FOLSOM New Archaeological Investigations of a Classic Paleoindian Bison Kill. By DAVID J. MELTZER, University of California Press, Berkeley. 2006. 387 pages, 183 illustrations, 68 tables, $55.00 (cloth).

Reviewed by Leland C. Bement, Oklahoma Archeological Survey.

This book is about the Folsom site—type site of the Folsom culture and eponym of the Folsom point. The book contains a preface, nine chapters, five appendices, references, and an index. Along with the author, David J. Meltzer, contributors are Meena Balakrishnan, Donald A. Dorward, Vance T. Holliday, Bonnie F. Jacobs, Linda Scott-Cummings, Todd A. Surovell, James L. Theler, Lawrence C. Todd, Alisa J. Winkler, and Carl Schwachheim.

The Folsom site is known as the first site in North America to unquestionably demonstrate the association of Native Americans with now extinct animals, thereby establishing the antiquity of the peopling of the Americas. Because of its historical importance, a history of science approach is employed to develop a context for the early years surrounding the initial discoveries at the site (Chapters 1-4). The investigation is documented and its early years chronicled by excerpts from the journals of Carl Schwachheim (Appendix B)—one of the initial excavators. Included in these chapters is the description of the modern site setting (Chapter 3) and the research design (Chapter 4).

The history of excavation is followed by a sequence familiar to archaeologists, especially those steeped in the tradition of multi-disciplinary investigations. In Chapter 5, an extensive geomorphological investigation contributed by Vance Holliday recreates the geologic context of the site, placing the kill in a steep-walled paleotributary feeding the larger paleovalley. A similar setting is found at other Folsom bison kills.

Chapter 6, with contributions by Bonnie F. Jacobs, Linda Scott-Cummings, James L. Theler, and Meena Balakrishnan, presents paleo-environmental reconstructions based on proxy samples of pollen, snails, and stable isotopes. The comparative data presented by Theler are a particularly important contribution that I predict will see substantial use in the future.

The analyses of faunal remains (Chapter 7) and material culture (Chapter 8) follow established formats. A historical perspective is once again employed in discussing the bone bed and the taxonomy of the bison. In conjunction with Lawrence C. Todd, the familiar topics of taphonomy, number of animals represented, herd demography, seasonality of death, and butchering patterns are presented. Alisa J. Winkler discusses the non-bison remains.

A descriptive analysis of stone tools segregates them by functional categories, stone sources, and use-life histories. These are then discussed in terms of technological organization and mobility. On the topic of projectile point hafting, a recently advanced, testable hypothesis relating projectile point refurbishing to hafting mode is dismissed out of hand by the author, without first obtaining the data necessary to properly address the model. Such treatment of innovative approaches to understanding Folsom technology typifies the conservative nature of many of the conclusions presented in this book.

Chapter 9 summarizes and revisits several questions guiding the discussions throughout the book. These questions are tied specifically to the Folsom site and run the gamut from the site's historical beginnings to artifact-specific breakage and discard patterns.

Several appendices contain additional information including the field procedures and methods (Appendix A by David J. Meltzer), Carl Schwachheim's diary (Appendix B with annotations by David J. Meltzer), historical archaeology...
Overall the book presents the best reporting available for the long history of investigation at the Folsom site. It amasses considerable descriptive data that have not been available to Folsom researchers. In this regard, this book makes a valuable contribution to Paleoindian studies.

Only topics directly tied to the Folsom site are discussed. The topics covered are very site specific and the author is careful not to stray too far from conventional analyses. Since no mountain resources were uncovered, no in-depth discussion of Folsom's adaptations to both plains and mountain habitats is presented. Without the recovery of a painted skull, the ritual aspect of Folsom culture is ignored. And since no ultra-thin bifaces were found at Folsom, there is no discussion of gender issues or technological innovations in meat drying.

An atypical venture away from the author's usual critical thinking is his discussion of the Archuleta bison—an isolated bison skeleton whimsically presented as a possible escapee of the Folsom kill event. It will take more then the luck of Bean Hayfire (R. D. Whiteley's fictional character of renown good fortune) to substantiate that claim. In another flight of fancy, the author errs in collapsing the stratified kills at the Cooper site into a single event, citing only a book review by one of his graduate students.

