

# Urbana Archaeological Conference

January 21 & 22, 1956

Transcribed in 2006 from copy of audio tape (original tape is in Library Archives)

By Dr. Laura Kozuch, Curator

Illinois Transportation Archaeological Program

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

---

## **Participants\* (in alphabetical order):**

J. Joe Bauxer, Rockford College

Elaine Bluhm, University of Illinois

Melvin "Mike" Fowler, representing Thorne Deuel, Archaeology Section, Illinois State Museum

William S. Godfrey, Jr., Beloit College

Preston Holder, Washington University at St. Louis

John McGregor [Conference Chair?], Head of Anthropology Dept., Univ. of Illinois

David J. Wenner, Jr., Chicago

Howard D. Winters for J. Charles Kelley, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale

## **\*[List of participants obtained from Porter 1983]**

---

SIDE "A" OF TAPE

FIRST MINUTE OR TWO MISSING FROM TAPE. NO LIST OF PARTICIPANTS VOICED

DISCUSSION REGARDING POLITICS

- [Fowler] Also one of the board members, ours is all, you know, the statement...
- [McGregor] Those men who [garbled] for the state...
- [Fowler] One of the board members has a son-in-law who is a state senator, too.
- [McGregor] Who else [garbled] down there?
- Well, I think the best thing to do would be to work through Morris. Get him to contact legislators. ...[garbled] influential
- [McGregor] [garbled – person's name] is a little new for this.
- Of course, most of these people are in Washington now... representatives ...have to be done by letter...
- [McGregor] That's right, or wire, or telephone. How about you up close up to Chicago?
- I don't know anyone with real political pull. At least I can round up a bunch of people so they can send telegrams to their representatives, and if I can find out who's on the commission, on the highway commission. If there's anyone there from Oklahoma, there's certain sections of Oklahoma (if we have a representative from there) why I get quite a bit of them. [garbled]
- [McGregor] There's another thing [garbled]
- [Fowler] Are you going to contact Carl [Chapman] in Missouri?
- [McGregor] Yes. Just now we've decided that these are the things to do. Not a complete transcription of all of our recordings, urging them to take action to that effect. But if this

business of Federal... [garbled] let's turn to the... [garbled] state conservation act... What do you think we had best do with this? In the first place we have to gather together all the data we can on the available State Antiquities Act. You have some...

- [Fowler] We have some and I'll try and get those copies and get them to you.
- [McGregor] Good.
- [Fowler] Whatever else we get.
- [McGregor] Now is it the general consensus that I should try and take this up with the legal department?
- [Fowler] I think that's an excellent idea, to get legal counseling.
- They're the only ones who could round out a successful [garbled]
- [McGregor] I'll take up with them these four points that I just reviewed, and explain to them that this is what we feel should be done, and then this burial looting act, I'll show them this letter and ask them [garbled] involved in the thing, and what should be done about it, and if I can interest them in it. That's the big problem.
- Here's one angle you might use on them here, probably, as well as elsewhere. These budding young lawyers have practice court. They have to prepare a case involving a particular legal situation. If the profs. are interested, they can throw this out to some of the boys and let them prepare a legal angle. After they track their practice case, the profs. usually take over, and work out a document that might be satisfactory for presentation to the legislature.
- Good idea.
- Well that's fine.
- [McGregor] If they have all of their things outlined, and their whole program for the rest of the year worked out, well we're out of luck.
- [Bluhm] We may be able to work with this lawyer too, because he's fairly interested in our problems...
- [McGregor] Let me see what I can do here then. If I can develop their interest here, I'll let you know as soon as any real results come from it. If I can't, if I'm stopped, then I'll advise you and Elaine [Bluhm] can try to [garbled] through this man, or the...
- University of Chicago...
- [Bauxer ?] I'll see what I can get out of the husband of one of the female professors on our campus. He's a civil lawyer, and pretty sharp character up in Rockford. Thomas James Berry [sp.?] it seems like [garbled]
- [Fowler] And all along, of course, we've got to be careful we don't tip our hand too far.

#### DISCUSSION REGARDING AMATEURS

- [McGregor] I think the next problem is what can we do with amateurs. At least I have that on the agenda here. I think this comes up [garbled]. At what point do we turn to the amateurs in the state for assistance? We can't keep this completely [in the dark?]. They're going to hear about it. If it comes to them as a surprise, they'll oppose it automatically. If they're consulted, at least some of them are consulted. These people are Dan Morse [Sr.] and maybe the officers of the society in Illinois. We might be able to get their backing, at least some of them. Don't you think so?
- Dan Morse [Sr.] yes, Byron Knoblock and his group, no — absolutely not.

- [garbled]
- [Fowler] Perino might go along with it, if you can pin him down. He said he had verbally brought the subject up himself. I guess knowing how we felt about Gilcrease [Museum in Tulsa, OK]. His son worked with Gilcrease.
- Oh he did?
- [Fowler] Uh huh. He brought the subject up himself two or three times, and said, “Why doesn’t [garbled] do something about this?”
- If you are doing anything with Mr. Morse [Sr.], keep my name out of it, because Mr. Morse doesn’t like me. After having his son [garbled], on top of that I gave Dan, instead of two A’s for his summer field course, I gave him a B and a C. Papa Morse came up and talked to the Dean and tried to persuade the Dean to persuade me to change his grade.
- [garbled]
- He was with Gilcrease at Griffin’s suggestion as some sort of control.
- [Fowler] At this point, is where this idea of archaeological survey set up like Wisconsin has... Because at least to me, it seems like the best way of getting amateur cooperation (and at the level where amateur cooperation is more profitable), I think, is in a site survey. Now this would only be one objective of such an organization I think, but it would be a primary concern.
- This would still be a lonely time to work up, and it would take years to really work out cooperation with amateurs. It occurred to me that (in approaching them) we could use Gilcrease very profitably [as a model]. They will respond nicely to the idea of keeping people from other states coming in and looting Illinois sites. This angle they would go along with.
- Yes, enlightened self-interest.
- [Winters] I think if you check most of your laws have been passed against looting have come about when outsiders invaded the state rather than [garbled] within the state. I know that [garbled] Arkansas and partially Oklahoma, because some of the guys from Arkansas [garbled] Spiro too. Just as soon as they raise your [sic] borders, then they go into action. It might be a rallying point.
- [McGregor] We have two kinds of amateurs, those who are doing intelligent work and keeping some records and so on, and if we could get through the State Antiquities Act, those can be permitted to work under certain limitations. It’s the other kind that we have to worry about. Frankly, gentlemen, I’ve been trying to work with them for 30 years and I’ve come to the point where my hands are up and my back is up against the wall and I don’t know what to do next. I just give up. I thought for a long time that a lot could be done with these people, but I’ve come to the conclusion finally that I can’t do it.
- Some states have been successful, such as Missouri, Tennessee, West Virginia...
- Have they been successful with the old collectors, or the guys that have not been recruited [polluted?] from within?
- No, no, no. It’s the younger generation that you can work with. It’s not the...
- [Fowler] I think that a lot of Missouri’s success is that right from the word “go” they were officially tied in with the state organization. The very setting up of the organization, the Secretary of State...
- What was his name?

