

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Entering America: Northeast Asia and Beringia before the Last Glacial Maximum. Edited by D. B. Madsen.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/80v5310f>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 30(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Ackerman, Robert E.

Publication Date

2006

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

There is no reason to excuse John Marshall from his clear personal and federalist interests in authoring the trilogy of cases that constitute the core of federal Indian law to this day. He may have regretted the use of coercion in the service of his doctrine, but there are no grounds to believe that he regretted or did not foresee the deep, long-term implications for diminished Indian sovereignty.

Marshall presented federal primacy as “protection” and this image would come to dominate federal Indian law and the story of Marshall as an “advocate of the Indians.” What is striking, however, is that Marshall’s adoption of Christian discovery as the foundation of land title in the United States has only rarely been seen for what it is: a subjugation of indigenous peoples to fifteenth-century theological and colonial legalisms, in derogation of their status as free and independent nations.

Marshall’s rhetorical skill transmuted the theology of Christian discovery into constitutional theory. He was willing to jettison “natural right” and even “reason” to uphold “that system under which the country has been settled.” Far from being an advocate for Indians, Marshall may be seen as advocating a concept of “tribal quasi-sovereignty” that formed the basis of US property law.

The merit of *Conquest by Law* is that it places law and legal doctrine at the center of the process by which indigenous peoples were displaced in the colonization of North America. Its failing is that it tries to rescue a hero from the author of these legal doctrines.

Peter d’Errico

University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Entering America: Northeast Asia and Beringia before the Last Glacial Maximum. Edited by D. B. Madsen. Salt Lake City: The University of Utah Press, 2004. 400 pages. \$50.00 cloth.

The rather lengthy and complex tome under review, *Entering America: Northeast Asia and Beringia before the Last Glacial Maximum*, takes the reader through fourteen contributed chapters in which questions regarding the type and timing of the settlement, or colonization, of the subarctic and arctic realms of Siberia and the consequences of that effort for the subsequent movement of Native peoples into the Americas are explored. One should not be misled by the book title as the time periods covered in *Entering America* extend into the Late Glacial Maximum (LGM, 22,000–20,000 years ago) and post-LGM intervals of the Late Wisconsin glacial of North America (Sartan in Russia) making its contribution all the more valuable.

The book opens with a lengthy introduction in which the editor’s major thesis, the possible entry of modern humans into Siberia and the New World prior to the LGM before the present (BP), is explored, thus setting the stage for the remainder of the volume. The introductory section, “Environmental Conditions in Northeast Asia and Northwestern North America,” provides an overview of the paleoenvironmental settings that Upper Paleolithic

hunter-gatherers would have encountered as they moved into the subarctic regions of Siberia and northwestern North America. The LGM “productivity paradox” (31), where the pollen data indicated sparse supporting vegetation while the fossil megafaunal evidence indicated otherwise, remains a relevant issue for those in later chapters who favor the human abandonment of Siberia during the LGM. Drops in sea levels (-80 to -50 meters) during Marine Isotope Stage (MIS) 3 (Kargin in Siberia and Late Wisconsin in North America, 57,000–27,000 BP) and an additional drop of -50 meters during MIS 2 (Sartan in Siberia and Late Wisconsin in North America, 27,000–12,000 BP) resulted in a broad land connection (central Beringia) between Siberia and Alaska and the emergence of continental coastal platforms. These are the backdrops for the colonization of subarctic and arctic Siberia by Upper Paleolithic hunter-gatherers and their expansion across the Bering Sea platform and into northwestern North America.

The stage then shifts to the occupation of the northwest coast, pre-Clovis sites, and the Clovis blade industry. A 10,300 BP bone tool from On-Your-Knees Cave, Prince of Wales Island in southeastern Alaska, provides the earliest evidence for a human presence on the northwest coast. A later occupation at 9,500 BP included microblades of obsidian bifaces, flake cores, and other stone tools. In the Queen Charlotte Islands the authors propose that the leaf-shaped bifaces from the early period (9,400–8,500 BP) provide evidence of a basal nonmicroblade component that can be related to the bifacial industry of the Nenana complex of central Alaska and to level 7 of the Ushki I site in Kamchatka. They propose that an early biface-oriented technology came out of Siberia at 12,500 BP or earlier and formed the earliest cultural complex of northwestern North America prior to the introduction of microblade technology. To bolster their position they ignore the greater than 12,000 BP dates for microblades at the Swan Point site in central Alaska and greater than 19,000 BP dates for microblades in Siberia. In Siberia and the Russian Far East microblades are associated with bifacial tools. Adovasio and Pedler reacquaint us with the case for pre-Clovis sites, particularly Meadowcroft. Collins and Lohse provide some very interesting data on the blade technology associated with Clovis that is most useful for comparison with other core and blade technologies.

