


Box 1
D-14

MANAGING THE SACRED AND THE SECULAR:

AN ADMINISTRATIVE HISTORY OF PIPESTONE NATIONAL MONUMENT



HAL K. ROTHMAN
DANIEL J. HOLDER, RESEARCH ASSOCIATE
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE 1992

ON MICROFILM

Color Scans
10/8/2002

PLEASE RETURN TO:
TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER
DENVER SERVICE CENTER
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

MANAGING THE SACRED AND THE SECULAR:
AN ADMINISTRATIVE HISTORY OF PIPESTONE NATIONAL MONUMENT

National Park Service
Midwest Region
MWR-1-0015-002

Final History
September 10, 1992

by
Hal K. Rothman

Daniel J. Holder, Research Associate

Hal K. Rothman and Associates
2809 Barrel Cactus
Henderson NV 89014
(702) 896-6475
(702) 739-1012

PLEASE RETURN TO:
TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER
DENVER SERVICE CENTER
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Table of Contents

Executive Summary i

The Coteau Setting 1

Clearing Federal Title 1858-1928 25

Founding Pipestone National Monument 51

"This National Park Service Outpost" 1938-1956 75

MISSION 66 and the Modern Era 104

"An Indian-Oriented Park:" Native Americans and the Monument . 140

Cultural and Natural Resources Management 172

The Park and Its Neighbors: The Hiawatha Club 202

Threats to the Park 219

Bibliographic Essay 235

Appendices 240

Executive Summary

Located in southwestern Minnesota, Pipestone National Monument is anomalous among national park areas. Containing the famed pipestone quarries of Longfellow's "The Song of Hiawatha," Pipestone National Monument is one of the few places in the United States that has deep spiritual meaning to more than one culture. Native Americans revere the site for the soft stone found there, while Euro-Americans have cast the quarries within the bounds of their romantic consciousness of a lost natural and cultural history of the continent. Decisions made about the administration of the quarries expand out from Pipestone in overlapping series of concentric rings. Since the establishment of the monument, administration has required tact, sensitivity, and creativity.

As did much other American Indian land, the pipestone quarries passed to the federal government as a result of treaties. After 1858, the only area of Minnesota to which the Yankton Sioux or Lakota people retained any claim was the 640-acre reservation that included the quarries. In 1928, after more than 30 years of legal maneuvering over the nature of that right, the Yankton received a monetary settlement. The quarry passed to the undisputed control of the federal government.

With clear title, efforts to utilize the quarries for other purposes proceeded. In 1932, a group of local citizens, led by a local woman named Winifred Bartlett, began to push for a national park area. Five years later, Pipestone National Monument was

established, one of the first national monuments proclaimed by legislative action rather than executive fiat.

The National Park Service faced typical problems at Pipestone. Initially, there was no budget for management and upkeep and only a volunteer to watch the monument. After the Second World War, a permanent superintendent came to the monument. Despite the commitment of personnel resources, the monument required much more before it achieved the standards the National Park Service established for its units.

The arrival of the first full-time employee in 1948 was the beginning of a 24-year period of growth and expansion at Pipestone. MISSION 66, the largest capital development program in history of the park system, built the physical plant at the monument. A new visitor center was the highlight of the program, which included housing, facilities, and a physical plant. In the late 1960s, another development began. Directed toward creating a climate of inclusion, a cultural center was constructed. Called the Upper Midwest American Indian Cultural Craft Center, the structure created an environment in which American Indians could practice their craftmaking skills and display their work.

The construction of the center was the last large capital project at Pipestone. Since the 1970s, issues such as relations with Native Americans, cultural and natural resources management, the annual Hiawatha Club pageant, and threat to the park have dominated planning at Pipestone. As elsewhere in the park system, Pipestone has been hampered by the changing emphases of

park policy, usually dictated from outside the agency, as well as a growing dearth of resources to support programs. With an important piece of the cultural heritage of the continent and the concomitant natural resources management issues, the monument had a complicated and sometimes expensive mission to fulfill. With the resources at the disposal of park administrators, attaining such goals will require foresight, planning, and careful management.

CHAPTER I: THE COTEAU SETTING

The roads of southwestern Minnesota wind their way through endless acres of cultivated fields. This land, once covered with a range of native grasses, has yielded to the insistent technology of the twentieth century. It seems tamed, a part of the ordered world Americans have made. Yet this land has been different, less subservient, only marginally harnessed for humanity. Its historic name, the Couteau des Prairies, the Highland of the Prairies, reflected a different, more unruly past. Given by some unnamed "coureur de bois"--the term French officials used for the traders who illegally went west--the name hints at the many cultures and peoples who have interacted in this place. Today, amid the ordered fields of crops and the grazing animals, this historic name seems anachronistic, a relic of a time gone by. Only in a very few places does any remnant of the prehistoric and historic coteau setting persist.

Pipestone National Monument is one of the most important of those places. Its 282 acres are mostly prairie, managed to recreate as much of an historic vista as possible. Its grasses resemble more the tallgrass prairies of historic time than the lands around them, and its cultural significance adds a measure of history to an environment transformed by human action. The quarries there hold one of the largest and most important deposits of Catlinite, the soft red stone used to make the famed calumet--peace pipe--of legend. Native Americans from many tribes come to the monument to quarry the stone. They are

mandated by National Park Service regulations to use only historic kinds of tools and methods. The presence of American Indians lends authenticity to the park, adding a dimension that the mere static quarries could not alone provide.

The quarries and their prehistoric and historic context are the reason for the existence of the monument. Before the arrival of Europeans and their descendants in what is now Minnesota, these unique natural features had tremendous religious and symbolic importance for Native Americans. The pipes they fashioned from the stone were integral parts of Native American religion and custom. Across the Upper Midwest, every important ceremony involving Native Americans utilized pipes, most made from the stone of the quarries. The area acquired significance as well. Ritual use of the stone from the quarries made the source a place to be revered. Through art and literature, Europeans and Americans attached their own meaning to the place, adding mythological significance to the activities of Native Americans. Like many such places, the quarries at Pipestone National Monument acquired a meaning that became as much a reflection of the values of the observer as of any historic reality.

Pipestone National Monument sits astride cultural, geographic, and topographic divisions that have influenced the way in which the stone from its quarries has been distributed and used. Geology and natural history created the conditions that formed the layers of the soft rock. The location of the quarry

between different types of physiographic regions added complexity to its prehistory and history. In this setting, natural and human factors have combined to create an area of cultural and natural significance.

The flatiron-shaped plateau that is the Coteau des Prairies stretches across southwestern Minnesota into South Dakota, with the land elevated by the remains of an ancient mountain range. At the eastern edge of the coteau, a series of broad steps descend from the plateau to the Minnesota River Lowland, a southeastern extension of the basin formed by the Red River of the North. As a result of almost continuous cover of glacial sediments, exposures of bedrock are rare in the area. Extensive areas of outcrop are found in the coteau region, with uptilted ridges of Sioux Quartzite of late Precambrian age underneath.¹

The Precambrian period encompasses seven-eighths of the history of the earth. It spans time from the formation of the earth nearly 4.5 billion years ago to the development of invertebrate life, about 600 million years ago. During this time, volcanic unrest of the crust of the earth, wind, water, and ice shaped the land. The earth developed a solid crust, continental seas formed and evaporated, and mountain ranges rose and fell.

Continental seas invaded Minnesota during the Paleozoic era, between 600 million and 225 million years ago, and the

¹ Richard Ojakangas and Charles L. Matsch, Minnesota's Geology (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982), 223-24.

subsequent Mesozoic era, ending 65 million years ago. The seas laid down what became layer upon layer of sedimentary rock, mostly sandstone, dolomite, shale, and limestone. Near the end of this era, around 100 million years ago, warm Cretaceous seas were an integral component of a tropical environment in Minnesota. At the beginning of the Cenozoic era, about 65 million years ago, mammals first appeared. Some may have inhabited Minnesota. In the most recent increment of geologic time, the Quaternary Period, glaciers transformed the landscape of Minnesota, leaving the contours recognizable today. The massive Laurentide Ice Sheet, centered on Hudson Bay, covered the state four times. The last great expansion of glacial ice, the Wisconsin glaciation, sculpted the many lakes of the state.²

The many periods of glaciation shaped the topography of the state, leaving rolling hills, contours, and the distinctive prairies of southwestern Minnesota. Even the distribution of rock and the depth of soil were influenced by glaciation. When the last glacier to cover the Pipestone area, the Des Moines lobe, pushed southward about 14,000 years ago, it scraped off great quantities of rock and soil. Some of these large boulders were left standing on the glacial plains when the glacier retreated. One example, the Three Maidens at Pipestone National Monument, is typical. Once it was a large glacial boulder, more than fifty feet in diameter. At some point, it fractured along

² Patricia Comdon Johnson, Minnesota: Portrait of the Land and its People (Helena, MT: American Geographic Publishing, 1989), 16-19.

natural seams or joints. The three largest pieces are each about twenty feet long and twelve feet high. They contrast with the landscape around them.³

The Des Moines Lobe, fed by the Laurentide Ice sheet in Canada, had other consequences. The surface deposits it left were loess, the fine textured silt deposited by wind during the final period of glaciation and lying over clay-rich till of pre-Wisconsin, or Kansan, age. The resulting prairie soils became rich and deep, for they developed on these thick deposits of glacial till.⁴

The vistas of southwestern Minnesota and the Pipestone National Monument area also resulted from the glacial process. The advance and retreat of glaciers defined the modern topography of the coteau region. Throughout the area, more than 700 feet of glacial drift, the loose debris left by advancing and receding glaciers, covers the bedrock. The Sioux Quartzite underneath is highly resistant to erosion, leaving higher elevations and relatively consistent topography in the Coteau des Prairies region. The coteau itself towers 500 to 800 feet above the surrounding plain of till. Its quartzite formation is nearly horizontal, accounting for the plateau-like characteristics of the region. Many exposed areas of Sioux Quartzite bear the marks

³ Ojakangas and Matsch, Minnesota's Geology, 225-27; George M. Schwartz and George A. Thiel, Minnesota's Rocks and Waters: A Geological Story (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1963), 289; Johnson, Portrait of the Land, 19.

⁴ Ojakangas and Matsch, Minnesota's Geology, 225-27.

of glacial abrasion, preserved because the rock is so resistant to weathering.⁵

As a result, the southwest corner of Minnesota consists of an elevated, lake-free, gently rolling landscape, with a surface composed of older drift material that is covered by wind-blown silt. The Big Sioux River carries water in a well-developed drainage system, with channels formed by glacial process. The occasional outcropping of Sioux quartzite is testimony to the hard rock lying beneath the surface of the coteau region.⁶

The defining feature of the region is the presence of this hard stone. A Precambrian sandstone, Sioux Quartzite is one of the hardest of the common rocks. It is at or near the surface south and west of Pipestone National Monument. Extensive exposures are found in the vicinities of Pipestone, Jasper, and Luverne. A large area along the southwest border of the state, from west of Lake Benton southward, also shows significant deposits. Sioux Quartzite is classified as a metamorphic rock formed from sandstone, with silicon dioxide as a cement, and recrystallized as a result of heat, pressure, and chemical action.⁷

⁵ Schwartz and Thiel, Minnesota's Rocks and Waters, 288; Johnson, Portrait of the Land, 68.

⁶ Ojakangas and Matsch, Minnesota's Geology, 223; Schwartz and Thiel, Minnesota's Rocks and Waters, 286-87.

⁷ Ojakangas and Matsch, Minnesota's Geology, 227-28; George A. Thiel, The Geology and Underground Waters of Southern Minnesota (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1944), 348-53.

The stone was formed early in geologic time. About 1,600 million years ago, erosion began to wear down the Penokean Mountains in the Lake Superior region. The weathering of the gneiss-granite terrace to the south was also under way. This erosion produced quartz sand, which eventually formed into a 1,500-meter-thick layer of Sioux Quartzite in southwest Minnesota.⁸

Sioux Quartzite is usually pinkish, but can vary from almost white to a reddish-purple color. Much of it is probably about one and one half billion years old. Geologists believe it was formed in shallow water, possibly on the edge of a shallow sea. The presence of the quartzite around Pipestone National Monument indicates the area was quiet and stable during the Precambrian period.⁹

The unique natural feature of the monument is the pipestone for which it is named. Pipestone is an easily carved, clay-rich rock layer found in the Sioux Quartzite. A red mudstone, it is colored by disseminated hematite. It is a naturally hardened clay, composed largely of aluminum silicate and iron impurities. Generally pipestone is found in shale-like layers sixteen to twenty inches thick that are sandwiched between massive layers of Sioux Quartzite.¹⁰

⁸ Ojakangas and Matsch, Minnesota's Geology, 47.

⁹ Schwartz and Thiel, Minnesota's Rocks and Waters, 286-87.

¹⁰ Ibid., 287; James N. Gunderson, "The Mineralogical Characterization of Catlinite from its Sole Provenance, Pipestone National Monument, Minnesota," (Omaha: National Park Service, 1991)

Geologists believe that more than one billion years ago, pipestone was a clay material and quartzite was sand that was deposited at the bottom of a sea. Other sediments buried these beds deep below the surface of the earth, where heat, pressure, and chemical action and reaction transformed the sand into quartzite and the clay into pipestone. Later, pressures beneath the surface caused the beds to fold and uplift. Subsequent erosion wore away underlying beds, until in some areas the pipestone was exposed.¹¹

The region in which this stone predominates lies in the southwestern corner of the state of Minnesota. While Minnesota straddles the transition zone between the eastern woodlands and western prairies of North America, southwestern Minnesota is prairie. The major portion of the region, north of Pipestone County, consisted of slightly contoured or entirely flat sheets of glacial till, ascending with a very gentle slope from east to west and enclosing shallow ponds and lakes. Tallgrass prairie covered the southwestern part of the state, where the common grasses were big bluestem, little bluestem, Indian grass, prairie clover, goldenrod, and pasque flower.¹²

Research/Resources Management Report MWR-17, 5; G. N. Delin, "Occurrence of Catlinite in the Southern Half of Pipestone National Monument, Minnesota," (Minneapolis, Minnesota: U.S. Geological Survey, 1980); Johnson, Portrait of the Land, 69.

¹¹ Johnson, Portrait of the Land, 69.

¹² Ojakangas and Matsch, Minnesota's Geology, 226, 229-30; Johnson, Portrait of the Land, 22.

Pipestone County, in which the monument and the town of Pipestone are located, is different from the rest of the area. It lies on a dividing line. The till of the Bemis Moraine, material deposited at the edge of the Des Moines Lobe, separates it from the surrounding area. The crest of the Coteau des Prairies crosses the northeastern corner of Pipestone County, producing a rough, irregular topography with elevations reaching 1,900 feet. Hills rise abruptly, 100 to 150 feet above the valleys, and are often very stony. The coteau crest forms a divide between the Mississippi and Missouri rivers. Along with Flandreau Creek and Rock River, which flow to the southwest, Pipestone and Split creeks drain the western half of the county.¹³

Most of the upland surfaces in Pipestone County remain covered with glacial sediment deposited by several different drift sheets. The sediment varies greatly in thickness. A line drawn diagonally from the northwestern corner of the county to its southeastern corner roughly forms the boundary between the thick and thin deposits. Drifts reaching 700 feet in depth are found northeast of this line. Southwest of the line, such drifts are thin or entirely absent.¹⁴

¹³ Thiel, The Geology and Underground Waters of Southern Minnesota, 348; Gunderson, "The Mineralogical Characterization of Catlinite," 3.

¹⁴ Thiel, The Geology and Underground Waters of Southern Minnesota, 349-50.

This drift covers the Sioux Quartzite. The quartzite forms a low, west-facing escarpment north of the city of Pipestone, over which Pipestone Creek leaps in a small cataract. At this location, the stone for which the monument is named is found near the surface. Easy access to this stone gave the area a practical and ceremonial significance.

Human beings utilized the soft pipestone they found on the prairies of what became southwestern Minnesota. Archeological surveys reveal that beginning about 1000 B. C. and ending around A. D. 700, artifacts made from pipestone found in the quarries of southwestern Minnesota were traded as far east as modern Ohio, as far south as the Kansas River, and as far west as north central South Dakota. Studies in the Ohio area suggest evidence of the greatest concentration of the stone, with a number of sites clustered along the Oletangy River. During this time, few Indians lived on the Great Plains, offering an explanation for the scant presence of local pipestone in the region. Until after the arrival of Europeans in the New World, Native American permanent presence was limited to a few scattered agricultural villages, such as those of the Mandan, Pawnee, Caddoe, and Wichita, in the various river drainages of the plains.¹⁵

More intensive quarrying began around A. D. 700 and certainly before 1200. There appears to have been easy access to

¹⁵ John S. Sigstad, "The Age and Distribution of Catlinite and Red Pipestone," (Ph.D. diss., University of Missouri, 1973), 49, 155; Arrell Morgan Gibson, The American Indian: Prehistory to the Present (Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath, 1980), 249, 262.

the sacred stone for many different groups. As a result, the pipes were traded or carried widely across the North American continent. Examples of stone from what is now Pipestone National Monument have been found in Anasazi and Hohokam sites in the Southwest, in villages located along the Arkansas River, up and down the Missouri River, throughout western Iowa, and as far east as the Ohio River area. The extent of the distribution suggests that more than one group of Native Americans traded raw quarried pipestone or artifacts made from it.

The horse revolutionized the lifestyles of the Native American tribes that surrounded the Great Plains. Introduced by A. D. 1500, horses spread widely as a result of Spanish presence, infiltrating the plains from all directions. Through trade and theft, Indians acquired horses, also utilizing the feral animals that roamed the plains. Horse culture gave Indians a measure of mobility that they previously lacked and allowed the transformation of the economy of some tribes from agriculture to hunting.

A number of Siouian-speaking peoples were among the Indians who used the horse to make the plains their home. Before the horse, few Native Americans lived on the prairies. Most of these people lived in river drainages. But the mobility that horses provided brought tribes from the surrounding area on to the plains. By the early 1600s, Otoes, Omahas, Iowas, and other groups were among them. These Indians quarried pipestone

material. Valued for ritual and religious purposes, the stone was an integral part of Native American ceremonial practice.

Before the coming of the Sioux at the beginning of the eighteenth century, Minnesota pipestone was common in southern Arizona, along the Ohio River in northern Kentucky, and along the upper Missouri River. It had become a trade item among the Indians who lived in the Midwest or traveled across it.

Sioux expansion westward from the Great Lakes, beginning in the mid-seventeenth century and continuing in the eighteenth century, had an impact on the distribution of pipestone. One indirect result of the Iroquois-Algonquin wars, which pushed Algonquin people from the East Coast to the Great Lakes region, was the movement of the Sioux peoples into Minnesota and further on to the plains. They were crowded by newcomers from the east and faced greater competition for the economic resources of the Great Lakes. Their motivation was economic in character: they valued the abundant beaver for trade purposes and the American Bison as a ready food supply. The increase in Indian refugees made westward movement the best alternative for some branches of the Sioux. With armed Ojibways and Crees to their east and north and lacking both firearms and the horse, the Sioux pushed westward towards the Missouri River.¹⁶

¹⁶ Richard White, "The Winning of the West: The Expansion of the Western Sioux in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries," The Journal of American History 65, no. 2 (September 1978): 319-43; Richard White, The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 1-49.

This squeezed the Oto, Omaha, Iowa, and other plains peoples who faced the aggressive expansionist Sioux. The various branches of the Sioux found the beaver trade lucrative. With the acquisition of firearms from the French, they became a formidable opponent for other Native Americans. By the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century, Sioux peoples had control of the area east of the Missouri River. While they acquired their first horses as early as 1707, it took longer to integrate the animals into their way of life. By the 1750s, the horse had become an important part of Sioux culture, setting the stage for later expansions westward.¹⁷ The Oglala branch migrated westward, while the Yankton Sioux established control of the coteau quarries from which the pipestone came.

The western Sioux, of which the Yankton were one branch, developed an economy that existed in uneasy balance with the limits of their physical environment. As long as they could control access to the natural resources of what they considered their domain, life was plentiful. During the summer, they followed the buffalo and in the winters they trapped beaver. In the spring, they traveled to trade fairs. The geographic location of different Sioux groups was reflected in the nature of their economy. Groups adapted to the available resources. The Yanktons in what is now Minnesota valued beaver ahead of buffalo,

¹⁷ White, "The Winning of the West," 322-23; Anthony McGinnis, Counting Coup and Cutting Horses: Intertribal Warfare on the Northern Plains 1738-1889 (Evergreen, CO: Cordillera Press, Inc., 1990), 6-9.

while the more western branches became buffalo hunters to the near exclusion of beaver trapping.

Trade fairs allowed the Sioux to function as middlemen between western non-Sioux tribes and eastern Santee Sioux, who had trade ties to the French to their north and east. Throughout most of the eighteenth century, the fairs worked successfully for the Yankton and other branches of the western Sioux. But by the early nineteenth century, the middleman role of the western Sioux began to collapse as French, Spanish, and later American traders came up the Missouri River and circumvented the Sioux network.

The trade fairs provide the best explanation for the unwillingness of the Yankton to allow others to quarry. The western Sioux sought to reduce some of the surrounding groups of Native Americans to serf-like status. As a result of the increase in Sioux population and the suffering and depopulation of peoples such as the Mandan from smallpox and other diseases in the nineteenth century, the Sioux were ascendant. They exerted economic control over such groups as the Arikara before 1800. As Sioux hegemony began to break down on the eastern plains in response to the influx of trade goods that followed Capts. Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, the Yankton sought to retain what they could of the old order. Domination of access to the quarries at Pipestone assured that a valuable trade resource that

American, French, and Spanish traders did not have remained exclusively theirs.¹⁸

But the potential for economic reward that brought the Sioux to the eastern plains also brought their successors--European-Americans. The Sioux came for what they could derive from westward expansion. Whites followed largely for the same reason. Late in the eighteenth century, French and Spanish traders moved up the Missouri River. The goods they brought to trade to villagers competed with the Sioux trade fairs, a threat to the Sioux economy. The traders had a different interpretation of the status quo. They saw the Sioux drawing off trade to Canada that should have come down the Missouri River. An economic war had begun.

Another consequence of the appearance of the traders affected the balance of power in the region. Epidemic diseases such as smallpox traveled in close concert with the traders, wreaking havoc on the settled villages of people such as the Hidatsas, Arikaras, and Mandans. In 1795, the Arikaras were reduced from 32 villages to two, causing immeasurable social and economic disruption along with the obvious cultural and demographic problems. The Sioux were largely unaffected; their

¹⁸ Ibid., 323-32; interestingly, George Catlin attributed Sioux domination of the quarries to "the instigation of whites, who have told [the Sioux] that by keeping off other tribes . . . they can acquire much influence and wealth." See George Catlin, North American Indians: Being Letters and Notes on Their Manners, Customs, and Conditions Written During Eight Years' Travel Amongst the Wildest Tribes of Indians in North America, 1832-1839 (Edinburgh: John Grant, 1926), 190.

advance to the south and west of the Missouri River put them out of reach of the primary path of the epidemics. Their mobile way of life gave them less contact with whites and fewer opportunities to contract disease. It also meant that they did not add the degree of risk that contact with refuse, fouled water, and other conditions associated with village life created. As a result, the Sioux were the only Native American group on the high plains that apparently increased in population over the course of the nineteenth century. The people who had held Sioux expansion in check were decimated, and the Sioux extended the area of their hegemony across the northern plains.¹⁹

While the Sioux were successful in keeping control over their neighbors, white encroachment on the plains caused larger long-term problems. White hunters eliminated the bison south of the Omaha villages before 1820, and by the 1840s, an increasing Native American population hunted far fewer animals. Maintaining economic control of the plains required greater Sioux vigilance, expanded hunting grounds, and gradually an increased recognition of the need to control other material commodities.²⁰

The Yankton Sioux, firmly in control of southwestern Minnesota, dominated the pipestone quarries. Trade associated with the stone was an important component of the Yankton economy. The quarries had an added advantage. They were located far from

¹⁹ White, "Winning of the West," 325-26; Alfred Crosby, The Columbian Exchange: The Biological and Cultural Consequences of 1492 (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1972).

²⁰ McGinnis, Counting Coup and Cutting Horses, 16-23.

the rivers that served as the course of white entry to the plains. As a result, throughout the increasing turmoil in the Native American world of the plains during the first half of the nineteenth century, the Yankton maintained uncontested control of this valuable spiritual, cultural, and economic resource.

Whites were aware of pipestone long before they found the source of the stone. French traders reported seeing pipes and other artifacts made from the stone as early as the middle of the seventeenth century. In the 1660s, Miami and Mascouten refugees near Green Bay offered French trader Nicolas Perrot a red stone calumet as part of a welcoming ceremony; in 1683, Father Louis Hennepin wrote of the importance of the pipe to the Sioux who captured him.²¹ But to these early trappers and priests, the source of the material was a mystery barely worth the effort to consider, much less solve. To whites, the source of the stone was an economic question of minimal importance.

By the beginning of the eighteenth century, there were occasional reports of a location from which the stone originated. In 1700, Pierre Charles Le Sueur, a French trader who defied French trading regulations and traveled deep into areas Europeans had not explored, identified the "Hinhanetons" of the "village of the red-stone quarry." Most probably, he reached the vicinity of what today is the monument and found newly arrived Yankton Sioux.

²¹ White, The Middle Ground, 6; William P. Corbett, "A History of the Red Pipestone Quarry and Pipestone National Monument," (unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of South Dakota, 1976), 5-8.

Le Sueur's report was the first evidence that anyone lived by the quarries.²²

It was also evidence of a changing world around the quarries. Early in the eighteenth century, French trading posts were built within 125 miles of the quarries. Traders may have seen the source of the stone. Some observers at the time remarked about such visits, but if they did, they left little documentation to substantiate their presence. Agents in the employ of the British frequently mentioned the calumet, the famed long-stemmed pipe made from pipestone, but few left any record of the quarries themselves. As much as one hundred years passed with little change in the situation. Traders had no reason to search for the source of the stone. The quarries were of such little significance that when whites began to visit the area more frequently after 1800, the quarries appeared as mere mentions in official French reports.²³ No other record of such visits was made, nor was the location of the quarries given any special attention.

By 1830, the coteau world had begun to change. More and more whites came to the region in search of economic gain. As the United States expanded, exploring and assessing the land and

²² White, The Middle Ground, 149; Corbett, "History of the Red Pipestone Quarry," 8.

²³ Corbett, "History of the Red Pipestone Quarry," 8-9; H. H. Sibley, to the Minnesota Legislative Council, Journal of the Council for the Territory of Minnesota, 1849, Minnesota Historical Society, 30; Major Lawrence Taliferro, "Journal," August 15, 1831, Pipestone National Monument.

its resources become an important activity. Some, such as Capts. Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, were sent by the government. Others acted in an unofficial capacity. Among them was Philander Prescott, an explorer and frontiersman who left the first written account of a visit to the quarries at Pipestone.²⁴

Prescott, who visited the quarry in 1831 or 1832, found a 100-yard-long quarry, ten feet deep at its south end, with a layer of pipestone one foot thick. Prescott and his party blasted the quartzite layer above the pipestone, collecting enough stone to make about twenty pipes. For the whites, this was a laborious task; they commented that Native Americans seemed to use only hoes and axes--along with a six-pound cannonball that fractured unearthened deposits of the stone.²⁵

Although Prescott and his party stayed only briefly, they were the first of many traders, explorers, and interested observers to come to the site. The number of whites who visited during the 1830s increased, with shorter and shorter time between visits. Some even stayed to quarry the stone for themselves. Joseph LaFramboise, a mixed-blood trader with the American Fur Company, may have done so in 1835. Even the construction of Fort Snelling, the northernmost fort in the chain called the permanent

²⁴ Donald D. Parker, ed., The Recollections of Philander Prescott, Frontiersman of the Old Northwest 1819-1862 (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966), 137; Robert Murray, "Administrative History of Pipestone National Monument, Minnesota," manuscript, Pipestone National Monument, Minnesota, 3; McGinnis, Counting Coup and Cutting Horses, 71-85.

²⁵ Parker, Philander Prescott, 136.

Indian frontier, could not prevent whites from spilling over into Indian land.²⁶ By the end of the decade, the steady stream of white visitors had begun to bring the quarry to the attention of the non-Native American world.

But the real popularizer of the quarry first visited in September 1836. George Catlin, on his way to fame although not fortune as an artist and ethnographer, was stopped at Traverse des Sioux, near modern St. Peter, Minnesota, by a band of Native Americans. He thought they sought to stop him from "trespass(ing) on their dearest privilege--their religion." The Sioux thought Catlin and his party were government explorers, sent to assess the material worth of the quarries as a prelude to seizure. Catlin and his companion explained otherwise and were allowed to continue on their journey. What he found when the party reached the quarries astonished and impressed him.²⁷

Catlin was captivated by the quarries. The people, the stories associated with the pipes made from the stone, and combination of sentience, spirituality, and scenery mirrored Catlin's views of Native Americans. While there, he painted a panoramic view of the quarries that reflected his sensibilities and experiences among Native Americans. Far more sympathetic than most observers of his time, Catlin saw an image of noble

²⁶ Corbett, "History of the Red Pipestone Quarry," 10-12; Earl Arthur Shoemaker, The Permanent Indian Frontier: The Reason for the Construction and Abandonment of Fort Scott, Kansas, During the Dragoon Era (Omaha: National Park Service, 1986), 37.

²⁷ Catlin, North American Indians, 189-90.

savagery in the use of the quarries and the importance of ceremonies involving pipestone. The quarries and their environs confirmed what his experience taught him about the aboriginal inhabitants of the American West.

Even more important for the image of the quarries was the display of his paintings and a series of lectures that he gave throughout the eastern United States. Beginning in the winter of 1836-1837, Catlin prepared his work for public view. On September 25, 1837, his "Indian Gallery" opened at Clinton Hall in New York. It was a rousing success. Catlin tried to sell his portraits to the federal government but was repeatedly rebuffed. In 1839, he took his collection to England, where the popularity of Indian themes and issues far exceeded the level west of the Atlantic Ocean. There Catlin again showed his work to the public and prepared his book, North American Indians: Being Letters and Notes on Their Manners, Customs, and Conditions Written During Eight Years' Travel Amongst the Wildest Tribes of Indians in North America, 1832-1839, for publication. While much of Catlin's art had as much ethnographic as artistic value, his prose struck a chord with audiences on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean.²⁸

The quarries at Pipestone had very quickly developed iconographic significance to the people of the United States and Europe. The process of industrialization had begun, and many

²⁸ Michael McDonald Mooney, George Catlin: Letters and Notes on the American Indians (New York: Clarkson N. Potter Inc., 1975), 60-65.

thought nostalgically about a simpler past. A subsurface tension existed in industrializing societies, for the urbanization and dislocation that occurred as factories and cities grew and spread caused widespread concern. One remedy was a longing for the idealized past, a more natural place devoid of the negative side of progress.²⁹

Native Americans figured greatly in this nostalgic but necessary attempt to understand widespread social change. Books and art with Native American themes expressed many of these sentiments. Authors such as James Fennimore Cooper in the 1820s glorified Native Americans and bemoaned their passing.³⁰

Catlin's work, although far closer to reflecting the nature of Indian life, showed similar sympathy and greater understanding of the ways of Native Americans. His work became part of the popular culture of the time. The quarries figured importantly in this process, for major authors began to use them in a symbolic manner.

The most prominent of these was Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, whose epic poem, The Song of Hiawatha, first published in 1855, offered a romanticized view of Native American life with the

²⁹ Leo Marx, The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), is the clearest articulation of this set of ideas. Curtis M. Hinsley, Jr., Savages and Scientists: The Smithsonian Institution and the Development of American Anthropology, 1846-1910 (Washington: D. C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1981) looks at many of the ramifications.

³⁰ Roderick Nash, Wilderness and the American Mind (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 3rd edition, 44-66.

quarries at its center. Building on Catlin's work, Longfellow created a legend as well as an epic. After an introduction, the poem opened "on the great Red Pipe-stone Quarry," where Gitche Manito smoked the calumet as sign to all nations. This deity offered compassion and wisdom, embodied in the location and the sacred pipe, to solve the quarrels of his children.³¹ In Longfellow, the quarries acquired a cultural meaning that equalled even the reverence American Indians felt for the place and its products. In the Romantic cosmology of the middle of the nineteenth century, the Pipestone quarries came to represent the best of human endeavor.

Despite the mythological Native American world that Longfellow's poetry created, the quarries remained a real place. Whites had continued to explore the region since Catlin's visit. One group, an expedition hired by the U.S. Army Corps of Topographical Engineers and led by Joseph Nicollet, a French scientist, and John Charles Frémont, headed for fame as an explorer and adventurer, arrived in 1838. Drenched by a sudden thunderstorm, the expedition entered the Pipestone Valley to find Native Americans quarrying. Six members of the party carved their initials in a piece of quartzite near Leaping Rock.

³¹ Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, The Song of Hiawatha (Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1855), 11-19.

Commissioned to survey and map western Minnesota, the Nicollet expedition located the pipestone quarries on survey maps.³²

For Native Americans, the Nicollet expedition was the beginning of the end. Between the popularization that followed Catlin's trip east and overseas and the location of the quarry on maps of the region, the Indian presence at the quarries faced genuine threats. The Coteau des Prairies began to fill with Anglo-American settlers. After 1840, the American government compelled Indians to sign treaties relinquishing their lands, usually in exchange for other land farther west and sometimes substantial annuities. The Sisseton and Wahpeton Sioux left after signing the Treaty of Traverse des Sioux in 1851; the Yanktons followed seven years later, after a number of Yankton chiefs went to Washington, where they insisted on their right to quarry pipestone. When that right was recognized, a treaty was concluded in April 1858.³³ With that treaty, Yankton control over southwestern Minnesota ended--except for the approximately 650 acres that became the reserved area at Pipestone. The disposition of that area in law was theoretically complete; working out an accommodation was a more complicated process.

³² William H. Goetzmann, Army Exploration in the American West 1803-1863 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959), 58, 69-74; Corbett, "History of the Red Pipestone Quarry," 16-17; U.S. Congress. Senate. Report Intended to Illustrate a Map of the Hydrographical Basin of the Upper Mississippi River. 26th Congress, 2nd session. Senate Document 237.

³³ Corbett, "History of the Red Pipestone Quarry," 20-21.

CHAPTER II: CLEARING FEDERAL TITLE 1858-1928

Following the treaty of 1858, in which the Yankton Sioux relinquished their land but retained "free and unrestricted use" of the quarry, federal officials began a long and complicated process in which they tried to clear title to the quarries and their surroundings. To federal officials of the time, this was a logical progression of events that would vest the government with title to this land until its disposition could be decided. Efforts to establish federal control faced the range of problems of settlement during late nineteenth-century America: the often flimsy nature of the treaties made with native peoples, the aggressive pro-settlement views of Congress and the American public, and the growing development of a federal system of protection for Indians. As a result, establishing an exclusive federal right to the area, a precursor to the establishment of any permanent federal institution, did not occur until the last Native American claim was extinguished in 1928.

The spread of Euro-American culture to the Upper Midwest had followed the time-honored practices of the eastern half of the nation. The first inkling American Indians in what is now Minnesota had of impending change in their world occurred in the late seventeenth century as Indian refugees from the Algonquin-Iroquois Wars began to spread west. By the end of the seventeenth century, fundamental changes in the distribution and location of Native American peoples were well under way.

Trappers and traders entered this disrupted world with material

goods to offer, initiating a complicated pattern of misunderstood agreements that served to establish a loose framework governing cross-cultural contact. Neither Europeans nor Native Americans were strong enough to do without the other in this liminal world.¹

By 1815, a new order had been reconstructed on the northern plains. The Lakota or Sioux people established themselves as the dominant power in the area around the pipestone quarries, and they resisted encroachment by other Indians and incoming Euro-Americans with equal zeal. Yet a process of transformation had begun, and by the middle of the nineteenth century, a long era of Native American dominance was coming to an end.²

By the end of the 1850s, compelled and voluntary treaties had removed Native Americans from most of Minnesota. Between the Louisiana Purchase in 1803 and the middle of the century, a number of agreements between the eastern Sioux, by then firmly ensconced in Minnesota Territory, and the U.S. government affected the autonomy of Native Americans. In most of these treaties, native peoples agreed to peace, friendship, and the supremacy of the federal government. In the summer of 1851, Native Americans were persuaded to relinquish their lands in

¹ White, The Middle Ground, 1-93; John Opie, The Law of the Land: Two Hundred Years of American Farmland Policy (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1987); E. Louise Peffer, The Closing of the Public Domain: Disposal and Reservation Policies 1900-50 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1951).

