



Introduction to the Symposium Issue: Stuart Struever's Contributions to Midcontinental Archaeology, Part 1

Jane E. Buikstra

School of Human Evolution and Social Change, 900 S. Cady Mall, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85281

ABSTRACT

This article complements other accounts of Stuart McKee Struever's personal background and professional contributions. Struever shaped the development of deep site archaeology in the Midwest, along with creating the Center for American Archeology, an institution that for more than 70 years has been dedicated to interdisciplinary archaeological research, education, and stewardship. Struever's other notable achievements are associated with multidisciplinary archaeology, archaeological education and outreach, and archaeological theory and methods.

This article also introduces the two issues dedicated to Struever, the contents of which are woven through the fabric of his career. Issue 1 (2026) includes articles that highlight Struever's early focus on Hopewellian studies and his commitment to interdisciplinary archaeology. The second issue (2027) begins with the Koster site and the development of geoarchaeology in the lower Illinois River valley. It then considers Struever's impact on regional Middle Woodland studies. The authors of these articles were deeply saddened by the passing of Lynne Goldstein, whose reflections on her interactions with Struever and the influence of his mentorship enlighten the initial issue. She, too, will indeed be missed.

KEYWORDS

Stuart Struever; Koster site; Hopewell; processual archaeology

I conceptualized somewhere in the early '60s ... a research universe that would include approximately the southernmost 70 miles of the Illinois River Valley running from around Meredosia to the mouth of the river and Grafton.

—Struever 2003

Introduction

This special issue celebrates the contributions of Stuart Struever (1931–2022) to Midwestern US archaeology.¹ These include four distinctive but related domains: (1) archaeological methods and theory; (2) mentorship of future archaeological scholars; (3) public outreach, including engagement of nonspecialist avocational

CONTACT Jane E. Buikstra  buikstra@asu.edu

© 2026 Midwest Archaeological Conference

audiences and precollege students in archaeological fieldwork and appreciation of ancient people in Illinois; and (4) institution building. This introductory article weaves these into the rich tapestry of Struever's life and contributions to mid-continental archaeology. An integrative theme is Struever's identity as an archaeologist as it crystallized and then evolved from professor/scholar to institution builder.

A Nascent Archaeological Identity

On Good Friday of 1939, eight-year-old Stuart Struever plucked a barbed projectile point from the surface of a farm across the Illinois River from the family home in Peru, Illinois. Reflecting on this experience 64 years later, Struever recalled,

What got me about that was I saw these barbs of this point sticking out of the ground—somebody made this thing. Somebody made this and we have no idea who. When I thought about that it just blew me away that I was handling a human-made object of some distant past. It just blew me away. I didn't know who made it, but I had this thing in my hand. And there was like an energy coming out of the object into me [Struever 2003:34].

The following year, this experience and its energy stimulated nine-year-old Struever to begin walking the fields on a nearby farm his father had purchased near Lowell, Illinois. He began surface collecting, keeping track of locations where objects were found and subsequently creating a museum on an unused porch at this grandparents' house. During high-school years, with the aid of a family car, he and a friend surveyed approximately 4 miles of the Vermilion River valley, plotting locations on USGS maps and in plat books. When asked why they did this, he responded, "We were doing it because it felt good. I loved the idea . . . for me it was wonderful" (Struever 2003:32).

Paralleling these experiences were times when Stuart's father, Carl, took him on Sundays to visit the source of family wealth, the American Nickeloid Company factory that his paternal grandfather had founded in 1898. Carl, described by Stuart as having been "remote," hoped that Stuart or one of his two brothers would follow him into the family business. However, Stuart recalled being identified as "Carl's son" wherever he went in this close-knit community in northern Illinois; in youthful rebellion, Stuart wanted to develop his own identity. Stuart did acknowledge having been impressed by the scope of the family business and how the various specialized units had to work together to electroplate base metals and thus produce shiny automobile trim and kitchen appliances.

First Professional Encounters

Following his brother to Dartmouth in 1949 led Stuart to experience new and challenging academic rigor and an opportunity to enroll in the two archaeology

classes the college offered, both taught by Elmer Harp. Reflecting on that period in 2003, Struever remarked that he “had more confidence that I (Struever) had intelligence” (Struever 2003:10). By the time he graduated in 1953, he had acquired archaeological field experience under professional guidance, first at the French Fort at Starved Rock (summer 1950) where, as a paid laborer, he learned field methods from Richard Hagen. Struever considered Hagen a “superb field technician” (Struever 2003:28). At Starved Rock, Struever met Jim Brown, a high-school student who was there for 2 weeks. Jim, who at that time was fascinated by early migrations from Siberia, was ultimately to become a longtime professional colleague and friend. Struever spent the next summer (1951) at Feather Cave, near Lincoln in southern New Mexico, to “broaden his horizons” (Struever 2003:29). He returned to Illinois during summer of 1952 to supervise excavation at the Guebert site, an early eighteenth-century Kaskaskia village. The project was directed by Melvin (Mike) Fowler, who was also in charge of the nearby Modoc Rock Shelter excavations, overseen that summer by Howard Winters. Struever shared a tent with Winters, another colleague whose friendship would persist (Struever 2003:29–30, 85–86). On his way to Illinois from New Hampshire for this field season, the 21-year-old Struever had stopped by the University of Michigan, where for several days James B. (Jimmy) Griffin introduced him to Middle Woodland (Hopewell) ceramic diversity (Struever 2003:25–26). This encounter also forged an enduring professional relationship that extended throughout Griffin’s life, despite Struever’s conversion to the “new” archaeology proselytized by Lewis Binford, beginning in the 1960s. (A portion of Griffin’s ashes were scattered in the Illinois River, east of the Kamp Mound Group, an acknowledgment of the importance of the area to him.)