The author ignores or overlooks an extensive body of literature on Folsom adaptations. No matter. This is not meant to be an encyclopedia of Folsom culture. It is a site report about a historically significant bison kill near the present day village of Folsom, New Mexico. As a result of this book, the Folsom site and its material can now be more fully integrated into the research of other scholars interested in the Paleoindian era.

This book represents considerable investment in time and effort. I congratulate all who contributed. The descriptive qualities expand our understanding of this important site and time in American archaeology.

Art of the Osage. By GARRICK BAILEY and DANIEL C. SWAN, with contributions by JOHN W. NUNLEY and E. SEAN STANDINGBEAR. Saint Louis Art Museum in association with University of Washington Press, Seattle. 2004. xi + 221 pp., 50 figures, 108 catalog plates, notes, references, index. $40.00 (cloth, ISBN 0-295-98387-6). $30.00 (paper, ISBN 0-89178-085-8).

A History of the Osage People. By LOUIS F. BURNS. The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa. 2004. xiv + 576 pp., 44 figures, notes, bibliography, index. $80.00 (cloth, ISBN 0-8173-13-19-2). $39.95 (paper, ISBN 0-8173-5018-7).

Reviewed by Jim D. Feagins, St. Joseph Museum, St. Joseph, MO.

From the Ozarks to the tall grasslands, for several centuries the Osage were masters of their domain—the environment which became significant portions of the states of Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas. Considered warlike and greatly feared by their many enemies, the Osage hegemony influenced (some would say controlled) the region's fur trade with the French and the Spanish. With the Louisiana Purchase (leaving only one government for the Osage to attempt to manipulate), with the westward movement of the citizens of the United States, and with the coercion of the eastern tribes as they were forced to move west of the Mississippi River, the Osage hegemony was broken. The Osage were to experience very hard times as their main villages, also, were forced southwestward by treaties, and prior to the discovery of oil on their greatly diminished reservation in Oklahoma.

The two volumes that are the subjects of this review add considerable insight about this colorful tribe. Taken from quite different viewpoints, each is useful for anyone seeking an increased understanding of the Osage tribe. However, it is important for the reader to understand the objectives and perspectives presented in each volume.

The Art of the Osage is a beautiful catalogue published to accompany an exhibit by the same title compiled and designed by the Saint Louis Art Museum. This display traveled to several American cities. The book presents a good range and quality of Osage artistry during historic times.
Clothing, blankets and other textiles, rattles, headdresses, roach spreaders, bone quirts, bear claw breastplate, stone pipes, beads, mirror board, feather fans, pipe-tomahawk, shell gorget, cradleboards, standards, wooden bowls, bows, calumet, scissors case, hide shields, clubs, “war” hatchet, horse regalia, parfleche, painted and woven bags, bison horn spoon, lance, dolls and other toys, peyote staffs, drums and drumsticks, silver bracelet, neckerchief and tie slides, whistles, and bone dice are among the many items illustrated. This material cultural is shown to good advantage with fine photographs mostly in color.

However, it is slightly disappointing that there is not even a token photograph or two of at least a few decorated, shell-tempered potsherds or some of the well-crafted chipped-stone work that was so abundant during prehistoric and very early protohistoric times. Without getting into stale arguments concerning what is artistic and what is merely craftsmanship, certainly the Osage did not suddenly become artists with the arrival of European materials supplied directly or indirectly by the fur trade. A few examples from the collections at the University of Missouri-Columbia or other institutions from the earliest of the Osage sites in Vernon County, Missouri could have been photographed to give a better understanding of the “older artistry.”

Although declining, Osage art is still dynamic and evolving. With a few individual exceptions that come to this reviewer’s mind, Osage art was never commercialized. Perhaps this is partly due to the eventual bonanza of oil revenue that, at a critical point in their cultural evolution, curtailed an economic necessity for individual Osage to sell art to the dominant society. Osage art was generally made for the Osage and not considered separately from other aspects of their material culture or from the contexts of their belief system. These are a few of the many important points made by Garrick Bailey and reinforced by Daniel Swan in a series of thoughtful and well-written chapters that accompany the volume’s photographs of Osage art. Bailey points out the complex and sophisticated use of symbolism in Osage art and the difficulty of separating everyday objects, and what many consider as art objects, from the sacred.