² Gibson, The American Indian, 249; White, "The Winning of the West," 319-43.

southwestern Minnesota. In treaties signed at Mendota and Traverse des Sioux, the Mdewakantons, Wahpekutes, Sisseton, and Wahpeton bands of the Sioux surrendered their claims to all of Minnesota except a twenty-mile-wide reserve along the Upper Minnesota River for about three million dollars in money and benefits. These bands of Sioux failed to claim the pipestone quarries in either treaty.³

The Yankton Sioux took a different view of the sale, and conflict resulted. Yankton people, who had almost complete control of the pipestone quarries, regarded the land that the other Sioux sold as their own. Each year, as the other bands received their annuities, the Yankton came to collect what they considered their due for land wrongfully sold. On some occasions, the Yankton used force to get what they felt they deserved. By the middle of the 1850s, Charles E. Flandreau, the agent for the Sisseton, complained about the actions of the Yankton. Federal officials took notice, and the process of negotiating with the Yankton began.⁴

As it did with many other Native American people, the settlement entailed a trip to Washington, D. C., for Yankton leaders. Federal officials envisioned a cession of Yankton lands and the creation of a reservation for them farther to the west.

³ William P. Corbett, "The Red Pipestone Quarry: The Yanktons Defend a Sacred Tradition, 1858-1929," South Dakota History 8, 99-116; Charles J. Kappler, Indian Treaties: 1778-1883 (New York: Interland Publishing, 1972), 588-93; McGinnis, Counting Coup and Cutting Horses, 85-108.

⁴ Murray, "Administrative History" 9.

The negotiations were long and complicated, and the Yankton resisted any settlement that did not include the right to use the quarries. Even the offer of a 400,000-acre reservation in south central South Dakota did not interest them until Chief Struck-by-the-Ree secured federal acknowledgement of the right of the tribe to the pipestone quarries. In the spring of 1858, with their rights secured by provisions in the treaty, the Yankton accepted its terms and went to their new home near Fort Randall in the Dakota Territory, about 150 miles from the quarries.⁵

One of the terms of the treaty of 1858 required that the federal government perform a survey to determine the boundaries of the Pipestone reserved area. In 1859, General Land Office surveyors used the rock on which Joseph Nicollet had written his name as the center and marked out the one-square-mile reserve.⁶ With that formal designation, the area passed from Native American hands to an entirely new kind of administration.

At the beginning of the Civil War, the newly established state of Minnesota was far from the consciousness of the divided nation. To the south, "Bleeding Kansas," itself a territory until January 1861, had captured the imagination of the nation. In an era when the question of preservation of the union and the efficacy of slavery as an institution dominated the national scene, federal efforts in the newly secured parts of Minnesota

⁵ Murray, "Administrative History," 10-11; Corbett, "Red Pipestone Quarry," 101.

⁶ Corbett, "Red Pipestone Quarry, 101-02.

were at best haphazard. Despite the promises made in 1858 to the Yankton about the sanctity of their quarries, the federal government failed to uphold its part of the agreement.

Encroachment on the newly designated reserved area became common.

The spread of Euro-Americans into what is now southwestern Minnesota served as the catalyst for wholesale change. During the 1850s, a trickle of adventurers came to the area, but only after the treaty of 1858 did any kind of permanent settlement begin. Before 1858, most Anglo visitors were traders or explorer/scientists, and the pattern continued for the next decade. After the treaty, the American government sent official representatives. A military detail of 150 men in search of a band of Indians camped within a mile of the quarries in 1862.

Commercial interests were not far behind. The celebrated Moscow Expedition, headed by nascent entrepreneur James Boyd Hubbell, held a rendezvous there. Within a year, Hubbell started his own company, Hubbell and Hawley, quarried large quantities of pipestone, and had it fashioned into pipes that he planned to sell to the military for use in trade. Although the military contract fell through, Hubbell recouped his investment by trading → the pipes for buffalo robes with Native Americans along the Missouri River.⁷

Hubbell's activity typified the actions of the first Anglo-Americans to come to the area surrounding the pipestone quarries. Characteristic of this time, such actions revealed a mindset as

⁷ Murray, "Administrative History," 12-15.

common on the peripheries as in the center of American society. The natural world was a bounty to be harvested by the aggressive, in most cases as quickly as possible so as not to share it with anyone else. Such an attitude was far from what George Catlin and others like him envisioned when they began to popularize the quarries, and even farther from the expectation of the Yankton Sioux when they agreed to cede their land. Administration of the quarry became a point of contention almost from the moment of the Yankton cession.

The completion of a public lands survey of the Pipestone area in 1870 inaugurated a new era in settlement. By September of that year, the public domain in the area could be claimed by homesteaders. The final plat maps failed to show the boundaries of the reserved area, leading to the filing of homestead claims within the one-square mile tract. The earliest of these occurred in June and July of 1871, and more followed. Some of these claims were later canceled, but one within the reserved area, held by August Clausen, was perfected. Despite a resurvey in 1872 that clearly outlined the border, two currents in American society had become proximate.⁸ Settlers who envisioned the West as an open area devoid of other humans came into contact with a federal government that at least acknowledged its obligations to the native peoples of the area. Some sort of conflict between

⁸ Murray, "Administrative History," 20-21; Corbett, "Red Pipestone Quarry," 102.

these contrasting and mutually exclusive world views became likely.

The increase of the pace of settlement in the middle of the 1870s made it even more likely. By that time, railroads and the other accouterments of industrial society reached past the Mississippi River, and smaller western communities could hook into this lifeline and envision an economic future. Near the quarries, the town of "Pipestone City" was founded in 1876, and within two years it had become a small but growing trading center.⁹

The influx of newcomers brandishing a new value system set the stage for conflict with Yanktons who sought to use the quarry. Since 1858, the Yankton had been left alone to quarry their sacred stone. The lack of Euro-Americans nearby assured that the Yanktons could proceed unhindered. But the creation of the town and its subsequent growth altered conditions for the Indians. As early as 1876, tension over Yankton use of the quarry surfaced. White settlers and some of the Yankton argued the all-important question in the history of the American West: whose land was whose?¹⁰

There were a number of related points of contention that had to be addressed. White settlers attempted to persuade the

⁹ Murray, "Administrative History," 22; Corbett, "Red Pipestone Quarry," 102-03; see also Daniel J. Boorstin, The Americans: The Democratic Experience (New York: Vintage Books, 1974), 3-37.

¹⁰ Murray, "Administrative History," 22-23; Corbett, "Red Pipestone Quarry," 102-03.

Yankton that their reserved area was much smaller than the Indians expected, and leaders of the tribe contacted John G. Gasmann, their agent, to assess their situation. Gasmann took the Yanktons' side, pressing the commissioner of Indian affairs for some action on their behalf.¹¹

This complaint triggered federal involvement. Although the process began slowly, the Bureau of Indian Affairs took notice of activities in its domain. Gasmann's successor, John W. Douglas, kept the issue alive, and by the end of the 1870s the question of the patent issued to August Clausen and later sold to H. M. Carpenter had become the focus of the inquiry. The commissioner of the General Land Office made serious efforts to revoke the patent granted for land within reserved boundaries. Although the case went to court and the patent was upheld, legal and practical resolutions were distinctly different kinds of reality.¹²

In 1880, the issue took on a new tone. A group of Yankton who returned from the quarry reported that whites were quarrying building stone, presumably quartzite, within the boundaries of the reservation. Demand for the stone was great, for a mini-building boom was under way in the Pipestone area. Although the activity was just inside the southern boundary line of the reserved area, it offered a serious challenge to the integrity of the quarries that had potential ramifications. Others in the

¹¹ Murray, "Administrative History," 22.

¹² Ibid., 22-25.

community planned to reactivate their extinguished claims if Carpenter's challenge succeeded.¹³

The situation worsened during the following three years. Carpenter won his court case, which was then appealed and sat on the U. S. Supreme Court docket until 1884. A newcomer, C. C. Goodnow, an agent for Carpenter, threatened Indians who came to the quarries and compelled them to leave. By 1883, Goodnow had become mayor of the town of Pipestone. He also built a substantial, two-story house within the boundaries of the reserved area. Nor was he alone. Other homes, including one Goodnow built for his mother, were also constructed. Although the Yankton made repeated inquiries and complaints, federal officials were far away. It seemed that local initiative would erode the Native American claim until the quarries and their environs would be inhabited and the Indian claim ignored or forgotten.¹⁴

An unusual triumvirate came together to try to stop the gradual disenfranchisement. Struck-by-the-Ree, who referred to himself as Head Chief of the Yanktons, the new Yankton agent, Maj. William M. Ridpath, and D. E. Sweet, a resident of Pipestone who was appalled by the conduct of his peers, all set out to stop the land grab. Ridpath visited the reserved area in November 1883 and found obstinate, intractable settlers, some of whom did not care that they had been denied the right to file on the land

¹³ Ibid., 25-26.

¹⁴ Ibid., 25-27.

because it was reserved. Ridpath was outraged, for he recognized that the settlers were not ignorant. Instead they chose to defy the law. Their conduct was "contemptible," Ridpath remarked. "I will take pleasure in removing [the settlers] and tearing down their improvements if you so direct," he wrote the commissioner of the General Land Office.¹⁵

The settlers' disregard for the rights of Indians was a common occurrence at this time. Across the West, the process of removing Native Americans from lands granted them by treaty continued unabated. From Kansas to the west coast, native peoples were moved farther and farther from their home areas onto smaller and smaller tracts of less productive land. Even the meager lands left them were not inviolable. By the middle of the 1880s, legislation to allot tribal lands to individual Indians to create more land for settlers was considered. This movement culminated in the Dawes Act of 1887, which allowed individual Indians fixed amounts of land and offered the leftover parts of reservations for sale.¹⁶ In the context of their time, the Yankton seemed to have no chance of recovering their expropriated property.

¹⁵ William M. Ridpath to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, November 14, 1883, Letters Received, RG 75, NA.

¹⁶ Brian W. Dippie, The Vanishing American: White Attitudes and U. S. Indian Policy (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1982), 175-190; Frederick Hoxie, The Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880-1920 (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984), 41-81.

The legacy of the previous secretary of the interior, Colorado Senator Henry Teller, further limited the chances that the Yankton could resist encroachment. The policies of Teller's department reflected his personal beliefs: development and growth were the greatest of examples of human achievement, and clearing the land of native peoples was essential to progress. His successor, L. Q. C. Lamar, shared a less virulent vision of a West dominated by yeoman farmers and ranchers. Western lands, he asserted in 1886, "will thrive and grow under the management of a hardy and industrious population."¹⁷ In the view of the time, Indians were neither hardy nor industrious. Little support for the Yankton position existed at the highest levels of the Department of the Interior, and Ridpath's desire to throw the settlers out was denied.¹⁸

Not surprisingly, local sentiment generally favored the settlers. Most westerners saw the world they had entered as barren of prior claim, and the simple matter of a mistaken federal promise could be easily overlooked. "Use it or lose it" was the dominant ethos, and the intermittent character of Indian use and the fact that there was no agricultural work on the reserved area offered the settlers support for their preconceived ideas. As long as Teller remained influential, there was little chance of anything impeding the acquisitive.

¹⁷ United States Department of the Interior, Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior for 1886 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1887) v. 1, 40-41.

¹⁸ Murray, "Administrative History," 30.

The election of Grover Cleveland in 1884 changed the tone of federal administration, although it did not eliminate the obstacles that the Yankton faced. Department of the Interior policy became more sympathetic to Native Americans and the Yankton received support for their position from the Supreme Court decision in the Carpenter case, which voided the Claussen patent, but enforcing the law depended on state and local officials. The mayor of Pipestone was a squatter on the land in question, and the U.S. Attorney for Minnesota, D. B. Searle, did his best to avoid addressing the situation. Yet as the complaints mounted and more settlers moved onto the reserved area, something had to be done.¹⁹

Maj. J. F. Kinney, Ridpath's successor as Yankton agent, became the catalyst for resolution. During a trip to Washington, D. C., he convinced the secretary of the interior and the commissioner of Indian affairs that the rights of the Yankton had to be protected. Kinney wanted a squad of soldiers to evict the squatters. In March 1887, the order was issued, and a conflict between settlers and the American military seemed imminent.²⁰

The concept of the use of military force against settlers in support of Indian claims was quite unusual. By the late 1880s, religious reformers had gained the upper hand in influencing policy directed at Native Americans, and their approach was far more sympathetic to Indians than that of earlier times. The

¹⁹ Ibid., 30-31.

²⁰ Ibid., 31-33.

prime thrust of their effort was to assimilate Indians into American society, for there was significant worry about the future of Native Americans. Assimilation required that Native Americans have land and tools to make them farmers, for the thinking of the time suggested that by imitating the ways of white America, Indians would learn to be "civilized." With the Indian wars almost completed and little military resistance left, the War Department concentrated its efforts on the enforcement of treaty requirements.²¹

A confrontation was imminent. On October 11, 1887, a detachment of ten soldiers led by Capt. J. W. Bean and accompanied by Agent Kinney arrived in Pipestone. The settlers were surprised to see the soldiers, and despite some grumbling, agreed to remove their property from the reserved area. Even Goodnow, the most intransigent of the squatters, agreed to leave when faced with federal troops.²²

←
10
soldiers

The situation at Pipestone was ironic. Soldiers there removed settlers from land, while elsewhere in the West, the opposite was far more characteristic. The appearance of the U.S. Cavalry melted local resistance and reminded settlers that they too were bound by the laws and treaties of the United States. As it did at many other places beyond the control of the institutions of American society, that reality came as something of a surprise to Pipestone residents.

²¹ Dippie, Vanishing American, 199-270.

²² Murray, "Administrative History," 33-37.

The resolution of this conflict left no doubt about control of the reserved area at Pipestone. The actions of the military established federal control of the quarries and clearly revealed the limits of local power. Future decisions about the quarries and their disposition would be made through the auspices of the U.S. government and its agencies. The quarries, and by inference all of southwestern Minnesota, had ceased to be open country, available to all comers. The rules set up by the government would hold there as well as they did in Philadelphia or New York City.

Other obstacles to federal title existed. In 1884, the Burlington, Cedar Rapids, & Northern Railroad completed construction of a stretch of track that crossed the Pipestone reservation. The railroad claimed the right-of-way areas that western railroads had come to expect as federal subsidy for their development efforts. It was a routine matter. But because of the terms of the treaty from 1858, the right-of-way could not simply be granted to the railroad. Four years later, railway officials were informed that they needed an act of Congress to secure title. While this too seemed a perfunctory step, it became a source of controversy.²³

If there was to be a typical, late-nineteenth century land grab, the people of the town of Pipestone wanted a chance to secure the lands from which they had been evicted. After the first bill that the railroad supported failed, a Minnesota

²³ Murray, "Administrative History," 37-38.

congressman introduced another measure that created a board of appraisers to evaluate the lands on the reservation, establish priority for the evicted settlers to acquire the land if the Indians chose to sell, and allow the sale of any portion of the reservation if the majority of adult male Yanktons agreed to it.

The passage of this bill in March 1889 inaugurated a new era at Pipestone. It demonstrated the change in authority and responsibility for the lands, while simultaneously showing that Indian land was not inviolable. The board of appraisers met and determined that \$1,740 was appropriate compensation for the right-of-way. After negotiations, the Yanktons agreed to accept that sum as compensation for the use of their land but they refused to sell any of the reserved area. A measure of order entered Indian-white relations at Pipestone, furthering accentuating the level of federal control.²⁴

The eviction of the homesteaders served notice that the people of Pipestone would have to look elsewhere for more land. But the reserved area presented other potential advantages. As the community grew, it sought a broader economic base. Agriculture and small commercial entities made up the largest part of the local and regional economy, and enterprising citizens sought to attract new businesses. As elsewhere in the West, local boosterism played an important role in promoting economic growth. But the real future of the town of Pipestone lay in transforming the federal presence into an economic advantage.

²⁴ Ibid., 38-40.

There were evident limits to the prospects of growth associated with the Pipestone reservation. Townspeople recognized that any federal project there would have to benefit Native Americans. Locals wanted the opportunity to bid for contracts and jobs at whatever kind of facility emerged. In this, the people of Pipestone were prescient. They recognized what much of the West spent the following century denying: the western environment was not sufficient to supply the demands of an industrial society with an exploding population. Federal programs and employment, soon to become the backbone of the western economy, made an early appearance at Pipestone.

A typical local effort to acquire a federal institution culminated in the creation of the Pipestone Indian School. In January 1890, the first inkling of the idea appeared in an editorial in the Pipestone County Star. This probably followed widespread discussion in the community. By March, the idea acquired a wide local following. The town began lobbying efforts as well. Locals sent pieces of pipestone from the quarry to congressmen as a means of currying favor, followed by memorials supporting the idea in March and April of 1890. The people of the town moved into action in an attempt to assure rapid success.²⁵

The people of Pipestone developed new strategies as a result of the eviction of their peers a few years earlier. They sought to use the system to support their objectives, rather than defy

²⁵ Ibid., 46-49.

it and risk further sanction. They also learned that the Native American perspective was useful. A number of petitions supporting the school circulated among area Indians. Many signed the petitions, perceiving some kind of advantage in the school. Conspicuously absent were the Yankton, who lived more than 150 miles away and apparently were not consulted.²⁶ But the presence of Native American signatures enhanced the credibility of the proposal, suggesting that the people of Pipestone and their neighbors had found a common ground acceptable to most.

With the groundwork completed, the legislative process proceeded smoothly. The idea seemed to reflect a consensus of the people of Pipestone and its environs, both Native American and Anglo. A bill to establish the Pipestone Indian School passed the U.S. House of Representatives in September 1890 and the U.S. Senate followed early in February 1892. On February 16, 1892, much to the pleasure of the people of Pipestone, President Benjamin Harrison signed the measure into law. Plans to select a site and construct a building followed.²⁷

But when they found out about the proposal for the school, the Yankton sought to stop its construction. The tribe entered a protest with its agent, E. W. Foster. They claimed the right to take allotments at the Pipestone reservation under the terms of the Dawes Act. The reserved area was theirs, Yankton leaders insisted, and to demonstrate that the signatures of other Indians

²⁶ Ibid., 49.

²⁷ Ibid., 49-50.

signatures were irrelevant, Yankton leaders collected 167 names on a petition of their own that opposed the bill.

The situation had become a legal dispute, and the secretary of the interior turned to the Justice Department for a ruling. Following the precedent established while Henry Teller was secretary of the interior in the early 1880s, the U.S. attorney general opined that Yanktons had only the right to quarry at Pipestone and that the establishment of the school would not interfere with that right. Nonetheless, negotiations to purchase "surplus" lands began with the Yankton. Despite the attorney general's opinion, federal officials sought to maintain some semblance of peaceful coexistence by acceding to the Yankton perspective.²⁸

This response also played into the hands of those who sought to acquire Native American land. Allotment rarely worked in the Indians' favor, and "negotiation" was often a code word for "swindle." Some federal legislation encouraged speculators and others who sought to grab land. The Indian Appropriation Act of July 13, 1892, allowed the government to seek to purchase land deemed surplus to Native Americans. But the concept of surplus land required two steps unfamiliar to northern plains peoples: individual ownership of land and agriculture as a basis for economy. Nomadic pastoral people rarely had surplus land; instead they had land they claimed that they planned to use at

²⁸ Ibid., 49-51.

another time.²⁹ This cross-cultural misunderstanding placed Native Americans at a severe disadvantage.

By the 1890s, most Native American peoples were experienced negotiators. Many government officials evinced far greater sympathy for the Native American position as well, for Indians had ceased to be any threat to the nation and were increasingly portrayed as a romanticized anachronism in American society. Yet federal policy dictated that assimilation was the objective of interaction with native peoples, and while government officials and negotiators might be sympathetic, their objectives were generally different from those of tribes and their leaders. The Yankton negotiations were typical of this trend, except that the Indians were extremely sophisticated.³⁰

When the talks concluded in 1893, the agreement reached was unusual. The U.S. government was allowed to contest the Yankton claim by taking the case to the Supreme Court within one year of ratification of the agreement by Congress. If the government failed to do so, title to the tract reverted to the Yankton. It was a gamble for the Indians, an all-or-nothing attempt to resolve the status of what they considered their land. The U.S. attorney general found the agreement specious, and in 1894 advised the Department of the Interior that this scenario was "impractical."

²⁹ Robert M. Utley, The Last Days of the Sioux Nation (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), 40-59.

³⁰ Ibid., 40-59; Dippie, Vanishing American, 158-62, 199-242.

The attorney general correctly assessed the situation, but that did not help the government and its case. Department of the Interior officials thought the Supreme Court an inappropriate venue and sought a legislative solution from Congress, but achieved little success. The issue did not reach the U.S. Supreme Court. In August 1895, a year and one day after ratification of the agreement, Yankton leaders requested proof of their ownership of the land under the terms of the agreement. Federal officials did not reply.³¹

The matter seemed unresolvable. The Yankton asserted their claim, and the federal government refused to recognize it. In 1896, at a tribal meeting, Yankton leaders again requested that their claim be given consideration, but were ignored. In January 1897, they petitioned for legal title to the tract as well as for compensation for damages that resulted from unauthorized use.³² With the support of Sen. Richard Pettigrew of South Dakota, a bill that included a measure authorizing negotiations with the Yankton about Pipestone passed Congress in 1897.³³

A subtle shift in the Yankton position help create a context for negotiations. Until the tribal meeting of January 1897, the Yankton wanted the land back with clear title. In that meeting, their perspective changed to include seeking damages for

³¹ Murray, "Administrative History," 50-52.

³² Corbett, "Red Pipestone Quarry," 110-11; Murray, "Administrative History," 53.

³³ Corbett, "Red Pipestone Quarry," 111; Murray, "Administrative History," 53.

alienated land. The new view was much more in line with the practices toward Native Americans in this era. It allowed payment for taking the land. Whether the Yankton recognized that they would never really regain the land and sought to make the most of the situation or their perspective changed to make such a solution more acceptable remained unclear. Nonetheless, the flexibility in the Yankton position propelled a move toward settlement.

Negotiations for the sale of the tract by the Yankton Sioux to the government began in 1899. The talks became a complex and protracted process that took considerable time. An impasse over dollar value delayed agreement until October of 1899. The Yanktons wanted \$1,000,000 for the reservation, a sum federal inspector James McLaughlin, who represented the U.S. government, found extravagant. McLaughlin had more than twenty years experience in the Indian Service and spoke Sioux, and he was an able negotiator. The Yanktons dropped their offer to \$100,000, but McLaughlin still regarded it as too much. His top offer was \$75,000. After an aggravating sequence of events that returned the price to the \$1,000,000 figure, McLaughlin changed his tactics and began to negotiate with individuals. The Yankton were both allottees and U.S. citizens. McLaughlin and the tribal council drew up a committee, made up mostly of younger, mixed-bloods, to negotiate. In October 1899, the committee presented its proposal to the tribe. A small majority of the Yankton

agreed to accept a total of \$100,000--\$75,000 in cash and the rest in cattle--for the property.³⁴

These tactics were common at the time. Assimilation remained the focus of Native American policy, and mixed-bloods and others with ties to the Anglo world were often tools of disenfranchisement. Farther to the south in Kansas, mixed-blood Charles Curtis participated in a similar allotment of Indian lands in Topeka. Curtis was rewarded with a personal fortune, a U.S. Senate seat, and later, the vice presidency of the nation.³⁵

But despite the advantages of the agreement, Congress refused to ratify it. The Senate Indian Affairs committee reported unfavorably on the bill. Some senators regarded the 1858 treaty as an easement for the property, not as title. In addition, they averred, the 1893 agreement contained impossible conditions and so could not be binding. Despite the efforts of U.S. Sen. Robert J. Gamble of South Dakota, the bill died on the floor. Similar scenarios followed in 1906 and 1910. Again Gamble promoted measures, but they failed or expired for lack of action at the end of the sessions. An unsatisfactory and seemingly permanent impasse had been reached.³⁶

³⁴ Corbett, "Red Pipestone Quarry," 111-12; Murray, "Administrative History," 55-57.

³⁵ William E. Unrau, Mixed Bloods and Tribal Dissolution: Charles Curtis and the Quest for Indian Identity (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1989).

³⁶ Murray, "Administrative History," 58; Corbett, "Red Pipestone Quarry," 112-13.

But the Pipestone case would not go away. The Yankton persisted, and some kind of resolution was imperative. In 1910, an amendment to the Indian Appropriations Act offered new opportunities for solution. It transferred the jurisdiction of the case to the U.S. Indian Court of Claims, and after delays that resulted from a lack of money appropriated for an attorney and an intratribal squabble, a petition was filed in November 1911. In 1917, the Indian Court of Claims determined that it lacked jurisdiction over the matter. In 1920, after the Yankton pressed the issue, Congress passed a bill giving the ICC jurisdiction over the dispute at Pipestone.³⁷

This dilatory process had a complicated impact on the Yankton view of its sovereignty. In the 1890s, the Yankton allowed that they would accept damages in addition to title to the tract, but the subsequent two decades of often spurious and specious maneuvering obscured the question of ownership and transformed the issue into a contest about sums of money. Mixed-blood and younger leaders were less worried about quarry rights than their elders, but the sense of the importance of the quarries remained strong. Cultural perceptions of Native Americans changed for the worse between 1900 and 1920 as true assimilation was replaced by an attitude that relegated Native Americans to the bottom echelon of American society. This change reflected larger changes in American society, but nonetheless

³⁷ Corbett, "Red Pipestone Quarry," 113-14; Murray, "Administrative History," 59-61.

compromised the position of the Yankton and eroded their appreciation for their spirituality. By the 1920s, the Bureau of Indian Affairs had been reasonably successful in limiting the transmission of Native American culture and language to young people. Most talented young Indians were educated at boarding schools such as the Pipestone Indian School, where Christianity and the values of Anglo-American society figured prominently. The Yankton were further limited by the distance between their reservation and Pipestone. As late as 1890, annual treks to the quarries were common, but as the older generation died off, fewer younger Yankton continued traditional practices. By the middle of the decade, Yanktons were infrequent visitors. The last known group of Yankton quarriers arrived at Pipestone came in 1899, and the final visit by any at all followed in 1911.³⁸ By the 1920s, the people who led the Yankton had few ties to older ways of living. A monetary settlement that might have seemed preposterous in 1899 had real viability by 1920.

Throughout the 1920s, the case unfolded in front of the Indian Claims Commission. Again the emphasis on monetary compensation remained stronger than the importance of spirituality, but whether this resulted from the feeling that tangible claims were the only thing an American court respected remained unclear. When the court reached its decision in 1925, the Yankton were displeased. Yankton rights were only an

³⁸ Hoxie, The Final Promise, 83-114, 189-210; Murray, "Administrative History," 62-63.

easement, the decision averred, and the claim to ownership lacked merit.³⁹

Unwilling to accept the decision, the Yankton devised a new strategy. Their attorneys petitioned for a writ of a certiorari from the U.S. Supreme Court. The court heard the case in November 1926 and reversed the decision of the claims court, deciding that the Indians held the land in fee and were entitled to compensation. It ordered the Indian Claims Court to determine the value of the tract. A series of hearings in 1927 determined that the land had a value of \$200,000 in 1891 and the Indians were entitled to an additional \$36,000 for use between 1891 and 1899. Despite the finding, the Indian Claims Commission set the value of the Pipestone reservation at \$100,000 plus interest accrued from 1891. The total sum delivered to the Yankton was \$338,558.90. After legal fees, the Yankton allotted almost \$300,000 among themselves, leaving each with the sum of \$151.99. A fifteen-dollar surplus was placed in the tribal treasury.⁴⁰

The settlement itself was an anticlimax. After nearly thirty years of legal maneuvering, the Yankton received a pittance for an important part of their cultural heritage. Even more telling was the demoralizing reality that in the 1928 agreement, the Yankton ceded their right to quarry at Pipestone. After 1928, those who wanted to dig the sacred stone had to

³⁹ Corbett, "Red Pipestone Quarry," 113; Murray, "Administrative History," 63-64.

⁴⁰ Murray, "Administrative History," 65-67; Corbett, "Red Pipestone Quarry," 114-15.

request the permission of the superintendent of the Pipestone Indian School. Nor could the Yankton prevent other Indians from quarrying. A 225-year hegemony over the quarry had come to an end. After 1928, the quarries at Pipestone belonged to the federal government and its agencies, who would ever after determine the most appropriate use for the tract. One of the options available was the creation of a national park area.

CHAPTER III: FOUNDING PIPESTONE NATIONAL MONUMENT

The establishment of Pipestone National Monument was a direct result of the settlement of the court case with the Yankton. The Indian School had been a prize catch in the late nineteenth century, but the people of the twentieth century demanded different kinds of federal support. Minnesota's singular lack of national park areas, the cultural significance of the quarries, active local support, and the depressed economic climate of the 1930s, in which the federal government rescued local economies, made the location of a national park area at Pipestone desirable. Local leaders and the Minnesota congressional delegation pursued this opportunity. This confluence of factors led to serious efforts to create a national park area at Pipestone that came to fruition in 1937.

The idea of a national park area at Pipestone had a long history. Early efforts at creating a park began as the town of Pipestone sought to find a federally funded anchor for the local economy. Along with the attempts to secure an Indian school for the town came suggestions of a national park. In 1890, some of the many petitions that circulated in favor of the school also referred to the establishment of a "national park or reserve."¹

This scattershot approach to acquiring federal support did not reflect the realities of the time. National parks were few and far between in 1890; only Yellowstone and Mackinac Island in

¹ Murray, "Administrative History," 46-49.

Michigan had long-standing national park status at the time, while Yosemite, Sequoia and General Grant national parks were created that year. Among historic and prehistoric places, only Casa Grande ruins in Arizona had been authorized to be reserved. In 1890, while there was a piece of legislation on the books for that purpose, no authorization for administration had yet been approved. More than two years later, President Benjamin Harrison finally authorized more than paper protection for Casa Grande.²

National parks were a different kind of prize in the late nineteenth century. They had little perceived economic value, for tourism and travel had not yet become important regional industries. No federal bureau existed to manage national parks, and in 1890, military protection remained the sole means of guarding the existing ones. Parks were perceived as large and spectacular natural areas, and no other category of reserved areas for cultural treasures existed.³

With this set of limitations, the proclamation of the quarry area as a national park was unlikely. Pipestone was too different from existing national parks. Its features were primarily cultural, not natural or scenic, and it was diminutive in contrast to Yellowstone or Yosemite. Despite the fact that in the process of negotiating the settlement of Yankton land claims

² Alfred Runte, National Parks: The American Experience, 2d. ed. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1987), 55, 62-63; Hal Rothman, Preserving Different Pasts: The American National Monuments (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989), 12-14.

³ Runte, National Parks, 11-22, 33-47; Rothman, Preserving Different Pasts, 53-54.

during the 1890s, an agreement was reached to maintain the quarry as a national park, the idea was too much of an anomaly for serious consideration. In 1895, a bill put forward for that purpose expired in the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives. In 1899, James McLaughlin, an inspector for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, negotiated an agreement with the Yankton that included the maintenance of the quarries as a national park or reservation. John Wesley Powell, the powerful head of the Bureau of American Ethnology, offered support, but Congress declined to ratify the agreement.⁴ Pipestone remained in limbo. Although real definition of the national park category had not yet occurred, the general conception of a national park seemed to preclude the inclusion of Pipestone.

Between 1900 and the early 1920s, the title dispute with the Yankton dominated local affairs. Despite efforts to utilize the quarry in a number of ways, the lack of resolution of the status of the land hindered the chances of any kind of permanent park. In one of many such examples that occurred, in 1916 plans for a recreational park for the local community were drawn up by a local architecture and engineering aficionado. But because of the dispute over title to the land, the project never went beyond planning.⁵

⁴ Murray, "Administrative History," 48-51, 75-76; Corbett, "Red Pipestone Quarry," 42-43.

⁵ Pipestone County Star, June 30, 1916.

As the title case moved through the court and claim process, other park efforts followed. In 1919, the Pipestone Businessman's Association received permission from the superintendent of the Indian school to develop a portion of one of the lakes on the reservation into a swimming area. Local funds supported the construction of a bathhouse and modification of the shoreline to create a beach. With a small recreational facility already built, the leadership of the business community sought to acquire a 14-acre portion of the reserved area. Commissioner of Indian Affairs Charles H. Burke informed them that until the dispute was settled, no permanent decisions could be made. Again the lack of clear title thwarted local efforts.⁶

But the direction of such local efforts was far different from the plans to preserve the quarry as an important part of the cultural heritage of Native Americans. Local proposals focused on a recreational park, seeking the use of lands with spiritual significance for more mundane, albeit important purposes. Faced with the growing power of local entities in relationship to the federal government, the quarries became vulnerable to expropriation. In this respect, the dilatory process of deciding who owned the quarries helped protect the area from uses that would have negated or eliminated the cultural features of national significance.

⁶ Corbett, "Red Pipestone Quarry," 43; Murray, "Administrative History," 78.

The desire to develop the quarry area was not confined to local people. By the early 1920s, much of the open land in the United States had been appropriated, and a nascent state park movement developed. Midwestern states such as Iowa, Indiana, and Minnesota were in the forefront. Minnesota established two state parks in the 1890s. By 1920, Iowa had emerged as a hot bed of conservation sentiment. In January 1921, 200 people met in Des Moines at the first of a series of annual meetings of an organization called the National Conference on State Parks. The idea spread. Within two years, officials in state government in Minnesota provided the impetus for a state park system. In 1923, State Auditor Raymond F. Chase offered a long list of potential state park areas in his biennial report to the Minnesota legislature. Pipestone was prominent on the list.⁷

The momentum generated at the state level encouraged local people to continue their efforts. The Pipestone Kiwanis Club encouraged the state highway department to conduct a survey, and a directive from the governor's office set the process in motion. W. E. Stoores, an assistant state engineer, executed the survey, finding among other things that the bathhouse erected was not part of the 14 acres previously requested. Stoores recommended that a 22- to 24-acre area around the Winnewissa Falls be made into a state park. The area, he determined, had "no value . . .

⁷ Murray, "Administrative History," 78; Thomas R. Cox, The Park Builders: A History of State Parks in the Pacific Northwest (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1988), 3-5; Robert Shankland, Steve Mather of the National Parks, 3d. ed. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970), 185-88.

except for park purposes."⁸ Despite acknowledgment of the cultural importance of the area, the proposal presented a strictly recreational park.

The Pipestone community wholeheartedly supported the idea. In September 1924, as Stoope's report circulated in the statehouse, the American Legion post in Pipestone organized a volunteer work force to help maintain the area. They cut weeds around Winnewissa Falls, hauled loose rock to the foot of the first small lake below the falls, scraped the lakebed, and built a small dam. This raised the level of the lake, making it more attractive as a site for swimming.⁹

The problem of clear title continued to limit the prospects for a permanent park. Despite a groundswell of support for the park both in St. Paul and Pipestone, the effort remained an exercise in futility. A Pipestone Park Committee was formed in the town. Minnesota state representative H. J. Farmer of Pipestone introduced a bill in the legislature to create Pipestone State Park. After its passage in March 1925, the governor signed the bill into law. But there were stipulations. The bill was contingent on the transfer of the land from federal authorities to the state, and again the commissioner of Indian affairs pointed out that the government could not release land to

⁸ "Proposed Development for Pipestone State Park, Pipestone, Minnesota, Prepared Under the Direction of the Commissioner of Highways, 1924, By Order of the Governor," Box B, Folder B-1973, Pipestone National Monument.

⁹ Murray, "Administrative History," 79.

which it did not have clear title. Despite passage of the state bill, the process was stymied.¹⁰ Without clear title, the land remained under the control of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Although the state park never became more than a paper document, the momentum generated had positive effects on the quarry area. Besides the drive to make the area more suitable for recreation, a significant amount of energy went into demonstrating that the quarry had historical significance. In an effort to show the importance of the area, efforts began to acknowledge the nineteenth-century explorers who visited Pipestone. In September 1925, these came to fruition when members of the local chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR) placed a bronze commemorative plaque on the stone carrying the inscriptions of Joseph Nicollet and his party.¹¹

The end of the court case in 1928 created new opportunities. With title cleared, the primary obstacle to some sort of permanent resolution disappeared. Yet other issues remained. By the late 1920s, a decision about the relative merits of the recreational and cultural attributes of the Pipestone quarries and their environs had to be made. The state park remained a paper entity, requiring only the transfer of the land from the federal government to become real. But other groups had a

¹⁰ Murray, "Administrative History," 79-81.

¹¹ Corbett, "Red Pipestone Quarry," 45; Murray, "Administrative History," 81.

broader scope in mind. U.S. Rep. Frank Clague of Minnesota, a primary supporter of earlier park efforts, again became interested in the quarries. The local DAR passed a resolution that favored the establishment of a national park or monument. A groundswell for some kind of permanent park area developed.