- [McGregor] Rensch, at the University and then [garbled]... it gave him a very definite [garbled]...
- These others have started to [garbled]
- [garbled] the Chicago region, that the ones who have sent out letterhead, we bind, but other than that we simply leave it alone, and look for, as you say, the younger generation, and maybe another two or three sites, and you can actually [garbled] But the others [garbled]
- I agree with you there - A pretty hopeless job...
- It's a waste of manpower...

#### INCEPTION OF ILLINOIS ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY (IAS)

- The basic idea of it originally was to do a survey of the archaeological sites in Wisconsin. But having started that way it then got mixed up with these other problems.
- [McGregor] There's no possibility of us affiliating with them and extending it to be the Wisconsin and Illinois? Because this is subsidized by the State of Wisconsin, and that precludes that. I think it's larger than Illinois, myself. Well, it's across state lines.
- I have a sneaking suspicion that Pennsylvania has something similar, some kind of a state-sponsored organization and I don't know...
- It's called the Pennsylvania Historical Commission.
- Something like that, yeah.
- John Witthoff [anthropologist at the Pennsylvania State Museum in Harrisburg in the 1950's] is the representative in the state.
- We don't want to call it the Illinois Archaeological Society because that's too much like the Illinois State Archaeological Society.
- [Fowler] It's too bad there can't be a copyright on the word archaeology...
- I don't think we'd want to use "historical" or anything, because there's no [garbled]
- [Winters] Well, do we have to use the term archaeology? Why can't we use anthropology?
- [Fowler] That would make it subjective and a little broader to include ethnohistory.
- [McGregor] I'm visualizing this more as a... At least I want to see here some kind of an organization where we can have a body (of professionals & semi-professionals) that can form some kind of body as a bunch of professionals. I think what you have up in Wisconsin is somewhat that, plus a lot of other people.
- No, theirs is strictly a professional group, with a representative from the Wisconsin Archaeological Society as an ex-officio. Now he's just ex-officio, he's not even a voting member of the organization. It's strictly (up there) a professional organization.
- There's one non-voting professional that's the guy from the Roads & Parks Commission.
- And he's very definitely in that because of his work at Aztalan. And he is our liaison with the legislature, and any bills that have to go through or [garbled] needs to be appropriated, he takes care of it.
- [Fowler] Of course, when I thought about this, I thought of the possibility of a similar thing for Illinois. Any professional anthropologist in the state could be on it as a participating member, but maybe even expanding it eventually beyond what they have to a subscribing membership with no votes (but subscribers) with publication for site reports and so on.
- That's what I'd like to see.

- [Fowler] I think that if we approach it from the survey angle, and the reason I like that is I think it would cause less antagonism with the already-existing organization. In other words, they say, “Why sure – Here’s something set up for a little different purpose than we are.”
- Shall we call it survey?
- I think certainly this is a good name.
- [garbled, mixed voices]
- [Winters] I mean, what you’re going to do over-all is excavate, but you’re actually the bulk of the work you’re going to do will end up being survey.
- [Fowler] I like Howard’s of idea of calling it anthropological too because it’s ethnohistory what’s going on. This state has a rich resource in that...
- Should we turn this into a situation, Mike, where you will get our moral (and whatnot) backing for appropriations to the State Museum?
- [Fowler] Well I had never thought of it on an appropriation basis yet. I didn’t realize they had state appropriations in that capacity.
- [McGregor] Because if you do that, at the moment, I’m congenial to this, but 10 years from now, or five, or someone, Freimuth, the next guy in here might suddenly buck that like...
- [Fowler] I think it should very definitely be set up as an organization of it’s own.
- Get it as an appropriation from the state, as such.
- Get it to the Survey, but not to any other organization.
- Or else [garbled]
- I’m interested in the impressions of the others here about [using the term] “anthropological” instead of “archaeological” survey.
- [garbled]
- That is a foreign name to the bulk of your intelligent amateurs or amateur layman who have [gone] a little beyond the pot-hunting stage. I think because they never associate archaeology with anthropology, because they’re only interested in material culture and therefore they don’t even know probably (the other) that it’s only one part of anthropology.
- I think the situation is changing pretty rapidly, more and more.
- [Wenner] What you do is more important than the name, anyway.
- Not rapidly enough, I mean we’ve still got a couple of generations to go before there’s been enough people in college that have taken anthropology to know what the word means.
- [Fowler] Well like Dave says, it’s what you do that’s important. I mean you can call it archaeological but still be concerned with...
- [McGregor] I’d like somehow to call it cultural or, this is not the right term, but I mean something that isn’t archaeological/anthropological. It would let ethnology or anything else come into it that wanted to eventually if you felt it was insightful.
- You could call it the “Illinois Scientific Survey.”
- Well we have two or three scientific surveys functioning now in Illinois.
- How about “Antiquities Survey?”
- [McGregor] What kind of organization is this like? Can we organize it right now here around this table and get the thing rolling?
- One question I’d like to ask: Can I write [garbled] the Illinois Archaeological Survey [garbled]?
- Yeah...

