

2002

Imprint on the Land: Life Before Camp Hood, 1820-1942, by
William S. Pugsley

Steven D. Smith
University of South Carolina - Columbia, smiths@mailbox.sc.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/anth_facpub



Part of the [Anthropology Commons](#)

Publication Info

Published in *Public Historian*, Volume 24, Issue 3, 2002, pages 72-75.

© [Public Historian](#) 2002, University of California Press.

This Book Review is brought to you by the Anthropology, Department of at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact dillarda@mailbox.sc.edu.

Heath does not stretch what archaeology can contribute to our understanding of antebellum plantations. She explores the location and type of housing for slaves, what people ate, what types of objects were used in daily life, and she adds to the growing literature on the lay-out of plantations throughout the South. Heath also suggests ways in which enslaved people took what they were given and struggled to transform it—houses and yards become sites where slaves worked on their own time, after their labors for Jefferson were done, to build lives for themselves. Heath places this plantation within the context of what scholars have learned about other plantations throughout the South, and in so doing distills the literature on slavery in the antebellum U.S. This book fits squarely within scholarship on power, resistance, and the “peculiar institution” developed over the last twenty years by such scholars as Eugene Genovese, Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, Drew Faust, Mechal Sobel, and Michael Mullins.

Most usefully for educators working in museums and historical societies, Heath provides context and language for a discussion of slave life and slavery as an institution, something that many museums and history societies are struggling with. She encourages the use of the term “enslaved people”; not once does she use the term “servant” to describe forced laborers. In her discussion of work and life, Heath suggests how resistance worked, suggests ways in which enslaved people tried to gain control over aspects of their lives, and suggests how the informal economy of the South afforded slaves money and place in a society that labeled them a commodity. Perhaps this is the best use for *Hidden Lives* (and for the *Jamestown* volumes as well)—as books which provide models for talking about archaeology, colonial settlement, and slavery for a general audience.

JESSICA NEUWIRTH

Historic Deerfield, Inc.

Imprint on the Land: Life Before Camp Hood, 1820-1942 by WILLIAM S. PUGSLEY. Austin, Tex.: Prewitt & Associates, Inc., 2001; xii + 178 pp., tables, maps, illustrations, notes, bibliography; paperbound, no price.

Agriculture and Rural Development on Fort Hood Lands, 1849-1942: National Register Assessments of 710 Historic Archeological Properties by MARTHA DOTY FREEMAN, AMY E. DASE, and MARIE E. BLAKE. Austin, Tex.: Prewitt & Associates, Inc., 2001; xvi + 248 pp., maps, tables, illustrations, references, appendices; paperbound, no price.

Archaeological Investigations and Integrity Assessments of Historic Sites at Fort Hood, Texas by MARIE E. BLAKE. Austin, Tex.: Prewitt & Associates, Inc., 2001; xiv + 246 pp., tables, appendices; paperbound, no price.

Historical Research of 401 Sites at Fort Hood, Bell and Coryell Counties, Texas by RUSSELL B. WARD, MARIE E. BLAKE, AMY E. DASE, and MARTHA DOTY FREEMAN. Austin, Tex.: Prewitt & Associates, Inc., 2000; xviii + 318 pp., references, paperbound, no price.

Historical Research Preliminary to National Register Assessments of 719 Historic Sites at Fort Hood, Bell and Coryell Counties, Texas by JENNIFER A. STABLER. Austin, Tex.: Prewitt & Associates, Inc., 1999; xxx + 550 pp., paperbound, no price.

The Department of Defense probably controls the most land in public ownership. Millions and millions of acres are under its care, and within that department, the United States Army must be the largest service branch landowner. Fort Hood, for instance, covers some 339 square miles. It follows then that the army probably has more archaeological sites under its care than any other federal agency. Since 1966, the National Historic Preservation Act, its amendments, and related cultural resource preservation laws and regulations have driven the army to develop substantial cultural resource management programs at most of its installations. These programs continue year by year to systematically inventory and evaluate archaeological properties for their National Register eligibility. Since the eligibility of an archaeological property is heavily dependent on a site's ability to clearly reveal meaningful information about the past, historic archaeological properties must be assessed not only on the basis of their archaeological matrix, but also on their significance in American history. Many army facilities have seen the usefulness of developing comprehensive and detailed histories of the area encompassing their installations, both for use in evaluating historic archaeological sites, and for the inherent value of preserving regional and local history. These histories are called historic contexts and allow for a logical, systematic method for the evaluation of archaeological properties both individually and collectively. Some army installations (e.g. Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, Fort Polk, Louisiana, Fort Bragg, North Carolina, Fort Huachuca, Arizona, and Fort Benning, Georgia) have taken the opportunity of revising these technical contexts into popular histories for public consumption. Of those that are familiar to this reviewer, Fort Hood's popular history is one of, if not the, best. Fort Hood and archaeological contractor Prewitt and Associates, Inc., of Austin, Texas, are to be congratulated for *Imprint on the Land: Life Before Camp Hood, 1820–1942*, an outstanding example of what can be done to preserve and present local history to the public, an important service that is often ignored as too narrow or particularistic by academics and academic presses.

