

Ouachita Baptist University

Scholarly Commons @ Ouachita

Honors Theses

Carl Goodson Honors Program

2001

Archaeological Pioneer or Pot Hunter: The Life and Work of Clarence Bloomfield Moore

Sarah Washam

Ouachita Baptist University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarlycommons.obu.edu/honors_theses



Part of the [History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons](#), [Indigenous Studies Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Washam, Sarah, "Archaeological Pioneer or Pot Hunter: The Life and Work of Clarence Bloomfield Moore" (2001). *Honors Theses*. 154.

https://scholarlycommons.obu.edu/honors_theses/154

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Carl Goodson Honors Program at Scholarly Commons @ Ouachita. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons @ Ouachita. For more information, please contact mortensona@obu.edu.

SENIOR THESIS APPROVAL

This Honors thesis entitled

**Archaeological Pioneer or Pot Hunter:
The Life and Work of Clarence Bloomfield Moore**

written by

Sarah Washam

and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for completion of the Carl Goodson Honors Program
meets the criteria for acceptance and has been approved by
the undersigned readers.

thesis director

second reader

third reader

honors program director

April 15, 2001

The early twentieth century bred a generation of amateur archaeologists with time on their hands and money in their pockets. Although amateurs, they made great advances in the science of archaeology. Among these archaeologists were men such as Heinrich Schliemann, who discovered the city of Troy; Howard Carter, the discoverer of the riches of King Tut's tomb; Mathew Stirling, the man who discovered the Olmec culture; Sir Arthur Evans, who discovered the Mycenae; and Hiram Bingham, who found the lost city of Machu Picchu. Most of these men were middle to upper class and thus had the money and free time to wander the globe pursuing their passion.

During this same time, an American counterpart to these international archaeologists emerged. Unlike the others, Clarence Bloomfield Moore chose to conduct his research in the southeastern United States and thus became one of the most important characters in the history of American archaeology. His societal and financial background put him on the same plane with these others and gave him the means to pursue his passion. However, while Moore's contributions to the science of archaeology are obvious, his methods are quite controversial. Was Moore indeed the conscientious scientist for which archaeologists today give him credit, or little more than a glorified pot hunter and grave robber?

Early Life

Clarence B. Moore was born into a very wealthy family in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in 1852. His family was always involved in varied sorts of scientific endeavors. His mother's father, Augustus Edward Jessup, was a distinguished scientist. At the age of nineteen he was the youngest member ever to be admitted to the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia. When he was twenty-one, the government sent him

to serve as the mineralogist on the first expedition to explore beyond the Rocky Mountains. Later in his life, after settling down from trips like this, he was able to use this scientific knowledge as a paper manufacturer.¹ Through this occupation, he acquired a vast fortune.

Clarence's mother, Clara Jessup Moore, was a very well-known socialite in Philadelphia and a prolific writer. She published numerous volumes of poetry, novels, and books on etiquette under the pen name of Mrs. Clara Moreton. Along with authoring numerous books, Mrs. Moore also used her husband's great wealth for philanthropic endeavors. She continued the family's interest in science with her controversial support of a scientist named John Keely. Keely claimed that he had found an "etheric force" that could be released by the disintegration of air and water from musical vibrations. A contemporary article waxed poetic on the virtues of Keely's motor, stating things like,

Heat, steam, electricity, magnetism are but crude antetypes of this new discovery. It is essentially the creator of these forces. It is scarcely less than the 'primum mobile.' Indeed in reading the exposition of its potentialities one can hardly help doubting whether the concrete matter of our earth is not too weak and volatile to contain, restrain, and direct this vast cosmic energy except in infinitesimal proportions.²

Mrs. Moore's financial books showed monthly sums given to Keely for the promotion of his research in amounts of approximately two hundred dollars.³ According to a later article in which Mrs. Moore announced that she would no longer be financially involved in the Keely Motor Company, she stated that her support of Keely had caused problems

¹ Clara Jessup Moore, "Ancestry of Clarence Bloomfield Moore, Of Philadelphia," reprinted from *National Genealogical Society Quarterly* (March 1940), 2.

² George Perry, editorial, *New York Home Journal*, 5 August 1885, <<http://www.svpvriil.com/svpweb32.htm>> (28 April 2000).

³ Account books of Bloomfield H. Moore (1879-1894), 31 December 1895, Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

between herself and her family due to the unsafe nature of the investment.⁴ Before Keely's death, Clarence Moore's inheritance had been shorted huge sums of money due to his mother's financial support of Keely. He then supposedly rented Keely's house to further investigate his findings and declared him "an unadulterated rascal." Keely's own obituary stated,

. . . the report that after his death hidden apparatus of a suspicious appearance was found in his laboratory tended to confirm the opinion that Keely was the most daring and successful charlatan of his time.⁵

For the last years of her life, Mrs. Moore lived in London where she met Queen Victoria at court, befriended such people as the Brownings and Benjamin Disraeli, and entertained important literary and artistic people in her home. She donated sums of money and her husband's art collection, all in his name, to different institutes and museums in Pennsylvania.

Clarence's father, Bloomfield H. Moore, was a respected and prosperous person in his own right. Although apparently not as involved in society and philanthropic affairs as his wife, society still respected him. Upon his marriage to Clara, he joined with her father, Augustus Jessup, the paper manufacturer, in his business. Together they formed the Jessup & Moore Paper Company. After his death, the *Philadelphia Inquirer* wrote,

It was the unswerving rectitude, the untiring industry and doubtless enterprise which marked his career from first to last, that made his life of such value to his fellow-citizens and gave him true distinction.⁶

During his early school years, Misses Labberton Chase and Buckingham taught Moore in his hometown of Philadelphia; he later learned under Professor Ferrus at Nice,

⁴ "Rid of Keely At Last. His Greatest Benefactor Washes Her Hands of the 'Inventor,'" 17 December 1890, <<http://www.svpvriil.com/svpweb32.html>> (28 April 2000).

⁵ "Obituary," *International Year Book*, 1898, <<http://www.svpvriil.com/svpweb32.html>> (28 April 2000).

⁶ "Clara Sophia Jessup-Bloomfield Moore," n.d., <http://www.svpvriil.com/svpweb13.html> (25 April 2000).

France, and Mrs. Kraftz in Lausanne, Switzerland. Moore attended Harvard University and graduated in 1873 with an A.B. degree. The Class of 1873 was each given a book to record their family history; however, Moore never accomplished this and his mother wrote the book for him in his name. In it, she explained that he had little interest in ancestry. The introduction of this book records that Mrs. Moore included the quote, "He who careth not whence he came careth little whither he goeth."⁷ This quotation would seem to be included to make her son feel guilty, a tactic which she apparently employed quite often and which may have helped to cause the growing rift between mother and son—a rift that would widen over the next decade. Mrs. Moore concluded the paper by stating, in the voice of her son Clarence, "In my studies I prefer languages and my plans are for a business life." This statement held true for a time but was not enough to fulfill Moore.

For his graduation trip, he traveled throughout Europe. In 1876, Moore traveled through Central and South America, a journey which included crossing the Andes on horseback and riding the Amazon in dugouts and rafts. In the years 1877-1878, Moore traveled to other exotic locations including southern India, Ceylon, Siam, and Java.⁸ It is highly possible that these international travels piqued Moore's interest in archaeology and ancient sites.

Moore ended his travels in 1877 and returned home to tend to his father's estate. He served the Jessup and Moore Paper Company as president for twenty years. However, also in 1877, Moore received a serious eye injury which permanently impaired

⁷ Clara Sophia Jessup, 2.

