

Journal of the Minnesota Academy of Science

Volume 2 | Number 2

Article 3

1881

The Ancient Copper Mines of Isle Royale

N. H. Winchell

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/jmas>

 Part of the [Geology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Winchell, N. H. (1881). The Ancient Copper Mines of Isle Royale. *Journal of the Minnesota Academy of Science*, Vol. 2 No.2, 29-34.

Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/jmas/vol2/iss2/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of the Minnesota Academy of Science by an authorized editor of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

also found bones of the great Auk, which is not found living anywhere within the knowledge of man.

The result of all this work has been embodied in various reports published by the commission, and practical use has been made of it in the distribution of spawn and fry and in a strict supervision of the means of capture. The public are gaining every day from this work in the greater abundance and cheapness of fish as a diet.

During the past summer there has been an international exhibition of the various fishing industries of the world at Berlin, and our methods of work and the results obtained were the subject of interest and approval of the other attending nations.

THE ANCIENT COPPER MINES OF ISLE ROYALE.

BY N. H. WINCHELL.

[ABSTRACT.]

Two papers were read in 1880, by Prof. Winchell, on the ancient copper mines of Isle Royale. After an account of the exterior phenomena of the mines, and an enumeration of the articles found in them, an inquiry was instituted as to the race that wrought them, and as to their relation to the Mound Builders, and to the Indians. As it has been admitted for several years that the Lake Superior miners were identical with the Mound Builders, the inquiry involved the examination of the relation of the Mound Builder to the present Indian. The characteristics of the Mound Builders were stated, as determined by the highest archæological authorities, and compared with those known to be possessed by the aborigines.

1. Squier and Davis state that there probably existed among the Mound Builders a state of society something like

that which prevailed among the Indians at the time of the discovery of America; each tribe had its separate seat, maintaining, with its own independence, an almost constant warfare against its neighbors.

2. They occupied the whole country, from Lake Superior, at least, on the north, to the Gulf of Mexico on the south, and from the Alleghanies, at least, on the east, to the Sierras on the west.

3. They were an agricultural people, of generally homogeneous customs, carrying on trade with surrounding tribes.

4. They worked copper in a cold state, having no knowledge of iron, nor of the methods of smelting any of the ores of the metals by the aid of fire.

5. They built extensive earthworks and mounds.

6. They exhibited very frequently a remarkable flattening of the shin-bone.

7. They made a coarse cloth by twisting and weaving the fibers and bast of various plants.

8. They made pottery of clay, hardening it by heat, and rudely ornamenting it with figures of animals, or by simpler lining.

9. They wrought stone, with which they made many implements for domestic use, and for war.

10. They made rude sculptures, in stone and burnt clay, of animals and of the human face.

11. They had no knowledge of writing by the use of an alphabet, nor hieroglyphics, but sometimes resorted to pictures to convey information.

12. They made articles for personal adornment of shells, pearls, sharks' teeth, obsidian, copper, silver, steatite (black and mottled), slate, mica, coralline limestone, the bones of some animals, and some minerals, especially galena.

13. They were cotemporary with the elephant and mastodon in America.

Some of these characteristics, it is not necessary to say, are

well known to be those of the present Indian. The flattening of the shin-bone, known as *platycnemism*, quite recently regarded by some as peculiar to the Mound Builders, is also found to occur rather frequently among the present Indians. A flattened tibia lately obtained from a mound at Lanesboro, in Fillmore County, was submitted to Prof. Leidy, of Philadelphia, who stated, in correspondence with Rev. E. D. Neill, of Minneapolis, that it had no particular significance, but was a common occurrence in the early races.

The burden of the investigation related to the questions—did the Indian tribes build mounds? and did the Indians use copper implements? Both of these questions were found to be answered in the affirmative, the answer being based on an extensive reference to historical statements. In regard to the use of copper by the Indians at the time of the discovery, and for two centuries later, quotations were made from the *Voyage of John de Verazzano*, in 1524, found in the collections of the New York Historical Society; from the *Journal of Robert Just*, who was mate of the vessel in which Hudson ascended the river of his name; from *Hudson's* own account of the same voyage; from the statements of *Sir Walter Raleigh* regarding the Indians of Carolina; from *Grancille* in 1580 in Virginia; from *Heriot's Voyage; McKenzie* on the tribes in the extreme north; from the *Travels* of Alexander Henry; from *De Soto's* discoveries among the tribes along the Gulf of Mexico; *Claude Allouez* in 1666 at Lake Superior; *Dablon* in his *Relation* for 1669-70; from *Jacques Cartier*, near Quebec in 1535; and from *Champlain's Voyage*, 1613. These all refer distinctly to the existence of copper among the aborigines, some of them giving some particulars of the manner of its use, and of the manufacturing of implements.