Struever graduated from Dartmouth in 1953, then spent nearly a year at Harvard in graduate school before being drafted into the army. Following a year and two months in the army, Struever returned to northern Illinois where he recalled discovering that his father was *not* supportive of his archaeological career, as that path left no interested heir for the family business. Struever began lecturing for fees, attempting to raise funds for archaeological fieldwork at the Kuhne Havana Hopewell site. He was advised to set up a nonprofit corporation for donations that would be tax deductible, which he recalled doing in 1955 (Struever 2003:14). Archaeological Research, Inc., thus came into being, according to Stuart’s 2003 account. Documents, however, on file at the Center for American Archeology’s (CAA) offices in Kampsville, Illinois, state that the nonprofit organization was formed on September 17, 1953. This date aligns with the history described by Brown and Wiant (2027). Footnote 4 on page 8 of Struever’s thesis (1960) also reports that Archaeological Research, Incorporated, was “[f]ounded in 1953 by three professional archaeologists in cooperation with several private donors whose initial contributions gave substance to the organization.” This explains the date discrepancy between Carr’s (2005:3, 12) account and the CAA’s legal documents.

***Serendipitous Beginnings in the Lower Illinois River Valley (LIV):
From Culture Historian to “New Archeologist”***

Struever reported that his LIV research program began inauspiciously during late spring 1958, when he became lost while driving to St. Louis (Figure 1). From Highway 100, north of Kampsville, Illinois, he noticed a burial mound with a “jagged gash” through it (Struever 2003:12). Inquiries in Kampsville brought him to Pete Kamp of the eponymous family associated with this modest riverside village. Kamp promised to stop his acts of destructive discovery if Struever would excavate the mound scientifically. Struever therefore returned with a team, including students from Northwestern University (NU), where he had just joined the graduate program, intending to study African archaeology. Struever finished his master’s at NU, writing his thesis on Kamp Mound 9 (Struever 1960). He analyzed the mound and its contents, including material culture of the mortuary context and referencing the human remains. Jimmy Griffin’s influence on this project is obvious given Struever’s detailed ceramic analysis designed to place the mound group in time. Jimmy’s fingerprints are also clear in his annotations to a copy of the thesis located at the CAA library in Kampsville. On page 66, for example, in the bottom margin, within Struever’s critical review of ceramic analyses, Griffin comments, “Good for you. The only ones as good are my own.” Later, however, as Struever turned to issues of social structure and wealth differences, Griffin became more skeptical. In the middle of page 112, the comment was, “I think you are going way beyond your data.” Griffin considered status differences, but not class distinctions, possible for Hopewellian social organization.



Figure 1. Stuart Struever on Perrins Ledge overlooking Highway 100 and the Kamp Mound Group, 1960s

In Appendix I (Struever 1960:168–179) of his thesis, “Archaeozoology at Kamp . . . and the problem of subsistence,” Struever voices a concern that would drive one of his key methodological contributions to archaeology. While it is possible that Middle Woodland folks were not consuming many plant products, he argued that both archaeological invisibility and recovery bias may have been influencing current interpretations. At that time, Struever favored Caldwell’s intensive hunting-collecting primary forest efficiency model (Caldwell 1958, 1959), which he discussed in association with Paul Parmalee’s archaeozoological study of Kamp Mound Group materials, including implications for community size based on such a production regime.

As noted by Bonnie W. Styles and Sarah W. Neusius (this issue), archaeozoology has a long history in Illinois archaeology. Stuart had collaborated with zoologists since his excavations at the Kuhne site in 1955–1957, when he asked Paul Parmalee at the Illinois State Museum (ISM) to identify archaeological remains. Stuart described Parmalee as having produced a “Sears Roebuck catalog” analysis, with lists but without the subsistence niche interpretations that Struever could see. By the time of his early Apple Creek excavation in 1962–1963, Struever was consulting with experts in fish, mammals, reptiles, and amphibians.

Struever recalled his thesis as being old style archaeology, which at the time was typically associated with LIV burial mound excavations and descriptive ceramic chronologies. Even so, his thesis clearly indicates that he was using comparative studies and his field-based knowledge to generate new questions and methodological innovations, whether or not they were appreciated by those with more traditional mind-sets, such as Griffin. A “new” archaeology was on the horizon.

During this period his personal connections to those engaged in Hopewellian research expanded to include Joseph Caldwell, whom Struever met either at Dickson Mounds excavations or at the Illinois State Museum. Caldwell visited Struever during the Kamp Mound 9 excavations (Struever 2003:84). In addition to having promoted a forest efficiency model for Hopewell (noted above), Caldwell is described by Struever as having “conjured up the concept of the Hopewell Interaction Sphere” and invited Stuart to join a symposium planned for the 1959 American Anthropological Association meetings in Philadelphia. “So my horizons about Hopewell just broadened out like mad in the fall of ’59. . . I loved the lower Illinois River Valley, and I felt what an interesting laboratory this would be for studying subsistence settlement systems of this Middle Woodland phenomenon” (Struever 2003:20). Struever went on to discuss the relatively pristine LIV archaeological record due to the lack of local industrial development. This was to become the core of an oft-repeated mantra that drew so many of us to LIV research. Important articles that emerged from Caldwell’s Hopewell Interaction Sphere (HIS) model included a paper in Caldwell’s edited volume (Struever 1964), as well as Struever (1965) and Struever and Houart (1972). Jimmy Griffin disliked the concept, frequently using the acronym and accentuating the S in oral representations.

An important influence on Struever's evolving perspective was a course that he took at the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago during 1959 co-taught by Struever's NU mentor, Creighton Gabel, and Robert Braidwood (Carr 2005:4). Both University of Chicago (UC) and Northwestern University students attended the class, and Struever found himself fascinated by Braidwood's discussions of the origins of agriculture and subsistence settlement systems in relation to the LIV (Brown and Wiant 2027). Based on this Illinois captivation, Gabel advised him to transfer to the UC (Struever 2003:15), so he did, entering during the fall of 1960.

From Student to Professor of Anthropology at the University of Chicago

While at the UC, Struever continued his formal and informal education with Braidwood, recalling having been impressed by Braidwood's conceptualizations of sociocultural systems and their changes: "And then you've got people like Robert Braidwood who began to become interested in subsistence settlement systems and the idea that archeology should focus on socio-cultural systems" (Struever 2003:2–3). Such sociocultural systems thinking complemented Caldwell's (1964) notions of the HIS, thus pervading Struever's conceptualizations of Middle Woodland and Hopewell throughout his LIV engagement, especially during the 1958–1968 period.