One woman played an instrumental role in the process of creating Pipestone National Monument. Lean and long-faced, with a look of determination in her eyes, Winifred Bartlett had been born on a farm a few miles north of the quarries. She graduated from Pipestone High School in 1903, trained as a teacher, and taught for a number of years. After changing careers, she worked for law firms and eventually for the U.S. Attorney's office in Sioux Falls, South Dakota. As court reporter for the Yankton case in the 1920s, Bartlett heard all the testimony. This experience heightened an already strong interest in cultural affairs in general and in particular, the Pipestone quarries.¹²

Prior to the 1930s, Bartlett had been active in a range of local issues. She developed a reputation as a local organizer and an advocate of preservation. She played in a role in the petition that the DAR developed to support a national park project.¹³

The founding of the Pipestone National Park Association, which later became known as the Pipestone Indian Shrine

¹² -----, "Winifred Bartlett: Monument Maker," H14: Area and Service History, Pipestone National Monument.

¹³ Ibid.

Association, revealed her extraordinary organizing ability. On a cold night in January 1932, a group of approximately 35 people met in the Calumet Hotel in downtown Pipestone. Representing nearly every local community organization and association, they sought to create a new entity to preserve the quarries in some kind of national park area. The new association formed an executive committee, which included Bartlett, Edward A. Trebon, Tad A. Bailey, Rev. Joseph Mangan, and Ruth Morgan. In a February 11, 1932, meeting, the executive committee agreed to seek the support of the only local federal employee of any significance, James W. Balmer, the superintendent of the Pipestone Indian School. Balmer understood how the federal government worked, and during a trip to Washington, D. C., he sounded out Bureau of Indian Affairs officials as well as others in the Department of the Interior. When he returned, the process of evaluating the quarries for park status had begun.¹⁴

Balmer persuaded the members of the association that although a Bureau of Indian Affairs representative would come to visit, that agency was not the best one to fulfill their wishes. Aware of the activities of another bureau in the Department of the Interior, Balmer believed the National Park Service was best suited to administer a park at Pipestone. But the Bureau of Indian Affairs remained in control of the quarries, and its officials had to assess the situation at Pipestone. In April

¹⁴ "Minutes of Meeting of Pipestone National Park Association, January," January 14, 1932; "Executive Committee Meeting," February 11, 1932; "Minutes, March 15, 1932," Box P, P196, PISA, Pipestone.

1932, Charles Berry, a BIA field representative, visited the area and answered questions. He and Balmer filed a report with the commissioner of Indian affairs that supported making the quarries into something they called a "National Indian Shrine." Despite this stance, Berry reiterated Balmer's contention that the BIA was the wrong agency for such action. Following this lead, members of the association sought out the National Park Service with a plan to highlight the historical and cultural significance of the area.¹⁵

Since its founding in 1916, the Park Service had become one of the most important agencies in the Department of the Interior. Prescient leadership by former borax tycoon Stephen T. Mather and his alter ego Horace M. Albright, success in acquisitions in the East, widespread congressional support, and a singular flair gave the agency a distinct identity. Between 1916 and the end of the 1920s, Mather and Albright added seven major national parks--including the Grand Canyon, Bryce Canyon, Zion, and Carlsbad Caverns--to the system, developed an integrated system of rail service, planned a park-to-park highway that would link all the major national parks, and built a strong base with the public. The Park Service even played an important role in supporting the state parks movement, offering the resources of the agency as a clearinghouse for information. It also stood in the forefront of

¹⁵ William P. Corbett, "Pipestone: The Origin and Development of a National Monument," Minnesota History, Fall 1980, 83-92; Murray, "Administrative History," 82; "Minutes, April 27, 1932," Box P, P196, PISA, Pipestone.

a longstanding rivalry between the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture. Despite the terrible economic depression of the early 1930s, NPS officials sought to expand their domain.¹⁶

The Hoover administration was cooperative. President Herbert C. Hoover himself had strong conservation credentials, and he recognized that he was likely to lose the election of 1932. The economic climate of the early 1930s and Hoover's inability to grasp the need for a massive and comprehensive federal response made the chances of re-election remote. Even Albright, a lifelong Republican who succeeded Mather as director, recognized and accepted that Hoover's presidency was doomed.¹⁷ But the loss had some advantages for the Park Service. After Hoover became a "lame duck" president in November 1932, he sought to prepare a conservation gift to the nation.

The Antiquities Act of 1906 gave him the power he needed. With it, the president could proclaim as a national monument any parcel of the public domain with prehistoric, historic, or scientific importance. After 1907, when Congress abrogated the president's power to reserve national forests in the West with just an executive proclamation, the Antiquities Act became the most important piece of legislation available to preserve the

¹⁶ Runte, National Parks, 97-102; Rothman, Preserving Different Pasts, 89-93.

¹⁷ Horace M. Albright as told to Robert Cahn, The Birth of the National Park Service: The Founding Years, 1913-33 (Salt Lake City: Howe Brothers Press, 1985), 278.

public domain. The law gave the president vast leeway, and Theodore Roosevelt consecrated the idea of lame duck proclamations when he reserved more than 600,000 acres of the Olympic Peninsula in his last 48 hours in office in 1909. The Antiquities Act gave Hoover a powerful tool, and precedent for any use he might care to make of it existed.¹⁸

In Secretary of the Interior Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur's department, E. K. Burlew was the most important staff member. He served as executive assistant to Wilbur, acting as both a conduit and buffer between the secretary and the heads of the various agencies. One of the most trusted men in the Hoover administration and one of the few high-level appointees that Franklin D. Roosevelt's secretary of the interior, the curmudgeonly Harold L. Ickes, chose to retain, Burlew served as the eyes and ears of the department. During the summer of 1932, he embarked on a tour of potential park areas that included Pipestone. While impressed with many areas, Burlew was not enthusiastic about the inclusion of Pipestone in the park system. He saw the quarries as an interesting natural place, but failed to recognize the nature of their historic value.¹⁹

¹⁸ Rothman, Preserving Different Pasts, 68-72, 224-32; Albright as told to Cahn, The Birth of the National Park Service, 276-78.

¹⁹ Donald C. Swain, "The National Park Service and the New Deal 1933-1940," Pacific Historical Review 41 (August 1972): 312-32; Barry Mackintosh, "Harold Ickes and the National Park Service," Journal of Forest History 29 (April 1985): 78-84; Murray, "Administrative History," 84; Corbett, "Origin and Development of a National Monument," 87; -----, "Winifred Bartlett: Monument Maker;" for Ickes' personal view of these issues, see Harold L. Ickes, The Secret Diaries of Harold L. Ickes: The First Thousand

Burlew's perspective was not unusual for the time. His views were similar to those of the people who sought to highlight the cultural importance of the quarries by commemorating the Nicollet marker. In the 1930s, heritage usually meant the history of European transplants to the New World and what was perceived as their advancement towards modern civilization. Few places commemorated American Indian life or culture, and those that did generally portrayed conflict between Indians and whites. Most often in popular culture, Indians were portrayed as savages devoid of the attributes of civilized people. Relativism had not yet become a mode of thinking in American society, and only a few of the elite and the educated genuinely appreciated other, non-European cultures.

Hoover's conservation gift to the nation materialized. Between December 1932 and Roosevelt's inauguration in March 1933, he proclaimed five new national monuments, Black Canyon of the Gunnison in Colorado, the second Grand Canyon National Monument, north of the park boundaries of that time, Death Valley, White Sands, and Saguaro.²⁰ Pipestone was not among them.

Pipestone's absence resulted from two reasons, one legal, the other cultural. The reservation was not in the public domain, rendering the Antiquities Act ineffectual and requiring

Days, 1933-1936 (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1954). Ickes' personal feelings about people often clouded his judgment. His antipathy for Albright's successor, Arno B. Cammerer, did volumes to damage the rapport to which Albright devoted himself.

²⁰ Rothman, Preserving Different Pasts, 224, 232.

an act of Congress to allow the establishment of a monument. As a lame duck, Hoover had little clout. Congress had grown noticeably hostile as Hoover's administration failed to respond to the chaos in the nation, and it had little reason to give him what he wanted. In addition, the features at Pipestone differed from those of most of the other candidates for national monument status. Since Albright sought to develop the representative area parks, the emphasis had shifted to typical areas of unusual flora. Albright recognized that to grow was to remain healthy, and that the store of spectacular mountain tops available for national parks had diminished. He promoted new kinds of parks, including the representative area national monuments. When Hoover's conservation gift became reality, the "lame duck" national monuments were all natural areas. Agency and departmental policy as well as legal standing made Pipestone an unlikely candidate in this climate.²¹

A different administration meant new and better realities for national park area acquisition. Franklin D. Roosevelt's actions as president transformed the nation and not incidentally the National Park Service and the park system. The New Deal provided capital and labor for nearly every project that the Park Service had planned throughout its 17-year history, as well as for thousands of others about which officials could only dream.

²¹ Rothman, Preserving Different Pasts, 170-72; Hal Rothman, "'A Regular Ding-Dong Fight': Agency Culture and Evolution in the NPS-USFS Dispute, 1916-1937," Western Historical Quarterly 20 (May 1989): 141-61.

In August 1933, the reorganization of the federal bureaucracy by Executive Order 6166 catapulted the Park Service to a place of prominence among federal agencies. As it acquired the park-like holdings of the War Department and the Forest Service, the NPS became a broader-based, more powerful agency with genuine resources at its disposal. During the 1930s, capital development programs were carried out in nearly every park area with potential for visitation. The constituency for the parks grew despite dismal economic times, as many saw the parks as an avenue to their personal economic future as well as places to visit to affirm their heritage. In its rivalries with other agencies, particularly the Forest Service, the Park Service emerged triumphant, with a clear mandate for its mission and more resources to support development than ever before.²²

With the enormous benefits of federal development programs for depressed local, state, and regional economies, a national park became a coveted prize. During the New Deal, national park areas were prime candidates for federal expenditures. After many years of statehood, Minnesota still lacked a national park area of any kind, something to serve both as a status symbol and a potential windfall in government spending in the state. Local support for a park area was strong, and the lack of large public

²² Harlan D. Unrau and G. Frank Williss, Administrative History: Expansion of the National Park Service in the 1930s (Denver: Denver Service Center, 1983), 1-25; Rothman, Preserving Different Pasts, 162, 169, 187-90, 202-04.

domain natural areas in Minnesota made Pipestone a good candidate for park status. But questions about its importance remained.

There was some opposition in the agency to pursuing Pipestone as a park area. During the New Deal, the best additions to the system were places where a development program could be easily implemented. Pipestone had some potential, but relatively little in comparison to larger parks. Park Service leaders who were closely tied to New Deal development money recognized the limits of Pipestone. Native Minnesotan Conrad L. Wirth headed the Civilian Conservation Corps programs of the agency. He used Burlew's opposition to voice his own misgivings. Wirth thought Pipestone a poor candidate for his support because he concentrated his development efforts on large, natural parks where he could put thousands of people to work. Harold C. Bryant, who led the educational division of the agency, sided with Wirth and Burlew.²³ Others recognized greater long-term potential.

After the change in agency policy in the early 1930s, "aggregate value" park areas--parks with a combination of values that together equalled national significance--became more common. Pipestone had potential in this regard; Burlew was not sure that the quarries alone were significant enough for inclusion in the park system, but a larger part of the reserved area might have natural and scientific importance as well as historical value.

²³ Corbett, "A History of the Red Pipestone Quarry," 48; Conrad L. Wirth, Parks, Politics, and the People (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980).

The input of Victor E. Shelford, a famous ecologist at the University of Illinois in Urbana who reported on the importance of the surrounding area, gave NPS officials a strong argument for a park area including a number of different categories of significance.²⁴

The land remained under Bureau of Indian Affairs administration, rendering much of the debate over values irrelevant. More important was American Indian sentiment about a public park at Pipestone. Across the northern plains, Native Americans expressed their support for the park. Sioux tribes in South Dakota, including some individual Yankton, and Ojibway in Minnesota were particularly prominent, although the absence of support of the Yankton Tribal Council was conspicuous. The council filed a complaint with Indian affairs, protesting the potential opening of the quarries to all tribes and requesting monetary compensation. Commissioner of Indian Affairs John Collier, noted for his liberal sentiments, rejected the request.²⁵

BIA officials were sympathetic to both the needs of Native Americans and the idea of some permanent resolution of the situation. With prodding from the ever-intrepid Winifred Bartlett, who used her own money to travel to Washington, D. C.,

²⁴ Victor E. Shelford to H. C. Bryant, November 7, 1933, Pipestone, Series 7, RG 79, NA; for more on Shelford, see Robert A. Crocker, Pioneer Ecologist: The Life and Work of Victor Ernest Shelford 1877-1968 (Washington, D. C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991).

²⁵ Corbett, "History of the Red Pipestone Quarry," 47.

to lobby for the park, the Park Service was secured a commitment from BIA that land not essential to the Indian School could be made available for permanent park purposes.²⁶ Increasingly, the combination of local support, acquiescence of the federal agency responsible for the land, and lack of concerted opposition from Native Americans made a park area possible. The last ingredient necessary was legislative support from the congressional delegation of the State of Minnesota.

Minnesota's elected officials were willing to oblige. With Bureau of Indian Affairs concurrence and encouragement of the Pipestone National Park Association, U.S. Sen. Henrik Shipstead, a Republican from Minnesota, offered a bill for the establishment of a national monument, the first of many such efforts, in May 1934. The 160-acre proposal doubled the size of the area acceptable to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Nor were the boundaries of the park within the reserved area made clear. The confusion surrounding these two issues stalled the bill, and it died in committee.²⁷

Despite the failure of the first attempt, momentum in support of the park remained strong. No one expressed opposition to the idea of the park, but only to the provisions of the bill Shipstead offered. In 1935, Shipstead introduced another measure. This one included 110 acres, much closer to the roughly eighty acres to which the Bureau of Indian Affairs previously

²⁶ Corbett, "A History of the Red Pipestone Quarry," 48.

²⁷ Ibid., 48-49; Murray, "Administrative History," 86.

agreed. The Park Service recognized that it could capitalize on the momentum and began a series of studies. J. W. Balmer of the Indian School prepared a report on the boundaries of the proposed park, Neal A. Butterfield, an NPS landscape architect, evaluated the area, and in August 1935 assistant regional historian of the State Park Division Region VI office Edward A. Hummel reviewed the features of the area. In order to include most of the quarries and the rocks called the Three Maidens, Hummel and Butterfield advocated a larger area than Shipstead included in the second bill.²⁸

Despite such support, Shipstead's second bill failed to create the park. The Senate public lands committee reported favorably on the bill without incorporating any of the amendments recommended by Hummel or Butterfield. On June 18, 1936, the Senate passed the bill that the public lands committee endorsed. This posed the classic dilemma for the Park Service. The opportunity to acquire a new park was available, but the area in question was not all the agency needed to fulfill its mission. In the history of the agency, the Park Service had become accustomed to such situations. Agency officials learned to keep

²⁸ Murray, "Administrative History," 86-87; Corbett, "A History of the Red Pipestone Quarry," 49; Shankland, Steve Mather of the National Parks, 304, John Ise, Our National Park Policy: A Critical History (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1961), 441. The Region II office in Omaha was established along with ones in San Francisco, Santa Fe, and Richmond, Virginia, in 1937. Region III, located in Santa Fe, had an additional administrative problem. The Emergency Conservation Work (ECW) program for Region III was located in Oklahoma City, creating split jurisdiction that was only joined in 1939.

expansion plans handy. But at Pipestone, such an eventuality did not materialize. Although the Senate passed the bill, the U.S. House of Representatives failed to act on it. The proposal for Pipestone National Monument died with the end of the 1936 congressional session.²⁹

All the necessary ingredients for the creation of the park remained in place. The Bureau of Indian Affairs was willing to give up the land, the Park Service supported the idea, and local support, led by Winifred Bartlett, remained strong. Both Minnesota senators introduced a new bill in January 1937. A Park Service boundary study incorporated the comments of Hummel and Butterfield into the proposal, and when the Senate committee reviewed the information, it concurred with the boundaries proposed by the Park Service. On August 6, the U.S. Senate passed the bill; fifteen days later, the House of Representatives followed. On August 26, 1937, Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the bill, and Pipestone National Monument came into existence.

At the time, this legislative process was uncommon. Most of the first generation of national monuments was selected from the public domain. Before the 1930s, if an area was not in the public domain or given to the government by private owners, it simply was not considered for monument status. By the 1930s, the selection process had become more discriminating. Later national monuments were chosen for reasons other than mere availability.

²⁹ Murray, "Administrative History," 87; Corbett, "A History of the Red Pipestone Quarry," 49.

During the 1930s, the historic message each contained became an important consideration. The establishment of Homestead National Monument, near Beatrice, Nebraska, illustrated the change. The first tract perfected under the Homestead Act of 1862, it was also established by congressional legislation. Homestead was selected because of what it symbolized to Americans, not as a result of any threat to its integrity.³⁰

The precedent held at Pipestone. Although it did not share the iconographic meaning of Homestead to Americans struggling with the greatest economic catastrophe in their history, Pipestone had considerable significance to a smaller segment of the public. Melding that meaning with the process used to proclaim other areas outside the public domain created a kind of opportunity that the beginning of the Second World War would terminate. Legislative establishment of national monuments became standard in the aftermath of the Jackson Hole National Monument controversy of the 1940s, but in the 1930s, it remained atypical. The establishment of Pipestone was an early example of what became characteristic of the process.³¹

³⁰ Rothman, Preserving Different Pasts, 197-202.

³¹ Ibid., 214-22; Robert W. Righter, Crucible for Conservation: The Creation of Grand Teton National Park (Boulder: Colorado Associated University Press, 1982) chronicles the aggressive use of executive power that created Jackson Hole National Monument and subsequent response from western legislators. The result set the stage for the post-war era, in which Congress routinely refused to fund national monuments that it had not approved by legislation. Once again, the limitations of the Antiquities Act of 1906 were made clear.

The establishment of Pipestone National Monument by legislation rather than proclamation was not the only way in which the monument was anomalous. In many ways, Pipestone was unique among park areas. Because of a clause allowing Native Americans to again quarry within park boundaries, the monument had a kind of obligation that other park areas did not share. It had a de facto responsibility for the protection and maintenance of historic Native American life. A park reflecting cultural as well as historic themes, it presented a skewed vision of Indian experience. The monument was not surrounded by Native American lands as at park areas such as Navajo National Monument, nor did native people have responsibility for services as they did at places such as Canyon de Chelly. But at both of those parks, the monument protected not locations and artifacts related to modern or historic Native American life, but prehistory. At the inception of Pipestone National Monument, living Native Americans were part of the reason for creating the park, their "historic" activities part of the milieu. One of the most important features the new park contained were Native Americans working the quarries in the old ways.

Yet this presented a tremendous administrative responsibility. Managing the quarries and the people that used them along with the guaranteed flow of visitors, the natural resources of the monument, and relations with the town of Pipestone required skill and dexterity. Without cooperative agreements, resources, and full-time personnel, Pipestone, its

supporters in town, and its volunteer staff shouldered a tremendous burden. They faced a complex situation without the tools and experience to properly address it.

Pipestone was also different from other park areas proclaimed and developed in its era. Executive Order 6166, Franklin D. Roosevelt's proclamation that reorganized government bureaucracy in 1933, gave the NPS control of the places representing American history that the federal system administered. Battlefields and other historic military areas were the focus of development during the first few years of the New Deal. Other parks established in the same era included natural areas such as the Everglades National Park in Florida and Capitol Reef National Monument in Utah, historical parks such as Homestead National Monument, and built parks such as the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in downtown St. Louis. Pipestone did not fit well into this company.³² Most other similar areas had been proclaimed a generation before. With the added dimension of the management of continued quarrying, Pipestone had all the appearances of a complicated situation.

In addition, Pipestone faced problems typical of the national monument category. It was established without an operations budget, putting any development plans aside until appropriations could be arranged. The monument lacked a full-time permanent custodian, the designation at the time for people

³² Swain, "National Park Service and the New Deal," 312-32; Rothman, Preserving Different Pasts, 163-74; Unrau and Williss, Expansion of the National Park Service, 43-74.

who administered national monuments, leaving it in the hands of interested and zealous volunteers who were not always aware of Park Service rules and standards. Pipestone was in the national monument category, still something of a liability at the end of the 1930s; although New Deal money was spread evenly throughout the system, the standard NPS allocation still funded national park programs more comprehensively than those at national monuments. The regionalization of the Park Service, which began in 1937, also put the monument at a disadvantage. Located in Region II, the Midwest Region which had its offices in Omaha, it was far from most of the other parks that addressed Native American or prehistoric themes. This made the development of the monument a difficult process. At its inception, implementing typical NPS programs at Pipestone remained a long-term objective.

CHAPTER IV: "THIS NATIONAL PARK SERVICE OUTPOST": 1938-1956

After its establishment, Pipestone National Monument faced the typical problems of a new park area. There were few permanent structures within the boundaries of the monument and almost no amenities for visitors. The only improvements that existed were small picnic tables and a shelter built by the Indian Civilian Conservation Corps earlier in the 1930s. The bill establishing the monument did not appropriate funds for its administration, and there were no provisions for permanent or temporary staff. As in the case of many other national monuments established more than twenty years before, a volunteer custodian needed to be found. At the inception, Pipestone lacked the most basic features of Park Service management.

In 1937, Pipestone's condition was unusual. Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal transformed the park system. Its programs created the greatest windfall in the history of the National Park Service, supporting the development of more than one hundred park areas. Through the reorganization of the federal bureaucracy, the agency added more than seventy park areas to the system, many of which presented important aspects of American history. Battlefields, historic sites, and other properties became part of the system, and proponents for such areas pressured NPS officials for development. By the late 1930s, park areas across the nation

sported new museums, administrative facilities, housing, roads and trails, utilities systems, and interpretation exhibits.¹

But Pipestone entered the system too late for much of the largess of the New Deal and without an established plan for implementing development. National parks still topped the list of development priorities, and the older archeological national monuments that lacked facilities until the New Deal had vocal proponents within the agency. The Civil War and Revolutionary War battlefields that were added to the system pulled on heartstrings of Americans; their obvious meaning to the public made them strong candidates for development.² Pipestone shared none of these attributes. Combined with its remote location and the unusual resources the monument contained, development became a slow and frustrating process until the advent of MISSION 66 in the 1950s.

At Pipestone in 1937, the agency faced a dilemma. The growth of the park system and its development gave Congress and the public a clear set of expectations. By 1937, travelers anticipated a certain level of service when they visited a national park area. Most popular parks had visitor centers, concessions, roads and marked trails, and interpretive personnel

¹ Rothman, Preserving Different Pasts, 187-90; Unrau and Willis, Expansion of the Park System, 75-105; Superintendent, Pipestone National Monument to Regional Director, Region II, July 27, 1950, Box 194, Folder 501, Kansas City Federal Records Center.

² Rothman, Preserving Different Pasts, 196-207.

and material. For two decades after its establishment, Pipestone could not meet the expectations embodied in such development.

Initially, NPS officials were not quite sure what to do with Pipestone National Monument. Pipestone's unique situation made successful administration a difficult proposition. There were many ways to approach its development. Some in the agency regarded Pipestone as a primitive park. Others sought to implement a characteristic NPS-style plan, emphasizing the historic and geological themes of the monument. But under the circumstances, initial optimism dissipated, and improvement of facilities became an arduous task.

The conditions NPS officials found when they visited Pipestone were discouraging. In the summer of 1938, nearly a year after the establishment of the monument, the quarries were filled with water and had become swimming holes. A "rather dilapidated looking" trailer stood atop the quartzite ledge, leaving an unfavorable impression on NPS Regional Geologist Carroll H. Wegemann. Local people complained that the established of the monument encouraged an influx of Native Americans who hoped to sell pipestone souvenirs.³ The beginnings of a tense situation existed at the monument.

One of the first steps taken at Pipestone was finding a volunteer custodian. Volunteers had been the mainstays of the national monuments since the passage of the Antiquities Act of

³ Carroll H. Wegemann, Memorandum to Mr. Brown, August 5, 1938, Pipestone National Monument, File 204, Kansas City Federal Records Center.

1906. During the 1920s, some southwestern monuments received trained NPS replacements, but elsewhere in the nation, volunteers remained the standard at national monuments until the New Deal. In many cases, respectable citizens from the vicinity, people with a specific interest in a park area, or nearby federal officials from other agencies volunteered their services. At Pipestone, the superintendent of the adjacent Pipestone Indian School, J. W. Balmer, one of the founders of the Pipestone Indian Shrine Association, accepted the responsibility. He and the Park Service had much to do.⁴

Balmer inherited the complex set of custom, rules, and regulations that governed the quarries at Pipestone. The act establishing the monument extended to all Indians the right to quarry at Pipestone, something the Yankton Sioux relinquished in the settlement of the court case in 1928. In the nine-year interim between the end of the case and the establishment of the monument, quarrying continued, but without legal sanction. As superintendent of the Indian School, Balmer exercised nominal supervision over the quarry, but any quarrying that occurred fell within his discretionary power. Officials of the Office of Indian Affairs explained that between 1928 and 1937, they had not restricted Indian quarrying, a policy that the act compelled the

⁴ Acting Assistant to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to Director of the National Park Service, Attention A. E. Demaray, October 7, 1938, Pipestone, Series 7, RG 79, NA; Rothman, Preserving Different Pasts, 89-139.

Park Service to follow.⁵ The enabling legislation strengthened existing custom. The establishment of the monument created a permanent legal relationship between Native Americans and the Park Service.

The protection of the rights of Native Americans in the proclamation assured that administration of the monument would be complicated. There were a number of constituencies vying for control of the monument and particularly of the money its visitors would spend. The Pipestone community correctly recognized that it stood to benefit from the presence of a national park area, but only if the monument provided visitors with an experience similar to that at other national park areas. Native Americans from the Indian School and across the northern plains recognized that their heritage was the story behind the pipestone quarries and their participation was essential to the success of the park. The two groups often found their objectives antithetical.

The slow development of facilities at the monument exacerbated existing tensions. Between 1937 and 1940, Pipestone functioned as a classic remote national monument. Balmer took time from his duties at the Indian School to watch over the monument, but he clearly recognized that without a budget for

⁵ Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs to Arno B. Cammerer, May 3, 1938, Pipestone, Series 7, RG 79, NA.

even the most basic maintenance, he fought a losing battle.⁶ Administered by the volunteer custodian, Pipestone languished on the periphery of the park system.

But unlike so many earlier national monuments, Pipestone began to be developed within a very few years. During the New Deal, funding for park development was easy to attain, and although Pipestone did not receive a CCC camp as did many other park areas, access to NPS funds came far more quickly than it had for earlier national monuments. The monument received its first appropriation of \$1,300 for fiscal year 1940. The first seasonal custodian, Albert F. Drysdale of Winona, Minnesota, was appointed late in 1939 and began work January 2, 1940.⁷ A rudimentary administrative structure began to take shape.

Local support for the monument remained strong. The appointment of the seasonal custodian was perceived as an important step forward, and Drysdale's arrival was greeted with banner headlines in the local newspaper, the Pipestone County Star. Drysdale collected visitation figures during the summer of 1941 as a means to gauge his public. Nearly 1,500 out-of-state visitors signed the register, an indication that the monument had considerable appeal despite its lack of amenities.⁸ To many in

⁶ J. W. Balmer to J. R. White, Acting Director of the National Park Service, August 16, 1939, Pipestone, Series 7, RG 79, NA; Rothman, Preserving Different Pasts, 75-86.

⁷ Murray, "Administrative History," 95-96; Pipestone County Star, December 26, 1939; Pipestone County Star, January 12, 1940.

⁸ Murray, "Administrative History," 97; Pipestone County Star, October 13, 1941.

the community, it appeared that Pipestone was beginning to develop.

By 1940, the NPS planning process had also begun. Edward A. Hummel, who had been involved with Pipestone since 1935 and had since become the Region II regional supervisor of historic sites, completed a preliminary historical development report, the first NPS planning document for the monument. Hummel suggested that planned development should include a museum and administration building, a custodian's residence, a utility building, roads, trails, and parking, signs and markers, provisions for the sale of pipestone materials and artifacts, and a research program to support interpretation. In 1940, a two-fold interpretive leaflet for Pipestone was designed and 10,000 copies were printed, offering the beginning of an interpretation program.⁹

Hummel's ambitious program reflected the experience of the New Deal. Federal money enhanced the agency's visitor service mission throughout the 1930s, and as a result, new planning had to include substantial visitor service to fit the standards of the agency. Without provisions for visitor service, development was unlikely. Implementing Hummel's program would bring the facilities at Pipestone up to the level of the rest of the park

⁹ Edward A. Hummel, "Preliminary Historical Development Report of Pipestone National Monument," Ca. 1940, Pipestone, Series 7, RG 79, NA; Thomas J. Allen, "Memorandum for the Director," December 28, 1940, Pipestone, Series 7, RG 79, NA; Herbert E. Kahler to Acting Regional Director, Region II, March 15, 1941, Pipestone, Series 7, RG 79, NA.

system. At the beginning of the 1940s, it almost seemed a realistic option.

But the attack on Pearl Harbor and American entry into World War II slowed the development of the national park system. The American economy rapidly retooled for wartime production, and spiritual and recreational needs ceased to be concerns of decision-makers. The Park Service was moved temporarily from its headquarters in the Interior Department in Washington, D.C., to Chicago to make room for more important war-related agencies. Many Park Service people, from the Washington office to the ranger corps, entered the military. Almost all park development projects were delayed or eliminated. Restrictions on travel, gasoline and tire rationing, and concerns about the war curtailed visitation as Americans concentrated on the difficult task they faced.¹⁰

Pipestone mirrored the national pattern. Any chance of rapid development disappeared with the mobilization that began after Pearl Harbor. Drysdale continued to serve in a seasonal capacity, but other than basic maintenance, there was little that he could do. Visitation to the monument diminished, although many people from the nearby Army Air Corps base in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, came to tour Pipestone. Local people continued to

¹⁰ Ronald A. Foresta, America's National Parks and Their Keepers (Washington, D. C.: Resources for the Future, 1984), 49-51; John Ise, Our National Park Policy, 447-53.

make use of the monument, and picnics and holiday outings became the most common forms of use.¹¹

The end of the Second World War brought an overwhelming sense of relief and exuberant celebration to the nation. In the aftermath of the Japanese surrender, Americans danced in the streets and made plans for the future. During the war, there had been shortages of all kinds of goods, while many people were able to save thousands of dollars. The result was a pent-up demand for consumer goods and travel and recreation, as millions of Americans set off in an aggressive frenzy to see their country and acquire the cars, clothes, appliances, and homes that the war denied them.¹²

The park system experienced an almost immediate impact. The national parks attracted visitors like never before, as more and more Americans accepted the natural and cultural heritage contained within them as an important part of their cultural patrimony. The construction of the interstate highway system and the popularization of highways such as Route 66 encouraged travel. At a time when Americans could travel from coast to coast by car, popular culture elevated the experience to the status of myth. Visitation across the national park system soared, reaching numbers that exceeded the wildest dreams of even

¹¹ Albert F. Drysdale, "Custodian's Report," June 3, 1944, Pipestone, Series 7, RG 79, NA; Stanley C. Joseph, "Memorandum for the Director," June 28, 1944, Pipestone, Series 7, RG 79, NA.

¹² Eric Goldman, The Crucial Decade--and After: America 1945-1960 (New York: Random House, 1961), 4-5, 12-15.

the most use-oriented NPS managers. Visits to the national park system rose from 12 million each year immediately before World War II to around 35 million in 1950 and continued to increase. In 1956, the system received more than 54 million visits. In the decade following the war, appropriations remained nearly constant.¹³

Changes in patterns of travel made handling the growth even more difficult. By the 1950s, the automobile had replaced the train as the primary mode of transportation of visitors to national parks. The individualized nature of automobile travel changed visitation and exponentially increased the impact of visitation. More than 98 percent of visitors arrived in private automobiles, leading to the use of larger percentages of national park areas, traffic congestion, parking problems, and in some places, air pollution.¹⁴

The increase in visitation revealed deep system-wide structural problems for the NPS. Throughout the late 1940s and early 1950s, the park system experienced tremendous annual growth in visitation without concomitant increases in appropriations for capital development, maintenance, visitor service, or administration. Across the country, park staffs and facilities were overwhelmed by an influx of visitors with money to spend and the desire to experience their natural and cultural heritage.

¹³ Runte, National Parks, 170-3; Ise, Our National Park Policy, 534-37.

¹⁴ Runte, National Parks, 156-61.

The quality of facilities and visitor experience declined rapidly throughout the era. Conditions became so bad that noted author and historian Bernard DeVoto called for the closing of the national parks if they could not be adequately maintained.¹⁵

Pipestone experienced many of the typical problems of the era. Without Park Service-caliber facilities or any of the characteristic agency accouterments, the monument was unprepared for the onslaught of visitation. Pent-up demand for travel and recreation caused immediate changes at Pipestone. The increase in visitation was almost instantaneous. War workers returning home increased visitation at Pipestone in the summer and fall of 1945. The influx continued during the 1946 travel season, when more than 5,000 visitors came to Pipestone between May and September. By the end of 1948, months with more than 2,000 visitors, more than the number that came during an entire travel season before the war, became common during the summers.¹⁶

But the condition of the monument remained a local embarrassment. Despite all the efforts at planning and development, the monument remained essentially the same in 1946 as it had been in 1937. Despite Drysdale's presence six months

¹⁵ Bernard DeVoto, "The National Parks," Fortune 35 (June 1947) 120-21; Bernard DeVoto, "Let's Close the National Parks," Harper's Magazine 207 (October 1953), 49-52.

¹⁶ Pipestone County Star, October 3, 1941; "Master Plan Development Outline, Pipestone National Monument," February, 1952, Box E, E 1501, Pipestone National Monument; Superintendent's Monthly Narrative, July 1, 1948; Superintendent's Monthly Narrative, October 1, 1948, Pipestone, Series 7, RG 79, NA.

of the year, the monument continued to deteriorate. Upkeep of the grounds was intermittent, there was little to entice or educate visitors, and as the situation failed to improve, local business people began to discourage visitors from going to the quarries. Some complained to U.S. Rep. H. Carl Andersen that the custodian was derelict in his duties, and the monument should be turned over to local people to assure better management. Andersen asked NPS Director Newton B. Drury to allow the Pipestone Civic and Commerce Association to receive federal money to administer the park.¹⁷

NPS officials rushed to the defense of their custodian and the limited care they could offer the monument. The situation at the monument was clearly substandard, and NPS officials reminded Andersen that Drysdale was at the monument six months of the year and because of government regulations, only five days each week, eight hours each day, during that time. Regional office officials determined that Drysdale put in a significant amount of time each week in excess of the required forty hours, but that the responsibilities at Pipestone were too great for one part-time person. Increased vandalism during the off-season posed another problem for the custodian. When Drysdale arrived at the monument in the spring of 1947, he found the buildings damaged, the partitions in the latrines torn out, and garbage dumped in a number of places. The fence along the Indian School boundary

¹⁷ H. Carl Andersen to Newton B. Drury, May 11, 1946, Pipestone, Series 7, RG 79, NA.

also required repair. The monument lacked an appropriation for repair and maintenance, and Drysdale did what he could.

Pipestone needed full-time care.¹⁸

The NPS sent a team to work with the Pipestone community. In a meeting with Mayor Fred Walz and a number of other civic leaders, Chief Historian Herbert Kahler, Regional Historian Olaf T. Hagen, and Drysdale explained the problems of the NPS. The climate had changed since the New Deal, when NPS officials could routinely summon the resources of federal programs to transform park areas. In the late 1940s, a master plan and a project construction program were in the planning stage for Pipestone National Monument, but had not yet come to fruition. Community representatives were eager to see progress, and NPS officials offered a preview. The plan included a full-time custodian in Park Service uniform, a seasonal employee, better training for park staff, provisions for tools and materials for the park, entrance, informational, and directional signs, a trailside exhibit, and greater cooperation with the local community. The Park Service officials stressed that the plan would take time to implement.¹⁹

¹⁸ Lawrence C. Merriam, "Memorandum for the Director," May 24, 1946, Pipestone, Series 7, RG 79, NA; Albert F. Drysdale, "Memorandum for the Regional Director, Region II," April 22, 1947, Pipestone, Kansas City Federal Records Center.

¹⁹ Herbert E. Kahler, "Report on Trip to Pipestone National Monument," July 12, 1946, Pipestone, Kansas City Federal Records Center.

The Washington office of the Park Service, which again became agency headquarters after World War II, also worked to include Andersen among its supporters in Congress. In the late 1940s, Pipestone was the only national park area in Minnesota, and much of its predicament could easily be attributed to a lack of resources. In a series of meetings with high-ranking NPS officials, Andersen received a clearer picture of the problems at Pipestone. Park Service officials sought to place a full-time resident custodian at the monument, and Andersen became a leading proponent of the idea. At a meeting of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, he called the condition of the monument a disgrace to the community and the entire park system. Andersen came out strongly for a permanent staff position for the monument.²⁰

A slow and steady move to professional NPS management began at Pipestone in no small part as a response to Andersen and the concerns of the Pipestone community. The monument acquired its first piece of permanent equipment, a used pickup truck, in the summer of 1947. The first full-time year-round custodian, Lyle K. Linch, arrived early in 1948. Later that year Linch was appointed "superintendent," a reflection of the pejorative connotation attached to the title of custodian as well as the

²⁰ Minneapolis Morning Tribune, April 27, 1947.

increased emphasis on equal status for personnel at all categories of park areas.²¹

Linch had a decade of experience with the Park Service before he came to Pipestone in 1948. He graduated from the University of Iowa with a degree in biology in 1936, entering the Park Service in 1938 as a custodial officer at the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D. C. He became a park ranger at Natchez Trace Parkway in Mississippi in 1939, and continued at Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado and Badlands and Jewel Cave national monuments in South Dakota before coming to Pipestone.²² Lean and angular, Linch knew the Park Service way before he came to the monument.