- ...from an official institution. I'm purely a private individual... I'm just wondering about official, institutional, backing.
- Well we have three going.
- Well as a matter of course I think we should start immediately affirm the objectives on such a survey as exchanging data on sites.
- Well here's some...[garbled]
- [Fowler] And what I've been thinking about on this is exchanging this information but having a central clearing house. This may sound like what you mentioned but I don't think it is. If the Museum was then maybe we could supply clerical help so that if David gave us a site record and we could record that in whatever system we agree as the central system, and then four or five copies be made and sent to all the institutions. And I think actually we might be able to get started on something like that right soon just using some of the clerical help that we have at the Museum to do it.
- [McGregor] Associated with this is the problem which I just took up with [J. Joe?] here a minute ago, where we get information about a site and this can be allocated. We can shift it around as long as we all know what's going on. So if, Mike, you & I don't hear about the same thing and both go rushing up there [to northern Illinois] within a day of each other, it's a waste of effort. Because it's survey I mean all of this is essentially survey. It's not digging or loot collecting, or competition with each other in any sense.
- Well now, what information are we going to exchange? First of all, there would be the survey sheets.
- [McGregor] There will be the location; the identification of the nature of the site; whether mound or village, whether Hopewell or Middle Mississippian; as far as determinable. And then someone has to assume the responsibility to allocate the central series of numbers to these sites. And that's a big job, believe me, Mike, you don't know how much trouble it is! It's a terrific clerical job.
- [Fowler] Well, I'm voicing what Dr. Deuel told me. He said he thought we could get some clerical help to do it.
- Well that's fine.
- [Fowler] If we made this official backing from the State, then there might be money appropriated to hire a clerk one place or the other, whose job would solely be this, 'cause it would take all that.
- Eventually it should come under the authority of the Illinois Archaeological Survey. That's no reason for not going ahead.
- [McGregor] We have here 400 sites plus. I don't know how many you have over there. You have, it sounds like more than you have, 'cause you've numbered each mound in a collection of mounds with separate numbers. However, this means that there has to be four times 400 cards made up and distributed right off.
- [Bauxer] I think that perhaps as far as outlier communities are concerned, such as Rockford, all the files that we would be interested in up there would be incorporated in two or three tiers of counties so that we wouldn't need to [garbled] master file wherever the seat of the commission is. And then we could, each of us, have a complete set if we wanted or just those which concern you.
- [Winters] Once you get around Shawneetown it gets interesting to me, but not [emphasis original] for file.

- [Fowler] Well probably the only institution that would be — I don't know, would Carbondale? Or would they just be interested in the southern half of the state...
- No, because we're working on the Archaic [Period], and...
- Yeah, alright.
- [Fowler] Three institutions that would be involved; maybe [the University of] Chicago would want to be.
- [Winters] But are you going to put all this data under one roof?
- [Fowler] What do you mean all the data? Now we're talking...
- Like your survey sheets.
- [McGregor] Well, you have to have, on any kind of a survey, some systematic means of getting it, and card files aren't too good. Because you want to be able to draw a map on it sometimes. We've come up with the old notebook system and we've got it. And that's better.
- So it should be able to be used like that, probably.
- [McGregor] Of course some of them have two lines on them, but some of them have two sheets. And I think that those that are fairly full should be made fairly full. I don't think we want any analysis of material, maybe a sketch or two of [projectile] point types, a map of the site, where it's hard to locate it specifically. That should be circulated, I think, to all the cooperating institutions. Now what we do with that is another problem. I mean do we put it on our [garbled] sheets or whatever it is. But it should include the specific location to a section or better. [emphasis original]
- [Fowler] Well like they use the quadrangle system. They can transfer that information and use their numbers...
- [McGregor] Whatever system you want. But there should be a central numbering system. [emphasis orig.] That's going to lead to some problems too. When I write a report on a site that I call PK-2, just as I am doing now, and you call it PK-something else (17), and he calls it whatever quadrangle it is...
- D1-4
- [writing on chalkboard in background]
- I think in Cook County every university should call [garbled] if it's 1928 or better, it'll always start out with Cook County number one. And two-thirds of Cook County with Cook County number one!
- [Fowler] I think you'd at least have to publish the central number, in other words the one that's in the central survey. And then if you wanted to publish the local number...
- [McGregor] Is the central survey number going to be based on PK<sup>V</sup>-2, or are we simply going to say "village site?" [garbled] ...PK-2 mounds, A, B, C, or D
- [Fowler] I think we [Illinois State Museum] use <sup>V</sup> and <sup>O</sup> for mounds, <sup>S</sup> for shelter, and <sup>C</sup> for cave because, well obviously you know why we use them.
- The [Smithsonian] River Basin Survey sets the standardized site locations throughout the country pretty well, and I think most of the institutions are using that system, and that's just a simple county and site number with a state designator.
- Like we're using here.
- Yeah
- [mixed voices]
- The state number 25 and PK, what is it?