Lewis R. Binford, Struever's dissertation advisor, arrived at the UC in 1961, a year after Struever. While there (1961–1964), he profoundly influenced the students, including Struever, Patty Jo Watson, Jim Hill, and Frank Hole, as well as subsequent generations, including Buikstra, who entered in 1967. Buikstra and other first years were invited to informal evening seminars held by Meg and John Fritz and Fred Plog who were adamant that fledgling archaeologists should be exposed to the then "new archaeology." Struever's peer group of students would later become important as influential colleagues, as he was for many of them. For example, Kent Flannery, another UC student who lived upstairs from Alice and Stuart (Brown and Wiant 2027), invited Struever to present his ideas about the organization of archaeological research as the monthly lecture for the Anthropological Society of Washington, DC. He did so and then in 1968 published his paper, "Problems, Methods and Organization: A Disparity in the Growth of Archeology," in *Anthropological Archeology in the Americas*, edited by Betty Meggers. Struever (1968a:149) had obviously contemplated his argument carefully, reaching two related conclusions.

1. From paleoenvironmental reconstruction to three-phase excavations in each of numerous sites, the magnitude of resources (funds, personnel, and facilities) required greatly exceeds those available to archeologists in the United States today.
2. More basically, the organization of archeological research no longer reflects accurately, either what are seen as today's important research problems, or the

continually expanding array of methods developed to solve them. Problems and methods have changed, but the institutional basis for executing research has not.

While the nature of the stated research problems and multidisciplinary methods evolved in subsequent publications, his dedication to developing a freestanding archaeological institution never wavered (Brown and Struever 1973; Struever 1971). Notable also is the fact that Stuart was now spelling *archeology* without the second *a*, in line with common practice for “new” archeologists.

Impressed with Braidwood’s efforts to study the origins of agriculture and his ability to integrate a large interdisciplinary team, Struever approached him to ask for advice on developing an archaeological institute. “In essence, what Braidwood said to me was, Stuart, forget that” (Struever 2003:17). Braidwood’s recounting woes encountered at the UC doubtless influenced Struever to conceptualize a freestanding institution, without the layers of bureaucracy encountered at museums and universities. Struever was obviously *not* deterred in his pioneering effort.

Struever had finished his residency at UC by 1963, having been awarded NSF support for excavations at the Apple Creek site in 1962–1963 (Supplemental Figure 1). This and other LIV Middle Woodland excavations stimulated numerous contributions to midcontinental archaeology, including the development of flotation systems for the first time in the Americas, as described by Asch Sidell and Asch (this issue). Alice Struever, Stuart’s first wife, was a key contributor to this effort (Supplemental Figure 2), which involved considerable student labor in nearby Apple Creek, agitating large wash pans and subsequently sorting debris. Published under Stuart’s name (1968b), the paper acknowledged Alice and the students, “To Alice Struever and the students who stood in Apple Creek for endless hours we owe the actual development of the water-separation method” (Struever 1968b:362). Supplemental Figure 3 illustrates the early days of water-separation stages of flotation in the Illinois River, along with one of the many thousands of samples taken at the Koster site.

By this time, Stuart had been pondering the use of plant resources, as emphasized by Asch Sidell and Asch (this issue), since his 1960 excavations at the Snyders site (Struever 1961, 1962). His discovery of charred seeds in charcoal lenses from two features associated with Havana Hopewell pottery encouraged him to consult Hugh Cutler of the Missouri Botanical Garden, who identified them as *Chenopodium* sp. and opined that they may have been accidental inclusions, which Stuart handily refuted in terms of context and seed quantities (~950; Struever 1962). He interpreted these data in relation to Fowler’s (1957) “re-opened” discussion of Volney Jones’s (1936) hypotheses concerning a center of independent plant domestication in the central Mississippi Valley, termed the “Eastern Agricultural Complex” (EAC; Struever 1962:584–585). As Asch Sidell and Asch (this issue) discuss, Struever contributed significantly to the development of this concept by adding archaeobotanists to his suite of multidisciplinary experts. Struever’s own

attitude is expressed in his discussion of the Snyders site: "Certainly as exciting as any of the hundreds of artifacts recovered was a quantity of carbonized plant remains taken from three Middle Woodland features" (Struever 1961:94).

Stuart later would return to notions of primary forest efficiency, perhaps linked to mud-flat agriculture, before finally arguing that the EAC deserved "serious consideration" (Struever and Vickery 1973:1213). The authors hypothesized that the technologically simple cultivation associated with mud-flat horticulture was associated (in part) with the increased complexity associated with the HIS. Just as Struever and Vickery carefully reviewed evidence for the EAC by the early 1970s, Asch Sidell and Asch (this issue) summarize the current status of the EAC in the LIV, following many years of systematic water-separation efforts.

Struever reported that Binford had "a very fertile mind" (Struever 2003:85). Binford's (1962, 1964) multilayered (technomic, sociotechnic, and ideotechnic) and multiscalar (site, region) approaches clearly influenced the way Struever conceptualized and taught archaeology. Struever credited Binford with having influenced his conception of the LIV. "He was constantly provoking me to try to develop a typology of sites and differentiation of sites and from that to try to evolve an interpretation of what kind of cultural system was going on down there" (Struever 2003:86). Conceptualizing the LIV region as a research universe or natural laboratory was a distinctive, innovative contribution. While others were focused on single sites and limited inter-site comparisons, Struever was beginning inventory and environmental reconstructions in the 1960s that would become three-dimensional in the following decade.

