NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARKS PROGRAM

WARNING

THIS FILE CONTAINS INFORMATION THAT IS RESTRICTED FROM PUBLIC ACCESS PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF 54 U.S.C. 307107 (formerly Section 304 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended).

THIS DOCUMENTATION OR AND PROVISIONS THEREOF MAY BE VIEWED OR REPRODUCED ONLY WITH THE PERMISSION OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR ACTING THROUGH THE KEEPER OF THE NATIONAL REGISTER OR HIS/HER AUTHORIZED DESIGNEE.

FILE (PROPERTY) Name: Fort Ouiatenon Archeological District

Location – State: Indiana

Location – County/Parish: Tippecanoe

1. NAME AND LOCATION OF PROPERTY

Historic Name: Fort Ouiatenon

Other Name/Site Number: Fort Ouiatenon Archeological District; Post Ouiatenon; Ouiatenon / 12T9

Street and Number (if applicable)**:** S. River Road

City/Town: West Lafayette **County:** Tippecanoe **State:** Indiana

2. SIGNIFICANCE DATA

NHL Criteria: 1, 6

NHL Criteria Exceptions: 3

NHL Theme(s):

I. Peopling Places
- 3. Migration from Outside and Within
- 5. Ethnic Homelands
- 6. Encounters, Conflicts, and Colonization

V. Developing the American Economy
- 1. Extraction and Production
- 6. Exchange and Trade

VIII. The Changing Role of the United States in the World Community
- 1. International Relations
- 3. Expansionism and Imperialism

Period(s) of Significance: 1717-1791

Significant Person(s) (only Criterion 2)**:** N/A

Cultural Affiliation (only Criterion 6)**:** French, British, Wea (Ouiatenon), Piankeshaw, Mascouten, Kickapoo

Designer/Creator/Architect/Builder: N/A

Historic Contexts:

I. Cultural Developments: Indigenous American Populations.
- D. Ethnohistory of Indigenous American Populations.
  - 1. Native Cultural Adaptations at Contact.

DRAFT

i. Native Adaptations to Northeastern Environments.
2. Establishing Intercultural Relations
e. Defending Native Homelands.
i. Trading Relationships.
3. Varieties of Early Conflict, Conquest, or Accommodation.
b. Forced and Voluntary Population Movements
2. The Changing Cultural Geography of the Northeast.
3. New Inter- and Intragroup Alliances.
II. European Colonial Exploration and Settlement.
B. French Exploration and Settlement
2. St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes.
C. English Exploration and Settlement.
III. Development of the English Colonies, 1688-1763.
A. Physical Development.
2. Territorial Expansion.
C. Military Affairs.

3. WITHHOLDING SENSITIVE INFORMATION

Does this nomination contain sensitive information that should be withheld under Section 304 of the National Historic Preservation Act?

_X_ Yes

___ No

4. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

1. Acreage of Property: 212.5

2. Use either Latitude/Longitude Coordinates or the UTM system:

Latitude/Longitude Coordinates:
Datum if other than WGS84:
(enter coordinates to 6 decimal places)

Latitude: **Longitude:**

OR

DRAFT

UTM References:	Zone	Easting	Northing	NAD83
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	

3. **Verbal Boundary Description**:

[redacted]

4. **Boundary Justification:** The district boundary conforms to the land parcels owned and operated as an archeological preserve by the Tippecanoe County Historical Association of Lafayette, Indiana, and The Archaeological Conservancy, a national not-for-profit organization based in Albuquerque, New Mexico, and dedicated to the preservation of endangered archeological properties. Other Historic period archeological sites, perhaps related, are known outside these boundaries, but it was felt that limiting the district to those proximate sites that can be protected was prudent and practical. The core property is the site of Fort Ouiatenon, with some 19 adjacent native sites to the immediate north rounding out the extent of the archeological district.

DRAFT

5. SIGNIFICANCE STATEMENT AND DISCUSSION

INTRODUCTION: SUMMARY STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

The site of Fort Ouiatenon is nationally significant for its association with the momentous struggle for colonial empire that played out during the early decades of the 18th century in what is now the United States. Perceptions of the European incursion into North America are often dominated by the establishment of British colonies along the eastern seaboard that eventually became the 13 original states of America. But, at about the same time the Mayflower landed at Plymouth Rock, a young Frenchman named Etienne Brule was on the shore of Lake Superior, some 1,000 miles west in the North American interior. The Great Lakes region played a pivotal role in the struggle for empire in North America. The French established a foothold in the western Great Lakes by virtue of a handful of outposts and, importantly, through trading partnerships with Native groups in the region. Between the latter part of the 17th century and the end of the French period in 1763, the French developed a far-flung network of posts across the Upper Great Lakes region. Some of the posts were active throughout the French period and served as logistical bases of operations for the fur trade—and as crucial nodes of French presence in the interior. Fort Ouiatenon was a critical location in the widely dispersed French network of posts in the western Great Lakes and lands immediately south of the lakes.

Not only was Ouiatenon important for its essential role as a local distribution center in the French fur trade of North America, in its later years—after the British held dominion in the region—it also figured prominently as the scene of preliminary negotiations that would eventually bring calm to what came to be known as Pontiac's Rebellion. Further, its destruction at the close of the 18th century, when the largely abandoned stockade was used as a staging ground for Native American raiding parties on white settlements in the region, was a direct result of American expansion into lands west of the Alleghenies and attendant military efforts to secure this region for continued American settlement.

No discernible trace of this 18th-century fortification remains above ground today, but the site of Fort Ouiatenon is also nationally significant for its important contributions to knowledge of the period gained through many years of intensive archeological field research. Moreover, the archaeological site retains substantial potential to add to our growing knowledge of French, British, and Native American interaction on the North American frontier. Data derived from the site have already produced a master's thesis, five doctoral dissertations, and dozens of other publications that shed light on the dynamics of this critical era in the emergence of our nation state. Furthermore, since only about 10% of the known site area has been scientifically investigated to date, there remains considerable potential for significant research outcomes in the future.

It is also worth noting that nearly 20 Native American occupation sites of varying size are now known to be present in the flood plain immediately north of the Fort Ouiatenon site. The presence of these villages was directly associated with the fur trade that was carried out at Ouiatenon throughout much of the eighteenth century. It is not certain what tribal groups occupied particular villages, but it is known that many closely related tribes gathered in the Ouiatenon vicinity during the Fur Trade Era—among them the Piankeshaw, the Mascouten, the Kickapoo, and especially the Wea (or Ouiatenon, as the French called them) who were the namesake for the French installation. Further documentary research or tribal oral traditions may yet provide information about these resources.

Accordingly, the Fort Ouiatenon Archeological District, comprising the fort and adjacent associated occupation sites, is eligible for designation as a National Historic Landmark for its association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad national patterns of United States history (NHL Criterion 1) in consideration of Exception 3 (the site of a building or structure no longer standing). The Fort Ouiatenon archeological site itself is also eligible for having yielded information of major scientific importance and for its potential to yield additional research data affecting theories, concepts, and ideas to a major degree (NHL Criterion 6). Further, the proximate associated village sites have the potential to inform archeological researchers on key characteristics of native groups of the region during the burgeoning Fur Trade Era. Those qualities make the Fort Ouiatenon Archaeological District an exceptional place with the power to produce a much greater understanding and enhanced appreciation of the early development of this nation. Among the applicable National Historic Landmark themes aptly illustrated here are "Peopling Places," "Developing the American Economy," and "The Changing Role of the United States in the World Community."

Fort Ouiatenon's primary area of historical significance relates to its role as a local center of commerce in the fur trade, from the time that the French established it in 1717 through the shift of regional hegemony to British hands in the early 1760s. Few notable events and little official trade occurred at the site after it played a key part in the momentous 1763 peace talks between British and Native American representatives that ultimately brought an end to Pontiac's Rebellion. Nevertheless, the Ouiatenon vicinity continued to be an important place of settlement for native peoples and, to a lesser degree, the few French *habitants* who remained in the vicinity despite the withdrawal of their military support system. This was true for almost another 30 years, when what

DRAFT

was left of the old stockade and most of the nearby Native villages were destroyed at the hands of American expeditionary forces who waged a punitive campaign against the various Indian tribes in this immediate area in 1791. Therefore, Fort Ouiatenon's principal period of significance is nearly three-quarters of a century, bracketed by the years 1717-1791. The main period of occupation for the nearby Native villages doubtless falls within that same time frame.

Outline of Historical Events

Fort Ouiatenon was one link in the great chain of fortified trading posts that once stretched across the Old Northwest. The French first came to this place on the Wabash, in 1717, to secure their trade with the local Wea (Ouiatenon) Indians whose main village stood on the opposite bank. The Wea, in fact, requested that a military officer and a missionary be sent to their village. Governmental powers at Quebec hoped that they could soon persuade the Wea to relocate to a more controllable position near Lake Michigan, but ultimately they were thwarted in that ambition. Accordingly, in order to protect this tenuous alliance against British rivalry, the French firmly established themselves at Ouiatenon, thereby founding the first European settlement in what is now Indiana.

The Wabash River proved in time to be a strategic avenue for the French, providing an efficient water route between their two major strongholds in North America—New France (French Canada) to the north and Louisiana to the south. In a British report to King George I, dated September 8, 1721, and prepared by the Lords Commissioners for Trade and Plantations to the King (i.e., the British Board of Trade), the Maumee-Wabash Portage, located near what is now the city of Ft. Wayne, Indiana, is described as the shortest water route from French Canada to the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico below (idiosyncratic spelling and capitalization in the following quotation, and all other direct quotations used in this nomination, appear as in the original):

> From this lake [Erie] to the Mississippi they [the French] have three different routs. The shortest by water is up the river Miamis, or Ouamis [Maumee River], on the south west of Lake Erie, on which river they sail about 150 leagues without interruption, when they find themselves stoped by another landing, of about three leagues, which they call a carrying place, because they are generally obliged to carry their canoes over land, in those places to the next river; and that where they next embark is a very shallow one, called La Riviere de portage [St. Mary's River]; hence they row about 40 leagues to the river Ouabache [Wabash], and from thence about 120 leagues to the river Ohio, into which the Ouabache falls as the river Ohio does about 80 leagues lower into the Mississippi, which continues its course about 150 leagues directly to the Bay of Mexico. [Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collections 1892:5]

In the early Historic period, Fort Ouiatenon was the first stopping place of consequence as one traveled from the north along that interior water route, located as it was about three days' paddle by canoe from the Maumee-Wabash Portage at modern-day Ft. Wayne. To solidify control of this important waterway, the French would eventually establish additional fortifications on the riverway both above and below Ouiatenon. In 1722, they established St. Philippe des Miamis (Ft. Miami) near the portage north of Ouiatenon. Below Ouiatenon, about half the distance downstream to the Ohio River confluence, the French established Fort Vincennes in 1732. In fact, Lieutenant Francois-Marie Bissot (1700-1736), son

DRAFT

of Jean-Baptiste Bissot and heir to the title Sieur de Vincennes, transferred from his posting at Fort Ouiatenon to establish the new fortification (and, later, the city) that would come to bear his name.

The importance of Fort Ouiatenon as a fur-trading installation grew as each decade passed, and its commerce attracted more native peoples, such as the Piankeshaw, the Mascouten, and the Kickapoo, to settle in villages around the post until the immediate environs around Ouiatenon came to be home to nearly 3,000. Archeological evidence clearly indicates that at one time the stockade perimeter was enlarged by a significant factor, but there is nothing in the documentary record or yet uncovered in the archeological record to suggest when that expansion of the enclosed area occurred. This physical growth probably reflects a combination of factors, including increased numbers of French residents at Ouiatenon, greater numbers of fur traders regularly passing through the region, and perhaps a much larger volume of trade goods requiring temporary storage prior to distribution or shipment. Recent archeological investigations in the field north of the fur-trading post site demonstrate the presence of several village sites that are part of this district nomination.

French interests in the region were to be defeated elsewhere, however, as a consequence of the French and Indian War of 1754-1761, in which the British vied against the French and their native allies for control of North America (the British, of course, had native allies of their own). Known also as the Seven Years' War, this episode of recurrent French-British conflict eventually spread from North America to Europe in 1756, where it can be viewed as an extension of the War of the Austrian Succession (1740-1748)—a conflict that engaged all of the major powers on that side of the Atlantic.

Most of the military engagements in the French and Indian War occurred about the easternmost Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River valley (e.g., Pennsylvania, New York, Ontario, Quebec, and the Fortress of Louisbourg in Nova Scotia). The Siege of Quebec in the late summer and fall of 1759 was a turning point in the war, after which British forces seized control of most major French cities and forts in North America. Ultimately resolved for the North American theater under the Treaty of Paris (1763), the French ceded Canada and its holdings east of the Mississippi to the victorious British. Soon thereafter, Fort Ouiatenon and all other French installations were subject to British hegemony. Late in 1761, Lt. Edward Jenkins brought a garrison of 15 British soldiers from Detroit to take control of Ouiatenon.

Within two years, however, the British garrison at Fort Ouiatenon fell to the general native uprising of 1763 that has been termed Pontiac's Rebellion by some. Ouiatenon was surrendered without bloodshed after the commandant had been taken hostage by natives feigning illness in one of the neighboring villages.