Linch initiated new programs from the day he arrived at Pipestone. The first involved much needed maintenance, cutting weeds, clearing trails, and generally cleaning up the monument. Linch organized cooperative programs with local and state authorities to assist in road and trail maintenance. He developed interpretation programs, followed in 1949 by research activities with Regional Archeologist Paul Beaubien and University of Minnesota archeologist Gordon Baldwin. These efforts provided the basis for interpretation at the monument as

²¹ Superintendent's Monthly Narrative, April 1, 1948, Pipestone, Series 7, RG 79, NA; Rothman, Preserving Different Pasts, 222.

²² Stanley C. Joseph, "Memorandum for the Custodian, Pipestone National Monument" and attached press release, "Full Time Custodian Appointed at Pipestone National Monument," April 1, 1948, Pipestone, Kansas City Federal Records Center.

well as much of its collection of artifacts. In addition, Linch hired George Bryan, a full-blooded Ojibway who quarried the monument, as the first seasonal interpretive ranger. In 1950, he, Winifred Bartlett, and others developed nature trails.²³ In two short years, a trained Park Service professional made a substantial difference in the condition of the monument.

Linch also supported larger-scale activities to increase the exposure of the monument. With his concurrence and urging, the local Exchange Club, a chapter of the national organization, produced its first "Hiawatha Pageant" in 1949. In it, costumed members of the community acted out Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's The Song of Hiawatha. The Exchange Club format did not fit local needs and the Pipestone club dissolved. The pageant grew in attendance and importance, and an entity called the Hiawatha Club was formed to administer it. The pageant became a regional attraction and a fixture at the monument.²⁴

Despite his myriad accomplishments, Linch became a controversial figure within the agency. Remembered as a "character," he had a flair for the dramatic and at times exceeded the bounds of acceptable decorum for agency personnel. While he aggressively promoted the monument and its features, his projects sometimes lacked objectivity and substantiation.

²³ Paul Beaubien, "Report of an Archeological Reconnaissance, Pipestone National Monument," unpublished manuscript, 1949; Murray, "Administrative History," 99-103; Corbett, "History of the Red Pipestone Quarry," 56.

²⁴ Gordon Backlund interview with Dan Holder, November 22, 1991, Pipestone National Monument.

Regional officials spent considerable energy keeping abreast of Linch's activities and reining him in. Some suspected him of unauthorized quarrying, a violation of the most cardinal agency rule, but such allegations were difficult to prove. In more public venues, Linch's claims that he discovered Egyptian hieroglyphics at Pipestone and his formation of an Ankh society were of particular annoyance. Regional office supervisors strongly recommended that Linch adhere to the information of respectable scientists and refrain from the "commercialized" and "gaudy" kind of presentation that characterized private sites. The boundary between successful promotion of an area and unacceptable showmanship was clearly defined, although Linch's often idiosyncratic presentations continued intermittently.²⁵

Despite the many positive strides in interpretation and maintenance that Linch made, the facilities at Pipestone lagged behind the rest of the park system. In 1948, no winter quarters for the superintendent and his family existed. Linch's family spent this first winter at the monument in Iowa, while he opened a winter office in the Calumet Hotel in downtown Pipestone. The separation was a hardship on the superintendent and his family,

²⁵ Acting Regional Director Stanley C. Joseph to Superintendent, Pipestone National Monument, "Confidential Memorandum," July 17, 1950; Regional Historian and Regional Chief of Land and Recreational Planning, Report on Visit to Pipestone National Monument, August 14 (1950), September 11, 1950; Regional Historian to Superintendent, Pipestone National Monument, September 21, 1950; Jerome C. Miller to Superintendent, Pipestone National Monument, Pipestone, Kansas City Federal Records Center; Chief Historian Ed Bearss conversation with Hal Rothman, March 13, 1992, Columbia, South Carolina.

precisely the kind of situation the Park Service sought to avoid as it professionalized management at smaller park areas.²⁶

Early in the 1950s, the NPS still had not established control over access to the monument. A horseshoe-shaped loop road allowed people to use the monument as a thoroughfare, and without a visitor center, the Park Service lacked an adequate way to orient travelers. In 1951, the loop road was closed permanently, but the question of visitor orientation remained beyond the scope of existing Park Service resources. Without a visitor center located between the parking areas and the quarries, the Park Service had little opportunity to control access to the monument and prepare visitors for their experience.

In addition, the monument did not yet include all the features of importance in the vicinity. The initial law establishing Pipestone placed the Three Maidens, the three large rocks near the southern boundary, within the boundaries of the monument, but the land remained in private hands. Both the Staso Milling Company and the City of Pipestone owned part of the area, and acquisition measures to acquire the area would be necessary.²⁷ While development of the monument was not predicated on its growth, including adjacent features of cultural significance enhanced the monument and made it seem complete.

²⁶ Lyle K. Lynch, Memorandum for the Regional Director, September 5, 1949, Pipestone, 620, Kansas City Federal Records Center.

²⁷ Weldon W. Gratton, Park Planner, "Resume of 'Three Maidens Area,' Pipestone National Monument," February 16, 1949, Pipestone, 610, Kansas City Federal Records Center.

Beginning in the 1930s, NPS officials sought to acquire the Three Maidens. City leaders recognized the need for the transfer, and in a February 26, 1940, meeting, the city council voted to deed its portion of the area, about .17 acres, to the NPS. Although the Park Service would have preferred to acquire the portion owned by the Staso Milling Company as well, it proceeded. Yet more than four years later, the city had yet to finish the transaction. The Park Service still had not received title to the parcel. In addition, the title held by the Staso Milling Company seemed to the County Recorder of Deeds to be "cloudy." Throughout the 1940s, legal wrangling over the title to the two tracts continued, until in 1949, the city council again passed legislation conveying the property to the NPS. Again the City of Pipestone prepared to donate the entire tract to the Park Service. The Park Service needed to fund a survey of the boundaries to acquire the land.²⁸

But the transfer was stymied. Robert S. Owens, the recorder of deeds who also owned an adjacent forty-acre tract, personally acquired the piece of land that had belonged to Staso Milling. A friend of the monument and one of the founders of the Hiawatha Pageant, he had only two stipulations. He requested that the pageant be allowed to use the area south of the Three Maidens as a stage for its production and that the Park Service refrain from

²⁸ Ibid.; George F. Ingalls to Regional Director, September 2, 1949; Charles A. Richey to Regional Director, September 2, 1949; Weldon W. Gratton to The Files, February 7, 1950, Pipestone, 610, Kansas City Federal Records Center.

erecting a boundary fence along the south side of the monument.

Although Lyle Linch thought the idea a good one, Acting Regional Director Howard Baker disagreed. Rather than include Owens' stipulations in the transfer, Baker sought to acquire the land and then discuss a special use permit for the pageant. Owens and the city council found Baker's counteroffer acceptable, and the agreement proceeded. Fee simple title to the land was transferred to the Park Service, and the Hiawatha Pageant received a special use permit renewable annually for twenty years. The Three Maidens were officially part of the monument, although a small nearby tract was not. The members of the Hiawatha Club retained a strong proprietary feeling for the features that continued to affect management and policy.²⁹

Developments outside the park system provided impetus for further expansion of the monument. During the 1930s, the New Deal changed the relationship between the federal government and Native Americans. Under the administration of Commissioner of Indian Affairs John Collier, a long-time critic of federal Indian policy whom Franklin D. Roosevelt placed in charge of Indian issues, Native Americans had been offered much greater control over their affairs. The prohibitions against speaking native languages or teaching traditional cultures were lifted as Indians passed from child-like status to near autonomy. One set of

²⁹ Lyle K. Linch to Regional Director, March 25, 1950; Howard Baker to Superintendent, Pipestone National Monument, April 11, 1950; Harold Gilmore, April 18, 1950; R. S. Owens to Lyle K. Linch, April 19, 1950, Pipestone, 610, Kansas City Federal Records Center.

programs, the Indian Reorganization Act, colloquially referred to as the Indian New Deal, sought to develop an economic backbone for native peoples.³⁰

By the late 1940s, the direction of federal policy towards Native Americans had again changed. Many of Collier's well-intended reforms had disastrous results, and in the postwar climate, his liberal policies seemed anachronistic. Under the leadership of Dillon S. Myer, the man who administered the internment camps for Japanese-Americans during World War II, the federal government sought to end its financial and administrative involvement with native peoples. The idea of termination--the elimination of reservations, allotment of lands, and integration of Indians into mainstream America--had become the prevailing current in federal Indian policy.³¹

To many at mid-century, termination was an attractive policy because it curtailed services provided to Native Americans. The federal government had invested enough in the reservation system, this line of reasoning contended, and Indians had reached the point that they could care for their own needs. Some tribes were terminated--removed from federal roles as authorized groups that could receive collective benefits. Many of the special programs offered Native Americans as a result of their treaties with the

³⁰ Dippie, The Vanishing American, 304-21.

³¹ Ibid., 336-43; Alvin M. Josephy, Jr., "Modern America and the Indian," 260-65, and W. Richard West, Jr., and Kevin Gover, "The Struggle for Indian Civil Rights," in Frederick E. Hoxie, ed., Indians in American History (Arlington Heights, IL: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 1988), 280-82.

U.S. government also ceased. Elimination of some of the many Indian boarding schools that dotted the West followed.³²

Pipestone Indian School was among those targeted for closure.

Efforts to close the school had begun in 1948 but were stalled by a powerful local outcry. In the fall of 1948, a parade of educators and state officials visited the Indian school, assessing their need for the property and its structures. Lyle Linch wanted to make sure that the closing helped the Park Service. His prime concern at the time was finding permanent housing for his family, and he suggested that the Park Service acquire a building from the Indian School. Land acquisition was more important to NPS goals. Linch also discussed adding some of the school lands to the park with Winifred Bartlett, who thought it an excellent idea.³³

The Pipestone Indian School had been founded in no small part because of the community and had become an integral part of the local economy. Local townspeople perceived its loss as a severe blow, and led by Rev. J. G. Steinmeyer, they lobbied to keep the school open. To the surprise and consternation of Linch, who expected to get one of the residences at the Indian

³² Dippie, Vanishing American, 336-53.

³³ Lyle K. Linch to Regional Director, October 20, 1948; Lyle K. Linch to Regional Director, October 20, 1948, Pipestone 620, Kansas City Federal Records Center.

School for his family, the lobbying effort was successful and the school not only remained open, but expanded its operations.³⁴

From Linch's point of view, one major positive feature resulted from the decision to keep the Indian School open. The situation brought his housing plight to the attention of regional office officials, and when Linch had to leave his temporary quarters at the school and send his family to Iowa for the winter, plans for construction of a Park Service residence quickly took shape. In September 1949, the regional office offered a revised construction program that included a new residence at Pipestone. In 1950, the first permanent staff quarters at Pipestone were completed. In typical NPS fashion at the time, the building included a room in which to store official records.³⁵

The potential for land acquisition continued to interest NPS officials. In the initial master plan for Pipestone, provisions to add Indian school lands were included. When the first talk of the school closing began, NPS officials assessed the chances of acquisition. Arthur E. Demaray, associate director of the agency and a person with vast experience in acquiring new park land,

³⁴ Lyle K. Linch to Regional Director, February 4, 1949; Lyle K. Linch to Regional Director, February 23, 1949; Howard W. Baker, Memorandum for the Superintendent, Pipestone National Monument, February 24, 1949, Pipestone 620, Kansas City Federal Records Center.

³⁵ Lyle K. Linch to Regional Director, September 5, 1949; Acting Regional Director to Director, September 8, 1949, Pipestone 620, Kansas City Federal Records Center; Murray, "Administrative History," 107.

contacted the Bureau of Indian Affairs. But until February 1951, when Regional Director Baker determined that the closing of the Indian school appeared "probable," little action occurred. Baker's regional office filed a recommendation for a boundary adjustment that provided the agency with the ammunition it needed to proceed. The pace accelerated rapidly, although the Park Service did not take over administration of the land until early in 1956.³⁶

NPS officials worked with the Bureau of Indian Affairs to reach an agreement. Chief Historian Herbert Kahler led a team that met with BIA officials and found them receptive to the idea of a transfer. Commissioner of Indian Affairs Myer was "quite happy to collaborate" with the NPS; getting rid of Indian land was in line with his objectives. In August 1951, plans for terminating the school were approved by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Secretary of the Interior Julius A. Krug sent a draft bill to Speaker of the House of Representatives Sam Rayburn allowing the transfer of the land. Although Rep. Andersen commended Congress for keeping the school open in 1953, the

³⁶ Lawrence C. Merriam, Memorandum for the Superintendent, Pipestone National Monument, October 29, 1948; Acting Director to Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs, December 16, 1948; Lyle K. Linch, Memorandum for the Regional Director, January 21, 1949; Associate Director to Assistant Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs, March 31, 1949; Regional Director to Director, November 18, 1949; Howard W. Baker to the Director, February 16, 1951; Region Two, National Park Service, "Recommendations for Boundary Adjustments, Pipestone National Monument," February 14, 1951, Pipestone 602, Kansas City Federal Records Center; Harvey B. Reynolds to Regional Director, February 3, 1956, L1419, Pipestone National Monument.

following year the school finally closed. The Park Service and other federal agencies claimed the buildings and equipment, and the Pipestone Indian School ceased to exist.³⁷

Park Service officials built solid justification for their acquisition. An archeological study of the monument in 1949 laid the basis for acquiring additional land. Archeologist Paul Beaubien's report showed that most of the area quarried in the historic period remained outside existing park boundaries. He concluded that the monument boundaries were "an arbitrary minimum area," and recommended the addition of portions of the Indian School area when the school ceased to exist. After the bill to transfer the land went to Congress, more than 160 acres of the school were placed under the administration of the park as a prelude to the eventual transfer.³⁸

Legislative efforts to permanently transfer land at Pipestone began in 1953. Supportive locals and a well-positioned congressional delegation from Minnesota helped the cause. In 1956, the original 115 acres of the monument were augmented by 164 acres from the former Indian School. The remainder of the

³⁷ Ronald F. Lee to Regional Director, June 14, 1951; Acting Regional Director to Director, August 24, 1951; Secretary of the Interior to Speaker of the House, August 31, 1951; Director to Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs, September 21, 1951; Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs to Director, October 5, 1951; Regional Director to Superintendent, Pipestone, November 30, 1951; Assistant Regional Director to Superintendent, Pipestone, April 1, 1952, Pipestone, 602, Kansas City Federal Records Center.

³⁸ Paul Beaubien, "Report of an Archeological Reconnaissance, Pipestone National Monument," unpublished manuscript, 1949; Dillon S. Myer to Associate Director, National Park Service, May 21, 1951, Pipestone 602, Kansas City Federal Records Center.

reserved area was given to the State of Minnesota for a wildlife refuge.³⁹ The 115-acre park had become 279 acres, and with the wildlife reserve, more than 400 acres of the 640 that had been designated as a reserved area in 1858 had become public land.

The Three Maidens area remained an issue. Although the legal transfer had been completed in 1951, the people who produced the Hiawatha Pageant still regarded the Three Maidens as their property. Part of Robert S. Owens' land to the south of the Three Maidens had passed to the pageant, and since the boulders were the staging area for the performances, their assumption of ownership seemed grounded in logic. Nor were there boundary markers to formally establish the line. In an effort to win continued local support and strengthen an institution that had the potential to help the monument, Park Service officials conceded their stewardship. Local custom gave the pageant de facto ownership of the tract, and the Park Service rarely contested the situation. It had little to gain and much good will to lose. Regional office officials did assist the Hiawatha Club with planning issues, transferring much of the old picnic equipment built by the Indian CCC. Just before the final transfer of the Indian School land to the Park Service in January 1957, the Hiawatha Club ceded its last portion of land, the area to the west of the Three Maidens. Although the Park Service owned the area, local feeling of ownership continued.

³⁹ Murray, "Administrative History," 103.

After six years at Pipestone, Lyle Linch was ready to move on to new challenges. As early as 1951, he began to request transfers to other parks. Despite the problems with unauthorized activity and standards of interpretation, Linch had been the right person at the right time for Pipestone. His enthusiasm, although sometimes misplaced, had contributed to the rapid development of the monument. By 1954, when Linch was transferred to Chalmette National Historical Park outside New Orleans, Pipestone had begun to take on the characteristics of the rest of the park system. Although substantial capital development was still necessary, the monument could offer many of the services available at better-known, better-funded parks.

Harvey B. Reynolds, Linch's successor, continued the pattern of aggressive development that had come to characterize Pipestone. Arriving in July 1954, he began to assess the needs of the monument. While local support remained strong, Reynolds recognized two important gaps. The Hiawatha Club had its own objectives, and the park lacked a comparable, organized entity. In addition, the Native Americans of the area, so crucial to the interpretive mission of the monument, had continuous economic difficulties. In November 1954, Reynolds, Winifred Bartlett, and Dr. Walter G. Benjamin began an effort to address both issues. They decided to consider a revival of the Pipestone Indian Shrine Association, which had become dormant after the establishment of

the monument. Within a year, the group had been reorganized and accepted as a cooperating association of the Park Service.⁴⁰

The Pipestone Indian Shrine Association defined a broader mission than most cooperative associations. Such groups usually provided economic support through sales of park-related books and postcards and assisted in park programs such as interpretation. Although the association developed a new trail guide as its first project, the situation at Pipestone offered a chance to tackle more substantive issues. Faced with growing visitation and the sad specter of Native Americans shamelessly selling pipes and artifacts made from pipestone for small sums everywhere from the train station to the boundaries of the park, the organization sought to develop a structure to help area Native Americans market their crafts. Its members established a small gift shop within the contact station that included Indian crafts among its postcards, books, and souvenirs.⁴¹

The reinvigoration of the Shrine Association typified the changes occurring at the monument. Lynch initiated many programs, and Reynolds continued to develop them. Reynolds set up a temporary museum exhibit in the old picnic shelter. Following the necessary and long-standing pattern of outside support dictated by a lack of resources, the St. Paul Science

⁴⁰ Murray, "Administrative History," 105-06.

⁴¹ Murray, "Administrative History," 106; Betty Zorich interview by Dan Holder, Pipestone National Monument, November 22, 1991.

Museum developed its exhibits. By the end of 1955, the temporary exhibit was ready for the public.⁴²

The temporary museum reflected the condition of the park at the end of 1955. Since its establishment, a great deal had been accomplished without significant agency expenditures. Local support for the park remained strong, rudimentary facilities and interpretation supported visitor services, and energetic and enthusiastic park personnel greeted new arrivals.

But the realities of park management changed in the decade following World War II. Annual visitation at Pipestone grew from 5,000 in 1945 to more than 52,000 in 1955, mirroring a similar trend throughout the park system. Despite the developments, Pipestone lacked the facilities to support such a level of visitation. Many of the measures enacted at the park had been stopgap in character. Comprehensive and permanent development required the allocation of resources from the highest levels of the agency.

⁴² Murray, "Administrative History," 107.

CHAPTER V: MISSION 66 AND THE MODERN ERA

By the mid-1950s, Pipestone National Monument was in dire need of capital development. The energetic leadership provided by its early superintendents had been responsible for the beginnings of a professional management regime, but the physical facilities at Pipestone remained substandard. Following the Second World War, NPS officials found themselves facing incredible increases in visitation without any kind of budget for the improvement of facilities. Nationwide, the agency tried stopgap measures to prevent further decline in service and facilities, but the resources at its disposal were nowhere near adequate. In the funding climate of the early 1950s, development at Pipestone appeared to be a long way off.

But the increased affluence of American society and the importance of the national park system as a symbol of American culture made greater development possible. Adept lobbying by NPS Director Conrad L. Wirth and the response to pronouncements of decline in the quality of the park system by critics led to the advent of a new program. MISSION 66, a ten-year capital development program funded by Congress designed to improve park facilities in time for the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Park Service in 1916, inaugurated a new era in the park system. Like the New Deal twenty years before, MISSION 66

reshaped the park system and the priorities of the National Park Service.¹

The modern era at Pipestone began with MISSION 66. As a result of the developments of the program, Pipestone became a modern park area with all the advantages of that status, as well as its occasional drawbacks. The development program for Pipestone allowed the Park Service to construct a physical plant that supported agency and visitor activities.

The genesis of MISSION 66 derived from the master planning process that had become standard throughout the agency. Hummel's preliminary historical development report early in 1940 recommended "sufficient space" for administration and some exhibits for visitors, but clearly did not envision a visitor center of the kind built at many parks during the New Deal.² The first master plan at the monument was developed in 1942. Like many similar plans, it was a place to begin rather than a comprehensive approach to the future. Some of the suggestions Hummel made were incorporated in the plan, but budget limitations hampered the ability of the NPS to alter the situation at the monument. Most of the implementation occurred in areas such as interpretation and maintenance. In 1951, the loop entry road was closed and other improvements made, but other than the

¹ Foresta, America's National Parks and Their Keepers, 53-54, 70-71, 100-07.

² Edward A. Hummel, "Preliminary Historical Development Report of Pipestone National Monument," ca. 1940, Pipestone 207, Series 7, RG 79, NA.

construction of the contact station and the superintendent's quarters, little construction had been completed.

Yet the planning process continued, yielding by 1948 a facsimile of what the Park Service would build. There were problems with the initial plan. It located the headquarters atop a ridge made of Sioux Quartzite, one of the hardest types of rock. This would have made the construction process extraordinarily expensive, and in 1949, plans were made to locate the headquarters on a more advantageous construction site. A new master plan, developed in 1952, codified this change and offered up more comprehensive possibilities. It included a complete development plan, a museum and administrative area housed in a visitor center, and other amenities, but was clearly relegated to the wish list until the advent of more affluent times for the Park Service.³

As late as the middle of the decade, NPS officials foresaw little opportunity to construct new facilities at Pipestone. In October 1955, the Park Service completed a remodeling project in the visitor contact station that added a number of new exhibits. Despite the development, the new enclosed facility was clearly

³ "Master Plan Development Outline, Pipestone National Monument, Minnesota," February 1952, Box E, E 1501, Pipestone National Monument, Minnesota; Acting Regional Director to the Custodian, Pipestone National Monument, March 21, 1940; Regional Chief of Planning, Memorandum for the Files, April 18, 1941; Edward A. Hummel, Memorandum for the Acting Regional Director, August 22, 1941; Chief of Planning, Memorandum for the Regional Director, June 3, 1942; Acting Supervisor of Historic Sites, Memorandum for the Director, June 5, 1942; Acting Regional Director to the Director, December 1, 1949, Pipestone 600-01, Kansas City Federal Records Center.

inadequate within months of its opening.⁴ Investment in a temporary project suggested that more permanent development was still a long time in the future.

When MISSION 66 was inaugurated in 1955, it began a rapid transformation of Pipestone National Monument. Development plans for all kinds of park activities were devised almost instantaneously, in an effort to spend the money allocated for improving facilities and programs. The rapid increase in visitation--to more than 60,000 by 1956 and projected to reach 100,000 by 1966--was the primary justification for development. The opportunity to present a realistic picture of Native Americans, their customs, and the importance of the calumet, also added significance, as did the need for curatorial storage and facilities to house and maintain the collection at the monument.⁵

There were other reasons for developing Pipestone National Monument. In 1958, Minnesota celebrated 100 years of statehood, and Pipestone remained the only operating national park area in the state. Although Grand Portage National Historic Site had been authorized in 1951 and became a national monument in September 1958, formal establishment did not occur until 1960. As a result, Pipestone was the only place in Minnesota where

⁴ Archeologist to Regional Historian, October 19, 1955, Box E, E 1495, Museum Displays, Pipestone; MISSION 66 for Pipestone National Monument, Box G, G 1519, Pipestone.

⁵ Paul L. Webb and Paul L. Beaubien, "Museum Prospectus for Pipestone National Monument," February 1957, Box G, G 2031, Pipestone.

visitors could have contact with the Park Service in 1958. In addition, 1958 marked the 100th anniversary of the treaty that designated the one-square-mile Pipestone reserved area. NPS officials wished to have the visitor center ready for the beginning of the 1958 travel season.⁶

The museum prospectus became the driving instrument in the process of preparing to develop the monument. The prospectus called for rapid development of a building design, an exhibit plan, and the rest of the documentation necessary to begin full-scale development. Recognizing the opportunity that existed, other branches in the Park Service expedited their plans. In July 1957, the exhibit plan for Pipestone received the approval of Director Conrad L. Wirth, who had become head of the Park Service in 1954. With unusual speed, the ingredients necessary to support the development project came together.⁷ After almost twenty years in the park system, Pipestone reached the pinnacle of the Park Service's list of priorities.

Budgeted at more than \$250,000, the project progressed rapidly. By the spring of 1958, the project was nearing completion. A one-story brick visitor center with an entrance constructed of attractive Sioux quartzite gradually took shape. It was located near the center of the monument, as had been

⁶ Ibid.; Ron Cockrell to Hal K. Rothman, August 2, 1992.

⁷ Ibid.; Paul L. Beaubien to Superintendent, Pipestone National Monument, March 6, 1957; Ralph H. Lewis to Chief, EODC, May 15, 1957; Ronald F. Lee to the Director, April 15, 1957; H. Raymond Gregg to Director, July 8, 1957; H. Raymond Gregg to the Director, February 28, 1958, D6215, Pipestone National Monument.

dictated by the revised master plan in 1952. Roadwork, parking areas, a wayside exhibit, and utilities were also built.⁸

In July 1958, the NPS dedicated its newly completed project. A range of dignitaries, including Rep. H. Carl Andersen, Minnesota Lt. Gov. Karl Rolvaag, National Park Service Regional Director Howard W. Baker, Winifred Bartlett, and Dr. Walter G. Benjamin, came to hear Director Wirth deliver the dedicatory address. Wirth took the opportunity to trumpet the success of the MISSION 66 program and the importance of the monument.⁹ It was a triumph for his home region, his agency, and the primary plan of his directorship.

The completed visitor center signaled tremendous changes in the way visitors experienced Pipestone. As at many similar park areas, the NPS inherited unsatisfactory physical facilities and a layout that did not reflect the standards and goals of the agency. The activities of the 1940s and 1950s brought NPS interpretation and care to the resources of the monument, but were not sufficient to turn the quarries and the contact station into a modern park area. Only the construction of the visitor center, set up at the end of the approach road and located between the parking lot and the quarries, established the NPS presence and made Pipestone equal to other park areas.

⁸ MISSION 66 for Pipestone National Monument, 1957, Box G, G 1519, Pipestone.

⁹ Conrad L. Wirth, Address at Dedication of New Visitor Center, Pipestone National Monument, July 26, 1958, Box E, E 1490, Pipestone.

Control of access to historic and prehistoric locations in the park system had long been the defining moment in the history of a national park area. With a physical plant that oriented visitors as well as served as barrier between the modern world and the prehistoric and historic, Pipestone joined the modern park system. The visitor center at Pipestone reflected the established practice of the agency, learned through experience at parks as diverse as Casa Grande and Bandelier. Its location allowed the Park Service a much greater degree of influence on the experience of visitors.¹⁰ With an enhanced physical plant to augment successful interpretive programming, Pipestone seemed sure to play a significant role in the regional economy.

MISSION 66 for Pipestone mandated the expansion of the permanent and seasonal staff, a necessary step as the plans to build the visitor center began to come together. The new situations would require additional personnel to support the expanded mission of the monument. The second permanent staff member, Park Historian Lloyd A. Abelson, arrived in August 1957 to join Superintendent Paul L. Webb, and a clerk was added early in 1960. In addition, the seasonal staff grew to one ranger and four maintenance people. By the time MISSION 66 for Pipestone

¹⁰ Hal K. Rothman, On Rims and Ridges: The Los Alamos Area Since 1880 (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992), 191-98.

ended in 1959, the park had been physically and financially transformed.¹¹

Pipestone became one of the first success stories of MISSION 66. Although the project at the monument proceeded quickly, some MISSION 66 programs faltered. Some ran into construction delays, while others were the victim of poor planning or weak leadership at some level. Congressional interest evaporated rapidly, and support for the program faltered. In an effort to save what had become the most important program in agency history, NPS officials began to collect information to tell the story of MISSION 66. In 1959, Pipestone was selected as one of the best places to illustrate the importance of the program and its successes. It offered an opportunity to show the impact of the program on small communities and their economies, the increase in spending in the town as a result of the growing number of visitors and their lengthened stays, and direct and indirect growth in employment opportunity for local people. The NPS planned to use the evidence in upcoming congressional hearings.¹²

The pride in the accomplishment at Pipestone was not misplaced. Visitors responded with enthusiasm to the improved facilities of the monument. Approximately five percent of visitors to the monument were surveyed in 1959. Of those, 98

¹¹ Murray, "Administrative History," 107; MISSION 66 for Pipestone National Monument, 1957, Box G, G 1519, Pipestone.

¹² Regional Director to Superintendent, Pipestone National Monument, April 17, 1959, Box G, G 1519, Pipestone.

percent reported that they enjoyed their visit, would return, and would recommend that others visit the monument. Nearly 75 percent of those surveyed said that they came to the area only to visit the monument, and 72 percent said that they stopped at businesses in the town of Pipestone. "No tax money is lost when spent on the Park Service," Mr. and Mrs. C. Winter of Detroit, Michigan, wrote, and their sentiments were echoed by other visitors. Such a response to the development was what NPS officials wanted to show Congress.¹³

It also illustrated an important new reality for the leading visitor service agency of the federal government. The democratization of travel changed the kind of person who visited national park areas. A developed area such as Pipestone attracted a more middle-class, mainstream, summer vacation audience than did an undeveloped area. A complex conditioning process was occurring; visitors began to rank parks by their facilities as much as by their features. It seemed to the public that the most important parks had the newest facilities precisely because the amenities at such places were of recent vintage. In some cases, the facilities became more important than the reason for preserving the park area. The newly developed Pipestone National Monument had broader appeal because its museum exhibits and facilities distilled its message into a form the public

¹³ Pipestone National Monument, Visitor Comments Regarding MISSION 66 Improvements, 1959, Box G, G 1519, Pipestone.

easily understood. The interpretive material at the monument reflected the perceptions of Americans of that time.

The people of the Pipestone community were also impressed with the new development. Little more than a decade before, the monument had been an embarrassment and local leaders had lobbied to wrest control from the Park Service. But the new development made the monument the main attraction in the Pipestone community, and local leaders such as Robert C. Palmer, the president of the Pipestone Civic and Commerce Association, recognized that the monument meant "several hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in additional income" for local businesses. He expected it to increase into the million-dollar range in the near future. From its position as an insignificant attraction to locals, a fact reflected as late as 1959 in the paucity of signs for the monument in the town, Pipestone National Monument had become an important part of the local economy.¹⁴

The completion of MISSION 66 at Pipestone and its success changed the management responsibilities of the Park Service. Consolidating the gains became the dominant theme of management as the park went from an era of rapid development to one of sustained growth. Making a successful transition from being an area with limited use to a developed one dominated management priorities. Managing growth and making that growth serve the needs of visitors were two distinctly different responsibilities.

¹⁴ Helen Schmidt, "Many National Park Superintendents Guests in Pipestone Tomorrow," Pipestone County Star, November 23, 1959.

For more than a decade following the dedication of the new visitor center, administrators at Pipestone sought to become accustomed to the new management situation. The improvement in agency facilities demanded more comprehensive approaches to management, and superintendents Paul L. Webb, W. Dean McClanahan, Carl R. Stoddard, and Ralph K. Shaver sought to implement NPS policy, preserve the resources of the monument, provide visitors with an enjoyable and educational experience, and maintain the quality of services at the monument.

Finding the optimal balance of seasonal and permanent personnel and defining their responsibilities became a priority for park superintendents. A management study suggested reallocation of positions from the MISSION 66 proposal. Team members recognized that the limits of the travel season and the nature of the people of Pipestone made a permanent winter staff something of a liability. It fed the inclination of local people to regard government employment as a sinecure. Since local people understood only the visible aspects of Park Service responsibility--principally visitor service--a full-time winter staff that appeared to do nothing was something the Park Service could not afford. From a full-time equivalency [FTE] of 6.3 in the MISSION 66 proposal, the management team subtracted .5 total FTE and recommended keeping the permanent staff at three instead of increasing it to four. During the 1960s, three more seasonal

rangers were added, making the total staff eleven people during the heavy travel season.¹⁵

Pipestone personnel had long-standing ties in the community, and during the 1960s, active participation by the park staff strengthened the existing relationship. Pipestone National Monument was the creation of local people, many of whom, such as Winifred Bartlett, remained active in community affairs. They regarded the monument as their creation and looked favorably on its growth and development. Superintendents such as Paul L. Webb, who was extremely popular in the community, were active in local organizations, further enhancing the reputation of the agency. Cooperative agreements that covered a range of services further linked the town and the park. The monument received many essential services, such as garbage removal, electricity and water supply, road and trail maintenance, and telephone service, from the local community.¹⁶ This allowed the Park Service to avoid building its own utility and sewage management system, an expensive and time-consuming management issue.

The community also benefitted. A national park area was a first-class attraction that brought visitors and the money to the town. The monument and its association with the historic past

¹⁵ Management Review Team, Region Two, to Regional Director, "Report of Management Review, Pipestone National Monument," June 26, 1959; Regional Director to Superintendent, Pipestone National Monument, June 29, 1959, Box B, Folder B-1552, Management Review-1959, Pipestone National Monument.

¹⁶ Carl Stoddard, telephone interview with Hal K. Rothman, April 24, 1992.

conveyed a certain prestige to the area at a time when it became harder and harder for small towns to survive. The boost to the economy created by MISSION 66 was also important. The links between the community and the park were strong. The growing pattern of interdependence illustrated the way in which the Park Service and local communities could cooperate and showed one of the many ways in which the park returned federal dollars to the area.

Throughout the 1960s, park leaders firmed up ties and improved services. Visitation increased, confirming the expectations of the Park Service and the local community. Superintendents continued to try to make Pipestone meet agency standards in areas as diverse as resources management, interpretation, and maintenance. As a result of the MISSION 66 program, Pipestone National Monument skipped a generation in the evolution of the park system. In the 1960s, it was one of the few park areas where visitation and the level of amenities and facilities provided were commensurate.

By the end of the 1960s, the U.S. was in the middle of a period of cultural upheaval. Spurred in part by the affluence that followed the Second World War, American intervention in Southeast Asia, and broad-based optimism about the perfectibility of American society, Americans sought to change the way in which their nation operated. Many conceived of a more inclusive ethic that allowed wider latitude in cultural expression. In the middle of the decade, the civil rights movement expanded from

African-American issues in the South to include Mexican-Americans and Native Americans in the West.¹⁷

As the rules of American society changed, agencies such as the National Park Service had to become more responsive. During the 1960s, the agency encouraged Native Americans, African-Americans, and other minorities to seek careers in park management. A number of talented minorities found themselves in leadership positions, usually at parks with themes that reflected their heritage. For Native Americans, the rise to superintendency had little to do with tribal background. Most who achieved leadership positions began federal careers after military service and some college.¹⁸ The rise to leadership had more to do with perceptions that these people understood and valued the way the Park Service operated than with any sense of their Native American identity.

In 1968, a new superintendent, Cecil D. Lewis, Jr., arrived at Pipestone. Sac and Fox, Delaware, and Potowatomi Indian, Lewis had grown up on the Navajo reservation, where his family worked for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In the proximity of Chaco Canyon, Mesa Verde, and Canyon de Chelly, he became

¹⁷ Todd Gitlin, The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage (New York: Bantam Books, 1987), offers an insightful look at the cultural issues of the 1960s; for a contemporaneous but idiosyncratic view, see William O'Neill, Coming Apart: An Informal History of the 1960s (New York: Quadrangle New York Times Book Company, 1971).