- [mixed voices]
- [Winters] And you've already got it set up in Cole and Deuel's book for the county system. That's already published...
- [McGregor] ...So we can use it. That's good – I'm for it. But what I'm trying to get away from is this horrible [emphasis orig.], small "o" which typesetters go nuts about,
- [garbled] ... you can't type it on a typewriter...
- ...that should just be ignored...
- if a local institution wants to use it again...
- ... let them.
- ...whether it's good or bad, we're going to use straight River Basin study [as a model]. It may be good, it may be bad, but that's what we're doing.
- [Fowler] Again, we've [Illinois State Museum] gotten into the position of bringing in a new factor on it, unfortunately, which we've allotted numbers to each township within a county, ahead of time, and then the site we find within the township.
- [Winters] I've done that at your suggestion.
- And that's a heck of a mess, because immediately you're into three letters.
- Six hundred... [garbled]
- And you only have six sites...
- [Fowler] Again, if the group agrees on it, which I think is excellent, is actually based on the Smithsonian River Basin Survey system, where you start PK-1, 2, 3, in sequence in a county.
- [Bluhm] Yes, but you're going to have to go with your central filing... [garbled]
- [Fowler] That's what I was thinking. In the central file it's got to be handled, I think on the River Basin [garbled]
- [McGregor] That's right. That's what I think. So, it might be, Mike [Fowler], if you could take the counties where I work most extensively and use my files directly if you're going to do this, and then correlate other things on those counties, at least. Now when it comes to Peoria County, for instance, we've got three things: we've got [the University of] Chicago, we've got [garbled], and we've got one developed by Peoria Cat[erpillar Corp.]...
- [Fowler] Which doesn't have townships, I think.
- I don't know how they....
- They were the...
- And then [Mr. Virginius] Chase has a series of numbers, which has nothing to do with the counties.
- [McGregor] Now if we can keep it simple – I know from having done this in many places – that the simpler the system the better it works. Then as he suggested I would favor it. Do you want to try and work it up so you can do it centrally, and are you people all willing to cooperate? I am, with Mike, on this, are you?
- Yes.
- Nobody will submit...
- [McGregor] The kind of identification that's in my notebooks there. You see that series of books there, Mike? [garbled] That's how much might have to be copied if you do this.
- Well, I'd like to send you copies of the survey sheets we use. They are six pages long and cover the site pretty thoroughly.
- I think for a central survey a single sheet is enough. You can get enough information on a single 8-1/2 by 11 on one side, and on the other side it'll use coordinate paper so you can

draw in your map. We used it on the Missouri River Basin Survey, and you get your basic information, because what you want to know is where is the site, what's it look like, who owns it, and what kind of stuff came off of it. If you want more information for your "personal" file, then that is not a concern to the central file.

- What if it hasn't been dug?
- [Fowler] We're using the sheets I'm sure you used when you worked in Springfield, and I guess the University of Chicago [used] the Basin Survey sheets.
- I don't like them, myself.
- I use them too, but when you have a form to fill out you have a lot of stuff that you think you should put down and you never have enough room to fill the thing out.
- The advantage of a form is that you don't overlook something that you might if you didn't [have one].
- The first part will give us the property owners, and section, township, and [garbled]
- It's all in an organized position so if you want to know what county it's in or what township it's in, you know exactly where to go to on the page, you don't have to look through a whole sheaf of notes.
- There is this certain amount of organization to one of these things.
- It's a big job – a terrific job.
- [Fowler] Like Howard [Winters] says, I think we need to be doing what we can before this organization is officially launched. I don't know if we ought to set up a constitution committee or something along those lines to get the thing laid out.
- [McGregor] I don't think we need a constitution for this [garbled]
- I don't know.
- [Fowler] Are we just going to be an unscheduled "get-together" organization, or are we going to try to put it on an official standing, so that if we want to, say, get some state funding to help support it, and we have something we can go to the state with?
- [McGregor] I think we're going to have to put in on some official standing – I don't see why we can't officially organize it right now, today or tomorrow, and make it known to the public [garbled] newspaper release even if you want: I'm willing to.
- [Fowler] I think when we write to a congressman or something we can do it officially too.
- All you probably need at this time or perhaps even at any time is a resolution and a statement of purpose.
- Alright, who can write one?
- So we adjourn here and write a resolution and a statement of purpose?
- [Bluhm] Well as a member of the Wisconsin [garbled] institutional member [garbled]
- Invitational or what?
- Let's see, how did they work it...? Well, for instance, both Bud in Iowa and two people [garbled] in Milwaukee, Mack and Bob Harper, are all on it. So it's by invitation [garbled] they dropped it.
- [Mixed voices]
- Do they want to get a representative, Wally?
- Oh sure.
- [Bluhm] That answers my question. I just wondered if it was one person per institution or...

- [Fowler] No, no, I don't think it should be. I think probably if there's a professional anthropologist in most cases he should be extended an invitation, and in some cases even when he isn't professional.
- What is the [garbled] regarding data?
- [McGregor] Here, let me turn this thing off – we'll just run into trouble with the tape.

RECORDER WAS TURNED OFF AT THIS POINT

CONVERSATION RESUMES WITH NO EXPLANATION REGARDING DATE, TIME, SUBJECT, OR PARTICIPANTS (Perhaps a break was taken)

- [Fowler] I propose that we organize the Illinois Archaeological Survey, with a membership to consist of professional anthropologists in Illinois, and others by invitation, the purposes being:
  1. To locate, record, and preserve records of archaeological sites in Illinois
  2. To standardize reporting methods
  3. To establish a ceramic [garbled] type repository
  4. To allot survey and salvage investigations
- [Fowler] I think it should have officers [consisting] of a president, and a secretary, whether these should be elected or appointed. For instance the secretary might automatically be the person who's going to take care of the survey records. In other words, as the Missouri Society has it, automatically the secretary is the anthropologist at the University of Missouri [sic]. These things can be worked out. Here is the proposal, and I...
- [McGregor] There's one thing there - You haven't said anything about, except people working in Illinois, have you? And outside people...
- [Fowler] All professional anthropologists in Illinois and others by invitation. In other words,
- [McGregor] Others who have worked in Illinois? How about that, or who have done work, or are doing work in Illinois should be included in this.
- Let me ask a question as far as professional people are concerned: Milton Malberg[?] for example, who is curator at the museum, local state[?] museum, who is not a professional archaeologist, yet has the scientific training; do we include him, and others, by invitation?
- [Fowler] Why I would think as a case came up like that, that after all, this group would take it under consideration not to be snobs, but to say, "Is this the kind of guy that's going to fulfill the objectives?" and to take him in.
- [McGregor] Let's get specific: Let's say, let's start in at this point and say, "The membership of this survey shall at this time consist of," and let's begin to name some people here.
- McGregor.
- OK.
- Deuel and Martin.
- [McGregor] Let's do it. Let's just jot them down, how about it? You got a piece of paper there, put them on!
- [Fowler] That's why I gave that paper to Elaine [Bluhm]
- [Bluhm] Do you want me to write them down?
- [Fowler] Members of the Illinois Archaeological Survey: McGregor, Thorne Deuel, don't forget yourself, Winters, and Kelley, and of course...