In a letter dated June 1, 1763, Lieutenant Edward Jenkins wrote from his post at Fort Ouiatenon to Major Henry Gladwin, commanding at Detroit:

> Sir: I have heared of your situation which gives me much pain, indeed we are not a great deal better, for this morning the Indians sent for me to speak with me, & immediately bound me when I got to their cabbin, & I soon found some of my soldiers in the same situation. They told me Detroit, Miamis and all these Posts were cutt off, and that it was a folly to make any resistance, therefor desired me to make the few soldiers I had in the Fort surrender, otherwise they would put all of us to death in case one man of theirs was killed. They were to have fallen on us and killed us all last Night, but Monsieurs Maisonville & Lorrain, gave them Wampum not to kill us all, and when they told the Interpreter we were all to be killed & he knowing the Canadians of

DRAFT

> the Fort beged of them to make us Prisoners. They have put us into the French houses and both Indians and French use us very well. All these Nations Say they are very sorry, that they were obliged to do it by the other Nations. The belt did not arrive here till last night about Eight o'clock; Mr. Lorrain can inform you of all. Just now received the news of St. Joseph's being taken, eleven were killed and three taken Prisoners with the officer; I have succour, & nothing more to say but that I sincerely wish you a speedy that we may be able to revenge ourselves on them that deserve it. I remain with my sincerest wishes for your safety, &c., N. B. We expect to set off in a day or two for the Illinois. [DeHart 1909:48]

Pontiac himself came to the post in 1765 to negotiate with British Indian agent George Croghan, who had been captured elsewhere and brought to Ouiatenon against his will. Though the hostilities were eventually resolved, and a peace was made, the British never regarrisoned Ouiatenon, as their concerns by then had shifted to less remote and more militarily defensible positions in their North American empire. Thereafter, the stockade was left to French *habitants* and *coureuers des bois*, who continued to carry on a much-diminished trade with their Indian friends and partners. Even those stalwarts, however, would eventually abandon the aging post for safer surroundings in the late 1780s as native unrest again was on the rise.

In the closing decades of the 18th century, Ouiatenon was used often as a haven for native raiding parties allied with the British who continually harassed encroaching American settlements of the Ohio Country. Finally, to preclude further use of the Wabash Valley as a staging ground for such raids, President George Washington, through Secretary of War Henry Knox, ordered the undertaking of a punitive military campaign in the region. General Charles Scott, a former Virginian and Revolutionary War hero, who was later elected the fourth governor of Kentucky in 1808, was sent to attack Indian villages along the Wabash and, particularly, those about the old fur-trading post at Ouiatenon. Leading a force of officers and mounted Kentucky militia, numbering 800, Scott attacked Ouiatenon and its nearby Indian villages in the spring of 1791. The expeditionary force crossed the Ohio River on May 23rd and descended on the villages near the old post on June 1st, presumably including those that are part of this archeological district nomination. When the natives took flight, Colonel James Wilkinson gave chase, killing or capturing many, and then presumably burned what was left of the aged stockade and buildings, its neighboring native villages, and their cornfields to the ground, bringing to a close the occupation of Fort Ouiatenon and its several villages in the immediate vicinity. Wilkinson then returned in the autumn of the year to burn the replanted crops and again rout the Native villagers. The raid on Ouiatenon and its environs is considered today to be among the most significant American campaigns in the Indian Wars of the Old Northwest Territory (1784-1794).

Comparative Context: Fortifications

Fort Michimackinac NHL

The archeological site most comparable in the Midwest region to Fort Ouiatenon is the site of Fort Michilimackinac, which was designated an NHL in 1964. Although not nominated at the time for its archeological research significance, Michilimackinac has been the subject of intensive field excavations every summer since 1959, and is most certainly one of the most extensively investigated Historic period archeological sites of any age in all of North America.

Located at the tip of Michigan's Lower Peninsula, on the south shore of the Straits of Mackinac, Fort

DRAFT

Michilimackinac held a strategic position along this historically important five-mile water passage connecting lakes Michigan and Huron. During the 17th and 18th centuries, the Straits were crucial from both a military and commercial standpoint, as the region was critical to conduct of the fur trade in this part of the world. Believed to have been founded by the French in 1715, a few years after the close of Queen Anne's War, the outpost soon established itself as an important regional distribution center of the interior fur trade. It was felt that a post was needed at the Straits in order to discourage competition for furs from the Hudson's Bay Company farther north, to control activities of the *coureurs des bois* (independent unlicensed fur traders), to cement alliances with the local Native Americans, and to serve as a base of operations for fur trading. The original French post is thought to have been a rather small, square enclosure with bastions, having a mission, two guard houses, and a 40-ft-long structure that housed personnel, but by 1760 the stockaded enclosure had tripled in area reflecting growth of the trade and its associated infrastructure (Stone 1974:8).

The French garrison at Michilimackinac, in the years 1715-1760, had only a limited military mission and instead was tasked chiefly with protecting the trade at this establishment. As was the case with Fort Ouiatenon, events elsewhere defeated the French at Michilimackinac. With the end of the French and Indian War (1744-1761), control of the Upper Great Lakes fell to the British, and the fort was surrendered to the 80th Regiment in September of 1761. French *habitants* were permitted to remain in the area, however, and continued to carry on trade with the local Native American population much as they had always done. Unlike the French, the British who took command at Michilimackinac maintained it more as a military installation than as a trading post or fortified settlement (Stone 1974:8-9).
Fort Michilimackinac also fell into the hands of Native Americans during the so-called Great Uprising or Pontiac's Rebellion, but here it was not a bloodless coup. To the contrary, 21 of the 35 British soldiers stationed there, and one British trader, were killed on June 2, 1763; survivors were later led away by friendly Ottawa and escaped to the safety of Montreal. Not until 1764 did the British again garrison the fort. Much of the British effort after that time was spent in repairing or rebuilding key structures that were no longer serviceable, such as some barracks and the powder magazine. The end ultimately came for Fort Michilimackinac in the winter of 1780/1781, when most of the stockade and its buildings were dismantled and moved to a more defensible position on nearby Mackinac Island (Stone 1974:10-12).

Although visible traces of the fortification site were soon lost among the shifting sands of the Straits of Mackinac shore, the position of old Fort Michilimackinac was not forgotten. Indeed, relic hunting at the site became something of a recreational activity among local residents and visitors to the area in the 19th century. By the mid-20th century, however, the historic importance of this site became widely apparent, and the State of Michigan initiated efforts to reconstruct the fort as part of a major heritage tourism undertaking. As part of the Michilimackinac reconstruction program, archeological investigations were begun in the summer of 1959 (Maxwell and Binford 1961). The early years of excavation produced such a wealth of artifacts that Lyle Stone (1974) devised a major classification scheme for the assemblage, which has since served as a means of identifying and dating material culture from similar sites in North America, including Fort Ouiatenon. Excavations in more recent years have focused on various structures at the fort, such as the powder magazine (Heldman and Minnerly 1977), a trading house (Heldman 1986), and various other residential structures that together formed rowhouses within the stockade (Evans 2001; Halchin 1985; Heldman 1977 and 1978; Heldman and Grange 1981). These investigations have combined to make Fort Michilimackinac one of the most important sites in North America for interpreting the 18th-century French and British colonial experience through archeology (Heldman 1991).

DRAFT

Grand Portage National Monument

Located on Lake Superior in extreme northeastern Minnesota, not far from the Canadian border, is Grand Portage National Monument, which includes two sites that can be productively compared with Fort Ouiatenon: the Grand Portage Depot, on the lakeshore, and Fort Charlotte, at the terminus of a 9-mile portage from the lake to a navigable section of the Pigeon River. The former has been subject to intensive archeological investigations since the 1930s as part of a reconstruction program, whereas the latter is near pristine and has seen little more than detailed mapping of surface features and limited archeological testing in recent years.

Pierre Boucher is credited with providing the earliest descriptions of this vicinity in 1664, but there is no specific mention of the Grand Portage (or "Great Carrying Place") until it appears in Pierre Margary's chronicles of 1722. It is likely, however, that other French explorers, such as Groseilliers, Radisson, and Du Luth, were well aware of this important link between Lake Superior and Rainy Lake in the mid-17th century and understood its great potential as a transportation route to the interior and its wealth of fur-bearing animals. Certainly native peoples of the region were intimately acquainted with this land route around the Pigeon River rapids long before the arrival of Europeans (Woolworth 1969:7-9; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982:22).

With the establishment of Fort St. Pierre on Rainy Lake in 1732 and Fort St Charles on Lake of the Woods soon thereafter, French traders traversed the Grand Portage with greater regularity. There is no good documentary evidence, however, that the French ever established a permanent trading post or settlement at either end of the portage. It seems likely that there would have been some sort of storage facilities on the lakeshore and at the Pigeon River terminus, but the historical record is silent on this question (Blegen 1975:57; Woolworth and Woolworth 1982:26-30).

After resolution of the French and Indian War transferred control of the upper Great Lakes to the British, Grand Portage took on even greater importance in the fur trade. By 1768, John Askin, a trader from Michilimackinac, had cleared land and erected buildings to service his interests. Then, by 1783, a merger of several trading concerns resulted in creation of the North West Company, and thereafter Grand Portage became the primary entrepot for trade to the northwestern interior with substantial infrastructure at the lakeshore. The trade flourished at Grand Portage in the 1790s, such that the lakeside depot consisted of a stockade surrounding 16 buildings, and the waterfront had wharves and docks that could accommodate a 95-ton schooner.

At about this time, also, Fort Charlotte was built on the Pigeon River end of the portage to facilitate the transfer of furs and trade goods. Indeed, the trade was so lucrative by this time that the competing XY Company established a second post on the Lake Superior shore in 1797-1798. Within seven years that concern had been absorbed by the North West Company, but by that time much of the trade had moved north across the international boundary to Fort William, which was established in 1802 after a boundary survey showed Grand Portage to lie within U.S. territory. Although smaller American concerns kept the trade alive at Grand Portage into the early decades of the 19th century, by the 1830s it was no longer a viable route to the interior reaches (Blegen 1975:72-73, 81).

The first archaeological investigations at the Grand Portage Depot were conducted by the Minnesota Historical Society and began in 1936 under the direction of Ralph D. Brown. The emphasis that first

DRAFT

summer was an attempt to delineate the stockade through the use of exploratory trenches. This enabled near total excavation of the stockade prior to its reconstruction. Brown continued work at the site in 1937 locating numerous features, including the Great Hall and other buildings inside the stockade (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982:225-228).

Investigations at Grand Portage did not resume until well after the site became a National Monument in 1954. In the summer of 1961, Eldon Johnson directed a field school for the University of Minnesota east of the Depot. James Stoltman excavated a series of exploratory trenches near the northeastern Monument boundary in August of that year, and Alan Woolworth continued work in that same area in September. All of this field work was performed to gather information for NPS management purposes (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982:230-233).

Woolworth expanded his investigations over the next three years, working outside the depot in 1962, and then around and within the structure in 1963, 1964, 1970 and 1971. Focusing on the Great Hall and a nearby kitchen building, more exploratory excavations were conducted by Woolworth in 1973 and 1975 in search of fur-trade related structures outside the depot (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982: 241-255).

Since that time, most archeological investigations at Grand Portage National Monument have been carried out by NPS personnel primarily for management purposes and compliance with section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (Monk 1986; Lynott 1988; Noble 1989 and 1990; Volf 2002; Sturdevant 2006 and 2009a). In addition there has been increasing interest in Fort Charlotte. Several recent projects focused on the mapping of surface features and limited testing (Sturdevant 2009b and 2010; LaBounty 2010; Sturdevant et al. 2017), building upon earlier work at the Pigeon River terminus of the portage trail (Jones 1980). The recent work also augments underwater archeological investigations carried out in the Pigeon River near Fort Charlotte mostly during the early 1970s under the auspices of the Minnesota Historical Society (Wheeler et al. 1975; Birk 1975).

Comparative Contexts: Native Villages

St. Ignace Mission NHL (Marquette Mission Site)

In the mid-1600s, the Huron were dispersed from their traditional homeland near Georgian Bay of Lake Huron. One group of them, the Tionontate (Petun) traveled as far west as Wisconsin, and relocated frequently, owing to continued pressures from the Iroquois, Sioux, and other native groups. Pushed east again, after 1665, from the mission at Chequamegon at the western end of Lake Superior, the Tionontate eventually settled on the northern shore of the Straits of Mackinac (present-day St Ignace) in 1671—where Father Marquette would soon establish a mission. They remained in a village there for some 30 years, actively engaged in the fur trade, until they were persuaded to move some 300 miles south with Cadillac's founding of Detroit in 1701.

The specific location of the mission and associated villages was not known until a farmer turned up tantalizing evidence of an early Historic period occupation in 1877. The Reverend Edward Jacker explored the site soon thereafter in hopes of confirming it to be the mission complex, and by the turn of the century a monument had been erected and a city park set aside to commemorate Father Marquette's famous mission. Today, the park is situated among commercial and residential developments in the town

DRAFT

of St. Ignace, Michigan.