While the volume’s photographs and their captions can generally stand alone, the descriptions of individual art objects often leave one hungry to know the dates they were made and when they were used. In most cases that information may not have been available. A few of the captions contained minor errors and occasional contradictions.

The chapters themselves serve as specific essays designed to give fuller meaning and understanding to the art. Actually they go far beyond an appreciation of Osage art for art’s sake. These chapters are often more about ethnohistory, and the scope of all that entails, than they are about Osage art. Repeating the seven chapter titles conveys a concise view of the volume—“Early Osage Art and History,” “Osage Cosmology,” “Osage Daily Life: Living Life as a Prayer,” “The Osage Peyote Religion,” “The Richest People in the World,” “Osage Dancing Societies and Organizations,” and “Osage Aesthetics—A Curatorial View.”

Art of the Osage does an admirable job of providing not only an appreciation of Osage art for its aesthetic qualities but a better understanding of Osage culture and history. This recommended volume is worthy of shelf space in even a crowded personal library.

First published in 1989 A History of the Osage People was long out of print. This revised edition has been augmented with additional maps, new information on archaeology, Indian literature references, and a new preface. A portion of part one of the text, appendices, and a biographical section were omitted in this paperback edition.

As with the first edition, the second brings valuable insight into Osage history from the perspective of Louis Burns, who is of mixed Osage, French, and Scottish heritage and a member of the Mottled Eagle clan. This close involvement, being a part of Osage society, must be a tremendous advantage when writing Osage history, as well as a big disadvantage. Can one be too close or emotionally connected to a subject to write about it objectively? I think so. This volume is clearly a work of love.

Its wonderful strength is in turn a major weakness because of the manner in which the material is handled. It is most valuable to have Osage per-
spectives about their past. That *A History of the Osage People* does this cannot be over emphasized. However, Burns frequently blends together, myths, speculations, and proven historical facts without clearly distinguishing them. Not only would serious historians cringe but so would archaeologists when considering the volume's "great leaps of faith" between prehistory and history, and the demonstrated poor understanding of archaeological taxonomy. Such statements as: "The Indian-Knoll theory makes a definite connection with the Folsom culture" (p. 3), "Like other Woodland cultures, the Mississippian phase was..." (p.6), "Mississippian phase of Late Woodland culture..." (p.4), "A second Woodland cultural influence on the Osage is a Mayan morning prayer" (p.8), "The purest, clearest natural quartz crystals ever seen by man were found in the Osage domain" (p. 29), and "It was no accident that in 1893 the American Frontier ended within the bounds of the old Osage empire" (p.30) can give pause to even casual readers. I suspect that the comment "If the Osage were not the most deeply religious Indians in North America, they were close to being the most religious" (italics in original, p. 89, with a similar statement on p. 208) is one with which members of several other tribes would have deep disagreement. Certainly the Osage were warlike, but here is another example of a questionable statement—"In the long run, it is probable that the Osage slew more Euro-Americans than any other Indian nation. This was surely true in the pre-American period and very probably true in the American period" (p. 264). These examples should suffice to illustrate the problem.

At times Burns spins certain aspects of Osage history where several other possible interpretations are simply ignored. At others he presents a new perspective that potentially adds useful insights to Osage ways. How can a reader distinguish between them? While Burns includes a number of endnotes, there clearly are not enough as a number of his statements are not backed up with any reference or statements of support. While wanting facts, the reader is often left to rely on faith in the author.

Frankly, I had a hard time writing this review without sounding overly critical, despite a concerned effort to be fair and evenhanded. Surely all writers, and that includes historians and archaeologists, have various biases. Perhaps it is good to have some "biases" from one Native American's perspective to help counter the years of Eurocentric bias from the dominant culture. Burns combines story telling, philosophy, myth, and mostly history—its just not always clear where one leaves off and another begins. *A History of the Osage People* is certainly worth reading and much can be gleaned from it; however, in places it must be read quite critically. While not a trained historian, Burns presents ethnohistory from the perspective of a student of his tribe's past. It is extremely doubtful that all Osage, even members of his own clan, would agree with all that is contained in his book. That would be expected.