⁸ "Clarence Bloomfield Moore," *Class Book of 1873*, Harvard University Archives.

his vision. Reports of the injury vary—some sources say it was caused by a tennis ball,⁹ while other state that it occurred from an accident while he was on safari.¹⁰ The most likely conclusion is a combination of these two reports—that is, that a tennis ball hit him while he was on safari.

Meanwhile, the problems between Clara Moore and her son Clarence persisted. Their disagreements over Keely and his motor may have been the beginning. He also seemed to distrust his mother's handling of the financial affairs. Upon his death in 1878, Bloomfield H. Moore left an estate of more than \$5,000,000 to be divided among his three children at the discretion of his wife. According to Mrs. Moore's obituary, Clarence was ". . . dissatisfied with the portion allotted him, and brought the matter into court, in which he averred that the eccentricity of his mother had deprived him of his full share of his father's estate."¹¹ Clarence even went as far as attempting to have his mother pronounced insane when her eccentricities became more evident.

Mrs. Moore's obituary also reported the problems existing between her and her son, stating,

Since the death of her husband Mrs. Moore's life had been stormy in her relations with her family, and her quarrels with her son, Clarence B. Moore, furnished frequent sensations to the public through the columns of the press.¹²

One such story that appeared in the papers reported that Mrs. Moore, with the support of one of her daughters, wanted Clarence removed as co-executor of his father's estate. The article related that

⁹ *ibid.*

¹⁰ Harriet Newell Wardle, "Clarence Bloomfield Moore," *Bulletin of the Philadelphia Anthropological Society* 9, no. 2 (March 1956) 9.

¹¹ "Philadelphia Woman, Interested in the Keely Motor, Dies in London an Eventful Life," 5 January 1899, <<http://www.svpvril.com/svpweb32.html>> (28 April 2000).

¹² "Mrs. Bloomfield Moore is Dead," *Philadelphia Evening Telegraph*, 5 January 1899.

... the son does not consult nor co-operate with her [Mrs. Moore] in the affairs of the estate, declines to receive or to read any communication from her, and that she has not seen him for nearly eight years, although she repeatedly solicited interviews, counsel, and assistance from him in matters of importance to the estate.¹³

She continued by accusing Moore of wasting the money of the estate, a feasible accusation in light of his extensive travels. The article ended by stating that, after inquiring at his home, it was found that Clarence was out of town and his return date was unknown. The passion he displayed for his archaeological endeavors often prohibited him from furthering personal relationships, familial or other. This type of reckless abandonment of family and responsibilities for the sake of archaeology continued even into his later life.

Moore continued to serve as president of the family business until 1899, although he had already begun pursuing archaeology before that time. It is unknown why he chose to retire at that time, or why he had waited so long to retire in the first place. Since he began his digs in 1891 or earlier, it is interesting that he continued to serve as president of the paper company during that time. Despite his obligations in Philadelphia, Moore chose to begin pursuing his passion—archaeology.

One of Moore's most valuable tools in his expeditions was his steamboat the *Gopher*, an appropriate name for the boat of a man with a passion for digging. Some have even gone so far as to say it is "arguably the most important steamboat in southeastern prehistory."¹⁴ He had this boat constructed in 1895 according to his own criteria which he had acquired from his use of other boats. An article detailing the

¹³ "Dispute over an Estate," collection of the Genealogical Society of Pennsylvania, v. XII, p. 65, located in Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

¹⁴ Charles E. Pearson, Thomas C. C. Birchett, and Richard A. Weinstein, "An Aptly Named Steamboat: Clarence B. Moore's *Gopher*," *Southeastern Archaeology* 19, no. 1 (Summer 2000): 82.

Gopher's first launching in 1895 stated that the lower deck contained accommodations for the crew and also for the tools needed to excavate.¹⁵ The upper deck held the private saloon used by "Dr." Moore and the boat's officers. It apparently even housed a photographic lab so Moore could develop his pictures at the site if he so desired. Moore navigated most of the rivers in the southwest U.S. using this boat. It was primarily captained by a man named Captain Raybon, although George W. Rossignol occupied that position at the time of its launching. Raybon not only captained the ship, but he also traveled ahead of Moore, along with a companion, to scout potential sites. After locating the areas, Raybon received permission from the land owners to dig on their land. Thus, Moore conducted the majority of his digs at sites along or adjacent to rivers. In the process, he traveled nearly every navigable river in the southeastern United States, a feat which would alone be worthy of note.

Florida Coasts

In 1891, Moore organized and led his first dig, which occurred in the Shell Mounds along St. Johns River in Florida. Although he had never before led a dig, it is arguable that this was his first time to participate in one. While in Harvard, Moore probably met Dr. Jeffries Wyman of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology.¹⁶ Dr. Wyman spent the winters of 1871-1874 conducting excavations along the St. John's River. Moore briefly mentioned digging in a shell heap in Florida in 1873. This, together with the facts that he quoted Wyman many times in his writings and began

¹⁵ "To Hunt for Skulls," *Jacksonville Evening Times-Union*, 28 August 1895, 1.

¹⁶ Jeffrey M. Mitchem, "Clarence B. Moore's Research in East Florida, 1873-1896," in *The East Florida Expeditions of Clarence Bloomfield Moore*, ed. Jeffrey M. Mitchem (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1999), 1.

his first excavation on the St. John's would seem to confirm the theory that they had met and worked together in 1873.

Moore's first love seemed to be the archaeology of Florida. He visited there many times during his long archaeological history. Moore spent the winters of 1891-1895 excavating the St. John's River drainage. At this time, Moore used a different boat to navigate the river since the *Gopher's* draft was too deep for the more shallow tributaries. For his purposes, he rented the commercial steamship the *Osceola* for his 1891 excavation. However, the boat's owners needed it back for commercial purposes, so Moore returned it on February 23, 1891. On March 5, 1891, he chartered another commercial steamship, this one named the *Alligator*. Moore later bought this boat and had it customized for his needs.¹⁷ George W. Rossignol served as captain at this time; Moore later hired Captain Raybon in Tampa in 1900.

During his initial excavations in Florida, Moore began to develop his own unique methodology. The reports he published after the digs reveal that the thought of burials from which to glean his information consumed him. He even employed his good friend, Dr. Milo G. Miller, for the purpose of helping to excavate and analyze human burials. Moore did, however, often present detailed descriptions of the artifacts he discovered, although he regularly mentioned whether or not they had found them near or with a burial.

Another pattern he developed was the destruction, either near or complete, of many mounds. In his report *Certain River Mounds of Duval County, Florida*, he wrote, "It [Broward Mound] was totally demolished with the courteous permission of its owner,

¹⁷ *ibid.*

Napoleon Broward, Esq., of Jacksonville."¹⁸ Luckily, Moore kept journals and completed reports of his findings; otherwise, today's archaeologists would have no clues about the mounds previously in existence.

Moore also jumped to quick, often incorrect, conclusions. For instance, in his first report on his excavation of Tick Mound in Florida, he came to the mistaken conclusion that the culture buried there had been cannibals. He wrote that "the presence of these charred human remains would be difficult to explain save by the hypothesis of cannibalism or human sacrifice by fire . . ."¹⁹ Again at Tick Mound, Moore concentrated the majority of his report on the burials he found, to the exclusion of the artifacts. Any information he included in that regard was superficial at best.

A positive* aspect of Moore's reports, however, is his knowledge of the work of other scientists. As mentioned earlier, Moore quoted Professor Wyman many times in his reports of excavations in Florida. He also made frequent mention of the opinions of other scientists such as fellow archaeologists, anthropologists, and medical doctors.