The St. Ignace Mission, also known in the archeological literature as the Marquette Mission site, has been subject to archeological investigations intermittently since 1971. Site number 20MK82 was assigned to the alleged Marquette Mission site, which has never been confirmed archeologically, and site number 20MK99 is the number assigned to the adjacent and overlapping native village site, which has been the subject of numerous excavations and is very well known archeologically. The first professional excavations carried out at the site were conducted under the auspices of the Mackinac Island State Park Commission in 1971 and 1972 (Stone 1972; Fitting 1976a). That field work sought to gather basic information on the extent and character of the native occupation associated with the mission. A third season in 1973, funded by the Michigan History Division, focused on the remains of a longhouse and other major cultural features (Fitting 1976b). A decade later, in 1983, work resumed at the site, and more extensive investigations were carried out there over the next several years by staff and students from Michigan State University (Branstner 1984, 1985, 1986, 1991 and 1992). Dr. Jodie O'Gorman (2003), also of Michigan State University, carried out more recent work at the site in 2001.

Archeological evidence from the Tionontate (Petun) village suggests that cultural continuity was still strong for this group of the Huron tribe through the end of the 17th century. Artifacts recovered at the site reveal that not only were many traditional items retained in the material culture assemblage, but also many European items were adapted for traditional uses (e.g., projectile points were flaked from fragments of bottle glass and worn brass kettles were cut into articles of adornment). Other evidence related to subsistence practices and settlement patterning also points to the persistence of Huron cultural identity despite rapidly changing conditions. As the late Susan Branstner (1991 and 1992) concluded in her study of the post-contact native site, the Huron seem to have readily incorporated exotic trade goods into their daily routine without having become dependent on them exclusively. Further, they appear to have adopted certain elements of Christian ritual without entirely abandoning their own systems of belief and cultural traditions.

Old Kaskaskia Village NHL (Grand Village of the Illinois, Zimmerman Site)

Located on the north bank of the Illinois River, near Utica between the modern-day towns of LaSalle and Ottawa, Illinois, is the site known as Old Kaskaskia Village (an NHL), which was the Grand Village of the Illinois visited by Jacques Marquette and Louis Jolliet while ascending the Illinois River via the lower Mississippi River during their storied explorations of 1673. Within sight of the distinctive and massive landform called Starved Rock (also an NHL), where René-Robert Cavelier, Sieur de LaSalle (sometimes called Robert de La Salle), and Henri de Tonti (sometimes spelled Tonty) would establish Fort St. Louis a decade later. The village included 73 cabins occupied by Kaskaskia Indians, a branch of the great Illinois Confederacy. Occupied by various peoples before and after the momentous visit of Marquette and Jolliet, the site—better known in the archeological literature as the Zimmerman site (11LS13)—is today an archeological preserve (not open to the public) managed by the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency.

The site was initially investigated in 1947 as a joint endeavor of the University of Chicago and the Illinois State Museum. James A. Brown (1961) would later prepare a report of those investigations from the field records of the original excavators. Three more seasons of excavation would follow in the 1970s under the auspices of the LaSalle County Historical Society (M. K. Brown 1975). Then, in 1991, after state acquisition of the archeological site in that year, more intensive examinations of the site were

DRAFT

undertaken in field seasons conducted there each year through the summer of 1996 (Rohrbaugh et al. 1998).

As with many early Historic period Native American villages, archeological evidence shows that this spot on the Illinois River was occupied periodically long before Europeans entered the region. A major pre-contact component is associated with the Healy phase, which roughly dates to the second half of the 13th century. Although it cannot be shown that the early Historic period occupants are direct descendants of those who occupied the site in pre-contact times, Brown (1961) notes that there are substantial differences between the two site assemblages. Houses, storage pits, and other cultural features also differ in size and shape between the two occupations, and subsistence activities seem to shift from one that was balanced between agriculture and small-animal hunting to one that focused more on the communal hunting of bison.

Criterion 1: Events Associated with Broad National Patterns

National Historic Landmark Themes:

Peopling Places

As one of several outposts on the 18th-century North American frontier, Fort Ouiatenon relates directly to the expansion of European settlement into the vast interior reaches of the continent. The site also directly relates to population movements among several Native American tribal groups, and especially to French efforts to control their patterns of settlement in order to solidify influence over them and maintain stronger trading alliances. Ouiatenon was preceded by only a handful of similar trading establishments in the region that has become known as the Old Northwest—for example, Fort Michilimackinac, and it was the first European settlement in what is now Indiana. Originally intended as a temporary outpost, the fort instead was fated to become a magnet for native peoples, drawing diverse groups from their traditional homelands elsewhere in the region to the banks of the Wabash River where they interacted with the French (and later the British) as well as with each other.

The intrusion of Europeans into the Wabash Valley brought about radical changes in native settlement patterns, and the encounters ultimately brought about a profound transformation of native social and economic systems. Not surprisingly, the demands of the fur trade, as well as the movements of different peoples, increased competition among the tribes and increased the prospect of conflict with the Europeans and among themselves. Relations with the French were fairly amicable, but the same was not always true of native relations with the British in this quarter. Native discontent with British policies after the conclusion of the French and Indian War (1754-1761) ultimately contributed to the rise of Pontiac and other Indian leaders who took arms against them in widespread rebellion, ultimately capturing Ouiatenon and seven other British fortifications.

Ouiatenon would later play a role in native attempts to thwart American settlement in the lands west of the Alleghenies. Used as a staging ground for raids on white settlements, Fort Ouiatenon in its years of decline would figure so prominently in that role that American military forces in 1791 ultimately laid waste to what little was left of the deteriorating stockade and buildings, as well as many of the native villages in its proximity. With the threat of harassment from native warriors diminished, the Old Northwest Territory became increasingly attractive for American settlement at the turn of the 19th

DRAFT

century.

Developing the American Economy

Ouiatenon's very existence owed itself to the needs of the 18th-century French fur trade, which was a major component of the North American economy in that century. Situated at the frontier between French Canada and Louisiana, Ouiatenon was remote from both centers of French power in the New World, but its position on the Wabash River was intended to solidify trading relations with the local Native Americans and protect that relationship against competition from the rival British. As a local distribution center of that trade, the post functioned at the retail level of the enterprise where pelts were offered in exchange for exotic goods. Here it is possible to examine the fur trade at its most basic level, enlightening our understanding of how that system operated and evolved in North America, as well as how it differed in practice between the French and British and later American fur traders.

Changing Role of the United States in the World Community

For much of Fort Ouiatenon's history, the United States did not exist. Furthermore, during the Revolutionary War, the aging stockade at Ouiatenon was inconsequential to the conflict, though it was visited occasionally by combatants passing through the region. By then, it was home to only a few French *habitants* and their native trading partners, and it was no longer a pawn in the struggle between France and Britain for the vast interior of North America. However, what remained of Fort Ouiatenon figured more prominently once the young nation sought to extend its reach across the Alleghenies in the closing decades of the 18th century. As American pioneers began to settle in Kentucky and the Ohio Country, Ouiatenon increasingly saw use as a haven and staging ground for Indian raiding parties bent on harassing American settlements in the region. The fort itself was essentially gone by this time, but French *habitants* and native peoples continued to live in its immediate vicinity. The punitive campaign waged on orders of President Washington against the inhabitants of Ouiatenon and its immediate environs was very much a product of American expansionism into new territories of North America. Native peoples sought to stop further expansion, while American political and military might was bent on establishing dominion over lands of the interior.

Criterion 6: Archeological Research Significance

The investigation of French and British colonial sites has been a staple of research in historical archeology since the discipline was in its infancy. Indeed, the study of North American colonial sites virtually defined the discipline in its early years, largely because it ably served the interests of heritage tourism and the reconstruction of major fortification sites, especially in the East. The excavations at Fort Michilimackinac and Grand Portage are just two examples from the upper Great Lakes region, but there are many others from northeastern North America, both in the United States and Canada, that could be cited—never mind the many colonial town sites, such as Jamestown and Williamsburg, that could also provide comparative data that would aid in the interpretation of Fort Ouiatenon and places like it.

The site of Fort Ouiatenon has already produced several important studies that have contributed meaningfully to archeological method and theory. Tordoff's (1983) examination of data from the site in comparative context did much to explicate the hierarchical organization of the 18th-century fur trade, whereas Martin's (1986, 1991a, 1991b, 2008) research on animal remains from Ouiatenon and related sites has been key to reconstruction of environmental conditions and understanding European

DRAFT

subsistence practices during that period. The Fort Ouiatenon investigations were among the earliest in historical archaeology to make extensive experimental use of geophysical prospection techniques, such as proton magnetometry and soil resistivity, followed by ground-truth verification of anomalies, which provided guidance to others using such analytical methods (von Frese 1978 and 1984; von Frese and Noble 1984). Finally, Noble's (1983) study of the north half of the site, using a stratified, systematic unaligned sampling strategy, employed sophisticated statistical analyses including factor analysis to elicit artifact correlations and trend surface analysis to examine spatial relationships across the study area in search of discrete activity areas—both early applications of those statistical methods in the field of historical archeology.

Aside from the important archeological studies that have already been completed, the site of Fort Ouiatenon continues to have the high potential to address other nationally significant questions. The following paragraphs provide a theoretical context for such research and outlines but a few areas that might be investigated with profit.

Archeological investigations at fur-trading posts were among the earliest undertaken in the emerging discipline of historical archeology. This owes in no small measure to the fact that much of historical archeology in its formative years was associated with the mission-oriented goals of site reconstruction and heritage tourism. For example, the fur-trade post at Grand Portage, Minnesota, was first excavated in the 1930s (Woolworth and Woolworth 1982), whereas excavations began at Fort Michilimackinac, at the northern tip of Michigan's Lower Peninsula, in 1959 and have continued every summer since that time (Maxwell and Binford 1959; Stone 1974).

Not until much later, however, did archeologists begin to build a body of theoretical literature applicable to the more general topic of frontiers. Historians, of course, had been examining the subject of the frontier in America since Frederick Jackson Turner's controversial essay, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History," written in 1893 and read at the American Historical Association meetings held in conjunction with the Columbian Exposition at Chicago in 1894; his original thesis was later developed into a more detailed treatment (Turner 1921).

Given the early interest of historical archeologists with frontier outposts, it is not surprising that the frontier experience would be one of the earliest topics of theoretical discussion once the discipline began to develop beyond its initial descriptive phase. One of the first archeological attempts to address frontier theory was Kenneth Lewis's doctoral dissertation using data from the Jamestown excavations (Lewis 1975), later built upon by his work in the Southeast (Lewis 1976, 1980, 1984, 1985). This work was largely focused on the development of settlement systems associated with frontier towns, however, and did not deal with remote trading establishments such as Fort Union.

Historical archeologists began to address the topic in many regions of North America during the 1970s and 1980s, when several influential books and articles were published, most notably Stanley South's (1977) *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology*, in which he defined the so-called Frontier Pattern, among others, using artifact assemblage data from the Southeast. Other interesting studies of this period include Ray's (1974, 1978) examination of native populations on the frontier of the Canadian sub-arctic, Waselkov's (1979) study of Zumwalt's Fort, one of several dozen early nineteenth-century settler forts in Missouri, Hardesty's (1980) study of the Intermountain West, Ostrogorsky's (1982) examination of the frontier experience in Idaho, Ewen's (1986) study of the fur trade in Wisconsin, and Lightfoot and Martinez's (1995) critical analysis of frontiers and boundaries using the example of Fort

DRAFT

Ross, a nineteenth-century Russian trading outpost in northern California. A recently published compilation of papers on the fur trade era (Nassaney 2015) and a volume on Fort St. Joseph (Nassaney 2020) shows that this is still a major topic of scholarly interest.

One of the most important articles published during this period was Waselkov and Paul's (1981) analysis of the frontier concept, which included a critical examination of frontier models promulgated in archeology up to that point. They pointed out the failure of most models of frontier adaptation to consider fully the interrelationships of both intrusive and indigenous cultures in frontier situations, which they defined "as a transitional area, a zone of mixture and interaction, where societies meet in open competition." They also discussed several archeological implications of their frontier model, which focused on "changes in Euroamerican and Indian settlement-subsistence patterns, economics, and material culture."

Later studies of the frontier were highly influenced by the theoretical writings of Immanuel Wallerstein (1979, 1980), who advocated world-system analysis using a so-called "core-periphery" model that defined relationships between the parent society and remote colonial outposts (see Orser 2009 for a critique of these concepts in archeology). Historical archeologists have adapted Wallerstein's concepts in examining the frontier, including urban areas such as the communities of Denver, Colorado (Nelson et al. 2008), and Alexandria, Virginia (Cressey and Stephens 1982; Cressey et al. 1982).

Although interest in developing theoretical models for explaining frontiers and boundaries was largely eclipsed by the diversification of historical archeology after the 1980s, scholars still examine questions related to the frontier experience (Parker and Rodseth 2005). Naum (2010), for example, performed a fairly recent comparative analysis of the frontier between Denmark and the Northwestern Slavic area and the colonial frontier in northeastern North America. Accordingly, analysis of archeological data derived from the site of Fort Ouiatenon can potentially contribute much to the continuing discussion and debate concerning the establishment and maintenance of frontiers in North America. Nationally significant questions concerning the frontier thus may be addressed and possibly answered. Such questions would also apply to the NHL themes of Peopling Places and Developing the American Economy.

Among the many questions that could be potentially investigated using data from the site of Fort Ouiatenon are the following:

- Does the artifact assemblage at Fort Ouiatenon conform to South's Frontier Pattern or differ from it? What cultural behaviors can be inferred to account for any similarities or differences noted in the archeological record?