*Art of the Osage* is well written and researched. While *A History of the Osage People* does not meet the same standards, it broadens one's understanding of the Osage past and present from an insider's perspective.

**Going Indian.** James Hamill. University of Illinois Press, Champaign IL, 2006. ix + 216 pp., appendix, bibliography. $40 (Cloth), $20 (Paper). 

*Reviewed by Eva Garroutte, Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, Boston College*

James Hamill is an emeritus professor of anthropology, recently retired from Miami University in Ohio. A previous book (*Ethno-Logic: The Anthropology of Human Reasoning*) has dealt with how patterns of logical reasoning may vary across indigenous cultures including the Navajo, the Ojibewa, and the Mende. His current book, *Going Indian*, turns its attention to the diverse Native peoples of Oklahoma. Hamill's analyses are largely based on historical documents—the Indian Pioneer Papers from the late 1930s and the Doris Duke Collection from the late 1960s and early 1970s. Both of these extensive collections contain extraordinary interview material from American Indian respondents in Oklahoma. Hamill supplements sampling from these historical sources with nine of his own contemporary interviews with American Indian people.

The book's thesis revolves around the author's observation, early in his research investigations, that "Oklahoma, unlike other places in the Indian
country, was one place where there really were Indians" (p. ix). By this assertion, Hamill seems to mean that the unusual history of Indian Territory (later Oklahoma) has given rise, in our own time, to a pan-tribal or generically “Indian” ethnic identity that differs from his experience in other tribes. As he elaborates, his past research had involved “people...who considered themselves Navajo, or Ute, or Ojibewa, and resisted the association with other Native American peoples that the idea ‘Indian’ carried with it.” In Oklahoma, by contrast, the author reports, “people did consider themselves Indian, and their lives were filled with formal and informal institutions that reinforced peoples’ Indianness. Indian professional groups, Powwows, Native American Church, sewing circles of Indian women, Indian research associations, and Indian social service agencies are parts of the everyday lives of Indian people throughout Oklahoma” (p. x).

Reasoning that the indigenous inhabitants of North America did not, at the time of European contact, consider themselves a single people, Hamill classifies contemporary Native Oklahomans under the category of “ethnic groups with no historical antecedents” (p. xi). He then dedicates the book to explaining the origin and development of their generalized “Indian” identity, attempting to show how contemporary understandings may have roots in the experiences and stories of Indian people in earlier periods. Toward this end, he examines his sampled historical interviews, paying special attention to experiences that respondents construct as markers of Indianness—symbolic boundaries that set off Native people, as a class, from non-Indians. Narratives that draw his attention include discussions about forced relocation and imposed educational experiences, ideas about Indian “blood” and blood quantum, and descriptions of religious and ceremonial practice.

No one who has lived in Oklahoma could overlook the kinds of intertribal social organizations and institutions that captivate Hamill and prompt him to characterize Oklahoma as the site for a florescence of a historically new, “Indian” ethnicity. Clearly, this context does foster a rich and unique profusion of possibilities for successful interactions across tribal lines. In Oklahoma, no one is surprised to find Indian churches, powwow clubs, Indian chambers of commerce, and even “Indian units” of mainstream organizations such as the Shriners. All of them embrace people from any and all Native tribes.

At the same time, one is compelled to point out that, even in Oklahoma, intertribal differences (not to mention intertribal grievances) can be pronounced and important. Anyone who suggests, for instance, to a Yuchi that he is actually a Creek, or observes to a Comanche that she is no different than a Cherokee will invite an extended discussion, if not a rather more intense interaction. Similarly, while an Oklahoma Cherokee may readily visit a Creek ceremonial ground to “help dance” or just to “support” a friend’s activities, and while an Osage might commit to a Kiowa language class, it is common that such individuals also have commitments to family ceremonial grounds and churches, or to organizations and societies specific to their own tribes. It is equally common, at least in my own experience, that such people understand those places as their primary locus of responsibility for participation.