Imprint on the Land, by William S. Pugsley, is the ripe fruit of the three technical and historic context reports listed above, and the culmination of several years of detailed archival, archaeological, genealogical, and oral historical research focused on the land that is now Fort Hood. Frankly, most of these reports will not be of interest to public historians or academics, being rather dry and deliberate. However, they deserve notice here for the Herculean efforts by Fort Hood's cultural resource managers and Prewitt and Associates Inc., to dig out the historic and archaeological details of 1,120 historic sites associated with the installation. Jennifer Stabler's and Ward et al.'s reports, for instance, develop individual histories for each historic site using deeds, tax records, and

census records. This data is important for site assessments, and though they develop no broad themes or hypotheses, the sheer effort in compiling and organizing this data is a remarkable achievement. Blake's archaeological report follows up on this data with archaeological field work at 85 sites. The report is well prepared and meets the project goals; however, again, there has been no attempt to interpret the archaeological data, which is a disappointment. Yet all three of these reports should be considered raw data, upon which future historians and archaeologists can feast. There are any number of thesis and dissertation topics and syntheses that aspiring graduate students could generate with this information.

Public history and public archaeology must meet three goals to be successful. The first is to identify, assess, and preserve sites. That goal has been met by these reports. The second is to gain knowledge about the past by interpreting the data within modern scholarship. Why else dig a site? Both history and archaeology are not complete until research about the past leads to new knowledge of the past. Here there is still work to do. Hopefully, this suite of reports will lead to scholarly pursuits like theses and dissertations in the future.

While the data developed in the technical reports are not interpreted therein, Freeman, Dase, and Blakes's *Agricultural and Rural Development on Fort Hood Lands* presents the historic contexts for Fort Hood's historic sites and provides the interpretive framework missing from the technical reports. Two broad contexts are identified—"Agricultural Development" and "Rural Development"—constructed within a fine, well-organized National Register evaluation. Within this work are the seeds of a more scholarly historic synthesis. The contexts make good use of the raw data provided by the previous three reports, integrating the data into the broader regional history. *Agricultural and Rural Development* also smoothly blends history and archaeology. From a management standpoint, property types are identified under each context by function. For instance, agricultural sites include ranches and farms as one type, commercial properties as another. Rural development sites include domestic and institutional properties. This allows for evaluation of individual sites within the broader regional context. It is an excellent manner in which to maintain the big picture while managing many sites of diverse function.

Finally, the third goal of public history and archaeology is giving the public back its history. Here Fort Hood's constituents are well rewarded with *Imprint on the Land*. This popular history of Fort Hood is very well written, stimulating, and beautifully formatted. Maps are clear and uncluttered, and it is evident that the interesting photos illustrating the text have been chosen with care. The story is told chronologically, but sidebars highlight topics like farming, harvest time, social life, and churches. Quotes from former residents provide intimacy and humor. This is a well-conceived and wonderful manner in which to present the public their history. Pugsley's goal in *Imprint on the Land* is "to send the curious child in search of more stories, filled with questions about a bygone era, as well as hold safe the memories for those who have yet to

come” (p. 9). That is a worthy goal and is most assuredly met with this book.

Another touch that is appreciated is that the book is endnoted. Oft times popular writers of history do not footnote their work, arguing that it detracts from the text, as if the average reader is easily distracted by referencing. On the other extreme, professional historians sometimes footnote practically each line, as if they are afraid no one will trust them otherwise. Pugsley’s notes and bibliography are balanced, welcomed, and do not detract from the book’s flow. In other words, Pugsley treats the reader as an intelligent human being with an interest in the past. Pugsley has managed to find a way to mix oil and water—he combines academic writing and popular prose and is to be heartily congratulated. Public historians should obtain a copy of this book simply to see how it can be done.

While Pugsley’s effort is the best of these works, ultimately, all contribute in public history’s final goal of presenting history back to the public. I do not know how aware professional historians are of the public’s intense and abiding interest in local history—not so much history interpreted, but history simply presented, and in meticulous detail. But those public historians and archaeologists who have worked on or for military installations know how desired even dry technical reports can be to those associated with the area in question. Past residents of Fort Hood and descendants of past residents will want to pore over each and every page of these reports to learn about the lives their ancestors experienced.

STEVEN D. SMITH

South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology
University of South Carolina

Rocks and Hard Places: Historical Research Study, John Day Fossil Beds National Monument by STEPHEN BOW BECKMAN with FLORENCE K. LENTZ. Seattle: National Park Service, 2000; xii + 254 pp., maps, illustrations, notes, bibliography; paperbound, no price.

The John Day Fossil Beds are well established as an important place in the Pacific Northwest, but most people probably see them as a “science place” rather than a “history place.” Science, however, is one of the central elements of American life and culture, and its history is no less important than the history of wars or politics. In the 140-odd years that we have been studying the fossil records preserved in the John Day hills, the status of the fossil beds has changed for the better. First they were a collecting ground, then a state park, and now they are a national monument. At the same time, the study of fossils has come of age, beginning with the Victorians’ fascination with collecting “curiosities” and blossoming into the contemporary science of paleontology.

Beckham’s *Rocks and Hard Places: Historical Research Study, John Day Fossil Beds National Monument* provides a set of connections between the fossil beds as a special place and the history of the surround-