The site of Fort Ouiatenon is ideally suited to examining this question, given the size and scope of its artifact assemblage. In light of the large artifact sample, which is essential to such analysis, the relative proportions of certain artifact categories in the assemblage can be calculated and compared with South's (1977) classic Frontier Pattern. Any similarities or differences might then be interpreted in terms of cultural behaviors and historical circumstances. This analysis would be highly informative, since South merely recognized patterning in the archeological record and did not take the next step of explaining it.

- Does Wallerstein's "core-periphery" model have any utility for explaining the frontier experience at Fort Ouiatenon? How was Fort Ouiatenon linked to Detroit, Montreal, New

DRAFT

Orleans, and the larger world economic system?

Again, the uniquely large artifact sample from the site of Fort Ouiatenon is key to exploring this research question. The huge assemblage, and the even larger one that might be derived from continued field investigations at the site, can be assumed to be representative of the whole to a greater degree than collections derived from some other contemporary sites. Analysis of the assemblage may reveal the extent to which Fort Ouiatenon (at the "periphery") was linked with major fur trade entrepôts in New France and Louisiana (the "core"). Was Fort Ouiatenon in a dependent relationship with those centers of commerce, or does the assemblage seem to indicate that it operated with a certain amount of autonomy? Sourcing of artifacts that can be identified with attention to place of manufacture should also be able to show the extent to which Fort Ouiatenon was linked to the larger world economic system.

- Does Fort Ouiatenon seem to fit any of the frontier models already developed in the archeological literature for other regions of North America? Can a new theoretical model be developed for the central Wabash?

As indicated above, scholars have developed theoretical models to explain the frontier experience in various regions of North America, but none have yet been developed for the region in which Fort Ouiatenon is situated. Comparisons of the artifact assemblage at Ouiatenon with data derived from other frontier sites elsewhere in North America may be able to show whether those other models are applicable here.

Other questions that potentially can be addressed with profit through analysis of the archeological record at Fort Ouiatenon include the following:

- Is social stratification among the fort's workforce evident in the archeological record? How did the lives of routine workers differ from managers and those who provided specialized labor?
- What does the archeological record indicate about subsistence practices at Fort Ouiatenon beyond conclusions reached by Martin (1986)? Were occupants of the fort more reliant on local resources or imported foodstuffs? Can subsistence differences be discerned among the Fort Ouiatenon population?

As for the archeological potential of the neighboring native sites in the archeological district, it has been nearly two decades since Patricia Rubertone (2000) lamented the relative dearth of archeological studies focused on post-contact Native American sites of the early Historic period. In her article, Rubertone argued cogently for the high potential that such sites hold for productive research. Accordingly, the several native sites within the Ouiatenon district would seem to hold considerable potential to yield archeological data affecting theory, concepts, and ideas while offering new insights into this dynamic period of American history. They can be compared profitably to other contemporary sites in the region (sites such as the nearby Kethtippecanunck [Jones 1987, 1988, 1989b; Strezewski et al 2006;Trubowitz and Jones 1987d] near the Tippecanoe-Wabash confluence and a large Wea village [Jones 19985a, 1985b; Trubowitz and Jones 1987b, 1987d] on the opposite shore of the Wabash from Ouiatenon), in North America, and to each other, as well.

Rubertone (2000:430) points out that foundational research on historic Native Americans can be traced back to the work of Quimby and Spoehr (1951) and their attempts to draw certain inferences about the

DRAFT

processes of acculturation by looking at the relative frequencies of certain exotic artifact categories.[1] Others, notably White (1974) and Cheek (1974), sought to refine that model by constructing numerical indices reflecting the proportions of European and traditional material culture. Fitting (1976b) and Ramenofsky (1998), on the other hand, have looked at the process of functional (and raw material) replacement in Native American artifacts of the early Historic period to draw conclusions about technological and evolutionary change. Rubertone (2000:430-431) notes, however, that numerous critics have challenged those notions as overly simplistic depictions of Native Americans as passive participants in the European trade, exploring other models for native consumer choices in the early Historic period using cosmological concepts. Rogers (1990), for example, has argued that Arikara trade with Europeans was shaped in part by cultural values and in part by their view that exchange was an important social process that needed to be maintained. His work, and that of others, affirms the conclusion that acculturation is a complex process that requires consideration of multiple processes and contexts to understand it fully.

A major area of research emphasis within the archeological district would almost certainly entail an examination of changing cultural adaptations during the early Historic period. Through comparison with late pre-contact occupation sites in the region, with special attention to relative frequencies of exotic European artifacts and traditional native material culture, one might determine the character and extent of culture change among the neighboring native populations in the face of increasing interaction with both the French and other native groups. To what degree were subsistence practices changing in response to depletion of game animals and new demands of the fur trade? The proportions of certain species represented in the assemblages of several sites might shed light on such a question. The various groups occupying the Ouiatenon district at different times moved into the area from elsewhere. Through comparison with sites of their traditional homelands, can different adaptations to a new environment be discerned in the archeological record here near the banks of the Wabash? How did processes of culture change at sites in the district differ from the experiences among historic Native Americans elsewhere in the broader Midwest region, at sites such as St. Ignace Mission and Old Kaskaskia Village? To what degree is acculturation or creolization evident at the several sites in the district? What generalizations can be drawn concerning cultural dynamics in the time of European contact by comparing data derived from these particular sites and others? Again, the relative proportions of certain artifact types among several comparative sites may help answer these and other important questions of research interest.

The nearly ubiquitous presence of European-made artifacts on native village sites during the early Historic period suggests rapid change in the character of native life. This is not to say that native cultural identity did not survive the new influences brought about by the fur trade, for there is evidence elsewhere to suggest that such items were incorporated into traditional practices, accommodating a persistence of long-standing patterns of cultural continuity in the face of profound outside pressures. How and to what extent is resistance to cultural change manifest in the adaptive reuse of European articles for traditional purposes at sites within the Ouiatenon district?

Another area of Historic-period Native American archeological research that Rubertone (2000:435-439) assesses, which has particular relevance to the situation at the Ouiatenon archeological district, is what she refers to as "investigating native landscapes: ancestral homelands, cultural survival, and resistance." Earlier studies of this sort focused on using settlement and stylistic evidence to delineate geographical

[1] N.B.: Jones's 1988 dissertation dealt with acculturation at two native village sites in the Ouiatenon vicinity, as did several of his other publications and papers listed in the Bibliography)

DRAFT

movements and continuities of native populations through time. She points out that the "cultural syncretism that may emerge from a blending and sharing of technologies and artistic traditions" in multiethnic colonial contexts is challenged by research that shows the maintenance of individual cultural differences. Again, she argues that the conclusion one must reach from these studies is that the construction of identity, even a creolized one, in pluralistic societies is more than a simple response to colonialism; it is a more complex and varied process. The challenge for historical archeology, she writes, "is to understand the different experiences of those who survived not only European contact but also proclamations about acculturation, assimilation, hybridization, and resistance."

Although changes brought about in the early Historic period among native peoples may not have been as great as it has been sometimes argued, and even changes in lifeways can be interpreted as a means of persistence (Rubertone 2000), the processes that would ultimately result in profound cultural changes were first unleashed at this time. Indications of those processes may be present in the archeological record at sites in this particular district. Archeological research provides a unique perspective on the native cultures that Europeans encountered in the Upper Great Lakes, setting in motion forces that would not take full effect until many decades had passed. Relatively few Contact period native sites have been excavated in the region, at least when compared against the high number that must have existed, and far fewer native sites of the 19th century have been examined for comparison with those of the 18th century. Nevertheless, viewed in the light of existing data derived from contemporaneous sites elsewhere in the region and beyond, as well as against pre-contact site data from localities throughout the Great Lakes and Mississippi Valley, it should be clear that native sites within the district can offer important insights into the effects of European contact on native culture in North America, affecting archeological theory, concepts, and ideas to a major degree.

It is encouraging to note that the study of post-contact native peoples in the Upper (or Western) Great Lakes is currently gathering a new following particularly among younger scholars of the past. At the 60th Annual Midwest Archaeological Conference, held in Iowa City, Iowa, October 6-8, 2016, a sponsored symposium was held entitled "Encounters, Exchange, Entanglement—Current Perspectives on 17th- and 19th-Century Intercultural Interactions throughout the Western Great Lakes." Organized and chaired by Jessica Yann and Heather Walder of Michigan State University, the symposium included contributions by six archeologists and a historian who together re-examined the thesis of George Irving Quimby's (1966) seminal book *Indian Culture and European Trade Goods*, which continues to be cited and to provoke thought 50 years after its original publication. Doubtless data yet derived from the Ouiatenon district will help inform these new interpretations of Quimby's insightful scholarship and refine his conclusions.

DRAFT

6. PROPERTY DESCRIPTION AND STATEMENT OF INTEGRITY

Ownership of Property		Category of Property	
Private:	X	Building(s):	
Public-Local:		District:	X
Public-State:		Site:	
Public-Federal:		Structure:	
		Object:	

Number of Resources within Boundary of Property:

Contributing		**Noncontributing**
Buildings:		Buildings:
Sites:	20	Sites:
Structures:		Structures:
Objects:		Objects:
Total:	20	Total:

PROVIDE PRESENT AND PAST PHYSICAL DESCRIPTIONS OF PROPERTY
(Please see specific guidance for type of resource[s] being nominated)

Introduction

Located about [redacted] miles down the Wabash River below the present-day cities of Lafayette and West Lafayette, Indiana, Fort Ouiatenon was one link in a chain of several French fur-trading posts that stretched across the North American interior during the first half of the 18th century. Established in 1717, under the command of Ensign François-Marie Picoté de Belestre, the outpost probably was not initially intended to be a permanent military installation on the Wabash. Rather, it was more likely conceived as a temporary measure meant to thwart growing British fur-trading ambitions in the vast wilderness south of the Great Lakes.

The French apparently hoped that their presence here would help persuade local tribes to relocate farther north to the vicinity of their earlier homelands at the lower reaches of Lake Michigan. Despite those supplications, several important tribal groups opted to remain in the Wabash River Valley, owing in part to a steadfast devotion to the memory of their late departed friend, Jean-Baptiste Bissot de Vincennes (1668-1719), who died in 1719. The French, in the face of that unwavering resistance, had little choice but to establish themselves more firmly on the Wabash in an attempt to secure France's economic and political interests against the rival British.

By that time, the western Great Lakes-Riverine region had been witness to the movements of various Native American groups over the course of a century. Wayne Temple (1958) and others have outlined the course of those movements. During the last quarter of the 17th century, several Miami bands moved from the Fox River Valley of modern Wisconsin to the area around present-day South Bend, Indiana (the River of the Miami), and from there many would relocate to the Illinois River at or near Starved Rock. It appears that the Ouiatenon (Wea) sub-group separated from the Miami in 1700, establishing a village on the Wabash River.

In the years immediately following that relocation, the Piankeshaw band also asserted their identity and established their own villages on the Vermillion and Wabash rivers downstream from where the Ouiatenon band had settled. Sometime before 1711, some Mascouten joined the Ouiatenon on the Wabash while others remained with the Kickapoo near Starved Rock and the Illinois-Mississippi confluence. Eventually, however, the Wabash also became home to the main bodies of the Mascouten and Kickapoo. Thus, the French intruders were to find many closely related, though culturally distinct, Miami groups—the Ouiatenon, Piankashaw, Kickapoo, and Mascouten—when they took their positions on the Wabash River in 1717.

Geological, Environmental, and Ecological Setting

DRAFT

The archeological site of Fort Ouiatenon is situated in the [redacted], Tippecanoe County, Indiana. The site lies southwest of the modern city of Lafayette, which serves as the county seat. While the geological and general physiographical setting is much the same today as it was during Ouiatenon's historic occupation, the environmental setting described herein reconstructs what would have existed during the 18th century, rather than reporting present environmental conditions. Much of this information is adapted from background material in Terrance Martin's (1986) excellent detailed analysis of the animal remains recovered during several seasons of archeological field research at the site of Fort Ouiatenon, whereas information available on the pre-settlement vegetation of the region reflects the work of King (1987), Jones and Trubowitz (1987), and Whitaker and Amlaner (2012).

Geologically, Tippecanoe County lies entirely within the Tipton Till Plain, a depositional plain typified by low relief that overlies a thick glacial till only slightly modified by post-glacial stream erosion. The Northern Moraine and Lake Region bounds it to the north, and to the south the Tipton Till Plain is bounded by the Southern Zone Low Plateaus (Schneider 1966).

The general terrain of Tippecanoe County comprises of gently rolling uplands, steep hillsides, rich alluvial river bottoms, and nearly level till plains. The most significant physiographical feature of the area is, of course, the Wabash River valley. The valley changes markedly in character where the present-day city of Lafayette is situated. Above Lafayette, the valley is typically narrow (approximately 5 km wide), and the bluffs on either side are steep. Below Lafayette, where Fort Ouiatenon was situated, the valley broadens to more than twice its width north of the modern city, and the more rounded bluffs there slope gently to the valley floor (Martin 1986).

