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ABSTRACT

Community plays a critical role in human life and this project explores community on multiple levels, both through exploration of a historic socialist community, the Equality Colony, and through its use of the community archaeology method. In 1897 the Brotherhood of the Cooperative Commonwealth, a Maine based socialist political group, put out a call to its membership of over 2,000 people across the nation to move to Washington State. Their long term goal was to win the heart of the state for American socialism. The short term goal was to establish a colony to demonstrate the utility of socialist living to the country. The long term goal was never realized; the short term goal resulted in the formation of the Equality Colony, which existed in Skagit County, Washington from 1897 to 1907. The Equality Colony has received some attention from historians but this is the first archaeological investigation. In fact, there has been little archaeological research of utopian communities in the Northwest region at all. By apply a strong anthropological theoretical framework; this project brings a new perspective and new insight to this fascinating piece of history and lays groundwork for archaeological survey on the former Equality Colony land. Historical research, including analysis of recorded interviews with former Equality Colony members and descendents, as well as historic photographs, maps, and documents, was utilized to both gain new insight into the Equality Colony history and to generate archaeological research questions. In the course of this project a wealth of information pertinent to the creation of an archaeological research design was compiled and explored. Work with a variety of maps and aerial photographs succeeded in locating the former Equality Colony infrastructure on the modern landscape.

The Equality Colony land is privately owned today and archaeological survey(s) of this land cannot be carried out without landowner cooperation. This thesis project utilized the community archaeology method to lay the groundwork for archaeological survey. Community archaeology is the purposeful engagement of a community, most often the local and/or descendant community, in an archaeological project. Community engagement activities for this project included mail correspondence with the landowners, public talks, a landowner meeting, and various other community interactions. Through landowner engagement I was able to do the first ever archaeological survey on a portion of the historic Equality Colony site. The community archaeological method is being increasingly utilized but best practice guidelines have yet to be established. By documenting my own community archaeology process I hope to contribute to the growing body of work from which guidelines may be created.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Community is a universal social group existing in every human society (Baxter 2012; Casella 2012; Heap and Zizzo 2009; Inomata and Coben 2006; Kolb and Snead 1997; Lawrence 2000; Murdock 1949; Yaeger and Canuto 2000). It plays a central role in human life, shaping and being shaped by social interactions. Social scientists recognize community as a dynamic, multi-scalar grouping of individuals who identify with, interact with, and share practices with each other (Casella 2012; Grave et al. 2012; Gowlett et al. 2012; Lawrence 2000; Yaeger and Canuto 2000). Given that community plays such a salient role in human life, it is surprising that the archaeological study of the community as a unit has remained underutilized and underdeveloped (Yaeger and Canuto 2000; Kolb and Snead 1997).

Traditionally, archaeologists have overlooked the study of community as a subject in favor of household and regional archaeology (Yaeger and Canuto 2000). However, the study of community as a unit is gaining in popularity and archaeologists are recognizing its value (Knapp 2003; O’Gorman 2010; Van Bueren 2006; Wilson 2010) as evidenced by Yaeger and Canuto’s (2000) volume, *The Archaeology of Communities*, written with the expressed goal to revitalize and standardize the archaeological study of communities.

The study of community has tremendous potential to contribute to the field of archaeology (Barnes 2011). The community fits between the unit of a household and the unit of a region and thus perfectly complements and unites these studies (Bartlett and Mcanany 2000; Pauketat 2000). Analysis at the community scale allows archaeologists to simultaneously examine the connections among people, such as in the household, and the way those connections form the larger networks that make up a region (Carroll 1999).

A community centered approach to archaeology can provide a new perspective on previously overlooked members of a community. Women and children are notoriously ignored in the archaeological literature and this has to do with the way that research has been focused (Spencer-Wood 2006). Lawrence (2000) looked at a previously documented mining community in Victoria, Australia. Prior to her work,
archaeologists had addressed the site’s technology and means of production. Though it is not always the case, historically, men have been at the center of technological developments and production outside of the home. Thus the archaeologists had focused on the male presence in the archaeological record. In addressing the mining site on the community level, Lawrence was not only able speak to the presence of women and children in the archaeological record but also to talk about their agency.

Community ties in closely with another topic of enduring archaeological interest, the evolution of complex social organization. Understanding community function, particularly the way that ritual is used to maintain communities, could help archaeologists to understand how larger social entities, like kingdoms and empires, arose (Henrich 2009; Inomata and Cohen 2006; Krause 1972; Olaveson 2002; Turner 1967, 1969).

The study of utopian communities is uniquely interesting. A utopian community is defined here as formed by a group of people who share key values, in their attempt to create an idealized society (Van Bueren and Tarlow 2006). Utopian communities offer perspective on social reproduction and the transmission of culture (Breen 2006:35; Tarlow 2002). Unlike many other communities, they have a defined start and end date. Further, utopian communities have well-defined ideological stances that are often in contrast to the ideological stance of the surrounding community. The members themselves may come from a variety of backgrounds, some of which differ enormously from the conditions and accepted values of the utopian community (Hoey 2003). This makes utopian communities excellent subjects for studying how human beings negotiate changing ideology and deal with conflicting viewpoints (Breen 2006; Hoey 2003; Tarlow 2002; Van Bueren 2006). Specifically, utopian communities can shed light on the nature of egalitarianism, as many of them took a definitive egalitarian stance (Breen 2006:36).

Utopian communities offer an alternative to the dominant narrative about the history of a society and remind us the past was not homogenous (Tarlow 2002). They are particularly effective in this because they exist, in part, as a criticism of the dominant culture and the social norms of a society (Breen 2006; Renfro-Sargent 2002; Tarlow 2002). In all communities members share practices and experiences (Kolb and Snead 1997). The landscape on which this sharing takes place is an element of the community.
(Anshuetz et al. 2001). In a utopian community the landscape is often actively shaped by members to reinforce the community’s goals and ideas (Van Bueren and Tarlow 2006).

This thesis will contribute to the growing body of archaeological research focused on utopian communities by investigating the Equality Colony, a socialist utopian community established in 1897 in what is today Skagit County, Washington. The Equality Colony was established by the Brotherhood of the Co-operative Commonwealth (BCC), a group of American socialists from the East Coast (LeWarne 1995). The BCC was seeking to create an example of idealized living to stand as propaganda for their political cause. Socialism was the shared value of the Equality Colony participants and the Colony’s guiding principle. From 1897 to 1907 the 440 acre property that made up the main holdings of the Equality Colony land was collectively owned and managed (Smith 1988). The group hoped that Equality would be the first of many such communities in Washington State but their dream did not come to fruition. However, they did spend 10 years at the site. Historical records indicate that at its peak the Equality Colony was home to approximately 300 people and that thousands of people visited Equality while it existed (LeWarne 1995; Smith 1988). Despite its impermanence, it is an important piece of history on a local, regional, and national level. Historian Charles LeWarne, who researched utopian communities throughout Washington State remarked, “Equality directly touched the lives of more people than any other communitarian experiment in western Washington. No community of three hundred persons in a frontier state should be dismissed lightly, and Equality drew many who remained in the Pacific Northwest.” (1995:112).

For the most part, the Equality Colony has been documented by historians as part of a larger story, e.g. the settlement of Skagit County by Euroamericans or early socialism in Washington State (Fogarty 1990; Jordan 1974; LeWarne 1995; Willis). LeWarne (1995) and Smith (1988), who offer the most in-depth looks at the Equality Colony, focus on establishing a timeline of major events. While these authors offer valuable information about the Equality Colony and place it in a larger historical context, they leave more to be learned.

This thesis combines archaeological and historical research methods to investigate the Equality
Colony and build upon previous research by historians. I apply a strong framework of anthropological and archaeological theory and in doing so I bring a new focus on the material culture, the configuration of the built environment and the daily functioning of the Equality Colony. This project makes use of five methods of investigation: historic research, photograph analysis, map analysis, pedestrian survey and community archaeology.

Today the Equality Colony land is privately owned and landowner cooperation is necessary for archaeological survey(s) of this land. Archaeology is often a sensitive topic for property owners due to concerns about state and federal regulation. For this project, I used the community archaeology approach in order to build relationships with property owners. Community archaeology is the purposeful engagement of one or more communities, most often the local and/or descendant community, in the process of an archaeological project (Chirikure and Pwiti 2008). I am interested in demonstrating the utility of the community archaeology approach and have documented my process for this project. Community engagement activities included mail correspondence with the landowners, public talks, a landowner meeting, and various other ongoing community interactions. Through landowner engagement I was able to complete a pedestrian survey of a portion of the historic Equality Colony site.

Chapter Two of this thesis details some of the theoretical frameworks and methods employed in the archaeological study of communities. The concise history of the Equality Colony in Chapter Three will provide context for this project’s research and results. In it I apply some of the theoretical frameworks described in Chapter Two to the history of the Equality Colony. Chapter Four provides important background information for the methods used in this project. In it I discuss the development of the community archaeology approach and provide some examples of community archaeological projects, including those on private property. Chapter Five outlines the five different methods used in this study. Chapters Six, Seven and Eight present the results of this study. Using these methods, this project will investigate the Equality Colony history from a new, archaeological perspective, and in doing so lay the groundwork for archaeological survey for the former Equality Colony. The historical research and photographic analysis results are provided in Chapter Six, the map analysis and pedestrian survey results
in Chapter Seven and the community archaeology results in Chapter Eight. In conclusion, in Chapter Nine, I summarize how each aspect of this research—the historic research, photograph analysis, map analysis, community archaeology and pedestrian survey—offer new information on the Equality Colony separately but also build on each other in such a way that they exceed the sum of their parts. Chapter Nine also makes suggestions for further research directions on the former Equality Colony property if permission for further archaeological research is obtained.
CHAPTER TWO: THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF COMMUNITIES

Community is both shaped by and informs an individual’s perception of the world (Kolb and Snead 1997; O’Gorman 2010; Wilson 2010). A broad definition of community is used here and community will be understood as a dynamic, multi-scalar grouping of individuals who identify with, interact with and share practices with each other (Casella 2012; Grave et al. 2012; Gowlett et al. 2012; Lawrence 2000; Yaeger and Canuto 2000). Community members must interact with each other on a regular basis but cohabitation is not necessary (Aldred 2012; Gowlett et al. 2012; Kolb and Snead 1997; Yaeger and Canuto 2000). The landscape that these shared practices and experiences take place on is an element of the community (Anschuetz et al. 2001). Many communities, particularly in the past, are place-based. The experience of community is spatial as well as intellectual (Botwick and McClane 205; Casella 2012; Gowlett et al. 2012; Hoey 2003; Wilson 2010; Yaeger and Canuto 2000). Communities are formed by members identifying with each other (Casella 2012; Kolb and Snead 1997; Lawrence 2000). Another critical component in community formation is members seeing themselves as distinct from non-members (Kolb and Snead 1997; Lawrence 2000). Communities use symbols to help establish and reinforce membership status and to identify out-groupers or non-members (Kamau 2002). In this way social norms are reinforced at the community level (Murdock 1949).

Social norms are transmitted to children through communities (Casella 2012). Communities create opportunities to socialize children into work habits, gender roles, spiritual norms and class roles (Baxter 2012; Casella 2012). As Henrich (2009) explains, contextual learning mechanisms have developed to allow humans to use, gather and integrate cues from a variety of individuals in their community. Social norms are also maintained through communities. Deviations from norms are punished, and conformity rewarded, at the community level (Murdock 1949). Communities formed by work, or occupational communities, create networks outside of kinship; further establishing and reinforcing norms throughout human life (Casella 2012).
Every aspect of their lives are affected by hominids’ social nature (Gowlett et al. 2012; Kimball 1982). Indeed the evolution of the large brain, so pivotal to human evolution, is linked to the evolution of sociality and the growth of the group sizes that individuals interacted and maintained connections with (Gowlett et al. 2012; Perez-Barberia et al. 2007). This sociality, played out as cooperative behaviors, is not fully explained by kinship (Nettle and Dunbar 1997). Primates and other animals have an evolutionary stake in the survival of their kin, but what compels cooperative behaviors among community members not linked by kinship? As Nettle and Dunbar (1997) explain, reciprocity and the promise of a returned favor are key direct and indirect mechanisms. The later pay-off can contribute to the survival of individuals and their kin, making it in their own self-interest to cooperate within a community.

Interest in understanding the resilience and sustainability of communities has recently come from a public health perspective because of the recognition of the effects of community on social capital and thus on health (Barrett 2010; Block 2009). Social capital is the benefits derived from social networks, relationships and trust (Ferlander 2007; Hellwell and Putnam 2004; Song and Lin 2009). Putnam (2001) in *Bowling Alone, the Collapse and Revival of the American Community* discusses at length the role that communities play in building social capital. Correlations between social capital, good health and subjective well-being have been demonstrated (Ferlander 2007; Heap and Zizzo 2009; Hellwell and Putnam 2004; Huijts and Kraaykamp 2012; Kim et al. 2006; Kitchen et al. 2012; Putnam 2001). A lack of social capital has been shown to have a relationship with health issues (Gronseth 2001; Oksanssen et al. 2010). Health inequalities in wealthy countries have been linked to an absence of social capital (Muntaner and Lynch 2001). Beyond the potential intrinsic value of community to health, Wayland and Crowder (2002) point out the pivotal role that communities often play in primary health care. Given all of this, it seems likely that in the near future the perceived value of the community will only increase (Bowles and Gintis 2002).

Within the discipline of archaeology, the study of community has been somewhat overlooked (O’Gorman 2010; Kolb and Snead 1997; Yaeger and Canuto 2000). However, there are indications that this is changing (Van Bueren 2006). In 2006 the Society for Historical Archaeology devoted a volume of
their journal, *Historical Archaeology*, entirely to articles involving the archaeology of utopian communities (Van Bueren 2006). The utopian communities discussed in this volume are historically documented, but the articles clearly demonstrate that the archaeological record has the ability to enrich and deepen the understanding of these sites through exploration of the intersection of material culture and ideology (Bintliff 2004; Little 2002; Preucel and Pendery 2006; Van Bueren 2006; Van Wormer 2006).

**Theoretical Frameworks Used in the Archaeological Study of Communities**

The study of communities by archeologists has been strongly influenced by theoretical frameworks in sociocultural anthropology. Early conceptions of community in archaeology were heavily functionalist and behaviorist in nature and viewed community as defined by spatial boundaries (Yaeger and Canuto 2000; O’Gorman 2010). Theoretical shifts in archaeology, most significantly the incorporation of agency models and practice theory, have resulted in a very different conception of community with the role of intention and choice being emphasized over spatial proximity (O’Gorman 2010). Although some practitioners see functionalism as defunct (Isabell 2000), O’Gorman (2010) makes a case that there is still value in this model when it is shorn of some of its overly simplistic assumptions, such as homogeneity. Communities are best understood archaeologically when both the spatial boundaries and the dynamic maintenance of the community through choices of group members are considered.

Functionalist and behaviorist approaches to community have tended to be favored by archaeologists, perhaps because a spatially conceptualized community translates well when exploring material culture (O’Gorman 2010). Behavioral archaeology focuses on measuring behavior in the archaeological record without trying to understand motive (Trigger 2006). The theory of functionalism makes an analogy between an organism and culture. Just as within a living organism all of the parts are related and function together, so do all the parts of culture (Johnson 2010). Within these frameworks the concept of natural communities is used (O’Gorman 2010). Natural communities are spatially defined, e.g. a village or a workplace. People who live close to each other form a community through regular interaction and because their actions have immediate effects on each other (O’Gorman 2010).
As is discussed by O’Gorman (2010), under behaviorist and functionalist theories communities are conceptualized as homogeneous and intuitively understood, i.e. the boundaries of a community would be readily apparent to a non-member. This approach has been criticized by archaeologists such as Yeager and Canuto (2000) for overemphasizing external forces working on the community and not giving enough consideration to the internal forces within the community, i.e. the community members themselves. Isabell (2000) argues that behaviorist and functionalist frameworks do not make it clear whether the community is defined from an emic or etic perspective and that it is incorrect to believe that a community is equally apparent to observers and participants.

Agbe-Davies (2010, 2011) points out archaeologists and other social scientists can define community and use it as a concept in their work but they should not discount the emic perspective. The community is a social construct and archaeologists must ask what the community meant to the people who participated in it and what it means to the people who are connected to it now (e.g. Casella 2012). This consideration of the emic perspective is in part an outgrowth of archaeologists’ increased interest in identifying agency in the archaeological record (e.g. Owoc 2005).

The increased incorporation of agency models and practice theory into archaeological theory has led to new perspectives on communities that emphasize intention over spatial proximity (O’Gorman 2010; Sassaman 2005). Practice theory, developed by Bourdieu (1977), approaches society as constructed by human action. Practice theory provides a framework for understanding how social norms are learned and then reproduced (Hodder and Cressford 2004) and acknowledges both the agency of individuals and, through the concept of habitus, the limitations to agency put in place by learned behaviors (Trigger 2006). In this framework, community is created and dynamically maintained by the practices of its members (Barnes 2011; Yaeger and Canuto 2000). Yaeger and Canuto (2000) collectively refer to the frameworks that incorporate practice theory as interactional approaches and argue that they are most useful approaches for analysis of communities.

Within interactional approaches, the concept of imaginary communities can be utilized (O’Gorman 2010). Imagined communities are understood cognitively rather than spatially and encompass
both communities with a spatial element and those without, e.g. a political party. The imagined community concept originates from Anderson’s 1991 *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Anderson uses a historical materialist, or Marxist approach, in his work. His concern is with the emergence and growth of nationalism, defined as strong identification with a nation. He identifies nations and, indeed, all communities as imaginary communities (Anderson 1991; Tamir 1995; Wogan 2001). Under this framework it is identity and identification with others that holds communities together (Inomata and Coben 2006; Lawrence 2000). The imagined community concept emphasizes the agency of community members over the spatial proximity of members (O’Gorman 2010).

It has been asserted that the functionalist approach has very little value to the archaeology of communities (Isbell 2000). However, O’Gorman (2010) believes that the concepts of natural and imaginary communities can and should be used concurrently. She acknowledges that natural, or spatially defined communities, are very useful to archaeology. Further, communities often have a very real spatial element. Recognizing agency and praxis does not have to mean throwing out spatial proximity as a factor for communities. However, there is value in approaching communities without a preconceived notion of what they are or should be, rather allowing them to be defined by the community members, as in interactional approaches and the concept of imagined communities.

**Theoretical Frameworks Used in the Archaeological Study of Utopian Communities**

Utopian communities are best understood through an interactional framework that acknowledges the importance of their spatial element. They are imagined communities whose members identify with each other because of shared values and who choose to become a natural community by moving into close spatial proximity to each other. Their critique of the dominant culture, an important element of their shared identification, leads them to disassociate themselves on some level from non-members (Brown 2002). This disassociation reinforces their membership in the imagined community and induces an out-grouper mentality (Brown 2002) that helps create a state of what Turner (1967) calls liminality or antistructure.
Turner saw society as in constant flux between structure or stability and anti-structure or transitions. Structure he defined as the deliberate and normative societal rules regulated by legal and social sanctions. Structure is static. Anti-structure he defined as changing, egalitarian, and affected (as opposed to the pragmatism of structure). Anti-structure or liminality exists only as a transition between structures (Siegler 2002). During liminality, the transition, norms are suspended and identity is ambiguous. The roles, values, and norms that a person has experienced during their association with a society are suspended (Kamau 2002). They have not yet been integrated with a new society and thus have not been given new rules, expectations and roles to replace the old ones. In this in-between place of uncertainty, individuals are left to ponder society and the rituals and symbols associated with it. Turner describes this aspect of liminality as a period of reflection (Turner 1967:105). Social scientists consider utopian communities liminal because of their conscious separation from society and their limited duration (Kamau 2002; Lindsey 2010). Within the utopian community, members hope to move through liminality and create a new norm and structure.

Liminality is established in different ways by various utopian communities (Kamau 2002). Some create a physical separation from the communities around them. Others break with the economic systems of the society from which they came. Still others create alternative religious systems, change the gender roles of members, offer a completely different world view from the surrounding society or some combination of these.

Periods of liminality can lend themselves to group cohesion for individuals. People experiencing liminality are bound together by their lack of status and their isolation from the community they have known. This feeling of togetherness in the liminal period lends itself to the development of communitas. Communitas is an emotional condition of intense group togetherness. It is often associated with feelings of equality and solidarity (Kamau 2002). Turner's concept of communitas is related to Durkheim’s collective effervescence (Olaveson 2001). As Olaveson (2001) explains, “Collective effervescence is thus characterized by intimacy, intensity, and immediacy, yet it involves will and intention, and symbolic focus. It is not simply mob psychology or camaraderie... Effervescence is more present in revolutionary
or creative epochs, and in times of social upheaval” (Olaveson 2001:101). Communitas is desirable for utopian community members (Kamau 2002). Group cohesion is important because the success of a utopian community rises and falls on the commitment of its members (Kamau 2002). However the state of liminality is always temporary (Renfro-Sargent 2002) and the feeling of communitas is difficult to sustain over time as structure is introduced to the group (Siegler 2002). The initial markers of separation, such as physical space or a distinctive code of dress lose their liminal quality and are not enough to maintain communitas.

To fuel group cohesion, successful utopian communities often employ rituals to continue the creation of communitas (Brown 2002). Through the use of symbols that inspire strong emotion, ritual is able to make participation in society desirable (Oleveson 2001). As is discussed by Oleveson (2001), Turner viewed the needs of a society as inherently contrary to the individual needs of the people that make up that society. Turner theorized that some apparatus was needed to keep people in a society. He believed that ritual could not only keep people but could actually make participation in society desirable. Turner observed that ritual is used to reinforce the structure of a social system but also plays a role in societal change. Rituals can reinforce commitment to group ideology (Henrich 2009). Henrich (2009) explains that humans have evolved to seek affirmation of a community member’s sincerity through a display or action, beyond words, that confirms the group member’s commitment to the group (Henrich 2009).

The difficulty in maintaining group cohesion in utopian communities leads them to often have limited duration (Andelson 2002; Hall 1988; Hingers 1976; Kitts 2009). Traditionally the belief has been that communities with a strong sense of shared beliefs, in particular religious beliefs, last the longest (Stephan and Stephan 1973). However, recent work has suggested that this is not a complete explanation (Brumann 2001). As is discussed by Kamau (2002), Kanter examined over 30 utopian communities and concluded that the communities lasting more than 25 years employed significantly more commitment mechanisms. Andelson (2002) credits Kanter with providing the most complete theoretical framework for the creation and dismantling of utopian communities but at the same time offers a critique of her work.
Andelson uses the rites of passage model first put forth by Van Gennep and later expanded by Turner to expand upon Kanter's framework.

Turner’s model of the stages of rites of passage—separation, liminality, and reaggregation—can be applied to the experience of members of utopian communities (Andelson 2002). Separation is the movement of members from the structure or state they have known into the utopian community, which is liminal. Reaggregation happens after the utopian community ends and members return to the structure of the dominant society. Andelson (2002) has suggested a variation of this model and new terms that refer to the community as a whole. In this variation separation is replaced by sociogenesis, the formation and maintenance of the utopian community though the adoption of shared identity by members. Reaggregation is replaced by schismogenesis, the termination of binding relationships. This provides a useful framework for beginning to analyze the life cycle of the utopian community.

Andelson (2002) outlines three mechanisms for the formation of utopian communities: a charismatic leader, shared commitment to an ideology, and previous noncommunitarian connections such as club membership. Comparisons of these three formation mechanisms reveal that they each have merit. Andelson borrows the term schismogenesis from the work of Bateson who defined it as a decline in similarity and an increase in difference (Andelson 2002). Andelson (2002) explains that schismogenesis implies the development of factions within the community and will not explain the demise of all utopian communities. As is discussed by Andelson, Bateson outlines two nonexclusive types of schismogenesis: symmetrical and complementary. Symmetrical schismogenesis implies that factions within the community have the same goals but a different method for obtaining them. In complementary schismogenesis, factions of the group have different behavioral patterns that are complementary to each other, e.g. one fraction is dominant and one submissive. There are several factors that can prevent schismogenesis, including shared opposition to something outside the community. This can reinforce the shared values of the community in such a way as to make the differences seem small. Another preventative measure is to normalize schismogenesis and allow the factions to break off into their own community while still under the umbrella of the original community (Andelson 2002). This strategy is
practiced by the Hutterites, an ethno-religious group found primarily in North America. The Hutterites are Anabaptists who live communally in rural settings.

Costly signaling theory can offer some insight into the lifespan of communities. Costly signaling theory, developed in biology, was first applied to people as an explanation for why costly signaling, that is great sacrifices by individuals, would persist, particularly in relation to religion, when costly signals seem contrary to evolutionarily sound processes (Henrich 2009; Wildman and Sosis 2011). Sosis (2004) sums up costly signaling theory as: “Rituals promote group cohesion by requiring members to engage in behavior that is too costly to fake” (2004:166). To expand, the benefit of cooperation is that if everyone cooperates, then the benefit to the individual is greater than the sum of the contributed parts. However, there is the ever present temptation of individuals to cheat or freeride, which is to reap the benefits of the cooperative group without actually contributing. Costly signally theory argues that rituals that require a high-cost signal to the group were developed as a sort of test of the individual. The cost must be too great to fake and by paying that cost the individual proves loyalty (Sosis 2004). There is indication that costly signaling is linked to larger group membership, more committed membership, greater cooperation among members and a longer lifespan of the group (Sosis 2004; Wildman and Sosis 2011). As is discussed by Renfro-Sargent (2002), utopian communities often require costly signaling from their members. The Oneida community, which existed for over thirty years on the east coast of the United States, required new members to give the group all of their possessions and wealth. Sosis (2004) agrees that utopian communities that employ costly signaling as a commitment mechanism last longer. While it is not always the case, communities with a religious shared ideology are more likely to employ costly signaling.

Building on Henrich’s (2009) cultural evolutionary model of costly displays, Wildman and Sosis (2011) emphasize that high costs to the individual for group membership would maximize group cohesion. High costs to group members can include restrictions on behaviors, identification of outsiders as enemies or complete submission to a charismatic leader. Wildman and Sosis also link the charismatic leader to group longevity and maximization of cooperation.
Although not a complete explanation, Turner’s (1967, 1969) rites of passage, Adelson’s (2002) adaption—sociogenesis, liminality and schismogenesis—and costly signaling theory (Henrich 2009; Sosis 2004; Wildman and Sosis 2011), provide a framework with which to view the life cycle of the utopian community. Yaeger and Canuto (2000), O’Gorman (2010) and others have offered theoretical grounding for the archaeological study of community through the interactional approach and the concepts of imagined and natural communities.

Methods Used in the Archaeological Study of Communities

Community is created and maintained by social processes and must be methodologically approached this way (O’Gorman 2010; Yaeger and Canuto 2000). Archeologists have been tempted to use the concept of community and that of site interchangeably (Gilpin 2003; Peterson and Drennan 2005). Equating site and community would fit well with the data archaeologists work with, but this strategy oversimplifies the study of community and does neither archaeological nor communal studies justice (Hutson et al. 2008; Wall et al. 2008).

However, approaching community as social entity and not as a physical site presents a real challenge to archaeology. Archaeologists have to rely on physical manifestations of social processes; e.g. the spatial configuration of buildings, physical evidence of social stratification, the nature of public and private land use, shared stylistic traits in material objects, materials shared between households, the material evidence of rituals, and physical manifestations of cooperative projects (Grave et al. 2012; Yaeger and Canuto 2000). These landscapes, structures and objects created and manipulated by humans are collectively referred to as material culture (Lawrence 2000). Although the material culture is able to yield important information about social processes carried out in a place, the interpretations are not unambiguous and thus archaeologists must design their methodology with care (Breen 2006; Casella 2012; Lawrence 2000; Yaeger and Canuto 2000).