¹⁸ Foresta, National Parks and Their Keepers, 145-47; Conservation Foundation, National Parks for the Future (Washington, D. C.: Conservation Foundation, 1972); Clarence N. Gorman, interview with Hal K. Rothman, January 5, 1991.

infatuated with the national parks. After military service in Korea, he hired on as a seasonal employee. Lewis recognized that completing his college education would further his chances of a permanent position and subsequent advancement in the NPS. With his degree in hand, he became a permanent employee in 1960. After stints at the Southwest Archeological Center in Globe, Arizona, and Bryce Canyon, Mesa Verde, and Rocky Mountain national parks, in April 1968 he became superintendent at Pipestone National Monument.¹⁹

With the support of NPS Director George B. Hartzog, Jr., who personally selected him for the position, Lewis brought new goals and priorities to the monument. The primary objective he set was greater participation for Native Americans in the activities of the park and increased interpretation of native culture. Lewis sought the support of the regional office to run Pipestone "as an Indian area as opposed to in the old sense a national monument."²⁰

Lewis' plans resulted in an effort to develop a Native American cultural center at Pipestone. George "Standing Eagle" Bryan, one of the most venerable quarriers and pipemakers and a frequent employee of the monument, offered the genesis of the idea just after Lewis arrived. Frank Fools Crow, a traditional Oglala Medicine Man who had been present at the opening of the

¹⁹ Cecil D. Lewis, Jr., interview with Hal K. Rothman, February 18, 1992.

²⁰ Ibid.

pipe bundle on the Cheyenne River Reservation, also supported the idea.²¹ He perceived in it the opportunity for whites and Indians to better understand each other. Lewis recognized the importance of the idea, but it was the following summer before the superintendent could begin to implement his plans. On a trip to Omaha, where he met with Hartzog, Lewis presented a rough conceptual idea for building a center to preserve Indian crafts and craft-making.²²

Lewis' proposal was a direct response to the agenda established by Richard M. Nixon's first secretary of the interior, Walter J. Hickel. When he took office early in 1969, Hickel established eleven policy guidelines for management of the park system. One called for programs that enhanced cultural, recreational, and economic opportunities for native peoples.²³ An Alaskan, Hickel entered office with an important crisis looming in the future of the department and his state--the Alaskan native land claims issue. Pro-development, he needed to cultivate an image of sensitivity to native issues. His policy guidelines were one step toward developing a public posture that allowed him to openly support more development and a smaller land base for native Alaskans.

²¹ Lewis interview.

²² Acting Regional Director to the Director, June 18, 1969, L1817, Pipestone National Monument; Lewis interview.

²³ U.S. National Park Service, "Indian Cultural Center to be Constructed at Pipestone National Monument, Minnesota," K 1817, Pipestone.

Hickel's goals inspired the initial proposal, and with encouragement from the regional office, Lewis proceeded. He sought to invite Hickel and Hartzog to one of the performances of the Hiawatha Pageant as an opportunity for presenting the proposal for the craft center. Minnesota Governor Harold E. LeVander, a Republican, planned to attend the July 18, 1969, performance, and since Hickel and the governor shared party affiliation, Lewis thought it a good opportunity. He planned to have George Bryan present Hickel with a ceremonial pipe as a prelude to introducing his plan.²⁴

Although Hickel ultimately declined the invitation to visit Pipestone, Lewis continued to develop the proposal. At the Midwest Regional Superintendents Conference in Omaha that summer, Lewis enlisted the support of his peers. In September, he, Paul McCrary of the Midwest Regional Office, and Don Ripley of Bighorn Canyon National Recreational Area traveled to three Department of the Interior cultural centers, in Rapid City, South Dakota, Santa Fe, New Mexico, and Anadarko, Oklahoma, to see what they could learn. They used the experience to add new dimensions to the proposal for what they called the "Upper Midwest American Indian Cultural Crafts Center." In September 1969, the proposal went to the director.²⁵

²⁴ Superintendent, Pipestone, to Regional Director, June 17, 1969, K 1817, Pipestone.

²⁵ Regional Director to the Director, September 17, 1969, K 1817, Pipestone.

The plan was impressive. With a proposed budget of upwards of \$500,000, it recommended the construction of a building of more than 3,600 square feet, 2,600 of which would be for work and exhibit space and the remainder for storage and utilities. It included ample room for visitors to view craft demonstrators, permanent wall and floor exhibitions, and space for the sale of pipestone materials and other related crafts. In the project, eight to ten rental trailers to house visiting Native American crafts people were proposed. Rental housing was in short supply in the town of Pipestone, and craftspeople would have to relocate to the area if the program were to succeed.²⁶

In February 1970, Lewis' planning came to fruition. Included in President Nixon's budget for fiscal 1971 was \$487,000 for the project. Simultaneously, the regional office in Omaha announced plans to construct the center. As suggested in the proposal, it was to be built adjacent to the rear of the visitor center, away from the parking lot. A six-unit apartment building for temporary housing was to replace the mobile trailers in the initial plan. On paper, the facility was impressive. "Maybe I robbed from Yellowstone," Lewis laughingly remembered two decades later when asked about the scope of the project.²⁷

²⁶ Upper Midwest American Indian Cultural Arts Center, Pipestone National Monument, Minnesota, ca. 1969, K 1817, Pipestone.

²⁷ U.S. National Park Service, "Indian Cultural Center to be Constructed at Pipestone National Monument, Minnesota," K 1817, Pipestone; Cecil Lewis interview.

The center added greatly to the interpretive capabilities of the monument. It included demonstration booths, video displays where visitors could view short movies about pipemaking, bead and quill embroidery, leatherwork, painting, weaving, birchbark craft work, as well as exhibits of similar craftwork from the modern era, and cross-cultural exchange of artifacts such as knives, guns, blankets, and beads. The sales counter of the Pipestone Indian Shrine Association, which in 1969 purchased \$28,870 in crafts from Native Americans, was also included.²⁸

The cultural center was part of a larger program to preserve craftmaking traditions, utilize the skills of area Indians, and teach them to manage natural and cultural resources. Lewis traveled to many of the reservations in South Dakota, where he sought the input of various tribal councils. Their contributions shaped the program. The initial plan called for full-time demonstrators who would serve as instructors for younger Native Americans. Pipemaking and other crafts were to be taught to students, who would then go home with a marketable skill and a knowledge to transmit to their peers. Some Native Americans were to stay at the park during the winters to learn resource management skills for use at reservation parks and cultural areas.²⁹

²⁸ Cecil D. Lewis, Jr., to Gene Schrader, February 25, 1970, K1817, Pipestone; Pipestone National Monument Interpretive Prospectus, January 1971, K1817, Pipestone.

²⁹ Pipestone National Monument Interpretive Prospectus, January 1971, K1817, Pipestone.

The result was supposed to be a revival of native arts and crafts, an opportunity for Indians to develop a livelihood, and better management of Native American holdings in tribal museums. But "the money didn't come," one park staffer remembered, and the program changed. No one to teach craft skills could be found, and as Vietnam-era inflation began to affect federal spending, there was no money to hire them anyway. Instead of an educational experiment, a demonstration program evolved.³⁰

The program that emerged was part expedience, part education. Cultural demonstrators were hired each summer to display Indian craft and pipemaking skills. Many of the initial demonstrators were from families with long histories at the quarry, limiting the impact of the program on potential craftspeople from nearby reservations. Yet visitors found the demonstrations compelling, and throughout the 1970s, the program grew, reaching seven demonstrators in 1977. Their work quickly became one of the most important focuses of interpretation at Pipestone. It offered a unique feature, for the demonstrators at Pipestone were not reenactors, but genuine practitioners of the cultures they portrayed.

This unique situation compelled different management strategies. Interpretation at Pipestone followed Native American custom more than NPS manuals. Involved in historic practice and ritual, Native American interpreters simply worked their

³⁰ Lewis to Schrader, February 25, 1970; Interpretive Prospectus, January 1971; Raymond "Chuck" Derby, interview by Dan Holder, November 22, 1991, Pipestone National Monument.

material, answering questions but usually volunteering little. While Indian interpretation was not like that of NPS personnel, who focused on explaining culture in a standardized manner that utilized the educational level of the public, the way Indians made traditional crafts offered a measure of reality different from that to which the American public was accustomed.³¹

The Park Service supported the demonstration program, but left its management to the Pipestone Indian Shrine Association. The association had a long history of supporting native arts in the region, and with the addition of cooperation between the nearby Flandreau, South Dakota, Indian school and the Park Service, a situation that benefitted all developed. Native skills and craftmaking were transmitted to younger Indians and made available to the public, and park visitors received a special kind of interpretation.

Not every feature associated with the cultural center succeeded. The six-unit apartment building was not popular with visiting demonstrators and became a headache for park managers. It was a relic of the planned teaching program and did not fit in the changed situation. There were problems with maintenance of the structure. Initially, the sewer could not be hooked up because of the nearly \$100,000 cut from the budget between the proposal for the center and its implementation. The building remained unusable until money could be found to hook up

³¹ Betty McSwain, "When Past is Present: Cultural Perspectives," Interpretation, (Fall 1990) 9-15; Betty McSwain interview.

the sewer. In one later instance, two to three feet of snow blew into the area between ceilings and the roof and melted, necessitating expensive and time-consuming cleanup. Park rangers had to climb into the area and scoop the snow out by hand. Worse, the building had little appeal for Native Americans, who preferred off-site mobile homes, trailers, or other accommodations.³²

As a result, park officials sought new tenants. In 1978, three of the six apartments were leased to the local school district and vocational education institute on a renewable ten-year basis. In 1989, the apartment building was sold and removed from the park area. During the spring of 1989, restoration of the ground began.

The cultural center also inspired bold interpretive planning for the visitor center. The exhibits in the visitor center had been put together in 1958 and they reflected the time of their genesis. New planning recommended greater reverence in the explanation of the importance of the ceremonial pipe and in the overall treatment of Native American religions. The prospectus also recommended displaying pipes "in profusion," a plaque or some other form of recognition for Winifred Bartlett, a reproduction gallery of nineteenth-century art that depicted Plains Indians, and an explanation of the impact of artist/explorers George Catlin and Karl Bodmer. It also

³² Don Thompson interview with Hal Rothman, February 25, 1992; Betty McSwain interview.

recommended a new audiovisual presentation, expanding on the existing presentation of the White Buffalo Calf legend, depicting religious use of the pipe. Social uses of smoking added a dimension, as would the use of Lakota language translated by a narrator. Another movie, this one interpreting the rise and fall of the horse-bison culture, was also recommended. The issues the film could address had much wider application than Pipestone National Monument alone.³³

The final interpretive prospectus recommended radical changes in the interpretive scheme of the museum. Of all the existing exhibits, only the diorama depicting prehistoric quarrying was to be retained. A number of exhibits were to be dropped, and others were to be incorporated into new exhibits. The plan proposed more than \$112,000 in changes to the visitor center and an additional \$66,700 for the cultural center.³⁴ Such an interpretation scheme would reflect the increased commitment of resources to the park. But the prospectus was not implemented.

The Upper Midwest American Indian Cultural Center and the interpretive prospectus ended the second period of rapid growth for the monument. After absorbing the MISSION 66 improvements,

³³ Pipestone National Monument, Interpretive Prospectus, February 12, 1971; Corbett, "Pipestone: The Origin and Development of a National Monument," 83-92; Joseph Epes Brown, ed., The Sacred Pipe: Black Elk's Account of the Seven Rites of the Oglala Sioux (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1953), 3-9, describes the gift of the pipe to the Lakota people.

³⁴ Foresta, America's National Parks, 85-89.

sustained management appeared close at hand, but the new developments spurred a second period of growth. After the construction of the center and the completion of the interpretive plan, the park was essentially complete. There was little need for further capital development, and the plans for upgrading interpretation were in place. Finding the resources to implement quality programs became the real issue.

The construction of the center strengthened the ties between the Park Service and the local Native American community. Superintendent Don Thompson, who followed two Indian superintendents when he arrived in 1971, recalled that he, park staff, local Indians, and the community formed touch football and softball teams and leagues. There were also a number of "sweats" held in a sweat lodge in the park. A Medicine Man from the Rosebud Sioux reservation, Charles Kills Enemy, built the lodge. On five occasions, Thompson participated in the ceremony.³⁵ The increased level of social and ceremonial interaction built on the professional and personnel ties that already existed. It also illustrated the importance of the monument in the life of everybody in town.

Yet despite the investment in the monument and the many advantages of the cultural center, its construction highlighted a historic problem at Pipestone. The monument was anomalous in the Midwest Region, a situation that its relative proximity to the regional office in Omaha did little to alleviate. From Fort

³⁵ Don Thompson interview.

Larned and Fort Scott in Kansas to the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis, most of the others parks in the region interpreted the history of Euro-American experience.

Despite Catlin and Longfellow, Pipestone did not fit easily with that heritage. Most parks with Native American themes were located farther west, in the Rocky Mountain, Southwest, or Western regions. The administrative questions at Pipestone more resembled those at Canyon de Chelly or Navajo national monuments, and Native American themes and issues remained a top priority for park administrators. In the politicized climate of the time, superintendents at Pipestone spent much time in contact with their peers in other regions.³⁶

The problems of Pipestone were underscored in 1971, when national park areas in Minnesota were transferred to the Northeast Regional Office, located in Philadelphia. This region, since retitled the Mid-Atlantic Region, administered many Revolutionary War and industrial revolution parks as well as the a significant number of the rapidly expanding category of urban national park areas. Pipestone was even more anomalous in the Northeast Region. Ironically at the same time, the Midwest Region added national park areas in Colorado, Utah, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming. Pipestone shared common themes and issues with many of these parks. Park administrators experienced some relief in January 1974, when a major realignment

³⁶ Cecil Lewis interview.

of national park system boundaries returned Pipestone to the Midwest Region.³⁷

By the mid-1970s, a sustained management mode came to govern decision-making at Pipestone. The monument was much like many other small areas in the park system. Its facilities and level of staffing were comparable, its issues similar, and its prospects about the same. Administrative priorities in 1975 included management and preservation of the quarries through permit use by Indians and education for visitors, interpretation of native cultures, and the preservation and restoration of prairie areas within the park. Pipestone National Monument moved toward integrated management.

The planning process that had become increasingly important in the park system helped establish continuity in decision-making. The existence of prepared documents and the evolving practice of listing area priorities helped park managers retain consistent objectives even with the typical frequency of staff turnover within the Park Service. Superintendents and staff still determined priorities, but on the basis of the priorities established by their predecessors. Pipestone moved toward more orderly and planned growth and change than in the past.

But by the 1980s, the Park Service was in crisis. Changes in culture and character in the agency in the 1960s and 1970s

³⁷ Barry Mackintosh, National Park Service Administrative History: A Guide (Washington, D. C.: National Park Service, 1991), 112-13; Don Thompson interview; Ron Cockrell to Hal K. Rothman, August 1, 1992.

affected relationships between the parks, regional offices, and the Washington office. After Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall forced out NPS Director Conrad L. Wirth in 1964, the Park Service scrambled to retain its familiar exalted position inside the capital Beltway. The selection of George Hartzog, a man with extensive agency experience, to succeed Wirth held off the changing climate, but a new level of precedent had been established. Earlier directors such as Newton B. Drury had been forced out in political situations, but never had the directorship of the NPS become a political perquisite. The firing of Hartzog and the appointment of Nixon assistant Ronald Walker, an insurance executive with little experience in the parks, in 1972 was evidence of the change. The remainder of the 1970s were disastrous for the Park Service, as a series of directors who could not inspire the rank-and-file came and went. Only with the ascension of career NPS official Russell Dickenson to the directorship in 1980 did the pattern begin to change.³⁸

But Dickenson's administration faced problems of its own. The election of Ronald Reagan in 1980 brought a new mode of operation to the federal bureaucracy. For the national park system, it had a mixed effect. Secretary of the Interior James Watt sought to privatize some public land, and emphasize the development of visitor amenities at existing parks instead of the

³⁸ Foresta, National Parks and Their Keepers, 84-91; Runte, National Parks, 259-65.

acquisition of new areas.³⁹ This seemed to bode well for Pipestone, but in actuality, Watt's development schemes focused on the grandiose scenic parks. With its newly completed physical plant, Pipestone was in no position to compete for resources.

In the late 1980s, agency officials were able to step out from under the iron hand of Watt and his successors, William Clark and Donald Hodel, and shift their objectives back to acquisition of new areas. But as the economic climate declined after the oil bust in 1985 and the savings and loan scandal a few years later, funding problems resulted. New parks were created, but their needs sometimes drained resources from other areas. The pool of funding for parks was not growing, and established areas like Pipestone found themselves with constant or shrinking budgets as a result of the addition of new park areas.

As leadership in the agency became increasingly politicized throughout 1970s, Park Service culture and the morale of NPS staff suffered. The appointment of Russell Dickenson as director in 1980 was clearly an effort to fashion a return to earlier agency values. But as rangers in the field toiled for many years without adequate pay or housing, and many times, without hope of career advancement, park-level staff throughout the system perceived a growing gap between national policy and objectives and local and regional needs. Attrition became an agency

³⁹ John C. Freemuth, Islands Under Siege: National Parks and the Politics of External Threats (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1991), 23-26; Runte, National Parks, 259-63.

problem, as many younger, talented people left the Park Service for other careers.⁴⁰

More strict enforcement of government regulations compounded the problems of agency personnel. A new bureaucratic mentality began to emerge in the agency as many suffered from burnout or found that they were discouraged from treating their jobs as anything more than a forty-hour-per-week obligation. The Park Service traditionally had been an organization with deep commitment. Individual rangers often worked "off the clock," on their own time, to assure that everything was accomplished at their area. By the 1980s, insurance regulations, the problems with compensation for time worked after hours, and other similar concerns limited the intense commitment park-level staff across the system once felt. Despite Dickenson's appointment and the subsequent rise in morale, the old Park Service was gone for good.

At Pipestone, these changes created a feeling of being left out. Park objectives were not always supported by higher administrative personnel, nor were resources available for many important projects. Park personnel expressed growing frustration, a sentiment shared by employees throughout the park system. Despite its impressive physical plant, Pipestone seemed again a remote place, far from the mainstream of a rapidly changing agency.

⁴⁰ Bernard Shanks, "The Endangered Ranger," National Parks 65 no. 1-2 (January-February 1991): 32-36.

The sustained management mode continued at Pipestone. Superintendents David Lane and Vincent Halvorson, who collectively served from 1973 into the 1990s, found that a number of management issues intrinsic to the nature of the park dominated their administrations. Pipestone's unique commitment to Native Americans, its role in the local community, the atypical function of the cooperating association, and relations with other resource management agencies defined the limits of park management.

The Pipestone Indian Shrine Association became an increasingly complicated management issue for the park. Since its reinvigoration in the mid-1950s, the association and the park had close working relations. When the sales counter that the association ran was located in the museum, rangers often worked the desk. After the construction of the cultural center, rangers handled some of the purchases of pipes from Native Americans, but no longer worked in sales. Superintendents and chief rangers from the park sat on the shrine association board, and the NPS had a reasonable amount of influence in its decision-making. Late in the 1970s, changes in NPS policy led to declining influence of the park on the Pipestone Indian Shrine Association, as the Park Service adopted more of a hands-off approach in the affairs of the association.⁴¹

⁴¹ NPS-32, Cooperating Association Guideline, Release No. 2, September 1986, 6-3; Betty McSwain interview.

Since its founding, the shrine association had a broader mandate than most NPS cooperating associations. This bifurcated mission had the potential to cause problems. The educational activities of the shrine association were typical, but the marketing of pipestone pipes and artifacts was an area into which most cooperating groups did not venture. Their sales items were usually limited to books, trail guides, postcards, and other mementos of a place.

As NPS influence on Pipestone Indian Shrine Association declined, marketing pipestone artifacts took on greater importance. Each year, the association purchased more and more pipestone from local Native Americans, its catalogue business grew bigger, and it became more of an institution. After the Park Service limited its influence on the association, its priorities began to change in a manner that some in and out of the agency questioned.

Late in the 1980s, two local Native Americans, Loren Zephier and Mitch Walking Elk, challenged the shrine association. The politics of being Native American had again developed public militancy, and some felt that the shrine association, despite its overwhelmingly Native American managerial and sales staff, was not closely linked to the Indian community. This spurred park officials to question whether it was appropriate for an NPS cooperating association to market artifacts and material that may have religious significance. There were other Native American institutions in the community that offered an alternative. The

Little Feather Indian Center, a local Indian support center, had the potential to evolve into a marketing operation. In the 1990s, park officials watched with great interest as the issue grew in importance.⁴²

Maintaining the longstanding ties between the monument and the adjacent town and county of Pipestone also required management skill. Pipestone National Monument was a source of pride in the local community, and some locals had a proprietary feeling. Many walked its trails on a regular basis, and participated in activities that supported the monument and its mission. Some chafed in 1987, when a fee was instituted for entering the visitor center. Despite initial grumblings, this deterred few of the locals, who continued to walk in the monument, but eschewed contact with the Park Service. Yet this "city park" phenomenon had important positive ramifications for the monument.

In no small part as a result of the feeling of local people, relations with local government remained good. The County Board of Supervisors were generally supportive of Pipestone National Monument. A web of service arrangements continued to link county, city, and park, although a county-city dispute over responsibilities to the park simmered. Park officials considered it indicative of tension between the city and county, not a reflection on the relationship between the park and the

⁴² Vincent Halvorson, interview by Dan Holder, November 22, 1991, Pipestone National Monument.

community. A number of specific issues required constant attention. Flooding and flood control and the monitoring and testing of groundwater mandated by a comprehensive water plan required NPS attention. Occasional projects, such as the roadwork done on Hiawatha Avenue, had to be monitored by the superintendent.⁴³

A number of other federal agencies had responsibilities in the southwestern Minnesota area, and on some occasion, these required the cooperation and participation of the monument staff. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Park Service shared a common interest in the protection of eagles and limiting the trade in eagle feathers. The Fish and Wildlife Service held title to the game reserve to the north of the monument that was created when the Indian School ceased to operate, although the state Department of Natural Resources (DNR) handled the daily administration and management. Monument officials and DNR often coordinated natural resource management programs such as controlled burning. In other situations, the park exchanged perspectives with other agencies on a range of issues.⁴⁴

Surprisingly, park officials reported relatively little communication with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In the era of self-determination, BIA officials were increasingly divorced from day-to-day decision-making of native peoples. This was particularly true in cultural affairs, where the legacy of nearly

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

one hundred years of repressive policy made government advice unwelcome. The Tribal Council of the Santee Sioux Reservation often served in the stead of BIA. NPS officials and the council worked out numerous agreements and arrangements covering issues of mutual concern. Occasionally, BIA officials called about the rules governing quarrying, but in the early 1990s, that was usually the extent of contact.⁴⁵

Relations with state agencies were closer. There were many issues of mutual concern that required consistent interaction. DNR and the park maintained a fairly close working relationship concerning the game reserve. DNR also monitored the new clean air act for the State of Minnesota, expanding the relationship with the Park Service even further. The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency became the lead state agency for issues such as pollution contamination, discharge, and water analysis, surveys and inventories. In the area, many of these focused on Pipestone Creek. The Minnesota Department of Transportation and the park worked together on issues of directional signing. Signs from highways to the monument were crucial to bringing visitors. Park relations with the state Department of Agriculture were more infrequent. If pollution could be traced to a farm chemical, the Minnesota Department of Agriculture was responsible. Initially, the state Department of Agriculture and the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency passed responsibility for such problems

⁴⁵ Vincent Halvorson interview; Josephy, "Modern American and the Indian," in Hoxie, ed., Indians in American History, 251-72.

back and forth, but changes in law made farm chemical pollution the province of the state Department of Agriculture. The people of the wildlife division in DNR and at nearby state parks had the closest relationships with Pipestone National Monument. Monument staff and state park administrators in particular had similar concerns and interacted on common issues.

The park faced another important visitation issue. the number of recorded visitors began to decline following the Bicentennial celebration. The fall was dramatic, from approximately 200,000 in 1976 to 130,000 in 1984. Pipestone was not alone in this predicament, as other park areas in the I-90 area showed similar percentage declines.⁴⁶ Inflation and the rise in gasoline prices played an important role in the decrease. Different methods of counting visitors may also have contributed.

In the late 1980s, visitation again fell by about ten percent, presumably in response to the initiation of an entrance fee. Since the people of the City of Pipestone regarded the monument as a city park, much of this decrease was attributed to the reluctance of local people to pay to enter the visitor center. Ironically, the entrance fee gave the monument extra operating capital to support operations, in an odd sort of way achieving the perennial bifurcated goal of the agency: to preserve and use simultaneously. Fewer visitors and more

⁴⁶ "Statement for Management, Pipestone National Monument," January 10, 1984, Basement Storage, Planning and Environmental Quality, Box 40, Statements for Management file, Midwest Regional Office.

resources pointed in the direction of less wear on the resource and better programming and service for each traveler.

At the beginning of the 1990s, Pipestone National Monument played an important role in southwestern Minnesota. A destination for travelers, it added measurably to the regional economy. Its programs worked in concert with those of state and federal agencies to implement federal, state, and local law and policy. Its presentation of Native American culture and craftwork added a dimension of heritage to life in the region, bringing Native Americans from across the continent for ceremonies, rituals, and celebrations. These many roles made administering the park a delicate and sensitive process that required knowledge, foresight, and constant preparation. As in any similar situation, the Park Service had to balance the demands and desires of many constituencies with its legally mandated responsibilities. Success in such a venture had to be measured in increments; not everyone was pleased with the Park Service all of the time.

CHAPTER VI:

"AN INDIAN-ORIENTED PARK": NATIVE AMERICANS AND THE MONUMENT

The establishment of the monument in 1937 gave the Park Service a set of specific responsibilities at Pipestone. Among the most important of these was the obligation to preserve the right of Native Americans to quarry in a traditional manner. The rights granted in the proclamation were both new and old. They had historic standing since the Treaty of 1858, which guaranteed the Yankton Sioux the right to quarry pipestone on the reserved area. The court case that began in the 1890s was based on those rights, but its resolution in 1928 extinguished all legal Native American claims to the quarries and their use. Between 1928 and 1937, Native American people had no more legal right to use the quarry than anyone else. Nonetheless, after 1928, Indian School administration officials allowed Native Americans from any tribe to quarry, a reality that the enabling legislation for the monument codified. The monument proclamation established a permanent legal relationship between the Park Service and native peoples. This relationship, with its many complications, has been crucial to NPS management of the area.

From its inception, Pipestone National Monument has been, in the words of former Superintendent Lyle K. Lynch, an "Indian-oriented park."¹ Native Americans and their myriad cultures are essential to the monument. The quarries the Park Service seeks

¹ Lyle K. Lynch to Regional Director, Region II, August 22, 1950, Box 194, Folder 600-01, Kansas City Federal Records Center.

to preserve have significance because of their importance to Native Americans; the interpretation is meaningful because of the presence of Native Americans working the stone in time-honored fashion. That orientation has made the management of the monument unique among national park areas in the United States.

At Pipestone National Monument, the Park Service inherited the existing set of relationships between Native Americans, Anglo-Americans, and the federal government. While NPS officials had the legal power to change local practice, they initially had little to gain from such an action. The agency lacked the work power, and in fact the desire, to implement new policies. From the inception of the monument, NPS inspectors, observers, and officials regarded the continuing practice of quarrying as an asset for the park. It provided built-in interpretation in a form that the Park Service could not match. Pipestone was special, early NPS observers agreed, and the continuation of quarrying was crucial to its unique nature. They also recognized that quarrying offered something visitors could not experience elsewhere--the opportunity to see an historic activity performed in a manner that resembled historic practice.²

In this respect, Pipestone and Canyon de Chelly had much in common. Both had visible Indian presence, and at two parks, American Indians were entitled to use the resources of the

² Carroll H. Wegemann, Memorandum to Mr. Brown, August 5, 1938, Pipestone 204, Kansas City Federal Records Center; Edward A. Hummel, "Preliminary Historical Development Report of Pipestone National Monument," ca. 1940; Howard W. Baker, Memorandum for the Director, November 27, 1939, Pipestone, Series 7, RG 79, NA.

monument in a historic manner. At Canyon de Chelly, Navajo guides were required of visitors, and some Navajos still farm and herd sheep in the traditional way in the bottom of canyon. The story of the Navajo and Hopi were also told in addition to that of the Anasazi. At Pipestone and Canyon de Chelly, Native Americans of many tribes were part of the story of the park. In addition, the story that the Park Service sought to tell at Pipestone was that of the Native Americans who lived nearby. At most other parks of this vintage, the interpretive story addressed prehistory, while modern natives who lived in the area participated in its transmission.³

Yet random quarrying was not in the best interests of the resource, its users, or the traveling public. Although agency officials agreed to a Bureau of Indian Affairs request to not limit the amount of stone quarried, the Park Service needed to set up a system of permits and regulations to govern quarrying. This allowed a measure of NPS oversight at Pipestone. Park officials could determine who quarried and how much stone they took. Almost from the moment the monument was established, different groups of Native Americans sought to control access to

³ David M. Brugge and Raymond Wilson, Administrative History: Canyon de Chelly National Monument (Santa Fe: National Park Service, 1976); Hal K. Rothman, Navajo National Monument: A Place and Its People (Santa Fe: National Park Service, 1991) Southwest Cultural Resource Management Series # 40.

the quarries. NPS officials recognized the need for some level of impartial administration.⁴

During the Indian School administration of Pipestone National Monument, Superintendent J. W. Balmer created an informal system to govern quarrying. As volunteer custodian, he continued existing practice. Initially Park Service officials were grateful, and when Balmer made suggestions toward developing a permanent policy, they listened closely. Balmer wanted to assure that Native Americans first secured a permit to quarry from the Park Service before they began to work at the site. He also insisted that they use only hand methods, that modern living facilities such as trailers be prohibited on the monument, and that the workshops used to prepare the stone at Pipestone be limited to Sioux-style tepees.⁵

Balmer's conception of a system fit well with NPS aspirations. NPS officials regarded quarrying as a valuable interpretive resource and recognized that the easily accessible resources of the quarry were limited. Following typical NPS guidelines, regulations were first proposed in 1938. These rules went through an extended series of reviews and were finalized in 1946. They limited quarrying to Native Americans using hand

⁴ Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs to Director, May 3, 1938, Pipestone 621; Director to Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs, June 9, 1938, Pipestone 621; Acting Regional Director to Director, November 27, 1939, Pipestone 000, Kansas City Federal Records Center.

⁵ Acting Regional Director to Director, November 27, 1939, Pipestone, Series 7, RG 79, NA.

tools, required quarriers to secure a permit, and prohibited modern amenities such as trailers or mobile homes as accommodations on monument grounds.⁶ These rules had the twin advantages of presenting quarrying as an interpretation activity and slowing the quantity of stone quarried.

Before the regulations were approved in 1946, regulation of quarrying occurred at the discretion of the custodian. Each Native American who sought to quarry had to secure a special use permit. In essence, the terms of the special use permit were the same as the proposed regulations, but nonetheless, the temporary system seemed cumbersome. When the custodian was forced to use discretion, administering quarrying was time-consuming. It required time and energy as well as paperwork. Both custodians and Native Americans were pleased to have a clearly defined permanent system. It was easier for everyone when potential quarriers could simply fill out one form.⁷

⁶ Director, Memorandum for the General Manager, Indian Arts and Crafts Board, January 8, 1940; Acting Regional Director to Director, June 5, 1940; Acting Regional Director to Custodian, June 6, 1940; Assistant Director to Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs, June 14, 1940; Acting Director to Regional Director, November 19, 1940, Region Two office, "Regulations to Govern Quarrying of the Red Pipestone . . .," September 16, 1944; Regional Director to J. W. Balmer, November 20, 1945; J. W. Balmer to Regional Director, November 23, 1945; Regional Director, Memorandum for the Director, November 29, 1945, Pipestone 208, Kansas City Federal Records Center; Federal Register 11 40, February 27, 1946, 2044.

⁷ National Park Service, Special Use Permit for George Redman of Pipestone, Minnesota, Pipestone 208, Kansas City Federal Records Center; see also Special Use Permit for Nelson Jones, August 30, 1946; Special Use Permit for Robert Wilson, August 30, 1946; Special Use Permit for George and Clara Bryan, October 1, 1948; Special Use Permit for Joe Wabasha, September 9, 1950, Box 195,

The implementation of a system had little impact on quarrying. The number of permits issued by the Park Service remained constant throughout the late 1940s and early 1950s. At the time, most of the quarriers were local Indians, descendants of families that moved to the town of Pipestone to quarry. Crafts made from pipestone became an important cottage industry for local Indians, but their market was seasonal. When visitors arrived in town, a market existed. During the long winter, when few visitors came to Minnesota, there was no one to buy Indian crafts. As a result, quarrying was only a sideline. It did not offer a consistent and dependable source of income for native people.⁸

The inconsistency led to some uncomfortable situations in the town of Pipestone. Some local merchants paid Native American craftspeople low rates for finished products in the off-season and sold the crafts at exorbitant rates during busier times. In some instances, desperate Native Americans met the trains that came to town, selling fine craftwork to incoming people for a pittance. A pattern had developed. Although the monument protected access to the stone, its officials could do little to protect the economic interests of Native Americans outside its

Folder 901, Kansas City Federal Records Center.

⁸ Gilbert Backlund, interview by Dan Holder, November 22, 1991; Betty Zorich interview.

boundaries. Native stone and craftwork increasingly benefitted everyone but the Native Americans.⁹

To some people in the town of Pipestone, this was an inequitable and untenable situation. Working with Superintendent Lyle Linch in 1954, they planned a revival of the Pipestone National Park Association, the organization that had been responsible for the effort to establish the monument in the 1930s. Its new incarnation was called the Pipestone Indian Shrine Association (PISA).¹⁰ This time, the association had a different purpose.

The new incarnation of PISA sought to provide Native Americans with both a structure to protect their economic interests and support to perpetuate the skills and crafts required in quarrying and pipemaking. The organization was not all Anglo-Americans; quarriers and pipemakers such as George and Winona Bryan, Harvey and Ethel Derby, and Ephraim Taylor were part of the organization from its inception, adding an important component of native influence. The association set up a marketing system that standardized prices for the sale of crafts. This established a minimum value for craftwork and prevented seasonal need from damaging the fragile native economy. The association opened a sales counter in the visitor center at the monument and purchased artifacts from Native Americans. It also meant that the selling of artifacts was limited to a few places,

⁹ Betty Zorich interview.

¹⁰ Murray, "Administrative History," 103.

taking Indians out of the embarrassing position of hawking their crafts in the streets.

The shrine association also took responsibility for the perpetuation of quarrying and pipemaking. The practices were dying in the 1950s, and the association worked to assure their revival. George Bryan, Harvey Derby, and Ephraim Taylor, three of the most consistent users of the quarry, were also important pipemakers. The trio were active participants both in the park and the association. Their input and ability to teach younger Indians the art of pipemaking was crucial. Robert and Clarence Crooks, former Indian School students, also became expert and renowned pipemakers. Under the loose aegis of the shrine association, Native American craftwork was sustained.

As PISA grew, other opportunities for Native Americans emerged. In 1969, the association began to develop a mail-order business. The cultural climate of the time made Native American crafts and clothing fashionable. In the early 1970s, pipestone artifacts gained popularity and business boomed. This meant a larger market for Native Americans who sold their craftwork to the association and more opportunity for PISA to support native people and the park. A bookkeeper, Betty Zorich, who was hired in 1969, became the business manager, and the seasonal staff increased. Although the business manager of the association was an Anglo-American, the remainder of the employees were Native American. Native American employment continued throughout the 1970s and 1980s. After the retirement of Zorich in 1989, Mattie

Redwing, a Native American, replaced her, and the entire PISA staff was Indian.

PISA benefitted from the changing cultural climate of Native American-white relations. During the 1960s, Native Americans again began to agitate for changes in their relationship with the institutions of American society. The era of "termination" had ended with little acclaim, and the predicament of many Native Americans remained as precarious as ever. Later in the 1960s, a new federal policy regarding Indians was implemented. Called "self-determination," this policy granted Indians greater autonomy and control of their affairs than at any time since the arrival of Anglo-Americans.¹¹

Despite the change in policy, new militance swept through Native American communities. In Minneapolis, about 150 miles from the monument, a group of urban Native Americans formed the American Indian Movement (AIM). It expressed its views in direct action, with incidents such as the seizure of the former federal penitentiary at Alcatraz in San Francisco Bay in 1969 and the takeover of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in 1972. AIM reached its critical moment in 1973, when members occupied Wounded Knee, South Dakota, the place where nearly 100 years before, the U.S. Cavalry slaughtered more than 140 Indians. The occupation was in response to perceived corruption within the Tribal Council of the Pine Ridge Reservation, and the BIA gave tacit support to those

¹¹ Josephy, "Modern America and the Indian," in Hoxie, ed., Indians in American History, 265-70.

who sought to quash AIM. An unfortunate series of circumstances culminated in a 71-day siege of Wounded Knee by federal agents. A number of skirmishes occurred, two Indians died, and another was paralyzed. A negotiated agreement ended the siege in May 1973, but the issues were anything but resolved. A small civil war broke out on the reservation, leading to more than 100 Indian deaths in a two-year period. Only the death of two FBI agents in a gunfight in 1975 refocused national interest on Wounded Knee and the Pine Ridge reservation.¹²

Wounded Knee had an iconography of its own. After the publication of Dee Brown's Bury My Heart At Wounded Knee in 1971, the name connoted injustice to Americans of all backgrounds. In an effort to attract attention, AIM leaders selected a place with broad-based cultural meaning. The choice of the location to express outrage was ironic; the results of the situation tragic.