Although he was in the area as early as 1762, Thomas Hutchins, in 1778, further described several natural features of the Wabash River, which may have been factors the French considered when selecting the location for construction of Fort Ouiatenon. With regard to transportation, Hutchins noted that the Wabash was of a depth normally navigable by barges drawing 3 ft of water the entire distance from the Ohio River confluence up to Fort Ouiatenon. Above that point, however, the shallower waters and a rocky bottom demanded the use of canoes.

> The stream of the Wabash, is generally gentle to Fort Ouiatenon, and no where obstructed with Falls, but it is by several Rapids, both above and below the Fort, some of which are pretty considerable. [Lindley 1916:7]

The Wabash valley sides in the Ouiatenon vicinity are formed by two distinct terraces and a lesser third terrace. The first terrace is represented by the low alluvial bottomlands that became so important to the agrarian pursuits of latter-day settlers in the 19th century. The Wea Plain lies on the second terrace west of Lafayette and south of the Wabash. Across the river from the site of Fort Ouiatenon, that landform would figure prominently as a source of game during the 18th century and was the location of many native villages carrying on commerce with the French. Indeed, early French correspondence from 1718 indicates that between 1,000 and 1,200 warriors and their families (perhaps representing as many as 5,000 individuals in all) lived in the large Wea village opposite Fort Ouiatenon. Major tributaries entering the Wabash in this general area include the Tippecanoe River and Wildcat Creek to the northeast, as well as Wea Creek, which enters from the south. Those, and several other confluences along the Wabash River, were also important loci of native villages.

The Fort Ouiatenon vicinity lies within the Beech-Maple Forest Region as defined by Braun (1950). Early 19th-century settler accounts record that, except for the tallgrass prairie (part of the Prairie Peninsula that once stretched from Iowa to central Indiana), the Tipton Till Plain region was heavily forested. Clearing of the forest

DRAFT

by those later settlers to promote farmland and pasturage, as well as to provide lumber for new communities along the Wabash, resulted in the development of modern vegetation patterns unlike those that existed during the time of Ouiatenon's occupation. Studies of the so-called pre-settlement vegetation (see King 1987) indicate the presence of two different forest succession scenarios, depending upon local micro-environments, as well as the presence of many native plant and animal species that have since been eradicated from the area. Native peoples and, of course, European intruders, also developed or introduced many domesticated plant and animal species.

Of the Wea Plain, one early account states that the native settlement across from Ouiatenon was located on:

> …a great elevation and has more than two leagues of open ground where they [the Wea] raise their maize, gourds, and melons. And from this elevation as far as one can see there are only prairies which are filled with buffalo. [Krauskopf 1955:161-162]

British Indian Agent George Croghan (ca. 1718-1782), who met with the influential native leader, Pontiac, at Fort Ouiatenon in 1763, remarked two years later that buffalo, deer, bear, and other wild game species were abundant in the region between Ouiatenon and Vincennes. He wrote of the Ouiatenon vicinity:

> The Country hereabouts is exceedingly Pleasant being open and clear for many Miles the soil rich and well watered all Plants have a quick vegetation and the Climate very temperate thro' the Winter. This post has always been a very considerable Trading place… [McCord 1970:21]

Croghan also observed that most of the area between Vincennes and Fort Ouiatenon was "fine meadow" on which "wild hemp" (probably giant cane, *Arudinaria gigantean*) was plentiful. It does not appear that the French applied themselves to agricultural pursuits other than small garden plots, but they doubtless exploited wild plant species and may have traded with native villagers for their domesticated crops.

The abundant wildlife in the area was critical to French subsistence, though there is clear archeological evidence from the site excavations that domesticated swine and chicken also were present for consumption. Various game birds were available seasonally, and the riverine environment was thick with aquatic animals and many species of fish. Bison and prairie chickens frequented the prairie, and game animals common to the forest included bear, elk, white-tailed deer, wolves, bobcats, raccoons, and wild turkey. More important, perhaps, were the high numbers of fur-bearing mammals, such as the beaver, whose pelts were important commodities of the burgeoning fur trade economy.

DRAFT

Historic Descriptions of the Fort

Eye-witness descriptions of Fort Ouiatenon itself occur only rarely in documentary records systematically examined to date. Nor is its location ever precisely identified in period documents. Not even the crudest period map or plan of the installation is known to exist, and verbal accounts of visits to the post are sparse in detail. In fact, all of the latter are from either British or American observers during the latter days of the post's occupation. Accordingly, almost all that is known of the fort's construction and layout during its primary period of use and occupancy is derived from the archeological investigations that have been conducted at the site. Even less is known about the neighboring native villages, which are described only briefly—if at all—in the historical record (an account from 1718 describes a Wea village in the vicinity).

In an undated log of the Maumee-Wabash route from Detroit to the Illinois Country, believed to have been written down ca. 1774, Fort Ouiatenon is recorded as situated 399 miles from Detroit, 183 miles from the British Fort Miami, and 18 miles below the mouth of the Tippecanoe River (the nearest major physiographic milestone identified upstream from Ouiatenon in that document).

> This Fort is on the right about 70 yards from the River. The Ouattanon nation of Indians is on the opposite side, & the Kiccaposses are round the Fort, in both villages about 1,000 men able to bear arms. [Dunn 1894(2):435-436]

Jacob Dunn's (1894) editorial footnote concerning this point is of interest as it is one of several sources that led to the establishment of Ft. Ouiatenon Historical Park opposite the mouth of Wea Creek. Although this conclusion was not entirely without basis, Dunn's speculative location of the fort was disproved almost three-quarters of a century later with the discovery of the true fort site about a mile further downstream:

> Post Ouiatanon- After careful study of authorities and maps I located this fort "on the north bank of the Wabash," "[redacted]" About five months after my "Indiana" was published, in February 1889, some workmen who were taking gravel from a bank near the river, about four miles above Indian creek, found the remains of a French officer, as appeared from parts of the uniform still existing. From this and other remains, silver crucifixes, utensils of various kinds, etc., many of which are now preserved at Purdue University, the site of the fort was identified. (Lafayette *Call*, Feb. 12 and Feb. 19, 1889) The location was afterwards confirmed by Mrs. Berilla Smith, an aged lady, who came to that region in 1831, and had the site of the old fort pointed out to her by earlier settlers. (Lafayette *Call*, March 11, 1892.) It is [redacted] below- the mouth of Wea creek, near Sand Ridge church. [Dunn 1894(2):436]

The same itinerary notes that, when going down the Wabash River from Fort Ouiatenon, one would first encounter the Vermillion River at 60 miles, the Highlands (Terre Haute) at 120 miles, and the fort at Vincennes at 240 miles. The document indicates further that Terre Haute was the old boundary between French Canada and Louisiana (Dunn 1894[2]:437).

One of the few descriptions of the fort reported from the documentary record comes from Henry Hamilton, Lieutenant-Governor and Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the British at Ft. Detroit during the Revolutionary War. Hamilton passed through the area en route from Detroit to recapture Ft. Sackville at Vincennes in 1778. He characterized the installation, which by then had been abandoned by the British for some 15 years, as "a miserable stockade surrounding a dozen miserable cabins," and as a "fort, which is formed of a double range of houses, enclosed with a stockade 10 feet high…" (Krauskopf 1955:157).

Discovery of the Fort Site and Archeological Investigation

After the punitive American military expedition of 1791, the Ouiatenon vicinity was no longer viable as a settlement for native peoples or the few French *habitants* who still remained in the area. In the years immediately following those events, the site may have been an object of curiosity for passersby, but in time it would have become overgrown with vegetation and, ultimately, forgotten. Situated on a low rise in the Wabash River floodplain, the site would occasionally become an island in the stream at high water and, more rarely, perhaps completely inundated during years of unusually high flood stages.

During the administration of President John Adams, Indiana Territory was carved out of the Old Northwest

DRAFT

Territory by an Act of Congress signed in 1800. American pioneers soon began to settle in small towns along the Ohio River, which formed the southeastern boundary of the territory. In the first decade of the 19th century, settlement in the region was hindered by a growing native resistance to white encroachment on their traditional lands. Most notably two Shawnee brothers, Tecumseh and The Prophet (*Tenskwautawaw*), mobilized a confederation representing some 14 tribes in opposition to American expansion into their homelands.

By 1808, a large number of natives had established themselves at Prophetstown, where the Tippecanoe River joins the Wabash. This presence caused great concern among American settlers, which culminated in the Battle of Tippecanoe on November 7, 1811. Indiana Territorial Governor William Henry Harrison, who would later become the 9th president of the United States, successfully led American forces in that fierce battle. On the next day, after native forces had been routed, he gave orders that Prophetstown be put to the torch. The battlefield site was designated a National Historic Landmark in 1963 and has been maintained as a memorial park by the Tippecanoe County Historical Association (TCHA) since the State of Indiana relinquished control of the historic property in 1972.

Tecumseh's Confederation subsequently regrouped and allied with the British against American forces during the War of 1812. With the resolution of that conflict under the Treaty of Ghent in December of 1814, there was renewed interest in obtaining statehood for Indiana. A census showed a sufficient number of adults living in the territory to qualify for statehood, and an enabling act was passed early in 1816. By the end of that year, a constitution had been written and a government formed, opening the way to statehood on December 11, 1816. It would be nearly 10 more years, however, before American settlement of the upper Wabash Valley began in earnest. The river trader William Digby platted Lafayette on the east bank of the Wabash River in May of 1825, and the town became the county seat when Tippecanoe County was established a year later. Lafayette initially grew up as a shipping center on the river, and completion of the Wabash and Erie Canal in the 1840s greatly enhanced its prominence by linking the area reliably with Lake Erie and the Ohio River. A decade later the arrival of railroads helped Lafayette maintain its position as a major trading center in the region. It was not until the 1850s, however, that the west bank of the Wabash opposite Lafayette was successfully settled as the town of Kingston, ultimately growing and merging with other communities to form the modern city of West Lafayette by 1888.

It is unlikely, in light of the dynamic nature of the Wabash floodplain, that even the most subtle traces of Fort Ouiatenon were still visible by the time American settlement of the area commenced more than a quarter-century after the torching of 1791 leveled what remained of the occupation. At least there are no known accounts that specifically remark on the presence of any physical remains from the old French fortification. That is not to say, however, that latter-day settlers were ignorant of those who preceded them to the area. A 19th-century pioneer settler and prominent citizen of Lafayette, Sandford C. Cox, boasted of having collected European-style artifacts during his youth (ca. 1827-1828) at his family's farm on the Wea Plain. In 1860 he wrote:

> In the Fall, after the grass was burnt on the prairie, the boys of the neighborhood used to amuse themselves with hunting up the blades of butcher knives, tomahawks, brass kettles, gun barrels, and etc., and the little girls in picking up beads, which in many places were strewn over the face of the ground, and had been washed up by the rains into gulches along the hillside. I remember that one day my little sister and a neighbor girl came running into the cabin, exclaiming "Is not this a rich country, when even the grass and weeds bear beads?" Each of them had a tuft of grass in their hands, on the spires of which beads were glittering, which no doubt once graced the neck of some Indian queen, or some of her maids of honor. It appeared that the blades of grass in growing had shot up through the eye of the beads, and

DRAFT

> lifted them higher and higher, in proportion to the strength and size of the weed or grass blades which protruded through the beads. I have myself found as high as six or eight Indian knives in an hour's search, soon after we moved on the farm. After the rust was taken off, these knives proved to be of excellent metal, and had not lost their temper, notwithstanding their long exposure to the prairie fires and the weather. [Cox 1970:34-35]

Some early settler accounts do mention Fort Ouiatenon by name, but information about its location is always vague, and at times the accounts are in direct conflict with one another. By the turn of the last century, however, there was a renewed interest in local heritage, and in 1909 the Daughters of the American Revolution placed a stone marker along South River Road at the spot where Ouiatenon was then thought to have stood (on the Wabash River opposite the mouth of Wea Creek). Dr. Richard Wetherill of Lafayette later donated funds to construct a replica blockhouse nearby in 1928. That structure of horizontal logs salvaged from the Monon Railroad shops in Lafayette, though executed in the British fortification style, would become the focal point of Fort Ouiatenon Historical Park. It now houses a small museum and souvenir shop.

Many local-history enthusiasts, however, were not satisfied that this low area on the Wabash floodplain was the true location of Fort Ouiatenon. Accordingly, the search for Ouiatenon continued in the agricultural fields downriver from Lafayette. Finally, in 1967, a concentration of apparent 18th-century artifacts was discovered [redacted] The Tippecanoe County Historical Association then contacted James H. Kellar, at that time Director of the Glenn A. Black Laboratory of Archaeology at Indiana University in Bloomington, about those exciting and tantalizing finds. Dr. Kellar would subsequently conduct archeological field school investigations at the presumed site in the summers of 1968 and 1969 (Kellar 1970).

Over two field seasons, Kellar's research teams completed a large block excavation near what is now known to be the very center of the archeological site. They revealed the remains of a substantial structure that included a large stone hearth. The manner of its construction, as well as its associated artifacts, at last left no doubt that this otherwise-innocuous cornfield was indeed the site of Fort Ouiatenon. Although the large artifact assemblage derived from the 1968-1969 excavations has never been comprehensively analyzed and reported in detail (the best study completed to date is one reported by Pope-Pfingston and Justice [1993]), those important initial investigations would later form the basis for a nomination to the National Register of Historic Places approved in 1970.