Georgia and South Carolina Coasts

In the winter of 1895, Moore and his crew began to move north along the Atlantic coast, concentrating their work in Georgia and in parts of South Carolina. The *Gopher* maneuvered between the coast and a series of barrier islands. It appears that part of the deciding factor of where he would dig was the accessibility of a landing near a reported mound.²⁰

¹⁸ Clarence Bloomfield Moore, *The West and Central Florida Expeditions of Clarence Bloomfield Moore*, (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1999), 97.

¹⁹ Moore, *East Florida Expeditions*, 59.

²⁰ Lewis Larson, "Introduction" in *The Georgia and South Carolina Coastal Expeditions of Clarence Bloomfield Moore*, ed. Lewis Larson (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1998) 3.

While in Savannah, Georgia, Moore was apparently approached by the press for an interview. One author wrote,

The Savannah press story suggests that Moore was somewhat peevish with what he perceived as a misunderstanding of what he was about and also that he probably did not suffer fools, or reporters, gladly . . . Moore's obvious impatience and barely maintained forbearance with the press can be detected just below the surface of his responses to questions that he had undoubtedly answered many times before.²¹

This type of description supports the view of Moore as a man driven by his goal, impatient with outsiders, and moody with people in general. That impatience and anti-social behavior would increase with age.

While in Georgia and South Carolina, Moore again concentrated his archaeological efforts on excavating burial mounds. His reports show drawings of skeletons and descriptions of bones and the positions in which they were found. Apparently Moore collected these bones to be used in research later. Lewis Larson, in his introduction to *The Georgia and South Carolina Coastal Expeditions of Clarence Bloomfield Moore*, wrote,

Evidently, Moore's practice was to collect only the skeletal material that was perceived to have some medical interest, for example, fractured limb bones that had mended well or badly. These bones were sent to the Army Medical Museum in Washington, D.C.²²

Again, following his normal pattern, Moore continued to destroy additional sites. While in Glynn County, Georgia, Moore reported that "a total demolition of the mound was without result."²³ It appears that he also completely destroyed a mound known as Mound F on Ossabaw Island. In 1974, an archaeologist named Chester DePratter

²¹ *ibid.*, 5.

²² *ibid.*, 43.

²³ *ibid.*, 9.

conducted an archaeological survey of Ossabaw Island but was unable to find Mound F due to the efficiency of Moore's destruction.²⁴

Moundville Expedition and Various Digs

In 1905, Moore moved his excavation to Moundville, Alabama. Normally, Moore and his crew began excavations in the late fall, continued through the winter, and ended in spring when the flooding season began. Moore used this time to prepare his notes for publication, photograph his finds, and prepare for the next season's work. However, Moore began the excavation at Moundville in the spring when he normally would have been returning home. This caused some problems as the mounds' owners had to plow and were annoyed by the digging. However, Moore spent 34 days there and acquired a wealth²⁵ of information and artifacts. Again his focus was on burials, but this time he did not appear to have been as destructive. When describing Mound O, he wrote, "This symmetrical mound was carefully filled by us, as were all others at Moundville where dug into by us . . ." ²⁵ He continued by describing the means they took to protect the soil from eroding from the sides of the mound.

In the fall of 1905, Moore surveyed the Chattahoochee and Flint rivers. At the beginning of 1906, he returned to Florida to excavate along the Crystal River and later made another trip to Moundville for more thorough excavations in November of that same year.

²⁴ *ibid.*, 47.

²⁵ Clarence B. Moore, *The Moundville Expeditions of Clarence Bloomfield Moore*, ed. Vernon James Knight, Jr. (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1996) 116.

Arkansas River

As the year 1908 began, Moore led his expedition to the Arkansas River. He and his crew spent fifty-six days surveying the river during parts of February and April and all of March, 1908. They had not found success in the excavation along the Yazoo and Sunflower rivers in Mississippi, so they decided to move to the Arkansas. They concentrated on the section of the river from its junction with the Mississippi River to Natural Steps, a site twenty miles north of Little Rock, for a total distance of 194 miles.

Clarence Moore began this dig in a different manner from the others—he did not send Captain Raybon or any other scout ahead to find potential sites. Moore, however, did not comment on the reason for this decision. His decision seems even more odd when considering the fact that the small number of mounds and aboriginal cemeteries disappointed him. It would seem that he would want to utilize local knowledge to find every available site. He reported,

. . . the mounds on the Arkansas river between its mouth and Natural Steps . . . are insignificant in number and size; while aboriginal cemeteries, as to the location of which a clue could be had, were far from numerous.²⁶

Moore attributed this lack of sites to the fact that the river constantly changed its course, thus either destroying or leaving behind any available mounds and burials.

While on the Arkansas River, Moore followed the pattern he had begun to establish on previous digs. In the introduction of his report and throughout the report itself, Moore made conclusions based on his findings. While not always coming to the correct conclusions, as is the case with the tribe he described as cannibalistic in Florida, he at least had the courage and knowledge to make a reasonable deduction. In his report

²⁶ Clarence Bloomfield Moore, *The Lower Mississippi Valley Expeditions of Clarence Bloomfield Moore*, ed. Dan F. Morse and Phyllis A. Morse (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1998) 171.

on the Arkansas River, Moored wrote that at nearly every site they investigated, they found glass beads and brass objects, a sign that the tribe had contact with white men.²⁷ He also concluded that the pottery they found did not compare with that found in Moundville, Alabama, due to its lack of thickness and uneven firing.

On this excursion, Moore continued his preoccupation with burials and cemeteries. He continually refers to "mounds and cemeteries" throughout the report. He makes careful analysis of the number of skeletons found, the positions in which they were found, and the objects found with them. In the introduction of the report, Moore reports that although most bones were badly decayed, they preserved many skulls and sent them to the United States National Museum at Washington, D.C.

Moore's concentration on burials helps to form the picture of him as a grave robber or pot hunter. Normally, the best and most ornate pots, vessels, and jewelry would be buried with the dead, while the everyday ware was kept for the more menial tasks for which it was designed. Moore would most definitely have been familiar with these facts due to his many excavations. If he had indeed been interested in gaining knowledge about aboriginal culture, he would have spent much more time excavating settlement sites rather than cemeteries. Granted, the type of ware found in burials can disclose some information about the culture, especially by classification of its pottery. However, the real facts about a culture can be found in excavating the trash heaps to discover that culture's diet, by examining discolorations in the soil for evidence of fire, and by examining remnants of housing to discover the types of dwelling they utilized. All of these facts should be examined in addition to the burials; they should not be mutually exclusive. This is one of the greatest downfalls of Moore's work.

²⁷ *ibid*, 172.

Sadly, Moore continued to follow the pattern of destruction he had begun during his first excavations. He wrote that much of the ware they found had "received injury from the spades of the diggers . . ."28 Most archaeologists today would not dream of using such methods on a dig, especially when the artifacts can be found at more shallow locations due to erosion and cultivation of the land. Archaeologists now favor trowels to skim off thin layers of dirt and mud, thus protecting the artifacts from further damage by the intruder. It would have been understandable if Moore and his workers used spades one time and then learned that that was not a good method, but the quotation sounds as though they practiced the technique quite often. Since he never spent a great deal of time at any particular location, he probably decided that the speed of using spades outweighed the potential damage they could cause the artifacts.

Finally, Moore again followed his precedent of referring to the works of other scientists, those both in his field and in related fields. He especially refers to a man named W. H. Holmes who published works entitled "Ancient Pottery of the Mississippi Valley" and "Pottery from Arkansas," among others. His footnotes include the names of numerous other individuals from whose works he had quoted. He also included other scientists on his expeditions, such as Drs. Miller and Keller; the latter made analyses of unknown substances such as pigments used to color the pottery. Moore's willingness to include the research of other scientists helped him to gain the credibility he lacked in other areas.²⁹

St. Francis, White, and Black Rivers

²⁸ *ibid.*, 176.