AIM and its militance reflected the changing situation of Native Americans. The end of restrictive policies and the vast autonomy native peoples received beginning in the middle of the 1960s led to changes in Native American perceptions of the larger world. Legislation such as the American Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968 vested Native Americans in a manner that Anglo-America never before saw as necessary or desirable. Many Native

¹² Gibson, The American Indian: Prehistory to the Present, 569-70; W. Richard West, Jr. and Kevin Gover, "The Struggle for Indian Civil Rights," in Hoxie, ed., Indians in American History, 290-91; Robert E. Schmidt, "The American Indian Movement," (unpublished M.A. thesis, Wichita State University, 1976), 10-14; Richard White, It's Your Misfortune and None of My Own: A New History of the American West (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991), 586-88.

Americans, particularly the old, were ambivalent about their new situation. Others sensed an opportunity to move forward in the larger world. Still others withdrew from both the Indian and white worlds. Legal emancipation offered many benefits, but it was also dislocating.¹³

Native Americans in the Pipestone area were not generally militant. Their exposure to Anglo institutions, residence in a largely white town, and the relative economic stability offered by the Pipestone Indian Shrine Association and the quarries made them poor candidates for involvement in cultural strife.¹⁴ Despite the relative conservatism of local Native Americans, the turmoil of the time intruded on the community.

The proximity of AIM in Minneapolis to the monument served as the catalyst for an expression of militance at Pipestone. AIM members often acted in symbolic ways. Stereotypic depictions of Native Americans was one of their important issues. The Song of Hiawatha annual pageant served as a lightning rod for this expression of dissatisfaction. In 1970, AIM protesters attended a presentation of the pageant. In the middle of the performance, they disrupted the show, shouting and stamping their feet. AIM members regarded the pageant as a romanticized, inaccurate depiction of their heritage. The white people who attended the show, schooled in a different tradition, were confounded. Even

¹³ West and Gover, "The Struggle for Indian Civil Rights," in Hoxie, ed., Indians in American History, 290-93.

¹⁴ Raymond L. "Chuck" Derby interview.

the Park Service overreacted a little. After the incident, the historic pipes from the monument were immediately locked away in the bank vault in downtown Pipestone.¹⁵

The Park Service fared better under AIM scrutiny. During their visit, AIM activists assessed the operations of the monument. While the museum and its interpretation were disappointing because of their overwhelming ethnocentricity, AIM members were surprised to find strong Native American representation both in the park and the co-operating association. Native American employees were established at the park. It had already had two Indian superintendents, and PISA worked to maintain native representation on its board and in its activities.¹⁶ While harmony did not ensue, a sort of informal accommodation was reached.

In a less militant climate a few years later, Native Americans won a major legislative victory. The American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978 codified in law the existing practice at Pipestone and other national park areas. It assured the rights of native people to practice religious and ceremonial rites on all federal land without interference. The new law granted Native American religions a degree of respect and

¹⁵ Cecil Lewis interview; Vincent Halvorson interview; Betty McSwain interview; Don Thompson interview.

¹⁶ Betty Zorich interview; Cecil Lewis interview.

protection that had not existed since Europeans first legislated Native American religion and behavior.¹⁷

The American Indian Religious Freedom Act both reflected and shaped changes in Native American society. Renewed Native American interest in their culture and heritage began as an outgrowth of the cultural upheaval of the early 1970s. The legislation resulted from the desire of some Indians to secure rights; the passage of the act spurred more people to greater awareness. A nascent spiritual revival existed in some parts of the Native American community by the early 1980s.

In no small part as a result of this heightened awareness, the narrative presented in the museum began to be the source of negative comment. European visitors often reacted to it in the aftermath of the 1960s, but the real objections came beginning in 1986 and 1987. More Native Americans with strong religious and cultural traditions came to the monument, and many were offended by the presentation of Indian-white relations and Native American culture in the museum exhibits. The interpretation dated from the 1950s and reflected the perspective of that time.

"Meanwhile, back at the ranch," one park staffer mused in the early 1990s, "people have changed." The museum vastly overemphasized the significance of white explorers, particularly

¹⁷ Francis Paul Prucha, The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984), 2:1139-70; see also Donald L. Parman, "Indians of the Modern West," in Gerald D. Nash and Richard W. Etulain, The Twentieth-Century West: Historical Interpretations (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1989), 147-72.

George Catlin. It portrayed Native American cultures in the past tense, belying their existence and viability in the present. One exhibit, titled "The White Man Comes," evoked particular animosity. In one instance, a woman scratched out museum labels in the exhibit. Others objected to the idea of the federal government depicting native religion that its regulations had censured for so long.¹⁸ In a climate of heightened awareness, the Park Service needed to respond to changing public perceptions.

The increase in cultural awareness among Native Americans led to other kinds of expressions of faith and belief. Pipestone National Monument had both cultural and religious significance for Native American people, yet federal officials in the green uniform of the Park Service administered the quarries. To newly empowered Native Americans seeking to rediscover and transmit their cultural heritage, the situation was an affront.

In 1986, the first inkling of a movement to restore the quarries to Native American hands surfaced. The National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) passed a resolution to prohibit the sale of objects and pipes made of pipestone. Their complaint was that the material from the quarries was sacred, and treating pipestone as a commodity instead of religious material was sacrilegious. The following year the Yankton Sioux took this concept further. Victor Provost, vice-chairman of the tribe, filed a petition with Senator Daniel K. Inouye of Hawaii, the

¹⁸ Betty McSwain interview.

chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs, that cited the American Indian Religious Freedom Act in an effort to wrest the monument from NPS control.¹⁹

This renewed militance was different than earlier versions of the same impulse. AIM had been founded by urban Indians to help newcomers to cities adjust and to lobby for the fair application of American law to Native Americans.²⁰ Its objectives were political. The new challenges to the Park Service were from Native Americans still on the reservation. Their motives were cultural rather than political. This presented the Park Service with an important problem. It was difficult not to sympathize with people whose objectives were spiritual in character.

Concerned Native Americans approached the park for help in achieving their goal. Adalbert Zephier, a former PISA cultural demonstrator whose son John marketed decorative pipestems through the shrine association, confronted the agency in a letter. He objected to the sale of pipestone artifacts because he "believed any thing sacred isn't for sale or shouldn't be sold, or marked for sale. . . we know people who buy pipes don't use it right."

¹⁹ File, park ranger, "Evolution of Language on Yankton Issue, no date; Victor Provost to Sen. Daniel K. Inouye, June 7, 1987, Pipestone.

²⁰ Gibson, The American Indian, 569.

Zephier sought to arrange a meeting between park officials and Native American crafts people.²¹

Zephier's letter required an NPS response. He and two of his other sons, Loren and Sherwin, previously worked at the park as cultural demonstrators. They were familiar with the park and its operations, and aware of the emerging sensitivity to native issues in the agency, they perceived the Park Service as a potential ally. A complicated drama began to unfold.²²

The position of the Park Service differed from that of the Yankton Sioux. The organic legislation that established the monument preserved the right to quarry for all Indians, not just the Yankton. The legal settlement in 1928 extinguished Yankton claims to the land. As a result, religious traditions other than the Yankton were represented among quarriers at Pipestone. Some of these had no problem with the marketing of artifacts. In addition, some of the Indian families in the town of Pipestone, who were not Yankton Sioux, had worked the quarries for generations. The shrine association remained an integral part of the local Native American economy. The religious and cultural traditions of Native Americans were, in the words of one Pipestone area Native American, "diverse and sometimes

²¹ Adalbert Zephier to Superintendent, Pipestone, July 7, 1987, A38, Pipestone.

²² Ibid.; Raymond L. Derby to Adalbert Zephier, July 22, 1987, A 38, Pipestone.

conflicting" on the question of the use of pipestone. Park officials sought some resolution.²³

The issue highlighted a schism among Native Americans. Not monolithic in culture or custom, native peoples had a range of points of view on the subject. The Yankton perspective dated from the end of the eighteenth century, when they established hegemony over the quarry and prevented others from using the stone. Other tribes believed differently, harkening back to the era before the Sioux, when a number of tribes used the quarries. Twentieth-century economics intruded on historic questions of spirituality. Other groups opposed Yankton control of the quarry because it would limit their livelihood as well as infringe on their religious views. The issue also forced native people to confront their attitudes about traditional culture. Divided by age, nature of reverence, tribal affiliation, and economic concerns, Native Americans disagreed over the proper use and disposition of the quarry.

To a large degree, the issue was moot. NPS officials showed little inclination to turn the quarry over to anyone. From the Park Service perspective, the agency served as a guardian of the place, preventing internecine cultural conflict from affecting its use. With the NPS at Pipestone, all Native Americans had equal access to the quarry. As long as the organic legislation remained unamended, little change was likely to occur.

²³ Raymond L. Derby to Adalbert Zephier, July 22, 1987, A 38, Pipestone.

The following summer, the drive to limit the sale of pipestone materials gained momentum. In June 1988, about fifty Sioux began a 450-mile trek across South Dakota toward Pipestone National Monument in pursuit of this goal. Nearly one month later, the group completed its spiritual run/walk, and the crowd came up the entrance road singing and made camp at the monument.²⁴ The letter-writing campaign had become direct action.

Native Americans remained divided on the subject. While most agreed that Native American control of the quarries would improve the situation, that was the extent of consensus. The marchers opposed the commercialization of pipestone, arguing that it should be used only for religious purposes. Many of their objections focused on the activities of the shrine association. "I cry because I'm seeing the sacred pipe at rummage sales," said Pretty Sounding Flute of Aberdeen, South Dakota, echoing one of the predominant concerns of the marchers. A significant contingent also wanted the quarries returned to native hands. In their view, the sale of the land in 1928 was illegal, a perspective modified by Herbert T. Hoover, a professor of history at the University of South Dakota. "You can talk about legality all you want," Hoover remarked about the sale of the land, "but

²⁴ "Sioux Complete Pipestone Journey," Sioux Empire, July 17, 1988.

you have to talk about morality, too." On that basis he favored returning the quarries to the tribe.²⁵

The demands of the group focused on the use of the stone from the quarry. They sought a board of trustees, to be selected from members of the Yankton tribe with reverence for tradition, to oversee quarrying. In addition, they wanted programs to educate the public and pipemakers about the nature of the sacred stone and sought to enhance economic opportunities for the Native American population of Pipestone so that when commercial quarrying eventually ceased, local Indians would not suffer. They also wanted all pipes on display at the visitor center disassembled and returned to the Yankton people.²⁶

Most local Native Americans, pipemakers, and others took a different view. People such as Adam Fortunate Eagle, an Ojibway ceremonial leader and internationally known sculptor and pipe maker who was educated at Pipestone Indian School, exemplified the opposition. Local pipemakers should be venerated, Fortunate Eagle believed, for they "kept these quarries going . . . [with] their tenacity and bravery over the years. The utmost irony in this protest is that our own Indian pipemakers are being condemned. I think the worst thing that could be done," he

²⁵ Melissa Jordan and Deann Holland, "Indians Seeking Return of Quarry at Pipestone," The Independent, July 18, 1988; File, park ranger, "Evolution of Language on Yankton Issue," Pipestone; Jerry Reynolds, "Pipestone Relay Off and Running," Lakota Times, June 27, 1989.

²⁶ File, park ranger, "Evolution of Language on Yankton Issue," no date, Pipestone.

continued, "is to try to destroy the livelihood of the very people who protected and preserved our sacred quarries."

Fortunate Eagle noted that the stone had always been traded and sold among Indians. Even after the Sioux takeover, trade continued. Nearly all of Pipestone's Native Americans agreed with Fortunate Eagle. Monument official Raymond L. "Chuck" Derby, himself a pipemaker, articulated this point of view: "We were taught by our elders to do this."²⁷

There was little support for the ideas of the South Dakota walkers, and in 1988, no resolution occurred. The shrine association explained its perspective, emphasizing a nearly forty-year-old commitment to pipemaking as an art, the more than \$260,000 it paid to Native American craftspeople and employees from five tribes in 1987, and the participation in its demonstration program of a number of Native Americans. The local Native American community perceived the marchers as a threat. They reminded non-Indians about the importance of PISA to the local Indian population and pointed out the long history of inter-Indian trade in pipestone. Perhaps most significant, the local Indian community asserted that the traditional medicine men of the generations before had been pleased by their efforts and were grateful that Indians still made pipes that they could use

²⁷ Barry Amundson, "Indian Leader says Local Pipemakers Should be Honored," Pipestone County Star, July 14, 1988; Melissa Jordan and Deann Holland, "Indians Seeking Return of Quarry at Pipestone," The Independent, July 18, 1988; White, "The Winning of the West," 322-25.

for their ceremonies. After a brief stay, the marchers left, vowing to continue their new tradition the following year.²⁸

The next summer, the process started anew. The Park Service had successfully maintained a neutral position in what had become an inter-Indian cultural dispute. As a result, the battle for control of the ideology of pipemaking would again take place at the monument. Early on the morning of July 4, 1989, a group of runners set out for Pipestone on what they termed the Spiritual Run for the Sacred Pipe. The 768-mile run was set to reach the monument on July 16, when a two-day conference would take place. The purpose was the same, although Yankton Sioux councilman Wesley Allen Hare, Jr., developed a new strategy for securing the quarry. He sought a contract to allow administrative control, which the tribe planned to give to a council of elders.²⁹

The marchers had expanded their claims and received some outside support. In 1989, the National Congress of American Indians called on Congress to prohibit the sale of pipestone and pipestone objects. Its leaders also asked the NPS to end its exhibition of pipes at the monument. Wesley Hare of the Yankton tribe claimed that the pipestone had faded in color because of improper use during the past four years. Arvol Lookinghorse,

²⁸ "Policy Statement of Indian Shrine Association," 1988; The Pipestone American Indian Community to the Editor, Pipestone County Star, May 1988, copies of both at Pipestone National Monument.

²⁹ Jerry Reynolds, "Pipestone Relay Off and Running," Lakota Times, June 27, 1989; Stephen N. Cournoyer, Jr., Chairman, Yankton Sioux Tribe, to Superintendent, Pipestone National Monument, June 5, 1989, Pipestone A 38, Spiritual Walk.

known by traditional Indians as Keeper of the Sacred Pipe, insisted that "Lakota spirituality was not for sale--this includes ceremonial songs, sweat lodge ceremonies, prayers, and sacred religious artifacts."³⁰ The lines between the different groups of Native Americans remained as clear as ever.

The Spiritual Run/Walk became an annual event, continuing in 1990 and 1991. Thirteen runners were part of a group of 33 people associated with the run/walk in 1990. Again they stayed at the monument about two days, practicing religious and ceremonial rites, discussing the situation, and attracting media attention. The following year, the process was repeated.³¹ The Lakota were determined to make their point.

As a result, NPS personnel were compelled to address interpretation at the monument. Since the mid-1970s, plans for renovating the museum had been shelved. Trapped by the funding problems that permeated the system late in the 1980s, the resources to implement the program simply were not available. As a result, at a time of increased militance, the portrayals of Native Americans at the monument were anachronistic and disappointing.

Much of the emphasis of the new traditionalists centered on the display of pipes in the museum. Of the sixty pipes displayed at the monument, about forty were displayed with the bowl and the

³⁰ File, park ranger, "Evolution of Language on Yankton Issue," Pipestone.

³¹ Untitled, chronological account of Spiritual Run activities, July 1990, A 38, Pipestone.

stem separated. The other twenty were joined. For some tribes, the bowl and stem of the calumet were only joined during religious ceremonies. The display of joined pipes inspired the wrath of some of the marchers. A number of the Yankton, including Wesley Hare, wrote to complain. In one instance in 1991, a member of the patrol team of the Sundance ceremony entered the museum for the first time and was grossly offended by the display of joined pipes and the sale of pipestone artifacts. He approached the park ranger in an aggressive manner, asking why these practices were allowed. The ranger told him to stay around a while and watch activities at the visitor center. Two days later, the young man showed the ranger a pipe he bought from one of the craftsmen, suggesting a new understanding of the situation.³²

Such conversions were infrequent, and the Park Service was compelled to defend its position. The agency contacted Dr. Martin Broken Leg, a Rosebud Sioux and professor of Indian Studies at Augustana College in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, to discuss retaining him as a consultant. In 1992, the planning process for such an arrangement began. In addition, park officials made a systematic survey of pipe displays in American and Canadian museums. Most museums displayed joined pipes, and a number of Native Americans, including George Horse Capture, curator of Plains Indian Museum, regarded it as an issue for individual interpretation because of the diversity of views in

³² Betty McSwain interview.

"Indian Country." Horse Capture himself displayed his pipes joined at the Buffalo Bill Historical Center in Cody, Wyoming.³³

Park officials recognized that they had to address an issue of great sensitivity. The pipes that were joined were used to express artistic and commercial aspects of heritage rather than ceremonial or religious ones. The dated museum exhibits depicted only Lakota images, neglecting the earlier groups that used the Pipestone region or the broader dimensions of the trade in pipestone that characterized the northern plains. NPS officials explained this to objecting Native Americans, and worked to assure them that the museum renovation would be undertaken as quickly as possible. More comprehensive interpretation that reflected increased sensitivity could only stand the Park Service in good stead with the entire Native American community.³⁴

The issue continued to attract attention. In 1991, Shaman's Drum, an alternative culture journal published by the Cross-Cultural Shamanism Network, published a misleading, inaccurate, and derogatory article about the situation at the park. The Park Service was accused of allowing local white business people to quarry at the monument, hiring crews of token Indians to "mass produce facsimiles of sacred pipes to be sold for hundreds of dollars each," and of allowing the stone to be made into trivial objects. Superintendent Vincent Halvorson responded with a

³³ Vincent Halvorson to Wesley Hare, Jr., August 21, 1990, A 38, Pipestone.

³⁴ Ibid.

letter explaining the laws, policies, practices, and procedures at the monument.³⁵ The considerable momentum of the movement to alter the use of pipestone meant that in the future, park officials will write many similar letters.

The issue increasingly became a battle between the Yankton Sioux and the heterogeneous Pipestone Native American community. In 1991, the Yankton Sioux passed another resolution seeking to limit use of the quarry to Yanktons who sought the stone for religious purposes. They sought to use the American Indian Religious Freedom Act to assert their exclusive right to the quarry. Yankton success would mean terminating PISA and its activities. The move left other Native Americans with the impression that the Yankton sought to reinstitute their prior control of the area. In this scenario, one historic moment would supersede all others.

The Indian community at Pipestone approached the Indian Affairs Council of the State of Minnesota, requesting an exemption from the American Indian Religious Freedom Act for Pipestone National Monument. The law prohibited any disruption of sacred places or events. The requested exemption would permit existing activities to continue. The council, set up to advise the state legislature and its agencies on Native American issues, agreed with the Pipestone Indians and passed a resolution

³⁵ Robert LaBatte, "Lakota Runners Seek Protection for Sacred Pipestone Quarries," Shaman's Drum (Summer 1991), 17; Vincent J. Halvorson to Timothy White, editor, Shaman's Drum, September 4, 1991, A 38, Pipestone.

supporting its position.³⁶ At the beginning of 1992, the relationship between the Yankton, the Native American families of Pipestone, and the Park Service had not yet been resolved.

Native Americans sought to use the quarry to express their sense of spirituality in other ways. In May 1991, the park received a request from the Sundance committee, a group affiliated with the American Indian Movement, to use the monument for a Sundance. This intricate religious ceremony, designed to promote unity, rejuvenation, and health, was a cornerstone of Native American religions. It required a four-year cycle. After a meeting with Superintendent Halvorson at the monument, a special use permit was granted for the ceremony.³⁷

The Sundance was different than the earlier Spiritual Run/Walks. While the marchers sought to make a point about the return of the quarry and the regulation of its use, those involved in the Sundance wanted to use the park as a place to express spirituality, renewal, and sacredness. The Sundance showed Native American culture looking inward to cleanse itself, not engaging with the outside world. Its leaders sought an enhancement of spirituality, not confrontation or redress of grievances. In keeping with this objective, the purification ritual that preceded the ceremony was scheduled for August 18,

³⁶ State of Minnesota Indian Affairs Council, Resolution 091891-02, September 18, 1991.

³⁷ Sundance Committee to the Pipestone Shrine Association (sic), Superintendent of Parks, Mr. Vince Halberson (sic), May 9, 1991; Vincent J. Halvorson to Chris Leith and Clyde Bellecourt, May 16, 1991, A 38, Pipestone; Brown, The Sacred Pipe, 67-100.

with tree day, a religious event, to follow three days later.³⁸

Early in August, Native Americans began to arrive at the monument to prepare for the Sundance. Clyde Bellecourt and Chris Leith, two of the leaders of the Sundance committee, were the first. A steady stream of heterogeneous Native Americans from a range of tribes followed, and by August 18, three large tepees, several tents, and a number of sweat lodges were in evidence. The Park Service cooperated with the campers to keep contact between park visitors and campers to a minimum. The ceremony was secret, and potential for offensive behavior by an inconsiderate public was vast. The event came off very well, and at the end, the Sundance committee thanked Halvorson and his staff for their cooperation. The superintendent invited the dancers back for the following year, and Native Americans departed knowing that their traditions and religion had been respected.³⁹

For the Park Service, the success of the Sundance ceremony illustrated the importance of remaining impartial in intra-Indian disputes. As the official keeper of the quarries, the Park Service had myriad obligations to native peoples. Negotiating a path among the competing interests required patience, careful reflection, and much cooperation. Despite claims that the Park Service should relinquish the quarries, events such as the Sundance demonstrated the importance of a non-partisan,

³⁸ Sundance Committee, press release, July 20, 1991; Sundance Committee, "To All Native People," May 27, 1991.

³⁹ 1991 Sundance, Daily Log, A 38, Pipestone.

unaffiliated administration for the quarries. The situation showed the Park Service and its managers in a positive light.

The growing sensitivity to Native American concerns was at least in part a reflection of the diversity of the workplace at the monument. Unlike many park areas with Indian themes, Pipestone had Native Americans involved with the park since its inception. There had been a longstanding Native American presence in the work force at the monument. Most of the quarriers predated the monument, either as students at the Indian School or as residents of the community. When NPS personnel arrived, these people were already at work in the quarries. NPS officials recognized this dimension as valuable from the beginning, and worked to use it for interpretive purposes. The presence of people working the stone in an historic manner gave Pipestone National Monument something unique. Late in the 1940s, George "Standing Eagle" Bryan began to work as a seasonal interpreter while quarrying. Others, such as Harvey Derby, followed.⁴⁰

Because the number of staff positions at the monument remained small, the employment of Native Americans in permanent positions began slowly. The first staff positions were for specialized professional employees at a time when few Native Americans worked in the Park Service. In the 1950s and 1960s, as at other parks with Indian populations and themes, most Native Americans were found in the maintenance department. At

⁴⁰ Corbett, "Red Pipestone Quarry," 56.

Pipestone, Native Americans were well represented among the seasonal maintenance staff.

In the early 1960s, the demography of the Park Service began to change. MISSION 66 created large numbers of new positions, and NPS officials increasingly sought minorities for positions with the agency. Many blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans with college training and military experience were sought and recruited by the ranger corps. This was a difficult task for the NPS because other federal agencies could offer higher incoming General Schedule (GS) grades than the Park Service could. A Native American could enter the Bureau of Indian Affairs as a GS-9. Generally the Park Service could only offer a GS-5 rank. As a result, those minorities who became rangers had great commitment to the agency.⁴¹ Minorities without military experience or college coursework usually became permanent maintenance workers.

At Pipestone, the first Native American permanent employee was a natural choice. Raymond L. "Chuck" Derby was hired as a permanent maintenance man. The son of Harvey and Ethel Derby, who quarried the monument, he grew up in the park. Following a typical pattern, he first hired on as a seasonal in 1963, became permanent in late 1960s, and was appointed the first maintenance supervisor in the early 1970s.⁴²

⁴¹ Cecil Lewis interview.

⁴² Raymond L. "Chuck" Derby interview.

By the time Derby became maintenance supervisor, a revolution in leadership had taken place at Pipestone. Many of the young minorities in the Park Service advanced quickly, some to positions of responsibility and leadership, and were ready for superintendencies by the end of the decade. Their presence and preparation dovetailed with the needs of the agency. In the late 1960s, the NPS sought to become more inclusive. Agency leadership recognized that at some parks, a minority presence in leadership offered advantages. At Pipestone, Cecil D. Lewis, Jr., a Sac and Fox Indian, was appointed the first Native American superintendent in 1968.

The Native American presence at the park provided a new dimension. Lewis offered strong leadership, spearheading the development of the Upper Midwest Indian Cultural Center and increasing sensitivity to Native American concerns. Clarence N. Gorman, a Navajo, succeeded Lewis. Gorman remained for only a year, preferring to return to his home in the Southwest.⁴³ Subsequent superintendents were Anglo-Americans. Despite that reality, the Indian superintendents left a legacy. Their successors were made aware of a broader range of issues. Some of the later superintendents, such as David Lane, were remembered as having special respect for Native Americans.

Although Native Americans ceased to occupy the superintendent's office, they remained an important presence in the work force. As of 1991, three Native American served in

⁴³ Clarence Gorman interview.

full-time positions, one as a ranger and two in maintenance. Two others served as seasonal maintenance workers. One glaring gap existed in seasonal interpretation, where despite extensive recruiting, no qualified Native Americans have been found who will accept a position at Pipestone. With regional office support for recruiting efforts, the chances of finding and hiring qualified Native Americans have increased.

In the past two decades, Native Americans have become an increasingly important force at the monument. Always a significance presence, Native Americans have again come to see the quarries as an integral part of their heritage, important to the viability of their many cultures. Within the guidelines of its management responsibilities, the Park Service has accommodated native peoples and their concerns, utilizing an integrated approach to management to find compromise solutions to often thorny issues. Sensitive to Native American needs, park personnel seek to maintain Pipestone as a cultural park. The result has been cordial relations that allow Native Americans to use the park and its resources without eliminating the federal presence.

Yet as the United States grapples with the implications of its multicultural heritage, the process of managing native relations may become more complex. Accommodating extreme perspectives may prove more difficult than past experience would suggest. Yet under enlightened leadership, Pipestone has developed an integrated management perspective that accommodates

Native American needs, serves the larger public, and preserves
and protects the resources of the monument.

CHAPTER VII: CULTURAL AND NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Although the organic legislation that established Pipestone National Monument emphasized its cultural features, the area also contained important natural attributes that required management. Since the establishment of the park, the Park Service integrated both kinds of resources management into the conception of its responsibilities at Pipestone National Monument. Resources management began long before a label existed for such activities. Initially it was a reactive, almost haphazard process; as a result of changes in legislation that began in the 1970s, the process became proactive and formal. That transition revealed many of the important aspects of the history of resources management at Pipestone National Monument and in the national park system.

Before the establishment of the monument, there had been rudimentary efforts to care for the quarries and their environs. While the quarries were under the nominal supervision of the Indian School, J. W. Balmer assumed responsibility for basic maintenance. He detailed students to clear weeds, maintain fields, clear brush from the creek, and perform the work necessary to keep the reserved area attractive.¹ Yet little was systematic about such an approach, and minimal planning went into the process.

¹ Memorandum, Assistant Regional Director to Director, August 30, 1939, Pipestone National Monument, Series 7, Box 2360, NA, RG 79.

After the establishment of the monument, the Park Service was limited by a lack of resources. Without a budget, any activities at Pipestone occurred because someone volunteered. Balmer, the first custodian and himself a volunteer, could do little without support. He received no budget or guidance for either interpretation or natural resources management, and as a result, simply continued the practices he began under Indian School administration. When Albert F. Drysdale replaced Balmer as custodian in 1940, he faced a similar predicament. He also lacked strong ties to the agency, a budget for resources management work, and the sense of direction that NPS training often instilled.² At its inception, resource management was reactive to a fault.

Widespread recognition of the importance of portraying Native American history, ethnography, crafts, and religion at Pipestone did not hasten the beginning of comprehensive cultural resources management. Work in the field was initially confined to issuing permits to quarry and maintaining features of the park such as the Nicollet marker. Regional office personnel solicited academic resources such as the Lithic Laboratory in Columbus, Ohio, which contributed a study of the properties of the Catlinite stone from which pipes were fashioned, but the agency

² Hummel, "Preliminary Historical Development Report of Pipestone National Monument."

had little more than that to commit to the development of any facet of the new park.³

Despite the lack of resources, the NPS strove to make clear the purpose and character of the national monument. In some instances, this led to the rejection of local attempts to assist the monument. At the beginning of the 1940s, the Park Service declined an offer from the county historical society to construct a building on the monument to house a collection of artifacts from the settlement era in southwestern Minnesota. The monument had been established to protect and interpret the quarries, NPS officials determined, not display local and regional settlement history. The first master plan at the monument, prepared in 1942, reaffirmed this goal, proposing that the interpretation at the monument and in its museum be limited to Indian pipes and customs, pipemaking, and the "specific" history of the area. Despite the need for development, NPS officials would not compromise on the character of the park.⁴

There were some early efforts at research to support cultural resources management and interpretation. Historian Hummel's preliminary historical development report in 1940, perhaps the single most important document of the first decade of the existence of the monument, laid out a clear direction for

³ Murray, Administrative History, 94-95.

⁴ Pipestone National Monument, Development Outline, D. O. NM-PIP-2000 - 1942, Pipestone; Albert F. Drysdale to Regional Director, January 23, 1940; Regional Director, "Memorandum for Custodian Drysdale," Pipestone National Monument, Pipestone 833-05, Kansas City Federal Records Center.

interpretation at Pipestone. The Lithic Laboratory study added a geological dimension to the story of Pipestone. Drysdale also began to collect information and photographs to prepare an interpretation pamphlet for the monument. Slowly, the background for an interpretation program began to take shape.⁵

Early natural resources management consisted of basic maintenance. Activities such as cleaning out brush, hauling hay bales in borrowed trucks, and starting efforts to eradicate undesirable species were common. Early in the 1940s, one plant, poison ivy, created a problem for Drysdale. He sought to eliminate it, but because it was native flora rather than an exotic, was forced to let it remain. Following that decision, the NPS expended significant effort to remove exotic plant species and restore the grasslands of the monument to the condition of the early nineteenth century. Policy changes led to new practices. By 1950, mowing for weed control decreased, and 2-4-D, one of the active compounds in Agent Orange and later discovered to be a carcinogen, was commonly used to spray undesirable plants. Sweet clover, assorted thistles, and after a policy change, poison ivy, were among the species eradicated. The program was successful, for native plant species such as Purple Gentian, a fall flower, and Foxglove, a spring bloom, returned.⁶

⁵ Corbett, "History of the Red Pipestone Quarry," 54.

⁶ Corbett, "History of the Red Pipestone Quarry," 53-54; Victor Cahalane to Daniel Beard, July 1, 1941, Pipestone, Series 7, RG 79, NA; Lyle K. Lynch to Regional Director, June 29, 1950,

Most of the successes in weed eradication and species restoration occurred on the prairies. The quartzite ledges presented a different set of problems. It was a "back breaking and painstaking" operation, according to Lyle K. Linch, that remained a costly investment of time and resources.⁷ The natural resources management goals of the Park Service at Pipestone and the resources it had to commit to such an objective were far apart.

Yet the embryonic natural resources management activities at Pipestone suggested that the monument was different from many other historic parks. Because it preserved Native American history and ethnography and descriptions of the appearance of the area at the time of contact existed, managing the natural resources of the monument took on an importance not then characteristic of historic areas in the system. The setting was important to the story of Pipestone, forcing a prescient kind of management of natural resources at a cultural park area.

The appearance of the energetic and idiosyncratic Linch led to the first comprehensive efforts to standardize resources management at Pipestone. Nature trails, improved access to exhibits, and the recreation of a typical section of prairie characterized his early efforts. Such activities were instigated at the park level and executed with little more than concurrence

Pipestone 885, Kansas City Federal Records Center.

⁷ Lyle K. Linch to Regional Director, June 29, 1950, Pipestone 885, Kansas City Federal Records Center.

from the regional office. As was typical of the era, superintendents such as Linch were expected to handle every aspect of research and management. Although possessing a biology degree, Linch set himself the task of completing basic archeological research at the monument in the winter of 1948-49. Regional office archeologist Gordon Baldwin planned to guide Linch, who expected to perform an archeological surface survey of the park, a task not beyond the scope of an interested amateur.⁸

But Linch's unique approach to history and prehistory had already come to the attention of the regional office. His flair for the dramatic made him suspect among the professional staff, and his adherence to unusual kinds of interpretation threatened his credibility with his superiors. They were unlikely to allow him to perform significant cultural resources work. In an effort to assure that NPS standards were maintained, archeologist Paul Beaubien from the regional office went to survey Pipestone in June 1949. Regional office officials put Linch's training to work in another way. Instead of the archeological survey, he completed "A Preliminary Study of the Geology of Pipestone National Monument."⁹

⁸ Hagan to Joseph, "Office Memorandum, Subject--Linch: Pipestone, Research and Funds," November 3, 1948, Box 195, Folder 845; Stanley Joseph, "Memorandum for the Files," December 22, 1948, Folder 204, Inspections and Investigations, Kansas City Federal Records Center.

⁹ Lyle K. Linch, "A Preliminary Study of the Geology of Pipestone National Monument," Box 195, Folder 732, Kansas City Federal Records Center.

Linch also had important ideas for natural resource management. In 1950, he proposed removing trees on the quartzite ledge in an effort to replicate the vista of the 1830s. The woody character of modern grasslands evident in the 1940s was anachronistic. The grassy plains described by people like Catlin had become wooded. Historical evidence suggested that as a result of fire in the historic period that had been suppressed since the Anglo settlement of the area, cyclic broadcast fire would have created a pattern of prairie regeneration that the modern distribution of trees did not reflect. Linch marshaled historical evidence that indicated fewer wooded areas as late as the end of the nineteenth century. Observers such as Philander Prescott, George Catlin, C. A. White, and William Henry Holmes all reported treeless quartzite ledges. Photographic evidence from the 1920s that showed a lack of forestation supported Linch's contention, and he proposed that the Park Service remove the timber from a 200-foot section of the rock outcropping to better emulate the vista reported by historic observers.¹⁰

This was an important tactical decision that required higher-level input. While the Park Service recognized restoring landscapes as an objective, such action had many potential negative consequences. People familiar with a place often resented such a move, for the "historic" setting they remembered

¹⁰ Superintendent, Pipestone National Monument to Regional Director, March 21, 1950, Pipestone 701, Kansas City Federal Records Center; Stephen J. Pyne, Fire in America: A Cultural History of Wildland and Rural Fire (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982), xii.

was different than the one the Park Service sought to reconstruct. In some parts of the country, an action like this smacked of federal insensitivity to local concerns. It had to be handled with some tact and sensitivity.

At Pipestone, a number of the important members of the community supported the idea of clearing the vista. Winifred Bartlett, Dr. Walter G. Benjamin, and Edward Trebon all remarked on the problem to Linch, lending credence and effectively countering any local opposition to the idea. Regional officials agreed that the proposal was a good idea. Archeologist Beaubien insisted that a landscaper, not Linch, remove the trees to assure that "someone competent to judge the consequences" evaluate the range of cutting undertaken.¹¹

This suggestion reflected a growing recognition within the agency that some park-level resources management decisions required greater sophistication and knowledge than usually existed in the field. By the early 1950s, agency officials recognized that Pipestone was more than just a few quarries, and had a range of issues associated with the management of the surrounding prairie. The regional office asserted control over what was to become an important category of decisions at the monument.

The decision to supervise the superintendent also reflected the style of resources management current in the agency in the

¹¹ Ibid.; Howard W. Baker to Superintendent, Pipestone National Monument, March 3, 1950, Pipestone 701-01.4, Kansas City Federal Records Center.

1950s and early 1960s. Throughout the two decades, cultural and natural resource management proceeded in a reactive manner. As problems were identified, they were addressed, particularly in conjunction with updating of the master plan for the area, which occurred about every seventh year until 1965. Most often, the lack of support for projects at places such as Pipestone meant that the important decision-making passed to the regional office level. The parks had neither the staff nor the expertise to prepare a comprehensive vision. As a result, park officials provided support and information for the planning process, but were not in a position of leadership in it.

At Pipestone, this translated into park-level work on specific issues. In cultural resources management, research into the historic activities of the monument continued throughout the 1950s, and in 1960, an administrative history was written that focused on acquisition of the land that became the monument.¹² In natural resources management, the patterns of the 1940s and early 1950s continued. Most efforts involved eradication of exotic plants species and efforts to reconstruct earlier vistas.

