I know others feel the same way about how he supported their work.

After excavations at Koster ended in 1979, Stuart found it increasingly difficult to raise the funds necessary to maintain the Kampsville research and education center, which had been renamed the Center for American Archaeology (CAA) just the year before, with hopes for expansion. Looking back at the era from the knowledge of organization building that he now has, Stuart recognizes that he made a number of critical mistakes in the Kampsville venture. First, although he built a strong board of trustees, it was not comprised of enough people of wealth—those who would donate to the organization and connect him with other large donors. Second, he did not build an endowment to solidify the financial base of the center. Third, he did not recognize that corporate and individual support for the center was so singly tied to Koster and that it would evaporate when the project ended. He expected that the fiscal momentum and network that he had created would continue in response to the more fundamental messages of the work at Kampsville. Fourth, just prior to 1980, when the Center began undergoing financial difficulties, Stuart’s vision, in the form of a Center for *American* Archaeology, was expanding to a three-campus institute, with one campus at Kampsville, focused on Ar-

chaic and Woodland archaeology; a second at Crow Canyon, near Cortez, Colorado, focused on the rich Puebloan record of the Four Corners area; and a third in New York City, to cover historic, urban archaeology. The Crow Canyon campus was realized in 1982 with the purchase of 70 acres of land and some facilities—an overhead for the CAA without returns through donor support and student tuitions substantial enough to balance its cost. Finally, Stuart tried some laudable but expensive experiments that could not be afforded, such as the *Early Man* magazine for the public.

These fiscal mistakes that Stuart made in his first attempt at organization building he learned from and quickly corrected in his second attempt, at Crow Canyon—today a very vivacious and financially stable research and teaching center. In 1984, Stuart made a bold move to secure Crow Canyon, just as he had in 1965 to start building the Kampsville center. With the help of Ray Duncan, an oil entrepreneur in Denver and friend since their birth in the same home town, Crow Canyon was purchased from the CAA, and Stuart resigned from both the presidency of the CAA and the faculty at Northwestern University and became President of the Crow Canyon Archaeological Center. He shared the decision making with Mr. Duncan as Chairman of the Board and CEO, and Ian Thompson as Executive Director of campus operations, to ensure that organization building stayed on goal. A board of wealthy and generous people was established, with only one academic—William Lipe—and an endowment was set up, which grew to \$3.4 million by the time Stuart left the presidency in 1992. The mission of the Crow Canyon center was kept pinpoint focused on research and education for the public, without admixing the complications of culture resource management contracts or other tangential projects. By the end of Stuart’s presidency, Crow Canyon served more than 4,000 people per year in its various education programs, including elementary, junior high, senior high, college undergraduate, and graduate students, as well as teachers and adult laypersons. The campus had 13 buildings. Today, the Crow Canyon center has an annual budget of

\$3.5 million, with \$400,000 to \$600,000 earmarked annually for research in the Four Corners area. In 1999, Stuart launched a \$9 million endowment campaign, over \$7 million of which has been raised as of this writing, as well as a \$1.5 million dollar bricks-and-mortar campaign. Stuart hit his mark, fully by organizational means, without the aid of one centerpiece archaeological site.

Over the course of his academic and institution-building career, Stuart's commitment to the educational aspects of archaeological fieldwork, especially public education, grew very deep. Early on, at Kuhne, Kamp Mound 9, and Apple Creek, Stuart had excavated with high school and college students in order to secure the labor necessary to the projects, and education was loosely coupled with fieldwork. This changed in 1970, when Mrs. Genevieve MacDougall, a seasoned junior high school teacher from Winnetka, Illinois, convinced Stuart with her single-minded persistence to take 15 junior high students on the Koster dig and demonstrated to him that they could do professional excavation work, and would provide tuition income on top of that. Although Stuart's "original motivation was, in truth, the need to greatly expand financial support for research . . . as time went on, the educational programs [at Kampsville and Crow Canyon] evolved their own independent missions" (Struever 2004). Today, beyond teaching excavation, the Crow Canyon center has seminars and workshops on Anasazi prehistory and on historic and contemporary Puebloan and Navajo culture. An active program for Native Americans engages more than 500 Puebloan, Navajo, and Ute students a year at the center. Perhaps most satisfying to Stuart is seeing Native American, ghetto black, and affluent suburban youth intermingle at the campus while focused on a common research cause, breaking down stereotypes, bridging ethnic groups, and building a healthy, pluralistic American society. And this valuable service has not been at the price of draining resources from archaeological research. On the contrary, Stuart points out that beyond bringing in tuition, the synergistic, experiential-based, educational environments created at Kampsville and