Part of the reason that material culture is able to provide information about social processes is that the two are intertwined in a reflexive relationship. Material culture both reflects and reinforces community norms and shared narratives (Beisaw and Gibb 2009; Casella 2012:288; Hodder 1985; Tarlow
A good example of this is seen in the built environment, i.e. the structures, landscapes and other settings designed and created by humans (Mehrer 2000; Perttula and Rodgers 2007). The built environment is a manifestation of the existing social order (Spencer-Wood 2006; Mehrer 2000). Buildings and landscapes are created within the context of community norms and expectations (Kapches 1990). At the same time, the built environment reinforces that same social order (Mehrer 2000). Beyond the buildings themselves, the layout of the community can play an important role in social processes (Bowser and Patton 2005; Thomas 1994). The placement of buildings, the designations of private and public space, and the divisions of types of buildings within a community can play an important role in building and maintaining group cohesion, i.e. the bond between group members (Kolb 1997; Thomas 1994). The layout of a community can also demonstrate existing divisions between community members and/or hierarchal organization that exists within the community (Breen 2006).

As discussed by Carballo (2012), archaeologists can look to the built environment for the physical manifestations of cooperation. He points out that communities with a high degree of cooperation would participate in mutual monitoring and that the built environment would likely have been constructed to facilitate this. Mutual monitoring is a strategy used by cooperative groups to reward the compliance of members with group norms and punish the non-compliance of members. Carballo (2012) also explores the role of ceremonial architecture and the physical space that group ritual takes place in. For instance, a community may have a central meeting hall where the group can gather. Rewards and punishments can be doled out within this central building in front of the entire community. Carballo (2012) also cites large open plazas as possible evidence of cooperative behavior in the built environment. A healthy community requires regular contact between members (Lawrence 2000). The structure of the community, including the built environment, can help to facilitate this needed contact (Lawrence 2000).

The built environment can further assist in the creation and maintenance of community by distinguishing the community from what is not the community, creating a boundary marker for community members (Barnes 2011; Baxter 2012; Botwick and McClane 2005; Larsen 2003; Thomas 1994). This boundary marker can be physical, symbolic or both. For instance, architectural styles or
layout of buildings can differentiate a community from outside communities (Baxter 2012). Actual physical boundaries, such as fences or hedges, are also built environment elements that can distinguish a community (Botwick and McClane 2005). These types of distinctions send signals to both members of the community and outsiders or non-members (Thomas 1994:19).

The built environment can reflect group norms but it also reflects differences within communities, which should not be considered homogenous (Baxter 2012; Thomas 1994). For instance, the arrangement of the residences when compared to communal centers can tell part of the story of status differentials that exist between groups within communities (Baxter 2012). Comparisons between household buildings and material goods within a household can also be indicative of differences in social status within the community (Baxter 2012:658). In a community with a high level of nonexcludable resources, i.e. goods that are publicly owned and have unrestricted access, individual households will show a high degree of continuity in subsistence remains such as faunal material (Eerkens 2012). The material remains of households in communities where access to resources are more privatized, i.e. where access to them is restricted, will show more differences between them. The meaning in material culture is simultaneously functional, social and symbolic (Lawrence 2000). This is why comparisons of artifact patterns in different types of spaces, i.e. designated public versus private spaces, can be useful (Baxter 2012).

The consumptive patterns, i.e. the amounts and types of consumables used, seen in communities can also be extremely telling (Carroll 1999; Tarlow 2002; Van Wormer and Gross 2006). People make purchases, produce goods, and barter both for functional and symbolic reasons (Van Wormer and Gross 2006). For example, the clothing acquired or produced by an individual will reflect the community norms around dress and personal appearance (Casella 2012). This is equally true for dietary and medicinal purchases; group norms will affect individual consumption choices (Van Wormer and Gross 2006). Unless a community exists in complete isolation, and not many communities do, procuring clothing, food, medicines and other consumables means interaction with other groups (Adams 1976; Nettle and Dunbar 1997). These inter-community interactions have an element of danger for communities and require a complex balance between community cohesion, trade relations and general goodwill among groups.
(Carroll 1999; Thomas 1994). Other external forces acting upon communities can include warfare, trade, introduction of new cultural elements and disease (Krause 1972).

Production of goods and shared economic structures are evident in the archaeological record (Byrd 1994). Identifying and analyzing these key components of community life is essential to understanding community function (Grave et al. 2012). Through material culture the ways that communities created structure and economic opportunity for themselves become evident (Landon and Bulger 2013). There can be continuity in the goods produced by community members (Carballo 2012). Group members can signal their identification with the community through the use of a certain style in the goods they produce. In archaeology, text aided and not, this is often explored in analysis of pottery decorations. Changes in production, economic structure and consumptive patterns identified in the archaeological record can demonstrate changes in overall community structure and in group and individual ideology over time (Burley 2003; Cheney 1992).

Every community must deal with the death of community members and the disposal of human remains (Bromberg and Shephard 2006). Mortuary practices are another set of behaviors that are formed by community ideology and norms while reinforcing these same mechanisms (Potter and Perry 2011). Potter and Perry (2011) point out that mortuary practices can tell archaeologists about both the individual and collective identities of those interred.

Much of the discussion above includes analysis of activities that may be carried out in a community without the community members acknowledging to themselves that they are the product of community membership. In contrast, feasting and building of large structures are two activities that happen in a community with the full awareness of members that their participation is an outgrowth of their membership (see Maxham 2000).

**Archaeological Contributions to the Study of Utopian Communities**

Although utopian communities have existed all over the world, this section references those that were in the United States. The methods previously detailed, such as the archaeological exploration of the built environment, consumptive patterns and mortuary practices, can be applied to utopian communities.
Utopian communities’ material culture is perhaps even more highly symbolic than in other communities (Van Wormer 2006). There is a sense of purpose in the design of architecture and landscapes and in the purchase of items that is arguably missing from dominant culture settings (Spencer-Wood 2006; Tarlow 2002). The ideology of the community is purposefully injected into everything within the utopian community (Preucel and Pendery 2006; Van Wormer 2006). The community members consciously construct and reinforce the community ideology in a way that less self-aware communities do not. For example, circular building practices have been historically used in some utopian communities as a physical representation of their commitment to the ideal of egalitarianism (Van Bueren and Tarlow 2006). Other examples of ideology purposefully represented in the built environment of utopian communities include building of multi-family homes, a practice that reinforces the ideal of regular interaction, and the use of nurseries for children, a strategy to reinforce the ideal of cooperation (Preucel and Pendery 2006; Van Bueren and Tarlow 2006).

In the case of Preucel and Pendry’s examination of Brook Farm, a historical utopian community in Massachusetts, the eclectic architectural style of the built environment reflected the Transcendentalist ideals originally held by the community. Transcendentalist ideology placed a high value on individual preferences. Meals were taken communally at a central building which held the only kitchen, but the residences themselves were not communal and allowed for personal expression. Brook Farm later made an ideological shift to Fourierism. Fourierism was a much more rigid doctrine and required standard communal architecture. The members of Brooke Farm built the communal residential center required by Fourierism but did not tear down the previously constructed residences. Preucel and Pendry hypothesize that the continued presence of the houses from the Transcendentalist Period impeded the full adoption of Fourierism despite the other changes to the landscape, including the new community center.

The internal structure of buildings and the items found therein can also provide important data. Archaeological investigations at American Shaker villages, found mostly on the east coast of the United States, have revealed structures inside of buildings that indicate the highly cooperative nature of these groups, such as large stoves, and large pots and serving dishes (Spencer-Wood 1999). Spencer-Wood
(1999) also points out that many Shaker inventions that facilitate cooperative housekeeping have been documented, such as the washing machine.

Sometimes the built environment does not reflect the expressed ideology of a utopian community and this can be illuminating as well. Van Bueren (2006) provides an excellent discussion on the use of built environment at a historical Los Angeles utopian community, the Llano del Rio Cooperative. In this article Van Bueren compares the historical record and the archaeological record of Llano del Rio. In the historical record the group professes a strong egalitarian ideal and a desire to express their ideology with a circular building plan for their colony. However, the archaeological record indicated that the buildings were primarily on a grid pattern similar to that utilized by the dominant culture. Van Bueren postulates that the members desired the circular pattern but were more familiar with the grid pattern, so they were using the grid pattern to establish the colony with the idea that they would move toward their idealized circular pattern later. In the end, the built environment more aptly illustrated the community members’ attempts to negotiate their changing ideology.

Utopian communities of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the United States were typically made up of a group of people with somewhat diverse backgrounds, i.e. from different places of origin and different socioeconomic statuses (Tamoso et al. 2006). The identity that they were attempting to take on as members of their utopian community was different, in at least some respects, from what they had known before. This reinforced the importance of material culture as a way to set themselves apart from other communities (Van Wormer 2006).

Trash deposits can offer excellent insights into the consumptive patterns of utopian community members. They can also help to measure the volume of interaction between the utopian community and other communities (Tarlow 2002). Communities where many of the goods used by members were produced internally would have likely had less interaction with other communities than those utopian communities that purchased their goods. Comparisons between utopian consumer patterns and other contemporaneous non-utopian communities can be enlightening in trying to understand how utopian community members otherized themselves. Van Wormer and Gross (2006) compared the refuse of the
Theosophical Society, a utopian community in San Diego, California, to other contemporary non-utopian community assemblages and found that the medical and dietary choices of the Theosophical Society were significantly different from that of the non-utopian communities. They attribute this to the Theosophical group’s desire to reinforce their ‘otherness’ from the dominant culture through their consumer behavior.

Bromberg and Shephard (2006) analyzed burial features from a Quaker burial ground in Alexandria, Virginia. Quakers espoused humility and simplicity as their defining community characteristics. According to the historical record, they rejected the elaborate burials that were typical of the ‘beautification of death movement’ in favor of simple burials. The archaeological evidence examined by Bromberg and Shephard showed that the local Quaker community indeed followed the stated ideology through their practices.

Summary

The study of communities by archeologists has evolved over time. Archaeologists are now acknowledging the important role of the social processes, which members use to create and maintain communities, along with the spatial component. Two concepts of community were used in this chapter; natural communities are those that are spatially defined and imagined communities are cognitively defined. However, these are not exclusive categories and some archaeologists believe that communities are best studied with consideration to both of these concepts. Archaeologists have also increasingly begun considering the emic definitions of historic communities when possible. These changes are heavily influenced by the increased incorporation of agency models and practice theory into archaeological theory. As discussed, Yaeger and Canuto have collectively referred to those theories that incorporate practice theory as interactional approaches.

I believe that utopian communities are best understood through an interactional approach that acknowledges the importance of their spatial element; thereby acknowledging the utopian community both as a natural community and an imagined one. Turner’s concepts of liminality and communitas are important for understanding the social processes at work in a utopian community. The role of ritual must
also be considered. Andelson’s variation on Turner’s model, the rites of passage—sociogenesis, liminality, schismogenesis—offers important insight into the life cycle of the utopian community. Commitment mechanisms and costly signaling theory can offer some insight into the lifespan of communities. Anthropological evidence indicates that communities with more commitment mechanisms last longer. Similarly, costly signaling theory posits that communities that ritually require a high-cost signal from members are correlated with higher group cohesion, less free-ridership and a longer lifespan of the community.

A methodological approach to the archaeology of utopian communities should take into account the important social processes that create and maintain a community as well as the spatial and physical aspects of the community. The two are reflexive as material culture both reflects and reinforces community norms. The built environment, the consumptive patterns and mortuary practices of a utopian community offer clues to the archaeologist about the nature of a community. They are often physical manifestations of shared community ideology. At times the ideology of the community and the material culture do not match and this is an opportunity for the archaeologist to learn about more about the social processes involved in changing ideologies, dissenting voices and more.
CHAPTER THREE: HISTORY OF THE EQUALITY COLONY

The Equality Colony has received attention from historians since its dissolution. Local Skagit County historians have mentioned it in their chronicles of the Euroamerican settlement of the region (Jordan 1974; Willis 1975). Historians, trying to understand the social movements of the 19th century, have included it as an example of one of the many utopian colonies this time period spawned (LeWarne 1968, 1995; Fogarty 1990). I draw on these diverse sources, which provide varying levels of detail and interpretation depending on their focus, for the following history of the Equality Colony. The work of the former provides a broad contextual understanding of the motivations of the Equality Colony members and places the Equality Colony is a larger historical context. The more descriptive narratives provided by historians (LeWarne 1968, 1995; Smith 1988) are invaluable for their rich detail that is particularly useful for comparison to the archaeological record. This chapter presents a concise history of the founding organization, the Brotherhood of the Cooperative Commonwealth, and important events in the lifespan of the Equality Colony. This chapter will give context for the results of this project. In the section below I provide background information about the sources I primarily used for this chapter.

Descriptions of the daily life and activities found in the Equality Colony historical documents are important for an exploration of the material culture and therefore necessary for the archaeological approach. Subsequent chapters present additional historical documentation that contributes to the creation of an archaeological research design for the Equality Colony.

Historical Sources for the Equality Colony

Jordan was a journalist and amateur historian who lived in Skagit County from around the turn of the last century into the 1980s. In 1974 he published Yarns of the Skagit Country (Ray's Writin's). In this volume Jordan compiles the stories about Skagit County residents and groups he collected throughout the twentieth century. Included in the book is Jordan’s own brief summary of the history of the Equality Colony. Jordan was familiar with some of the members of the Equality Colony and offers an interesting
first person perspective on some of the Colony events.

Willis edited the 1975 Skagit County Historical Society’s volume, *Skagit Settlers, Trials and Triumphs 1890-1920*. This book is a compilation of stories about Skagit County. Similar to Jordan’s account (1974), it offers a brief description of the Equality Colony, details some of the major events of the Colony and offers an opinion on the Colony’s worth.

Fogarty’s 1990 monograph is an exploration of communes and utopian communities in North America from the mid 1800s to the early 1900s. Fogarty briefly discusses the Equality Colony within the context of the national movements of political socialism and utopian communities of the late 1800s. His focus is on the trends in history concerning communes and utopian communities on a national scale.

The Equality Colony is not the focus of the works of Fogarty (1990), Jordan (1974) or Willis (1974). Rather it was a piece of the larger story that these authors were trying to tell. Similarly in 1995 LeWarne published *Utopias on the Puget Sound, 1895 to 1915*, a book about the five utopian communities that existed in the Puget Sound region around the turn of the last century. LeWarne includes a detailed chapter on the history of the Equality Colony in which he offers an excellent summation of the Colony’s major trajectory. However, the real purpose of his book is to demonstrate how the five utopian experiments reflected the spirit of Washington State at its formation and how the colonies have influenced and continue to influence the state’s political and social climate.

LeWarne did write an article in 1968 that was focused on the Equality Colony. This article was a sort of precursor to his 1995 book and exhibits the author’s same interest in demonstrating how the Equality Colony contributed to the political and social climate of Washington State throughout the twentieth century. LeWarne sees Washington State as a radical place, home to progressive political and social movements. He believes that Washington can trace this penchant for liberalism back to the presence of utopian experiments such as the Equality Colony in Washington State during its early statehood years. The history of the Equality Colony shared in the article overlaps heavily with LeWarne’s 1995 book.

Smith’s 1988 book is focused on the Equality Colony. Smith was raised in Skagit County,
Washington, near the location of the Equality Colony. He was born in 1914, after the Equality Colony had already been dissolved, but it made a lasting impression on him. His aim was to historically document the Equality Colony so that it was not forgotten. While Smith’s book provides a great deal of information on the Colony, he is focused on the Equality Colony as a human interest story. He writes of the Colony fondly and focuses on the members, the overall story of the Colony and anecdotal tales from Colony life. Although he includes some details about the material culture of the Colony, it is not his real interest. He does not spend any time on analysis of the built environment or other material culture elements of the Colony. Nevertheless, Smith’s book was the most useful for my own research.

**Formation of the Brotherhood of the Cooperative Commonwealth**

In the United States the 1890s were marked by economic changes and feelings of unrest among the citizens (Smith 1988). Industrialization, urbanization and the factory system all contributed to individual feelings of helplessness and discomfort. In addition, the growing fiscal gap between those who had wealth and those who did not led to a desire for reform in those who were not profiting (LeWarne 1995). As is discussed by both Smith and LeWarne, in these trying times, socialism gained a foothold in the U.S. The U.S. had seen an influx of German Socialists in the mid 1800s and the work of socialist authors such as Laurence Gronlund, Julius Wayland and, on the West Coast in particular, Edward Bellamy were gaining influence. American socialists preferred ideals of cooperation and brotherhood to those of class struggle and revolution (LeWarne 1995; Smith 1988).

The Brotherhood of the Co-operative Commonwealth (BCC) was formed in Maine in 1895 by a group of socialists, who were led by Norman Wallace Lermond. The BCC whole-heartedly believed that the only way to prove to the American people that socialism worked was through a practical demonstration (LeWarne 195; Willis 1975; Smith 1988). That demonstration would come in the form of utopian socialist settlements to be concentrated in one state with the objective of first wooing that state and then the nation to their cause (Smith 1988). They would be utopian residential villages collectively owned and managed under the ideals of socialism (LeWarne 1995). It would be a return, of sorts, to a time before industrialization and urbanization but rather than separating the utopian settlers from society,
the aim would be to engage with the surrounding communities and stand as an example to the larger society that surrounded the utopian community (Fogarty 1990).

Communitarian experiments were not new in the United States (Fogarty 1990; Pitzer 1997; Van Bueren 2006). Antebellum America had seen the creation of historically important communities such as New Harmony in Indiana, Brook Farm in Massachusetts and the Oneida Community, first founded in New York but with several communities throughout New England (Fogarty 1990; Pitzer 1997; Preucel and Pendery 2006; Van Bueren 2006). However, after the mid 1800s communitarian experiments had fallen out of favor with reformists (LeWarne 1995; Pitzer 1997). It was not until the 1890s that they became popular again. As is discussed by LeWarne (1995), between 1885 and 1915, five utopian settlements were established on the Puget Sound. These were the Puget Sound Co-operative Colony on the Olympic Peninsula, the Equality Colony in Skagit County, Freeland on southern Whidbey Island, and the Burley Colony and Home, both of which were located on the Kitsap Peninsula. Four of the five colonies espoused socialism as an ideal. The exception was Home, which was a community of anarchists.

The BCC enrolled members throughout the nation and amassed money through their dues. At the same time, the search was on for an ideal place to carry out their socialist experiment (LeWarne 1995). “It had to be a place where the opportunities for agriculture and industry were developing rapidly and where a successful demonstration could spawn other colonies and hopefully evangelize an entire state in a reasonably short time. Washington had just elected a populist governor who was believed ripe for experimentation” (Willis 1975:145). Euroamericans perceived Washington as a frontier. Washington had just been granted statehood in 1889 and it was believed the ratio of its Euroamerican population to the land was ideal for agriculture and industry. Also, the transcontinental railroad had connected the east coast with the Puget Sound in 1880 so the settlers’ ability to access the state was increased (Smith 1988).

Selection of the Equality Colony Location

The BCC sent member Ed Pelton, an experienced woodsman, to select a spot for their communitarian experiment, dubbed the Equality Colony after a Bellamy novel (Fogarty 1990; LeWarne 1995; Willis 1975). Pelton first visited Burley on the Kitsap Peninsula. Burley had been established by
BCC members anticipating Pelton’s arrival but ultimately he did not endorse the community (Smith 1988). Instead he made his way to Skagit County (LeWarne 1995) (Figure 1). Pleased, with the abundant natural resources of the area, Pelton, with the assistance of Skagit County residents Mr. and Mrs. Carey Lewis, originally purchased 280 acres in the very northwest corner of Skagit County, just outside the community of Blanchard (Fogarty 1990; Smith 1988). The land purchased by Pelton was two and a half miles east of Samish Bay. The Lewis home was enveloped into the Colony and provided initial infrastructure for the project. Later with additional purchases and donations of land, the Equality Colony eventually owned over 600 acres (Willis 1975).

![Figure 1: Location of the Equality Colony in Skagit County, Washington. Map drawn by the author.](image)

The first wave of colonists arrived in 1897 (Jordan 1975; Willis 1975). The first official members of the Equality Colony were all men although it was noted that some of them had families (Smith 1988).
Within a month Equality was home to 22 men and 38 women and children (Scontras 1985).

Under the leadership of Pelton, the members set about turning their tract of forested land into a utopia (Jordan 1975). Within a year they cleared over 100 acres of land (Willis 1975). Livestock, including horses, cattle and hogs, were purchased (LeWarne 1995). Buildings were erected, among them an apartment for residents, a saw and shingle mill, a barn, a cereal coffee factory, a bakery, a laundry facility and a school (Jordan 1975; Willis 1975). Jordan (1975) points out that the colony did not include a saloon, a jail or a church. These things were not part of the Equality Colony’s vision of utopia. The early days of the Equality Colony were filled with enthusiasm, great optimism and a sense of action. Socialism was the underlying value that held the Colony together (LeWarne 1995).

Andelson’s (2002) adaptation of Turner’s rites of passage provides a useful framework for understanding the experience of the Equality Colony. During this time the Colony was experiencing sociogenesis, the formation of a community through the adoption of shared identity by its members. The members of the Colony were separating from the structure they had known and forming the utopian community, thereby entering a liminal state, and beginning to adopt a shared identify with the other members of the Colony. Andelson (2002) suggests that there are three mechanisms for the formation of utopian communities; a charismatic leader, shared commitment to an ideology, and previous noncommunitarian connections such as club membership. The Equality Colony fulfilled two of these criteria. There was no charismatic leader (Smith 1988) but many of the Equality Colonists had belonged to the BCC before moving to the Colony and members shared the ideology of American socialism.

Life at the Equality Colony

The Equality Colony was an imagined community with an important spatial element. Part of a national movement, the Equality Colony members were part of an imagined community of American socialists across the United States before and after they came together in Skagit County, Washington. After the Colony members came together in Skagit County, the Equality Colony became a natural community as well. The members created the Equality Colony community through identifying with each other, first as socialists and then later as pioneers sharing the daily struggle of trying to live an idealized
life in frontier conditions. As they worked the land and built their utopia, the communal bonds of the members strengthened. The physical and cultural landscape of the Equality Colony is an important element of its history.

Equality Colony members identified not only with each other but also with members of the BCC across the nation (Smith 1988). Although they intended to build a utopia, they did not see themselves as entirely separate from other members of society either. They wanted to maintain many of the customs and ways of life practiced outside of their utopia. They sought to improve society and to draw all of its members into their fold. Socialism was the guiding principle of the Equality Colony (LeWarne 1995; Smith 1988). The members of the Colony ascribed to a more utopian or Fabian brand of socialism (Smith 1988). They wanted to reform the capitalist system gradually by persuasion. Through the Equality Colony, the BCC would show the utility of a direct democratic government, i.e. where laws and decisions are made through a general vote from the population, and of communally owned and managed production and distribution of goods (LeWarne 1995). The Equality Colony practiced these two principles for most of its existence.

The membership fee for a family was set at 160 dollars (Jordan 1975). Those who came to Equality with little money could arrange to work off the bulk of their dues (Jordan 1975; Willis 1975). A money substitute, ‘script’, was used in the place of currency issued by the United States (Jordan 1975). The script was good at the Equality Colony commissary, which was well stocked and comparable to some of the general stores outside the Colony (Willis 1975).

Labor was organized into departments, including housekeeping, transportation, public works and agriculture, among others (Smith 1988). By organizing the labor this way, the Equality Colony members were meeting their ideology of cooperative production. For the most part, individuals could choose what department to join based on their own skills and preference. However, if the Colony had a need for members in other departments then people were expected to fill that need. Departments had elected heads but these positions were not meant to be viewed as an elite or power role but rather as a responsibility. As
part of the Equality Colony ideology, everyone in a department was equal. The concept of a leader was just used to organize the department. All males over the age of 18 were expected to work an eight hour day. Females over 18 worked a five hour day and received the same pay as the men (Jordan 1975; LeWarne 1995; Willis 1975). This too reflects the Equality Colony’s ideology of equity although there is some indication in the historical records that housekeeping, laundry, care of the communal kitchen and childcare duties were primarily fulfilled by women and that women did not work outside these traditionally female labor roles (Smith 1988). It is worth noting that the eight hour work day was virtually unknown at this time in history; elsewhere in Washington an 11, 12 or even 13 hour day was to be expected (Willis 1975). Colony men sometimes found work outside of the Colony. It was expected that these men would turn in their wages to the communal fund (LeWarne 1995; Willis 1975).

As discussed, the Colonists practiced direct democracy. They met once a week to vote on Colony decisions. All men and women over the age of 18 were given a vote and formed the General Assembly, as the Colony referred to their main governing body (Smith 1988). The federal voting age was not lowered from 21 to 18 until the 1960s. Women were not given the vote by the federal government until the 1920s. The Equality Colonists practiced direct democracy at these meetings. There was no distinction made between decisions that should be made by someone with expertise or even experience and those that could be made by the general population. Smith (1988) explains that the Equality Colonists were suspicious of authority and sought to guard against it.

The Equality Colony was not isolated from surrounding communities. In addition to the Colony men who found outside work the Colony, there were also visitors from surrounding communities to the Colony. Weekly Saturday night events were held and all were welcome (Jordan 1975; Willis 1975). These events were in line with the Colony members’ belief that education and recreation were important at all ages and they could include music, dancing and lectures (Willis 1975). The ideas of the Equality Colony and the BCC were further spread through their weekly publication, Industrial Freedom. The Industrial Freedom was circulated nationally and, at one point, had around 6,000 subscribers (Jordan 1975). It was first printed in Edison, a nearby town, and then later within the Colony itself (Smith 1988) (Figure 2).
Population estimates for the Colony differ, though it is agreed that the population widely fluctuated over the ten years. Based on historical documentation, LeWarne and Jordan place the peak population as high as 300 people (Jordan 1975; LeWarne 1995). Willis is more conservative in her interpretation of the records, and she places the population at 200 people (Willis 1975). The people who ventured to make Equality their home brought skills in carpentry, teaching, printing, cooking, fishing, farming, housekeeping and lumber milling, among others (LeWarne 1995; Willis 1975). Smith (1988) relates that in general, the Equality Colony members were a diverse population of Euroamericans and European immigrants but did not include any non-white persons. The Equality Colony drew Americans from the southern, eastern and Midwestern parts of the country. European Immigrants included those from Germany, Austria, Russia, Norway, Ireland, England, Canada and Switzerland. It is not clear if these people immigrated directly to the Equality Colony or not.

In addition to those who made their home at Equality, there were also thousands of visitors who stayed for various lengths over the ten years (Smith 1988). There are not many details in the historical records about these visitors. There is little indication of how long they stayed, what their purpose was in coming to Equality: whether it was a vacation or they were accessing it as a possible home, or how they were received by the Equality Colony members. Presumably, the Equality Colony members were happy to have visitors, as the Colony existed in part to be a living example of Socialism in action but it is unknown if the Colonists prepared special events or accommodations for their visitors.
Not everyone who came to the Colony to live or to visit did so for the reasons its founders had intended. “Quite a few members were unmarried men and the home cooked meal coupled with laundry services and mending made the colony attractive to them” (Jordan 1974:134). In an interview between Smith and Chas Marquart, a former Equality Colony member, Marquart recalled the hard times of the late 1800s and early 1900s (Smith 1968d). Marquart explains that the hard times drove people west for opportunity but many found only more poverty. Hundreds of people, according to Marquart, who found themselves low on resources, came to the Colony, where they could find room and board without joining the Equality Colony then leave when they found employment elsewhere.

In general, Equality Colony members were well regarded by their Skagit County neighbors (Jordan 1975; Smith 1988). Although other Skagit Valley residents might have initially expected to dislike the Colony members, based on different political beliefs and values, they found that the similarities between them outweighed the differences. The Colonists were generally regarded as sturdy and grounded with typical rural values (Smith 1988). However, Smith (1988) does note that the Colony's penchant for attracting erratic thinkers and oddballs did not go unnoticed.