My point is that intertribalism is not identical with pan-Indianism. Both phenomena are observable among Oklahoma Indians, and both are necessary to understand the complexities of their social and cultural relationships. Yet Hamill’s argument tends to confuse the distinction. His observations are often astute and significant, but he tends to overdraw his point. He does so, moreover, in a way that is likely to annoy some Native readers in Oklahoma who will feel that he is comparing them unfavorably to the “real” (perhaps more exotically imagined) Indians in other parts of the country. A more nuanced discussion, informed by a larger literature, might have avoided some such negative reactions and misunderstandings.

One of the book’s major strengths is the author’s attention to the various pathways that brought different groups of tribes—the so-called “Five,” “Western” and “Small” tribes—together in Oklahoma. Hamill’s efforts to show how the diversity of these groups’ early experiences are reflected in themes characterizing individuals’ historical narratives are important to our understanding of the documentary record, and readers may
well wish for more of this type of discussion. Several of the narrative themes that Hamill takes up—such as educational experiences—represent sufficiently well trodden scholarly ground that professionals in the field will probably not find a host of new revelations. Other parts of the book deal with less familiar themes, such as the truly wonderful discussion in chapter 6 of ways that Indian people in earlier times contrived strategies to honor both Christian and traditional, tribal ritual commitments.

Hamill’s methodology is generally sensible and precisely described. The book has, overall, a workmanlike character. Discussions are put together in an interesting way and make welcome use of important primary sources. The family stories that the author weaves through the discussions—from which we learn, for example, that Hamill is an enrolled Choctaw who nevertheless adamantly insists that “I am not an Indian” (p. 8)—provide additional and provocative insights into changing interpretations of Native identity in Oklahoma. They will invite instructive classroom debates about complicated ideas such as the meaning of “blood,” blood quantum, and legal and cultural criteria for Indian identity.

A methodological limitation relates to Hamill’s use of contemporary interviews. His nine interesting respondents are not identified by name, tribe, or any other information, and the author does not describe their criteria for selection. The reader does not even know if these respondents’ tribal affiliations are the same or different as the individuals who speak out of the sampled historical documents. In my own experience, Oklahoma Indian people are not necessarily resistant to having identifying information, including names, attached to their published remarks (and often welcome it under appropriate circumstances). It would have been very useful if readers could contextualize respondents’ remarks with some information about the speakers; one wonders whether Hamill has gone too far in “protecting” his respondents in this respect.

Nevertheless, Going Indian will hold the attention of undergraduates in anthropology and Native American Studies. It will likely help them rid themselves of common stereotypes by introducing them to useful ideas such as the important differences across tribes in ideas about land ownership in the Allotment period, the extent to which the identities of today’s American Indian people are shaped not only by inherited cultural traditions but also by federal policies aiming for assimilation, and the role of Christianity in creating and maintaining distinctively tribal identity. It is not difficult to imagine that the book might also inspire some good dissertations drawing on the same historical sources.

Paleoamerican Origins Beyond Clovis. Edited by ROBSON BONNICHSEN, BRADLEY T. LEPPER, DENNIS STANFORD, and MICHAEL R. WATERS. Texas A&M University Press, College Station, 2005. ix + 368 pp., 84 figures, 24 tables, index. $60.00 (cloth).

Reviewed by Marvin Kay, Department of Anthropology, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR 72701

Paleoamerican Origins Beyond Clovis is the second of two volumes stemming from the Clovis and Beyond Conference held in Santa Fe, New Mexico in 1999. Although copyrighted in 2005, Paleoamerican Origins Beyond Clovis actually was published May 1, 2006. Robson Bonnichsen, the senior editor, died in late December, 2004 and prior to the work’s completion; the final editorial tasks were by Dennis Stanford and Michael R. Waters. In most respects, I think, the vision of Rob Bonnichsen was adhered to carefully in this volume’s production. And as Mike Waters notes, this volume “is the last time Rob will speak to us directly” about subjects of genuine concern to every practicing American archaeologist and all others who are fascinated by how, when, where, and by whom the Americas were initially populated. The key word, Paleoamerican, is deliberate and is intended to signify a shift in assumptions if not facts about the initial peopling of the Americas. No longer, it seems, is the conventional label and wisdom connoted by Paleoindian adequate. The larger point is where there once was certainty there is now doubt and a need for a fresh look at old evidence.