- [Bluhm] Who's that other one down there?
- [Fowler] There's a couple more down there isn't there? . [Irvin] Peithman,
- Peithman is transferring to public relations. [J. Joe] Bauxer , [David J.] Wenner, and (yeah, we'll let him in!), Elaine [Bluhm], [George] Quimby, Godfrey, Don, Glenn A. Black, [garbled], Jimmy [Griffin], Spaulding, Carl [Chapman],
- [Bluhm] Well here's... I have no objection to [garbled]
- You always have to say Griffin and Spaulding.
- What about Townsend in Kentucky?
- Dr. Watson,
- No, he's survey.
- This is the survey part.
- [Bluhm] There's really no reason to...
- [Fowler] He's never worked in Illinois.
- Carl [Chapman] hasn't either.
- Leave him alone. I don't know why... I think he's just so busy in Missouri.
- [McGregor] How many do you have there?
- [Fowler] 14
- [McGregor] That's a pretty good start. That's enough.
- [Fowler] And that pretty well covers... Well, now what about Bob Adams up in Chicago?
- [McGregor] He hasn't done any survey work.
- [Bluhm] Officially his interest is more recent an also, at the present he's channeled his Illinois interest off to Caldwell. Caldwell was only around for a year.
- [McGregor] I think if we start with the list, we'll find that there are perhaps some amateurs who really contribute that it will be worthwhile at least inducing [sic] as ex-officio.
- Another class of members - non-voting contributors.
- [Bluhm] And then there's Wheaton College. They dug for a while.
- [Winters] The fellow that's out there now – I heard him – a collector – the other night, and he's all Near East.
- Any one or anything in Kentucky?
- [McGregor] This is just for Illinois. I don't think any of them have.
- [Fowler] I think it should just be. Of course you might say Glenn Black has never worked in Illinois, but his proximity is so close there... He has and in fact he's interested in the salt springs on the other side of the river.
- He's visited a number of sites in Illinois.
- [Holder?] I will raise the voice of the outsider: Do you think you need to be so violently chauvinistic you need to say Illinois Survey?
- [McGregor] There's a reason for this. We hope to get state funds.
- Oh. Alright.
- [Bluhm] The Upper Mississippi Valley is a bigger [garbled]
- That statement has gone on the record. [laughter]
- [Fowler] If someone writes to us and says there's a hot site down in E. St. Louis, well we'll probably contact you and have you investigate it. If it's up north, we'll contact Dave [Wenner].

- [McGregor] The purpose of this is to have a central clearinghouse where all records will [garbled] through, and a standard number will be given to each of them, and then you give your own numbers. Also, if I get word that something in your area that you don't know about; instead of me running down there and you running down there, and then you hear about it later, we simply get in touch with you and then after you go to it, you give us a simple report that the site is Middle Mississippian, and it is in such-and-such a location that consists of mounds...
- [laughing]
- Well it was here yesterday...!
- [McGregor] What we said here (I don't know whether I mentioned it to you after you came in), what we feel is if we can get some kind of an organization here in Illinois, and then a bigger organization, where the professionals can come together, you see, and exchange ideas, and when there comes a problem (like this highway business) we can work [in a] concerted way, then we can swing an awful lot of weight. As it is, you try and get something done down there politically, you haven't much to show, and neither do I. But when we get an organization of all these states, especially, then we feel we can (and I think we will) swing some real weight. It's good for us to get together for these exchanges of ideas.
- This is in addition to the fundamental survey problem.
- [McGregor] The survey problem is one thing and then this broader Upper Mississippi Valley archaeological [garbled] is another. There are two things.
- Go ahead and add Eggan's name to the list.
- Fred Eggan . He's not in archaeology any more.
- He served the survey...
- I just got a postcard from [Fay Cooper] Cole and he said, I mentioned the problem down there, and he said I should mention [Sol] Tax. Now why did he say that?
- [Fowler] Eggan has always shown a quite lively interest in these problems.
- Some day, the University of Chicago's going to come out with [garbled].
- [Bluhm] Oh, I think, yes it's too far off.
- [mixed voices]
- [Fowler] I'd also like to suggest Wayne Temple. He's our ethnohistorian. Of course, in doing that work, he's got a lot of information on historic sites and so forth.
- I don't think we should make this too big, but...
- [Fowler] We're getting to be 16 and up. I don't know whether we're at that stage yet.
- I certainly think we should go on with the University of Chicago.
- Alright.
- [McGregor] Then if Fred finds he doesn't want to be on it, let him suggest someone else.
- [Fowler] Well that's 15. That's a pretty workable sized group.
- [McGregor] To start. Now this can be expanded or contracted. Now I think that expansion should be up to the membership.
- [Fowler] This group can meet as a committee or organization, say for an hour, at the time of this conference, to set policy. I'm sure, even though we've tried to standardize our forms there are going to be lots of questions that come up that we want to decide on.
- [McGregor] Now there's one other problem, and this is how to get this started. As I understand, you're going to investigate the possibility of the [Illinois State] Museum doing the clerical work necessary to get it going and I will investigate the possibility here [at the

Univ. of Illinois]. Let's see if we can find any funds for two or three months to get the initial recording done. Should we hash out this next problem of how we're going to number these sites right at the moment? Suppose we suddenly get the funds, and you decide you're going to do it. Are you going to do it? We have eliminated the little "o" above the line [superscript letters].