²⁹ *ibid.*, 171-176.

As Moore and his team ended the season's field work, they next moved to excavations on the St. Francis, White, and Black rivers in Arkansas, traveling as far north as Missouri. For this excavation, Moore followed his previous routine of sending Captain Raybon ahead to scout potential sites and obtain permission from the landowners to dig on their property. Again, it is unknown why Moore decided not to follow this precedent on his expedition to the Arkansas River, but he continued the tradition on this trip.

Besides this return to his habit of sending a scout ahead, the excavation to these rivers varied little from that of the Arkansas River. Moore continued to concentrate on cemeteries and the best examples of pottery that he could find. In describing the prevalent pot hunters along the St. Francis River, Moore wrote,

Moreover, vast numbers of vessels have been destroyed along the St. Francis in the process of cultivation of the cemeteries in which they lay, while others have been dug out or have been shattered in the digging by unskilled local endeavor.³⁰

In his reference to "unskilled" workers, Moore seemed to forget that he and his crew were guilty of the same mistakes.

The site at Parkin, Arkansas, on the St. Francis River, proved to be quite unusual for Moore and company. The Northern Ohio Cooperage and Lumber Company owned the aboriginal cemetery on the site. During times when the mill was closed, the workers were permitted to dig for pots as their means of livelihood.³¹ Despite the fact that both the lumber company's employees and Moore dug at Parkin, it remains a productive site. Today it houses the Parkin Archaeological State Park with a full-time archaeologist, lab, and numerous volunteers. Pottery, remains of animals used for food, and charred bits of

³⁰ *ibid.*, 299.

³¹ *ibid.*, 343.

wood still provide invaluable information about the mound's aboriginal inhabitants.

Today, however, the scientists conduct research much more carefully and thoroughly than did Clarence Moore.

Moore also encountered another interesting episode while on this excursion. Due to its interesting content, the account will be written in its entirety:

Our quest, however, which ended at Lepanto, on Little river, came to an end owing to the hostility against negroes, entertained by the natives along the river above Lepanto, who maintain a negro dead-line, permitting no colored person to go among them. As this race prejudice has resulted in the murder of a number of negroes, we did not deem it fair to expose to slaughter men who had served us faithfully for years. Our sole motive for referring to this disagreeable episode is that when an amply equipped expedition abandons a most promising region, a valid reason for doing so should be forthcoming.³²

This account is interesting for several reasons. First, it shows the attitude that existed among many Arkansans toward African-Americans. It also shows that Moore's feelings toward this group were much more open-minded than those of his contemporaries. This can probably be attributed to the fact that he came from the Northeast, where deep-seated discrimination did not factor as prevalently into culture. Moore, however, did frequently use African-Americans on his team as manual laborers, thus adding another layer to his complex personality.

Lower Mississippi River Valley

Moore next moved to the Lower Mississippi River for 131 days of excavation during parts of November and December, 1910; parts of January and April, 1911; and all of February and March, 1911. In total, the crew covered a distance of 775 miles by water; this number seems especially impressive when realizing that they traveled this far in only 131 days on a steamboat.

³² *ibid.*, 296.

On this trip, Moore also continued to follow his predetermined patterns, especially those concerning his passion for cemeteries. He made several interesting comments regarding this. The first concerns his view of the function of domiciliary mounds³³ for his purposes:

Though there is but little hope of the discovery of relics of any kind in domiciliary mounds, they nevertheless are of great importance in an investigation, since they mark former centers of aboriginal life, and as life and death go hand in hand, the presence of these mounds indicates where cemeteries are or have been.³⁴

Again, his only reason for being concerned with how the aboriginals lived was the light it would shed on their deaths. If his actual intent had been knowledge of the culture instead of only finding interesting pottery, he would have been able to find a wealth of information in the domiciliary mounds.

The next quote helps to reveal his true motive for finding pottery and also sharpens his identity as a pot hunter. He wrote,

Another fact to emphasize, especially in connection with the Middle Mississippi Valley region, is the large proportion of inferior earthenware placed with the dead in some of the sites . . . without decoration of any kind, with the exception perhaps of beaded or notched margins, or possibly a few rude lines of incised decoration . . . It has been our fortune there, more than once to unearth fifty successive vessels without coming upon one presenting any feature of especial interest, either in the way of elegance of form or of decoration, or of oddity of design.³⁵

He records that, in total, they recovered sixty-five skulls in good condition and also other skeletal remains. These were all sent as a gift to the United States National Museum. The rest of the finds, such as pottery that he deemed worthy of display, were

³³ Domiciliary mounds are those used for dwellings and everyday living as opposed to burials.

³⁴ *ibid.*, 29.

³⁵ *ibid.*, 32.

sent to the Academy of Natural Sciences in Philadelphia to be exhibited with the rest of his collections.

Ouachita River

Through the months of November 1908, and January through April 1909, Moore and his crew conducted their excavation along the Ouachita River. As normal, Captain Raybon and a companion left during the fall of 1908 to scout for mounds and burials and to gain permission to dig from the landowners. On this excavation, Moore traveled a distance of 320 miles on the Ouachita River, 134 miles on Bayou Bartholomew, 100 miles on the Boeuf River, and on Little River to a destination south of Georgetown, Louisiana.

Although Captain Raybon conducted the reconnaissance mission in the fall, a different man captained the ship during the excavating season. Moore chose W. D. Platt of Ouachita, Louisiana, as his captain due to his superior knowledge of the streams of the region. He also aided Moore and the crew in archaeological work.³⁶

During this excavation, Clarence Moore continually encountered problems with the soil along the Ouachita and the other adjacent rivers. Because of flooding in the area each spring, most of the ancient peoples chose higher locations on which to build their mounds. Later, as farmers began cultivation, they also chose the higher land for the same purpose, in addition to the fact that the soil had been enriched by the ancient burials. This cultivation led to the eventual erosion of the soil, cemeteries, and artifacts. Moore noted that it was not uncommon for a farmer to find a skeleton or artifact on his land

³⁶ Clarence B. Moore, "Antiquities of the Ouachita Valley," *Journal of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia* 14, 10.

years prior, although Moore could no longer find any evidence in that same area.³⁷ He also wrote that rain easily washed the soil away, especially soil that had been cultivated. Thus, Moore and his crew often found bones and artifacts scattered in the fields far from their original locations. He concluded that these skeletal remains and artifacts were not in their original placement because the soil in which they found them was too shallow to contain burials.

On this trip, Moore continued to focus on burials and cemeteries. In the introduction to his report, he stated,

In the territory investigated by us aboriginal burials had been made . . . ordinarily in dwelling-sites. These dwelling-sites, as a rule, are but slightly above the general level of the surrounding ground, and only about one in ten of these sites contains burials or gives evidence of having done so. Nevertheless, it is on dwelling-sites that the student of the archaeology of the Ouachita valley places his main reliance.³⁸

One can only assume that the student of archaeology would place his "main reliance" on dwelling-sites due to the burials they contain, even though few burials existed.

Moore's work in this region, although still concentrating on burials, produced many pieces of pottery that provided valuable information. He wrote in his report's introduction, ". . . we unearthed some pottery which is to an extent distinctive and representative of the region, and fills a gap that has hitherto existed."³⁹ He also noted that they discovered some of the best pieces of pottery near the junction of Bayou Bartholomew and the Ouachita River. Moore then deduced that these facts pointed to the existence of a cultural center at that location. However, along with the exceptional pieces, they uncovered numerous ordinary artifacts. He wrote,

³⁷ *ibid.*, 8.

³⁸ *ibid.*

³⁹ *ibid.*, 9.