Crow Canyon for young students attract the donations of parents and other adults. While university administrators and the American public generally place archaeology low on the pole of financially worthy investments, because its social payoffs are unclear, adults in America are very concerned about the education of their young and generously support education enhancement. Thus, after decades of hard work, Stuart found a fiscally sustainable infrastructure for American archaeology—the combination of professional research and public education through private organization.

Today, and over the last six years, Stuart has gone beyond building the financially sustainable, independent, archaeological research and education center at Crow Canyon to building a "culture" of institution building within its leadership, which will help to secure the center. As a member of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees for the center, he actively mentors President Ricky Lightfoot and the Committee, one on one, in the priorities for successful institution building. He also is in the process of constructing a strong department of institutional development that will support the President's and Board's efforts. No longer in the day-to-day stream of demands of the presidency, Stuart has had the time to reflect on and define the most fundamental elements of sustainable, not-for-profit institutions—a stimulated Board of Trustees, a substantial endowment, a strong presidency, and a sophisticated development department—and to instill these values in the center's staff: the final cornerstone to sustainability beyond the lifetime of one institution builder.

Stuart has held many positions that mark his intellectual and professional achievements and standing. He has served as President of the Society for American Archaeology, President of the Illinois Archaeological Survey, member of the National Science Foundation's Research Grant Committee for Anthropology, member of the National Endowment for the Humanities' Grant Committee on Basic Research, member of the Chicago Academy of Science's Board of Scientific Governors, editor of the Society for American Archaeology's *Memoire* series, editor of

Academic Press's *Studies in Archaeology* series, and Chairman of Northwestern University's Department of Anthropology. In 1995, he received the Society for American Archaeology's Distinguished Service Award. His most seminal writings on prehistory and other topics are cited in the bibliography below. In each of these ways, Stuart has contributed strongly to the making and operating of contemporary American archaeology. His premier gifts to the profession, however, have been the Kampsville and Crow Canyon centers, which he built through incredible vision, energy, and commitment, and the intensely creative research and educational experiences the centers have embodied. For these experiences, a huge American public, and scores of now professional archaeologists who passed through his programs, are deeply thankful to Stuart.

