

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

The Mississippian Emergence. Edited by Bruce D. Smith.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/24c8852t>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 16(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Rogers, J. Daniel

Publication Date

1992

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

The Mississippian Emergence. Edited by Bruce D. Smith. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1990. 280 pages. \$39.95 cloth.

Since the mid-1970s, Bruce D. Smith has repeatedly conducted or facilitated high-quality research addressing some of the fundamental questions in American archeology. Now, as editor of *The Mississippian Emergence*, he again sheds light on one of the elemental concerns in the late prehistory of the eastern United States by bringing together many of the scholars most qualified to present the data and the answers, such as they are. The book reveals how the complex chiefdoms of the Midwest and Southeast evolved from the relatively egalitarian societies of the Woodland Period to the hierarchical societies that built sites like Cahokia in Illinois or Moundville in Alabama; it is about how hunters and gatherers who cultivated native crops on the side became hardcore farmers, in some cases living in urban settings; and it is about how leadership by consensus became leadership by right. These things and more are part of the process implied by the emergence of Mississippian societies over the period from A. D. 750–1050. How increasingly complex societies take shape is certainly an issue that goes beyond the confines of the Eastern Woodlands as one of the central questions for archeology and history everywhere. Whether interested in the broad outlines of cultural evolution or the subtle details of change in diet, readers will find this volume a welcome guidepost for further comparative study.

Following the introduction, Smith has organized the volume's contributions into two major sections. The first section deals with significant individual sites or site complexes, while the second is concerned with regions and cross-regional issues. These sections are not meant to be geographically or topically comprehensive but rather to provide a certain level of detail for particular key sites and regions. Several of the chapters make available the essential information from selected sites and regions that is needed for a long-term evaluation and rethinking of the Mississippian Period. The first section (chapters 2 to 5) includes authoritative essays by John House on excavations at Powell Canal site, by Martha Ann Rolingson on the Toltec site, by Phyllis and Dan F. Morse on the Zebree site, and by John E. Kelly on the Range site. Each of these chapters provides information on environment, culture history, and relevant details on important sites.

In the next section (chapters 6 to 11), the authors broaden their focus to the regional scale and provide interpretive statements linking specific data to the variables considered significant in the rise of social complexity. In chapter 6, John Kelly expands his evaluation of the Range site to a discussion of the American Bottom region, along with a review of past and current theories of cultural development. Because of the unusual quantity and quality of information from this region, Kelly is able to explore detailed changes within a tight chronological framework. In chapter 7, Dan and Phyllis Morse examine information for the central Mississippi Valley. In chapter 8, Gerald F. Schroedl, C. Clifford Boyd, Jr., and R. P. Stephen Davis, Jr. review the relevant information on Mississippian origins for eastern Tennessee, paying particular attention to issues of chronology. In chapter 9, Paul D. Welch considers data from the central Tombigbee River area, the Moundville area, and the Bessemer area, all in west-central Alabama. John F. Scarry conducts a similar review in chapter 10 of the Fort Walton area in Florida, with particular attention to the Cayson and Lake Jackson phases. Scarry's chapter is especially interesting, because it constitutes the most detailed model in the book for chiefdom development, integrating stress-related subsistence change with control of information by chiefs.

The final chapter, by James A. Brown, Richard A. Kerber, and Howard D. Winters, is particularly well suited to round things out. Unlike the other region-focused chapters, they address the issue of trade in general, something widely acknowledged as playing a role in the Mississippian emergence. Their discussion is couched in a well-thought-out and innovative theoretical approach that relies on the notion of a prestige goods economy. Such an approach has rarely been used in eastern United States archeology but has much potential to explain variation in the historical trajectories of different regions, since it does not rely on the notion of increasingly centralized control to explain chiefdom development. Instead, hierarchy is seen as a consequence of differential allocation of socially important trade valuables, rather than as a response to controlling agricultural or other types of production. Most of the authors see population increase and the related necessity of controlling access to land and other limited resources as causal (although Paul Welch's argument does deviate from this general theme). In the contrasting prestige goods approach advocated by James Brown and colleagues, families compete to acquire wealth to achieve

the highest possible social levels. Clearly, the Mississippian is a time of extensive trade in prestige goods, and it is reasonable to believe that these items are significant in developing and maintaining the complex hierarchies that took shape across the Midwest and Southeast.