Stuart was already developing a systems approach to the LIV that meshed well with Binford's advice. Building on his survey experience along the Vermilion River, including his ever-increasing knowledge of LIV avocational archaeologists, Struever began a multipronged approach to surveying. Personally, he went out with students, such as David Asch whom he had recruited to the Apple Creek excavations in 1962 while David was a high-school junior. Struever reports surveying "in the spring. . . . [W]e would start before the crops were up growing in the field and after the plowing had started. We started taking small areas of the research universe and systematically surveying, not in the most sophisticated way. But we would take USGS maps, pick out sections and go methodically over the whole section. Talk to farmers, walk on the fields. . . . I was doing it because it seemed like the right thing to do, not because anybody told me that" (Struever 2003:23–24). He also remarked that during the "spring of '64, we walked nothing but sand ridges in the northern part of the universe, using USGS maps and plat books. By that time, we were able to type them" (Struever 2003:25). Thus, Struever initiated strategies for evaluating human history in his chosen "research universe."

Struever considered the amateur collector network to be an important source of archaeological knowledge. He visited collectors in their living rooms, photographing and recording collections. He also provided bags and tags for them to keep pieces together by location. This strategy provided important information for

Struever's dissertation (1968c), and the approach was extended into the Macoupin Creek, a major tributary draining eastern uplands into the Illinois River (Farnsworth 1973; see also Miller and Farnsworth 2027). Specialized material classes were also the subject of collector surveys, notably a plummet study conducted during the winter of 1969 by Beloit College sophomore Lynne Goldstein (this issue) who was dispatched to Kampsville without prior knowledge of the region, not to mention a driver's license, which she acquired specifically for this project. The Kampsville ferry was on a cable then and did not operate in the winter (which Struever failed to mention). Lynne recalls vividly, that in trying to turn around on a slippery hill in the LIV, she and the FIA station wagon landed in the ditch.

As Carr (2005) emphasizes, by 1968, Struever's (1968d) thinking about Middle Woodland in the LIV had benefited from the input of Binford, as well as Griffin, Caldwell, Braidwood, and his graduate-student cohort. Struever's research "documented both of the systems [Black Sand, Hopewell] 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" (Carr 2005:5). Stuart's innovative approach, which included both ceramic details and concern for radiocarbon chronologies, addressed contemporary research questions in a multiscalar, nuanced manner. This has led Holland-Lulewicz and colleagues (2027) to opine that if Struever were a practicing research archaeologist today, he would no doubt agree with their observations about the future of LIV archaeology.

While Binford's approach resonated with graduate students, the anthropology faculty at the UC were considerably less enchanted with the challenges he vociferously launched against long-received archaeological wisdom. After three years at the UC, Binford's contract was not renewed. Struever was invited to teach his classes for the 1964–1965 academic year. In 1964, Struever went from "graduate student on Monday, you might say, to instructor on Tuesday" (Struever 2003:16), which brought him into closer contact with Professors Braidwood, Robert McCormick Adams, and Clark Howell.

The "New Archeology" at Northwestern University (NU): Nascent Institution Building

Just as Lewis Binford had left the UC, Sally Binford vacated her position at NU, recommending Struever for the job, thus beginning two further professorial decades. At this point Struever's plan to build an archaeological institution was well in mind.

So I went up there and said to them in '64 or by that time the spring of '65, I said to them, I want to build an archaeological research institute. And they, those professors, Hsu, Bohannan and others, we don't give a damn what you do. You do whatever you think you want to do. If to do your kind of research you need to create an institute of Archaeology, do so. . . . Northwestern was a frontier place to go for me. And was good because they

had no preconceptions about how archaeology ought to be done or organized. So, I went to Evanston and started teaching in the fall of '65. So, I was already creating an archaeological research organization by the fall '65 [Struever 2003:18].

One of the efforts started at NU, expanded and later managed by Ken Farnsworth, was the Contract Archaeology Program, as discussed by King et alia (this issue). Small-scale surveys were conducted, beginning with the "Archaeological Survey of the Collins Generating Station near Morris, Grundy County, Illinois" reported by Margaret Brown and Stuart Struever in 1972 (see King et al., this issue).

Stuart's charisma pervaded Northwestern's classrooms. I recall attending some of his basic lectures on Hopewell as a new instructor at NU just to hear how he put concepts together and communicated them. He was clearly a role model college educator for early-career professionals.

Stuart's ever-expanding vision and ambitions for an independent archaeological institute began to cause tensions with NU's central administration during the 1970s. Stuart recalls that the vice president for research/dean of science was angry with him because indirect costs from contracts were being routed through the FIA/CAA rather than NU. The NU development office was also not pleased that he was raising funds for the FIA/CAA rather than for NU. Stuart argued that NU received considerable publicity from his efforts and that NU paid little for the university coursework conducted in Kampsville. I was never privy to these discussions, but I do know that during the 1980s, whenever I attempted to engage NU's higher administration in discussions about the future of the CAA, Kampsville, and NU, I was treated to a never-ending (it seemed) litany of "Struever stories" and no indications of further commitment.

The Koster Years: Archaeological Identities Honed and Others Abandoned

The story of Struever's serendipitous discovery of the Koster site due to interactions with Alec Helton has been told so many times that it need not be repeated here (e.g., Carr 2005:9; Struever and Holton 1979). At that point, Stuart had planned to focus on Late Woodland and agricultural intensification, but that effort was quickly abandoned in the face of the increasingly deep, rich occupation levels below Teed and Mary Koster's cornfield. The changing face of the Koster excavations from 1969 test pits (Supplemental Figure 4) to the 1979 closing is the subject of Brown and Wiant's contribution to these special issues (2027).

In turning to the Koster project, Stuart was leaving behind over a decade of Woodland research, focused on Hopewell. In their interview, Carr asked Struever how he felt about leaving Hopewell behind academically. Stuart responded that he "didn't like it. It was truncated. But also at that time [he] had other students, various students who were beginning to work on it, who cared about it. So, there was some compensation in that. [He did not feel] good about it. But [he] was impelled to want to build" (Struever 2003:46). In the course of their conversation, students mentioned were Ken Farnsworth, David Asch, Frank Rackerby, and Dan Morse Jr.