In section III, “Human Genetics and Forager Mobility” suggests that, based upon molecular genetic diversity, the New World was colonized by several separate migrations of hunter-gatherer groups with an early group of colonizers from 31,000 to 12,500 BP and a later one from 12,500 to 11,400 BP. The genetic data seems to support the linguistic data for an earlier colonization of the New World, but, as noted in the following chapter, the sites haven’t been uncovered (244). They provide an intriguing model of mobility based on a computer simulation of how people coming out of Siberia could make it to Monte Verde, which is close to the tip of South America, by 12,500 BP. Their model deals with opening and closing corridors and a coastal route into the Americas. From their discussion the reader is left with the mistaken impression that people literally scampered across a hostile Bering Sea platform when there were three major river systems (Anadyr, Yukon, and

Kuskokwim) that provided riparian zones as well as lakes and surrounding grasslands that would have caused hunting-gathering groups to tarry and adapt to local resources as they had done in Siberia.

In section IV, “The Archaeology of Northeast Asia” delves into the time-space dynamics of the Early Upper Paleolithic (EUP) of northeast Asia, presents the evidence for the presence of humans along the Pacific coast of northeast Asia prior to the LGM, and details the search for a Clovis progenitor in Siberia by an extended discussion of the artifact complexes and the time of their occupation. The authors provide an informative discussion of the six features of the EUP and chart the spread of the EUP into subarctic and arctic Siberia. They note that Levallois procedures were not found above 58 degrees north latitude, blade technology extended up to 63 degrees, bifaces were found around 60 degrees, microblades extended up to 63 degrees, and bone, antler, and ivory technology and art were found at 60 degrees. With the discovery of the 27,000 BP Yana RHS site at 71 degrees north latitude, and 100 kilometers from the arctic coast, the spatial and temporal aspects of the EUP will need to be reconsidered (V. V. Pituko et al., *The Yana RHS Site: Humans in the Arctic before the Last Glacial Maximum*, 2004, 52). This discovery would also modify Goebel’s discussion of the occupation of subarctic and arctic Siberia. Regarding the LGM, Goebel advances the rather worn hypothesis of a general abandonment of Siberia citing harsh conditions and the lack of or small number of archaeological sites during the period 20,000–18,000 BP. The authors have admirably dispelled the concept of an impoverished LGM environment in chapter 2. Ikawa-Smith’s review of early site data from Japan, Korea, and the Ryukyu Islands is a welcome addition. The 25,000 and 32,000 BP skeletal remains from the Ryukyu Islands certainly demonstrate a pre-LGM human presence along the Pacific coast.

The book closes with commentaries by D. J. Meltzer and D. K. Grayson on the previous chapters and a final retrospectus by the editor. In sum, the human occupation of Siberia during the warm interval of the Kargin interstadial now seems to be well established both for the subarctic and arctic regions. A continued occupation during the beginning of the cold period (Sartan stage) and throughout the LGM also seems assured although questions of dating will remain. The increase in archaeological sites in Siberia after 18,000 BP is acknowledged. Kamchatka and Chukotka as critical staging areas for movement into the New World have thus far yielded only a few late-glacial to postglacial sites, none of sufficient antiquity to serve as models for an early New World settlement. And finally, there is as yet no solid evidence for a Clovis progenitor in Siberia. *Entering America* is an impressive body of data by well-known contributors and a valuable contribution to the movement of Upper Paleolithic hunter-gatherers into the far reaches of Siberia and thence into the Americas prior to the LGM and afterward.

Robert E. Ackerman

Washington State University