**The Dissolution of the Equality Colony**

Historians do not agree on why the Equality Colony dissolved after only 10 years. Anthropological theory can offer a new framework in which to examine the disbanding of the Colony. Costly Signaling theory, with the insight that actions of great consequence to individuals prove authentic loyalty and promote group cohesion (Sosis 2004), and (Andelson’s (2002) schismogenesis, which offers the idea that utopian communities often disband when factions have developed and cannot be reconciled, are particularly useful.

The Equality Colony attracted free-riders, those who took resources from the Colony but did not contribute back to the resource pool (LeWarne 1995). These free-riders were attracted to the Colony either out of curiosity or a desire for the available resources, but they did not contribute to the Colony (LeWarne 1995). This group must have put considerable strain on the Colony’s reserve (Jordan 1975; Willis 1975). The Equality Colony membership offered room and board at cost to members and visitors
out of principle. However, it was their belief that this showing of the socialist ideal would change the hearts and minds of people coming to the Colony. They may have anticipated more converts to their cause, who then would have contributed to the growth of the Colony, then actually materialized and this may have been emotionally exhausting as well as resource depleting. However, it could be that the Equality Colony members tolerated free-riders because providing them with food and goods at cost met their ideals. It may be that this was enough of a reward for the Colony members and that it is only in retrospect that the free-riders are seen as problematic.

Costly signaling theory assumes that the temptation to freeride is ever present in individuals and therefore a community must require high cost signals, i.e. required actions that are too costly to an individual to fake, to combat free-ridership (Sosis 2004). High cost signals have been correlated with utopian community longevity (Renfro-Sargent 2002; Sosis 2004; Wildman and Sosis 2011). The Equality Colony did not have high cost signals in place. Members could retain their own wealth and possessions and some members were allowed into the Colony without having paid the membership fee. Interaction with non-group members was not discouraged. Some of the male members worked outside the Colony, and although it was expected they would turn over their earnings to the Colony, this was not well enforced. Members were expected to contribute labor to the Colony each day. However, the expected labor contribution was much lower than members might have had to work off of the Colony for similar compensation. All in all the cost of membership for the Equality Colony was low. Historians have pointed out that as the regional economy strengthened and well paying jobs became more readily available, people left the Equality Colony. Perhaps the cost of joining and staying on at the Equality Colony was too low to weed out disingenuous members and to inspire long term commitment and group cohesion.

The formation of factions within the BCC and the Equality Colony can be seen in several points of the Colony’s lifespan. As is discussed by LeWarne (1975) and Fogary (1990), factions formed within the BCC early on in the Colony’s timeline as members who lived at the Colony and those who did not disagreed about the future of the BCC. Lermond, the founder of the BCC, never lived at the Equality Colony. Lermond saw the Equality Colony as a first step in a larger plan. At first he managed the BCC
and acted as a Colony leader from his home in Maine. Then in 1898 he moved to Washington but not to the Colony. Instead he established a BCC headquarters in the nearby town of Edison. This physical separation meant that the BCC and the Equality Colony operated as two distinct entities. The Edison group controlled the finances and publications and the Colonist began to feel that the Edison group was supported by their labor. The Colonists and the Edison group disagreed about how to proceed. Colony residents wanted to firmly establish Equality before creating more utopian settlements, while the Edison group saw no reason to wait. These issues finally reached a tenuous resolution when the Colony was granted autonomy over management of the Equality land and finances in 1898. Lermond returned to Maine (Smith 1988). After the Equality Colony made this formal break with the BCC, national support of the project declined. Subscriptions to Industrial Freedom were cancelled and donations from backers across the nation were lost. The socialist utopian movement was falling out of favor politically. The rift between the BCC and the Equality Colony caused those supporters who were left to lose confidence in the project.

Ray Jordan, a Skagit Valley resident and amateur historian who knew several former Colony members, speculated that the loss of Pelton in 1901 left the Colony without leadership and contributed to growing dissent and unrest at the Colony. In 1905 Alexander Horr, an anarchist, arrived at the Equality Colony at the request of some of the members (Fogarty 1990; Smith 1988). It is unclear whether the Colonists who invited Horr realized that he was an anarchist and not a socialist, but either way Horr introduced elements of anarchism into the ideology of the Equality Colony. Not all of the Equality Colony members converted from the ideology of socialism to anarchism, but some did. This resulted in further factioning of the Equality Colony.

The Equality Colony members had broken into groups at odds with each other and were struggling to find resolution and a way to keep their utopia alive when in 1906 a devastating fire destroyed barns, hay, cattle, and other infrastructure (Jordan 1975; Willis 1975). The fire is believed to have been arson although this has not been proven (Willis 1975). This was the last straw for the Colony. The remaining members petitioned the court for a receiver, a court-appointed person to manage the
property and to see to its legal dissolution. On June 1, 1907 the bulk of the property was sold to George Peth, a Skagit County farmer who was not a member of the Equality Colony. There are no records to indicate that Peth was involved with the Colony at all before purchasing the property. Some Equality members—the Halladays, W.R. Giles, the Herz family, and Charles Hart—purchased small pieces of the land (LeWarne 1995; Jordan 1975). The last act of the Equality Colony was a legal skirmish over Peth’s deed to the land. The Equality members lost and with that the Colony was no more (Jordan 1975).

The ideas of the Equality Colony did not end with the Colony, both literally and symbolically. A group of Equality Colonists left the land in Skagit County and relocated to Whidbey Island where they established another socialist utopian settlement, the Freeland Colony (LeWarne 1995; Willis 1975). Margret Willis, editor of Skagit Settlers Trials and Triumphs 1890-1920, reminds us that the Colony had other lasting effects. “However, many Skagit County families can trace ancestors back to the industrious, idealistic founders of the colony who have seldom been given the credit they deserve for their pioneering efforts. At least some of their radical ideas have become commonplace today, the eight-hour work day, equal rights for women, the 18-year-old voting age, for example” (Willis 1975:148). Smith (1988) reminds us that the Equality Colony was not the sole effort of the BCC and that in 1897, along with the call to colonize the Equality Colony, the BCC encouraged members to populate Washington State to stand ready for the coming time when socialism would make its bid for the heart of the Washington government. In truth, the impact of the BCC and the Equality Colony can never be fully quantified.
CHAPTER FOUR: THE COMMUNITY ARCHAEOLOGY APPROACH

Community archaeology is the purposeful engagement of a community or communities into the process of an archaeological project (Chirikure and Pwiti 2008). Communities targeted for engagement are often referred to as stakeholders. Stakeholders can include, but are not limited to, landowners, descendant communities, government agencies, tribes and land developers. Stakeholder is an appropriate term because community archaeology recognizes that archaeological sites represent tangible value to the communities that are concerned with them (Baumann et al. 2008).

Community involvement in archaeology is the inclusion of indigenous people and other communities in various areas of archaeological practice and interpretation. It takes various forms that are context-dependent, including public outreach, involvement of school groups and local communities in archaeological excavations, site management, and conservation. When it involves local communities in the design, implementation, and control of projects it has a way of empowering previously marginalized groups. It underscores the importance of using local sources of knowledge such as oral traditions, myths, and legends as well as ethnographies to gain insight into local perspectives (Chirikure and Pwiti 2008:469).

Several factors have contributed to the development of community archaeology as it is practiced today: increased dialogue with communities due to consultation on archaeological projects, increased responsibility to taxpayers for archaeological projects paid for with state or federal money and theoretical paradigm shifts within archaeology. These are discussed below.

The Development of a Community Archaeology Approach

The 1966 National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and the subsequent development of the applied field of cultural resource management (CRM) increased consultation between archaeologists and other interested parties for archaeological projects. NHPA was enacted to establish a national preservation
program for historic heritage, including archaeological sites (United States Congress 2006). Historic heritage is understood here as resources that can contribute to the understanding and regard of a nation’s history (Orser 2001). NHPA thus established that the historic heritage of the United States, including archaeological sites, was important to the American people and consequently required federal protection. NHPA included specific federal and state guidelines and procedures for archaeological sites including the creation of the National Register of Historic Places, a database of sites determined to be qualified for federal protection (Orser 2001). NHPA significantly increased the federal government’s involvement in the management of historic heritage. It also increased federal agencies’ consideration of archaeological sites in their planning process.

The requirement that Federal agencies consider the impacts of developments that they conducted, regulated or funded on archaeological sites, historic properties and other heritage resources created an applied field, cultural resource management (CRM), that involves practitioners of archaeology, history, architectural history and ethnography (King 2008). Cultural resources are identifiable locations or objects of past human activity including archaeological sites, historical structures and traditional resources (King 2005). “The thrust of [CRM] today is principally the preservation of historic buildings, cultural landscapes, and archaeological sites (or the information they contain) deemed important to our national heritage” (Noble 2007:67). CRM has become a significant part of the archaeology discipline. In fact, in the United States around 70 percent of archaeological investigation happens within the CRM industry (Green and Doershuk 1998; Orser 2001). Previous to the development of CRM, archaeological projects were mostly prompted by the interests of archaeologists, primarily academics, themselves. CRM projects, on the other hand, are initiated for reasons unrelated to archaeological research; rather, they are related to infrastructure development and compelled by federal, state or local laws and regulations. This has led to archaeological survey and investigation in new geographic areas and increased overall the breadth of the archaeological record (Green and Doershuk 1998; Nobel 2007).
Whitley (1998) argues that the development of the CRM industry was, in part, influenced by the widespread adoption of post-modern and post-colonial theory into the discipline of archaeology. Thomas and Kelly (2007) define post-modern theory as a response to modernism. Modernism is defined by its belief that absolute truth is knowable through science. Post-modernism is a move away from overarching ideas of ‘truth’. Post-modernism instead represents knowledge as relative and science as an interpretation.

Post-colonial theory recognizes the agency of all peoples involved in the colonial period and the reciprocal influences of different cultures (Carlson 2006). It moves archaeological theory away from classification of culture as homogenized (Liebmann 2008). Archaeologists are recognizing that their discipline has been dominated by the Euroamerican upper-class male perspective for too long and are making conscious strides to incorporate previously marginalized viewpoints (Carlson 2008; Conkey and Spector 1984; Liebmann 2008; Whitley 1998). Post-modern theory is evident in the dawning recognition by archaeologists of the role that they themselves play in forming the archaeological record (Carlson 2006). Rethinking the role of colonial thought in archaeology is related to the increase in community archaeology. The adoption of the post-modern paradigm has encouraged consideration of formerly marginalized, and even dissenting, viewpoints (Whitley 1998).

This multivocality brings up questions of ‘who owns the past’ (Little 2007a). That is, who, if anyone, has the ultimate authority on interpreting past events and the material culture left behind by these events? In archaeology this discussion includes ownership and authority over artifacts and other articles of history. In her discussion of the criterion for inclusion to the National Register of Historical Places, Little (2007b) points out those archaeologists asking if a site is significant are getting ahead of themselves. The first question should be: significant to whom? This line of thinking has encouraged dialogue between archaeologists and local communities.

Community Archaeology Projects

Archaeologists have increasingly recognized the value of the community archaeology approach (Baumann et al. 2008). In 1996 the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) adopted public outreach
and education as its fourth principal in its ethical guidelines (SAA 1996). This guideline is published on the SAA website and reads:

Archaeologists should reach out to, and participate in cooperative efforts with others interested in the archaeological record with the aim of improving the preservation, protection, and interpretation of the record. In particular, archaeologists should undertake to: 1) enlist public support for the stewardship of the archaeological record; 2) explain and promote the use of archaeological methods and techniques in understanding human behavior and culture; and 3) communicate archaeological interpretations of the past.

Many publics exist for archaeology including students and teachers; Native Americans and other ethnic, religious, and cultural groups who find in the archaeological record important aspects of their cultural heritage; lawmakers and government officials; reporters, journalists, and others involved in the media; and the general public.

Archaeologists who are unable to undertake public education and outreach directly should encourage and support the efforts of others in these activities.

Community archaeology can be seen as serving the needs of both archaeologists and the public. As is exemplified by Baumann, Hurley and Allen in their 2008 article about a community archaeology historic preservation project in St. Louis, Missouri, a shared past can act as a glue binding community members both to each other and to the physical space of the community. Community archaeology also represents other possible benefits to a community such as revenue through tourism and educational opportunity (Chirikure and Pwiti 2008).

On the other side of the coin, the community archaeology approach is beneficial to the goals of the archaeology. Communities that have been consulted and included in the process of archaeological preservation feel more invested in the protection of the sites. Within the archaeological discipline, people who safeguard archaeological sites are known as ‘stewards’ (Chirikure and Pwiti 2008). The practice of community archaeology recognizes the value of having good stewards and encourages people to become
stewards (Simpson 2008). Archaeologists can record and register archaeological sites but they cannot hope to defend them full time. Tapping into people’s interest in the past and the inclusion of the public in the archaeology process promises to do much for preservation efforts (Moser et al. 2002).

The community archaeology approach is not without problems. When considering this approach and how to implement it, archaeologists must consider logistics such as time frames and extra expenses (Moser et al. 2002). Additionally, for some archaeologists the idea of multivocality undermines archaeology as a science. This argument is that approaching all interpretations of an archaeological site as valid reduces archaeology to a narrative (Folorunso 2008). Finally, another big concern is multiple stakeholders (Chirikure and Pwiti 2008; Davis-Salazar et al. 2007). In an archaeological project with a descendent community and a local community with different needs, how do you take everyone into consideration? Who do you prioritize in the event you cannot reconcile the priorities of the stakeholders?

Despite these issues, the community archaeology approach has had much theoretical support within the discipline of archaeology (Shackel 2011). However, this has not translated well into general procedure. Although archaeologists often express support for the community archaeology method, a lack of policy and guidelines restrict their ability to effectively use this method (Birch 2006).

Best practice guidelines have yet to be established (Baumann et al. 2008; Shackel 2011; Simpson 2008). However, there is a growing body of examples of community archaeology projects (Shackel and Gadsby 2011). A review of some of these projects, which differ in location, scope and desired community for engagement, offers some insight into key components of a successful community archaeology approach. Among these are consistent communication between the archaeology crew and the community, inclusion of the community in the entire project process, use of education opportunities and active work to balance power and control among stakeholders (Baumann et al. 2008; Chirikure and Pwiti 2008; Moser et al. 2002). Community archaeology projects have a spectrum of community involvement. Some offer community members some archaeological education and invite them to view archaeologists at work. On the other side of the spectrum, some community archaeology projects involve partnership between
archaeologists and one or more communities throughout the project through planning, excavation, interpretation and site management.

The excavation at the Ozette site on the Olympic Peninsula is an excellent example of an early community archaeology project (Marshall 2002). Excavations at this extraordinarily well-preserved village site were begun by Washington State University at the request of the Makah Tribal Council in 1970. Fieldwork at the project was carried out continuously for 11 years during which Washington State University and the Makah community continued to participate as partners in the project, working closely in the planning and execution of the project. The Ozette excavations were open to the general public and it is estimated that during the initial portion of the project up to 60,000 people a year visited. The Ozette site is still maintained by the Makah and open to public visitation today. A museum was opened to display the artifacts recovered during this work and is an important continuing legacy.

A more contemporary local example of the community archaeology approach is being carried out at Fort Vancouver located in southern Washington State. Archaeology at Fort Vancouver is directed by the National Parks Service (NPS) and has a heavy emphasis on public engagement (Marks 2004). The NPS hosts a six week field school at the site each year. The field school is open to the public and provides access to interested visitors and tourists. Additionally, students who participate in the field school are taught public engagement skills along with the more standard field skills. They are expected to interact with visitors and answer questions from the public (Marks 2004).

Community Archaeology and Private Land Ownership

There are not many examples in the literature of community archaeology project that involve privately owned land. In fact, two of the three examples discussed below are from the recent work of university graduate students. Private property can present some difficulties to any archaeological project. As is discussed by Ingram (2008), private property is held as a sacred concept in United States culture. The rights of private property owners are constitutionally protected. This has meant that most laws written to protect archaeological resources apply only to those on federal and state lands. Only a few states,
including Washington State, have laws that protect archaeological sites on private land. Generally this falls under the purview of local government (Jones 2010).

In Washington State there are laws that protect significant historic and archaeological properties on private property. The 1974 Archaeological Sites and Resources Law (Chapter 27.53 Revised Code of Washington) prohibits knowingly disturbing archaeological resources on private or public property without a permit from the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) and assigns civil penalties to those who do so. Other laws dealing with management of archaeological resources in Washington State include the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), the Forest Practices Act, Governor’s Executive Order 0505, and the Shoreline Management Act. However, even in Washington State, community archaeology is still an important asset for management of archaeological sites on private land. For example, under Washington State law archaeological sites cannot be registered without the permission of the property owner. Community archaeology can offer opportunities for public education on the tax breaks and other potential benefits of registering an archaeological site. Further, community archaeology, as discussed, helps to create good stewards for archaeological sites. This is critical for private property.

Community archaeology is a reflexive process that accounts for the multiple worldviews, needs, and wishes of the different groups involved (Jones 2010). It is appropriate that community archaeology projects would look significantly different from each other as they take into account specific, localized factors. Ingram (2008) discusses an example of a statewide voluntary stewardship program instituted in Kentucky. The program created a database for landowners to voluntarily register privately-owned archaeological sites. The landowners were asked to act as stewards for the site they registered and to inform the program of any threats to the site. In return they were provided with information about the site and offered assistance with site maintenance.

Washington State has a similar program, the Washington Heritage Register (http://www.dahp.wa.gov/washington-heritage-register). The Washington Heritage Register is maintained by the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP). This register is
intended to raise public awareness about archaeological sites, historical buildings and other structures and places of archaeological or historical significance. Private property owners can register archaeological sites that exist on their own property without incurring additional restrictions on use of their property outside of the existing Washington State and Federal laws that apply.

Appler (2012) offers some perspective on a community archaeology project at the city rather than state scale. Alexandria, Virginia has had a municipal archaeology program since 1961. In the time since its inception the program has grown and changed according to the needs of the citizens of Alexandria. In Alexandria the citizens are recognized as both the “generators and the primary consumers of archaeological knowledge” (Appler 2012:3). The archaeology program was developed with the priorities of the citizens in mind. By relying heavily on volunteer citizens to carry out many aspects of the program, the city continues to involve them. The Alexandria archaeology program attempts to engage all of its citizens in the history and archaeology of their city. It attempts to create a feeling of ownership and responsibility. The city has an ordinance requiring archaeological review as part of their local development review process (Appler 2012). This means that in Alexandria, with the public’s support, archaeological sites on private property are protected by law.

Jones (2010) offers an example of a community archaeology project on privately owned land on the individual project scale. The First Agape A.M.E. Zion Church in Cabin John, Maryland needed to have an archaeological survey done of their property as part of renovation work. An unmarked cemetery was known to be located on the church property. The church wanted to locate the cemetery and exhume the bodies for reburial in a nearby cemetery. In taking on this project Jones identified three main communities for engagement: 1. Cabin John residents; 2. members of the First Agape A.M.E. Zion Church; 3. descendants of the individuals buried on the property. The community archaeology aspects of this project included public outreach, consultation with the communities throughout the process, archaeological education, and public interpretation. Public interpretation is understood here as disseminating archaeological information to the general public and receiving feedback.
A community archaeology day was held at the field site. This event was advertised in local newspapers and invitations were sent to specially targeted groups. It was a public event designed to offer attendees education on archaeological theories and methods. It also presented an opportunity to gain public feedback and local knowledge about the site. Local knowledge was a very important component to this project. Jones reports that she had expected gaps in the documentary record but not the gaps in the archaeological record created by a lack of preservation at the site. With the ‘silences’ created by these two information streams, she found local knowledge to be an invaluable source (Jones 2010:42).

Jones further involved the public by taking on several local high school children as interns for the project. The local high school had an archeology program and the youths were already trained in basic archaeological skills. Again Jones (2010) reports that this presented opportunities to involve local people and to gain local knowledge.
CHAPTER FIVE: RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND METHODS

The primary goal of this project was to investigate the Equality Colony history from a new, archaeological perspective, and to do so in a way that laid the groundwork for archaeological survey for the former Equality Colony. Further, it was hoped that this project would include some archaeological survey of a portion of the former Equality Colony land. Archaeological projects are often multi-staged and the initial stage of a large project often includes historical research and relocation of the subject, sometimes through analysis of historical maps. To this end, goals identified for this project included: historical research to gain new insights and to help formulate research questions, map analysis to help locate the former Equality Colony infrastructure on the modern landscape to guide selection of survey areas, and development of relationships with current landowners of former Equality Colony land to facilitate access for archaeological survey. Today the former Equality Colony land is privately owned. The community archaeology method was used in this project as a strategy to potentially generate an archaeological survey. The community archaeology method is still a growing practice, so an additional goal was to observe and document the process of the community archeology method itself.

In undertaking this project I fully expected to be able to meet my goals. Given the historical records, photographs, maps and other resources available for the Equality Colony, I felt confident that I would be able to create an adequate research design. Gaining access to one or more properties seemed potentially challenging, but I felt that the Equality Colony was an interesting enough piece of local lore to pique at least one person’s interest. I anticipated being able to gain access to at least one property for pedestrian survey.

This study utilized five distinct methods: historic research, map analysis, photographic analysis, pedestrian survey and community archaeology. Each of these methods builds on the others and they worked in concert to meet the goals of this study.

**Historic Research**

Historic research is a routine element of historical archaeology and this step is important in
developing the context for future archaeological work. I began with the published works of historians including Fogarty (1990), Jordan (1968, 1975), LeWarne (1968, 1995), Smith (1988) and Willis (1975). These works provided me with a base of knowledge about the Colony. As noted, most of these publications were not focused on the Equality Colony and mainly included the Colony’s major events and general time line. However, Smith’s (1988) volume had notable depth and breadth of information. This book provided a good deal of useful information about the Equality Colony’s built environment and other aspects of its material culture.

I expanded my research to unpublished documents and records from historians, and also used records contemporary to the Equality Colony. I found these documents and records in several collections: the Frederick E. Smith Papers at the Western Washington University Heritage Resources Center for Pacific Northwest Studies, the Equality Colony Collection at the Skagit Valley Historical Museum, the E.B. Ault Papers at the University of Washington and the Library of Congress online database of historical American newspapers entitled Chronicling America which contains 61 issues of *Industrial Freedom*.

The Western Washington University Heritage Resources Center for Pacific Northwest Studies holds the Frederick E. Smith Papers, a collection of documents, photographs, newspaper articles and audio recordings of interviews with former Equality Colony residents and their descendants collected by Smith. I listened to over 20 hours of recorded interviews between Smith and various former members of the Equality Colony, their children, and other people who lived in Blanchard during or soon after the Equality Colony’s existence. These interviews were unstructured. They contained some useful information but a lot of the interviews were not relevant. I did find information pertinent to my research in Smith’s interviews with Edna Rodgers, Mrs. Halladay, Etta Kenyon Kerr, Mel Brann, Bill Giles, Howard Ault and Chas Marquart.

The Skagit Valley Historical Museum houses a collection of Equality Colony photographs, articles and papers written about the Equality Colony, transcribed oral history interviews and other documents including a piece of Equality Colony script (the Colony’s currency), several BCC receipts and
an Equality Colony labor check. One of the transcribed oral history interviews was with Charles Herz who was born on the Equality Colony. It contained details about the material culture of the Equality Colony. The Skagit Historical Museum also has on file Catherine Savage Pulsipher’s written recollections of the Colony. She lived on the Equality Colony as a child.

The University of Washington has the Peter L. Hegg Equality Colony Photographs collection and the Harry E.B. Ault Papers. The Peter L. Hegg photographs are discussed in the photograph analysis section of this chapter. Harry E.B. Ault moved to the Equality Colony as a young man and, although the collection is mainly dedicated to his work with Washington State labor politics, it does include some autobiographical documents dealing with Equality Colony life. Reading these allowed for some first-person insight into the social structure of the Equality Colony.

The Library of Congress maintains an online database of historical American newspapers entitled Chronicling America that can be accessed at http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/. Through this database I was able to get access to 61 issues of *Industrial Freedom*, the newspaper of the BCC. These issues were published between 1898 and 1901. Many colonists authored works for publication in *Industrial Freedom*. Some of the articles are authored but many are not. Authors of articles that I utilized for this research include Joseph Adams, An Old Maid Cook, Harry E.B. Ault, Anne Billingley, Rhoda C. Eddy, Claude Hallady, Clinton Halladay, E.C. Halladay, Anna Oss, G.E. Pelton, Randolph and Hellen Topman.

These papers were extremely useful to this project. They provided invaluable first person information on Equality Colony infrastructure and material culture, but it is important to remember that *Industrial Freedom* was written for distribution to members of the BCC. Articles were often aimed at gaining support for the Equality Colony and therefore presumably are biased toward a positive depiction of the Colony. However, some of the articles do discuss the hardships and setbacks experienced by the Colonists.

**Photograph Analysis**

In the course of this project Equality Colony photographs were identified in four different
collections. The image content of these collections was first analyzed to confirm that the photographs pertained to the Equality Colony and not to other BCC activities. Duplicate photographs across collections, e.g. photographs that have been scanned by both the Skagit Valley Historical Museum and the University of Washington, were also identified. This research has been compiled and is provided in Appendix 1: Photograph Inventories.

A selection of the photographs from the four collections was chosen for further analysis with a combination of methods utilized by Blackman (1981), Frassanito (1975) and Markham (1993). This analysis included identifying the photographer’s position relative to the subject matter in the image, the season the photograph was taken, the content of the photograph and the relationships between photographs. This photograph analysis parallels and adds to the historical research for this project.

The Peter L. Hegg Equality Colony Photographs Collection is located at the University of Washington Libraries, Special Collections Division in Seattle, Washington (Appendix 1). Peter L. Hegg lived close to the Equality Colony and often visited it to photograph the Colony. He was considered the Equality Colony's 'official' photographer by the Colonists themselves. His photographs have been inventoried and labeled by the University of Washington Libraries staff. In the first table in Appendix 1, I provide the labels used by the University of Washington and the inventory information for these photographs.

A second collection of interest, Society and Culture, is located at the University of Washington Libraries, Special Collections Division in Seattle, Washington. This collection contains photographs from a variety of places, times, and subjects. It is a digital collection with over 7,000 images. Fifteen of the images, inventoried and labeled by the University of Washington Libraries, pertain to the Equality Colony. I provide the catalog information and descriptions for these 15 photographs in the second table in Appendix 1.

The third collection of photographs examined is housed at the Skagit County Historical Museum in LaConner, Washington, as part of their Equality Colony collection (Appendix 1). These photographs were primarily donated by descendants of Colony members. They have been inventoried and some
descriptive information has been attached to them. In the third table in Appendix 1, I provide the inventory information from the Skagit Historical Museum for these photographs. I also provide labels that I have created, combining the descriptions provided by the Skagit Historical Museum with other historical research.

The final collection, the Frederick E. Smith papers, is located at the Center for Pacific Northwest Studies, Heritage Resources, at Western Washington University in Bellingham, Washington. These photographs are neither inventoried nor labeled, and it is outside the scope of this project to do so; therefore I am unable to provide an inventory of these photographs in the same way that I am for the other three collections. There are a total of 228 photographs and 24 photocopies of photographs in the collection. The photographs are organized into four folders roughly by photograph content. Many of the photographs in the collection could not be confirmed as Equality Colony photographs. In fact, some could be positively identified as not Equality Colony photographs and related to Smith’s other research interests. Fifty of the Equality Colony photographs in this collection are repeats of photographs in either one of the collections at the University of Washington or the collection at the Skagit Historical Museum (Appendix 1).

Map Analysis

Understanding the location of the Equality Colony, its infrastructure and high use areas and the activities on the historic Equality Colony land through time was critical to the development of a research design for archaeological survey. Two historic maps were located at the Center for Pacific Northwest Studies at Western Washington University in Bellingham, Washington, that include the location of Equality. These maps are both from 1901, a year when the Equality Colony had its own post office.