Thus, Stuart began privileging his identity as an archaeological institution builder above that as a researcher. After two seasons of full-scale excavation at Koster, Stuart turned over field supervision to Bruce McMillan, edging further away from his scholarly identity. Stuart lecturing to Koster site visitors is illustrated in Supplemental Figure 5, with an example of the enormous crowds gathered to view the site shown in Supplemental Figure 6.

Brown and Struever (1973) developed a revised version of Struever's earlier LIV research-program descriptions, which had been aimed at regional studies of Woodland peoples, primarily Early and Middle Woodland. Here we find the new emphasis on goals of archaeology within the context of the 12-horizon Koster sequence. Archaeologists were said to be addressing new questions, such as the following (Brown and Struever 1973:264):

1. Is archeology a science, and can its practitioners work effectively within the strictures of the scientific method?
2. Can archeologists develop an understanding of prehistoric social, political, and economic behavior, or must they confine themselves to simpler statements about technology, diet, and subsistence practices?
3. Can archeologists study the interdependence of cultural, environmental, and human biological systems and define the processes that account for change and stability in these systems throughout the long prehistoric record?

Whereas Struever's earlier statements had been couched explicitly in a LIV regional context, arguing for a systems approach to supersede the old, normative archaeology along with the need for altered support institutions, Brown and Struever's Koster-based questions explicitly linked the many cooperating scientists and their analyses to understanding the processes of change and stability (Supplemental Figure 7). The study of change had figured in Struever's earlier discussions of culture change and adaptation, but here the issue of "science" is raised. Stuart had one "scientific" perspective that I did not share, which was that each scientist should observe independently and then test each other's ideas. This was context free in a way I found limiting at Perrins Ledge Crematory (Buikstra and Goldstein 1973), wherein Struever emphasized that Lynne and I should reach independent conclusions based on material culture and context (Lynne's domain) and the study of the physical remains. I needed to see the maps!

Among the specialists added to the familiar suite of archaeobiologists were geoarchaeologists, crucial for inferring the degree of anthropogenic changes in sediments as well as the conditions under which "natural" units had been deposited or otherwise developed. Ed Hajic and Tom Styles (2027), in the special issue, report on further LIV geoarchaeological results, while also challenging us to think more carefully about the integration of knowledge about floodplain site distribution and river dynamics in the LIV. Tom Styles was also a veteran of the 1970s Kampsville experience, beginning his laboratory rotation in the archaeobotany laboratory.

Emphasis was placed on extending the definition of field-school education to include data processing and analysis, along with knowledge from across the sciences in a context where not only were there multiple site excavations but also 10 research laboratories headed by resident scholars, along with 4 affiliated researchers from other institutions (Supplemental Figure 8 illustrates some of the laboratory directors). Scholarly productivity was also enhanced by the “isolation of the research group for 60 to 90 days in a rural village of 450 people” (Brown and Struever 1973:267).

Thus formed, the Kampsville archaeological commune indeed promoted remarkable intellectual and other experiences. Chris Carr (2005:7) reports on the former.

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. . . . 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.

In fact, I recall one such interchange vividly. Jimmy Griffin was lecturing when Lew Binford, present in St. Anselm's lecture hall unbeknownst to Jimmy, asked a question. Jimmy, who seemingly flew down the center aisle, was blocked by the slide projector, where I was sitting. This was a particularly vivid introduction to the tensions between the cultural historical and the processual approaches to archaeology that I will never forget. Lew Binford lecturing in St. Anselm's Hall appears in Supplemental Figure 9.

There are other memories of Kampsville, the floods (Supplemental Figure 10), the friends, the late-night tours of the Calhoun watering holes, including the Copper Kettle, the Kampsville Inn, and Alice's Palace. Other escapades involving water and other liquids occurred in more secluded locations, such as Indian Creek, with its flexible dress code. So long as we made it to breakfast and through our physically demanding but rewarding days, all was well.

Stuart was actively involved in the 1969 Koster test excavation program, including mapping the site, training students, and making key logistic decisions. I watched Stuart instruct students in excavation methods, beginning with surface skimming by shovel at the start of the Koster East field excavations. By all appearances, he too, was as he described Richard Hagen during his first excavation experience in 1950, a “superb” field technician.

The careful reader of the Brown and Struever 1973 paper on the organization of archaeological research, which used the 1971 Kampsville residential and remote laboratories as an example, will notice that on page 266 the Human Skeletal

laboratory was among the research laboratories that were “under the direction of a collaborating scientist and manned by students who will analyze materials recovered from excavations in the surrounding region.” Of the 14 collaborating scientists so listed, in fact, the only one who was female was the director of that laboratory. Ironically, the director so identified was Lynne Goldstein, who writes (this issue) about students and mercurial mentoring. This was news to her, as it was to me at the time of this writing. Struever had been an inspiring force for me, serving on my dissertation committee and being instrumental for my being hired at NU, where I was in my second year as an instructor in 1971. During the late spring of that year, I had been planning for my small excavation crew to be located in Kampsville, which housed several other project teams besides that for the Koster site. Precipitously, I was told by Struever that “there was not enough room in Kampsville for me.” I was taken aback, to say the least, as I had discussed this prospect with Struever during the fall of 1970, and the agreement to lodge my project, including students, field and laboratory personnel, and me in Kampsville had been made. I was at the time focused on completing my dissertation, so this was unwelcome news indeed. I never received an explanation or indication of what Struever expected me to do, perhaps suspend my research program? That never occurred to me, and soon I was the proud owner of the “Hamburg Schoolhouse,” bought at auction. With mortgage in hand, I prepared for a summer much more logistically complex than originally planned. In subsequent years, apparently accommodations in Kampsville became more elastic, and my students, staff, and I joined the “Kampsville experience.”

The Bubble Bursting

The Koster site was a massive undertaking, and there has never been a formal site report. Specialist studies have appeared along with syntheses, which are enumerated in tDAR (<https://corre.tdar.org>). Stuart lamented the overall problems of raising money for publications, including both specialist and nonspecialist titles, such as the *Early Man* magazine. Struever (2003:52) cited the periodicals as the fourth of his expensive experimental mistakes in Kampsville, following attracting wealthy *and* generous board members, building an endowment, and not recognizing that fund-raising would become vastly more challenging after the Koster excavations closed.