During the years immediately following Kellar's initial field research, local volunteers working under the direction of archeology students at Purdue University continued limited investigation of the Fort Ouiatenon site. Mindful of their own lack of qualifications to excavate undisturbed archeological contexts, in 1971 and 1972 those teams prudently confined their efforts to screening for materials located in the ca. 1-ft-thick plow zone that blankets the site after years of cultivation. A brief field season also was conducted in 1973, at which time the volunteers ventured below the plow zone in the southwest area of the site. Not only did the 1971-1973 investigations result in the collection of numerous artifacts related to occupation of the fort, those efforts were important for maintaining a vital local interest in the systematic investigation of Ouiatenon. Furthermore, they were critical to the TCHA's decision to acquire the fort site in 1972 and seek the assistance of professional archeologists more familiar with the investigation of sites related to the 18th-century fur trade.

Accordingly, in 1973, the TCHA contracted with Michigan State University (MSU) to begin the next year more intensive investigation of Ouiatenon in the hope of gathering more extensive data that might eventually contribute to a contemplated reconstruction for heritage tourism. With considerable experience derived from

DRAFT

major excavations carried out theretofore at the site of Fort Michilimackinac (1715-1781) at the Straits of Mackinac (Maxwell and Binford 1961; Stone 1974), as well as other contemporary European and native sites in the upper Great Lakes region, faculty and students at MSU undertook six consecutive seasons of field research at Fort Ouiatenon from 1973 through 1979. Charles E. Cleland, then Professor and Curator of Anthropology at the MSU Museum, served as Principal Investigator for the research program. With guidance from Dr. Cleland, the first three field seasons were conducted under the direct supervision of graduate student Judith D. Tordoff (1975, 1980), culminating with the completion of her doctoral dissertation on the excavations (Tordoff 1983). Graduate student Vergil E. Noble (1978, 1979, 1980, 1982a, 1982b, 1991) directed the final three seasons of fieldwork and also produced a doctoral dissertation that built upon Tordoff's prior three years of research (Noble 1983). Other students at Michigan State subsequently carried out independent analytical studies employing data and collections derived in whole or in part from those six years of field investigations at the site of Fort Ouiatenon (e.g., Anderson 1991, 1992, 1994; Jackson 2005; Martin 1986, 1991a, 1991b, 2008). Students at other institutions also have employed field data from those years, particularly information derived from a geophysical study carried out in conjunction with the MSU investigations (von Frese 1978, 1984; von Frese and Noble 1984). A dissertation completed in 2016 by Kelsey Noack Myers, of the Department of Anthropology at Indiana University, uses data from Ouiatenon and associated native villages; it is not available at this writing.

The initial field strategy employed under Tordoff's direction (1974-1976) can be characterized as one of exploration. Since Kellar's earlier excavations were limited to a large block of test units near the presumed center of the site, it remained to define the perimeter of the fortification. Working outward from areas believed to lie well within the stockade enclosure, Tordoff's crew in 1974 excavated exploratory trenches on the cardinal directions formed from 5-ft-x-10-ft test units placed end to end in series. In addition to intersecting apparent stockade lines at various locations, the exploratory trenches also encountered evidence of internal structures and other cultural features, including an abandoned well that was partly excavated to the water table some 18 ft below the ground surface (at that depth, water-logged wooden cribbing was preserved in place).

Another important element of Tordoff's fieldwork was a cooperative research initiative undertaken with the Department of Geoscience at Purdue University in West Lafayette. This joint venture involved an early application of geophysical prospection techniques to investigate a Historic period archeological site. Proton magnetometer and other geophysical instrument data were gathered under the direction of Purdue graduate student Ralph R. B. von Frese in 1974 and 1975, and in both of those years excavations were carried out specifically to ground-truth certain anomaly signatures indicated by the instruments, disclosing what proved to be a blacksmithing area and the remains of a semi-subterranean trader's storehouse that apparently had been lost along with its contents in a devastating fire. That early study was quite primitive by modern standards, but proved to be highly effective. Although the placement of excavations was no longer determined by geophysical findings after 1975, attempts were made to interpret anomalies as each field season through 1979 revealed more cultural features that could be correlated with the geophysical data gathered in earlier years (von Frese 1978, 1984; von Frese and Noble 1984).

The 1976 field season, Tordoff's last, had three primary goals, all of which were accomplished: continue exploring for segments of stockade, especially on the north, east, and south sides of the fort; complete the excavation of the semi-subterranean storehouse partly excavated in 1975; and relocate precisely the position of Kellar's 1968-1969 block excavation. The search for stockade trenches was facilitated by use of a backhoe to skim off the plow zone and expose any subsurface features.

MSU graduate student Vergil E. Noble continued the investigation of Fort Ouiatenon for three more field seasons, beginning in the summer of 1977. Noble initiated a stratified systematic sampling strategy across the

DRAFT

north half of the site area, which would examine about 10% of that 150-ft-x-300-ft area. The data collection scheme was intended to gather information that would be representative of the site as a whole. Spatial analysis of those data, employing trend surface analysis in conjunction with a factor analysis of the artifact assemblage by test unit, sought to ascertain whether discrete activity areas could be identified from the systematic sample.

Among the many discoveries made through that 1977-1979 archeological research were several that bear directly upon description of the historic site. Findings show that at least two different stockade perimeters, indicated by construction trenches containing substantial postmolds, enclosed the outpost at different times. What appears to be the original 1717 stockade measured approximately 120 ft (East-West) x 160 ft (North-South). A much larger perimeter was established at some later date, expanding Fort Ouiatenon's size to approximately 180 ft (East-West) x 240 ft (North-South). Although a date for this expansion could not be approximated from the data available, it more than doubled the enclosed area from approximately 19,200 sq ft to 43,200 sq ft. Within the stockade lines were numerous wall trench features indicating the locations of interior structures built in the typical French poteaux-en-terre (posts-in-ground) style, and the investigations also disclosed the edge of what appeared to be another well near the very center of the site. In addition, the interior was peppered with trash pits, hearths, and other cultural features typically associated with residential structures.

[redacted]
(Sauer et al. 1988).

In short, the six years (1974-1977) of intensive study by student crews from Michigan State University demonstrate that the site of Fort Ouiatenon is largely intact and possesses outstanding archeological integrity, showing only minor disturbance to its upper reaches as a result of periodic cultivation. The wide variety of cultural features, coupled with exceptional preservation, makes Ouiatenon an ideal location to address important questions related to the challenges and hardships of frontier settlement, the dynamics of the North American fur trade, and the processes of culture change and continuity among native peoples of the mid-continent. The site has already contributed data to several dissertations and theses, as well as numerous scholarly papers published in journals and edited volumes, and it clearly has the potential to contribute much more to our knowledge of the 18th-century frontier. Even if additional excavations were never again commenced, the massive curated collection of artifacts, animal remains, and other archeological materials could undergo additional study with considerable profit.

It should be added that the site of Fort Ouiatenon continues to draw the attention of archeologists interested in studying the 18th-century fur trade and the interaction between French and Native peoples (Pope-Pfingston and Justice 1993; Strezewski and McCullough 2010; Trubowitz 1991). Ouiatenon has also figured prominently in the study of several nearby Native American sites of some importance (Jones 1984, 1988; Strezewski 2014; Strezewski et al. 2007; Trubowitz 1987, 1989a, 1989b, 1990, 1992; Trubowitz and Jones 1986, 1987b, 1987d). As alluded to above, a 2016 dissertation by Kelsey Noack Myers (not yet available publicly) focuses on

multiethnic native communities associated with Fort Ouiatenon, framing its analysis around indigenous cultural persistence throughout the colonial period in relation to the deep history of the site.

To date, some 19 native sites have been recorded in the immediate vicinity of Fort Ouiatenon to the north. This adjacent parcel, owned and maintained as an archeological research preserve by The Archaeological Conservancy, has been investigated to some extent by various researchers in recent years. The sites that have been discovered within the parcel include the following: 12T___ 025, 240, 335, 336, 351, 352, 417, 418, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 472, 511, 513, 514, and 516. Unfortunately, despite systematic survey leading to their discovery, at this point the historic occupation sites have not been thoroughly investigated, but for the most part have been merely delineated and minimally tested. Geophysical investigations of several village sites, however, show that they have good integrity (Strezewski and McCullough 2017). Although believed to be contemporary with Fort Ouiatenon (12T9), the approximate age of the native sites has not been determined, nor has the ethnic affiliation of their occupants. Indeed, it is conceivable that some nearby occupation sites were associated with Europeans who lived outside the stockade at Ouiatenon.

It should also be noted that not all of the native sites are large enough to represent villages. Some are quite small and could indicate individual households separated from the village sites or perhaps special activity areas employed by certain villages or used in common among them. As noted above, it is also possible that some of sites were occupied by Europeans associated with the fort, rather than Native Americans. Continued field investigations in the archeological district could help clarify the noted disparities in site size while raising new questions to be asked of the archeological data.

DRAFT

7. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES AND OTHER DOCUMENTATION

Anderson, Dean L.
1991 Variability in Trade at Eighteenth-Century French Outposts. In: *French Colonial Archaeology: The Illinois Country and the Western Great Lakes*, edited by J. A. Walthall, pp. 218-236. University of Illinois Press, Urbana.

1992 *Documentary and Archaeological Perspectives on European Trade Goods in the Western Great Lakes Region.* Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

1994 The Flow of European Trade Goods into the Western Great Lakes Region, 1715-1760. In *The Fur Trade Revisited: Selected Papers of the Sixth North American Fur Trade Conference, Mackinac Island, Michigan, 1991*, edited by J. S. H. Brown, W. J. Eccles, and D. P. Heldman, pp. 93-115. Michigan State University Press, East Lansing, and Mackinac State Historic Parks, Mackinac.

Barnhart, John D., and Dorothy L. Riker
1971 *Indiana to 1816: The Colonial Period*. Indiana Historical Bureau and Indiana Historical Society, Indianapolis.

Birk, Douglas A.
1975 Recent underwater recoveries at Fort Charlotte, Grand Portage National Monument, Minnesota. *The International Journal of Nautical Archaeology and Underwater Exploration* 4(1):73-84.

Blegen, Theodore
1975 *Minnesota: A History of the State*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Cayton, Andrew R. L.
1996 *Frontier Indiana*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.

Cheek, Annetta
1974 *The Evidence for Acculturation in Artifacts: Indians and non-Indians at San Xavier del Bac, Arizona*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Department of Anthropology, University of Arizona, Tucson. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Cox, Sandford C.
1970 *Recollections of the Early Settlement of the Wabash Valley*. Reprint of the 1860 original. Books for Libraries Press, Freeport, NY.

Craig, Oscar J.
1893 *Ouiatenon: A Study in Indiana History*. Indiana Historical Society Publications Volume 2(8). Indianapolis.

Cressey, Pamela J., and John F. Stephens
1982 The City-Site Approach to Urban Archeology, In *Archeology of Urban American, The Search for Pattern and Process,* edited by R. S. Dickens, Jr., pp.41-62. Academic Press, New York.

DRAFT

Cressey, Pamela J., John F. Stephens, Stephen J. Shephard, and Barbara H. Magid
1982 The Core-Periphery Relationship and the Archaeological Record in Alexandria, Virginia, In *Archeology of Urban American, The Search for Pattern and Process,* edited by R. S. Dickens, Jr., pp. 143-174. Academic Press, New York.

DeHart, R. P., editor
1909 *Past and Present of Tippecanoe County, Indiana*, Vol. 1. B. F. Bowen and Co., Indianapolis, Indiana.

Dowd, Gregory Evans
2002 *War under Heaven: Pontiac, the Indian Nations, & the British Empire*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

Dunn, Jacob Piatt, editor
1894 *Documents Relating to the French Settlements on the Wabash.* Indiana Historical Society Publications, 2 vols. Indianapolis.

Evans, Lynn L.M.
2001 *House D of the Southeast Row House: Excavations at Fort Michilimackinac, 1989-1997*. Archaeological Completion Report Series No. 17. Mackinac State Historic Parks, Lansing, Michigan.

Ewen, Charles R.
1986 Fur Trade Archaeology: A Study of Frontier Hierarchies, *Historical Archaeology* 20(1):15-28.

Halchin, Jill Y.
1985 *Excavations at Fort Michilimackinac, 1983-1985: House C of the Southeast Rowhouse, The Solomon-Levy-Parant House*. Archaeological Completion Report Series No.11. Mackinac Island State Park Commission (MISPC) Lansing, Michigan.

Hardesty, Donald L.
19980 Historic Sites Archaeology on the Western American Frontier: Theoretical Perspectives and Research Problems, *North American Archaeologist* 2(1):67-82.

Heldman, Donald P.
1977 *Excavations at Fort Michilimackinac, 1976: The Southeast and South Southeast Row Houses.* Archaeological Completion Report Series No. 1. MISPC, Lansing, Michigan.

1978 *Excavations at Fort Michilimackinac, 1977: House One of the South Southeast Row House*. Archaeological Completion Report Series No. 2. MISPC, Lansing, Michigan..

1986 Michigan's First Jewish Settlers: A View from the Solomon-Levy Trading House at Fort Michilimackinac, 1765-1781. *Journal of New World Archaeology* 6(4):21-33.