- Oh fine! I did that about two years ago.
- [McGregor] That's out. Now the question is: do we number each mound as a separate site, or do we number them, where logical, as one site?
- I think this should be flexible.
- Or logical.
- [Winters] You might even... the guy that's in the field could judge that.
- If he makes a mistake, if it turns out to be four or five sites, then he has to make some changes.
- That's a good policy.
- I'll tell you all the sites that show up around Cahokia. They'll show up on an emergency basis, you see. And then people will go out there and see it, and willy-nilly, in spite of yourself, you're going to have to give it a number, even though it may leave behind...
- I think I can refute that, but there are certainly several villages there in Cahokia in that group, there isn't just one.
- And since it's accident that brings it to light, right now... Some guy's going to dig a garden, or somebody's going to build a building that brings them to the site, just not so much for scientific reasons as for practical reasons, you give the thing a number.
- Sure.
- Now that may not be the same as somebody's making like the Cache River, you're making a survey...
- That's another matter.
- [McGregor] The policy could be: "Where there is a number of small mounds, obviously closely related, then you give them one site number. If there is a group of mounds scattered around in different clumps they could be given a different numbers at the discretion of the individual." How's that?
- You could have Hopewell mounds, Mississippian mounds...
- [Fowler] After all, isn't numbering of a site kind of akin to the controls we use in excavation, whether arbitrary or...
- [McGregor] But the policy is not, as I understand it, to give every single mound in every site a separate site number. Is that right?
- [Fowler] That's where I'm going to disagree, because after all, you're excavating. You're excavating this mound, and you want a system for keeping the materials from this mound separate from this mound. So what do you do? You call it Pike County 1A, and Pike County 1B? Why not just call it Pike County 1, Pike County 2, eliminating ...
- [McGregor] It's a little silly, and this has happened at Kincaid and many other places, to talk about (whatever that site or county is down there) MX-01, and then the mound next to it is MX-56. Then there's another one over here which is culturally no relationship at all because isn't Middle Mississippi[an], it's Woodland, and this is MX-057.

- [Fowler] Yeah, but actually when people refer to those mounds, the number is just a recording system. When they refer to it they call it the Big Mound, or the House Mound, or the Temple Mound, they don't use the number.
- [McGregor] What site do you call this now? What site do you call the village site or the mounds? MX-01...
- [Bluhm] Well they do use those numbers... [garbled] For years we've never talked about [garbled] I've never seen it. I've always talked about MX-04, MX-010, and the gang that worked with me on it...
- Yes, but when we're talking about the site, what do you call it?
- Call it Temple Mound, Kincaid...
- [Fowler] Well I can see it working either way. It just seems for recording you're eliminating...
- [McGregor] I'm thinking of above the Pool site, there's a little ridge with about seven or eight mounds on it, and some of the mounds overlap other mounds and obviously they're all one...

#### CONTINUED ON "B" SIDE OF TAPE

- [McGregor] ...I'd give this eight different numbers.
- How would you define...
- My inclination is no.
- [garbled]
- [garbled] Perino's excellent technique this summer. I would be inclined to Mike's [Fowler] point of view that all of those were five or six obvious Hopewell mounds, and probably related in time. If you're going to pick up the pieces after Perino, you ought to have one [garbled], two, three, four, and so forth.
- I don't think you have to be that precise.
- [mixed voices]
- You draw a sketch of the site, normally, when you make a survey of it. If you give that the site number M-1, on your sketch you'd have Mounds 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. When you do a control [garbled]
- [McGregor] The reason I oppose this (and let me tell you why), and it's a very practical one, when it comes to recording this, you make a separate sheet for each mound. You have to put on each of these sheets the specific location of section and whatnot. So you have, instead of at this Pool site, instead of one site sheet, PK-1, and you have PK-1 and PK-17, 19, 23, 64, and whatever it is, and they're not related in any way, and each one will have to have a location.
- Can I make a proposal, in the nature of a compromise? If it doesn't delay proceedings too much, if we can come to some sort of a compromise today. We could ask the surveyor [garbled]
- Bauxer has enough experience in the world of survey.... [garbled] ...would give him a great many numbers up and down the Missouri or give him one number, because they've been through the mill on that.
- Yeah we can solve that wherever possible.
- And then you can call it, what, McGregor?

- [McGregor] The Museum of Northern Arizona has 5,000 or 6,000 sites now. Believe me, this gets to be an item. And we give one [consecutive] number to each site, if we can, under any stretch of the imagination, call it one [site]. And then if we wanted to divide the site up later, if we work in it, we divide it. By A, B, C, or 1, 2, 3, or whatever.
- You cannot easily add numbers later.
- What did Jim [James A.] Ford and [Phil] Phillips, and [James “Jimmy”] Griffin do when they did this?
- I imagine they would tend, too, to pull just as much information into one number as they possibly could, for the records.
- I know they listed in the [garbled] where they had the place, why they showed site [garbled]
- I think when you’re faced with the practical problem of having a lot of material you probably end up... that’s going against what I said about Cahokia. I would reserve the right, however, John, at Cahokia, you know... [garbled]
- [McGregor] I think what you should do is use your own discretion at the time. At Cahokia there’s several different mounds, I’d give each one of those [garbled] immediately. Later on, you might find that you want to divide some of those further, and then you can come back and give them another number. But for practical filing and recording [garbled] that’s better than what we have to start with... ..well that’s arbitrary. We make sketches of all the sites.
- Yeah.
- [McGregor] And we have architectural ruins in the Southwest.
- Yeah.
- And even if there are three or four units, if they’re pretty close together we give them all the same site number.
- [Fowler] Well I’ve always used a site number just like, say a grid number on an excavation unit. So what I do on a survey sheet, I put PK-1 to -17, and then I list on there 17 mounds. If I go to excavate them, why, I’m excavating number 17 instead of number 1-B or something like that.
- So PK-1 goes across 17 mounds? So it’s really just the same site.
- [Fowler] The only point I was making is that, to me, it seemed like it would save a little recording work: instead of saying PK-1A, or something, why, you’d just say PK-2, etc. Really it’s a small point.
- Next time we come out to look at the site you find six more mounds, well then you’ve got six more consecutive numbers that are not related.
- That’s the problem.
- [Fowler] It’s just so you can locate the thing. Number five doesn’t have any cultural significance...
- How about the Zimmerman site?
- [Bluhm] Three grids, four grids. Grids run wild.
- But it’s still... when we talked about it, we talked about the Zimmerman site. As far as the excavation units are concerned or the occupation areas, those are grids, by the Chicago method we call them, excavation units.
- [Bluhm] The question is, you don’t want any, there should be no file, no sites in the master file that we know of that allows visitors.
- Well we haven’t talked about that.
- [Bluhm] Here’s the question: We frequently [garbled] farmers