In no region, however, in which we have worked, have we obtained so great a proportion of pottery of inferior ware, of commonplace form, and of rude and carelessly executed decoration, and having such sameness of design as we found in the lower Mississippi region, although we met with there, in exceptional instances, vessels which, in our belief, in respect to incised decoration, exceed in beauty any discovered elsewhere in the United States.⁴⁰

Moore also noted that they found a type of pottery in that area that they had not previously discovered; this type had both incised decoration and a colored body.

In regard to the region's pottery, Clarence Moore again quoted W. H. Holmes.

Holmes wrote,

In shape many of the vessels are worthy of special note. They range from simple shallow bowls to high-necked bottles, and much skill and taste are shown in the modeling, especially of the formal shapes . . . The decoration of this ware is even more noteworthy than the forms. It consists, in the main, of incised work, the scroll motive, which takes a multitude of forms, prevailing to a remarkable extent.⁴¹

In conclusion, much of the pottery impressed both Moore and Holmes due to its originality of form, color, and decoration.

The cemetery in Boytt's Field, Union County, Arkansas, also provided many interesting features. First, this site is one of the few for which Moore provided exact coordinates. He recorded the surveying information such as the range and township location, information which he normally did not include.

Another distinguishing characteristic of this site was its owner. Mr. W. H. Harry and his family, according to Moore, exhibited shrewd observation skills, quite unlike other land owners with whom he had dealt. He wrote that Mr. Harry's family had "dug

⁴⁰ *ibid.*, 11.

⁴¹ William H. Holmes in "Antiquities of the Ouachita Valley," *Journal of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia* 14, 13.

shortly before our arrival . . . where the soil looked darker than elsewhere in the field, and had found there three skeletons in fairly good condition."⁴²

Moore must have been very pleased with the outcome of this dig, for they uncovered a total of 55 human burials, not including the bones that had been scattered about due to the ancient peoples' digging numerous graves.

Although Moore often interpreted the facts he recorded, he strayed from this practice in one instance. He wrote, "Eight pebbles, averaging about an inch in diameter, were found in the body of a water-bottle without a neck, which lay with a burial."⁴³ This presents an interesting situation, so it is surprising that Moore hazarded no guesses as to the placement of these pebbles.

One of the practices Moore continued to follow, however, was that of destroying the sites he excavated. After digging in one of the many mounds at the Keller Place in Arkansas, Moore wrote,

This mound was completely dug away by us to a depth slightly less than 10 feet from its top, except a very limited portion around a tree at the margin of the mound, which was left standing.⁴⁴

Sadly, he never seemed to realize the effect his work would have on the future of archaeology. If he were to practice such tactics today, he could be arrested, fined or both. His actions, and those of others like him, possibly helped to bring about the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). This possibility will be examined in more detail in a later section.

Red River

⁴² Moore, "Antiquities of the Ouachita Valley," 82.

⁴³ *ibid.*, 84.

⁴⁴ *ibid.*, 92.

After conducting digs along the Ouachita River and its tributaries, Moore next moved to the Red River. They spent nearly five months of 1911 and the beginning of 1912 on the Red River and Old River, which connects the Red with the Mississippi. Their travel covered 519 miles, ending 37 miles above Fulton, Arkansas.

Moore followed his normal pattern in that he instructed Captain Raybon to scout the territory they proposed to cover later that year. This allowed him to determine the exact location of mounds and gain permission to dig from the owners, thus saving valuable time during the digging season. The captain and his companion spent two summers conducting this field research.

Another pattern Moore continued to follow was his concentration on burials and cemeteries. In his report, Moore complained that they could only dig in mounds since cemeteries in flat land hardly existed along the Red River. He stated that these mounds "were built for places of residence and that they do not contain burials except occasionally, and when burials are found in them they are superficial."⁴⁵ Again, he seemed to show no interest in discovering clues as to the way people lived, but only wanted to find human remains and the artifacts with them.

Moore made another interesting quote, showing his denial that he used the same methods which he accused others of using:

Previous to our work there had been no investigation of the antiquities of Red river: digging by treasure-seekers; the occasional putting down of small holes in mounds by local residents impelled by curiosity; or infrequent demolition of portions of high places by collectors with the aid of scoops drawn by horses, can scarcely be termed investigation.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ Clarence B. Moore, "Some Aboriginal Sites on Red River," *Journal of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia* 14, 484.

⁴⁶ *ibid.*

The tactics he accused others of using differ little from the ones he used in the field. The major difference is that Moore took the time to record his finds and their location in detail, thus saving some information for posterity. This has been enormously valuable for contemporary archaeologists, especially since he permanently destroyed many sites in the process.

While on the Red River, however, Moore was not able to destroy the mounds he researched. He wrote that the locals used the mounds as places of refuge for themselves and their domestic animals during times of high water. Hence, they were not allowed to damage the mounds or change them in such a way that they would be vulnerable to erosion by water. In fact, while working at the Haley Place in Arkansas, he recorded, "The entire excavation was filled at the close of our work, leaving the mound as useful a place of refuge as we found it."⁴⁷ Thankfully, he did not consistently damage mounds in the course of his work along the Red River.

As mentioned before, Moore probably knew that the best pottery would normally be buried with the dead, which would be a good motive for always digging in burials. While working on the Red River, Moore found his efforts especially rewarded in this regard. He recorded, ". . . we believe it likely that the mounds contain the burials of persons of note . . ."⁴⁸ He continued by saying that the burials of the common people had probably disappeared due to flood and erosion, as was the case along the Red River in Louisiana. In Arkansas, however, Moore noted,

Stories of the discovery of Indian objects -especially pottery- and mounds containing burials, some of them richly endowed with artifacts, are fairly abundant. Indeed, we know of no other region in all our fields of investigation where the proportion of deposits with the dead was so great . . . Along the Red

⁴⁷ *ibid.*, 528.

⁴⁸ *ibid.*, 485.

River in Arkansas, to come upon a burial unaccompanied by artifacts is indeed a rare occurrence.⁴⁹

Moore showed disappointment in regard to the pottery he found along the Red River in Louisiana. Not only had the majority of cemeteries been washed away, but also few artifacts were placed in the burials. Moore wrote, "So little pottery was found by us in the Red river region in Louisiana that it would be unwise to draw conclusions."⁵⁰ The pottery of Arkansas, however, existed in abundance. Most of these pieces exhibited symmetrical lines and careful modeling. The shapes of and decorations on the pottery varied little, but many pots had a high polish, making them more attractive. He also noted that this pottery differed from that of northern Arkansas, such as the St. Francis Valley, in its careful symmetry and more delicate designs.

The site comprising the major portion of Moore's report was the Haley Place in Miller County, Arkansas. This site contained numerous mounds with one containing many burial pits. Moore analyzed the different soil levels admirably. In one such example he wrote,

Not far below this material, however, the pit was clearly defined, the sides of it enclosing a broken, mixed, and granular material readily distinguishable in the digging. The downward course of the pit, moreover, was apparent where it cut through local layers in the mound, and was darker and more variegated.⁵¹

Included in his thorough coverage of the Haley Place is a detailed drawing of the locations of the burials.

Another interesting feature in Moore's report on the Red River was his reliance on historical data. In the introduction, he told of a French explorer named Pénicaut who

⁴⁹ *ibid.*

⁵⁰ *ibid.*, 486.

⁵¹ *ibid.*, 530.

explored the Red River in the eighteenth century.⁵² Using Pénicaut's writings, Moore endeavored to find the sites about which he wrote, taking into account the changing course of the river. Although his search for the former settlement of the Tassenogoula did not meet with success, he should be commended for utilizing historic sources.