1991 The French in Michigan and Beyond: An Archaeological View from Fort Michilimackinac Toward the West. In *French Colonial Archaeology: The Illinois Country and the Western Great Lakes*, edited by John A. Walthall, pp.201-217. University of Illinois Press, Urbana.

DRAFT

Heldman, Donald P., and Roger T. Grange, Jr.
1981 *Excavations at Fort Michilimackinac 1978-79: The Rue de la Babillarde*. Archaeological Completion Report Series No. 3. MISPC, Lansing, Michigan.

Heldman, Donald P., and William L. Minnerly
1977 *The Powder Magazine at Fort Michilimackinac: Excavation Report.* Reports in Mackinac History and Archaeology No. 6. MISPC, Lansing, Michigan.

Huggins, Robert, and John W. Weymouth
1979 A Magnetic Survey of Fort Charlotte, Grand Portage National Monument. Report on file, Midwest Archeological Center, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Jackson, Misty May
2005 *Classification by Historical Archaeologists and Eighteenth Century Montreal Merchants and Military Personnel in New France: Emic and Etic Approaches*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, Michigan State University, East Lansing. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Jones, Bruce A.
1980 Historic Site Archeology at Fort Charlotte, Grand Portage National Monument. Ms. on file, Midwest Archeological Center, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Jones, James R., III
1984 *Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Century Aboriginal and Euroamerican Occupations in the Vicinity of Lafayette, Tippecanoe County, Indiana*. Report prepared for the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology. Glenn A. Black Laboratory of Archaeology, Indiana University, Bloomington.

1985a An Archaeological Survey of an 18th Century Wea Village near Fort Ouiatanon, West Lafayette, Indiana. Paper presented at the 3rd Annual Symposium on Ohio Valley Urban and Historic Archaeology, Columbus, Ohio.

1985b An Archaeological Survey of an 18th Century Wea Village near Fort Ouiatanon, West Lafayette, Indiana. *Proceedings of the Symposium on Ohio Valley Urban and Historic Archaeology* 3:105-116.

1985c 1984 Archaeological Survey of Historic Sites in the Lafayette-Battle Ground Area. Paper presented at the 1985 Indiana Historical Society Meetings, Indianapolis.

1987 Kethtippecanunk, a Mixed 18th Century Village Near the Mouth of the Tippecanoe River: Recent Research. Paper presented at the 1987 Indiana Historical Society Meetings, Indianapolis.

1988 *Degrees of Acculturation at Two 18th Century Aboriginal Sites Near Lafayette, Tippecanoe County, Indiana: Ethnohistoric and Archaeological Perspectives*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, Indiana University, Bloomington. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

1989a The Ethnic Identification of Historic Aboriginal Sites. Paper presented at the 1989 Conference

DRAFT

on Historical and Underwater Archaeology, Baltimore, Maryland.

1989b Abstract for Kethtippecanunk, a Mixed 18th- and Early 19th-Century Town on the Banks of the Tippecanoe River: Recent Research. Indiana University, *Glenn A. Black Laboratory of Archaeology Research Reports*, No. 10.

1989c Acculturation at Historic Aboriginal Settlements in Tippecanoe County, Indiana: The Artifactual Evidence. Paper presented at the 1989 Midwestern Archaeological Conference, Iowa City.

1992a Acculturation and Ethnicity at Historic Aboriginal Settlements in Tippecanoe County, Indiana: The Artifactual Evidence. *The Michigan Archaeologist* 38(1-2):105-120.

1992b Archaeological Patterns of Ethnic Adaptation and Culture Change in 18th and 19th Century Cultures in Indiana. Paper presented at the 1992 Midwest Archaeological Conference, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Jones, James R., III, and Neal L. Trubowitz
1986 Progress Report: May 14-September 26, 1986 for Archaeological Reconnaissance and Testing of Historic Occupations Along the Wabash River in the Vicinity of Lafayette, Tippecanoe County, Indiana. Report prepared for the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology. Indiana University-Indianapolis.

1987 *1986 Archaeological Reconnaissance and Testing of Historic Occupations Along the Wabash River in the Vicinity of Lafayette, Tippecanoe County, Indiana*. Report prepared for the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology. Indiana University-Indianapolis.

Kellar, James H.
1970 The Search for Ouiatenon. Outdoor Indiana 34(10):4-10. Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Indianapolis.

King, Frances B.
1987 Presettlement Vegetation of the Fort Ouiatenon Area. In *1986 Archaeological Reconnaissance and Testing of Historic Occupations Along the Wabash River in the Vicinity of Lafayette, Tippecanoe County, Indiana*, by James R. Jones III and Neal L. Trubowitz, pp. 9-21. Report prepared for the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology. Indiana University-Indianapolis.

Krauskopf, Frances, editor
1955 The Ouiatanon Documents. *Indiana Historical Society Publications* 18(2):132-234.

LaBounty, Andrew E.
2010 Awaiting the Call: Historic Sites Monitoring and Preservation at Fort Charlotte (21CK7), Grand Portage National Monument, Minnesota. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

DRAFT

Lewis, Kenneth E.
1975 *The Jamestown Frontier: An Archaeological Study of Colonization,* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Oklahoma, Norman.

1976 Camden: A Frontier Town. University of South Carolina, Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, *Anthropological Studies*, 2. Columbia.

1980 Pattern and Layout on the South Carolina Frontier: An Archaeological Investigation of Settlement Function, *North American Archaeologist* 1(2):177-200

1984 *The American Frontier: An Archaeological Study of Settlement Pattern and Process*. Academic Press, New York.

1985 Functional Variation among Settlements on the South Carolina Frontier; An Archaeological Perspective, In *The Archaeology of Frontiers and Boundaries,* ed. S.W. Green and S.M. Perlmann, pp. 251-274. Academic Press, New York.

Lightfoot, Kent G., and Antoinette Martinez
1995 Frontiers and Boundaries in Archaeological Perspective, *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24:471-192.

Lynott, Mark J.
1988 Archeological Survey of a Proposed Road Construction Locality at Grand Portage National Monument. USDI, National Park Service, Midwest Archeological Center. Report on file, Midwest Archeological Center, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Martin, Terrance J.
1986 *A Faunal Analysis of Fort Ouiatenon, An Eighteenth-Century Trading Post in the Wabash Valley*. Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

1991a Modified Animal Remains, Subsistence, and Cultural Interaction at French Colonial Sites in the Midwestern United States. In *Beamers, Bobwhites, and Blue-Points: Tributes to the Career of Paul W. Parmalee*, edited by James R. Purdue, Walter E. Klippel, and Bonnie W. Styles, pp. 409-419. Illinois State Museum, Springfield, and the University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

1991b An Archaeological Perspective on Animal Exploitation Patterns at French Colonial Sites in the Illinois Country. In *French Colonial Archaeology: The Illinois Country and the Western Great Lakes*, edited by John A. Walthall, pp. 189-200. University of Illinois Press, Urbana.

2008 The Archaeozoology of French Colonial Sites in the Illinois Country. In: Dreams of the Americas: Overview of New France Archaeology, edited by Christian Roy and Hélène Côté, pp. 185-204. *Archéologiques, Hors-série* 2 (Journal of the Association des archéologues du Québec).

Maxwell, Moreau S., and Lewis Binford
1961 Excavations at Fort Michilimackinac, Mackinac [sic] City, Michigan, 1959 Season. Publications of the Museum, Michigan State University, Cultural Series Vol. 1, No. 1. Lansing.

DRAFT

Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collections
1892 *Reports on American Colonies, 1721-1762, Canadian Archives,* vol. 19, pp. 1-8. Lansing.

Monk, Susan M.
1986 A Summary of Archeological Monitoring at Grand Portage National Monument during Creek Bank Stabilization, August 18-21. Ms. on file, Midwest Archeological Center, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Nassaney, Michael S.
2015 *Archaeology of the North American Fur Trade*. University Press of Florida, Gainesville.

Naum, Magdalena
2010 Re-emerging Frontiers: Postcolonial Theory and Historical Archaeology on the Borderlands, *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 17(2):101-131.

Nelson, Sarah M., K. Lynn Berry, Richard E. Carrillo, Bonnie J. Clark, Lori E. Rhodes, and Dean Saitta
2008 *Denver: An Archaeological* History. University of Colorado Press, Boulder.

Noble, Vergil E.
1978 Excavations at Fort Ouiatenon 1977 Field Season: Preliminary Report. Report prepared for Tippecanoe County Historical Association, Michigan State University Museum, East Lansing.

1979 Excavations at Fort Ouiatenon 1978 Field Season: Preliminary Report. Report prepared for Tippecanoe County Historical Association, Michigan State University Museum, East Lansing.

1980 Excavations at Fort Ouiatenon 1979 Field Season: Preliminary Report. Report prepared for Tippecanoe County Historical Association, Michigan State University Museum, East Lansing.

1982a Excavations at Fort Ouiatenon 1979 Field Season: Supplementary Report. Report prepared for Tippecanoe County Historical Association, Michigan State University Museum, East Lansing.

1982b Excavating Fort Ouiatenon, A French Fur Trading Post. *Archaeology* 35(2):71-73.

1983 *Functional Classification and Intra-Site Analysis in Historical Archaeology: A Case Study from Fort Ouiatenon*. Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

1989 *An Archeological Survey of Development Projects within Grand Portage National Monument, Cook County, Minnesota*. USDI, National Park Service, Midwest Archeological Center. Report on file, Midwest Archeological Center, Lincoln, Nebraska.

1990 *A Report on Archeological Investigations within the Grand Portage Depot (21CK6), Grand Portage National Monument, Minnesota*: The Kitchen Drainage Project. USDI, National Park Service, Midwest Archeological Center. Report on file, Midwest Archeological Center, Lincoln, Nebraska.

1991 *Ouiatenon* on the *Ouabache*: Archaeological Investigations at a Fur Trading Post on the Wabash River. In: *French Colonial Archaeology: The Illinois Country and the Western Great Lakes*, edited by J. A. Walthall, pp. 65-77. Univ. of Illinois Press, Urbana.

DRAFT

Orser, Charles E.
2009 World-Systems Theory, Networks, and Modern-World Archaeology, In *International Handbook of Historical Archaeology*, edited by T. Majewski and D. Gaimster, pp. 253-268. Springer, New York.

Ostrogorsky, Michael
1982 An Idaho Model of Frontier Settlement, *North American Archaeologist* 3(1):79-84.

Parker, Bradley J., and Lars Rodseth, editors
2005 *Untaming the Frontier in Anthropology, Archaeology, and History*, University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

Parkman, Francis
1994 *The Conspiracy of Pontiac and the Indian War after the Conquest of Canada*, 2 vols. Reprint of the 1851 edition. Bison Books, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Pope-Pfingston, Jodi, and Noel D. Justice
1993 *Fort Ouiatenon: A French and Indian Occupation along the Wabash River in Tippecanoe County, Indiana: A Collections Management Report*. Glenn A. Black Laboratory of Archaeology, Indiana University, Bloomington.

Quimby, George Irving
1966 *Indian Culture and European Trade Goods*. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.

Quimby, George I., and Alexander Spoehr
1951 *Acculturation and Material Culture*. Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago.

Ray, Arthur J.
1974 *Indians in the Fur Trade: Their Role as Hunters, Trappers and Middlemen in the Lands Southwest of Hudson Bay 1660-1870*. University of Toronto Press.

1978 History and Archaeology of the Northern Fur Trade, *American Antiquity* 43(1):26-34.

Reck, Todd M.
2004 *Re-excavating Michilimackinac: Use of Harris Matrices to Analyze Stratigraphy for the Purpose of Studying French Canadians Living in the South Southwest Rowhouse of Fort Michilimackinac*. Doctoral Dissertation, Department of Archaeology, Boston University.

Rubertone, Patricia E.
2000 The Historical Archaeology of Native Americans. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 29:425-446.

Sauer, N. J., S. S. Dunlap, and L. R. Simson
1988 Medicolegal Investigation of an Eighteenth-Century Homicide. *The American Journal of Forensic Medicine and Pathology* 9(1):66-73.

DRAFT

Schneider, Allan F.
1966 Physiography. In *Natural Features of Indiana*, edited by Alton A. Lindsey, pp. 40-56. Indiana Academy of Science, Indianapolis.

South, Stanley
1977 *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology*. Academic Press, New York.

Stone, Lyle M.
1974 *Fort Michilimackinac 1715-1781: An Archaeological Perspective on the Revolutionary Frontier*. Publications of the Museum, Michigan State University, Anthropological Series 1, No. 1. East Lansing, Michigan.

Strezewski, Michael
2014 *Fur Trade Archeology in the Fort Ouiatenon Vicinity: The 2012/2013 Investgations*. University of Southern Indiana, Archaeology Laboratory, Reports of Investigations 13-03. Evansville, Indiana.

Strezewski, Michael, James R. Jones, III, and Dorothea McCullough
2006 Archaeological Investigations at Site 12-T-59 and Two Other Locations in Prophetstown State Park, Tippecanoe County, Indiana. IPFW Archaeological Survey, Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne, *Reports of Investigations* 513.