In 1981, Stuart changed the name of the FIA to the Center for American Archaeology, feeling that the former name was too provincial. His initial response to fund-raising challenges was to attempt to extend archaeological efforts to a northern Illinois location in the Fox River valley and one in lower Manhattan on the East River. The northern Illinois location operated briefly, and the New York site option never materialized. Stuart turned to the Southwest to build on an educational effort started at Crow Canyon by Ed and Jo Berger. Due to financial issues, the relationship between the CAA and Crow Canyon became fraught, as

Berger relates (2009:343–354). I was on the CAA board of directors at that time, and while the details were not widely shared, it became clear that Struever had lost confidence in Kampsville and the staff there. I was an informed supporter of Kampsville and its personnel, and I soon discovered there were board meetings to which I was not invited, the stated reason for nonattendance being that I was “too busy” and “not interested” in the CAA. The scenario painted in Berger’s publication is consistent with my memories, especially the key role Clark Hinsdale played in developing educational programming following 1979, when he became the residential director of the education program and then director of the CAA during Stuart’s board-mandated sabbatical in 1984. Clark’s perspective on the education programming in Kampsville is presented as an epilogue to this introduction. Clark is now a valued member of the CAA Board of Directors.

A moment that I will never forget occurred during a spring 1984 meeting of the CAA Board of Directors, held on the Northwestern University campus in Evanston, Illinois. Obvious to me as I entered the room was that there had been an informal premeeting about which I did not know. I, in the meantime, had been contemplating a productive and uneventful sabbatical at the School of American Research in Santa Fe, New Mexico. The first order of business for the CAA board was the announcement that “if we can’t find an archaeologist to accept the role of President of the Board of Directors, we will dissolve the corporation.” Everyone turned to me, and the world changed. At least mine did!

Closing Comments

During his interview with Chris Carr, Stuart commented that the Kampsville “experiment had failed” (Struever 2003:10). He had (erroneously) heard that we were selling the buildings and going out of business. The CAA was indeed restructuring during the early twenty-first century in response to further flood events and the fact that the CAA Contract Archeology Program had been transferred by the State of Illinois to the supervision of the University of Illinois. The latter was a severe blow to our income stream due to no fault of our own; this was an administrative decision to place all such efforts under state-run units. Also, the 9–11 tragedy meant that few students were seeking enrichment activities away from home. The outcome was a reintegration of our high-school program with our research initiatives and refocused efforts to take our precollege spring and fall programming to schools as well as welcoming classroom students to Kampsville. The CAA was indeed the nimble organization that Stuart had envisioned during the 1970s.

A few moments of pride are on exhibit in Stuart’s 2003 interview. He was obviously proud of the Crow Canyon center as an example of a successful research institution. Innovation in precollege archaeological education and avocational outreach are also mentioned, along with methods: multidisciplinary archaeology and flotation. He does *not*, however, somewhat mysteriously, take pride in the professionals he has trained. He mentions Howard Winters and Jim Brown as

valued colleagues; Ken Farnsworth, David Asch, Frank Rackerby, and Dan Morse Jr. are noted for their interest in Middle Woodland. Perhaps he was so far removed from contemporary archaeology that he was unaware of the impact that he had on Midwestern archaeology and beyond. We whose careers were shaped by Stuart's vision assemble here examples of efforts for which he should be justifiably proud.

The CAA's Kampsville Center thus continues its record of archaeological excellence in research, education, and outreach at a smaller scale than in the Koster years. We are proud of our more than 70 years of achievements, many due to the foresight and efforts of Stuart Struever.

Epilogue, Stuart Struever's Contributions to Precollege and Other Avocational Archeological Education, by Clark Hinsdale

In the winter of 1973–74, Stuart Struever lectured at Middlebury College by invitation of a former classmate, Rudolph Haerle, who was chair of the sociology/anthropology department. His topic was the Koster site. He was also recruiting for the Northwestern University summer field school. I attended that lecture as a Middlebury freshman. After the lecture, I stayed to get a chance to visit with Professor Struever. In our conversation, I said that the Koster site and the Northwestern Archeological Field School sounded very interesting and that I would like to participate. Dr. Struever responded that lots of people say that but few follow through and do it. My response was, "See you this summer." I participated in the 1974 Northwestern University summer field school. I stayed for the fall field school as well. I then came back as a summer staff member in 1976 and 1977 before joining the staff full-time in 1978. The following is my perspective on the precollege and other avocational programming.

The discovery, excavation, and publicity associated with the Koster site presented new opportunities for Stuart Struever in his efforts to build a sustainable research and teaching center under the dual banners of Northwestern University and his fledgling Foundation for Illinois Archeology (FIA). In addition to the broad interest in Koster from the professional archaeological community, progressive educators in area junior and senior high schools sought opportunities for "hands-on" educational experiences through the Northwestern archaeological program. Prominent among this group were Evanston high-school teacher Earle Carlson and Winnetka junior high-school teacher Genevieve McDougall, both of whom made lasting contributions to the development of the programs at Kampsville and the integration of archaeology into the precollege curriculum generally.

Northwestern University's educational mission turned to the greater flexibility of Struever's foundation to create innovative avocational programming. While archaeology remained at the core of these programs, Struever saw the allure of Native American technologies as stimulating interest in ancient cultures. In addition to the many traditional scholars Struever invited to spend the summer in

Kampsville, practitioners of various Native American technologies found a home under the broad interdisciplinary tent Struever created. John White, an anthropologist of Cherokee descent, and Greg Thomas, a skilled flintknapper, both found their way to the banks of the Illinois River and became integrated into the nontraditional educational programs.

Stuart saw the precollege and adult field schools as creating opportunities to broaden fund-raising as well as creating a much larger audience to understand and promote the discipline of archaeology generally. By 1978, Stuart had concluded that these programs needed year-round staff and expanded Kampsville facilities to permanently integrate nontraditional field schools and educational initiatives into his archaeological institution.