Christopher Carr
January 8, 2004

TIME LINE OF STUART STRUEVER'S CAREER

- | | | |
|---------|---|--|
| 1931 | Born in the upper Illinois valley, in Peru, Illinois, on August 4, in a rural landscape rich in archaeological remains, to a family that understood money, of a father who was an industrialist and knew how to harness the teamwork of specialists. | |
| 1939–47 | Age 8. Learned that creating products efficiently requires combining the expertise of many specialists, through Sunday walks with his father through the family metal plating company, American Nickeloid. | |
| 1940–49 | Age 11. Began actively collecting prehistoric artifacts from plowed fields surrounding Peru. Catalogued the finds and created a small museum of them in his grandparent's house. | |
| 1946–49 | Age 15. Surveyed four miles of the Vermilion River for archaeological sites, self-trained. Mapped, num- | |
| | bered, and named sites on USGS quad sheets and plat books. | |
| 1949 | Age 18. Entered Dartmouth College and met first professional archaeologist. | |
| 1950 | Age 19. Worked on first professional excavation, at Starved Rock State Park, Illinois, under the direction of Richard S. Hagen. | |
| 1951 | Age 20. Attended University of New Mexico Field School at Feather Cave, under the direction of Professor Paul Reiter. | |
| 1952 | Age 21. Met James B. Griffin and learned concepts of ceramic chronology through a one-week, one-on-one, hands-on session with the type collections in the Ceramic Repository, Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan. | |
| 1952 | Age 21. Met Melvin L. Fowler and Howard Winters as a field supervisor on the 18th-Century Illiniwek village site excavations under the direction of Fowler, and through work at neighboring Modoc Rock Shelter under the direction of Winters. | |
| 1953 | Received B.A. in anthropology from Dartmouth College. | |
| 1955 | Age 24. Founded his first not-for-profit, tax-exempt corporation, Archaeological Research, Inc. (later renamed the Foundation for Illinois Archaeology), to receive private contributions in support of his archaeological research in the Illinois valley. | |
| 1955–57 | Age 24. Organized, led, and funded the first excavation of his own: a Middle Woodland habitation, the Kuhne site, in the upper Illinois valley. | |
| 1958 | Age 27. Met and had long talks with Lewis Binford for the first time, at the University of Michigan. | |
| 1958 | Age 27. Began graduate work in archaeology at Northwestern | |

- University, Department of Anthropology.
- 1958–59 Age 27. Began the Lower Illinois Valley Archaeological Program, in a 40 × 70 mile research universe centered on the valley, with excavations of the Kamp Mound Group, a Middle Woodland mortuary and habitation site, for his Master’s thesis.
- 1959 Age 28. Learned the concepts of long-term, multidisciplinary archaeological research and subsistence-settlement systems from Robert Braidwood (University of Chicago) at an “Origins of Agriculture” seminar held at the Field Museum of Natural History.
- 1959 Age 28. Asked by Joseph Caldwell to apply Caldwell’s “Interaction Sphere” concept to Hopewell in a paper for a symposium at the American Anthropological Association meetings.
- 1960 Age 29. Received M.A. in anthropology from Northwestern University.
- 1960–69 Age 29. Lower Illinois Valley Archaeological Program continued with Stuart’s annual excavation of Middle Woodland habitations (Apple Creek, Peisker, Snyders, and others) and building models of Middle Woodland subsistence-settlement systems.
- 1961 Age 30. Began doctoral work at University of Chicago, where he learned many theoretical and methodological concepts from Lewis Binford.
- 1961–62 Age 30. Recognized the infrastructural problem with sustaining long-term, regional-scale, multidisciplinary archaeological research programs and conceived of building an independent, privately funded archaeological research center with staff, facilities, and budgets necessary for the task.
- 1963 Age 32. Completed residency for Ph.D. in anthropology at the University of Chicago.
- 1964–65 Age 33. Worked as Instructor, Department of Anthropology, University of Chicago.
- 1965 Age 34. Colleagues at University of Chicago discouraged him from building a privately funded archaeological research center, motivating his move to the Department of Anthropology, Northwestern University, as Instructor.
- 1968 Age 37. Received Ph.D. in anthropology from the University of Chicago. Launched a permanent field research and teaching center to house the long-term Lower Illinois Valley Archaeological Program with the purchase of a first building in Kampsville, Illinois. Joint Northwestern University–Foundation for Illinois Archaeology venture.
- 1968 Age 37. Appointed Associate Professor of Anthropology, Northwestern University.
- 1969–79 Age 38. Excavation of the Koster site led to nationwide funding of a multidisciplinary research team of scholars and major expansion of the Kampsville center.
- 1970 Age 39. Appointed Professor of Anthropology, Northwestern University.
- 1970 Age 39. Became a protégé and friend of Robert Lemon, then CEO of NBC’s Chicago operations, who taught Stuart how to work with the press to finance Koster and the Kampsville center.
- 1972 Age 41. Became a protégé and friend of Gaylord Freeman, chairman and CEO of the First National Bank of Chicago, who taught