On this excursion, Moore and his team uncovered thirteen skulls and other skeletal remains, which they then sent as a gift to the United States National Museum. Moore sent the artifacts that he considered interesting to the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia to be displayed with his other collections.

Three years later, in 1915, Moore wrote a letter to Mr. Heye, apparently a fellow archaeologist, giving advice regarding Heye's excavations along the Red River. Moore advised him to make his headquarters in Fulton, stating that it is located "right in the thick of the finest mound country . . ."⁵³

He continued by stating that, when he excavated years earlier, he had not been able to obtain permission to dig at Williams Place and Egypt Place, both in Lafayette County, Arkansas. This information is substantiated in his published reports. He also wrote in the report that the mounds at Williams Place "were of little promise because of their imperfect condition . . ."⁵⁴ After giving this unfavorable report, he wrote in his letter, "In my account I do not speak favorably of these mounds but, after mature thought I am convinced that they contain pits."⁵⁵ In this letter to Heye, Moore also reported that he had instructed Captain Raybon to return to Egypt Place and Williams Place to try obtaining permission again.

⁵² *ibid.*, 484-5.

⁵³ Clarence Bloomfield Moore, Philadelphia, to George Heye, LS, 12 August 1915, National Museum of the American Indian Archive, Suitland, MD, Box OC 167, F-1.

⁵⁴ Moore, "Some Aboriginal Sites on Red River," 566.

Regarding Egypt Place, Moore gave Heye an interesting piece of advice. He wrote, "You might defer digging at Egypt until the last and then offer the owner a sum of money—ten dollars would look as big as a house to him."⁵⁶ This statement reveals a great deal about his patrician opinions of Arkansans. Moore included another interesting statement concerning the Jones Place. After stating that it might have a new owner, he wrote, "If there is a new owner, Capt. R. [Raybon] is to see him. Ownerships change in the South about as often as men's undershirts do in hot weather."⁵⁷ This statement reveals his colorful character and also his opinion of southerners.

All in all, when considering both Moore's reports and his letters, he apparently experienced more success on the Red River than on the Ouachita River—at least, what he considered success. He discovered better, more beautiful pottery. However, the Ouachita River Valley produced a greater number of human remains. Considered together, the four years of excavations along the Ouachita and Red Rivers seemed quite productive.

Later Digs

Clarence Moore spent the next digging season, in 1913, on the Tennessee River. He had apparently dug along this river before, for in a short biography by Harriet Newell Wardle, she wrote, ". . . Mr. Moore undertook the re-study of the Tennessee River, on which a great deal had been published that needed clarification by careful fieldwork."⁵⁸ After his work, Moore published a 422 page paper regarding his research.

⁵⁵ Moore to Heye, LS, 12 August 1915.

⁵⁶ *ibid.*

⁵⁷ *ibid.*

⁵⁸ Harriet Newell Wardle, "Clarence Bloomfield Moore," *Bulletin of the Philadelphia Anthropological Society* 9, no. 2 (March 1956) 13.

His next excavations occurred on the Green River in Kentucky and the Lower Ohio River and Mississippi. After this, he returned to the Mississippi. He wrote, "The end of the work on Green River, Kentucky, virtually completed for us the list of all rivers navigable by our steamer."⁵⁹ With such a lofty goal nearly accomplished, Moore's never-ending drive to pursue archaeology must have begun to slow.

According to Harriet Wardle's biography, Moore and his crew spent 1917 exploring a river that had previously been unnavigable. The removal of a sandbar facilitated its opening, which runs through Alabama and northern Florida. They had evidently found a shard of a rare type of pottery and were hoping to discover more. His expedition was rewarded by the unearthing of rich, red vessels.⁶⁰

Also in 1917, Frederic Seward of the Museum of the American Indian in New York invited Moore to be a trustee of the museum. According to the address on Moore's reply letter, he was in Arkansas City, Arkansas, in January 1917.⁶¹ Although there appears to be a discrepancy in these two accounts of his location, it is possible that he spent the beginning of the year in Arkansas, returned to Philadelphia to write his reports and photograph his finds, and then traveled to the Chocktawhatchee River to begin the next season's field work in late 1917.

In 1918, at the age of 66, Moore began yet another excavation. He returned to Florida, the state of his first dig, to conduct his final ones. He did a minor project on the Flint and Apalachicola Rivers in northwest Florida. Also in the same year, he visited Crystal River for the last time. His descriptions of finds seemed to become less detailed

⁵⁹ *ibid.*, 14.

⁶⁰ Wardle, 14.

⁶¹ Clarence B. Moore, Arkansas City, AR, to Frederic K. Seward, LS, 21 January 1917, National Museum of the American Indian Archive, Suitland, MD, Box OC 244, F-4.

on these digs. When summarizing the results of a particular mound Moore had investigated, Jeffrey Mitchem wrote, ". . . Moore did not report burials from this one. He made no mention of artifacts from either mound."⁶² In describing another mound, Mitchem wrote, "It is not possible to determine a date of occupation from the artifacts as described."⁶³ Evidently Moore's enthusiasm began to wane as he aged, causing him to describe his finds in a less detailed manner.

In 1920, Moore evidently began the final dig of his long career in Florida. Although Harriet Newell Wardle, the curator of his field notes, stated that his last dig took place in 1918, he published a paper in 1921 stating that he had conducted a dig the year before. They spent the season on the southwest coast of Florida exploring many aboriginal sites. He reported that they were familiar with many of these sites since they had already worked in Florida numerous times. They had visited this particular area in 1904.⁶⁴

Florida still continued to influence Moore, for he returned to escape the Philadelphia winters. The authors of an article about the *Gopher* indicated that he returned to Florida every winter;⁶⁵ however, no evidence could be found to firmly support this idea. Harriet Wardle, who worked with Moore on many projects, mentioned in an article that Moore was in Florida from January through April of 1929, but she did not state that this was an annual occurrence.⁶⁶ The authors of the aforementioned *Gopher*

⁶² Jeffrey M. Mitchem, "Clarence B. Moore's Work in Western and Central Florida, 1895-1921" in *The West and Central Florida Expeditions of Clarence Bloomfield Moore*, ed. Jeffrey M. Mitchem (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1999) 28.

⁶³ Mitchem, 29.

⁶⁴ Clarence Bloomfield Moore, *The West and Central Florida Expeditions of Clarence Bloomfield Moore*, ed. Jeffrey M. Mitchem (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1999) 386.

⁶⁵ Charles E. Pearson et al., "Clarence B. Moore's *Gopher*," 86.

⁶⁶ Harriet Newell Wardle, "Wreck of the Archeological Department of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia," *Science* 70, no. 1805, 2 August 1929, 119.

article used Wardle's article as evidence that Moore spent every winter in Florida, but this simply cannot be supported by her brief statements. However, the return address on a letter from 1931 was St. Petersburg, Florida.⁶⁷ Putting these two pieces of information together, it is reasonable to assume that Moore spent every winter in the more pleasant Florida climate.

Later Life

As Moore began to pursue pleasure and rest rather than archaeology, he no longer had a need for his faithful steamer, the *Gopher*. After almost 31 years of service, he sold the boat in 1926 to an apparently wealthy man of Tampa, Charles Smith.⁶⁸ Moore must have been sorrowful as he parted with the boat he had crafted for his specific purposes, but he no longer needed it for professional purposes.