That fall, Stuart hired me as a full-time Kampsville-based director of FIA Educational Programs, while mapping out an aggressive program of institutional growth. Program offerings were expanded to April through October, winter months were spent lecturing, recruiting, and hiring staff. National and regional teachers' conferences in science, history, and gifted and talented programming allowed us access to teachers who, in turn, sent us more students.

New offerings included teacher's workshops and Native American technology and winter laboratory programs. A structure was built to cover part of an archaeological site to expand the excavation season. Involving the general public in archaeological excavations certainly raised questions and concerns from the broader professional community. Generally speaking, two kinds of projects were used by these nontraditional programs. True salvage archaeology projects were often utilized as described below in our discussion of the high-school field schools. Plow-zone excavations were another focus of these field schools, with any features discovered at the base of the plow zone mapped and then covered.

Earle Carlson led two five-week sessions of his summer high-school field school accredited through Evanston Hish School. A significant salvage archaeology project staffed by his students was the Mortland Island site near Hardin, Illinois. This site was eroding away largely due to the wakes from barge traffic, and many features could be seen in profile view. This site and others provided data for graduate students in archaeology and helped save information that would otherwise have been lost. The graduate students also supervised the high-school students in laboratory work. Earle also skillfully accessed many of the scholars in residence to share lectures on their areas of specialization in the evening. In most cases, these professionals did not charge for their assistance.

There are some social aspects of the Center's presence in Kampsville worth noting. The rapport among the scholars and students often felt like an attempt at a scholarly utopian community. Money was largely considered unimportant, willingness to cooperate was paramount, and knowledge was prized by all. Personal attire was casual, old vehicles were cool, and "roughing it" was a way of life.

While not all the "townies" were thrilled by the invasion of the "arkies," the program received invaluable support from one extended family that provided most

support services we relied on. The Schumann–Retzer–Becker clan were descendants of the original German settlers, and they filled virtually all our needs. Family members included both maintenance men, our head cook, our program secretary, and our vehicle repairman, who fixed our “cool” vehicles at night and on the weekends after his regular job.

John White created a village of several prehistoric dwellings along with fire pits, a kiln, and the ongoing effort of creating a dugout canoe. Students heard lore by evening firelight and learned weaving, flintknapping, and pottery making. Greg Thomas led flintknapping workshops, while also doing flintknapping demonstrations for a wide range of Kampsville visitors. Certainly, these programs helped fuel a renaissance of interest in precontact technologies and their role in the broader educational community. John White bought land in neighboring Michael, Illinois, and moved his family there in a school bus with all their earthly possessions, including their goats. His children and grandchildren still live in the house created from an old post-and-beam barn on the property. Greg Thomas’s legacy lives on through the many talented flintknappers he inspired, and Kampsville holds “knap-ins” to this day. Various Native American technologies have gained standing as “experimental archaeology” as scholars recognize their contribution to understanding and interpreting ancient lifeways.

The center’s premier student dormitory, named for educator Genevieve McDougall, was constructed largely from funds donated by grateful parents of this determined and inspirational teacher. It remains an important symbolic and real center for the CAA’s avocational archaeology programs.

At its peak, noncollege programming brought over 2,000 learners a year to Kampsville. While the programs hosted by the Center for American Archeology today are much smaller, many of the concepts generated there have been integrated into schools and museums across the country.

Note

1. Further details of Struever’s history are contained in Christopher Carr’s “Dedication to Stuart Struever” (2005) and his 6-hour interview of Struever in 2003 (ms on file, Center for American Archeology, Kampsville, Illinois). Carr’s publication will be cited as Carr (2005) and Struever’s interview as Struever (2003).

Acknowledgments

Despite bumps in the road, I owe the course of my largely unplanned and unexpected career to Stuart Struever’s charismatic leadership. During my graduate years, the monthly lunches at Michelini’s restaurant in Evanston became the inspiration required to keep me energized and on track. His incisive critical review of my first, inadequate draft of an NSF proposal for graduate student research was essential to its eventual success. During my first years as an instructor at Northwestern, I and others would attend familiar lectures to witness Struever’s communication skills for nonspecialist audiences that, at that point, were extremely aspirational. Thank you, Stuart!

I would also like to thank all colleagues, former students, and other members of the CAA community who have made the “Kampsville experience” an enduring pleasure. I am especially indebted to Chris Carr for graciously sharing his 2003 interview with Struever.

The assistance and encouragement from the immediate past editor of MCJA, Robert Cook, and the present editor, Logan Miller, have been essential for the closure of this project.

Supplementary Material

Supplementary material for this article can be found at <https://www.midwestarchaeology.org/mcja/supplemental-materials>.

Supplemental Figures 1.1–1.10

Declaration of Interest

The author declares that she has no financial interest in the project described in this article nor has she benefited financially from it.

Funding Statement

No grants have supported the preparation of this article.

Note on Contributor

Jane E. Buikstra (PhD U of Chicago, 1972) is Regents’ Professor of Bioarchaeology and Founding Director, Center for Bioarchaeological Research in the School of Human Evolution and Social Change at Arizona State University. Professor Buikstra was elected to the National Academy of Sciences (1987) and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences (2019). She is president of the Center for American Archeology (1986–present) and past president of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists, the American Anthropological Association, and the Paleopathology Association. She has received the following awards: the Pomerance Award for Scientific Contributions to Archaeology (AIA, 2005), the T. Dale Stewart Award (AAFS, 2008), the Charles R. Darwin Lifetime Achievement Award (AABA, 2008), the Eve Cockburn Award for Service (PPA, 2011), an honorary DSc (Durham University, UK, 2014), the Lloyd Cotsen Prize for Lifetime Achievement in World Archaeology (2016), the Lucy Wharton Drexel Medal (U PA, 2018), the Gorjanovic-Kramberger Medal in Anthropology, Croatian Society of Anthropology (2018), the Aleš Hrdlička Memorial Medal, Anthropology Society of the Czech Republic, the Shanghai Archaeological Forum, Lifetime Achievement Award (2019), and the Distinguished Career Award (MAC, 2020).