In 1992, M.V. Markham, a graduate student at Western Washington University, used the Skagit County Auditor’s Office records to place the Equality Colony’s main holdings, the original purchase and the option, on a modern parcel map (Markham 1992). This, combined with the 1901 maps, provides the location of the historic Equality Colony property.
The archaeology repository at Western Washington University had on file a copy of an 1899 plat map of Equality Colony infrastructure. The map had been included in an issue of Industrial Freedom, the Colony's own publication. The map included Colony Creek and the edge of the hillside as geological reference points. I used these reference points to overlay the 1899 map on a modern topographic map. This gave me the likely locations for many of the Colony's main buildings and approximate locations for other infrastructure not on the map but known to be in the vicinity of buildings on the map. This was an important step in thinking about potential archaeological survey locations. I also overlaid the 1899 plat map on an aerial photograph and a Skagit County assessor parcel map.

I did not change the alignment or the configuration of the 1899 plat map. Little is known about how this map was created and it is possible that features are not accurate on the map. Archaeological fieldwork may provide an opportunity to further refine the locations of Equality Colony infrastructure.

I undertook searches for maps of the former Equality Colony land regardless of the year they were created. Maps and aerial photos were collected for the area from the Center for Pacific Northwest Studies at Western Washington University in Bellingham, Washington, and from the Padilla Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve in Mount Vernon, Washington. Aerial photos were obtained from the Skagit County Assessor’s website. An online search for historic maps returned one Metsker Map for the area. All located maps are compiled and analyzed in order to give a picture of the land use for the historic Equality Colony area both before and after the Equality Colony existed. Each time I overlaid the 1899 plat map on a new image I tried to keep the building locations consistent with their placement on the modern topographic map. I did not try to realign them using the Colony Creek and edge of hillside landmarks.

Lastly a 2006 lidar image was obtained from the Padilla Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve. This lidar image was part of a 2006 lidar survey of most of Western Washington by the U.S. Geological Survey. “The survey was designed in accordance with FEMA lidar data collection standards to provide on-ground pulse spacings of no greater than 1.4 meters, or approximately 0.5 pulse/m2. The task order for this survey specified horizontal accuracy of 1 m or better (RMSE), vertical accuracy of 18.5 cm RMSE (37 cm in vegetated areas), and return classification adequate to remove 95% of all outliers, 95%
of all vegetation, and 98% of all buildings. Data were acquired in May, June, August, and September 2006, using Leica ALS-50 and Optech 2050 instruments” (Haugerud 2008).

I digitally overlaid the 1899 Equality Colony plat map on the lidar image. I then analyzed this image for any potential contour matches between what is visible in the lidar and the probable location of Equality Colony infrastructure.

**Pedestrian Survey**

On March 8, 2014, Dr. Sarah K. Campbell, Rachael N. Kannegaard, and I surveyed two properties that were formerly part of the Equality Colony holdings (Table 1). The property owners volunteered their land for survey. It is essential to the community archaeology approach that the archaeologist(s) relinquish a certain amount of control over how and when the project is carried out (Baumann et al. 2008). In this case that meant surveying any property to which I was able to gain access. This worked out rather advantageously as the two properties that I was able to survey both likely had Equality Colony infrastructure on and adjacent to them in the past.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Property owner(s)</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Township/Range/Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15985 Colony Road, Bow, WA</td>
<td>P48295</td>
<td>Warren and Diane Bingham</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>36/03/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16063 Colony Road, Bow, WA</td>
<td>P48286</td>
<td>Peggy Stowe</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>36/03/26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An intensive pedestrian survey was carried out at each property. Transects were walked tightly together and overlapped so that each area was viewed by more than one set of eyes. Ground surface visibility was moderate to low. All areas of exposure, including mole hills, were thoroughly examined. These surveys were mapped and photo documented. Artifacts were recorded and photo documented but not collected during the survey.

**Community Archaeology**

As discussed, the primary purpose of the community archaeology method was to develop a
relationship with one or more of the landowners of former Equality Colony land and to gain access to their land for an archaeological survey. The former Equality Colony land has 35 separate landowners today. I will here after refer to this group of 35 as 'the landowners'. A secondary purpose, in keeping with the spirit of community archaeology, was to offer some education and information to the larger Skagit Valley community. The community engagement activities for this project are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Project community engagement activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community engagement activity</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attending meetings for Skagit County interest groups.</td>
<td>June 2013 to November 2014. This is an ongoing process that I have participated in throughout the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail correspondence with the landowners.</td>
<td>October 2013 to February 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Detectives; an event hosted by the Burlington Historical Society.</td>
<td>October 23, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email and telephone correspondence with some landowners and other community members.</td>
<td>October 2013 to November 2014. This is an ongoing process that I have participated in since October 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community talk held at the Blanchard Community Club. Hosted by myself.</td>
<td>November 14, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner meeting held at the Blanchard Community Club. Hosted by myself.</td>
<td>December 17, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest lectured at the Lucille Umbarger Elementary School.</td>
<td>February 20, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailed questionnaire to landowners.</td>
<td>February 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of copies of my thesis to select community organizations and members.</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From June 2013 to September 2013 I attended meetings for local interest groups, both those directly interested in history and those who were not. In observing these meetings I was hoping to answer three questions. Who attends these meetings? What are the goals and aspirations of these groups? Does this project have anything to offer these groups? After September 2013 I continued to attend some meetings of local interest groups but it was a less concentrated effort.

On October 23, 2013 I participated in a local event, History Detectives, hosted by the Burlington Historical Society in Burlington, Washington. I had an information table at this event where I spoke with local residents and had informative displays about the Equality Colony and Washington State archaeology. I was also given five minutes in the program to talk about this project. On November 14,
2013, I hosted a public talk at the Blanchard Community Hall in Bow, Washington. This location was chosen because it is less than two miles from the former Equality Colony land. The landowners, as well as the greater Skagit Valley community, were invited to this talk. Posters were hung in public places, online postings were written on different online forums and word of mouth was utilized. Oral invitations were extended to many of the local interest groups with whom I had previously met.

The landowners were invited by postcard. I designed the postcard with a historical photograph of the Equality Colony on the front and a short message on the back. In each postcard I introduced myself and the project briefly; I informed the landowner of an upcoming event; I let them know I would like to speak with them; and I gave them my contact information. Over the course of this project I sent three rounds of postcards to the landowners: one before the Burlington Historical Society's History Detectives event, one before the November 14 talk, and one before a landowner meeting that I hosted in December.

The November 14 talk was approximately 45 minutes long. Topics included the goals of this project, historical archaeology, archaeological approaches to the study of communities, the Equality Colony history, the former location of Equality Colony infrastructure, and the nature of Washington State archaeology. A question and answer period was held after the talk. A handout was distributed to some of those in attendance.

I held a meeting for the landowners on December 17, 2013. I prepared a brief statement to begin the meeting. The primary goal of this meeting was to hear the thoughts and concerns of the landowners and to answer their questions. I gave each landowner copies of maps of Equality Colony infrastructure that I had created. I also had on hand copies of Washington State archaeology laws and regulations, e.g. Executive Order 0505.

On February 20, 2014, I was a guest lecturer in Arie Werder's 7th grade classroom at Lucille Umbarger Elementary School in Burlington, Washington. I gave a total of three approximately 40 minute lectures. The lecture content was focused on Washington state archaeology and archaeology as a career but also included some Equality Colony history and a brief description of this project. The lecture was designed to be interactive and allowed for questions to be asked throughout.
In February 2014 I sent out a brief questionnaire to the landowners. The questionnaire was designed to provide a gauge of each individual landowner’s interest in this project, Equality Colony history and archaeology. The questionnaire was seven questions long and in multiple choice format. See Appendix 4 for a copy of the questionnaire. One of the values of the community archaeology approach is it provides an opportunity for the community members to express their own opinions about archaeology and heritage resource management (Baumann et al. 2008; Chirikure and Pwiti 2008; Little and Shackel 2007; Tully 2007). This questionnaire was an attempt to facilitate exactly that.

Copies of this thesis will be distributed to the Skagit Valley Historical Museum, the Center for Pacific Northwest Studies at Western Washington University, the University of Washington Library Special Collections Division, the Blanchard Community Club, and landowners, Peggy Stowe and Warren Bingham. By distributing copies of a report of my work I will be complying with the reciprocal nature of community archaeology, not just gathering information from the community but also putting information back into it (Chirikure and Pwiti 2008).
CHAPTER SIX: HISTORICAL RESEARCH AND PHOTOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS RESULTS

In this chapter I will explore first the results of my historic research and then the results of my photographic analysis. The two sections of this chapter will use the same analytic categories so that the two discussions will parallel and complement each other. I am exploring the historical records separately from the photographs for a few reasons. At times the texts inform the content of the photographs and the photographs in turn illustrate the records. At other times they contradict one another. There are things in photographs not mentioned in the historical records. The historical records may detail something that appears entirely different in a photograph. I want these contradictions to be clear. These inconsistencies can indicate areas where archaeological research can refine our understanding of the Equality Colony.

Historic Research

A concise and focused summation of the history of the Equality Colony was previously provided in Chapter Two and will not be repeated here. The intent of this section is to provide more details that pertain specifically to the development of an archaeological research design for the Equality Colony. A timeline of important Equality Colony events is provided in Figure 3 to give context for the results and to act as a reference for the reader.
Figure 3: A timeline of Equality Colony events.
The Equality Colony Property

The Equality Colony owned at least 625 acres (Smith 1988). Two hundred and eighty acres were originally purchased in October 1987 (LeWarne 1995). In May 1898 160 acres were added to the south and west for a total of 440 contiguous Equality Colony acres (LeWarne 1995; Smith 1988). This land was where most of the Equality Colony buildings and infrastructure were located. It is referred to hereafter as the Equality Colony’s main holdings and is the focus of this study.

Additionally, the Equality Colony owned twenty acres that did not adjoin the main holdings. This land was referred to as the hatchery and was utilized by the Colony (LeWarne 1995; Smith 1988). The Colony owned another 180 acres that appears to have gone unused by the Colonists (LeWarne 1995; Smith 1988) (Table 3). In the summer of 1898 the Equality Colony rented neighboring lands that were readily cultivatable as their own land was not fully cleared (Industrial Freedom 1901). At least two properties outside of Washington State were owned by the Colony (Industrial Freedom 1899b, 1899c, 1899d). Notices appear in Industrial Freedom offering to sell them or trade them for livestock or machinery. Smith (1988) writes that the Equality Colony members did not use or improve upon these properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Known as</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The original purchase</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>Together with 'the option' this property forms the main holdings of the Equality Colony. The bulk of the buildings and infrastructure were located on this land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Option</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>An abandoned farm. Adjoined the original purchase to the south and west. A productive orchard was on this land and it was cultivated by the Colonists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hatchery (formerly the Lewis Property)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Welcoming center for arriving Colonists. Located a mile west of the main holdings on Edison Slough, near the intersection of Chuckanut Drive and Bow Hill Road today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The McKenzie tract</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Located two miles south of the main holdings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Melbye tract</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Located two miles south of the main holdings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Built Environment

The built environment of the Equality Colony included buildings, structures, the cultivated landscape, roads and other pathways.

Buildings and Structures

The ideal for the Equality Colony built environment was set by socialist J. Pickering Putnam. Putnam donated copies of his book, *Architecture Under Nationalism* (the Bellamy socialist movement was referred to as Nationalism), to the Colonists to guide their work at the new utopia. In it he wrote, “Instead of monotonous rows of inharmonious facades, crowded closely together, leading to the exclusion of sunlight from their rooms, with their still more monotonous interiors, we shall have separate, large and graceful edifices standing in open spaces wide enough apart to give ample chances for the air and sunlight to bathe each part...Each building will constitute a complete work of art in itself, set in an independent miniature park...there will be no crowded, insanitary, half-dilapidated firetraps for the 'poor' as now, constituting at once a disgrace to humanity and an eyesore and peril to the whole community” (Putnam 1890 as quoted in Smith 1988:50-51).

Putnam (1890) argued for the built environment to reflect equity and cooperation. He was critical of those who would live in luxury while their neighbors languished in squalor. He saw the institution of socialism as a chance to right this very physical wrong. The Equality Colonists were of the same mind as Putnam. They were building a utopia and they wanted their built environment to reflect that.

In practice, the purchase of the land by the BCC for the Equality Colony site seriously taxed their reserves (Smith 1988). The Equality Colony had little money and resources to work with but needed to make room for plenty of eager BCC members and socialists from across the nation (*Industrial Freedom* 1898w). The Equality Colonists planned for and dreamed of the construction of their ideal city from the beginning but they had to make do with what was convenient and expedient for the first few years.

Crowding was an issue through the first few years (Topmann 1899). Articles in *Industrial Freedom* were published offering warning of the frontier conditions of the Equality Colony (*Industrial
“Some short sighted people come here and see our log houses and working clothes and other crude arrangements and get the ideas that these are permanent and that they don’t like socialism. All right, if you cannot look ahead with us to the time when our labor can make all the nice and beautiful things we want, why you have our permission to retire” (Industrial Freedom 1898i:4). Some of the more genteel BCC members who arrived in Skagit County expecting to take up residence at the Equality Colony simply could not bring themselves to do it. Some stayed in nearby Edison in a hotel room and others moved on (Ault n.d.b).

As is discussed by Smith (1988), when the first BCC members arrived on what would become the main holdings of the Equality Colony in 1887, it had already been altered by human activity. Loggers had been making their way through the Skagit River Valley for 30 years. The slightly decayed remains of a logging camp stood on the site. When other Colonists began arriving these buildings were used for their expedient and practical value. “The logging camp shacks gave a ragged edge to the settlement, but they were too useful to destroy” (Smith 1988: 60). The old log bunk houses, kitchen, stables, and storage sheds were cleaned up and made usable.

In the fall of 1897 the Colonist constructed their first building on the Equality land, a communal kitchen and dining room they dubbed Fort Bellamy. Most of the other buildings erected by the Colonists were built in 1898 and 1899 (LeWarne 1995; Smith 1988) (Table 4). Although the Colonists might have liked to build fine homes for one or two families, the demand for shelter led them to first build large communal apartments (Smith 1988). By May 1898 Equality had its own portable saw mill and could supply itself with lumber for its projects (Billingsley 1898c). They also produced lumber and shingles for sale to non-members (Industrial Freedom 1899i, 1899l). The Industrial Freedom (1898a) reported that the portable mill had a capacity of 6,000 board feet of lumber a day.

Later when the Colony had its permanent sawmill, it could produce 20,000 board feet a day and the Industrial Freedom (Randolph 1898) estimated that up to 50,000 shingles could be produced daily. Wooden sidewalks were built to connect the apartment houses to Fort Bellamy (Smith 1988). The manufacturing labor department made the furniture and often used lumber milled at Equality to do it
Residences were furnished with a mixture of Colony manufactured furniture and personal belongings, brought in by Colony members, since members were not required to give up personal belongings (Billingsley 1898d; LeWarne 1995). There is not much recorded information on the interior of Equality Colony homes and buildings, including the furniture they contained.

Stoves for residences were purchased in the nearby town of New Whatcom until a member arrived with the skills and equipment to make them (Smith 1988). The Industrial Freedom (1899b) makes mention of a sheet iron stove fashioned by the Colony's tinner. The paper claimed that the sheet stoves freed them from needing to purchase anymore 'monopoly made' stoves. A brickyard was established in June 1898 to take advantage of the local clay deposits and brick chimneys were installed in a number of buildings (Billingsley 1898g; Smith 1988). A horse powered machine was hooked up to mix the clay for bricks (Smith 1968c). Adobe bricks were made and bricks were fired in the cereal coffee oven (Industrial Freedom 1898n; Smith 1968c). Cereal coffee was a product produced by the Equality Colony both for consumption by member and also marketed for mail order sale in Industrial Freedom. It is discussed in more detail in the Foodways section of this chapter.

There were two natural springs providing fresh water to the Colony, one of which was located near Apartment House No. 1 (Billingsley 1898a). Both of the springs were enclosed by the Colonists. In August 1898 the Industrial Freedom reported that the Colonists had purchased a hydraulic ram, a cyclical water pump powered by hydropower (Industrial Freedom 1898f). A large wooden rectangular tank was located at the north end of Apartment House No. 1 (Smith 1988). According to Smith, it was filled by pumping water from the creek, but a news item in the Industrial Freedom (1898f) seems to indicate that it may have been filled from a spring. “We have received our hydraulic ram, and as soon as it is put in position we will have fresh spring water for culinary and drinking purposes and we will be enabled to economize the extent of a team and hand now doing the water hauling, and thus step by step we climb the hill of difficulty” (Industrial Freedom 1898f:4). From the water tank, water was piped into Fort Bellamy (Smith 1988). There was also a faucet on the tank so that people could fill buckets with water and haul them to where they were needed.
In the summer of 1898 the Colonists laid out ‘the New City,’ a 200 foot public square surrounded by 100 square foot lots (Industrial Freedom 1898a, 1898b, 1898f; Smith 1988). They called this area the New City to juxtapose it from the expediently constructed ‘Village’ where they currently resided. The New City was to be built in the style of their ideology, allowing them to abandon those structures they had first built according to necessity. “The plan contemplates a square in the center for a hotel and other public buildings desired. Four blocks face the square – A, B, C, and D, six lots each (Industrial Freedom 1898f:4). The cabins built in the New City were single family occupancy and most were simple in design with two to four rooms (Smith 1988). The first was started in March of 1899 (Industrial Freedom 1899h). In June 1899 the first two families moved in, the Peltons and the Marquarts (Industrial Freedom 1899n).

Eleven cabins were built in the New City between 1898 and 1901 (Smith 1988) Two larger houses were built in 1901 but they were considered too time consuming and costly by the majority of the general assembly and no more were built. Four more cabins were constructed. No spring was located in the area of the New City so water was piped in from one of the springs located near the Village (Industrial Freedom 1899d). It is unclear which one. Over 1,000 feet of water pipe were purchased for this project.

In January of 1899, approximately 300 people lived at the Equality Colony (Smith 1988). By December the population was half that. As buildings were erected and the population decreased, pressure to live communally was relieved. In the first years of the Colony, Fort Bellamy acted as a social hub (Smith 1988). The official bulletin board hung there, announcing news and displaying documents. After the printery was built in 1899 the bulletin board was moved there. It housed the Equality Colony store and post office and became the social center. The communal kitchen was part of the ideology shared by Colony members early on (An Old Maid Cook 1899). However, increased infrastructure in the private dwellings and shifting preferences among members led to private kitchens at Equality. Fort Bellamy was eventually rented to non-members along with the shingle mill, and space in an apartment house. The saw mill burned down in September 1904. In February 1906 the barn also burned down.
Table 4: Equality Colony buildings and other infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Materials and design notes</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Fort Bellamy”</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>In the fall of 1897 it was a 2 story L-shaped log building.</td>
<td>Kitchen and dining hall down stairs - seated 60 or 70 in fall 1897.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining room and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In Spring of 1898 the northern log wall was removed and a rough</td>
<td>Doubled in size by April 1898 – seated 130.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kitchen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>timber addition built to make it a T-shaped building.</td>
<td>Living quarters upstairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dining hall is 20 by 80.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the main</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchen is 20 by 40.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holdings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Piped with running water.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A vegetable preparing room and pantry were added.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A wash up room was located behind the kitchen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A new range and new floor were added in November 1900.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry shed</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>First used one of the old logging camp buildings.</td>
<td>In the beginning of the Colony, at least until 1899, all of the Colony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brick furnace.</td>
<td>clothes were washed together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two boxes with sheet-iron bottoms over furnaces to boil clothes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A public bathroom in one side.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A new laundry building was started in December 1898.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Three laundry machines run by water wheel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The creek was dammed to facilitate the water wheel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A number of tubs and wringers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log cabins</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Built with logs from the property.</td>
<td>Partitioned off for two families each.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First 3 finished in the first of January 1898, fourth added in the spring – that one</td>
<td>One cabin was disassembled and rebuilt on Samish Island after the Colony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>was made of split logs.</td>
<td>dissolved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment House</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Built with lumber from a local mill.</td>
<td>The downhill west side was a basement that housed the shoe making and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nailed together in January and February 1898 on the hillside (angle ~10.45 degrees).</td>
<td>tailor shops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outside stairways on both ends and a balcony along the east side of the second floor</td>
<td>In May 1899 carpentry shops were there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for fire safety.</td>
<td>Before other buildings were finished some of the rooms were used for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outside stairways were built from the apartment houses to the dining room.</td>
<td>school and general assembly meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A faucet installed outside the apartment on the west side for filling buckets with</td>
<td>The attic was a dorm for bachelors and called “Paradise Hall”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>water.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The main floor ground level matched the uphill side of the slope.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Main and 2nd floors had 12 rooms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Equality Colony Buildings and Other Infrastructure Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Materials and design notes</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apartment House No. 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Built with lumber from their mill.</td>
<td>People lived on the ground floor before the 2nd floor was finished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“While the colony’s appearance was stamped with the frontier look by the log cabins, the apartment houses were similar to hotels in early Puget Sound lumber towns” (Smith 1988: 60).</td>
<td>An attic was for bachelors but also used as a sick bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed in June 1899.</td>
<td>In the partial basement was a barber shop, sewing room, library and colony offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It had seven porches and outside stairways.</td>
<td>The shoe maker moved here by May 1899.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There were 30 rooms measuring 12x14 feet for families.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The attic had 50 beds for bachelors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Torn down after the Colony dissolved and a chicken house built in its place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith shop</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>An old logging camp bunkhouse was first used in the spring of 1898.</td>
<td>Worked on horseshoes, metal farm equipment, wagons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In December 1889 a new one was built near the barn as the old one was too small.</td>
<td>Took work from non-members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iron lathe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Finished in September 1898.</td>
<td>Hay storage, oat storage, and cow house (20 tons of hay, 500 sacks of oats and 16 cows in November 1898)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52 feet to comb.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Horse powered hay fork.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burned in 1906.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stables</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>No information. This may have been an old logging camp building used by the Colonists.</td>
<td>The Colony had nine horses, four mules, and four wagons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Part was converted into a root house in November 1898.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinner shed</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Located in an old smokehouse near the laundry.</td>
<td>Made milk pails, cans for preserving fish and cook stoves among other things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Width</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Materials and design notes</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>Surfed with 4 inch planks.</td>
<td>Built to facilitate lumber loads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A continuation of the tramway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fell down in 1905 or 1906.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printery</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Two stories.</td>
<td>Housed the general offices of the BCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Occupied in Feb 1899.</td>
<td>The <em>Industrial Freedom</em> was printed here after March 1899.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Had an elevator to carry forms to the second story.</td>
<td>In April 1899 the post office was moved to the main floor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The printing press had a one cylinder gas motor.</td>
<td>The Colony store, kindergarten and sewing room housed here in May 1899.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Library upstairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor quarters upstairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School house</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Built in the summer of 1898.</td>
<td>Space shared by the general assembly, the school, school board, weekly dances, lectures, the lyceum, religious services, and weddings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Three rooms – two classrooms and a reception room.</td>
<td>The dances were held in the basement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The rooms were created by removable partitions.</td>
<td>8 grades taught at the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>216 feet of black board.</td>
<td>70 children and two teachers in May 1899.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Croquet green between the school house and apartment 2.</td>
<td>At least one non-member child attended the Equality Colony school for a time while the Colony was in operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The seats, benches, and desks were manufactured at Equality.</td>
<td>The Colony school continued to operate after the Colony itself ended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage on the north end.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outhouses</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>There were at least 14 in total.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>They were placed “reasonably” close to main buildings and divided by gender (Smith 1988:122).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There was one located between the barn and the apartment house, one outside the school and one outside the kitchen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Both single and double occupancy models.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Width</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Materials and design notes</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrel house</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>At the bottom of the hillside below Fort Bellamy.</td>
<td>Barrel manufacture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable Mill</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A portable shingle mill was operational in May 1898.</td>
<td>Shingles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw Mill</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>The permanent mill was built in the early fall 1898.</td>
<td>Produced lumber and shingles (capacity: 15,000 feet and 30,000 shingles a day). Flour was milled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A shingled roof.</td>
<td>Carpentry and machine work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colony Creek was dammed to create a pond to float logs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A 35 horse power donkey engine was purchased in January 1899.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bull wheel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flour mill installed here.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete carpenter and machine shops built adjoining the building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attached wash room.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rented out by a non-member in 1904.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burned down in September 1904.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New City cabins</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Two to four rooms.</td>
<td>Single family homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring shed 1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>8 feet square.</td>
<td>Water management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A natural spring located near Apartment House No. 1 was enclosed in stone masonry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apiary</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>2 hives in May 1898.</td>
<td>Hives were kept for honey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burned down and rebuilt in 1901.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4: Equality Colony Buildings and Other Infrastructure Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Materials and design notes</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tent</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>In June of 1898 there were a dozen. In November 1898 there were 3. One was near the school house. At least one was on a wooden platform with wooden sides.</td>
<td>Expedient housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakery</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>A brick oven made from the Colony's own clay. Finished in August 1898.</td>
<td>Bread was baked for the Colony and available for non-member purchase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood sheds</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Various locations including one near the kitchen.</td>
<td>For storage and processing of stove wood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironing room</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Approximately 100 feet in front of Fort Bellamy.</td>
<td>Colony clothing was laundered together for at least the first few years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food preservation building and Kindergarten</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Located east of the bakery. Had a brick furnace and copper-bottomed pan.</td>
<td>Manufacture of apple butter and sweet pickles, chow-chow, and canned fruit. Kindergarten classes – in November 1898 there were 27 children attending class here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hog pen</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Moved around quite a bit. In November 1898 it was moved across the railroad track so the hogs could help clear land for spring. Contained the hogs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hen house and yard</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A little east of the barn. Picket corral around it.</td>
<td>60 or 70 chickens in February 1899.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot house</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Roof of glass. Part of the nursery.</td>
<td>Helped with the growth of early vegetables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Just east of the mill. The hot house was part of the nursery. To the west of the hot house was a garden.</td>
<td>Vegetable production.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Equality Colony Buildings and Other Infrastructure Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Materials and design notes</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dam in Colony Creek</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>A dam with a gate was installed approximately 100 feet from the permanent sawmill site and a flume, a deep narrow channel, off of the creek was dug.</td>
<td>Created a pond to float logs in. When the salmon ran through the creek this infrastructure could be used to help with harvest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root house</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Above the barn.</td>
<td>For storage of root vegetables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silo</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Described as new in 1906.</td>
<td>For storage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: data from Adams 1899; Billingsley 1898a, 1898d, 1898e, 1898h, LeWarne 1995; Halladay, E.C. 1901; Halladay, H.W. 1900, 1901; Heacock 1977; Industrial Freedom 1898f, 1898i, 1898j, 1898k, 1898l, 1898m, 1898p, 1898q, 1898r, 1898s, 1898t, 1898u, 1898x, 1899a, 1899e, 1899f, 1899g, 1899i; Randolph 1898; Smith 1967a, 1967b, 1968a, 1968b, 1968c, 1968d, 1968e, 1988; and Topmann 1899F.
Landscape

The Colonists put considerable energy into cultivating and managing the landscape (Smith 1988). Although part of the land had been previously logged, the Colonists set about felling trees and clearing brush to create even more space for their utopia (Billingsley 1898e). LeWarne (1995) notes that part of the tide flats had been drained for use as farm land prior to the arrival of the Colonists but there was still plenty to be done. The creek that flowed through the northern stretch of the property was rerouted and diked by the Colonists (Smith 1988).

Ditches were dug to drain the marsh lands (Industrial Freedom 1898f, 1898g). Orchards were planted on the hillside north of the residential buildings and to the west of Colony creek (Smith 1988). The existing orchard on the Option, the second piece of property purchased by the Equality Colony, was utilized and added to (Industrial Freedom 1899k; Smith 1988). Five acres of strawberries were planted on the Option (Smith 1968a, 1988). Seeds and plant starts were a common gift to the Colony from supporters across the United States and Canada, so the plant life of the Colony was varied (Industrial Freedom 1898w, 1899c, 1899k). The Colonists maintained a nursery and extra plant starts were available for sale to non-members (Billingsley 1898f; Industrial Freedom 1899k).