In regard to the building of mounds by the existing race of Indians, it was stated that the habit of building mounds

was one that has prevailed in nearly all parts of the earth, and among nearly all nations. Reference was made to the Scythian mounds, to the Celtic, to the Japanese, and to those of New Zealand; to the *tumulus* of the heroic age of Greece, as sung by Homer; to the customs of the Persians and the Lydians; to the *tumulus* on the plain of Marathon, and to the earth-mound on the field of Waterloo. The practice of mound-building is therefore not distinctive of any race, tribe or epoch of the human family, and it is to be presumed that the Indian would not be an exception. It is, rather, a practice which seems to be common to all mankind, and to have survived from prehistoric times, being at once an easy way of commemorating the dead, and the most enduring monument to their memory.

It is often stated that the Indian, when interrogated concerning the mounds and earthworks of the country, shakes his head in ignorance, affirming that he knows not their origin. This fact is carried further than it should be when it is appealed to to prove the non-Indian origin of those mounds. Admitting, with some reservation, that the Indian at present knows nothing of the origin of the mounds, still it may be true that his immediate ancestors were familiar with the facts of their erection. The Indian has been driven from the home where he was born, and where his ancestral traditions and customs have centered, and exhibited their unconstrained development, and has been for several generations a fugitive from the cupidity and the bayonet of the white man. When it is remembered that the erection of a mound, such as are seen all over the Northwest, was not the act of a day, nor of a year, but of many years, and perhaps generations, it is easy enough to understand why the custom has become so nearly extinct. The Indian has become greatly modified by contact with the European. He has gradually been compelled to forsake many customs, and abandon arts, which came into competition with the customs and arts of the stronger race.

The semi-nomadic life which he has been compelled to adopt, has not been favorable to the erection of mounds, which requires the quiet of permanent and peaceful residence.

As evidence that the present Indian tribes formerly erected mounds for different purposes, quotations were made from the journal of Lewis and Clark among the Omahas; Bertram on the Choctaws; General Oglethorpe concerning the Indians at Savannah; Featherstonhaugh on the Osages; Bradford on the general practice by the southern Indians; Jefferson on the practice in Virginia; McCauley on the same in New York; Beck's Gazetteer on mounds made by Indians in Illinois; the President's message in 1806, on a mound erected by the Natchez in Louisiana; C. C. Jones on the practice of mound building by the Florida Indians; George Catlin on the Mandans; the old chief Winnoshiek for the practice among the Sioux; Dr. Sternberg, U. S. A., for mounds of Indian origin in Florida, and E. G. Squier for testimony concerning the Iroquois in New York.

The views of Jones, Bradford and others were referred to as establishing the fact that the practice of building earthworks was prevalent among the Indians of the country generally, prior to their disturbance by the whites; and the opinions of Rev. T. S. Williamson, and S. W. Pond of Shakopee, were cited, as corroborative of the same among the Iowas and the Dakotas.

Thus it appears that every prominent trait of the Mound Builder was possessed also by the Indian in occupancy of the country at the time of the discovery. It hence becomes unnecessary to appeal to any other agency than the Indian. It is poor philosophy and poor science that resorts to hypothetical causes, when those already known are sufficient to produce the known effects. The Indian is a known adequate cause. His testimony, which has often been appealed to, cannot be received. It is impeached successfully by the witnesses above quoted. His knowledge of the past is not valid,

as historical evidence, and must be entirely ignored in the investigation of his early history. Hence we infer that the Indian was the ancient miner on Isle Royale, and the Mound Builder of America.

REPORT OF THE CORRESPONDING SECRETARY
FOR 1880, AND TO APRIL, 1881.

The following exchanges have been received:

1. From the Philadelphia Academy of Natural Sciences:
Page 229 of Bulletin.
2. From the St. Louis Academy of Sciences:
 1. Transactions, Vol. IV, No. 1.
 2. A pamphlet entitled "Contributions to the Archæology of Missouri," by the Archæological Section of the Academy.
3. From the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences:
Transactions, Vol. V, Part 1.
4. From the American Geographical and Statistical Society:
Bulletin No. 10 for 1879.
" " 2 " 1880.
5. From the Buffalo Society of Natural Sciences:
Bulletin, Vol. III, No. 5.
6. From the Kirtland Society of Natural Sciences, Cleveland:
Papers read before the Society, 1879..
7. From the Rhode Island Historical Society:
Proceedings, 1879 and 1880.
8. From the Vermont Historical Society:
Proceedings of the Governor and Council,
Vol. VIII.