Strezewski, Michael, and Robert G. McCullough
2010 Report of the 2009 Archaeological Investigations at Three Fur Trade-Era Sites in Tippecanoe County, Indiana: Kethtippecanunk (12-T-59), Fort Ouiatenon (12-T-9), and a Kickapoo-Mascouten Village (12-T-335). Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne Archaeological Survey, Reports of Investigations 903. Submitted to the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, Indianapolis, Indiana.

2017 Fur Trade Archaeology at the Ouiatenon Preserve: The 2016/2017 Geophysical Investigations. University of Southern Indiana, Archaeology Laboratory, Report of Investigations 16-03. Evansville.

Strezewski, Michael, Robert G. McCullough, Dorothea McCullough, Craig Arnold, and Josh Wells
2007 Report of the 2006 Archaeological Investigations at Kethtippecanunk (12-T-59), Tippecanoe County, Indiana. Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne Archaeological Survey, Reports of Investigations 703. Submitted to the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Sturdevant, Jay T.
2007 Trip report for archeological testing of proposed pathway route at Grand Portage National Monument, October 9-26,2006. Memo on file, Midwest Archeological Center, Lincoln, Nebraska.

2009a Trip report for archeological fieldwork at Grand Portage National Monument, Minnesota, May 13-May 30, 2009. Memo on file, Midwest Archeological Center, Lincoln, Nebraska.

2009b Trip report for archeological fieldwork at Grand Portage National Monument, Minnesota, September 6-19, 2009. Memo on file, Midwest Archeological Center, Lincoln, Nebraska.

DRAFT

2010 Trip report for archeological fieldwork at Grand Portage National Monument, Minnesota, May 10-June 10, 2010, Memo on file, Midwest Archeological Center, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Sturdevant, Jay T., Andrew E. LaBounty, David J. Cooper, and Ashley J. Barnett
2017 *Terrestrial Archeological Resources of Fort Charlotte, Grand Portage National Monument, Minnesota*. Technical Report xxx. USDI, National Park Service, Midwest Archeological Center. Lincoln, Nebraska.

Tanner, Helen, editor
1987 *Atlas of Great Lakes Indian History*. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.

Temple, Wayne C.
1958 Indian Villages of the Illinois Country. *Illinois State Museum Scientific Papers*, Vol. 2, pt. 2. Springfield.

Tordoff, Judith D.
1975 Preliminary Report of Excavations at Fort Ouiatenon, 12T9, Tippecanoe County, Indiana. Report prepared for Tippecanoe County Historical Association. Michigan State University Museum, East Lansing.

1980 Excavations at Fort Ouiatenon, 1974-76 Seasons: Preliminary Report. Report prepared for Tippecanoe County Historical Assocation. Michigan State University Museum, East Lansing.

1983 *An Archaeological Perspective on the Organization of the Fur Trade in Eighteenth-Century New France*. Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Trubowitz, Neal L.
1989a Historical Archaeology Research by IU-Indianapolis, 1987. In Current Research in Indiana Archaeology and Prehistory: 1987 & 1988, edited by C. S. Peebles, pp.29-30. Indiana University, Glenn A. Black Laboratory of Archaeology Research Reports No. 10, Bloomington, Indiana.

1989b Historical Archaeology Research by IU-Indianapolis, 1988. In *Current Research in Indiana Archaeology and Prehistory: 1987 & 1988*, edited by C. S. Peebles, pp. 50-51. Indiana University, Glenn A. Black Laboratory of Archaeology Research Reports No. 10, Bloomington, Indiana.

1990 Thanks, But We Prefer to Smoke Our Own: Pipes in the Great Lakes-Riverine Region During the Eighteenth Century. In *Current Research in Indiana Archaeology and Prehistory: 1989*, edited by C. S. Peebles, p.17. Indiana University, Glenn A. Black Laboratory of Archaeology Research Reports No. 11, Bloomington, Indiana.

1991 Inventory and Analysis of Fort Ouiatenon (12T9) Collections,1987-1990. In Current Research in Indiana Archaeology and Prehistory: 1990, edited by C. S. Peebles, p.24. Indiana University, Glenn A. Black Laboratory of Archaeology Research Reports No. 12, Bloomington, Indiana.

1992 Native Americans and French on the Central Wabash. In *Calumet and Fleur-de-Lys: Archaeology of Indian and French Contact in the Midcontinent*, edited by John A. Walthall and Thomas E. Emerson,

DRAFT

pp.241-264. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

Trubowitz, Neal L., and James R. Jones, III
1986 Historical Archaeology Research by IUPUI, 1986. Paper Presented at the Indiana Historical Society Meetings, Indianapolis.

1986 The Search for the Eighteenth Century Wea: 1986 IUPUI Research. Paper presented at the Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Nashville.

1987a Historical Archaeology Research by IUPUI, 1986. In *Current Research in Indiana Archaeology and Prehistory: 1986*, edited by Christopher S. Peebles, p.20. Indiana University, Glenn A. Black Laboratory of Archaeology Research Reports No. 7, Bloomington, Indiana.

1987b Testing the Wea Site (12T6): Long Term Research Begins. Paper presented at the Society for Historical Archaeology Conference, Savannah.

1987c Recent 18th Century Archaeological Research in Central Indiana. Paper presented at the Fortress of Louisbourg, Cape Breton Island, Nova Scotia.

1987d Wea and Kethtippecanunk: The Two Largest Known 18th Century Indian Villages in Indiana. Paper presented at the Southeastern States Archaeological Conference/Eastern States Archaeological Federation Joint Meeting.

Turner, Frederick Jackson
1921 *The Frontier in American History.* Holt, New York.

Volf, William J.
2002 Magnetic Gradient and Resistance Geophysical Surveys at Grand Portage National Monument (21CK6), Cook County, Minnesota. USDI, National Park Service, Midwest Archeological Center. Report on file, Midwest Archeological Center, Lincoln, Nebraska.

von Frese, Ralph R. B.
1978 *Magnetic Exploration of Historical Midwestern Archaeological Sites as Exemplified by a Survey of Fort Ouiatenon*. Master's thesis, Department of Physics, Purdue University.

1984 Archaeological Anomalies of Midcontinental North American Archaeological Sites. *Historical Archaeology* 18(2):4-19.

von Frese, Ralph R. B., and Vergil E. Noble
1984 Magnetometry for Archaeological Exploration of Historical Sites. *Historical Archaeology* 18(2):38-53.

Wallerstein, Immanuel
1979 *The Capitalist World Economy*. Cambridge University Press.

1980 *The Modern World System II: Mercantilism and the Consolidation of the European World-Economy, 1600-1750*. Academic Press, New York.

DRAFT

Waselkov, Gregory A.
1979 Zumwalt's Fort: An Archaeological Study of Frontier Process, *Missouri Archaeologist* 40.

Waselkov, Gregory A., and R. Eli Paul
1981 Frontiers and Archaeology, *North American Archaeologist* 2(4):309-329.

Wheeler, Robert C., Walter A. Kenyon, Alan R. Woolworth, and Douglas A. Birk
1975 *Voices from the Rapids: An Underwater Search for Fur Trade Artifacts, 1960-1973*. Minnesota Historical Soceity Series No. 3. St. Paul.

Whitaker, John O., Jr., and Charles J. Amlaner, Jr. (Editors)
2012 Habitats and Ecological Communities of Indiana: Presettlement to Present. Indiana University Press, Bloomington

White, John R.
1974 Historic Contact Sites as Laboratories for the Study of Culture Change. *Conference on Historic Sites Archaeology Papers 9:153-163.*

White, Richard
1991 *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650–1815*. Cambridge University Press, London.

Woolworth, Alan R.
1969 Archaeological Excavations at Grand Portage National Monument, 1963-1964 Field Season. Ms. on file, Midwest Archeological Center, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Woolworth, Alan R., and Nancy L. Woolworth
1982 Grand Portage National Monument: An Historical Overview and an Inventory of Its Cultural Resources. 2 vols. Ms. on file, Midwest Archeological Center, Lincoln, Nebraska.

DRAFT

Previous documentation on file (NPS):

_X_ Previously listed in the National Register (fill in 1 through 6 below)
__ Not previously listed in the National Register (fill in **only** 4, 5, and 6 below)

1. NR # 70000008 (Fort Ouiatenon site only)
2. Date of listing: February 16, 1970
3. Level of significance: state
4. Applicable National Register Criteria: A__ B__ C__ D_X_
5. Criteria Considerations (Exceptions): A__ B__ C__ D__ E__ F__ G__
6. Areas of Significance: commerce; military; politcal

__ Previously Determined Eligible for the National Register: Date of determination:
__ Designated a National Historic Landmark: Date of designation:
__ Recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey: HABS No.
__ Recorded by Historic American Engineering Record: HAER No.
__ Recorded by Historic American Landscapes Survey: HALS No.

Location of additional data:

State Historic Preservation Office: Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, Department of Natural Resources, Indianapolis
Other State Agency:
Federal Agency:
Local Government:
University: Glenn Black Laboratory, Indiana University, Bloomington
Other (Specify Repository): Tippecanoe County Historical Association, Lafayette, Indiana

DRAFT

8. FORM PREPARED BY

Name/Title: Dr. Vergil E. Noble, Archeologist

Address: National Park Service
Midwest Archeological Center
Federal Bldg., Room 474
Lincoln, NE 68508

Telephone: 402-437-5392 x 108

E-mail: vergil_noble@nps.gov

Date: **October 8, 2020**

Edited by: Michael P. Roller
National Park Service
National Historic Landmarks Program
1849 C St., NW - Mail Stop 7508
Washington, DC 20240

Telephone: (202) 354-2125

DRAFT

PHOTOGRAPH INFORMATION

List of Photos and Photo Identification Information.

Name of Property: Fort Ouiatenon Archeological District
County and State: Tippecanoe County, Indiana
Name of Photographer: John Colby Bartlett
Photograph Date:
Location of Original Digital Files: Tippecanoe County Historical Association, Lafayette, IN

Photo Number	Description	Camera Direction
1	Location of Fort Ouiatenon site (12T9)	West
2	Location of associated native village sites within district	North

Photo Log

Ink and Paper Combination: **UltraChrome HD Pigment Inks** on **Moab Juniper Baryta Rag Glossy Fine Art Inkjet Print Paper** using an **Epson SureColor P600** printer

Photo 0001: Location of Fort Ouiatenon site (12T9) (view west)
Fort Ouiatenon Archeological District
Tippecanoe County, Indiana
Photo courtesy of John Colby Bartlett
04/23/2018
Image archived at Tippecanoe County Historical Association, Lafayette, IN
Image file name: IN_Tippecanoe County_Fort Ouiatenon Archeological District_001.tif

Photo 0002: Location of associated native village sites within district (view north)
Fort Ouiatenon Archeological District
Tippecanoe County, Indiana
Photo courtesy of John Colby Bartlett
04/23/2018
Image archived at Tippecanoe County Historical Association, Lafayette, IN
Image file name: IN_Tippecanoe County_Fort Ouiatenon Archeological District_002.tif

DRAFT

FIGURES

Figure Number	Description of Figure
1	Location of Fort Ouiatenon and related eighteenth-century sites.
2	Fort Ouiatenon Archeological District NHL boundary.
3	Fort Ouiatenon Archeological District cultural resources, showing fort site (12T9) and associated native sites to the north.
4	Fort Ouiatenon site controlled excavations, 1968-1979.
5	University of Indiana field crew's block excavation at Ouiatenon, 1968.
6	Michigan State University exploratory trench, 1974.
7	Stockade trench exposed during exploratory excavations, 1974.
8	Forging area detected in magnetometer study, 1974.
9	Remains of semi-subterranean storehouse detected by magnetometry, 1975.
10	Well discovered in exploratory trench, 1975.
11	Excavating systematic sample unit, 1977.
12	Excavation of large block in NW quarter, 1979.
13	Aerial view of large block and dispersed sample units, facing SW, 1979.

DRAFT

National Historic Landmarks

Property Name: **FORT OUIATENON ARCHEOLOGICAL DISTRICT**

PAGES REMOVED

Figure Number: Figures 1, 2, 3, 4

Some information about this property is restricted under law:

National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, section 304, 16 U.S.C. 470w-3(a)
- *Confidentiality of the location of sensitive historic resources*

Section 304

[16 U.S.C. 470w-3(a) – Confidentiality of the location of sensitive historic resources]
(a) The head of a Federal agency or other public official receiving grant assistance pursuant to this Act, after consultation with the Secretary, shall withhold from disclosure to the public, information about the location, character, or ownership of a historic resource if the Secretary and the agency determine that disclosure may –
(1) cause a significant invasion of privacy;
(2) risk harm to the historic resources; or
(3) impede the use of a traditional religious site by practitioners.

DRAFT

Figure 5. University of Indiana field crew's block excavation at Ouiatenon, 1968.

DRAFT

Figure 6. Michigan State University exploratory trench, 1974.

DRAFT

Figure 7. Stockade trench exposed during exploratory excavations, 1974.

DRAFT

Figure 8. Forging area detected in magnetometer study, 1974.

DRAFT

DRAFT

Figure 9. Remains of semi-subterranean storehouse detected by magnetometry, 1975.

DRAFT

Figure 10. Well discovered in exploratory trench, 1975.

Figure 11. Excavating systematic sample unit, 1977.

Figure 12. Excavation of large block in NW quarter, 1979.

DRAFT

DRAFT

Figure 13. Aerial view of large block and dispersed sample units, facing SW, 1979.