The Colonists farmed on the flat land down the hill from their buildings (LeWarne 1995; Smith 1988). The land was prolific and crops flourished (Smith 1968a, 1988). In one season 40,000 cabbage were grown (Industrial Freedom 1898b). Carrots, rutabaga, potatoes, turnips, onions, beans, oats, hay and more were also grown on Colony lands (Industrial Freedom 1898k, 1898l). Howard Ault, who was a young man of the Colony, told Smith (1968c) in an interview that the Equality Colony made use of human feces as compost. He also talked about the practice of burying fish carcasses with potatoes.

Logging and clearing left the landscape pockmarked with stumps (Industrial Freedom 1898b). Many of these were burned and then removed. As additional land was cleared, debris from cutting trees and bushes piled up (Industrial Freedom 1898h). In August of 1898 a controlled burn of some of the material got away from the Colonists. No buildings were lost but the fire burned almost right up to them. In June of 1899 the Industrial Freedom (1899i) remarked how lucky the Colony had been in general with
fires. No buildings had been lost to fire at that point. However, fires had started and been extinguished in Fort Bellamy, the cereal coffee building and Apartment House No. 2, among others. In November 1898 the *Industrial Freedom* (Randolph 1898) reported that over one and a half miles of ditch had been cut, 100 acres of timber land slashed and burned, and around 15 acres of land cleared of stumps. The Colony had nearly 50 acres of cultivated land at this time.

Roads

Roads were built and maintained (Billingsely 1898a; *Industrial Freedom* 1899k). Often coarse sawdust from the mill was laid down on roads and paths in an effort to stem the constant flow of mud (Billgsley 1898a). Other times board walks were constructed to keep paths passable (*Industrial Freedom* 1899k). A road was constructed between Equality Colony and the nearby towns of Bellfast, Blanchard and Bow (*Industrial Freedom* 1898f, 1898x; Smith 1968c). A skid road was built in the fall of 1898 to connect the Colony buildings on the hillside to the permanent sawmill which was located on the flats (*Industrial Freedom* 1898q). Colony members used horse and wagon and bicycle to make the trips to and from town (*Industrial Freedom* 1898l, Smith 1968c). The Equality Colony communally owned nine horses, four mules, and four wagons (Randolph 1898).

Social Structure

The social structure of the Equality Colony was largely borrowed from the outer society that surrounded it (Smith 1988). Marriage and relationship structure, e.g. friendships and relations within the immediate family, at the Equality Colony followed the customs and norms of the prevailing culture (Smith 1969). Several weddings took place at the Colony (Smith 1988). Birth and death were also handled in a manner reflected of the larger societal norms. Arrangements for these things were handled on an individual level. In the case of death the Equality Colony provided a coffin and funeral wagon when requested. In general, it was the policy of the Equality Colony members not to interfere with these matters as they were considered to fall into the category of personal freedoms.

The Equality Colony was not formed to stand apart from society but rather to act as an inspiration
to society (Smith 1988). The members joined the Colony knowing it would put them on display. Membership came with a certain degree of public scrutiny. The Equality Colony members identified with each other and also with the larger BCC community (Industrial Freedom 1898h). They saw their efforts on the Colony as laying the groundwork for future members. Further, they saw themselves as connected to and building a future for all of Washington State (Smith 1988).

As discussed, the central tenant of the Equality Colony was socialism and the Equality Colonists believed in what could be described as utopian or Fabian socialism. However, the Colonists rejected these labels. They believed that they sounded too passive and they saw themselves as people of action. Whether or not it is labeled utopian or Fabian, the Equality Colonists believed in a gradual reform of the capitalist system where people would be persuaded to convert to socialism. Their commitment to socialism was manifested in their direct democratic government and in their communal production of goods. The Equality Colonists believed in the ideals of cooperation and equality.

As discussed by Smith (1988), the women of the Equality Colony enjoyed the right to speak and vote in the general assembly. However, the female members of the Equality Colony never worked in the ‘men’s’ work departments, e.g. transportation, public works and agriculture. Women did the more traditional female jobs – cooking, sewing, laundry, childcare, and housekeeping. Further the women of Equality were expected to show more social restraint than the men. Smith (1988) explains that this is an outgrowth of the Equality Colony’s desire to present a good face to outside communities.

The Cemetery

The exact location of the Equality Colony cemetery is not recorded. Smith (1988:89) describes the cemetery location as, “On the lowest slope of the hill...north of the creek...” In a November 1898 issue of Industrial Freedom (1898t) it is remarked that the cemetery is across the railroad track from the Village. Presumably this refers to the Alger logging railroad. Cedar markers were placed on individual graves. Smith (1988) places the number of graves in the Colony cemetery at 30, although not all of these were dug while the Colony was in existence (Table 5).
Not all of the Colony members who passed away were buried in their cemetery. Orchil Gifford, a seven year old male was cremated (Industrial Freedom 1898v). Jimmy Mooney, a three year old male, was buried in a Catholic cemetery in the nearby community of Bow (Industrial Freedom 1899i).

Table 5: Individuals known to have been buried in the Equality Colony cemetery (Billingsley 1898b; Industrial Freedom 1898b, 1898c, 1898j, 1898t; Smith n.d., 1968c).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archie Williams Stoney</td>
<td>May 6, 1898</td>
<td>A male infant, only five days old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazel F. Billingsley</td>
<td>June 18, 1898</td>
<td>Female youth, age unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee Bridges</td>
<td>July 1898</td>
<td>A male infant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois A. Foy</td>
<td>September 1, 1898</td>
<td>Female youth, around 12 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennie Boyd</td>
<td>November 18, 1898</td>
<td>Female youth, age unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland B. Jolly</td>
<td>November 30, 1898</td>
<td>8.5 years old, male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? Amby</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Adult male?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.W. Giles</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Adult male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jocelyn</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Adult male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foodways

There were no definitive Equality Colony rules concerning diet (LeWarne 1995). According to Smith (1988), Equality Colonists made use of their close proximity to Samish Bay by feasting on clams, crabs, oysters, herring, trout and salmon. For a time the Colonists had a fleet of boats which aided their harvesting of resources from the Puget Sound (Ault n.d.b; Halladay and Halladay 1899; Pulsipher n.d.). The Colony's sloop, The Progress, was sold in 1901 after the Great Northern railroad line destroyed the landing used by the Colony. Mrs. Anne Billingsley wrote in a May 1898 Industrial Freedom article: “Our fishermen returned today with over 1,500 lbs. of fish. They were mostly herring, and are fine eating. We salted down over two large barrels full” (Billingsley 1898b:4). Wild duck was eaten (Halladay, H.W. 1900; Smith 1988). The Industrial Freedom (1898a) reports that the Colonists also hunted for ‘wild steer’. Though the Colony kept livestock including cows, pigs, chickens, and even the occasional ram, meat was rarely eaten (Billingsley 1898g; Smith 1988). Eggs were served around twice a week (Smith 1988). Some of the Colonists practiced vegetarianism although how many is unknown (Ault n.d.a; Industrial Freedom 1898a). Although having enough good dairy cows was a perpetual problem for the Colony, butter and cheese were made when able (Industrial Freedom 1898c, 1899a, 1899b, 1899c;
As the Colonists became more established, they were increasingly able to supply much of their own food. The Colonists’ goal was to live efficiently so that they might reduce their costs and dependence on the capitalist system (Griggs 1899). They were not opposed to purchasing staples such as flour from nearby towns or arranging trades with neighbors if that was more cost effective (Heacock 1977; *Industrial Freedom* 1898g, 1899k; LeWarne 1995; Smith 1988). There is no record of the Colonists going hungry. Randolph wrote in *Industrial Freedom* (1898:5) as part of his summation of the Colony, “Our bill of fare consists of very plain, wholesome food, of which we have an abundance.” Colonists relied heavily on beans, bread, corn and oatmeal in lean times. A typical breakfast might consist of oatmeal with sugar, potatoes and gravy, bread, and cereal coffee with milk (Topman 1898). A typical midday meal, or dinner as the Colonists referred to it, would also include potatoes and bread. Additionally on the menu would be vegetables including beans, peas, carrots, cabbage or sauerkraut, or some combination of those with tea or coffee. The evening meal, or supper, was similar to dinner. Once or twice a week the Colonists were treated to pie and hot rolls.

When food was plentiful it was preserved. With a tinner in residence to make cans, the Colonists were able to can the fish they caught (*Industrial Freedom* 1898f). Sauerkraut was made in abundance and fruit, including plums and blackberries, was canned (*Industrial Freedom* 1898l, 1899e). In October of 1898 a furnace and copper bottom boiler were constructed in order to make apple butter (*Industrial Freedom* 1898m). When the Colony did have surplus, it was often sold (Heacock 1977; Pulsipher n.d.). Bread was baked in the colony and the Colony bakery produced enough loaves to supply the membership and to sell to non-members (*Industrial Freedom* 1898d; Smith 1968a, 1988). The bakery utilized 1,000 lbs of flour on average in a week (Randolph 1898).

A cereal coffee was manufactured in the Colony and available by mail order (LeWarne 1995). The type of grain used to make the cereal coffee is not made clear in the historical records. However, it is known that the grains for the cereal coffee were grown on the Colony. The cereal coffee was advertised in the *Industrial Freedom*, “It is undoubtedly the best in the market, and a wholesome nourishing food and
not a stimulant. We can conscientiously recommend it to our comrades” (*Industrial Freedom* 1889x: 5). Although the cereal coffee was manufactured as a retail item, it was also consumed by the Colonists. According to Catherine Savage Pulsipher, who lived on the Colony as a child, “Much grain was raised and made into a dry cereal similar to today’s ‘Wheaties’ and ‘Corn Flakes’, but without added sweetening. An expert from a large New York factory headed this enterprise. Members objected to eating this ‘dry fodder’ and were permitted to use sugar on it” (Pulsipher n.d.:2). The description of the cereal coffee in the *Industrial Freedom* and Pulsipher’s description seem contradictory. The *Industrial Freedom* advertisement seems to be describing a roasted grain that would be soaked in hot water and drank. Pulsipher seems to be describing a grain that would be eaten, like porridge. It is possible that both products were made at the Equality Colony.

Food was served three times a day at Fort Bellamy (LeWarne 1995; Smith 1988). At the height of the Colony population, meals were served in shifts, e.g. breakfast was served at 6:00 and then again at 6:30 (Smith 1988). Colonists were called to meals by the banging of a harrow tooth on a circular saw (*Industrial Freedom* 1898d). The *Industrial Freedom* (1898d) reported that most of the Colony men were present at the dining hall before the signal was given while women waited to hear the signal before coming. The dining hall was outfitted with long tables set with plates, silverware, salt, pepper and vinegar. In November of 1898 the Colony dining room was serving meals to 300 people (*Industrial Freedom* 1898q). While the Colony’s population was high, men took the first meal shift, and women and children the second. The children ate together at the same table. Later, after the population had thinned, families sat together at assigned tables.

There are twelve girls and six women employed in the kitchen and dining rooms…The cooks get up at 4 o’clock a.m. to prepare breakfast, and it is 8 o’clock at night when the lights are out in the dining rooms. The cooks are now working three shifts, but the girls as waiters work every day…One man helps to lift the large heavy vessels about the range and one washes the large dishes and pumps the water into the heater. The vegetables and fruit are all prepared by the women (*Industrial Freedom* 1898q:4).
Members were expected to eat at Fort Bellamy and there were no private kitchens at the Equality Colony until at least 1899 (An Old Maid Cook 1899). However, a June 1899 article in the Industrial Freedom notes that some Colony members were open to the idea of private kitchens in the future (An Old Maid Cook 1899). It is unclear when the Colony member’s stance on the communal kitchen changed, but by 1904 there was no longer a communal kitchen and all cooking was done in private kitchens (Smith 1988).

Non-members were welcome at the Equality Colony dining hall and could get their meal at cost just like a member (Smith 1988). The Industrial Freedom (1898b:4) reported, “Mr. E.W. Nedrow registered at the dining room on Tuesday. He got a meal on socialist principals – at cost, and he says he wants to know more about practical socialism. We will bet you he comes back.”

Personal Adornment

Smith (1988) notes that the sewing department kept the women and young girls in fashion with the styles of their neighboring communities so effectively that the Colony seamstresses took in many orders from non-members. “To make a good impression on the watching world, these residents of a model community made it their habit to dress fashionably and well, to be clean and courteous...” (Smith 1988: 163). The Industrial Freedom (1899a) agrees that women were kept outfitted in fashion and notes that large white aprons were worn as they worked.

Male clothing was also sewn in the Colony including tailor-made suits “right up to date in every particular” (Industrial Freedom 1898g:4). Flannel shirts and underwear were available for purchase for non-members (LeWarne 1995). There was no official Equality Colony costume. The fabrics used to make Colony clothing were cost effective and simple (LeWarne 1995). There was no prohibition from purchasing more lavish fabrics to make your own clothing. Shoes were made on site and available to members and non-members alike.

Equality Colony members were fastidious about appearance (Industrial Freedom 1899a). Their clothes were regularly laundered and they kept themselves neat as well. Men shaved once or twice a
week. Smith (1988) reports that the laundry building had an attached bathhouse and that Colonists sometimes bathed at their own homes in zinc wash tubs. Men and women also took advantage of nearby water features for bathing (Smith 1968b).

Laundry and ironing were taken care of collectively by a committee assigned to the task (Pulsipher n.d.; Smith 1988). The committee was part of the subsistence department and made up of an unknown number of women and two men (Industrial Freedom 1898q). Equality Colony laundry services were available for hire by non-members (Oss 1901). The women of the subsistence committee also had the task of housekeeping for the bachelors of the Colony (Industrial Freedom 1898q; Randolph 1898). There is no mention in the historical record of whether or not single women also lived at Equality. If they did, it is unknown if they did their own housekeeping or if this was taken care of by the housekeeping department as well.

In general the Equality Colony women and not the men were responsible for housekeeping; both the official housekeeping tasks considered part of the Equality Colony subsistence work department, e.g. cleaning the bachelor’s quarters, and personal housekeeping. As discussed, men were expected to spend a minimum of eight hours working for their assigned department. The Colony women worked five hours for a man's eight because it was understood that she needed time to care for her own household. The Colony did have a nursery and women to provide care to the infants while the other women worked (Eddy 1899).

Medical

As is discussed by Smith (1988), the Colony often staffed its own physician although they were not averse to sending those who needed it to the hospital in nearby New Whatcom. All medical expenses were included in Colony membership (Industrial Freedom 1898a). Pulsipher (n.d.:3), who lived on the Equality Colony as a child, has a somewhat different recollection of the medical care at the Colony. “When a diphtheria epidemic swept the Colony, all infected were taken to the 'camp' and many luckless guests never survived. They were confined in tents and had little actual medical care.” A search of the
historical documents found nothing to substantiate Pulsipher’s story. In July 1898 the Industrial Freedom (1898e) reported a minor measles and whooping cough epidemic. There is no mention of mass illness or death at the Equality Colony in other historical records. No medicinal practices special to the Colony are noted.

**Leisure**

The Equality Colony did not prohibit alcohol or tobacco. According to Smith (1988), alcohol was not regularly used by Colonists. However, in a 1977 interview Charles Herz, who was born in the Colony in 1901, recalls going to the nearby town of Bow for a pail of beer with his father on a regular basis (Heacock 1977).

Events, including dances, lectures and debates, were regularly held at the Colony (Billingsley 1898d, 1898f, 1898g; Industrial Freedom 1899k; LeWarne 1995; Smith 1988). The Colony had a band to provide music (Randolph 1898). The Equality Colony was not closed to visitors or other non-members - in fact they were encouraged (Billingsley 1898a, 1898b; Industrial Freedom 1899a, 1899j). Likewise Equality members visited nearby towns and attended events held by non-members on a regular basis (Industrial Freedom 1899l).

The Equality Colony members seem to have established a good rapport with their neighbors, although they were sometimes a source of speculation and rumor (Smith 1967c, 1968e). The Equality Colony was formed to stand as an example to the nation (Smith 1988). Exposure to non-members was part of the strategy. Billingsley (1898c:4), an Equality Colony member, wrote, “In fact it is seldom that we are without visitors who come to see how the socialists live. We intend to make them all heartily welcome.”

Books were donated by BCC members from around the nation to stock the Equality Colony library (Industrial Freedom 1898c, 1898d, 1898r, 1899a, 1899d, 1899n). Picnics, hikes and excursions by boat were regularly enjoyed by the Equality Colony members (Industrial Freedom 1898i, 1898j, 1899l; Smith 1968c).
Religion

Religious services were held in the schoolhouse on Sundays (Smith 1988). The Equality Colony officially endorsed no religion (Industrial Freedom 1899f) However; an issue of Industrial Freedom (1898f) reporting on the new school house, seems to indicate that the majority of religious Colonists practiced Christian denominations. It reads: “And on the 24th the religiously inclined (Christian Religion) invited all to meet in the school house and organize a Sabbath school. The work was a success and thereafter at 10 a.m. Sunday mornings the classes will meet to study the word of God” (1898f:4). On the other hand, that same issue of Industrial Freedom reports that a lecture on Theosophy was also recently given at the Colony reinforcing the idea that the Equality Colony had no official religious doctrine and allowed members to follow their own religious convictions. Some individual members attended churches in nearby communities (Smith 1988).

Photograph Analysis

Photographs are a valuable source of data. They can capture details that are not otherwise recorded (Blackman 1981). The photographs examined for this project, including the over 50 photographs taken of the Equality Colony grounds, buildings, members and infrastructure between 1897 and 1907, and the four photographs of Equality Colony buildings taken in 1941, provided a useful data set. Using methods from Blackman (1981), Frassanito (1975), and Markham (1993), I have identified the view direction of the photographer, the season and year the photograph was taken in and the relationships between photographs wherever possible.

Analyzed photographs were selected from four different collections: the Peter L. Hegg Equality Colony Photographs from the University of Washington Libraries, Special Collections Division in Seattle, Washington; the Society and Culture collection located at the University of Washington Libraries, Special Collections Division in Seattle, Washington; the Equality Colony Collection at the Skagit County Historical Museum housed in LaConner, Washington; and the Frederick E. Smith papers, located at the
Center for Pacific Northwest Studies, Heritage Resources, located at Western Washington University in Bellingham, Washington.

Peter Hegg lived near the Equality Colony. He was not a Colony member but was considered by the Colonists to be the official Equality photographer. The photographs in the Peter L. Hegg Equality Colony Photographs Collection at the University of Washington Libraries were taken by Hegg. Some of the other collections examined for this project also contained photographs by Hegg. I was unable to identify any of the other photographers for these collections.
The Equality Colony Property

The photograph in Figure 4 is a view north/northwest of the area where the Equality Colony permanent sawmill was built in the fall of 1898. The creek known today as Colony Creek runs in the foreground. The abandoned logging camp that predates the Equality Colony can be seen through the trees. These buildings housed the Colony members while they built the Village. This photograph indicates what the flats of the Equality Colony main holdings looked like when the Equality Colonists arrived.

Figure 4: Equality Colony grounds, spring 1898 (Courtesy of the University of Washington Libraries. Special Collections, UW11234). Photograph taken by Hegg.
Built Environment

The following is a continuation of the discussion on the built environment of the Equality Colony started in the historical research section of this chapter. I have selected photographs that I believe best highlight the nature and character of the Equality Colony buildings, infrastructure, and landscape. It is worth noting that stumps and other indicators of a ‘frontier’ lifestyle are visible in the majority of these photographs. This supports descriptions of the Equality Colony in the historical records.

Fort Bellamy was the first building constructed by the Equality Colonists on the Equality Colony’s main holdings. It was built in the fall of 1897 and expanded in the spring of 1898. According to the University of Washington records, the photograph in Figure 5 was taken in 1898. In the photograph the addition is not yet built so the image must have been taken in the winter. The deciduous trees visible in the photograph and the ground around the dining hall show very little vegetation, further supporting this assertion.

The first floor of Fort Bellamy is logs and the top floor is dimensional lumber. The roof appears to be shingles. There are at least six windows visible in this photograph. This photograph is of the backside of Fort Bellamy; the entrance to the lower level is not visible. Based on the building’s shape and the fact that the front door is not visible, this is likely a view northwest.
Figure 5: Fort Bellamy, 1898 (Courtesy of the University of Washington Libraries. Special Collections, UW11236). Photograph taken by Hegg.
The photograph in Figure 6 is a view southeast of the log cabins built in the winter of 1897/1898. A fourth cabin was added south of the cabin in the far right of the photograph shortly after this photo was taken. These cabins are built in a very similar style to Fort Bellamy. The photograph is a view southeast.

Figure 6: Cabins, early spring 1898 (Courtesy of the University of Washington Libraries, Special Collections, UW11237). Photograph taken by Hegg.

The photographs in Figure 7 and Figure 8 are southeast views of Apartment House No. 2. Apartment House No. 2 appears to have horizontally arranged siding. There are 16 windows visible in the photographs in the west side of Apartment House No. 2.
The photograph in Figure 7 must have been taken prior to the photograph in Figure 8 because the fire escapes have not yet been built on the northside of the apartment and the basement is not yet finished. In the photograph in Figure 7 the three log cabins built in the winter of 1897/1898 must be just outside the photograph as they were built before Apartment House No. 2, which was completed in June 1899. In Figure 7 it appears to be still under construction but nearly finished. This observation, combined with the nature of the visible vegetation in the photograph, makes it likely that this photo was taken in the spring of 1899.

Figure 7: Apartment House No. 2 (Courtesy of the Skagit County Historical Museum, D-13-20011). Photograph taken by Hegg.
Although the University of Washington records indicated that Figure 8 was taken circa 1898, it is more likely that this photograph was taken in or after June of 1899. It is difficult to assess seasonality from the image. In the photograph in Figure 8, Apartment House No. 2 seems to be complete. The basement is finished and the access stairs and fire escape structures are all complete. In the foreground of the photograph is a wooden sidewalk which, historical records indicate, created a path from the apartment houses to Fort Bellamy. The slope of the hillside is more evident in this photograph than in those previously displayed in this section. The juxtaposition between the log cabins and the milled lumber apartment houses discussed in the historical records section is also illustrated in Figure 8.

Figure 8: Equality Colony grounds and buildings, ca. 1898 (Courtesy of the University of Washington Libraries, Special Collections, SOC0090). Photographer unknown.
Notes for the photographs in Figure 9 and Figure 10 were found in the Fredrick Smith Papers at the Center for Pacific Northwest Studies. Smith’s notes for Figure 9 indicate that this is a view west/northwest taken from near log cabin 2 looking toward the printery. It is unclear which cabin this refers to exactly and this assertion seems contrary to the 1899 plat map of the Equality Colony showing the printery to the south of the log cabins (see the Map Analysis section of Chapter Seven). Smith does not mention the other buildings. If Smith is correct, that the building featured is the printer, then it seems to have been built in a similar fashion to the apartment buildings. According to the historical records reviewed, the printery was two stories and became the center for Equality Colony business. This seems to fit with the two rows of windows visible in the side of the building. The other buildings in the photograph might be houses in the New City, which was built to the west and south of the printery. If these are New City buildings then this is one of the only photographs reviewed in this study of the New City after buildings were erected.

Figure 9: Overview of Equality Colony landscape and buildings (Courtesy of the Skagit County Historical Museum, D-13-21012). The printer was labeled by the author. Photographer unknown.
In Figure 10 Blanchard Mountain is visible in the background indicating that this is a view northwest. Notes from Fredrick Smith indicate that this is a photograph of the barn, root house, and bakery. Smith also notes that the men in the photograph are standing near the barn door. Historical records indicate that the barn was 52 feet tall to the peak of the roofline. If this is accurate that makes it unlikely that the men are standing next to the barn. Using the men pictured, it can be estimated that even if they are 6 feet tall, the building is likely only 18-20 feet tall, less than half the recorded height of the barn. Historical research did not reveal much information about the root house or bakery. It was indicated in one account that the root house was ‘above’ the barn which intuitively would mean uphill from the barn. This is contrary to Smith’s notes on this photograph. Again Smith’s notes do not fit with an 1899 plat map of the Equality Colony showing the bakery southwest of the barn (see the Map Analysis section of Chapter Seven). For both Figure 9 and Figure 10 it is difficult to say which records are correct and this is an area where archaeological field work might clarify the written documents.

Figure 10: Equality Colony grounds and buildings, ca. 1900 (Courtesy of the University of Washington Libraries. Special Collections, UW10541). Blanchard Mountain was labeled by the author. Photograph taken by Hegg.
The photographs in Figure 11 and Figure 12 are overviews of the Equality Colony village buildings and infrastructure. Figure 11 is a view northeast. Figure 12 is a view east/southeast. Figure 11 and Figure 12 ‘re-fit’ with each other as demonstrated in Figure 13. These photographs were likely taken in 1901 as Figure 11 is labeled, ‘Equality Farm from the new R.R.’ and the Great Northern Railroad was built through the Equality Colony lands in 1901. Figure 12 is a view of the area pictured in Figure 4, although Figure 12 is taken from farther away and from a different view. In Figure 13, these two photographs have been placed side by side.

Figure 11: Overview of the Equality Colony Village (to the left) and New City (to the right) (Courtesy of the Skagit County Historical Museum, D-13-14017). Photograph taken by Hegg.
The photograph in Figure 12 shows the location of the New City. In Figure 13 the New City is labeled by the author. This is one of the few photographs of the New City and it offers, perhaps, the best information on where the New City was located on the landscape.

Figure 12: Overview of the Equality Colony saw and shingle mill buildings (Courtesy of the Skagit County Historical Museum, D-13 SSH-3991016). Photograph taken by Hegg.
Figure 13: Composite of Figure 11 and Figure 12 showing much of the Equality Colony Village and New City with some buildings labeled. Labels from Smith 1988 and confirmed by the author’s own research. (Photos courtesy of the Skagit County Historical Museum, D-13-14017 and D-13 SSH-3991016).
As discussed in the historical research section, the Equality Colony operated saw and shingle mills from 1898 to 1904 and were able to supply much of their own lumber for their buildings. Figure 14 and Figure 15 are photographs showing different aspects of the saw and shingle mills. Figure 14 shows a building, maybe the permanent saw mill, in the far left. In front of that is the donkey engine. Throughout the photograph are stacks of partially milled lumber. The photograph in Figure 15 shows several storage structures for the milled lumber. As is evident in the photographs in Figure 14 and Figure 15, the saw and shingle mills would have had a number of outbuildings and other infrastructure surrounding them.

Figure 14: Sawmill showing donkey engine, mill crew, and shingle bolts ca. 1898 (Courtesy of the Skagit County Historical Museum, D-13-27 B009). Photograph taken by Hegg.
As discussed in the historical research section, the Equality Colonists maintained a nursery. A photograph taken in May 1898 shows several Equality Colony men working in this nursery (Figure 16). This photograph was taken in May 1898 and men can be seen with various farming implements including a cultivator which assists with weeding between rows and fences can be seen behind the nursery in the background of the photograph. This photograph is a view northwest.

Figure 15: Equality Colony showing lumber yard, ca. 1900 (Courtesy of the University of Washington Libraries, Special Collections Division, UW11244). Photograph taken by Hegg.

Figure 16: Equality Colony, May 1898. The nursery (Courtesy of the University of Washington Libraries, Special Collections Division, UW11255). Photograph taken by Hegg.
Two photographs (Figure 17 and Figure 18) show people on or near paths associated with the Equality Colony. The Skagit Historical Museum’s notes on Figure 17 indicated that it is of new arrivals to the Equality Colony walking the five miles from Belfast on the Great Northern Railroad line, July 1900. It is not clear if this means that they arrived in Belfast on the Great Northern railroad or if they are walking the rail line in the photograph. The path they are on in the photograph appears too level and even to be a rail line. There are no indicators of the rail line ties or tracks. So, while they may have followed the Great Northern tracks from Belfast to Equality for a ways, it is unlikely that they are on the Great Northern rail line in the photograph. The historical records indicate that a road was constructed by the Colonists between Belfast and Equality and it is likely that the newcomers are using this road.