In 1929, controversy again surrounded Clarence Moore, but this time it did not regard his relationship with his mother. It now regarded his other love—his archaeological collection. Throughout the years, Moore had sent his most important finds to the archaeological department of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia. He also gave them copies of each of his journals as he published them. The academy had just gained a new president, Effingham Morris, who had only agreed to the presidency if a man named Charles Cadwalader acted as managing director. George Heye of the Museum of the American Indian wrote about Cadwalader, "He seems a rather energetic young man but does not know, or does not claim to know anything about

⁶⁷ Clarence B. Moore, St. Petersburg, FL, to "Classmate," LS, 30 December 1931, Pusey Library, Harvard University Archives, Cambridge.

⁶⁸ Charles E. Pearson et al., "Clarence B. Moore's *Gopher*," 86.

science."⁶⁹ Both Cadwalader and Morris desired to rid the academy of the archaeological collections and replace them with groups of sheep, goats, and other mammals.

Cadwalader stated that there was no longer space for the archaeological collections, unless someone donated money for it. Apparently a gift of \$500,000 had been bequested with the R. H. Lamborn Mexican archaeological collection, but it seems that the museum's directors had dedicated themselves to ridding the museum of archaeology.

In the meantime, George Heye decided that he would like to purchase Moore's collection to display in the Museum of the American Indian in New York. Because the museum's directors worried that Philadelphians would protest if they felt a valuable collection was being moved away from their city, they conducted the transaction in secret. In a letter appraising Moore of the situation, Heye wrote that Morris, the academy's president, had said,

"What will Philadelphia say if the Academy should allow a collection that some people might consider valuable to be sent from Philadelphia to another city?" I told him that nobody need know about it until long after the deal had been consummated.⁷⁰

Heye suggested that he come to Philadelphia to pack the collection and then place it in storage for a few months before secretly moving it to New York. Then, if anyone asked after its whereabouts, the president would be able to truthfully say that it had been placed in storage.

Moore agreed, however, that the collection should be moved. Upon inquiry from Harriet Wardle, Moore replied,

Of course, I regret the transfer of my collection to New York, the fruit of thirty years' hard work of Dr. Miller and myself and very heavy expense.

⁶⁹ George Heye to Clarence B. Moore, Philadelphia, LS, 15 April 1929, National Museum of the American Indian, Suitland, MD, Box OC 121, F-LD.

⁷⁰ *ibid.*

The academy is now wholly devoted to the lower animals and the floor on which the archeological specimens were is needed for natural history groups. The Vaux archeological collection, after the death of Mr. Vaux, the trustee, was moved out and I felt confident that, at once, after my death my collection would go to undesirable quarters, perhaps even into storage.

As it is, my collection goes to a museum wholly devoted to archeology and ethnology of the American Indian, where it will be properly displayed and cared for. I regret to see it leave the city, but it is Hobson's choice.⁷¹

So, Moore experienced very mixed feelings in regard to the sale of his collection. He knew it would be properly looked after; Heye wrote to Moore, saying, ". . . I know positively this is the place for your magnificent collection, where it will be taken care of properly, will be of use to science, will not be neglected and will be personally loved."⁷² Yet he had also specifically donated his finds to the Academy through the years, which must have made it difficult to see it moved to a new location.

Heye and Moore agreed to ask for \$10,000 for Moore's collection. The papers were signed on April 29, making the transfer official. They began to move the artifacts on May 6, including the copies of Moore's reports published through the Academy. Throughout his long career, Moore had published the results of his findings in twenty-one volumes. Cadwalader asked that one set be kept for the Academy's library, to which Heye agreed. Moore replied in a letter, however, "Mr. C. [Cadwalader] evidently does not know that bound copies of the Academy Journal, containing all my writings, are in the library of the Academy already."⁷³ Apparently Cadwalader had already minimized the importance of the archaeological collection in the Academy.

⁷¹ Wardle, "Wreck," 120..

⁷² Heye to Moore, LS, 15 April 1929.

⁷³ Clarence B. Moore, Philadelphia, to George Heye, LS, 1 May 1929, National Museum of the American Indian Archive, Suitland, MD, Box OC 121, F-LD.

In August 1929, Harriet Wardle, who aided in compiling the indices of Moore's reports and was the assistant curator of the Academy's museum, published a scathing article condemning the Academy for selling Moore's collection. She included many indignant comments, some of them incorrect. Wardle reported that Cadwalader planned to enforce his plans without consulting Moore, since he was in Florida at the time. She obviously did not hold Cadwalader in high esteem, for she wrote,

The managing director was without museum experience, and his first official inspection of the archeological department revealed him as ignorant of the value and importance of its collections.⁷⁴

Apparently Mr. Cadwalader also stressed the importance of secrecy in the transaction and showed much shock upon hearing that Wardle knew of the sale. He commanded her not to publicize the sale, either within or outside the Academy. When she stated that she had the freedom to say what she felt was right outside the Academy, he threatened her with dismissal. Because of all these factors, Ms. Wardle felt that she was left with no other option than to resign. She handed her resignation to the president, Mr. Morris, on May 6, 1929.

In her indignation, Wardle included a false statement. She wrote,

It is obvious from this sequence of events that Mr. Moore's consent to the sale of his collection . . . was not a free choice. It was the only way he saw to save his collection from such destruction as has fallen upon this returned material. He was left in ignorance even of the price the academy took for it—a price far below its marketable value, had the wish to sell been known.⁷⁵

However, unknown to Wardle, Heye and Moore had communicated via letter regarding the price of his collection. The contract was signed on April 29, yet Heye wrote Moore on April 15th, stating that he and Moore had already agreed to the price of \$10,000 for the

⁷⁴ Wardle, "Wreck," 119.

⁷⁵ *ibid.*

collection. Wardle's anger is understandable, but some of her statements should not be taken at face value because of the anger with which she wrote the article.

She did, however, include an interesting comment in her article. In describing Moore's collection, she wrote, "The Clarence B. Moore collection is the finest, most comprehensive and best documented assemblage of Indian antiquities from the mounds and cemeteries of the southern states."⁷⁶ This seemed to be the general consensus among Moore's contemporaries. After about 30 years of collecting, Moore had undoubtedly amassed one of the finest collection of American archaeological specimens to date.

Conclusions

Sadly, scholars know little of Moore's life after he retired from archaeology. Since he no longer conducted digs, he had no reason to publish his writings. He also did not seem to write many letters, and from appearances, became quite a recluse. In Wardle's biography of Moore, she wrote, "Although Clarence B. Moore was in correspondence with many Americanists of his time, he was personally known to few."⁷⁷

She also remembered him as being unfailingly generous, especially in distributing his journals. Wardle included an interesting anecdote regarding this characteristic of Moore:

His superb reports were generously distributed to all in the field as well as to institutions, and he expected only a simple acknowledgment. None came from the Government ethnologist, Dr. W. J. McGee. When this was repeated, Mr. Moore sent him a self-addressed postcard with instructions: "If received, write 'yes'; if not received, write 'no'; if not wanted, write 'nit'." That report was acknowledged.⁷⁸

⁷⁶ *ibid.*

⁷⁷ Wardle, "Clarence Bloomfield Moore (1852-1936)," 15.