## TAPE TURNED OFF, THEN RESUMES

- [Holder?] With regard to the preservation of sites at Cahokia, all the flat land is very valuable for horseradishes and so forth. A lot of those mounds are not, and have never been, cultivated, so they're just grown up in trees and so forth. Now they don't cover a lot of acreage, and they're not valuable as farm land because you have to invest so much dough in leveling them. I have no idea how much success one would have in going around spotting and buying up those mounds which are not today cultivated. [garbled – some site or mound was mentioned] for instance – it's over there with trees all over it. There's one just across from Monks Mound, that's just east of it, still has trees on it and so forth. There's a mound behind the Club Preview which I'm sure you can get Buster Wardman [Wortman?] in a quiet corner and ask him he'd probably give it to the State. You might be able to spot, you see...
- [McGregor] Actually, archeologically, I think the Ramey area has been pretty much despoiled through erosion and other things. There's a lot still to be gotten but I mean there's a lot lost there. Those mounds have been plowed down.

## [THE FOLLOWING DISCUSSION SEEMS TO BE ABOUT GREGORY PERINO'S EXCAVATIONS OF MOUND 34, EAST OF MONKS MOUND]

- How [garbled] some 9 feet deep?
- Sure. You see what came out of it?
- I know.
- Well he had a house. He didn't work the house up.
- [McGregor] The nine feet didn't show the distinguishable stratigraphy [garbled] chronologically.
- He had a house. You could see the damn thing come right through, and he knew it, too.
- [McGregor] Well anyway, that isn't, probably, the most viable archaeological site in the Ramey area. But there are others, certainly, in there, that are. I think if the... What department is that, over in the... I'm thinking of the director of that department. He's in charge of the highways and the parks, and I don't know what all. I used to know... Public Works and Buildings!

## DISCUSSION OF STATE PARKS

- [Fowler] Did they take parks out of that recently?
- I don't know.
- But anyway that's... [garbled, mixed voices]
- [Fowler] I think they moved it over to conservation.
- [McGregor] Anyhow, I thought it was very congenial, and we got Dickson Mounds made into a national park, I mean a state park. When he was in there, he was very congenial to this sort of thing, and that was gotten comparatively inexpensively he was delighted with the way it turned out. Now, I thought, the next move is into the Cahokia area and to try and pick up some of that stuff, and then the political scene changed and he was out. Well that got to be all built up again, but as Mike [Fowler] here said, maybe this commission that we're talking about, or the survey group (either one), could, acting as spokesmen for a larger body here,

carry some weight and be heard by these people and build those contacts again. Boy, there's nothing I'd rather do than to see that Cahokia mound change from a baseball park to a real worthwhile site.

- [Holder?] It's very clear from just six weeks work over at Kunneman [mound], there's a world of stuff. My lord!
- [McGregor] If to do nothing else than just to hold it... from being completely lost. It is going, it's terrible!
- [Holder?] There's a new lot for sale right on the flanks of that mound. It's across from, across the road and just east of Monks Mound, that nice little [garbled] that they cut the highway through. When I go back, I'm going to call them and find out who has it for sale.
- [McGregor] You understand, that if the State Antiquities Act goes through, before any highway rebuilding is let, if done the way it is in New Mexico, we will have notice of this, an archaeological program will have...
- Automatic liaison. It's up to them to notify us.
- [McGregor] That's correct, if it works like New Mexico. And if federal funds are involved then the funds will be supplied with the Federal Bureau of [garbled] and so on. The whole thing is a beautiful opportunity. I guess you missed out on this thing.
- Yeah. That's the urgency of this meeting.
- Is everybody tired out?
- You know, I don't think the [garbled] should be made clear that the urgency of the Cahokia area is not necessarily because of its scientific value, but because this is the only real big area that's in the heart of a big metropolitan area which is expanding rapidly.
- [McGregor] It's the only big site in the heart of America, isn't it?
- Obviously...
- What time is it?
- Four-thirty.

TAPE IS TURNED OFF, AND RE-STARTED [NEXT DAY?].

- [McGregor] The points that we have covered, and that I think we're all pretty much in agreement in, are as follows:
  1. We are all agreed that we want to push for federal highways act to include the use of these funds for archaeological salvage.  
And then I want to put on the record here that it has been suggested in our telephone conversation last night with [Fred] Wendorf, that we try to contact Senator [Robert S.] Kerr of Oklahoma, Senator [Albert Arnold] Gore of Tennessee, Senator [Alexander] Wiley of Wisconsin, and Senator [Paul Howard] Douglas of Illinois, all of whom are influential in this. And, I should add, that this is a series of bills, not one bill, so there's no one number for it. But it is known, generally, as the Highways Act. I think we're all in agreement on this, aren't we? OK.
  2. That we attempt, here in Illinois, state legislation of the following, an Antiquities Act to do these things:
    - A. For the conservation of archaeological remains, including perhaps, if we find it expedient, historical remains, and even paleontological (I am to investigate this – I think you should too, Mike [Fowler], over there – and I'll take it up with the Department of Geology here, and also the Geological Survey and get their views).