As was true service-wide, by the middle of the 1950s, MISSION 66 and its capital development programs dominated

¹² Murray, "Administrative History." Murray's work was typical of administrative histories of its time. It was narrative in character, parochial in scope, and addressed the era before the Park Service in far greater detail than it offered for the activities of the agency. Yet the work remains an excellent reference for specifics in the history of the quarries.

attention at the national, regional, and park levels.¹³ Facing the onslaught of visitation limited the effectiveness of response in other areas. At one- and two-person park areas, of which there were many, the work power to do more than service visitors and plan MISSION 66 developments did not exist.

At Pipestone, the museum and its exhibits were the major accomplishments of MISSION 66. As was typical at the monument, the plans for a museum were in place long before the agency had the resources to implement them. The first proposals dated from the immediate postwar era and included a museum room in a larger administrative center. The 1952 master plan highlighted the lack of a museum, but it was not until the MISSION 66 process began that a comprehensive museum prospectus was assembled.¹⁴

The prospectus was a galvanizing document that planned a future in cultural resources management for the monument. It proposed a many-faceted museum that would augment the existing trailside exhibits and lend some sort of comprehensive story to interpretation at Pipestone. Its authors, former superintendent Harvey B. Reynolds and archeologist Paul Beaubien, envisioned a range of exhibits that explained the geology of the area, the distribution and properties of catlinite, the history of

¹³ Foresta, America's National Parks and Their Keepers, 53-54, 70-71, 100-07.

¹⁴ A. E. Demaray to Walter G. Benjamin, July 28, 1948, Pipestone 833-05, Kansas City Federal Records Center; "Master Plan Development Outline, Pipestone National Monument, Minnesota," February 1952, Pipestone; Harvey B. Reynolds and Paul Beaubien, "Museum Prospectus for Pipestone National Monument, 1957," Pipestone.

quarrying at the monument, Native American practices of smoking and the importance of the calumet, Native American living patterns and lifestyle, the commercialization of the quarry, and the cultural history of contact between Europeans, their descendants, and Native Americans. The importance of pipestone and the pipes in literature were also part of the plan. A 600-square-foot exhibit room for the display was recommended.¹⁵

The exhibit room in the MISSION 66 visitor center was a major triumph for the monument. It laid the basis for modern cultural resources management at Pipestone. No longer would interpretation be limited to a one-wall museum in the contact station, a few trailside exhibits, and a guide pamphlet. Instead a substantial effort to explain the meaning of the monument that used historic and prehistoric artifacts, required professional management, and allowed for the protection of cultural resources replaced more limited earlier efforts. The MISSION 66 program for Pipestone made the monument equal to the standards of the time.

The nature of natural resources management changed shortly afterward. By 1960, a revolution in natural resources management within the agency had begun. With its roots in the nascent ecological thinking of the 1930s, a new enthusiasm for scientific management of natural resources took hold. Many of the practitioners were trained scientists who had begun to assume positions of leadership in the NPS. They brought a different

¹⁵ Reynolds and Beaubien, "Museum Prospectus."

understanding of science as well as a new set of goals with them, and sought to apply the latest in scientific thinking to park management. The Wildlife Management Advisory Board's 1963 report, better known as the Leopold report after its chairman, A. Starker Leopold, pointed the way toward a new approach to natural resource management. A national park area should, in the words of the report, "represent a vignette of primitive America."¹⁶

At Pipestone, the Leopold report merely reflected existing practices. In this respect, Pipestone's unique theme, short visitation season, and remote location helped protect the monument from the commercialization that characterized some park areas. While other park managers worried about the impact of visitation during the boom of the postwar era, Linch had planned the removal of exotic and ahistoric flora and timber in an effort that anticipated the direction of the Leopold report. In the 1960s, the limited kind of resources management that the staff at Pipestone could provide coincided with the new dominant currents of thinking in the agency.

Similar changes had begun in the presentation of history. By 1963, after the debut of How the West Was Won, a full-length feature movie epic of westward expansion that modified the

¹⁶ U.S. Department of the Interior, Advisory Board on Wildlife Management, Wildlife Management in the National Parks, by A. S. Leopold et al., Report to the Secretary of the Interior, March 4, 1963; A. Starker Leopold et al., "Wildlife Management in the National Parks," National Parks Magazine 37 (April 1963). The Leopold report was originally published by the Department of the Interior, but most of the major conservation journals reprinted the significant parts of it.

traditional view of a great and glorious westward quest, a different picture of Native Americans began to emerge among the public at large. No longer were they mere obstacles to progress and civilization, savages to be tamed by the progress of civilization. Instead they had begun to become historical characters with ideas and values of their own. This resulted in greater sensitivity to Indian themes in the Park Service and a stronger effort to present the many dimensions of native cultures in a comprehensive fashion.

The new museum at Pipestone quickly became outdated as the cultural presentation of Native Americans changed. The museum had been conceived and designed during the 1950s and it reflected the standards of the time. As the cultural current in the nation changed, the interpretation of Native American culture and life in the museum exhibits became anachronistic.

Changes in federal law also compelled a more aggressive approach to resources management. The Wilderness Act of 1964, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Clean Air Act of 1970, and the rest of the range of environmental legislation that emanated from the Johnson and Nixon administrations mandated specific actions by the Park Service.¹⁷ Resources management became an

¹⁷ Samuel P. Hays, Beauty, Health, and Permanence: Environmental Politics in the United States 1955-1985 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), is the most comprehensive look at the evolution of law and environmental policy and its impact on American society; see also Walter A. Rosenbaum, The Politics of Environmental Concern (New York: Prager Publishers, 1973).

increasingly sophisticated process that was driven by directives outside of the agency. This required a new kind of labor-intensive compliance as paperwork started to increase.

These changes gradually filtered down to Pipestone National Monument and spurred a move towards more thorough planning of resources management activities. No longer did initiatives begin at the park level. Park superintendents generally responded to directives from above that required some kind of evaluation of a range of situations at the monument. Among the efforts initiated in this changing climate were John Sigstad's archeological research in 1965 and 1966, which sought to determine the age and distribution of pipestone from the monument, and the controlled burning program to regenerate historic grasslands that began in 1973.

Controlled burning was a management step of tremendous significance. Although Native Americans utilized fire for a variety of purposes, it had been the age-old enemy of Euro-Americans settlers. Suppression efforts across the northern plains began with white settlement and were usually complete by the 1890s. Yet there were environmental consequences, the most severe of which was demonstrated in the periodic vast fires that swept large timbered areas across the continent. In the most severe of these, entire communities succumbed to fire, and millions of acres were burned. In the summer of 1910, more than five million acres of American national forests burned despite the fact that fire suppression plans already existed. More than

fifty years passed before scientists recognized that suppression only delayed the onset of fire and changed its character into something far more difficult to control. Nonetheless, suppression became the dominant mode of fire control as farms and towns developed across the plains, necessitating a semi-permanent state of local nervousness during dry seasons as well as brigades of volunteer firefighters.¹⁸

The Park Service was heir to the tradition of fire-fighting, and many among its first two generations of employees in the West felt a personal hatred for fire. Some lost friends and coworkers fighting fires in the course of their careers and could not conceive of anything positive resulting from a fire. In the Park Service, as nearly everywhere else in the federal natural resources bureaucracy and the West, fire was anathema.¹⁹

Yet by the early 1970s, the value of fire as a resources management tool began to become apparent. Fire had the ability to reshape landscapes, transforming the visual and ecological character of the physical environment and often providing a new and broader range of management options. Across the nation, it had been a primary technique of pre-Columbian people. Natural fire, usually resulting from lightning, also had transformative qualities, and NPS scientists quietly began to consider controlled burning policies in an effort to assess its impact.

¹⁸ Pyne, Fire In America, 232-255.

¹⁹ John Lissoway, interview with Hal K. Rothman, February 25, 1987; Milford Fletcher, interview with Hal K. Rothman, August 21, 1986; Pyne, Fire In America, 261, 290-91, 298.

At Pipestone, the controlled burning program began as a result of a series of coincidences. An accidental fire in 1971 removed significant amounts of woody vegetation, enabling the spread of prairie grass to previously wooded areas. Since the late 1940s, the NPS desired such a result. Efforts at cutting timber such as those initiated by Lyle Linch were mere stopgap measures that addressed the consequences rather than the causes of the increase in timber. Grasslands more closely fit the historic descriptions of the quarry and its environs, and controlled fire proved to be the most efficacious way of achieving a better mix of prairies and woodland. Beginning in 1973, burning was conducted in the spring, with each of six management units in the park fired on a four- to five-year rotation. Yet no burning occurred on the quartzite ledges or along Pipestone Creek, suggesting the limitations of natural resources management in park area reserved for cultural purposes.²⁰

Management issues that had to be addressed as a result of changing legislation included preservation and use of the quarries at Pipestone. Beginning in the 1960s, historic preservation took on increased importance in the federal system. New laws that required evaluative procedures became part of the code of federal regulations, and the NPS struggled to fulfill another in the seemingly endless set of directives governing

²⁰ Gary Willson, "Prairie Management Perpetuates Historic Scene at Pipestone," Park Science: A Resource Management Bulletin 3 no. 4 (Summer 1983) 21-22.

federal activities. In compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the Park Service filed a request for clearance of ongoing quarrying at the monument. This compelled the Section 106 compliance process, which meant that quarrying would have to be evaluated for its impact on the historic resources of the monument.

As the ramifications of the new laws became clear, the Park Service sought to develop a program to administer new responsibilities. In response to the amended National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, Nathaniel Reed, assistant secretary of the interior with responsibility for national parks, orchestrated a Park Service response. The appointment of Robert M. Utley, former chief historian of the agency, to the position of assistant director for park historic preservation confirmed that the agency planned to regard its preservation responsibilities in a serious manner. An experienced NPS professional, Utley worked to help the agency get over what he referred to as its "psychological hangover from MISSION 66" and recognize that in law, preservation came before development and visitor services. As Utley worked to stress this different and seemingly foreign set of objectives, he struck the very strong chord of preservation sentiment that lay just below the surface of the agency.²¹

²¹ Foresta, National Parks and Their Keepers, 85; Robert M. Utley, "Toward a New Preservation Ethic," NPS Newsletter 19 8 (October 15, 1974).

Among those interested in exploring the legal and cultural ramifications of the new mandate was Roy W. Reaves, III, a former archeologist at Pipestone who served as executive order consultant in the NPS offices in Denver. Reaves noted that the practice of quarrying at the monument had not been reviewed by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), a violation of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and Executive Order 11593, which mandated compliance.²²

The problem was complex. Two different pieces of law contradicted each other. The new set of historic preservation laws mandated a review of adverse impacts on historic resources, which clearly encompassed quarrying. If the NPS sought to stop this adverse impact, it would violate the organic legislation of the monument, agreements, understandings, and other similar legally binding stipulations. If it did not address the problem, the NPS would fail to be in compliance with its own regulations and those of the secretary of the interior and the president.²³ Compliance with the terms of the historic preservation laws was a seemingly insoluble dichotomy.

Reaves advocated "doing the right thing by the cultural resources of the monument." He recognized that the stone itself had long been treated as the primary resource at the monument,

²² Executive Order Consultant to Regional Director, Midwest Region, May 30, 1975, File H1417, Division of Cultural Resources Management, Midwest Regional Office, National Park Service, Omaha, Nebraska.

²³ Ibid.

superseding the value of the history, archeology, and ethnology of the quarries. Reaves argued that the ethnological character of the monument was its outstanding feature, for it was what made Pipestone unique. It merited inclusion as a resource in the study of the characteristics of the monument. This approach gave the Park Service a way to present a case to avoid its dilemma. If quarrying was a part of the resource protected at Pipestone, even the removal of the stone could not be considered an adverse impact.²⁴

Following Reaves' lead, the NPS undertook the Section 106 compliance process to legally determine the fate of quarrying. In practice, there was no doubt that the quarrying would continue. Its sanction could withstand any legal challenge, and as many within the NPS pointed out, curtailing the activity would have been a public relations disaster that could have done vast damage to NPS relations with Native Americans.²⁵ But Park Service officials needed approval to continue their congressionally sanctioned programs.

The NPS began to implement its compliance activities. Regional officials dug out John Sigstad's archeological study of the monument, performed in 1965 and 1966, to use as its compliance inventory. The Midwest Archeological Center in Lincoln, Nebraska, an arm of the NPS, agreed that Sigstad's work was a thorough inventory, and Acting Chief Adrienne Anderson

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Ibid.

noted that the quarrying had enough historical importance to mitigate the adverse impact of the activity. Park Service officials offered the management expertise of the agency and its continued supervision and administration of the quarry and its use as a remedy for the situation. With this potential resolution, the NPS approached the Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office to get the concurrence of that agency. Initially, state officials did not respond, but in phone conversations, NPS personnel secured their agreement.²⁶

Receiving the comments of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation was the next step. As soon as ACHP officials received Reaves' memorandum, they requested an NPS investigation to determine if ACHP comment was required. The Park Service regarded the impact of quarrying as adverse, necessitating a response from ACHP. Yet in October 1976, more than one year after the NPS began to evaluate its actions at Pipestone, the ACHP had not yet heard from the NPS. With a little prompting from ACHP officials, the Park Service quickly produced initial documentation.²⁷

²⁶ Adrienne Anderson to Regional Chief, Federal, State, and Private Liaison, Midwest Regional Office, July 15, 1975, H2215-PIPE; Merrill D. Beal to Russell M. Fridley, Director, Minnesota Historical Society, January 22, 1976, H34, National Park Service, Midwest Regional Office, Omaha, Nebraska.

²⁷ John D. McDermott to Merrill D. Beal, June 18, 1975; Merrill D. Beal to Robert Garvey, August 5, 1975; Regional Director to Robert Garvey, May 24, 1976, H34 MWR CL, National Park Service, Midwest Regional Office, Omaha, Nebraska; Acting Regional Director to Robert Garvey, October 20, 1976; Myra F. Harrison to Merrill D. Beal, October 20, 1976, Merrill D. Beal to Robert Garvey, November 12, 1976, H30 MWR PE, National Park Service, Midwest Regional

The reticence on the part of the Park Service resulted from a natural fear of dealing with a new agency that had the power to behave in a capricious manner. The 1974 directives changed the rules within the Park Service for administering historic and cultural resources. In the view of agency officials, the ACHP was an unknown factor. The NPS had offered a potentially damaging assessment of its legally mandated activities at Pipestone. Although the ACHP had only the right to comment, if it disagreed with the contention that quarrying was a significant historic activity and its impact could be mitigated through careful management, the Park Service faced a complex legal situation at Pipestone.

Some sort of memorandum of agreement was the likely solution. In response to the NPS, the ACHP offered a proposal that moved toward an accord. The ACHP disagreed with the Park Service, for it did not regard quarrying as an adverse impact. Quarrying was the principal reason that the monument was reserved, and ACHP officials recognized the importance of the activity and believed that the Park Service should continue to encourage quarrying in the future. They also expressed concern about the loss of information that resulted from continued quarrying and recommended a resources management plan to address such questions.²⁸

Office, Omaha, Nebraska.

²⁸ John D. McDermott to Merrill D. Beal, February 10, 1977; Acting Associate Regional Director, Planning and Resource Preservation to Chief, Midwest Archeological Center and

Yet there were some aspects of the comments of the ACHP that disturbed the Park Service officials. Such areas usually reflected an intensive and expensive degree of management that the NPS regarded as more effort than necessary. In one example, the ACHP report noted the importance of the tailings piles of quarried and discarded pipestone material as a source of information. ACHP officials suggested an ongoing program of research into this and other areas as part of the mitigation process. They felt this would add measurably to knowledge about the quarries. NPS officials regarded such ongoing activities as costly and unnecessary. Prior archeological studies by Beaubien, Sigstad, and Reaves did not reveal stratigraphic information in the tailings piles, nor was any other evidence of ordering apparent. The Park Service previously compiled more information than the ACHP was willing to recognize, and implementation of the suggestions of the ACHP seemed likely to deprive the park of resources necessary for the management of other aspects of the monument.

The two agencies had different focuses. In an ironic maneuver in the aftermath of Utley's contention about the importance of preservation, NPS officials reminded the ACHP that they had other responsibilities as well. The perspective of the two differed as well. The NPS regarded historic activities as

Superintendent, Pipestone National Monument, March 11, 1977, H30
MWR PE, National Park Service, Midwest Regional Office, Omaha,
Nebraska.

more important, while the ACHP wanted more effort expended on evaluating modern cultural resources practices.²⁹

The difference in opinion sprung from an obvious inconsistency in the position of the NPS. Although the Park Service insisted that ongoing quarrying activity was the most important facet of cultural resources management at Pipestone, its response suggested that in fact, historic quarrying was the primary value of the monument. NPS officials stressed mitigation for the reopening of areas of historic quarrying, with lesser emphasis on the cultural resources related to modern activity. The ACHP suggested a route, though expensive, that elevated modern quarrying to a position of prominence at the monument.

The result of this disagreement moved the Park Service toward a systematic kind of resources management at Pipestone National Monument. By November 1977, NPS officials had not heard from the ACHP and assumed ACHP acquiescence to the counterproposal the Park Service offered. The NPS proceeded with research to determine the extent of pipestone deposits and their distribution at the monument as a prelude to resources management planning. ACHP officials were willing to accept a resources management plan as a Section 106 compliance document, and the Park Service assembled what became the catalyst for another

²⁹ Merrill D. Beal to John D. McDermott, April 26, 1977, H30 MWR PE, National Park Service, Midwest Regional Office, Omaha, Nebraska.

change in the philosophy of resources management at the monument.³⁰

The debut of the resources management plan for Pipestone in 1981 revealed that management priorities and procedures had again changed. Included in the document was an overview and assessment of natural and cultural resources management needs, project statement and programming sheets, and an environmental assessment. In natural resources management, the plan suggested that basic research had been accomplished and present needs in interpretation, management, and preservation were being met. Some problems, such as the appearance of domesticates such as stray cats and dogs and occasional other feral animals, had no easy solution, while a major issue, water pollution, was beyond agency jurisdiction. Cultural resources management presented a different range of management issues. Further archeological research was necessary, as was a "general museum exhibit overhaul," not the first time that the inadequacy of static interpretation at the monument attracted attention. The plan served as a means to develop long-range programming for Pipestone, as well as to summarize and evaluate the goals and objectives of prior activities.³¹ It was a watershed, the first

³⁰ Regional Director to Central File, Midwest Region, August 9, 1979, H4217 MWR(PE); Regional Chief Scientist, Operations, Midwest Region to Don Albin, District Chief, U.S. Geological Survey, July 30, 1979, K3035 MWR(MN); Acting Chief, Midwest Archeological Center to Chief, Cultural Resources Management, July 28, 1980, H2215-PIPE, National Park Service, Midwest Regional Office, Omaha, Nebraska.

³¹ Resources Management Plan and Environmental Assessment, Pipestone National Monument, December 21, 1982, D18, Pipestone National Monument.

comprehensive look at resources management practices and plans at the monument.

It also inaugurated a new style of resources management. The resource management plan took precedence over any individual project, centralizing goals and driving every facet of research and resource management. Resources management plans became common throughout the agency in the late 1970s, and they had vast impact on the way parks functioned. Priorities and revisions of lists of significant needs came to replace ad hoc management throughout the system.

The change in policy and process required that staff members acquire different skills than their predecessors. Park officials began to search for people who could implement the programs they recommended in their management plans. Some parks were able to secure permanent resource management either by hiring new personnel or converting existing staff through retraining. At Pipestone, funding from the Natural Resources Preservation Program [NRPP] for a comprehensive prairie management and exotic species eradication program supported only a temporary staff member, Denise Boudreaux. Ecologist Gary Willson of the regional office designed the program in coordination with Boudreaux. The park tried unsuccessfully to find permanent funding for Boudreaux's position, and she left the NPS in 1991. In September 1991, Willson transferred to a global climate change coordinator position at the University of Missouri-Columbia. The departure of the two primary people involved in the natural resources

management program created a large gap for Pipestone. The regional office recognized the value of the work accomplished by Boudreaux and Willson and coordinated the recruitment of Pamela Benjamin, a natural resources management specialist from the service-wide training program. In the spring of 1992, she arrived at the monument. The regional office also agreed to fund the program until it became permanent.³²

Pipestone accomplished much research in both cultural and natural resources management during the 1980s. Without a park archeologist, basic fieldwork fell to the Midwest Archeological Center of the NPS, located in Lincoln, Nebraska. The center provided field archeological work, excavating the bones of a large mammal found during trail work, monitoring capital development work such as the installation of underground powerlines, and performing in lieu of a park archeologist. This model had become common throughout the agency. Prior examples included the Navajo Lands Group, which provided the smaller park areas of Navajoland with archeological and maintenance support, the Western Archeological and Conservation Center in Tucson, which provided archeological work after the demise of the Navajo Lands Group in 1983, and the Submerged Cultural Resources unit in Santa Fe, which handled much of the underwater archeological work throughout the agency. Such entities spared small park areas

³² Vincent Halvorson interview; Steve Cinnamon to Ellen Foppes, August 1, 1992.

from supporting a permanent staff member in a field they did not need on a full-time basis.

Because of the increased demand for specialization at the park staff level, contract work became an important part of the resources management process. These studies became the basis for a significant portion of resources management decision-making. A prairie management study by Roger Q. Landers, Jr., of Iowa State University, revealed that most of the trees at the monument dated from the beginning of fire suppression about 1880 and recommended that the Park Service continue to use fire to manage wooded areas of the monument. By burning even the area near the circle trail, Landers believed that the monument could move towards presenting a natural setting similar to that described by early Anglo-American observers of the area. The program had gained much ground since Landers' previous work in 1975 and even more since Lyle Linch began to think in that direction in 1950. Further work published in 1986 by Donald A. Becker outlined the actions necessary to restore a vegetation scene that resembled the historic period at Pipestone. In addition, Becker identified stream and prairie wetland degradation as the most critical resources management problem at the monument, with extirpation of native prairie plants a close second. The remedies for these problems required long-term commitment of agency resources at the regional office-level and the cooperation of other agencies as well as short-term measures that reflected the capabilities of

the staff at the monument.³³ Yet the research itself was directed toward developing an ongoing strategy to manage long-term issues. From an overall perspective, such work promised solid management for the future.

Work in other areas also continued. An evaluation of the Catlinite resources of the monument in 1980-81 yielded information about the distribution and quantity of pipestone within the boundaries of the monument and identified eight sites with high potential to contain large deposits of the stone for future quarrying. A mineralogical characterization of the material in 1991 added new perspective, filling gaps in scientific knowledge and asking new questions about the nature of pipestone.³⁴

Cultural resources management also underwent a similar process of standardization in the 1980s. While more issues remained to be addressed, new directions suggested that the comprehensive planning process would also encompass even the peripheries of cultural resources management. Inadequate museum interpretation remained a primary issue. The 1971 interpretive prospectus recommended comprehensive changes but had never been

³³ Roger Q. Landers, Jr., "A Report on Management of Native Prairie Areas, Pipestone National Monument," February 1, 1979; Donald A. Becker with Thomas B. Bragg and David M. Sutherland, "Vegetation Survey and Prairie Management Plan for Pipestone National Monument," August 1986, National Park Service, Midwest Regional Office, Omaha, Nebraska.

³⁴ G. B. Morey, "Evaluation of Catlinite Resources, Pipestone National Monument, Minnesota," National Park Service, Midwest Region, Research/Resources Management Report MWR-4, April 1983; Gundersen, "The Mineralogical Characterization of Catlinite."

implemented. The story told in the museum had become an embarrassing anachronism, and park staff anxiously awaited funding to revise interpretation. In addition, a new collections management policy was drafted in 1987 in an effort to establish collecting policy, set goals and limits for collecting, and enhance the procedure for describing the object categories in the collection. By 1988, the park had a new scope of collections statement that established clear boundaries for the monument.³⁵

With direction established through the planning process, new priorities for the monument had been developed. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, archeology was low on the list for Pipestone and seemed likely to remain there for the foreseeable future. There was no park archeologist, and the Midwest Archeological Center, which had responsibility for archeology in the Midwest Region, was inundated with the needs of new park areas. In comparison to other parks in the region, Pipestone had been thoroughly studied. As a result, despite a long-term need for additional field work, particularly in the northern part of the monument, the archeological component of cultural resources management had been delayed. In an effort to achieve some progress in this area, the park sought cooperating agreements for field research with accredited universities.³⁶

³⁵ Betty McSwain interview; Betsy H. Bradley, "Pipestone National Monument Collection Management Plan," June 1987, D6215, Pipestone; "Pipestone National Monument Scope of Collection Statement," November 17, 1988, K18, Pipestone.

³⁶ Vincent Halvorson interview; Resources Management Plan, Pipestone, 1982.

By the early 1990s, the climate in which natural and cultural resources management occurred had come to reflect the professionalism of the Park Service. Resources management had become a sophisticated, science-based field that helped allow for standardization of management practices at Pipestone. In a future of limited allocations, careful management of natural and cultural resources will become an increasingly important responsibility for park staff. As they are required to do more of the management with less financial support, policy recommendations in planning documents will become increasingly important ways of programming the future needs of the monument. But if the experience of the museum at Pipestone is indicative, even the most worthy of programs may take a very long time to implement.

CHAPTER VIII: THE PARK AND ITS NEIGHBORS: THE HIAWATHA CLUB

The annual presentation of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's classic poem, The Song of Hiawatha, as a dramatic performance has become an important link between Pipestone National Monument, the town of Pipestone, the surrounding region, and a public interested in history and culture. Each summer, the pageant recurred, bringing visitors, media attention, and a sense of vitality to the Pipestone area. The pageant provided a tremendous boost for the local economy. People from all over the northern plains attended, staying in town, spending money, and contributing to an enlivened cultural and economic environment. The park received thousands of extra visitors as a result of the pageant. But The Song of Hiawatha is a complicated endeavor that requires much cooperation and compromise and has entailed significant management issues.

The roots of the pageant predated the creation of the national monument. It was first performed during the 1930s by children from the Pipestone Indian School in an area to the east of Winnewissa Falls along Pipestone Creek. Mrs. Omar Rains, the wife of the principal of the Indian School who also taught in the school, served as director. The story was narrated by an older student, usually a ninth-grader, and to carry the storyline, the cast floated a crude raft down the creek when necessary.¹

¹ Wanita Beal, I Have a Story to Tell About Pipestone (Pipestone, MN: Wanita B. Beal, 1991), 54.

The first incarnation of the pageant was short-lived. After a few seasons of the performance, a drought dried up the creek. During World War II, the Indian School had no more resources than any other similar institution. The Rains family moved to Fort Smith, Arkansas, eliminating another catalyst for the performance, and as the Indian School became subject to closure after the Second World War, enthusiasm for the activity diminished. The pageant became a memory.²

But one local man carried the idea of the pageant onward. An avid reader of Longfellow since childhood, Robert S. Owens was determined to recreate the pageant. He selected a spot near the Three Maidens, purchased the land, and sought the support of his friends in the community. The founding of the local Exchange Club helped the project. It had been formed to promote the pageant. But national exchange clubs were dinner gatherings, a format that did not suit the needs of a community with a show to produce. The local club stopped having dinners, leading to a rift with the national organization. The local incarnation of the Exchange Club ceased to exist and was replaced by the Hiawatha Club, the sole purpose of which was to put on the pageant.³

The initial pageants were "weird," as Gilbert Backlund, who along with Lyle Linch was one of the first new members to join after the club was chartered, recalled. The stage was a narrow

² Ibid.

³ Gilbert Backlund interview.

little strip in front of the Three Maidens. Owens remembered that the first show had "a basketful of mishaps." A narrative tape had been recorded in advance, and the day of the performance, Owens sat down to listen to it to make sure it would work. The tape was blank, necessitating a 45-mile drive to nearby Marshall to find another announcer. As Owens returned at the end of the day, storm clouds gathered to the west. On the night the show was set to debut, a cloudburst washed out the performance.⁴

Other problems were more mundane. At the beginning, there was no seating, and people brought their own blankets. The only place to spread them out was a long way from the stage. The audience used field glasses to see the activities. Many remembered the bugs as being awful, and insecticide became standard equipment. The first lighting came from car headlights. The crowds were small and mostly local, and the director rounded up people for the show. Often the audience consisted of family members and few others. At its beginning, the pageant was an amateur affair.⁵

Despite such travail, the pageant continued. Robert Owens and his wife, Mary, were instrumental in its growth, and the community rallied around the idea of the show. Many people contributed time and effort to keep the project going, and as in any similar production, the skills of nearly every professional

⁴ Beal, Pipestone, 54-58; Gilbert Backlund interview.

⁵ Gilbert Backlund interview.

and tradesperson in town were necessary. Newcomers also participated, as the pageant became a way to become part of the community. One such person was Kay Gillott, who with her husband, Chet, came to Pipestone during the first summer of the pageant. Gillott had been a teacher in Minneapolis and had an interest in poetry and literature. She was also close to the literary and theater communities in the state and became a valuable resource. Her contribution became evident the second summer, when she directed the pageant.⁶

Initially, the Park Service paid little attention to the pageant. Despite the involvement of Linch, NPS officials regarded the pageant as a largely local event. Linch's participation may have inspired more worry than confidence. By 1950, the regional office was well aware of his idiosyncratic sense of significance. Many regarded the pageant as a "stunt out of keeping" with agency objectives for the monument. In the first years of the pageant, no regional office personnel attended, prompting at least one typical outburst from Linch. "I was bitterly disappointed that even the added inducement of the unique and classic "Song of Hiawatha" pageant failed to attract any of our supervisory superiors," he wrote with great sarcasm in the summer of 1950. "I strongly feel that the pageant is

⁶ Beal, Pipestone, 55.

destined to be a rapidly growing Siamese twin attraction for this great grain basket area."⁷

In this respect, Linch was correct. During the following decade, tremendous growth in the pageant and its facilities occurred. In 1952, Philip J. Smith of the drama department at the University of Minnesota became director of the pageant. He was charged with making the performance professional. Smith retained the vocal solos by local performers and the gestures, pronunciations, and voice inflection taught to the performers by Charles Morrison, a teacher at the Indian School, but reshaped the rest of the program. He used music departments at universities to assist in finding appropriate music, selected the best voices among his students as narrators, coached local performers, and improved the staging. Although he stayed only two years, Smith helped shape the pageant into something more than a local event.⁸

Professionalization helped make the popularity of the pageant grow. Other faculty members followed Smith, and the pageant became a regional theater kind of performance. By the late 1950s, the club had more than \$20,000 invested in a range of equipment and capital facilities. Bleachers and opera-style seating had been constructed, as had light towers and a building

⁷ Superintendent, Pipestone National Monument to Regional Director, Region Two, July 27, 1950; Regional Historian to Acting Assistant Regional Director, August 30, 1951, Box 194, Folder 501, Kansas City Federal Records Center.

⁸ Beal, Pipestone, 56-57.

with communications equipment to run the show. In a decade, the pageant had become an important institution.⁹

Yet the pageant reflected only some aspects of the mythic past. Although the pageant and the poem on which it was based presented a positive if romanticized view of Native Americans, few of the participants in its activities were Indian. A number of people with close ties to the park and the town, most notably Bea Burns and George and Winona Bryan, were involved, but generally, area Native Americans avoided the pageant. The heritage they saw presented seemed foreign to their experience.¹⁰

Leaders of the pageant made some attempts to include more Indians in the pageant. In the early 1960s, club members drove to Nebraska to hire Native Americans to participate in the pageant. The Indians danced in costume at the festivities in what some remembered as a caricature of their traditions. But the lack of Indian participation remained notable. It was as if local Native Americans sought to demonstrate their discomfort by refusing to participate.¹¹

During the 1950s and 1960s, the pageant had grown into a regional tradition that the Park Service had come to enthusiastically support. Lynch's sarcasm piqued the interest of

⁹ Ibid., 55.

¹⁰ Cecil Lewis interview; Raymond L. "Chuck" Derby interview.

¹¹ Gilbert Backlund interview; Cecil Lewis interview; Raymond L. "Chuck" Derby interview.

the regional office, and some from the staff visited the pageant. Regional Historian Merrill J. Mattes was the first; on his initial trip in 1952, he was "agreeably surprised." The pageant was far more professional than he anticipated. Throughout the 1950s, Pipestone remained an outpost in the park system, and with its new visitor center, the park had attributes the agency sought to showcase. Increasingly, agency officials believed that the presence of the pageant supported the objectives of the Park Service, bringing visitors to the area without the commitment of agency resources. It became a "real asset" for the monument, as Mattes noted in 1951. In the 1960s, the pageant took on a celebratory character, as Regional Office officials attended, accepting accolades for the role of NPS in supporting the project.¹² By 1970, the Park Service had become a major supporter of the pageant.

The change in the Park Service view of the pageant stemmed from a number of sources. The developments of the MISSION 66 program helped bring Pipestone National Monument more into the mainstream of the agency. After MISSION 66, the monument got more attention from the regional office than ever before, and events such as the pageant became worthy of notice. The growth of the pageant and its impact on visitation at the monument were also noteworthy. So was the effort to professionalize the presentation of a classic poem to the public. While NPS

¹² Regional Historian to Acting Assistant Regional Director, August 30, 1951, Box 194, Folder 501, Kansas City Federal Records Center; Don Thompson interview.

officials might not always approve of such an event, the Park Service understood the importance of good public relations and community relations. Agency personnel also recognized an asset when they saw one.

Nor was their confidence misguided. By the middle of the 1960s, the pageant had become a local tradition and a fixture of the cultural landscape. Foreign visitors became common, with Europeans, themselves overwhelmingly interested in the experiences of Native Americans, predominating. Local businesses anticipated the coming of the pageant in the way that merchants in a college town await homecoming. There was little to object to in the pageant. Everyone made money, the town of Pipestone had a unifying event, and the portrayal of Native Americans was benign, if a little patronizing. In an era that prided itself on an increasing liberalism regarding minority groups, the pageant fulfilled many socio-cultural needs.

But like nearly everything else in the United States, the changing cultural climate of the late 1960s affected The Song of Hiawatha pageant. After nearly two decades of trying to eliminate Indian tribal structure, the federal government adopted a policy that allowed Native Americans greater autonomy than they had since the beginning of the reservation system. In the aftermath of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Voting Rights Act of 1965, a spate of new legislation that formalized Indian control over their lives and customs continued for more than a decade. A cultural awakening seized the nation. For Native

Americans, a movement that challenged the romantic view of native experiences closely followed.¹³ In a time of increased militance, the pageant was vulnerable to charges that its very nature exploited Native American culture.

At Pipestone, this culminated in an incident at the pageant in 1970. Although the Native Americans who lived in Pipestone were generally conservative, Minneapolis became a center of activism. Urban Indians faced more bleak and trying conditions, and Native American support groups formed to help newcomers from the reservations adapt to city life. These groups became increasingly militant, spreading their message not only to other Indians, but to the larger world as well. At the 1970 pageant, a number of activists disrupted the performance as an expression of their discontent, stamping their feet, shouting epithets and briefly drowning out performers. Aggressive and strident, these groups temporarily focused their animosity on the pageant.¹⁴

Yet, as one former superintendent noted, such expressions were short-lived because of the genuinely benign nature of the pageant. The Song of Hiawatha shared little with the offensive stereotypes of Native Americans that permeated nineteenth-century American literature. The poem "did the Indian quite a bit of justice," former Superintendent Cecil D. Lewis, Jr., remarked,

¹³ Prucha, The Great Father, 2:1139-70; Parman, "Indians of the Modern West," in Nash and Etulain, The Twentieth-Century West, 165.

¹⁴ Cecil Lewis interview.

dispelling the fears of the militants.¹⁵ Romanticized characterizations of Native Americans were the least of their worries, for they engaged in a form of romanticism tinged with direct action that differed more in degree than kind from that embodied in Longfellow. Their actions were symbolic, an effort to disrupt a symbol of that to which they objected. To many Native Americans, a pageant about Native American culture that included few Native Americans represented the worst side of American popular culture to Native Americans. In this, the pageant differed little from all the bad western movies of yesteryear.

Despite the fact that Lewis was called back to the monument to help diffuse the situation, the protests ceased before his return. Planning to continue their protest, the militants stayed in the area to observe the situation of Native Americans in the community, park, and pageant. By the next week, they discovered that Pipestone offered Native Americans many positive opportunities. The superintendent at the time, Clarence N. Gorman, was a Navajo, and the man sent in to help, Cecil Lewis, was Sac and Fox, Delaware, and Potowatomi. The two had gone to grade school together in Chinle, Arizona, and together made up a strong Indian presence at the monument. There, Native Americans had positions of leadership. The monument worked to convey a comprehensive approach to the history of the people of the northern plains, the Pipestone Indian Shrine Association created

¹⁵ Ibid.

economic opportunity, the Native Americans of the town were generally positive about local institutions, and the pageant, at the very worst, was benign. Although the militants stayed in town, they ceased to protest.¹⁶

In the aftermath of the incident, relations between the Native American community in Pipestone and the pageant improved. The increased involvement started during Lewis' superintendency and continued throughout Gorman's tenure and that of his successor, Don Thompson. As a result of what Lewis characterized as a number of "misunderstandings," the local Indian community felt that the pageant had discriminated against its members. With Lewis's leadership and the close relations between the park and the local Native American community, the problems were slowly rectified. Bea Burns continued to play Nicomus in the pageant, and Chuck Derby and his daughter also participated.¹⁷ New bonds were formed that furthered the goals of pageant, the Native American community in Pipestone, and the monument.