Figure 17: New arrivals to the Equality Colony walking the five miles from Belfast on the Great Northern railroad line, July 1900 (Courtesy of the Skagit County Historical Museum, D-13-36 A015). Photograph taken by Hegg.
The second photograph (Figure 18) is captioned, ‘No. 14, Equality Colony, a lane’. This throughway is edged with logs and the path is of a much lighter color than the ground around it. As discussed in the historical research section, the Equality Colonists made use of the sawdust from their mill on pathways through the Colony to help keep them dry. It is possible that a sawdust surface is visible in the photograph. The vegetation in the photograph in Figure 18 suggests that it was taken in spring or summer. The vegetation is also quite different in Figure 18 than in Figure 17, suggesting that these are not the same path or at the very least are different sections of the same path.

Figure 18: The Equality Colony grounds, ca. 1900 (Courtesy of the University of Washington Libraries, Special Collections Division, UW11242). Photograph taken by Hegg.
Social Structure

It is worth noting here that photographs of the Equality Colony were available for sale to non-members of the Colony and advertised in issues of Industrial Freedom. Likely, Colonists hoped that the photographs would inspire other members of the BCC to donate to the Equality Colony, move to the Colony, or both.

Figure 19 shows a photograph titled Equality Colony ca. 1898. Apartment House No. 2 is visible in the background of the photograph and it appears to be partially finished. The vegetation in the photograph suggests spring or summer. Therefore it is more likely that this photograph was taken in the spring of 1899. It is a view southeast. Many Equality Colony residents are pictured in this photograph. There are groups of children in the foreground with a mix of adults and children in the background. A banner inscribed with ‘B.C.C. Read Industrial Freedom’ is displayed.

I include this photograph here because I think that it illustrates that the members of the Equality Colony saw themselves as a cohesive community but not as an isolated or entirely separate one. The banner refers to their publication, the Industrial Freedom, which they used as a mouthpiece to communicate with the larger BCC and other socialists, with whom they identified. I also observe that this photograph is very comparable with other contemporary community photographs and in that way marks the Equality Colony’s desire to maintain many of the social norms and characteristics of the surrounding communities.
The Cemetery

There are no photographs in these collections relating to the Equality Colony cemetery.

Foodways

The photograph in Figure 20 is of the interior of the Equality Colony kitchen in Fort Bellamy. This is one of the few photographs reviewed that showed the interior of buildings. There are large beams and logs visible supporting the building. A portion of the floor is wooden planks. The floor in the foreground is harder to see but it seems to also be made of milled lumber. The change in the flooring potentially indicates that this is one of the additions to Fort Bellamy. The quality of the photograph makes it difficult to identify the wall materials but there appear to be wooden planks. In the center of the back
wall there appears to be a brick chimney. There are shelves and cubby holes built into the back wall for storage. There is a pile of wood against the back wall. There are several tables in room with various bowls, cups, and other dishware on them. On the far right there is a wooden cupboard. It appears that there is a central table with open space all around it and then cupboards and other tables against the walls. It could be that the kitchen was designed with an open floor plan to accommodate the number of cooks and servers needed to cooperatively prepare and serve food for 300 people.

Figure 20: Equality Colony kitchen, ca.1898 (Courtesy of the Skagit County Historical Museum, D-13-23010). Photograph taken by Hegg.

Figure 21 is a photograph labeled as the interior of the creamery. I did not find any mention of a creamery in the historical record. In fact the records indicate that butter and cheese were scarce, as the Equality Colony was always in need of dairy cows. It is possible that the creamery was inside a building that served multiple purposes. It is interesting that the creamery was photographed though. Photographing it seems to indicate that it played an important role in the Equality Colony which contradicts the historical
record. Another reason it might have been photographed is that butter and cheese are luxury items and having a creamery may have been symbolic of increased status for the Equality Colony.

The room has a wooden plank floor and walls. The planks on the floor are narrower than the ones on the wall. The one window in the photograph has a retractable shade attached to the top. There is a wooden shelf built onto the wall next to the window and several other objects including papers and a box are attached to the walls.

Figure 21: The interior of the creamery, ca. 1898 (Courtesy of the University of Washington Libraries. Special Collections Division, UW11248). Photograph taken by Hegg.
Several objects related to milk processing are in the room including two milk cans, a wooden barrel butter churn, and a cream separator. Figure 22 shows examples of these same milk processing tools from a 1902 Sears Roebuck catalog. Historical records indicate that the Equality Colony manufactured a portion of its equipment. It is unknown if the Equality Colony tools were made at the Colony or ordered from outside.

Figure 22: Examples of milk processing tools from a 1902 edition of the Sears, Roebuck catalogue (Cleveland Amory n.d.).

Personal Adornment

The photograph in Figure 23 is of several women who worked in Fort Bellamy, all wearing long dresses made from patterned fabric with high collars and long sleeves. Note that while they were dressed in similar styles, their dresses are by no means uniforms. Some of the dresses have a shirt collar with buttons on the front of the dress and some have a turtleneck collar. Their hair is all worn pinned up. They are wearing aprons over their dresses and holding tools of their trade, various kitchen implements.

It is also worth noting that the building in the background of this photograph is likely Apartment House No. 1. I was not able to find any other photographs of Apartment House No. 1. The building seen here has the characteristics described in the historical record for Apartment House No. 1. For example, Apartment House No. 2 had 12 rooms and two rows of 6 windows are visible in the photograph.
Figure 23: Kitchen staff (Courtesy of the Skagit County Historical Museum, D-13-35 B013). Photographer unknown.
Figure 24 shows dress styles from a 1902 edition of the Sears Roebuck catalogue (Cleveland Amory n.d.). The dresses seen in the catalogue are of a similar style to those seen in Figure 23. This reinforces the historical records, which indicate that the Equality Colonists dressed in a way that reflected the current trends of the larger society.
The photograph in Figure 25 shows two Equality Colony men logging in the woods. Similarly to the uniformity seen in the women’s dresses, they are dressed in a similar manner although some individual stylistic difference can be seen, e.g. the buttons on the front of the shirt. Both men pictured have well groomed facial hair. In comparison with contemporary photographs of men working in the woods, it is revealed that both the men’s style of dress and grooming were typical in the broader society. Both Figure 23 and Figure 25 illustrate that the Equality Colonists did not attempt to separate themselves from the surrounding society by their clothing and/or grooming.

Figure 25: Men logging (Courtesy of the Skagit County Historical Museum, D-13-27 G022). Photographer unknown.
The photographer in Figure 26 shows the Equality Colony school children and their teachers. The adults in the photograph are dressed in a different style than the adults in either Figure 23 or Figure 25. The children’s clothing reveals quite a few individual variations. Some of the children are barefoot. Of the 14 children whose feet are clearly visible in the photograph, eight have shoes and six do not. The girls are wearing dresses, patterns and fabrics vary. Their hair is primarily tied back although a few wear theirs down. The boys are dressed in various types of pants and shirts. Some wear jackets and a few hold hats. Their hair is cut short. This photograph illustrates that there was no uniform or costume adopted by the Equality Colonists. Style of dress was chosen individually although it was surely constrained by access.

The building in the background is likely the school house, completed in the summer of 1898. The University of Washington records indicate that this photograph was taken circa 1898 and the lack of shoes on some of the children could indicate that this was summer time.
Medical

There are no photographs in these collections relating to the medical practices at the Equality Colony.

Leisure

The photographs in Figure 27 and Figure 28 show Equality Colony members on outings away from the Colony. Historical records indicate that this was common for both adults and children. Again it is interesting to note the individual differences in dress among members.

Figure 27: Equality Colony members at Chuckanut, ca. 1900 (Courtesy of the University of Washington Libraries, Special Collections Division, UW11256). Photographer unknown.
There are no photographs in these collections relating to the religious practices of the Equality Colony.

Post-Equality Colony

The only photographs from the Fredrick Smith Papers collection housed at the Center for Pacific Northwest Studies at Western Washington University in Bellingham, WA included in this analysis are shown in Figure 29, Figure 30, Figure 31, and Figure 32. They are a series of photographs taken in 1941 of historic Equality Colony buildings and places. It is unclear where Smith obtained the photographs and who the people in the photographs are. Judging by the vegetation and the style of dress of the people
visible in the photographs, they were likely taken in late spring or summer. The photographs all have captions on their backside. These photographs have tremendous potential for helping to relocate the Equality Colony building locations.

Figure 29 and Figure 30 are photographs of the Equality Colony log cabins. Two cabins can be seen close up in Figure 29. Figure 30 is a view southwest and four cabins can be seen at a distance. The nature and character of the cabins suggests that they are the cabins that were built in the Equality Colony Village in winter of 1897/1898 and spring of 1898 (Figure 6 and Figure 8). The photograph in Figure 29 is likely a view southeast and its caption describes the cabin to the right as in ‘remarkably good shape.’ It does appear to be intact at this time but not well kept up. The vegetation around the cabins is overgrown and neither have windows or doors.

![Image of log cabin](image)

Figure 29: The caption on the back of this photograph states, ‘log cabin at the Colony. At this time the cabin was 40 years old and in remarkably good shape.’ (Courtesy of the Fredrick Smith Papers 1865-1988, Center for Pacific Northwest Studies, Western Washington University, Bellingham, Washington). Photographer unknown.
The photograph in Figure 30 shows the four log cabins built in the Village. The second cabin from the right is obscured by vegetation. It is unknown when these cabins were torn down. However, these photographs prove that they were still standing until at least 1941. This is interesting from an archaeological research point of view because the less time that has elapsed since the structure’s destruction, the higher the likelihood of physical remnants. Figure 30 must be taken from either where the Apartment House No. 2 was located or just east of there. It is known that Apartment House No. 2 was converted to a barn post-Equality Colony but this photograph suggests that Apartment House No. 2 was already gone at this point.

Figure 30: The caption on the back of this photograph states, ‘Remains of log cabins at the Colony.’ (Courtesy of the Fredrick Smith Papers 1865-1988, Center for Pacific Northwest Studies, Western Washington University, Bellingham, Washington). Photographer unknown.
The photograph in Figure 31 is a view southwest from the area where the school house once stood. In the photograph there is what appears to be a fairly level area in the foreground. The people are standing on the beginnings of the slope. Historical records do indicate that the school house had a basement. With many of the other buildings the basement was built to accommodate the hillside slope.

This photograph is identifiable as the modern location of the former rock quarry at the end of Tulip Lane. This area was heavily mined for rock in the recent past and has been converted to residential lots. See the Map Analysis in Chapter Seven.

Figure 31: The caption on the back of this photograph reads, ‘Where the school house stood.’ (Courtesy of the Fredrick Smith Papers 1865-1988, Center for Pacific Northwest Studies, Western Washington University, Bellingham, Washington). Photographer unknown.
The photograph in Figure 32 is likely a view northeast and is reportedly of the Equality Colony bakery. This building appears to be very similar in style and character to the building on the far right in Figure 10, although the door and window are reversed; making it less likely that it is the same building. The building in Figure 32 does still have at least one window but it does not appear to have a door. The vegetation around it has grown up similar to vegetation around the cabins.

Figure 32: The caption on the back of this photograph states, ‘The Bakery of the old Colony.’ (Courtesy of the Fredrick Smith Papers 1865-1988, Center for Pacific Northwest Studies, Western Washington University, Bellingham, Washington). Photographer unknown.
Summary

The historical records and photographs largely support each other, reinforcing many key ideas about the Equality Colony. These sources of information paint a picture of a community eking out an idealized living in a rural area. The written descriptions of style differences between the cabins and the apartment buildings are visible in the photographs. The photographs of people illustrate the written depictions of Equality Colony members as conforming to regional clothing and grooming styles. They also clearly show people acting on personal preferences for style and grooming which is in line with the text descriptions.

There are fewer photographs than written records available and the texts cover a wider range of subject matter. Things not well recorded in text, for example the New City, are also not well photographed. In the case of the New City this could be because the Equality Colony had lost much of its momentum and broader public appeal by the time the New City was well established.

The historical texts and the photographs tell a similar story of the Equality Colonist’s negotiation of their socialist ideals and the physical realities of their landscape. The historical records indicate that the Equality Colonists wanted to build a utopia of wide streets, aesthetically pleasing buildings, sunlit yards, and plentiful public areas that would reflect their commitment to equity and cooperation. They reportedly believed that this would be easily and quickly done through socialist practices. The reality of the Equality Colony can be seen in descriptions included in Industrial Freedom articles citing ‘pioneer’ conditions and non-member criticisms of living conditions at the Colony, as well as in the photographs by Hegg and others showing stump dotted, muddy landscapes. Crowding and funding were an issue for the Equality Colony early on, leading to the utilization of the existing log camp buildings and the building of apartment houses instead of the planned, grand, individual family homes. Even after construction of the New City was begun, the Colonists continued to compromise on their vision, as demonstrated by the described simplicity of the New City houses.
The Colonists actively practiced the principals of cooperation and equality, striving to create a landscape and built environment that reflected their ideals but they were restricted by the existing landscape and their available resources. Practice theory emphasizes that society is constructed by human action and that action is restricted by habitus. The historical texts and photographs deal more directly with the physical limitations on the Colonists’ practice and not the behavioral ones but perhaps those can be inferred. The Equality Colonists imagined a utopia based on visions and definitions that preceded their occupation on the Colony land and that did not necessarily take the actual Colony land into account. Yet this blueprint of utopia heavily influenced the way they lived at the Equality Colony.

Contradictions exist between the historical records and notes from Smith about the historical photographs. Understanding the layout of the Equality Colony Village and the New City is important to discussions about the Colony’s social environment and work habits. The photographs from Smith’s collection at the Center for Pacific Northwest Studies indicate that at least some of the Equality Colony buildings were still standing in the early 1940s. Although the buildings themselves are gone now, it is likely that some of the Equality Colony building foundations could still exist hidden by vegetation or soil. Archaeological survey could be extremely useful in clarify questions about the discrepancies between Equality Colony photographs and historical records.
CHAPTER SEVEN MAP ANALYSIS AND PEDESTRIAN SURVEY RESULTS

The first step in any archaeological project is to locate the subject of the study on the ground. In historical archaeology this step often includes referencing and cross-referencing historical maps. After the subject has been located geographically then potential survey areas can be assessed and field work carried out.

Map Analysis

For this section I have reviewed available historic maps and aerial images of the former Equality Colony land, as well as modern topographic maps, lidar and aerial images. As is explained in Chapter Six, the 440 continuous acres that made up the Equality Colony’s main holdings are the focus of this study. Using an 1899 plat map drawn by an Equality Colony member, I was able to approximate the location of the major buildings and infrastructure of the Colony on the ground. Comparing maps that were drawn at different scales, which used different methods, and were created for different purposes, can be a challenging endeavor. I have made every effort to control for error.

There are four goals for this section. First, I define the boundaries of the Equality Colony’s main holdings and place it on modern assessor and topographic maps. This places the Equality Colony in a geographic location. Second, I use maps that predate the Equality Colony to look at development in the area before the Colonists arrived. This provides useful information for archaeological survey on the ground. Third, I align the 1899 plat map of the Equality Colony townsite, drawn by an Equality Colony member, with modern topographic and assessor maps as well as an aerial photograph to help relocate the Equality Colony infrastructure on the modern landscape. Fourth, I trace the changes to the Equality Colony land through time by reviewing maps, aerial photographs and a lidar image that postdate the Equality Colony.
The Equality Colony Property Boundaries

The main holdings of the historic Equality Colony were located in the northwestern corner of Skagit County, Washington; approximately two and a half miles east of Samish Bay and six and a half miles south of Lake Samish (Table 6) (Figure 33 and Figure 34). The area where the Equality Colony was once located is today bisected by Colony Road (Figure 35 and Figure 36). The map in Figure 34 shows the Great Northern Railroad line, constructed in 1901, through the southwestern portion of the historic Equality Colony. In the early 1900s, the Equality Colony had a post office and in the map in Figure 34 its location is labeled. This map helps to establish the general location of the Equality Colony.

In 1992 M.V. Markham, a graduate student at Western Washington University, used the Skagit County Auditor’s Office records to place the Equality Colony site on a modern parcel map (Markham 1992) (Figure 35). The lands mapped by Markham would have been part of the Equality Colony’s main holdings. Markham’s research further refines our knowledge of the location of the Equality Colony.

Table 6: Location information for the historic Equality Colony.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quad map</th>
<th>Bow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Township/Range/Section</td>
<td>36N/ 03E/ 26,27,34 and 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude/ Longitude (North end)</td>
<td>48° 35’ 4” N/ 122° 24’ 20” W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude/ Longitude (South end)</td>
<td>48° 34’ 2” N/ 122° 24’ 20” W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTM (North end)</td>
<td>Zone 10 543904E 5381405N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTM (South end)</td>
<td>Zone 10 543849E 5379524N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevation</td>
<td>~10 feet (3 meters) to 180 feet (55 meters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landforms</td>
<td>Drained Samish Bay estuary land/farm land and the foothills of the Chuckanut Mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage, major and minor</td>
<td>Colony Creek and Harrison Creek, Samish Bay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 33: Map of Skagit County, outlined in a pink dashed line, with an arrow indicating the approximate location of the historic Equality Colony (Skagitcounty.org). Arrow added by author.
Figure 34: A portion of a 1901 Millroy and Egan’s Sectional Map of Washington with the Equality Colony labeled simply as Equality (courtesy of the Center for Pacific Northwest Studies, Western Washington University, Bellingham, Washington). This map was drawn while the Equality Colony existed and helps to verify the general location of the Colony. Also note that the Great Northern Railroad Line is completed through the Equality Colony property at this time although not yet connected to the rest of the line. The red oval around Equality was added by the author.
Figure 35: April 28, 2014 Skagit County Assessor's map showing the former Equality Colony main holdings outlined in red (http://www.skagitcounty.net/Departments/assessor/Main.htm). Records from the County Assessor’s office were used to establish which properties were owned by the Equality Colony.
Figure 36: The former Equality Colony outlined in red on the 1968 7.5 minute Bow topographic map. I was able to transfer the Equality Colony property lines from the Skagit County Assessor’s map to this map by following section and quarter section lines as well as cultural features such as the railroad line and roads, and natural features such as Colony Creek.
The Equality Colony Area Developments Previous to the Equality Colony

Knowing how the land was used prior to the formation of the Equality Colony can help to identify areas appropriate for archaeological testing. It may also help the archaeological surveyor(s) to identify potentially confounding elements on the landscape.

The historic Equality Colony land was logged before it was purchased by the BCC. The T-sheet data from 1887 shows a logging camp located near where the wash house and tin shop are mapped in the 1899 Equality Colony plan map (Figure 37). As discussed in the historical research section, the Colonists did utilize buildings from an abandoned logging camp. The T-sheet shows the logging camp on the flats and not on the hillside where the Village was later constructed. As was mentioned in the photograph analysis section, the photograph in Figure 4 shows a portion of the abandoned logging camp that predates the Equality Colony. The permanent saw mill was later constructed in the vicinity of the abandoned logging camp.

The Alger Logging Railroad was also established previous to the Equality Colony (Figure 38). Aside from the logging camp, the remainder of the Equality Colony area was mixed forest or mixed forest fenced (Figure 37). An 1894 map of Skagit County shows a wagon road though the eastern and southern portions of the Equality Colony land (Figure 38). This road may have been utilized by the Colonists later when they were building a road to Bow; which is located southeast of the Equality Colony.
Figure 37: 1887 T-sheet data overlaid on a modern topographic map with a dark red rectangle indicating the approximate location of the Equality Colony’s major infrastructure (courtesy of the Padilla Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve). The location of the Equality Colony infrastructure was approximated using cultural landmarks such as roads and natural landmarks such as Colony Creek.
Figure 38: A portion of an 1894 Skagit County, Washington map, compiled from official data by J.D. Parsons, C.E., showing the approximate location of the former Equality Colony lands outlined in red (courtesy of the Center for Pacific Northwest Studies). The location of the Equality Colony property was approximated using section lines and quarter section lines, as well as the location of the Alger Logging Railroad. This map illustrates the development of the Equality Colony land prior to its establishment. The Alger Logging Railroad line can be seen just north of the Equality Colony property. The green line labeled ‘proposed route No. 3 to Skagit County’ was drawn in at a later date and may be an approximation of the Great Northern railroad line.
**Plat Map of the Equality Colony Townsite, May, 1899**

In May of 1899 one of the Equality Colonists, A.K. Hanson, drew a sketch map of some of the Equality Colony’s existing buildings and infrastructure (Figure 39, Figure 40 and Table 7). It was printed in an issue of the Industrial Freedom (1899m) with this notation: “Scale about 107 ft. to inch. Lettered with view to order of erection. Included all buildings except the poultry house east of the barn and three cottages each 22 feet square lying southeast of the school house – further up the hill” (*Industrial Freedom* 1899m:3). Further notations are made about each building under the map. The methods for creating this map are unknown.

Two important natural landmarks are included in the plat - the edge of the hillside and Colony Creek. Using these landmarks I was able to approximate the location of the Equality Colony infrastructure on the modern 7.5 minute USGS Bow topographic map. After overlaying it on the topographic map I used that same placement and overlaid it on an aerial photograph and a Skagit County Parcel map (Figure 41 - Figure 44). I did not alter the north-south alignment of the 1899 plan map nor attempt to adjust any of its ratios. I simply best fit it on the topographic map as is. There is room for interpretation and I have no way of knowing how accurately the map I created represents the built environment of the Equality Colony. Archaeological field work may be able to help confirm or refine aspects of the map I have created.
Figure 39: The plan plat map as it appeared in the June 17, 1899 issue of Industrial Freedom (1899m). (scanned by the Library of Congress and available in their online database of historical American newspapers entitled Chronicling America that can be accessed at http://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/.)
Table 7: The annotations for the buildings included on the May 1899 plan sketch map in Figure 39.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number label</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A, K</td>
<td>Dining room, seating about 130.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Kitchen, 18x24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, D, E, and H</td>
<td>Log cabins, each 14x20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Apartment house No. 1, two stories and attic, 24x60, all family rooms, attic for bachelors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Apartment house No. 2, two stories, attic and basement, 54x100, all family rooms, attic for bachelors, Barber shop, storage room, secretary’s office and shoe shop in basement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Tin shop, originally a smoke house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>Wash house or ‘laundry.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Log cabins, each 14x20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Bakery, 20x40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>School house and meeting place, 30x68. Dance hall in the basement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Dining room, seating about 130.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Ironing room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Barn, 42x100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Cereal coffee factory, 18x38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Vegetable room - accessory to kitchen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Saw mill building, 40x120, includes planner and a shingle mill. Logs pulled to upper floor from north end of building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Blacksmith shop, 28x42, two forges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Printing office, two stories and an attic, 22x80. Building includes store, sewing room, post office, and attic for bachelors, and a room to be fitted for library and a reception room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S, T, U</td>
<td>Tents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Hot house, 20x60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Easement bridge from hill to knoll between hot house and saw mill of 4 in. plank, 18x24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Old skid road. Cedar logs of which it was made now being torn up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Alger logging R.R. Hauls logs from camps near by to Sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Creek. Divides near bridge, one branch running under wash house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZX</td>
<td>Edge of Colony land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Edge of hill on which town site lays. The slope of hill (eastward from dining room) is at an angle of 10.45°.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>Flat extending westward to the Sound which is about 1.5 miles off. This flat is of exceptional fertility, being mostly alluvial soil. Cedar logs have been found 10 or 12 feet below the surface, showing that in ages gone by the ocean or sound once extended this far inland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 40: The 1899 plan sketch map redrawn in color with labels and aligned so that north is at the top of the map. This map was drawn by the author using the map in Figure 39.
Figure 41: Skagit County Assessor's map showing the former Equality Colony lands outlined in red with the placement of the plan sketch map shown outlined in black dashes (http://www.skagitcounty.net/Departments/assessor/Main.htm, outlines added by author). The location of the 1899 plat map was approximated using the location of Colony Creek and the base of the hillside as indicated by topographic lines. Both of these natural features were drawn on the original 1899 plat. This map illustrated the location of the Equality Colony’s high activity area, the zone where the bulk of their dining, washing, building, and other activities took place day to day.
Figure 42: The plan sketch map (Figure 40) overlaid by the author on the 1968 7.5 minute Bow topographic map using the location of Colony Creek and the base of the hillside as indicated by topographic lines. Both of these natural features were drawn on the original 1899 plat. This map shows the Equality Colony buildings and infrastructure and modern developments such as Colony Road.
Figure 43: The plan sketch map (Figure 40) overlaid by the author on a Skagit County Assessor’s map (http://www.skagitcounty.net/Departments/assessor/Main.htm). The 1899 plat map was overlaid onto this map using the same placement as the topographic map in Figure 42. This map allows us to associate Equality Colony infrastructure with modern properties.
Figure 44: The plan sketch map (Figure 40) overlaid by the author on a Skagit County Assessor aerial photo (http://www.skagitcounty.net/Departments/assessor/Main.htm). The 1899 plat map was overlaid onto this map using the same placement as the topographic map in Figure 42. This map allows comparison of the locations of Equality Colony infrastructure with modern developments. It shows that some of the former buildings are less likely to be represented by archaeological remains due to modern developments, i.e. the school and dance hall area has since been extensively excavated out as a gravel pit.
Knowing the types of activities carried out on the land after the Equality Colony no longer existed can help to further identify areas appropriate for archaeological testing. It can be especially useful to note which areas may have had limited use after the Equality Colony dissolved. Those areas are more likely to have undisturbed remains of the Equality Colony activities.

As previously discussed in this document, when the Equality Colony was terminated in 1907 the lands were parceled and sold. The majority of the lands went to one man, John Peth. Some individual Equality Colonists were able to retain parcels of land with individual cabins on them. In 1925 John Peth still retained the bulk of this land (Figure 45). In a 1925 Kroll’s Atlas of Skagit County, the only portion not owned by Peth is marked ‘Ferris Rec’v’ (Figure 45). This is presumably the land that was retained by some of the Equality Colonists. In this map a road is seen following the same route through the former Equality Colony as the western portion of Colony Road today. The eastern portion of Colony Road is not there and the road ends in the Ferris Rec’v properties.

By 1941 the lands owned by Peth had been inherited by his daughter, Lucille Peterson (Figure 46). The area retained by the individual Equality Colonists was divided four ways. The 1937 Skagit County aerial photograph shows limited development in the historic Equality Colony area (Figure 47). Colony Road is visible on the 1937 aerial photo (Figure 47) and appears on the 1941 Metsker’s map as a dirt road (Figure 46). In both, Colony Road appears to have a very similar alignment and placement as today. Colony Road bisects the area where the Equality Colony village was located. The quality of the 1937 aerial photograph makes it difficult to be certain, but it appears that there are some buildings in the approximate area of the Equality Colony village (Figure 47). In this photograph, the western and southern portions of the former Equality Colony area appear to be agricultural while the northern and eastern areas seem to be forested. This follows a similar pattern to the way the land was used when the Equality Colony occupied it.
The 1952 Deming District map prepared by the Washington State Division of Forestry showing the Equality Colony area shows roads located along the same routes as Colony Road and Colony Mountain Road today (Figure 48). According to the map’s legend, Colony Road at this time was surfaced with bituminous material. Bituminous surface treatment is a flexible pavement used on low-traffic roads. Colony Mountain Road is labeled as a primitive road. The maps also show an unoccupied sawmill west of Colony Road and south of Colony Creek. The Equality Colony sawmill burned down in 1904 and was not rebuilt so this sawmill must have been constructed by Peth or another later resident. According to the 1952 map, there are two unused farm units north of the sawmill, three south of the sawmill and west of Colony Road and one south of the sawmill and east of Colony Road. The map also shows two in use farm units south of the sawmill and east of Colony Road. The map legend does not clarify what is meant by a farm unit but this does imply that the former Equality Colony land was used agriculturally for some time and that the agricultural use had either been scaled back or discontinued. No dwellings are marked on the 1952 map.