This volume provides access to a number of insights developed over the last few years by the intensive work conducted in various regions. Considering the wide variety of information presented, probably the single most important contribution of this volume is that it allows recognition of variability in the cause-and-effect role of traits once thought synonymous with the Mississippian and its origins. For instance, Dan and Phyllis Morse discount environmental change as causal to subsistence or social changes, while several authors note that maize had been around for centuries and that increases in its use do not necessarily correspond with the Mississippian emergence. The same kind of variability goes for two other hallmarks of the Mississippian—shell-tempered ceramics and platform mounds. In some areas, shell-tempered ceramics span the range from the Woodland through the Mississippian periods (e.g., eastern Tennessee), yet, in another area (Fort Walton region), this technological innovation remains relatively insignificant through the Mississippian Period.

This book is a very useful compilation of information and an even more useful launching pad for ideas about the formation of complex societies and, indeed, archeology's very ability to provide answers that can stand the test of changing theoretical fashions. Interpreting the Mississippian emergence is more difficult than describing it, and some authors were hampered by lack of information. In many areas, details for the A. D. 750–1050 time range are hard to come by; this scarcity of data is well noted by several authors who were forced to base their interpretations on limited excavation results. John Scarry observes in chapter 10 that in many areas we are just now at the point of being able to test models of chiefdom development. The lack of information is largely due to a long-standing deemphasis of the Late Woodland and Early Mississippian periods, although this book and other recently published efforts such as *Stability, Transformation and Variation: The Late Woodland Southeast*, edited by Michael S. Nassaney and Charles R. Cobb (Plenum, 1991), are bringing renewed attention to these critical periods.

It is not possible for any one volume to cover all the relevant issues, although Bruce Smith has done an admirable job of assem-

bling key, thought-provoking chapters. These chapters should serve a wide audience and become part of the necessary building blocks that will allow the development of broader, and perhaps more realistic, theories of chiefdom development.

J. Daniel Rogers
Smithsonian Institution

The Dispossession of the American Indian, 1887–1934. By Janet A. McDonnell. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1991. 163 pages. \$20.00 cloth.

Thoughtful critics of Indian policy such as Janet McDonnell correctly characterize the treaties of land cession and the allotment of Indian lands as *dispossession*. In the nineteenth century, when Indians were separated from millions of acres of territory and forced to live on marginal reservations, dispossession, however perceived as legal, could be interpreted as the “spoils” of conquest and colonization. Subsequently, the nation made promises to the tribes, who complied with governmental wishes to relocate and assist them in redirecting their lives. But just as soon as the government abrogated the policy of treaty-making, it moved boldly (arrogantly?) toward a new goal—in effect, the transformation of Indians into whites who would now embrace the culture of the dominant society and forsake tribal lifeways.

The traditional view holds that policymakers and friends of the Indians mistakenly but honorably believed the route to this bold new world was the conversion of tribal lands into homesteads (allotments). Policymakers embraced the notion that private property possessed some magical force that would lead to the acculturation of indigenous people to the ways of Western culture. Begun in earnest with the Dawes (Severalty) Act of 1887, the process lasted legally until 1934, when it was replaced by the Indian Reorganization Act. However, the impact of allotment remains with us today. Not only did it lead to the alienation of tribal patrimony—from about 138,000,000 acres to 52,000,000 acres—but it frustrated and/or disrupted the modicum of successful Indian land use by fragmenting landholdings through inheritance, by necessitating dependence on the leasing of land, and by causing landlessness of individual Indians through sale of allotments, as well as out-migration from reservations. The results