

Re: Copper Casting In America (Trevelyan)

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology/2004-06/0115.html>

From: Eric Stevens (*eric.stevens_at_sum.co.nz*)

Date: 06/25/04

Date: Sat, 26 Jun 2004 11:13:49 +1200

On Wed, 23 Jun 2004 23:46:01 -0500, Tom McDonald
<tmcdonald2672@charter.net> wrote:

>Eric Stevens wrote:

>

>> On Fri, 11 Jun 2004 22:57:04 GMT, ke4zv@bellsouth.net (Gary Coffman)

>> wrote:

>

><snip>

>

>>>Realize that casting is primarily a technique used for cheap mass

>>>produced items.

>>

>>

>> With respect, that is nonsense. Casting is a technique which is used

>> to make shapes and structures which cannot be easily made any other

>> way.

>

>Eric,

>

> In the case of the copper artifacts in the upper Great Lakes

>area, all of the shapes and structures have been shown to have

>been made via cold and hot-working techniques.

This is not my understanding. Metallurgical examination has shown that some of the artifacts have been cast.

>(Note that I am

>not saying that all the copper artifacts were so made; only that

>casting was not necessary.)

That seems to be a different topic. Are you saying that even if they were found to be cast, it wasn't necessary for them to be cast?

> As for whether certain types of

>tools and ornaments might be more easily made by casting, this

>is only true if the technology for casting has been developed.

>That is what is at issue.

sci.anthropology: Re: Copper Casting In America (Trevelyan)

I think you and I are approaching the question from opposite ends. You seem to be saying that no artifacts can have been cast, in the absence of direct evidence for casting techniques. I am saying that cast artifacts are evidence for the existence of casting techniques, even if direct evidence for such techniques is not known.

>

>>

>>

>>>*It allows relatively low skilled workers to produce large numbers of relatively complex identical items.*

>>

>>

>> *You do them a disservice to describe them as "low skilled". The work is difficult and dangerous, and it took centuries to develop the techniques.*

>

> *Yes, especially wrt copper (see Gary's discussion of copper casting problems below). So far as I can see at this point, there isn't good evidence for such a period of development in the archaeological record.*

>

> *OTOH, at least for the Old Copper and Red Ochre complexes in the Upper Great Lakes region, there don't seem to be many well-documented sites from that period (ca. 3000-1000 BC); and stratified sites are even more rare. Most of the copper artifacts were surface finds, and many came from collectors whose documentation of their finds generally ranged from fair to non-existent.*

>

>>

>>

>>>*Cold working is a much more challenging, and artistically unique, way to produce intricate copper ceremonial items. The smith has to have a higher level of skill than the foundryman to produce equally complex work.*

>>

>>

>> *Which is why the people who know how to melt and cast copper use that technique rather than straight smith-work.*

>

> *Again, I don't know that that is true wrt copper, given the difficulty the technique appears to have in creating strong, high-quality results. OTOH, cold and hot working were known by the Native peoples in the Great Lakes area to produce that very strong, high-quality result.*

>

><snip>

>

>>>*But that said, casting pure copper is a bitch.*

>>

>>

sci.anthropology: Re: Copper Casting In America (Trevelyan)

>> *This from the guy who has just written that the task can be undertaken*
>> *by low-skilled workers?*
>
> *Eric, I read that to mean that casting, in general (as with*
> *iron, silver, bronze, gold, etc.) can be done by folks with*
> *fewer skills than smiths. However, copper appears to present*
> *particular problems with casting that are not so pronounced with*
> *other metals, and which require higher skill levels than would*
> *be required by those who cast other metals.*

I don't read 'low skilled' as meaning 'lower skilled'.

>
> *This should be taken into consideration along with the fact*
> *that Great Lakes copper, and drift copper, don't need to be*
> *smelted to use. In other areas, where smelting ore _is_*
> *required, the technology for melting metal is a given; here, it*
> *isn't.*

There is a difference between 'smelted' as in refining and 'melted' as for casting. I am not aware of evidence for the former in NA but there may be evidence for the latter in the form of cast artifacts.

>
>>
>>
>>> *Porosity is the enemy,*
>>> *even for modern copper foundries. They charge a hefty premium for*
>>> *low porosity castings. Alloying the copper to make bronze improves*
>>> *matters *enormously*, and production of such alloys was a huge*
>>> *technological leap forward for the casting industry.*
>>>
>>> **If* the Native Americans of millenia past made the technological*
>>> *leap of producing bronze alloy, it would be a significant achievement*
>>> *(as it was when Old World artisans did it). But I've seen no evidence*
>>> *produced in this thread that the ancient Native Americans made*
>>> *such a technological leap forward.*
>>>
>>> *The artifacts described appear to all be relatively pure native copper.*
>>> *As such, the *intelligent* way of working the material would have*
>>> *been smithing rather than casting. So if the motive were to make*
>>> *ancient Native Americans appear stupid, then claiming that they*
>>> *used open casting techniques would be the method of choice to do*
>>> *so. Now ask yourself which side of the argument is making that*
>>> *claim.*
>>
>>
>> *Neither. The claim merely is that some copper items have been cast.*
>
> *Eric, Yuri was making the claim that to say Indians of the*

sci.anthropology: Re: Copper Casting In America (Trevelyan)

- >Great Lakes area didn't cast copper was to express bigotry
- >towards the First Nations of the area. Gary's argument flows
- >from Yuri's standard 'mainstreamers are racists' rap, with its
- >particular application in the cast vs. worked copper issue.
- >
- >I'm still agnostic, and am reading up on the archaeological
- >references I can find. If you, or other folks, have suggestions
- >for reading, I'm all eyes.
- >
- >BTW, I've just gotten Mallery's book (the 1979 version, revised
- >and extended by Mary Roberts Harrison). I've only skimmed a bit
- >of it, so I don't have an informed opinion on it yet. Will advise.

Very much the curate's egg.

Eric Stevens