A 1969 Skagit County aerial photograph reveals further development of the former Equality Colony area (Figure 49). Colony Mountain Drive, Tulip Lane, and Kallstrom Road can be seen and appear to be laid out as they are today. The construction of these roads suggests that Lucille Peterson had begun selling off portions of her land by this time. Again the quality of the image makes it difficult to be sure, but there do not appear to be many buildings in the area. This photo may have been taken towards the beginning of development for the rural residential neighborhoods that exist today.

In a 1998 Skagit County aerial all the major roads that exist in the historic Equality Colony area are visible and appear to follow the same routes they do today (Figure 50). The land west of Colony Road is agricultural fields. The area to the east of Colony Road is primarily a mixture of residential clearings and forested land. Houses and driveways appear along Colony Road, Lookout Lane, Tulip Lane, Kallstrom Road and Colony Mountain Drive at a density very similar to what exists today. The construction of these roads, particularly Colony Road and Tulip Lane, and the subsequent development of houses along them would have had effects on the archaeological record of the Equality Colony. There is a
gravel pit at the end of Tulip Lane. The Equality Colony school house and bakery were located in the area of this gravel pit. It is likely that any material culture remains that were once located there are gone now.

There is very little visible change in land use in the reviewed subsequent aerial photos after 1998. Notably, the gravel pit gets smaller until it is finally converted into residential lots which it still is today (Figure 51). No houses have been built on the lots.

Figure 45: A portion of a 1925 Kroll Map Company map showing the Equality Colony area (courtesy of the Center for Pacific Northwest Studies, Western Washington University, Bellingham, Washington). The Equality Colony property lines were drawn on this map by the author using assessor property lines and section lines. This map shows how ownership of the Equality Colony land was divided post-dissolution. The majority of the land was owned by John Peth, but a corner was retained by former Equality Colony members, labeled Ferrice Rec’v. From the map it appears as though Colony Road may have been started as a way for the Equality Colonists to access their properties post-dissolution.
Figure 46: A portion of a 1941 Metsker’s map showing the former Equality Colony land outlined in red (Mesker 1941). The Equality Colony property lines were drawn on this map by the author using assessor property line and section lines. John Peth’s properties were inherited by his daughter, Lucille Peterson. This map offers more detail into how the land retained by the Equality Colonists was divided.
Figure 47: 1937 Skagit County Assessor aerial photograph showing the historic Equality Colony area (Courtesy of the Center for Pacific Northwest Studies, Western Washington University, Bellingham, Washington). The Equality Colony property lines were drawn on this photograph by the author using natural features such as Colony Creek, cultural features such as the railroad line and Colony Road, and visible property lines. This photograph shows Colony Road as it is being developed.
Figure 48: A portion of a 1952 Deming District map prepared by the Washington State Division of Forestry showing the Equality Colony area (courtesy of the Center for Pacific Northwest Studies, Western Washington University, Bellingham, Washington). The Equality Colony property lines were approximated on this map by the author using section lines and cultural features such as the railroad line. This map shows the development of Colony Road and Colony Mountain Road. Further it demonstrates that this area continued to be used for agriculture and logging after the Equality Colony dissolved.
Figure 49: 1969 Skagit County Assessor aerial photograph showing the historic Equality Colony area (courtesy of the Center for Pacific Northwest Studies, Western Washington University, Bellingham, Washington). The Equality Colony property lines were drawn on this photograph by the author using natural features such as Colony Creek, cultural features such as the railroad line and Colony Road, and visible property lines. This photograph shows the development of Colony Road, Colony Mountain Lane, Tulip Land and Kallstrom Road. The building of these roads likely means that Lucille Peterson had begun parceling off the Equality Colony land and that this area was becoming more residually developed.
Figure 50: 1998 Skagit County Assessor aerial photograph showing the historic Equality Colony area (Courtesy of the Center for Pacific Northwest Studies, Western Washington University, Bellingham, Washington). The Equality Colony property lines were drawn on this photograph by the author using natural features such as Colony Creek, cultural features such as the railroad line and Colony Road, and visible property lines. This photograph shows the development of the rural residential neighborhoods that still exist today at a similar density. Note the gravel pit at the end of Tulip Lane and the extent of ground disturbance.
Figure 51: 2011 Skagit County Assessor aerial photograph showing the historic Equality Colony area (http://www.skagitcounty.net/Departments/assessor/Main.htm). The Equality Colony property lines were drawn on this photograph by the author using natural features such as Colony Creek, cultural features such as the railroad line and Colony Road, and visible property lines. Note that the gravel pit has been converted to residential lots.
Lidar Images

Figure 52 shows the 1899 Equality Colony plan sketch map overlaid on a lidar image of the former Equality Colony area. There is a large flat area in what would have been the center of the Equality Colony village, east of Fort Bellamy, south of the barn, west of Apartment house No. 1, and north of the cabins. This flat area looks too large to be a natural landform and likely indicates human activity. Although none of the historical records specifically reference it, it is possible that the Equality Colonists worked to flatten this land to create a town square feeling to their village. There are several rectangular shapes on the lidar image that could represent building foundations, for example to the south of Apartment House No. 2.
Figure 52: The plan sketch map in Figure 39 overlaid on a lidar image of the historic Equality Colony area (courtesy of the Padilla Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve).
Pedestrian Survey

On March 8, 2014 the author, Dr. Sarah K. Campbell, and Rachael Kannegaard, WWU graduate student, surveyed two properties within the historic Equality Colony land. These properties were chosen for survey simply because the landowners’ volunteered through the community archaeology process (see Chapter Nine summary). Both Warren and Diane Bingham and Peggy Stowe agreed to host a pedestrian survey on their perspective properties (Table 8 and Table 9). Advantageously, both properties were within the Equality Colony high activity area (Figure 43). The goal of these surveys was to identify any historic surface features or artifacts and to assess the likelihood of historic subsurface features or artifacts.

Table 8: Location information for Warren and Diane Bingham’s property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>15985 Colony Road Bow, WA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel</td>
<td>P48295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township/Range/Section</td>
<td>36N/ 03E/ 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude/ Longitude (center of property)</td>
<td>48° 34’ 35” N 122° 23’ 57” W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTM (center of property)</td>
<td>Zone 10 544314E 5380541N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevation</td>
<td>~ 55 feet (17 meters) to 90 feet (28 meters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>Residential landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House built year</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Location information for Peggy Stowe’s property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>16063 Colony Road Bow, WA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel</td>
<td>P48286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township/Range/Section</td>
<td>36N/ 03E/ 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude/ Longitude (center of property)</td>
<td>48° 34’ 31” N 122° 23’ 57” W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTM (center of property)</td>
<td>Zone 10 544322E 5380412N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevation</td>
<td>~ 100 feet (31 meters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>Residential landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House built year</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bingham Property

We arrived at the Bingham property, 15985 Colony Road, at one p.m. The sky was overcast with occasional showers. Mr. and Mrs. Bingham were home and Mr. Bingham first gave us a tour around the property (Figure 53, Figure 54, Figure 55, and Figure 56). The Bingham built the house on their property and are its first occupants. Mr. Bingham did not recall having seen any significant evidence of the Equality Colony during the house’s construction. He pointed out the former location of a garden that he had maintained for several years. Each year that he tilled the garden he found artifacts including glass Ball canning jars, horse shoes, a handcuff other metal objects, a wooden object, glass fragments and ceramic sherds. Some of these artifacts he kept and I was allowed to photograph these. (Table 10) (Figure 57, Figure 58, Figure 59, and Figure 60).

Included in the artifacts collected by Mr. Bingham are nine metal horse shoes of various sizes, some with nails still in them and some with staples. It is likely that the variations indicate that they were used for different sized animals and that these animals probably did different kinds of work. The Equality Colony owned both horses and mules. The historical records do not provide much information on the specific types. They were used to pull carriages and to carry people and supplies. A horse-powered machine was used to make bricks on the property for a while. Similarly the barn was equipped with a horse-powered hay lift. The historical records indicate that the blacksmith made and repaired horseshoes. The blacksmith shop was located away from the Bingham property on the flats. Horse shoe technology has changed little for hundreds of years and positively dating these horseshoes to the Equality Colony period may be difficult without further excavation of the area they were found.

Two other non-identified metal objects were among those collected by Mr. Bingham. Both these objects appear to be part of a connection mechanism though not necessarily the same one. Object 1, seen on the left side of Figure 60 is an approximately 7 inch long, 1 inch wide rectangle with two round holes in it approximately 3 inches apart and 2 inches from either edge. In construction this sort of object is often referred to as a gusset. Object 2, seen on the right side of Figure 60, is approximately 12 inches long. It
has a cylindrical piece in the middle approximately 1.5 inches long and .5 inch wide. The right arm is approximately 5 inches long and curved into a gentle ‘s’ shape. At the end of the right arm there is a round hole. Intuitively it seems as if this object would be attached to something else by a screw or a nail. The left arm is approximately 6 inches long and more of a diagonal, though there is a hint of an ‘s’ shape that might indicate that at one point it may have been more like the right arm. The left arm ends in a piece that looks as though it was designed to fit into something else.

An unidentified wooden object was also among the artifacts in Mr. Bingham’s collection. It was casually suggested in the field that this object might be part of a construction technique, though a specific technique was not identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of artifact</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metal horseshoe</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>• Variety of sizes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Some nails, some staples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified metal object</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>• Potentially these are part of a connection mechanism – not necessarily the same one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified wooden object</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>• Continuous piece of wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Approximately 14 inches long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Shaped to be bulbous (wedge shaped) on one end then tapered through the midsection to flair at the other end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Several small round head nails are lodged in the bulbous end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal handcuff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>• Single cuff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Approximately 3.5 inches long and 4 inches wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The opening when the handcuff is closed is approximately 2 inches wide - standard for handcuffs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the pedestrian survey, Campbell, Kannegaard, and Rowland lined up approximately one meter apart and then moved forward in a zig zag pattern so that every part of the yard was viewed by more than one set of eyes. The entire property was examined in this manner, including the exposed areas under the house’s deck.

The vegetation on the Bingham property is primarily grassy lawn. There are sections that are landscaped with bushes and shrubs and there is an orchard just west of the house. The ground is bare.
under the deck. The property is sloped and the drainage is such that the lawn becomes increasingly saturated as it approaches Colony Road. This more saturated area in the western portion of the property had some patches bare of grass and vegetation. This area is not used by the property owners very often and is only mowed a few times a year. The northern and southern boundaries of the property are fenced. Visibility of the ground’s surface on the property was best under trees, along the fence lines, in the western water-saturated portion and in the mole hills that frequently appeared in the higher, drier eastern portions of the property.

In total, four non-diagnostic ceramic sherds, three porcelain and two earthenware, and five non-diagnostic glass fragments were observed, photographed and mapped during the pedestrian survey (Figure 61) (Table 11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of artifact</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain ceramic sherd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>• 1 fluted/scalloped, thin walled, likely from a serving sized vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 1 likely from a plate or saucer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 1 with no distinguishable characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthenware ceramic sherd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>• 1 with a brown annular band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glass fragment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>• All were colorless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 1 with pale green caste and slight curve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 1 flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 1 was too small to identify if it curved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 1 thicker than the others, seems to have been heat modified (melted)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One ceramic sherd and one glass fragment were seen in the western portion of the property, in the area that is infrequently used by the present property owners (Figure 62). Two ceramic sherds and two glass fragments were identified along the fence on the southern boundary of the property (Figure 63). Two ceramic sherds were in the orchard west of the house (Figure 64). Two pieces of glass and one ceramic sherd were observed in the flower bed west of the house (Figure 65). No historic surface features were identified.
Although all of the items observed during the pedestrian survey of the Bingham property were non-diagnostic and cannot be associated or disassociated with the Equality Colony, their presence is still interesting. In particular the fragments found on the southern boundary along the fence line would seem indicative of buried deposits brought up when the fence was installed. The items found in the flower bed and orchard areas west of the house could potentially be from the current landowners. In the water-saturated area near Colony Road and on the southern boundary of the property along the fence line this is much less likely. These areas are infrequently used by the property owners.

Figure 53: View west/southwest, from the northeast corner of the Bingham property looking toward the water saturated area and Colony Road.
Figure 54: View south, from the northeast corner of the Bingham property looking toward the house and the former garden location. The property line is visible in the vegetation change.
Figure 55: View southwest, from the northwest corner of the Bingham property looking over the water saturated area.

Figure 56: View southwest, looking toward the orchard area.
Figure 57: Metal handcuff recovered from the Bingham garden.
Figure 58: Horse and possible mule shoes recovered from the Bingham garden.
Figure 59: The wooden object recovered from the Bingham garden.
Figure 60: Metal objects recovered from the Bingham garden.
Figure 61: Sketch map of the Bingham property.
Figure 62: Glass fragment and ceramic sherd from the western portion of the property.
Figure 63: Ceramic sherds from the fence on the southern end of the property.
Figure 64: Ceramic sherds from the orchard area west of the house.
Figure 65: Glass fragments and ceramic sherd from the flower bed on the west side of the house.
Stowe Property

We arrived at the Stowe property, 16063 Colony Road, at three p.m. The sky was overcast with occasional showers. Peggy Stowe, the property owner, and Melissa Stowe, her daughter, were home. Melissa Stowe does not live with her mother and had made a special trip to be present for the survey. They gave us a tour around the property (Figure 66, Figure 67, and Figure 68). The Stowe house was built by Emma Hertz Peterson, who was born on in the Equality Colony toward the end of its span. Emma Hertz Peterson sold the property in 1979. The Stowes purchased the house from the people who purchased from Peterson in 1984. When they purchased the property there was a cabin that they believed to have been built by the Equality Colonists in the northeast corner of the property. In 1991 they added an addition to the house and tore down the Colony cabin. In 2012 they redid the deck. They did not see any significant Equality Colony deposits during any of these activities.

The pedestrian survey was done in the same manner at the Stowe property as at the Bingham property. Campbell, Kannegaard, and Rowland lined up approximately one meter apart and then moved forward in a zig zag pattern so that every part of the yard was viewed by more than one set of eyes. The entire property was examined in this manner.

The vegetation on the Stowe property is primarily grassy lawn. The grass at the Stowe property was thicker with far less ground exposure than at the Bingham property. There are several trees and bushes along the perimeter of the property and along the driveway, including several large trees in the southwestern corner of the property. There is some landscaping and a planter in front of the house. The house has a deck and the ground is bare under it. The deck is low to the ground and access under the deck is not good. The property is sloped though not as severely as the Bingham property. The northern portion of the southern boundary of the property is fenced. Visibility of the ground’s surface on the property was best under trees and along the fence line. Visibility at the Stowe property was poorer than at the Bingham property.

In total two non-diagnostic ceramic sherds and one non-diagnostic glass fragment were observed,
photographed and mapped during the pedestrian survey (Figure 69). The piece of glass was located under a tree. The ceramic sherds were located in front of the deck. Peggy and Melissa Stowe were shown the ceramic sherds and neither felt that they looked familiar. No historic surface features were identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of artifact</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic sherd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>• Both burned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 1 thicker than the other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>• Colorless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• thicker than those observed at the Bingham property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although few items were observed during the pedestrian survey and all of the items observed were non-diagnostic and cannot be associated or disassociated with the Equality Colony, this property is still made extremely interesting by the presence of the Equality Colony cabin on the property until 1991. Limited information is available on the Equality Cabin. The Stowes only have one picture that shows the Equality Colony cabin (Figure 71). The photograph is a family photo and the Equality Colony cabin is only visible in the background. The general shape and character of the cabin can be seen. The Stowe cabin does not resemble the Village cabins (Figure 6 and Figure 8) nor the cabins revisited in 1941 (Figure 29 and Figure 30). It does not appear to be a log cabin. It is likely that this cabin, if it is an Equality Colony cabin, was built as part of the Equality Colony New City. No historic photos have been recovered showing the New City cabins close up and very little historical documentation could be found.

This photograph (Figure 71) is also interesting because it shows some landscaping changes in the area. In the photograph there are several large, conifer trees around the cabin. Those are not there today and must have been removed in the last 25 years or so. Melissa Stowe briefly had a garden in the area where the Colony cabin was located after it was torn down. She recalls digging up some nails but does not remember any other items.

The Herz family joined the Colony permanently in the fall of 1898 (Industrial Freedom 1898q). Mr. and Mrs. Herz met and were married at the Colony in 1901 (Heacock 1977; Smith 1988). Mr. Herz worked as a logger before joining the Equality Colony. Their son, Charles Herz, was born in Apartment
House No. 2. In an interview with Heacock of the Skagit Historical Museum Charles described their family home as a log cabin and said it was the 'one in the middle' (Heacock 1977) (Figure 72). According to Charles there were three cabins at this time. The Herz family stayed on after the Colony dissolved along with the Barrys, Halladays, and the Giles family (Smith 1988). Each family was able to purchase a cabin and the land surrounding it. It is not clear if they purchased one of the log cabins in the Village area or one of the newer cabins in the New City. Smith (1988) claims that the central Village, where the Apartment Houses and Fort Bellamy were located, were sold to Peth and not offered to the Colony people for purchase. This would seem to indicate that the Herz family and the others purchased cabins in the New Village. That does fit with the fact that the Stowe cabin (Figure 71) bears little resemblance to the log cabins in the Village (Figure 6). However, the current placement of the 1899 plat map on the modern topographic map shows the Equality Colony log cabins in the Village on the Stowe Property.
Figure 66: View east, from the northwest corner of the Stowe property toward the area where the Equality Colony stood until 1991.
Figure 67: View east, the northeast corner of the Stowe property where the Equality Colony cabin was located.
Figure 68: View south/southeast, over the Stowe property, Colony Road to the right.
Figure 69: Sketch map of the Stowe property.
Figure 70: Side a and b of the ceramic sherds from under the deck.
Figure 71: Stowe family photo showing the Equality Colony cabin in the background (courtesy of Peggy Stowe).

Figure 72: The Herz family in front of their cabin (courtesy of the Skagit County Historical Museum, D-13-39 B014).
Future Archaeological Survey

An archaeologist surveying the former Equality Colony properties should be mindful of logging activities that happened in the area before the Equality Colony was established. Logging Camps are an industrial community and in some ways would have operated similarly to the Equality Colony, i.e. a shared kitchen and meals.

The 1899 Equality Colony plat map illustrates where the high activity areas were for the Equality Colony but the nature of the map does not make it easily comparable to other maps and it was not clear where this map belonged on the modern landscape. By laying that map over a modern topographic map we are able to see where the buildings and other infrastructure would have existed on the landscape. It is important to note about this map that it does not include the New City. Hanson, the creator of the 1899 plat map, indicates in writing that the New City was located to the southeast of the school house but the buildings are not included on the map. I found no maps and very few photographs indicating the location of the New City on the landscape.

Archaeological sites can exist in the high activity areas, such as within the Equality Colony Village documented in the 1899 plat map. Archaeological sites can also exist in the areas peripheral to the high activity areas. For example, outhouse holes were often filled in with a community’s trash. Outhouses are more likely to be placed away from high traffic areas. They need to be close enough to allow access but are usually far enough away for some privacy. Garbage piles and other historic trash dumps are often the same way, outside of the main thoroughfare.

To choose the most appropriate survey location for the former Equality Colony land, an archaeologist should consider the main buildings and structures on the landscape and the developments that have happened since the Equality Colony ended, i.e. the development of Colony Road and other roadways and the gravel pit at the end of Tulip Lane. Given these two factors, an archaeological survey would be best carried out south of Lookout Lane, west of Colony Road, and east of the former gravel pit (Figure 42, Figure 43, and Figure 44). The areas around the dining room, blacksmith shop, and barn in particular might be the most promising for archaeological research. The types of activities and material
culture that would have been associated with these buildings, make the areas around them likely to have remnants left behind. Additionally, the location of the former sawmill to the north of Colony Mountain Drive should be strongly considered. Any archaeological site that exists there has no doubt been affected by the development and maintenance of Colony Road, as well as other farming and residential activities. However, the sawmill consisted of several buildings, machinery and other infrastructure and there is likely to be material culture left where the buildings stood.

If the opportunity arose it might be valuable to do a pedestrian survey on the property to the west of Colony Road, south of Colony Mountain Road, and north of Colony Creek. The historic records indicate that this is likely the location of the Equality Colony cemetery. It is unclear how much physical evidence would be left of the cemetery. Cedar boards were used for the headstones and those are likely gone now. However, a survey of the grounds surface may reveal some notable irregularities or other clues.

As previously mentioned, for this project I was able to survey two properties. I did not choose which properties to survey. The property owners volunteered their land. However, the two properties were within the area I have recommended as most advantageous for survey, south of Lookout Lane, west of Colony Road and east of the former rock quarry. I do not believe that this is pure coincidence. I think that the landowners were intrigued by the possibility of an archaeological site on their property because they saw the map clearly showing their property with Equality Colony buildings on it. I think other landowners, who may have been initially interested in participating in an archaeological survey, were less interested when they could not identify their property with buildings or activities.

The first property surveyed, the Bingham’s property, would have been the location of the Equality Colony dining room, kitchen and cereal coffee factory, according to the current map placement. It was adjacent to Apartment House No. 1 and likely a thoroughfare between the barn and the rest of the buildings, including Apartment House No. 2 and the cabins. The Bingham property would have been well used while the Equality Colonists occupied the land. The second property, the Stowe property, would have had several Equality Colony cabins on it according to the current map placement. It would have
been adjacent to the ironing room, the print shop, and Apartment House No. 2. The Stowe property would have been less busy during the height of Equality Colony activities. The cabins were mainly used for sleep during this time with dining and work mostly happening outside the individual homes. However, Apartment House No. 2 had several workshops in its basement and the print shop was the center of Equality Colony business after 1899.

Neither of the archaeological pedestrian surveys of these two properties revealed artifacts that could be positively linked to the Equality Colony. It is interesting to note that more artifacts were observed during the archaeological survey on the Bingham property than on the Stowe property. Also the Bingham family had recovered artifacts from their yard while gardening. When asked if they had ever dug anything that might be of interest, the Stowes said they had not.

The Bingham property would have been rented out by the Equality Colony by 1904 along with the saw mill. The Stowe property continued to be used by the Equality Colony until 1907 when it was sold to the Herz family and possibly other former Equality Colony members. So the Stowe property was actually part of the Equality Colony’s social landscape for longer than the Bingham property. Each of these properties is interesting archaeologically and warrant further archaeological investigation, if possible.
CHAPTER EIGHT: COMMUNITY ARCHAEOLOGY RESULTS

The community archaeology portion of this project started in the fall of 2013. While the ultimate goal was to use the community archaeology approach to establish and build relationships with the property owners of the former Equality Colony land, a secondary goal was to establish relationships within and offer education to the larger Skagit County community. The main holdings of the historic Equality Colony land have since been divided and there are 35 different landowners today (Figure 35).

In the fall of 2013 I initiated contact with different community groups that were concerned with the history of the Skagit County area and/or the present and future of northwestern Skagit County. These groups included Skagit County Genealogical Society, the Skagit County Historical Society, Burlington Historical Preservation Society, the Blanchard Community Club, Chuckanut Transition, Friends of the Skagit Valley, and the Alger Improvement Club. These contacts were informal and consisted mainly of attending scheduled meetings. The goals of this were to: 1. get an idea of the work already being done with Skagit County history; 2. see how this project might help meet any existing goals of these groups; and 3. to build interest in and support of this project by seeking out people who have an established interest in Skagit County’s heritage. I continued to periodically interact with these groups throughout the duration of this project.

Burlington History Detectives’ Event

In October of 2013, I was invited by the Burlington Historical Preservation Society to participate in their Burlington History Detectives event (Figure 73). At this event I had an information table with flyers and visual aids, including a poster highlighting the how, what, when and why of Washington State archaeology that I produced for the event. As an interactive activity, I had people attempt to place the Equality Colony infrastructure on a modern map. I had printed an aerial photograph and USGS topographic map of the historic Equality Colony area. I also printed the Equality Colony 1899 plat map at several different scales on transparency paper. This allowed people to follow the same process that I was
in trying to match major landmarks to place the Colony on the modern landscape. I was also given five minutes in the event’s program to speak to the crowd.

This event was attended by approximately 50 people. All of the attendees were adults; most of them were over 65 years of age. None of the property owners of the former Equality Colony land attended the event. My project was well received by the majority of people who spoke with me. The moderator of a local history website, Noel Boursaw, talked to me at the event about featuring this thesis project on the website, www.skagitriverjournal.com. By the beginning of November he had put an endorsement of the project on the website’s home page. One man wearing a U.S. veteran’s hat did have a negative response to the project. He objected to the study of ‘communism’ and was clearly uncomfortable with the nature of the Equality Colony. He was not interested in discussing the project in depth.

In advance of the Burlington History Detectives event I made my first contact with the landowners of former Equality Colony land. I sent postcards to each of the 35 individual property owners. In the postcard I introduced myself and the project and invited them to the event (Figure 74). The front of the postcard was a historic photograph of the Equality Colony. I chose postcards because they are noninvasive. It was critical for me to approach the landowners and personally inform them that the project existed. However, I wanted to respect the sense of privacy people maintain around their homes. I do not think that they would have appreciated me invading that privacy by initially just showing up or even by calling. I believe the postcards gave the property owners a sense of power and control in the project. I continued to use postcards to communicate with the landowners throughout this project.

Shortly after I attended the Burlington History Detectives event, I was contacted by several property owners and community members. Two property owners contacted me by email and one property owner and two community members by telephone. All but one person expressed support and interest in the project. I maintained contact with two of the property owners throughout the project; for the others this was the only contact. One of the property owners to contact me by email at this time was Peggy Stowe. She had heard about this project from her father who attended the History Detectives event, as well as from my postcard. Ms. Stowe wanted to share a school project that her daughter, Melissa Stowe,
had done on the Equality Colony some time ago. We maintained email correspondence throughout the project.

![Flyer advertising for the event hosted in October 2013 by the Burlington Historical Society.](image)

Figure 73: Flyer advertising for the event hosted in October 2013 by the Burlington Historical Society.

![Postcard sent to the property owners in advance of the Burlington History Detectives event.](image)

Figure 74: Postcard sent to the property owners in advance of the Burlington History Detectives event.
November 14, 2013, Talk at Blanchard Community Hall

In advance of the October 2013 Burlington History Detective’s event, I had begun planning my own event, a community talk to be held on November 14, 2013, in the community of Blanchard. I advertised this talk at the Burlington History Detectives event and invited those people who contacted me afterwards.

After some consideration I held the November talk at the Blanchard Community Hall on Legg Road in the community of Blanchard. I had considered holding it in Burlington, as it is a more populated place. However, the Blanchard Community Hall is located just five minutes from the former Equality Colony land and is therefore extremely convenient for the landowners. Ultimately I felt that if some of the landowners were undecided about attending the talk then the close location might make the difference.

I again sent postcards to the 35 property owners of former Equality Colony land inviting them to the talk and expressing my interest in connecting with them (Figure 75). I also invited the larger Skagit Valley community to the talk. I posted flyers in public spaces, utilized social media, and contacted the community groups that I thought might be interested (Figure 76). The talk was attended by over 90 adults. The Blanchard Community Hall was filled to capacity and there were not enough seats to accommodate the attendees. This far exceeded my expectations. I had printed handouts, scratch paper and pens for 50 people and had not expected to exhaust these supplies (Figure 77, Figure 78, and Figure 79).