ORCID

Jane E. Buikstra  0000-0003-0206-0165

References Cited

Berger, Edward F. (2009) *Crow Canyon: Pioneering Education and Archaeology on the Southwestern Colorado Frontier*. 2nd ed. Authorhouse, Bloomington, Indiana.

- Binford, Lewis R. (1962) Archaeology as Anthropology. *American Antiquity* 28(2):217–225.
- Binford, Lewis R. (1964) A Consideration of Archaeological Research Design. *American Antiquity* 29(4):425–441.
- Brown, James A., and Stuart Struever (1973) The Organization of Archaeological Research: An Illinois Example. In *Research and Theory in Current Archaeology*, edited by Charles Redman, pp. 261–280. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Brown, James, and Michael D. Wiant (2027) Deep-Site Excavation Strategy. *Midcontinental Journal of Archaeology* 52(1), in press.
- Brown, Margaret K., and Stuart Struever (1972) *Archeological Survey of Collins Generating Station near Morris, Grundy Co., Illinois*. Center for American Archeology Report of Investigation 1. Report on file at the Center for American Archeology, Kampsville.
- Buikstra, Jane E., and Lynne Goldstein (1973) *The Perrins Ledge Crematory*. Illinois State Museum Reports of Investigations No. 28. Illinois Valley Archaeological Program Research Papers Vol. 8. Illinois State Museum, Springfield.
- Caldwell, Joseph R. (1958) *Trend and Tradition in the Prehistory of the Eastern United States*. Illinois State Museum Scientific Papers, Vol. 10. Illinois State Museum, Springfield.
- Caldwell, Joseph R. (1959) The New American Archaeology. *Science* 129:303–307.
- Caldwell, Joseph R. (1964) Interaction Spheres in Prehistory. In *Hopewellian Studies*, edited by Joseph R. Caldwell and Robert L. Hall, pp.133–143. Illinois State Museum Scientific Papers, Vol. 12. Illinois State Museum, Springfield.
- Carr, Christopher (2005) Dedication to Stuart Struever. In *Gathering Hopewell: Society, Ritual, and Ritual Interaction*, edited by Christopher Carr and D. Troy Case, pp.1–15. Springer, New York.
- Farnsworth, Kenneth B. (1973) *An Archaeological Survey of the Macoupin Valley*. Reports of Investigations No. 26. Illinois State Museum, Springfield.
- Fowler, Melvin (1957) The Origin of Plant Cultivation in the Central Mississippi Valley: A Hypothesis. Paper presented at the 56th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Chicago.
- Hajic, Edwin R., and Thomas R. Styles (2027) Stuart Struever: Pioneer and Advocate for the Discipline of Geoarchaeology. *Midcontinental Journal of Archaeology* 52(1), in press.
- Holland-Lulewicz, Jacob, Jason L. King, and Jane E. Buikstra (2027) Grappling with Time and Space in the Lower Illinois Valley: A Retrospective and New Directions on Woodland Chronologies. *Midcontinental Journal of Archaeology* 52(1), in press.
- Jones, Volney H. (1936) The Vegetal Remains of Newt Kash Hollow Shelter. In *Rock Shelters in Menifee County, Kentucky*, edited by W. S. Webb and W. D. Funkhouser, pp. 147–165. University of Kentucky Reports in Archaeology and Anthropology No. 3. Lexington.
- Miller, G. Logan, and Kenneth B. Farnsworth (2027) Crane and Loy: Exploring Middle Woodland Settlement and Hopewell Interaction in a Tributary Valley. *Midcontinental Journal of Archaeology* 52(1), in press.
- Struever, Stuart (1960) The Kamp Mound Group and a Hopewell Mortuary Complex in the Lower Illinois Valley. Master's thesis, Department of Anthropology, Northwestern University, Evanston.
- Struever, Stuart (1961) Further Excavations at the Snyders Site: An Analysis of Snyders Ceramics. *Central States Archaeological Journal* 8(3):94–100.
- Struever, Stuart (1962) Implications of Vegetal Remains from an Illinois Hopewell Site. *American Antiquity* 27(4):584–587.
- Struever, Stuart (1964) The Hopewell Interaction Sphere in Riverine-Western Great Lakes Culture History. In *Hopewellian Studies*, edited by Joseph R. Caldwell and Robert L. Hall, pp. 85–106. Illinois State Museum Scientific Papers, Vol. 12. Illinois State Museum, Springfield.
- Struever, Stuart (1965) Middle Woodland Culture History in the Great Lakes Riverine Area. *American Antiquity* 31(2):211–223.

- Struever, Stuart (1968a) Problems, Methods and Organization: A Disparity in the Growth of Archaeology. In *Anthropological Archeology in the Americas*, edited by Betty Meggars, pp. 131–151. Anthropological Society of Washington, Washington, DC.
- Struever, Stuart (1968b) Flotation Techniques for the Recovery of Small-Scale Archeological Remains. *American Antiquity* 33(3):353–362.
- Struever, Stuart (1968c) A Re-Examination of Hopewell in Eastern North America. PhD dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Chicago.
- Struever, Stuart (1968d) Woodland Subsistence-Settlement Systems in the Lower Illinois Valley. In *New Perspectives in Archaeology*, edited by Lewis Binford and Sally Binford, pp. 285–313. Aldine, Chicago.
- Struever, Stuart (1971) Comments on Archaeological Data Requirements and Research Strategies. *American Antiquity* 36(1):9–19.
- Struever, Stuart, and Felicia Antonelli Holton (1979) *Koster: Americans in Search of Their Past*. Anchor/Doubleday, Garden City, New York.
- Struever, Stuart, and Gail L. Houart (1972) An Analysis of the Hopewell Interaction Sphere. In *Social Exchange and Interaction*, edited by E. N. Wilmsen, pp. 47–147. University of Michigan Museum of Anthropology Anthropological Papers, 46. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Struever, Stuart, and Kent D. Vickery (1973) The Beginnings of Cultivation in the Midwest-Riverine Area of the United States. *American Anthropologist* 75(5):1197–1220.