The outburst at the pageant in 1970 signified one kind of change at the monument, but other far more ominous forces have affected the pageant. The decline of American education and the subsequent lack of inclination to teach poetry or any other subject with real content to American school children has limited the potential for growth of the pageant. Poems such as The Song of Hiawatha used to be the common currency of anyone who

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid.

graduated from eighth grade in the United States. By the 1990s, they were no longer part of the common experience, nor really was any other basic educational document. As the U.S. hesitantly embraced the concept of multicultural education, the presentation of Native American experience made Longfellow and his views anachronistic. The combination of these factors deprived the pageant of much of its younger audience, complicating the future of the pageant. Few young people were exposed to The Song of Hiawatha, and each year, the audience at the pageant became more gray.

The Park Service took an active role in the affairs of the Hiawatha Club, for the people of the monument had an investment in the public perception of the program. Visitation increased dramatically during the pageant weekends, and because of its themes, the public evinced a much stronger interest in the history of the quarries and the people that used them. The park also liked to keep track of the activities of the Hiawatha Club. In many areas with similar kinds of privately run events that reflected the themes of nearby park areas, the NPS found itself combating substandard interpretation, anachronistic and inappropriate costuming, and other problems that affected the ability to interpret within park boundaries. Close ties were essential.

The Park Service had no control over the pageant, but its officials were valued members of the Pipestone community. The boundary issue was still alive, and the Hiawatha Club needed the

cooperation of the Park Service to assure the smooth operation of the pageant. Park personnel became a fixture on the Hiawatha Club Board. For many years, the superintendent and the chief of interpretation and resources management were members as a result of their position at the monument. Their presence gave the Park Service the opportunity to influence the decisions of the Hiawatha Club.

Yet administrative control and consistency in relations still escaped the Park Service. Following the incident in 1970, park officials sought to more clearly define the relationship between the club and park. In the middle of the decade, Superintendent Don Thompson negotiated a memorandum that governed the relationship. While this effectively established the parameters of interaction, there were a number of ongoing issues. At the end of the 1980s, the Park Service determined that the old memorandum no longer sufficed. Superintendent Vincent J. Halvorson sought a special use permit for the Hiawatha Club that more clearly delineated obligations and responsibilities. By the early 1990s, this goal had been achieved.¹⁸

The main point of potential contention between the monument and the Hiawatha Club was the uncertainty of physical boundaries between park and club land. Since the 1940s, the issue had been confused and convoluted; on more than one occasion, Park Service officials thought they secured the Three Maidens and the area

¹⁸ Statement for Management, Pipestone National Monument, revised March 30, 1984; Statement for Management, Pipestone National Monument, December 30, 1988.

around it, yet were frustrated by the lack of purchase money, city council decisions, inaccurate description of the land in question, and longstanding local custom. Superintendents recognized that the monument had little to gain from forcing the issue, and the loosely constructed relationship continued unimpeded, with people on both sides alternately chafing and chafed.

Yet by the 1980s, Pipestone National Monument had become a different kind of park. In response to the changing tenor of the agency, many of the informal procedures that long characterized the agency were clarified and formalized. Young park superintendents recognized that the future depended on their ability to execute the policies of the agency. When Halvorson arrived at Pipestone in 1982, he placed resolving the boundary issues at the top of his list of priorities. He researched the land descriptions, determined where the boundary was located, brought in a surveyor who marked the exact line, put up boundary markers, and made sure the boundaries were clear. Then Halvorson brought Robert S. Owens, recorder of deeds of Pipestone County as well as inspiration behind the Hiawatha Club and its pageant, to view the boundary lines marked by the surveyor. Halvorson demonstrated that the land had never been removed from the public domain, and Owens agreed. The Park Service in fact owned part of the land to which the club lay claim.¹⁹

¹⁹ Vincent Halvorson interview.

This was a disconcerting reality for the members of the Hiawatha Club. Long used to autonomy and a sense of proprietary control of the land, they were compelled to face different realities. Although some of the members of the club feared that the NPS would use the situation to put the pageant out of business, park officials had little desire to do so. The pageant clearly expressed the interdependent relationship of the town and the park. Terminating the pageant would be "like committing suicide in this town," Superintendent Halvorson remarked in 1991.²⁰ The adjustment of formal boundaries reflected internal agency objectives much more than any relationship with the pageant. In the first decade following resolution, there was little impact on the pageant.

Close ties between the Park Service and the pageant persisted in the public mind. NPS officials at the park and regional office recognized that much of the public perceived the pageant as a function of the agency. In the early 1990s, Pipestone National Monument still received telephone calls from people who wanted to purchase pageant tickets or find out when it occurred. More vexing were the slow but steady stream of inquiries about the characterization of Native Americans presented by the pageant. While the performance had come a long way in its sensitivity since the days when Indians were hired to dance as a sideshow, the tone of militance and the growing trend toward multiculturalism assured that such presentations would be

²⁰ Ibid.

carefully scrutinized. Yet at the beginning of the 1990s, the Park Service remained committed to the pageant. Only serious and persistent objections from Native Americans could compel NPS to reconsider the relationship.²¹

The story of the Hiawatha Club pageant at Pipestone National Monument reflected much of the changing nature of Park Service administration. Like many remote park areas, Pipestone functioned more as part of the local community than the national park system during much of its early history. The result was the codification of practices that could not be initiated in an era of more strict adherence to the policies of the agency. Yet at Pipestone and many other park areas, these vestiges of a more fluid and less structured past remain, creating a number of management issues for agency administrators and compelling close and careful management.

Events such as the Hiawatha Club pageant add much to a community and lay the basis for close cooperation between park areas and surrounding communities. At Pipestone, the pageant also reflects the themes of the park, drawing the two entities closer than they otherwise might be. The result has been a complicated set of interactions that has helped both the park and the club, while simultaneously causing the leadership of both many sleepless nights. In the early 1990s, the relationship appeared to work well. In the changing cultural climate of the

²¹ Ibid.

United States, maintaining that close and mutually beneficial interaction may become more difficult.

CHAPTER IX: THREATS TO THE PARK

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, external threats to national park areas became a central administrative issue for the National Park Service. At Pipestone National Monument, this had typical ramifications. Like many park areas, Pipestone was surrounded by private land over which the agency could exert varying degrees of influence. The area reserved for Yankton access under the 1858 treaty was 640 acres, in itself not large enough to eliminate threats from beyond the park borders. In 1937, 115 acres were deeded to NPS, a minuscule size to protect from encroachment. Even the addition of 164 acres to the monument during the 1950s and the creation of the 100-acre state game refuge did little to insulate the park. The General Services Administration sold the remaining portion of the original 640-acre reserved area to the state of Minnesota and the city of Pipestone with a covenant that the land be used for educational purposes, but even this caveat did little to assure the kind of land use that would protect the monument. The small size of Pipestone National Monument enhanced its vulnerability.

As a result, Pipestone National Monument remained an island, surrounded by other types of land use and susceptible to encroachment from a number of different sources. To the east, roughly half of the original reserved area that passed to the city and state became Southwest Technical College. One private development, a KOA facility, and a Good Samaritan Society project, a home for retired people, were also located in that

area. The rest of the area was contracted out to farmers. To the south lay the Hiawatha Club land and facilities and a parcel of private farm land. To the west, private farmland dominated the boundary, and in the northwest corner of the monument an historic cemetery added another dimension to potential management problems surrounding the monument.

With its 283-acre landbase, Pipestone National Monument faced problems that were even more severe than those of many larger national park areas. Many of the western national parks were surrounded by federal land in other jurisdictions, allowing the Park Service a measure of input in decision-making that private landowners were unlikely to consider. Other parks had such vast land bases that while encroachment of various kinds was a problem, it did not present an overwhelming threat to the management of park areas.

The importance of the management of land outside park boundaries to the NPS and the park system was a phenomenon of the post-World War II era. Because of the nature of the selection process that limited most early national park areas to tracts of federal land in largely unsettled areas, the first generation of national parks rarely faced significant encroachment. Inholdings, land claims that were perfected before the founding of the park, were the worst threat to these parks. A general lack of access was a greater problem to the growing agency and its mission than was the proximity of other activities. Postwar development, better transportation systems, and more leisure time

and money for the middle class spurred dramatic increases in visitation. Instead of being ignored into oblivion, the park system faced the prospect of being overrun.¹

Capital development to accommodate visitors was the NPS response, but such programs did little to address a parallel issue: the growing dependence of local economies such as that of the town of Pipestone on their regional national park area. As the nature of the American economy began to change, small towns held fewer opportunities for young people. The tourism industry, with its emphasis on bringing in revenue generated in other places, held tremendous appeal. National park areas offered genuine advantages for this quest, for the brown sign that indicated a national-caliber attraction influenced the choices of travelers far more than did any similar local and state feature. In towns such as Pipestone, the presence of the park became an important part of the local economy.

Yet the Park Service only slowly recognized the implications of this gradual shift. Well into the 1970s, the NPS took a narrow view of its responsibilities, regarding events within park boundaries as its primary and many times exclusive focus. The development of exploitive ticky-tacky businesses on park boundaries, while a nuisance, was seen as beyond the purview of

¹ Ise, Our National Park Policy, 534-36; Foresta, America's National Parks and Their Keepers, 223-58.

agency officials. Most took the same response when faced with changes in private land management beyond park boundaries.²

The changing cultural climate of the 1960s and 1970s propelled the Park Service towards a new view of its responsibilities. In the 1960s, the conservation/environmental movement took a more holistic approach to preservation. This approach meshed with changes in scientific thinking, creating a stronger understanding of natural science that suggested the dire consequences of encroachment. Such concerns stretched beyond the protection of the park system, elevating the importance of unreserved landscapes to the management of the islands that many national park areas had become. By the 1970s, this perspective dominated policy in the Park Service, and a broader view of management followed.³

In resources management, this translated into a concern for lands outside park boundaries. The Park Service began to develop a strategy to combat this category of threats of growing importance. In the early 1970s, allied organizations such as the National Parks and Conservation Association and the National Parks for the Future study group expressed concern about activities beyond park boundaries. By the middle of the decade, NPS Director Gary E. Everhardt determined that threats to the parks were the most severe problem the system faced. An agency

² Conservation Fund, National Parks for the Future.

³ Runte, National Parks, 197-208; Foresta, America's National Parks and Their Keepers, 223-58.

report to Congress, The State of the Parks, 1980, became the catalyst for translating concern into policy. According to the study, the greatest and most comprehensive threats the park system faced came from beyond park boundaries. After its publication, the NPS fashioned a response. Each park was required to assess the nature of threats it faced and their potential for damaging the natural and cultural features of the area.⁴

Pipestone National Monument faced threats that were different from many other national park areas. Commercial enterprise, extractive resource use, and industrial development posed problems throughout the nation. Air pollution presented a growing threat in other places. But few parks other than Pipestone had to address problems associated with the changes in American agriculture.

At Pipestone, a study mandated by The State of the Parks, 1980 report determined that pollution of Pipestone Creek by runoff of pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers from area farms as well as waste from feedlots was the primary threat to the integrity of the monument. Polluted runoff resulted from the industrialization of American agriculture and the changes in practice and land use designed to facilitate greater crop yield. Much of this began in the 1930s. Like many other states,

⁴ John C. Freemuth, National Parks and the Politics of External Threats (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1991), 5-21; Foresta, America's National Parks and Their Keepers, 225-28, 232-37; Runte, National Parks, 261-63.

Minnesota gained infrastructure as a result of the New Deal. One of these projects, a drainage ditch system, "channeled" rivers to provide better distribution of water and runoff for agriculture. No one foresaw the increase in pesticide use that began after the Second World War and increased exponentially in 1950s and 1960s. As such use increased, the very system designed to help farmers became the means that spread the toxic runoff of agricultural progress.⁵

At Pipestone National Monument, a "fish kill" that occurred in the fall of 1982 illustrated the gravity of the problem. The Park Service set out to identify the culprit. It quickly ascertained that an agricultural drainage ditch that entered Pipestone Creek east of the monument had the potential to be a source of pollution. Pipestone Creek also served as storm sewer drainage for parts of the town. An old landfill just off the eastern boundary offered another potential source of pollution. Industrial or agricultural pollutants could have caused the kill, and after some study, farm chemicals and fertilizers draining from a culvert appeared to be the most likely cause. For aesthetic and health reasons, the issue had to be addressed, and the NPS embarked on a program of regular monitoring.⁶

Park staff brought the matter to the attention of the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA), where the reputation

⁵ Opie, The Law of the Land, 161-99.

⁶ Denise Stocks, Park Technician, "Water Quality Study Proposal SP 6540-4-0001," May 2, 1984, Pipestone, D18, Planning Program.

of the creek preceded it. "Pipestone Creek, the dirtiest little stream in Minnesota," one MPCA scientist in St. Paul remarked when informed of the problem. Water samples first taken in August 1983 indicated higher-than-normal levels of chloride and sulfate in the creek. Resource management ranger Denise Stocks assumed responsibility for monitoring the creek. Other park personnel were asked to watch for obvious signs of pollution. One park official remembered that "suds below the falls" were considered the most typical visual clue. A sampling and testing program was set up as a response. MPCA identified two point-source polluters, and for the immediate future, the problem was resolved.⁷

By the early 1990s, a consistent monitoring program was in place and there had been clear improvement, but agricultural and urban pollution required constant vigilance. Heavy rains often washed pollution through the monument before it could be monitored, suggesting that the overflow of ditches could have serious environmental consequences throughout southwestern Minnesota. Some observational accounts from 1991 indicated that the problems persisted. Occasionally debris such as paint cans, herbicide containers, and lumber washed out of the landfill and into the monument. One NPS official reported that sometimes when

⁷ Ibid.; Betty McSwain interview; "Resources Management Plan and Environmental Assessment, Pipestone National Monument," revised February 27, 1989, 6.

approaching the Winnewissa Falls, the smell of pesticide was overwhelming.⁸

There were other kinds of threats to national park areas. With a battle over the vistas of Manassas battlefield looming in the late 1980s, visual intrusions on park areas became a primary threat.⁹ As development threatened many parks, securing scenic easements and preventing development in the sight lines of park areas became an agency objective. Pipestone faced this particular problem. Located adjacent to a city, its accouterments such as power and gas lines, a cemetery, and city buildings intruded on the historic scene. Understanding the spirit of the quarries and seeing George Catlin riding up on his horse in the visitor's mind's eye became more difficult when the view included power lines and modern homes. Yet particularly on this issue, the Park Service could do little other than urge that adjacent landowners and others remain sensitive to park values. As in similar situations throughout the nation, some of them

⁸ Vincent Halvorson interview; Betty McSwain interview; Ellen K. Foppes to Hal K. Rothman, November 4, 1991; "Resources Management Plan," February 27, 1989.

⁹ Among the many newspaper and magazine accounts of what is now called "the Third Battle of Manassas," is Robert A. Webb, "The Third Battle of Manassas," Washington Post Weekly Edition, March 28-April 3, 1988; see also Jim Myers, "War Buffs, Builders Draw Battlelines," USA Today, June 24, 1988; and "What to Preserve and Protect?" U.S. News and World Report, July 16, 1990. For an interesting perspective on the issue, see Bruce Craig, "Confessions of a Guerilla Preservationist," in Michael G. Schene ed., The National Park Service and Historic Preservation (Malabar, FL: Krieger Press, forthcoming).

sought to help preserve the visual integrity of the park and others were ambivalent.

With a city as a neighbor, Pipestone National Monument faced a number of threats similar to those of many urban park areas. Domesticates such as dogs and cats were often found within its boundaries, and the noise of the city frequently intruded on the park. On some occasions, the spread of the community threatened the park. In the late 1970s, the City of Pipestone and a local development company, Brower-DeVries Estates, developed plans for a low-income housing area on the south boundary of the monument. Park officials found themselves in a difficult situation, arguing against the interests of a needy constituency for largely aesthetic reasons. The economic arguments about the value of tourism had yet to be widely accepted. After some negotiating, the two parties reached an agreement to put in a shelter belt of trees to conceal the buildings and protect the view from the park.¹⁰ While a less than optimal situation, the compromise reflected the difficulty of park management in the proximity of an urban area. In the end, construction of the housing did not take place.

Preserving the historic character of the grasslands at the monument also required constant NPS vigilance. Beginning in the 1940s, agency personnel made a concerted effort to recreate as much of the natural setting of the mid-nineteenth century as

¹⁰ Pipestone National Monument, 1977 Annual Report, 1, Pipestone National Monument, A2621-PD.

possible. The introduction of controlled burning in the 1970s helped restore prairie areas to a semblance of their historic character, but protecting these areas from the incursion of exotic plants and in some instances, aggressive native plants, required a sizable investment of time and resources. The fire-generated prairie areas at the monument supported interpretation, for they allowed visitors to experience the feel of an earlier time. Controlled burning and the use of approved herbicides formed much of the agency response to what will remain a constant threat to the historic character of the monument.

Another classic problem for national park areas also appeared at Pipestone. The appearance of tacky souvenir and curio shops near the entrances of park areas had been an agency problem since the 1910s. Places such as Yellowstone, Zion, and Carlsbad Caverns also experienced this affliction, but for a long time, the existence of the town of Pipestone insulated the monument from such activity. The souvenir shops remained downtown, not far at all from the monument.¹¹ In the early 1980s, a modern souvenir shop in the shape of a historic blockhouse was constructed directly across from the entrance to the park. Called "Fort Pipestone," this unlikely structure appeared historic to the uninitiated. This posed a classic NPS problem. At many parks, visitors had to run a gauntlet of souvenir shops before they reached the entrance, leaving some visitors feeling as if they had just experienced a carnival.

¹¹ Ise, Our National Park Policy, 232-38, 608-14.

Such an eventuality reflected poorly on the parks, for some visitors could not distinguish between NPS attractions and those of exploitive promoters. When such attractions were pseudo-historical, the Park Service faced a significant educational problem. At Pipestone, park personnel reported that some visitors mistook the structure for the monument.¹²

Ironically, outside threats to the cultural resources of the monument were limited. The unique mandate of the park offered inherent protection for its resources, and the consistent activity associated with quarrying and the close management necessary to assure that it continued in a traditional manner allowed the Park Service greater control than was typical. Other parks with cultural resources faced the potential for great damage from the outside, but at Pipestone, the real threats were to the natural features of the monument.

An even greater threat loomed on the horizon at the start of the 1990s. Throughout the park system, funding limitations placed expanded programming in jeopardy, and in some cases, base budget cuts threatened existing levels of service. An extraordinary federal budget deficit, the aftermath of the savings and loan scandals, and a prolonged recession in the early 1990s meant that the situation was likely to grow far worse before it improved. Every penny became valuable as the funding for a range of kinds of programs disappeared, with little hope of base budget increases to offset the change.

¹² Betty McSwain interview; Vincent Halvorson interview.

Changes in the philosophy of national park management at the Cabinet level aggravated the situation. Throughout the 1980s in the Reagan-era Department of the Interior and particularly during the tenure of Secretary of the Interior James Watt, funding was almost exclusively directed toward providing amenities for park visitors. With a lack of respect for the preservation side of the mission of the Park Service, Watt held a vision of the national parks as playgrounds and expected them to cater to the sedentary with the kinds of facilities available in suburban America. Hotels, roads, and other trappings of convenience dominated his approach to national park management, and with a zealotry designed to infuriate and fragment the traditional bipartisan support for national parks, he focused on his self-proclaimed mission to turn the parks back to the people. Other kinds of programming suffered or were maintained through "soft money," funds not included in the base budget of park areas, and the concern of individuals and organizations at the national, regional, or park level.¹³

Watt's policies limited the chances for growth at Pipestone. As a result of declining or constant numbers of visitors since the mid-1970s, Pipestone did not qualify for the type of development the new leadership emphasized. Most people within and outside the agency felt that the physical plant at Pipestone was sufficient. The monument needed resources management and protection from external threats more than new buildings. With

¹³ Runte, National Parks, 259-61.

its claim on new funding declining along with visitation totals, park staff had to wait for an era with a different set of priorities.

With the return of high-level departmental leadership more in tune with the historic priorities and balance of objectives in the agency, the climate for supporting other kinds of activities improved. In the mid- to late-1980s, managers across the system readied new plans for all kinds of activity in an effort to accumulate the kind of baseline data necessary for long-term decision-making. About the same time, the combined burdens of the American economy slowed growth that could allow for increased expenditures on park protection and management. Many in the Park Service embraced a cautious optimism.

Despite the sense of Watt and his subordinates that places such as Pipestone needed little, the monument faced major funding needs at the dawn of the 1990s. The exhibits in the museum dated from 1958 and required a complete overhaul. Interpretation reflected the standards of the 1950s, and the language, terminology, and ideas reflected the values of American society before the cultural turmoil that began in the 1960s. For the Park Service, which among federal agencies prided itself on its sensitivity to culture, the museum became an embarrassment. Native Americans in particular found the portrayal of their heritage offensive, and many complained.¹⁴

¹⁴ Betty McSwain interview.

The tightening of the federal budget in the aftermath of the national election of 1988 made remedying the problems of the monument more problematic. An estimate for refurbishing the museum suggested that the project would cost approximately \$125,000, with a comprehensive overhaul of interpretation that provided on-site facilities for curator and conservation closer to \$300,000 in cost. By the early 1990s, the U.S. was mired in a long recession that resisted numerous attempts to resuscitate the economy, and funding remained tight for federal agencies. An outlay such as that necessary for the museum at Pipestone seemed unlikely.

The funding situation left other principal needs at the monument unattended. A resources management initiative to remove and control exotic plant species was as necessary as the rehabilitation of the museum. At an estimated cost of \$20,000 per year, this was projected as a \$200,000 project over ten years. The Natural Resources Preservation Program funded three years of the program, and in its aftermath, a resources management specialist to implement the plan was funded through the regional office. Without a permanent resources management person in place, the program would continue in a haphazard manner.¹⁵ The commitment of the regional office to the program reflected the importance of the program, but as was

¹⁵ "Resource Management Plan," February 27, 1989, 19-21; Becker, et al., "Vegetation Survey and Prairie Management Plan," 28-31, 119-20.

characteristic of the 1990s, a program essential to the management of the monument required significant resources.

The realities of funding threatened other areas of management at the monument. Across the federal government, many administrators found themselves facing a recurring predicament. Each year, the salaries of their staff were increased by law, but rarely did specific appropriations to fund these increases follow. As a result, money had to be reallocated from other areas. In the park system and particularly at smaller areas, this problem was exacerbated because individual parks handled every facet of their budgets. At Pipestone, if the park had to continue to absorb the cost of annual pay increases, at least two seasonal positions on which the monument depended for visitor service in the summers could be jeopardized.¹⁶

The 1990s will be a difficult decade for park managers. They will be asked to do more with less, to build constituency sometimes at the expense of established management priorities. At Pipestone, the developed physical plant and the relatively short primary visitation season help mitigate against limits on available resources. Yet at the beginning of the 1990s, the monument reflected a major issue facing the entire national park system. The public expected more of the park system and the National Park Service while agency standards required more expensive, more comprehensive programming and management. At the same time, the budget to administer park areas such as Pipestone

¹⁶ Vincent Halvorson interview.

remained constant or decreased. If doing more with less becomes the motto of the agency, serving the public and protecting the resources at places such as Pipestone National Monument will entail mutually exclusive choices that support one part of the NPS mandate while threatening another. For the park system and the public that loves it, this is a chilling prospect.

Bibliographic Essay

In recent years, the National Park Service and its holdings have been the subject of a growing number of important studies. Still first among these is Alfred Runte, National Parks: The American Experience, 2d. ed., (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1987), an excellent study that covers the evolution of the park system since its inception. Ronald A. Foresta, America's National Parks and Their Keepers (Washington, D.C.: Resources for the Future, 1984) is a close look at NPS policy in the modern era. Although dated and marred by inconsistent footnotes, John Ise, Our National Park Policy: A Critical History (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1961), remains a seminal work. Packed with narrative detail, it offers the most comprehensive chronology of the evolution of policy and decision-making in the agency. The only extant biography of Stephen T. Mather, Robert Shankland, Steve Mather of the National Parks 3d. ed., (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970), also has stood well the test of time. Hal Rothman, Preserving Different Pasts: The American National Monuments (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989), tells the story of the Antiquities Act of 1906 and the national monuments it spawned.

Growing numbers of park areas have been the subject of individual histories; among the best of the genre are Alfred Runte, Yosemite: The Embattled Wilderness (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1990), and Duane A. Smith, Mesa Verde National Park: Shadows of the Centuries (Lawrence: University Press of

Kansas, 1988). Other notable studies are Lary M. Dilsaver and William C. Tweed, The Challenge of the Big Trees: A Resource History of Sequoia and King's Canyon National Parks (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1991), and Susan R. Schrepfer, The Fight to Save the Redwoods: A History of Environmental Reform, 1917-1978 (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1983).

More specialized studies of current topics have also begun to appear. John C. Freemuth, National Parks and the Politics of External Threats (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1991) is the first of what will be a significant genre. Nonetheless, the National Park Service and the park system remain among the least thoroughly studied of federal agencies.

American Indian or Native American history has undergone a revolution in the past two decades. Numerous scholars have contributed to this, not the least of whom is Richard White. Two of his books, The Roots of Dependency: Subsistence, Environment, and Social Change Among the Choctaws, Pawnees, and Navajos (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983) and The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991) reveal much about the nature of Indian-white relations across the continent. White's seminal article, "The Winning of the West: The Expansion of the Western Sioux in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries," The Journal of American History, 65 no. 2 (September 1978), redefined the way in which westward expansion and growth on the northern plains was understood. Anthony

McGinnis, Counting Coup and Cutting Horses: Intertribal Warfare on the Northern Plains, 1738-1889 (Evergreen, CO: Cordillera Pres, 1990), is the best look at intertribal warfare and territorial expansion among the Indians of the northern plains. Other valuable works include Frederick E. Hoxie, The Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880-1920 (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984), Brian W. Dippie, The Vanishing American: White Attitudes and U.S. Indian Policy (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1982), and James S. Olson and Raymond Wilson, Native Americans in the Twentieth Century (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984). Robert M. Utley, The Last Days of the Sioux Nation (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), has stood the test of time. Utley's work remains the most readable history of the end of the story of which Pipestone is an early chapter. A standard reference for Indian treaties is Charles J. Kappler, Indian Treaties: 1778-1883 (New York: Interland Publishing, 1972).

Perhaps the area about which least has been published is natural resources management. The lead book in the field is Stephen J. Pyne, Fire in America: A Cultural History of Wildland and Rural Fire (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982). Pyne's work established the groundwork; unfortunately few have followed his lead. R. Gerald Wright, Wildlife Research and Management in the National Parks (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992), is another pioneering work. In contrast to some of the more strident assessments of national park wildlife policy,

Wright has set a scholarly and considered tone and standard for others to follow.

Two unpublished works about Pipestone National Monument were invaluable in this study. Robert Murray, "Administrative History of Pipestone National Monument," (unpublished typescript, 1961), offers a clearly documented history of the process that led to the creation of the monument. William P. Corbett, "A History of the Red Pipestone Quarry and Pipestone National Monument," (M. A. thesis, University of South Dakota, 1976) offers a broad-based of the history of the monument. Corbett is particularly adept at Indian history. In addition, two of his articles, "The Red Pipestone Quarry: The Yanktons Defend a Sacred Tradition, 1858-1929," South Dakota History 8, 99-116, and "Pipestone: The Origin and Development of a National Monument," Minnesota History, Fall 1980, 83-92, refine his earlier work.

As always, primary sources are the guts of any good administrative history. Record Group 79, the Records of the National Park Service, in the National Archives in Washington, D. C., provided essential documentation, as did records in the Federal Records Center in Kansas City. Pipestone National Monument also contains a fine collection of documents pertaining to the history of the park. Of equal importance was the willingness of present and former park staff to discuss the many issues of Pipestone National Monument. Superintendent Vince Halvorson, Chief of Interpretation and Resource Management Betty McSwain, and Maintenance Supervisor Raymond L. "Chuck" Derby all

added perspective and insight. Former Superintendents Carl Stoddard, Cecil D. Lewis, Jr., Clarence Gorman, and Don Thompson also answered questions. As is always the case in the National Park Service, the people of each individual unit make that place what it is. The willingness of these and many other people to share their insights has made this a better history.

IMPORTANT EVENTS IN THE HISTORY OF
PIPESTONE NATIONAL MONUMENT

- 1858--Yankton Sioux cede their lands in Minnesota, with the exception of the right to quarry on a 640-acre tract surrounding the pipestone quarries.
- 1880s--U. S. Army forces out illegal white settlers on the reserved area.
- 1890--First mention of the Pipestone area for national park status.
- 1890s--Yankton seek compensation for unauthorized use of the quarry area. U. S. government seeks to buy out the Indians. The case continues for more than thirty years.
- 1892--Pipestone Indian School founded.
- 1910s--First efforts for a park develop.
- 1924--State park proclaimed, but because of the court case over Yankton rights, no land for it is secured.
- 1928--U. S. Supreme Court rules on Yankton claim; awards the tribe \$100,000 and interest from 1890, more than an additional \$200,000, for the 640-acre area. Indian legal claim extinguished.
- 1932--Pipestone National Park Association founded; Winifred Bartlett is instrumental in the process.
- 1933--Department of the Interior official E. K. Burlew visits Pipestone to assess its merits as a park area. He decides that it had greater regional than national significance and does not merit inclusion in the park system.
- 1935--First National Park Service study of the area by Edward A. Hummel.
- 1937--115 acres of the former reserved area proclaimed as Pipestone National Monument proclaimed. NPS officials recognize natural as well as cultural potential of the new area. Superintendent of the Pipestone Indian School, J. W. Balmer, is enlisted as volunteer custodian.
- 1940--Seasonal custodian Albert F. Drysdale begins work at Pipestone.
- 1941--First plans to change the entrance road are conceived.
- 1941-1945--World War II puts growth and development aside.
- 1946--Initial NPS improvements compelled by local complaints about conditions at the monument.
- 1946--First regulations to govern quarrying established.
- 1948--First permanent, full-time employee, Lyle K. Lynch, arrives. Within months, his title is upgraded from custodian to superintendent.
- 1948--George "Standing Eagle" Bryan serves as first American Indian seasonal interpreter at Pipestone.
- 1949--First Song of Hiawatha pageant begun by local Exchange Club. The pageant became a tradition. Later the club changed its name to the Hiawatha Club.
- 1953--Pipestone Indian School closes. Attempts to close it began in 1948, but local opposition delayed its demise. Closure paves the way for transfer of additional land to the monument.
- 1954--Pipestone National Park Association reconstituted as Pipestone Indian Shrine Association. Winifred Bartlett remains a

leading influence.

1956--164 acres of the formerly reserved area are formally transferred to the monument. The transfer of the Three Maidens area on the south boundary of the monument closely followed, bringing the total area of the park to 282 acres.

1957--Second permanent staff member arrives.

1958--MISSION 66 program for Pipestone implemented; new Visitor Center constructed and dedicated.

1966--National Historic Preservation Act passed.

1968--Cecil D. Lewis, Jr., becomes first American Indian to serve as superintendent at Pipestone.

1968--Raymond L. "Chuck" Derby becomes first full-time American Indian employee at Pipestone.

1970--American Indian Movement protesters disrupt Hiawatha pageant.

1971--Upper Midwest American Indian Cultural Crafts Center completed.

1973--experimental controlled burning program begins at Pipestone. The program was developed as a result of the knowledge gained from an accidental fire in 1971.

1975--Pipestone faces preservation-use dichotomy in cultural resources management. Officials can not allow quarrying to continue and be in compliance with Section 106 of the amended National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Nor they can stop quarrying, for it would place the monument in violation of treaties, proclamations, and the organic legislation of the park. A resources management strategy is developed as part of the solution.

1978--American Indian Religious Freedom Act becomes law.

1981--First comprehensive resources management plan for the monument developed.

1982--Fish kill in Pipestone Creek illustrates pollution problems at the monument.

1988--First Spiritual Run/Walk to protest inappropriate uses of Pipestone begins. A rift in the Native American community develops, with the Park Service in an uncomfortable position. The run/walk continued through 1991.

1991--Sundance ceremony occurs at Pipestone; close cooperation between organizers and park personnel make for a successful event.

CUSTODIANS AND SUPERINTENDENTS AND THEIR TENURE

Custodians:

J. W. Balmer, volunteer	January 1, 1939-January 1, 1940
Albert F. Drysdale, seasonal	January 2, 1940-November 10, 1947
Lyle K. Linch	March 1, 1948-December 4, 1948

Superintendents:

Lyle K. Linch	December 5, 1948-July 17, 1954
Harvey B. Reynolds	July 18, 1954-September 29, 1956
Paul L. Webb	September 30, 1956-April 30, 1960
W. Dean McClanahan	June 1, 1960-December 8, 1962
Carl L. Stoddard	December 16, 1962-July 18, 1965
Ralph K. Shaver	August 1, 1965-April 20, 1968
Cecil D. Lewis, Jr.	April 21, 1968-June 13, 1970
Clarence N. Gorman	June 14, 1970-August 21, 1971
Don R. Thompson	September 5, 1971-January 5, 1974
David Lane	March 31, 1974-September 4, 1982
Vincent J. Halvorson	November 28, 1982-

VISITATION
(calendar years except where noted)

1948 (FY)	5,143	1969	146,393
1949 (FY)	21,435#	1970	157,466
1950 (FY)	42,443	1971	156,803
1951 (FY)	70,895	1972	169,706
1952 (FY)	91,137	1973	143,568
1953 (FY)	97,894	1974	147,963
1953	114,042*	1975	164,128
1954	82,642	1976	198,907
1955	52,182	1977	188,544
1956	61,001	1978	180,595
1957	64,459	1979	143,995
1958	126,604	1980	136,358
1959	136,814	1981	149,172
1960	155,451	1982	134,782
1961	164,411	1983	133,831
1962	157,277	1984	129,064
1963	178,500	1985	131,204
1964	111,271	1986	138,993
1965	92,091	1987	117,053@
1966	102,773	1988	105,190
1967	114,198	1989	109,198
1968	102,010	1990	106,623
		1991	118,149

Various multipliers were used to compute the visitation totals at Pipestone.

#Totals from Lyle K. Linch's tenure (1948-1954) are highly suspect. Linch was known to inflate his numbers.

*The change from fiscal to calendar year created two totals for 1953.

@ Fee collection was initiated in 1987. This significantly decreased the number of local people who entered the Visitor Center.



The Nicollet inscription, Pipestone National Monument.

Photo courtesy National Park Service




Winnewissa Falls
in 1879.

Photo courtesy National Park Service




Photo courtesy National Park Service

The Three Maidens boulder group, looking east. Photograph dated 1939.



The early visitor's center at Pipestone National Monument.

Photo courtesy National Park Service



The old visitor's center, looking northwest.

Photo courtesy National Park Service



Ephraim Taylor, Harvey Derby and George Bryan (?) in the early quarry exhibit. Photo courtesy National Park Service



George and Clara Bryan quarrying at Pipestone National Monument. Photo courtesy National Park Service



Ephraim Taylor at Pipestone National Monument.

Photo courtesy National Park Service



Seasonal Ranger Truax with visitors from the Minnesota Historical Tour at the Nicollet Marker, September 24, 1950.

Photo courtesy National Park Service





Photo courtesy National Park Service

The dedication ceremony for the new Visitor's Center at Pipestone National Monument in 1958.



Photo courtesy National Park Service

The ribbon-cutting ceremony for the Visitor's Center. From left, Park Superintendent Paul Webb; Bea Burns, Sen. Edward Thyne (R-Minn.); NPS Director Conrad L. Wirth; Minn. Lt. Gov. Karl Rolvaag; U.S. Rep. H. Carl Andersen (R-Minn.); and Dr. Walter G. Benjamin.



The front of the Visitor's Center at Pipestone National Monument.

Photo courtesy National Park Service



At the dedication ceremony, from left: former Superintendent Harvey Reynolds; Superintendent Paul Webb; former Superintendent Lyle K. Linch; and NPS Director Conrad Wirth.

Photo courtesy National Park Service




Photo courtesy National Park Service

Museum displays along the east wall of the Visitor's Center at Pipestone.





Photo courtesy National Park Service


Museum displays along the west wall.


PIPESTONE NATIONAL MONUMENT (Pre-Mission 66)



PIPESTONE NATIONAL MONUMENT

1992





One of the museum displays: "The White Man Comes."

Photo courtesy National Park Service



An Indian powwow held at Pipestone National Monument in 1978.

Photo courtesy National Park Service