This volume is large, almost a coffee table book in size but not in intent. From its size and most production values, its price is reasonable and
Brad Logan, Editor  

The biological evidence for Paleoamericans is regrettably sparse (we are looking at less than a baker’s dozen individual skeletons) but is surveyed in substantial detail in the next two sections of the volume. This is often done with passing mention to linguistic data for the Americas, but mostly without a detailed critique. The larger of two chapters on genetic evidence and, in my opinion, the more instructive is by Theodore G. Schurr. One should read this for its overview of the history of genetic studies and a careful and largely understandable summary of the DNA evidence. The skeletal evidence is presented in four chapters (George W. Gill, Richard L. Jantz and Douglas W. Owsley, A. Russell Nelson, and Douglas W. Owsley and Richard L. Jantz) that tackle subjects of where founding populations likely were from, the evaluation of a Pacific coastal migration route, the distinctiveness of Paleoamerican skeletons from those of later American Indians, and evolutionary biology. Several of the osteological treatments lament with justification that not only are there but a handful of Paleoamerican skeletons but scientific access to them is now restricted or even excluded. These biological contributions are uneven in their individual treatments, but no less or more so than the archaeological summaries that precede them. The Clovis and Beyond Conference, as a whole, is well summarized in these statements, while some go substantially beyond the original presentations. Were I to hazard a recommendation, I would encourage the perusal especially of the individual papers by Haynes, Jodry, Johnson, Gruhn, Schurr, and Gill, and the two papers by Jantz and Owsley. They are especially readable, have something to say, and on occasion do so with a bit of wit.

The Paleoamerican origins (Bonnichsen, and Bonnichsen and Bradley T. Lepper) and the Conclusions (Alan L. Schneider and Bonnichsen; Dennis Stanford, Bonnichsen, Betty Meggers, and D. Gentry Steele) represent a second, more administrative and legal focus that centers about the Native American Graves and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). This information is at the beginning and end of the volume, although I think it would have been better had it all been in the beginning. It is a clarion call and its eloquence is muted somewhat by spreading it out. Of more relevance, issues related to NAGPRA are at the heart of how archaeologists conduct their investigations in the United States and have been for more than a decade. In my opinion and from talking with Rob Bonnichsen, NAGPRA is really two things. It is law; it is also regulations and interpretations about
the law. Sadly, and the reason why Bonnichsen and his several colleagues were successful (so far) in contesting the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers’ administrative decisions about Kennewick Man, federal departments and agencies were shown in their NAGPRA policies and regulations to give short shrift to the Constitution of the United States while trying to curry favor to interest groups. So it wasn’t that the Kennewick Man case was decided on the scientific merits but rather on the rights of scientists to be treated fairly and honestly by the federal government. The rulings so far have not touched on the science of the case but on who has the right to decide about access; that is, who controls the skeleton. As archaeologists, we should all recognize whatever ruling ultimately is upheld in this case, it is likely to be decided on narrow, legal grounds not the larger scientific questions about Paleoamericans. It is also clear, as Bonnichsen and his coauthors sardonically note, there is neither the political clout nor will among our various professional societies and organizations to engage in lawsuits about NAGPRA. It is not giving away the farm to say that Bonnichsen and his coauthors are deeply worried about the future integrity and coherence of our profession, and whether or not we as a literate society are ready to act on our principles and the interest of society at large.

A product not of NAGPRA but of American history is the adversarial relationship between historians and archaeological or biological scientists and Native Americans. One need only look to Canada, our neighbor to the north, to see the pointlessness and ultimate folly of this course. It not only damns our science of essential and unfettered access to invaluable information, it also harms those who have an equal or greater right to this information. If we are to understand American history and prehistory, it will not be done at the expense of Native Americans. We must develop new strategies that solidify the natural bonds between prehistorians and the descendents of the populations that first migrated to the Americas. There is ample reason to believe that where once adversarities existed, we can build from mutual respect and value native traditions and oral history as a natural component of these investigations. *Paleoamerican Origins Beyond Clovis* is one step along this path to greater understanding. In both intended and unintended ways, this volume joins the debate about the legacy of the past and who owns it.