⁷⁸ *ibid.*

He remained a bachelor throughout his life, probably due to the fact that he could not share two loves. He worked with women, such as Harriet Wardle who helped to compile his indices, and Mary Louise Baker, who illustrated many of Moore's finds for his reports. Wardle recorded a time when Baker asked Moore if he had recently seen the widowed sister of a friend, to which he replied, "Why, I never call on the ladies. They might ask me to call again!"⁷⁹ Wardle also wrote,

But once a year, he hired a carriage and pair, with special driver, in which he took an old lady on a drive through Fairmount Park. And also once a year, at Christmas time, it was his habit to give a formal dinner—not stag—at his home at 1321 Locust Street in Philadelphia.⁸⁰

After a long and productive life, Clarence Bloomfield Moore died on March 24, 1936, at the age of 84. He left an enduring legacy, one which still causes debate among scholars. As has been shown in this paper, many of his methods could be described as crude at best. He destroyed mounds and artifacts, collected and wrote about only the best specimens, and left less-than-precise record of the locations of his sites. He could also be described today as a grave robber. Due to people with methods like his, the government enacted laws such as NAGPRA. As early as 1906 a law existed to protect archaeological sites and artifacts from pot hunters. The Antiquities Act of 1906 provided preservation for historic and prehistoric lands on federal land, a permit system to study archaeological sites on federal and Native American lands, and imposed the possibility of criminal misdemeanor charges with fines and/or imprisonment.⁸¹ Moore escaped charges by digging on private land and avoiding federal lands. He always stated clearly in his

⁷⁹ *ibid.*

⁸⁰ *ibid.*

⁸¹ Trey Berry and Douglas L. Reed, "Protecting the Past: A Comparative Study of the Antiquities Laws in the South," Working paper for delivery at the annual meeting of the Southwestern Political Science Association Meeting, 14-18 March 2001.

reports that he had asked private landowners for permission to dig on their land, thus waylaying the chance for possible government repercussions. His actions would certainly garner some form of punishment under today's standards.

Despite Moore's shortcomings in these areas, it must be remembered that he was exploring a field of science with very little precedent. His methods were certainly more respectable than many of his contemporaries.

Another reason that his methods seem shocking is that they are being examined in comparison with the methods of today. He indeed paved the way for current archaeological practices by being willing to experiment in a little-known science. The progression of science occurs through trial and error, and Moore just happened to be at the beginning of this process.

One of his greatest contributions to the science are his journals. Few other archaeologists published the results of their findings with the regularity of Moore. Luckily, he recorded his findings with great detail, since he destroyed many sites in the process. If not for these publications, no information regarding these sites may have remained today. Mary B. Davis, who helped preserve his papers for filming wrote,

All [today's archaeologists] are impressed by the regularity and quality of his publications, which were profusely illustrated with photographs taken by Moore (he was an award-winning photographer) . . .⁸²

Many archaeologists today still find his journals very useful in their work. Jeffrey Mitchem wrote,

Although some modern archaeologists may decry Moore's field methods, all are impressed by his prodigious, prompt reporting of his discoveries . . . The quality,

⁸² Mary B. Davis, "In Search of C. B. Moore" in "Field Notes of Clarence B. Moore's Southeastern Archaeological Expeditions, 1891-1918: A Guide to the Microfilm Edition," Huntington Free Library, Museum of the American Indian, Bronx, NY, 8.

timeliness, and thoroughness of his publications far exceeded the efforts of his contemporaries.⁸³

Moore also contributed to the science of archaeology by his willingness embark on this relatively new field of study. If not for his efforts, archaeology as we now know it may not have come into its own, or its progress may at least have been slowed. Although his methods are debatable, he at least made the effort.

The results of Clarence B. Moore's work can be seen in many areas—his field notes, his extensive collection scattered all over the country, the current antiquities protection laws, and even the lack of many formerly-existing sites. He was a complex man, yet at the same time the overriding goal of archaeology guided his life. Many professional archaeologists today may consider him an amateur, a destructive pot hunter who devastated important sites. It is important, however, to remember not to judge his conduct according to today's methods. Clarence Bloomfield Moore truly made enormous progress in the study of archaeology and of the ancient peoples of the American Southeast.

⁸³ Jeffrey M. Mitchem, "Clarence B. Moore's Work," 1.

Works Cited

- Berry, Trey and Douglas L. Reed. "Protecting the Past: A Comparative Study of the Antiquities Laws in the South." Working paper for delivery at the annual meeting of the Southwestern Political Science Association Meeting. 14-18 March 2001.
- Davis, Mary B. "In Search of C. B. Moore" in "Field Notes of Clarence B. Moore's Southeastern Archaeological Expeditions, 1891-1918: A Guide to the Microfilm Edition." Huntington Free Library. Museum of the American Indian. Bronx, NY.
- Heye, George to Clarence B. Moore. Philadelphia. LS. 15 April 1929. National Museum of the American Indian. Suitland, MD. Box OC 121, F-LD.
- Moore, Clara Jessup. "Ancestry of Clarence Bloomfield Moore, Of Philadelphia." Reprinted from *National Genealogical Society Quarterly* (March 1940).
- Moore, Clarence B. *The Georgia and South Carolina Coastal Expeditions of Clarence Bloomfield Moore* ed. Lewis Larson (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1998).
- _____. *The Moundville Expeditions of Clarence Bloomfield Moore*. ed. Vernon James Knight, Jr. (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1996).
- _____. *The East Florida Expeditions of Clarence Bloomfield Moore*. ed. Jeffrey M. Mitchem (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1999).
- _____. *The Lower Mississippi Valley Expeditions of Clarence Bloomfield Moore*. ed. Dan F. Morse and Phyllis A. Morse (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1998).
- _____. "Antiquities of the Ouachita Valley." *Journal of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia* 14.
- _____. "Some Aboriginal Sites on Red River." *Journal of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia* 14.
- _____. *The West and Central Florida Expeditions of Clarence Bloomfield Moore*. ed. Jeffrey M. Mitchem (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1999).
- _____. Philadelphia, to George Heye. LS. 12 August 1915. National Museum of the American Indian Archive. Suitland, MD. Box OC 167, F-1.
- _____. Arkansas City, AR, to Frederic K. Seward. LS. 21 January 1917. National Museum of the American Indian Archive. Suitland, MD. Box OC 244, F-4.
- _____. St. Petersburg, FL, to "Classmate." LS. 30 December 1931. Pusey Library. Harvard University Archives. Cambridge.
- _____. Philadelphia, to George Heye. LS. 1 May 1929. National Museum of the American Indian Archive. Suitland, MD. Box OC 121, F-LD.
- Pearson, Charles E., Thomas C. C. Birchett, and Richard A. Weinstein. "An Aptly Named Steamboat: Clarence B. Moore's *Gopher*." *Southeastern Archaeology* 19, no. 1 (Summer 2000).

Perry, George. Editorial. *New York Home Journal*. 5 August 1885.
<<http://www.svpvriil.com/svpweb32.html>> (28 April 2000).

Wardle, Harriet Newell. "Clarence Bloomfield Moore." *Bulletin of the Philadelphia Anthropological Society* 9, no. 2 (March 1956).

Wardle, Harriet Newell. "Wreck of the Archeological Department of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia." *Science* 70, no. 1805. 2 August 1929.

Account books of Bloomfield H. Moore (1879-1894). 31 December 1895. Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

"Clara Sophia Jessup-Bloomfield Moore." n.d. <http://www.svpvriil.com/svpweb13.html> (25 April 2000).

"Clarence Bloomfield Moore." *Class Book of 1873*. Harvard University Archives.

"Dispute over an Estate." Collection of the Genealogical Society of Pennsylvania, v. XII, p. 65. Located in Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

"Mrs. Bloomfield Moore is Dead." *Philadelphia Evening Telegraph*. 5 January 1899.

"Obituary." *International Year Book*. 1898. <<http://www.svpvriil.com/svpweb32.html>> (28 April 2000).

"Philadelphia Woman, Interested in the Keely Motor, Dies in London an Eventful Life." 5 January 1899. <<http://www.svpvriil.com/svpweb32.html>> (28 April 2000).

"Rid of Keely At Last. His Greatest Benefactor Washes Her Hands of the 'Inventor.'" 17 December 1890. <<http://www.svpvriil.com/svpweb32.html>> (28 April 2000).

"To Hunt for Skulls." *Jacksonville Evening Times-Union*. 28 August 1895.