- B. To apply to all state-owned land and to control if feasible, private work, work on private lands. (This has to be explored.)
- C. An Antiquities Commission be set up in the state to consist of a trained anthropologist representing each of the following institutions:
  - The University of Illinois
  - Southern Illinois University [Carbondale]
  - The [Illinois] State Museum
 To be expanded if necessary to include representatives of these other fields. (That has to be explored, too.)
- D. Four, [sic] That this Commission draw up a set of regulations covering the issuance of work permits. (I don't like that too much. I wish that could be somehow put into the bill but maybe, as New Mexico has done, it's necessary to revise these somewhat.)

We're all in agreement that that's alright in general outline? We'll proceed with this.

- [Fowler] I think we ought to have on the record too that we don't want to jeopardize the antiquities for state properties by adding on the private properties. If it's going to jeopardize [the act] then we want that left off at this time.
- [McGregor] That's right. Elaine [Bluhm] suggested a few minutes ago that it be made clear that this is for the purpose of encouraging scientific work, not discouraging it or making problems of it. We're all agreed that that's pretty much what we want. Then Mike [Fowler] and I can go ahead with this. The second legislation we want is some kind of a revision or addition to this burial act:
  - A. an amendment or addition so that qualified individuals representing recognized institutions or organizations may be permitted to do such work;
  - B. permission for this work be granted by the Antiquities Commission
 Is that what we had in mind?
- You've left out "institute"... add to the present act our advice to include archaeological material as well as the assumed modern burials.
- Alright.
- [Holder?] Question on the Commission: Do you think it would be feasible for the all three members of the Commission to grant permission personally, or do you think it would be...
- [McGregor] No, as a group.
- [Holder?] ...individuals delegating...

#### BLANK SPOT IN TAPE

- [McGregor] Or, I think the way this works, is that they all pass on it as a body, and then they elect somebody in the group to [garbled] this letter and then turn it down. I think that would be worked out under the heading that I suggested up here that the Commission draw up a set of regulations.
- [Winters] If one man signed it you would need some information and that fouls you up. It'd be a little easier for you to get out of the situation on a Commission basis [garbled]
- [Fowler] I think what Howard [Winters] has in mind, and I think I go along with it, is the idea of... Many states in these laws provide for a state archaeologist and we want to have him backed by a Commission, you see. In other words, is it feasible, say if, Joe Blow from

[garbled] comes in and wants a permit to dig then we have to contact all three of us and we call a meeting, and he's kind of up in the air...

- [garbled]
- [Fowler] I suppose what we could do is have a regular, specified time for the meeting and when a guy comes in we'll say the Commission is meeting the third Friday of every month, or once every quarter and we'll hold your application and notify you of the action.
- [McGregor] I think, [garbled] point that I could justify Mike, is to see that Commission draw up regulations. [garbled] ... be worked out. To go to our third major point, this is the organization to be known as the Illinois Archaeological Survey. You have the data on that. Do you want to give it to us?
- [Fowler] I don't know if we want to take the time. I've got it jotted down. I think the ideas that we talked about yesterday, and maybe they can just be incorporated in the record of this meeting: With one or two points – I think we talked about this liaison with state, county, and federal officials which I think would be a major part to put it here and encourage the preservation of antiquities as parks and monuments. Also, I've added in here a statement that there are two types of membership in the Survey. The one to start with would be the professional people, professionally trained persons who have been, or are engaged in, work in Illinois archaeology; also, by invitation. These are the functioning members. Then I suggest a subscribing membership for the time when we want to try and get out a publication. It seems to me the necessary [garbled] ...for interested people to contribute.
- [McGregor] I like this. Does everybody like this?
- [Fowler] Also the idea [garbled]...

REST OF TAPE IS BLANK

#### CITED REFERENCES:

Porter, James W.

1983 Toward A History of the Midwest Archaeological Conference. *Mid-Continental Journal of Archaeology*. 9(1):135-139.

Young, Biloine Whiting, and Melvin L. Fowler

2000 *Cahokia: The Great Native American Metropolis*. University of Illinois Press, Urbana.

Excerpt from Young and Fowler (2000)

p. 15: "The new Archaeological Survey soon found that it had more to do than map the collectors' sites in the state. McGregor had a better pipeline into the workings of the Illinois Department of Transportation than had Deuel, and he and Fowler went together to the highway department offices in Springfield. There they learned that the department *was* planning to carry out the federal program to construct a complex of interstate highways near East St. Louis and that parts of them were planned to go through the archaeological site of Cahokia. The highway engineer got out his maps and Fowler and McGregor pored over them. Interstates 55, 70, and 270 were routed

through the area, one just to the north of Monks Mound, through Cahokia Creek and a nearby swamp area. Altogether, four portions of the site were scheduled to be invaded by interstate highways or their interchanges.

There was no possibility of changing the routes of the highways or of preserving monuments in the 1950's. Highways had precedence over historic sites. All the engineers could offer was some funding. In the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 a maximum of one-tenth of one percent of the budget of federally constructed projects was set aside for "salvage archaeology."

p. 23: "If it had not been for the imminent construction of the interstate highway in the 1960s, the Illinois Archaeological Survey would have shown little interest in Cahokia.

P. 57: "Though the Illinois Archaeological Survey had been formed by the mid-1950's, it had not yet taken action at Cahokia. Even the small portion of the site that had been purchased by the state was not protected from unauthorized digging. The remainder of the site, available for commercial and industrial development, was subjected to a confused series of excavations and bulldozing. Frustration over the state's inability to do anything and regret over lost opportunities hung like a cold fog over Cahokia until it was eventually dispelled in the 1960's by the juggernaut of the federal highway program. In the meantime, Cahokia struggled to survive the 1950s.