The handout was two-sided and in color. One side gave quick facts about the historic Equality Colony and Washington State archaeology. The other provided a map of the Equality Colony lands. The handouts were distributed as people entered the venue. Scratch paper and pens were set out on the tables around the room. People were asked to jot down any questions, comments or thoughts that came to them while listening to the talk.

I prepared a 45 minute introductory lecture on the history of the Equality Colony that included maps of the Colony, the goals and aims of this project and a section on Washington State archaeology. The power point slides and a script for this talk can be found in Appendix 2. This was followed by a formal question and answer/discussion period that lasted approximately thirty minutes. The bulk of the
questions and comments posed at this time can be divided into four categories: questions about the history of the Equality Colony, offers of resources for this project, questions about archaeological regulations and issues, and comments from landowners of former Equality Colony land about the locations of Colony infrastructure in relation to their own land. Examples of the types of questions and comments that make up these categories are provided in Table 13. After the formal question and answer period, community members approached me at the front of the room to introduce themselves and to express their enjoyment of the talk and their support for the project (Figure 80).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| History                           | Connecting Equality to other colonies and places – both giving information and asking  
|                                   | Were there possible connections between the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) and the Equality Colony members? |
|                                   | Why did the Equality Colony end?                                         |
|                                   | Who burned the Equality Colony barn down? Can we find out who did using archaeology? |
|                                   | Suggestions of books I might read                                        |
|                                   | Suggestions of people I might talk to                                   |
| Offering resources                | Volunteering neighbors to participate in an archaeological survey and suggesting ways to organize the landowners for an archaeological survey |
|                                   | With modern development is there stuff left to find archaeologically?    |
| Archaeological regulations and issues | How could pre-contact sites affect the survey?                         |
|                                   | Questions about other archaeological sites in the area                   |
| Land owners connecting Equality Colony infrastructure with their own property | Is my land associated with a particular building?                        |
|                                   | Could there be stuff on my property even if the map shows it empty?    |
Figure 75: Postcard sent to the property owners in advance of the November 14, 2013, talk.

Figure 76: Flyer advertising the November 14, 2013, talk held at the Blanchard Community Hall.
Some facts about the Equality Colony

- The Brotherhood of the Co-operative Commonwealth, who established the Equality Colony, was a nationwide organization. In 1898 7,000 people all over the U.S. subscribed to their weekly newsletter, Industrial Freedom.
- Washington State was chosen, in part, because it had a populist governor, John Rogers, who was sympathetic to their cause.
- The Equality Colony’s central tenet was American socialism.
- At its height, Equality consisted of approximately 600 acres and 300 people.
- The Colonists farmed over 100 acres on the flats, had an extensive orchard, manufactured cereal coffee, ran a saw and shingle mill, and owned a fishing boat.
- In the Colony all decisions were made by the General Assembly. Everyone over 18 got a vote, including women. Women didn’t get the vote nationally till 1920.
- The Equality Colony members often welcomed people from Blanchard and Edison to their Saturday night dances and educational lectures.

The Skagit Valley today is a wonderful community full of interesting characters with fascinating stories, and hilarious quirks. The Skagit Valley of the past was no different. The rich heritage of the Skagit Valley has given rise to the community we know and love today. By exploring the historic Equality Colony which existed from 1897 to 1907 along Colony Road, I hope to learn more about this shared history.

Some facts about local archaeology

- In Skagit County over 400 archaeological sites and historic districts are recorded.
- Archaeologists use the word cultural resources as a catch all for archaeological sites, historical architecture, artifacts, historical districts, etc.
- Archaeological sites are nonrenewable resources. When they are gone, they are gone.
- Archaeology sites can contribute to our shared history. They can help ground us in a sense of place and of shared heritage.
- There are state and federal laws that protect archaeological sites.
- In Washington State we have a Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation.
- Archaeologists study the material remains of culture.
- Historical archaeologists study cultures that have written records.

If you have any interest in this project or stories to share about the Equality Colony please contact Julia Rowland: 360-630-9003 or julia.rowland@hotmail.com.

Figure 77: Side one of the handout from the November 14, 2013, talk.
A Sense of Place
To the right is an 1899 plan map of the Equality Colony that was published in *Industrial Freedom*. I have overlaid it on a modern topographic map. The map below shows the larger Equality colony area with the current Skagit county assessor parcels drawn in.

Figure 78: Side two of the handout from the November 14, 2013, talk.
Figure 79: Photograph of the Blanchard Community Hall during the November 14 talk.

Figure 80: After the November 14, 2013, talk ended many of the attendees wanted to speak with me (shaking hands, right of center).
On November 17, 2013, I met with Melissa Stowe, the daughter of Peggy Stowe, a property owner of former Equality Colony land. Melissa Stowe grew up on Colony Road, on the property that her mother still inhabits. She did a school project on the Equality Colony some years ago. We talked about the sources that she had used for her school project and her knowledge of the Colony Road area. Melissa Stowe had done several interviews with people, now deceased, who lived in the Colony Road area in the early 1900s. She shared the notes from these interviews with me.

After the November 14, 2013, talk I was contacted by one of the property owners of former Equality Colony land. He invited me out to his property to have a look at a mushroom patch that he found unusual. I visited his property on Tulip Lane on November 27, 2013. We looked at the mushroom patch, walked the length of Tulip Lane and discussed the project. This was the only time I visited his property.

Another landowner, Warren Bingham, contacted me to express interest in this project. He had come to the November 14 talk but had left because it was so crowded. He expressed interest in a meeting for landowners only.

**December 17, 2013, Meeting for the Landowners**

I organized a meeting for the landowners on December 17, 2013. This time I did not invite the general Skagit Valley community, only the 35 property owners. I sent a postcard to each of them (Figure 81). I also sent emails and made phone calls to invite those property owners with whom I had established a relationship.

I planned this meeting to be collaborative. I wanted it to be a chance for the landowners to speak about the project, to give feedback and to participate in the planning process. I had several handouts available at the meeting, including different graphics showing the likely historic locations of Equality Colony infrastructure and copies of archaeological laws and regulations including Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and Washington State Executive Order 0505. Examples of these handouts are included in Appendix 2.
Only four landowners attended the December 17, 2014. Of these four landowners, two were married and owned the same properties. This couple was not interested in hosting an archaeological survey on their property. They were interested in the project and wanted to see how it was progressing. One of them had grown up on Colony Road. The reason they gave for not wanting to host a survey was that they did not believe that anything would be found on their property archaeologically. Their property is not located in the Equality Colony Village and New City areas. I expressed interest in surveying their property anyway but it did not change their minds.

Another one of the property owners had only recently acquired his land. He was interested in the project and in possibly hosting an archaeological survey but had serious reservations. He expressed concern about his property rights. He feared that recording an archaeological site on his property would limit his autonomy on his land. We agreed to keep the conversation open.

The final landowner, Warren Bingham, expressed interest in hosting an archaeological survey on his property. Mr. Bingham brought with him several items that he had dug up from the garden in his yard over the years. His concerns were around his liability for people visiting his property and his own power in planning the archaeological survey. These concerns were manageable. Mr. Bingham was not ready to set a date for the survey so we agreed to continue the conversation at another time. Several weeks later, after several conversations, Mr. Bingham and I were able to set a date for a pedestrian survey of his property. This survey is discussed in the next section.

Figure 81: Postcard sent to property owners in advance of the December 17, 2013, landowner meeting.
Landowner Questionnaire

Due to the lack of attendance at the December 17, 2013, meeting I decided to send out a brief questionnaire to the 35 different landowners. On February 19, 2014, I mailed a packet to each landowner. The packets included an eight question multiple choice questionnaire, two copies of a consent form, a self-addressed envelope with postage, and a brief instruction letter. These questionnaires were anonymous. Copies of the items included in the packet can be seen in Appendix 3. Eight, or 22.9%, of the questionnaires were returned.

Only three of the landowners who returned questionnaires had been to my November 14, 2013, talk at the Blanchard Community Hall (Table 14). The other five had not. Two of the landowners who did not attend said they were too busy; two said that they were not interested; and one said that it had been too crowded. Of the landowners who did attend, two said they came because they were curious and one did not give a reason. Altogether four of the eight landowners said they would attend future talks concerning the history of the Equality Colony, although one of them specified that he/she would only attend small talks with only the landowners present. Two replied ‘maybe’. The two landowners who had indicated they were not interested in the project replied no, they would not attend future talks.

The results from this questionnaire represent a small sample size and limited conclusions should be drawn from them. With these first three questions I hoped to determine the level of landowner interest in the history of the Equality Colony as a subject of study. Six of the eight landowners indicating that they would, or would at least consider, attending future talks about the history of the Equality Colony seems to suggest that the Equality Colony history is compelling to the community or at least interesting. The fact that all three of the landowners who attended the November talk would consider attending future talks also suggests that they enjoyed the talk in November.
Table 14: Answers for the first three questions of the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Did you attend the November 17 talk Julia Rowland gave at the Blanchard Community Club?</th>
<th>Why or why not?</th>
<th>Would you attend future community talks concerning the history of the Equality Colony?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>I was busy.</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>I was busy.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>I am not interested.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>I am not interested.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Too many people.</td>
<td>Yes (If property owners only of Colony site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No answer given.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>I was curious.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>I was curious.</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With questions four and five I hoped to gauge the landowners’ comfort with the idea of hosting an archaeological survey and with archaeology more generally. Of the eight responding landowners, two stated that they were interested in having an archaeological survey on their property (Table 15). One of the two did not give an answer as to why but the other indicated an interest in the Equality Colony and was curious to know what might be in their yard. Two landowners indicated that they would maybe like to have an archaeological survey and a third circled both maybe and no. Two of the landowners were concerned about property rights and how archaeology might affect theirs. The third was not sure if he/she wanted things dug up in their yard. Four of the landowners said that they would not be interested in hosting an archaeological survey. Two of these landowners were also concerned about their property rights. In all, half of the landowners who took this survey expressed this concern. One of the landowners indicated a disinterest in archaeology.

Even though just over half of the respondents would consider hosting an archaeological survey, it is important to acknowledge the potential bias that exists in this sample. It could be that people who are
potentially interested in participating in the project are more likely to return a questionnaire about it. The most common answer given for hesitating to host a survey is concern about property rights. This is not surprising as it reflects my observations from the conversations I have had with the community over the course of this project and before. The most common reasons for being interested in hosting a survey are a desire to know more about the Equality Colony and curiosity about what may be under the surface of a landowner’s yard.

Table 15: Answers for the fourth and fifth questions of the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Are you interested in having an archaeological survey on your property?</th>
<th>Why or why not?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>I am concerned about property rights and how archaeology might affect mine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Not really sure I want things dug up in my yard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>I am not interested in archaeology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>I am concerned about property rights and how archaeology might affect mine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Yes (per our discussion)</td>
<td>I would like to know more about the Equality Colony. I am curious to know what might be in the dirt in my yard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>I am concerned about property rights and how archaeology might affect mine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>I am concerned about property rights and how archaeology might affect mine. I would like to know more about the Equality Colony. I am curious to know what might be in the dirt in my yard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question six asks what, if anything, interests the landowner about this project. I hoped that these answers would shed some light on whether the landowners found the history of the Equality Colony or the potential of an archaeological site more compelling. One of the landowners indicated no interest in this project. Seven of the respondents indicated some level of interest in the Equality Colony history and/or local history more generally. Only one of the landowners replied with a statement of curiosity about archaeology. This would seem to imply that the Equality Colony history is compelling the interest of landowners in this project.

Table 16: Answers for the sixth question of the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>What, if anything, interests you about this project?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>I am mildly interested in the colony.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>I love local history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think the Equality Colony is fascinating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>I love local history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It [the Equality Colony] is interesting to study [why] it failed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Nothing interests me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>I think the Equality Colony is fascinating since we own property on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>I am curious about archaeology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I love local history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think the Equality Colony history is fascinating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>I love local history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>I love local history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think the Equality Colony history is interesting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With question seven I hoped to explore more deeply the landowners’ feelings about archaeology. When asked how they felt about archaeology as it concerns their community, four of the landowners replied that they thought that archaeology had the potential to contribute to the history of the community. Two indicated that they found archaeology interesting but were not sure how it fits into their community. One gave no answer and one replied with a comment indicating skepticism about archaeology having
anything to offer the community. With only one negative response, the answers to the question could be interpreted as favorable for archaeology. Half of the respondents could see value in archaeology and two more could potentially get there through more education. This potentially demonstrates a good degree of openness to archaeology within this group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>How do you feel about archaeology as it concerns this community?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>No opinion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>I think it has potential to contribute to the history of this community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>I find archaeology interesting but I am not sure how it fits into this community. I don’t think archaeology has anything to offer this community. Archaeology has a part in the development of every community and is interesting as such.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>I don’t think archaeology has anything to offer this community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>I think it has potential to contribute to the history of this community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>I think it has potential to contribute to the history of this community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>I find archaeology interesting but I am not sure how it fits into this community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>I think it has potential to contribute to the history of this community. I am concerned that archaeological ‘digs’ be done with respect to owner’s rights.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final question was open-ended and asked, ‘anything you would like to add?’ Only two respondents answered this question. Respondent E used this space to reference an earlier conversation with the researcher. Respondent H replied to express willingness to help with the project and concern about property rights. This final reference to property rights concerns really underscores its prevalence within the community.

**February 20, 2014, Talk at Lucille Umbarger Elementary School, Burlington, Washington**

On February 20, 2014, I gave a forty minute talk on local archaeology and this project three different times to three different seventh grade classes (Figure 82). I had met Ms. Arie Werder, a seventh
grade school teacher at Lucille Umbarger, through the Blanchard Community Club. She attended my
November 14, 2013, talk and invited me to visit her classroom. This talk was a variation of the talk I gave
on November 14, 2013. The power point slides and a script for this talk can be found in Appendix 4.

Educating young people is an important goal of community archaeology (Moser et al 2002). Public outreach for school children can include both archaeologist presenting in schools and archaeologists bring children to sites. Both serve as a type of public outreach, which is a basic tenant of community archaeology. School children can be a very accessible community for archaeologists to reach, and in educating this community archaeologists are laying ground work for a new generation of stewards for archaeological sites. This type of outreach represents an opportunity to teach young people not only about archaeology but also about their own heritage.

Figure 82: From one of the February 20, 2014, talks given to seventh grade classes.

Summary

In total I spoke to 10 of the 35 different landowners, or 28.5%. Figure 83 shows the modern Skagit County parcels that make up the former Equality Colony land with those owned by people that I spoke to shaded in red. It is possible that some landowners attended the November 14, 2013, talk at
Blanchard Community Hall and did not identify themselves to me. The conversations with the landowners and community members with whom I developed relationships over the course of this project have been ongoing.

Two of those 10 landowners, Peggy Stowe and Warren Bingham, agreed to host an archaeological survey on their property (Figure 84). Other property owners expressed some level of interest in allowing an archaeological survey of their land but no survey was ever scheduled. It is interesting to note that neither Mr. Bingham nor Ms. Stowe attended the Burlington History Detectives event or the November 14, 2013, talk at Blanchard Community Hall discussed in the last section. Mr. Bingham did attend the December 17, 2013, landowner meeting but Ms. Stowe did not. In some ways this would suggest that none of these events had a significant influence on whether a landowner agreed to do an archaeological survey. On the other hand, holding these events created conversation about this project both with the researcher and within the community. The initial contact with both Mr. Bingham and Ms. Stowe came after one of the public events. The events also added structure to the project and may have helped the community members to view it as legitimate even if they did not attend the events.

I have maintained contact with Warren Bingham and Peggy Stowe throughout this project. Drafts of this thesis were sent to both property owners and I invited both to all public events concerning my thesis work. Warren Bingham and Peggy Stowe continue to be interested in this project and in possibly hosting future archaeological surveys on their properties. Copies of the final draft of this thesis will be shared with both property owners.
Figure 83: The properties of landowners with whom I spoke with over the course of this project shaded red. The former Equality Colony properties were drawn on a Bow topographic map by the author.
Figure 84: The Bingham and Stowe properties shaded in red. The former Equality Colony properties were drawn on a Bow topographic map by the author.
Figure 85: The 1899 Equality Colony plat map on a modern Skagit County parcel map showing the Stowe and Bingham properties in red (http://www.skagitcounty.net/Maps/iMap/). The Equality Colony infrastructure was drawn on this map by the author.
CHAPTER NINE: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

I was able to meet the primary goal of my project, which was to investigate the Equality Colony history from a new, archaeological perspective, and to do so in a way that laid the groundwork for archaeological survey for the former Equality Colony. This included historical research to both gain new insight into the Equality Colony and to generate archaeological research questions. In the course of this project a wealth of information pertinent to the creation of an archaeological research design was compiled and explored, resulting in new insights into the Equality Colony history as well as possible future research questions. Work with a variety of maps and aerial photographs succeeded in locating the former Equality Colony infrastructure on the modern landscape. A portion of the Equality Colony infrastructure was placed onto modern maps. Access was gained to two properties within the historic Equality Colony land area for archaeological survey and both of the property owners have expressed some level of interest in potentially hosting more archaeological survey on their property.

Historical Research

Analysis of the historical records, photographs and maps of the Equality Colony with an anthropological theoretical framework provided new insight into the Equality Colony history. By analyzing each of these components—written records, photographs and maps—separately I was able to see inconsistencies between them that helped to generate research questions. Combined, these sources of information provided meaningful data on the material culture of the Equality Colony. Using this data, I will discuss below some of this project’s insights into the Equality Colony’s history and the research questions produced.

New Insights into the Equality Colony History

The Equality Colony was a dynamic, imagined community with an important spatial component. Part of a national movement, the Equality Colony members were from all over the United States and included recent immigrants to the United States. Its members were part of an imagined community of
American socialists across the United States both before and after they came together to live in Washington. Once settled in Skagit County, the Equality Colony members were a natural community. As discussed, an archaeological research design for the Equality Colony should use a framework that acknowledges the agency of the former community members and considers their definition of their own community as it can be extrapolated from the records they left behind.

The Equality Colony was a utopian community held together by the ideology of political socialism, specifically utopian socialism. Many of the Colonists, and certainly the founding members, saw themselves as socialists working for a greater cause. They viewed the work they did as not just for themselves but for all members of the BCC and even for the non-socialist members of the United States. In some ways the Equality Colonists viewed their community as a cohesive and separate entity from the rest of society. This is evidenced by their desire to become a faction of the BCC when they felt the BCC was not meeting their needs and by their use of script instead of United States currency. In other ways they saw themselves as connected to other surrounding communities, the BCC membership across the nation, socialists across the nation and all US citizens. This is evidenced by: 1. the invitations to Equality Colony dances, lectures, and meals issued to non-colonists; 2. their willingness to allow members to find employment off the Colony; and 3. the continued distribution of Industrial Freedom to BCC members into at least 1901.

The Equality Colony made several significant changes to the ideology and the practices used to maintain their ideology over the ten years the community existed: 1. They broke with the BCC; 2. they lost Pelton’s leadership, 3. They shifted from a communal kitchen to individual kitchens; and 4. They introduced anarchism. The move from communal apartments to individual residences could be seen as an ideological change but the Colonists had planned individual homes from the beginning of the community. The communal apartments were a temporary solution to their overcrowding problem in the early years.

In 1898 the Equality Colony formally took control of its own finances and future from the BCC. The BCC was the Equality Colony’s founding and parent agency. Splitting off from the BCC in this way was a huge ideological leap. In 1897, when the Equality Colony was started, it was seen as just an initial
step in a larger, grander plan. It was believed the Equality Colony would quickly become self sufficient and functional enough to inspire other colonies in rapid succession. In 1898 when the Equality Colonists voted to separate the future of the Colony from the BCC’s, the Colonists were realizing how much work establishing Equality would take. They wanted to focus their efforts on Equality before spreading their resources any thinner. This break represents a narrowed focus for the Equality Colonists ideologically.

In 1901 Ed Pelton died. Although officially the Equality Colony had no leader and, in practice, the Colonists put safeguards in place to ensure egalitarianism, Pelton was a source of inspiration for many of the Colonists. It has been suggested by historians that Pelton’s death inspired an ideological shift in the Equality Colony away from a more collective approach towards a more individualistic approach.

From 1897 to around 1904 (the exact date is not indicated in the historical records), the Equality Colonists lived communally, sharing meals and living in close quarters. Their buildings were clustered in one area, the Village. By 1904, membership had dwindled, and the Equality Colonists were no longer sharing meals. They had individual kitchens. Many individual homes had been built so people did not need to live so closely together. The New City had been constructed so the Colony landscape was more spread out. The Colonists continued to connect with each other as part of the Equality Colony, but how much they were really physically interacting is unclear.

In 1905 Alexander Horr, an anarchist, arrived at the Equality Colony at the request of some of the members. Horr introduced elements of anarchism into the ideology of the Equality Colony. This was extremely divisive for the Equality Colony members because not all of them agreed with Horr’s ideas. This resulted in the formation of factions in the Equality Colony and ultimately its dissolution.

Andelson’s adaptation of Turner’s rites of passage—sociogenesis, liminality, schismogenesis — offers a framework for understanding the ten year lifespan of the Equality Colony. The Equality Colony was formed, sociogenesis, by people who shared a political ideology of socialism, equality and cooperation. They had no charismatic leader. Indeed it has been pointed out by historians that after the first two years they had no strong leaders at all. Most of the membership had no previous relationship. They traveled to the Colony and were immediately thrust together under frontier conditions contributing
to the liminal state of the community. The Equality Colony did break down into factions, schismogenesis, created after a group of political anarchists came to the community with new worldviews and goals.

Costly signaling theory offers an important best insight into the lifespan of the Colony. The Equality Colony did require a substantial fee for membership. However, members could retain their own wealth and possessions. Some members were allowed into the Colony without having paid the fee with the agreement that they would exchange labor for the fee. Interaction with non-group members was not discouraged. In fact, some of the male members worked outside the Colony, and although it was expected they would turn over their earnings to the Colony, this was not well enforced. Members were expected to contribute labor to the Colony each day. However, the expected labor contribution was much lower than members might have had to work off of the Colony for similar compensation. All in all, the cost of membership for the Equality Colony was low. Historians have pointed to the prevalence of free-riders and the depletion of Colony resources. Instances of non-socialists with little resources coming to the Colony, paying no fee, working very little, acquiring three meals a day, as well as supplies from the Colony store, and then disappearing a short while later have been well documented.

I found the interactional approaches, based on practice theory, critical to developing an approach for the archaeology of the Equality Colony. It was the daily practices of the Colonists that created and sustained the community. Although the Equality Colony was formed around the ideals of political socialism, very few rules or ideas were sacred and not up for debate. Decisions were made and unmade on a regular basis by the General Assembly. Practice theory also acknowledges that the Colonists may have had every intention of acting cooperatively as good socialists but that they were limited by their habitus.

Archaeological Research Questions

One of the challenges to the archaeology of the Equality Colony will be discerning how it was different from contemporary surrounding communities. Environmental constrictions on the material culture of the Colony must be considered alongside the ideology of the Colony. In many ways the
Equality Colony operated much like its neighboring frontier communities, the major differences being in the egalitarian and cooperative ideals of the Colony.

The built environment of the Equality Colony represents both the ideology of the Colonists and the restraints placed on their manifestations of those ideals. Many of the members did live in communal housing but this was due to the overcrowding of the Colony and a scarcity of resources to build homes. However, they ate at the communal dining room for at least half of the time the Colony existed and they did so because of their ideals. This communal dining is a marked difference from surrounding communities. Although there was no official prohibition against eating outside the dining room, individual kitchens were discouraged, and individual homes would likely not show archaeological evidence of food storage during this time.

Sometime before 1904 the Equality Colonists made a shift to individual kitchens. This ideological change may be particularly well represented in the archaeological record. The Equality Colony collectively owned and produced their food. Presumably, in the early years of the Colony, when they maintained a community kitchen and discouraged individual kitchens, members would have had no reason to store food within their own homes. After the Colonists moved to individual kitchens, people may have begun storing food in their own spaces. It is possible that this introduced an element of privatization to the communal food. When use of the food was not communally organized then individual members may have felt that their access to the food was in some way limited. It is possible that archaeological excavation at individual homes may show some social stratification represented in food remains or food storage after the Equality Colony moved to individual kitchens.

The individual homes at the Equality Colony should show other marked differences from homes in contemporary communities as well. The Equality Colony operated collectively to produce, distribute and consume goods. Equality members were paid in script which was redeemable at the Equality Colony store. The Colony store was reportedly comparable to other small stores in the area. While there was no official prohibition against purchasing things from outside Equality, it seems likely that members did most of their shopping there. This should be reflected in the archaeological record. The material goods
associated with individual homes should be more similar than in homes outside of Equality, where people would have access to a larger variety of goods. If the individual homes do not show a high degree of continuity in goods, this also provides data on the nature of cooperation at the Equality Colony.

The archaeological record should reflect specialization at individual homes or buildings within the Colony. Equality Colony members were divided into work departments and cooperatively completed their tasks. It is likely that members would have met at one central point to complete tasks. This would be reflected in the archaeological record as clusters of tools and materials.

In the late 1800s and early 1900s in Skagit County, water systems were installed and maintained by individuals, not by the town or community. According to the historical records, this was not true at Equality. The water system at Equality was an excellent example of the cooperation of members and sets the Equality Colony apart from its contemporary communities. Similarly, housekeeping was a work department at Equality. Outside of the Equality Colony, individual homes were frequently maintained by individual women. At Equality, at least some of the buildings, including all of the community buildings, were maintained by the same group of women – the housekeeping department. This is another example of Equality Colony cooperation that I would expect to result in greater uniformity in the material culture among the buildings. It is possible that there are other examples like this that are not mentioned in the historical records. It is fairly common for things that are considered mundane to go unwritten by record keepers. It is safe to say that, over all, the Equality Colony should reflect continuity in management and design not seen in other contemporary communities.

The Equality Colony had several public buildings used to gather members together. The school house/dance hall, Fort Bellamy, and the prinery are the most notable. These buildings would have been the space where mutual monitoring was carried out by members. The archaeological record may provide more information on how these buildings were used to reinforce the social norms of the Equality Colony. The historical records indicate that Fort Bellamy was the first center of community interaction and that later, the prinery became more central. As far as can be discerned, the school house/dance hall maintained a similar status in the community throughout the ten years. The shift of the social center from
Fort Bellamy to the printery may have had effects on the social structure of the community that may be seen in the archaeological record.

Over time, as they were able, community members built individual cabins for families and the Equality Colony members spread out over the landscape. This change may be accompanied by a shift to more individualism that could be represented in the archaeological record. As the members moved further away from each other and the central resources, it may have made more sense to have and store individual tools and consumables. On the other hand, the Equality Colony members’ commitment to cooperation and communal ownership may have prevented this. Both of these things should show in the archaeological record and both offer meaningful data.

The members’ consumptive patterns may reflect their commitment to the economic independence of the Equality Colony and their economic dependence on each other. The Equality Colonists were cooperatively producing goods and it seems likely that the products of the Equality Colony likely share some stylistic similarities. It is possible that as the Colony’s ideologies shifted, there were stylistic changes in the products they produced that could be correlated to the changing ideology. As discussed, it is likely that Colony members did most of their shopping at the Equality Colony store. This means that clothing was likely made from the same bolts of fabric available at the store. The Equality Colony had its own shoe maker and it seems logical that members would have obtained their shoes from within the community. Similarly, the Equality Colony had a furniture factory and produced stoves. Again, there seems to be no reason that Equality Colonists would not have outfitted their homes with these Colony products.

While it is true that Equality Colony members were not required to give up their personal belongings when they arrived at the Colony, and that should be reflected in the archaeological record as individual differences, it also seems likely that over time, the material culture of the Equality Colony would have begun to have more similarities than differences. On the other hand, the historical records seem to indicate that cooperation waned at Equality towards the end of its lifespan. It is possible that the
archaeological record could reflect increasing conformity of goods and then decreasing conformity of goods, in response to the shifts at the Colony.

Although discerning the differences between the Equality Colony and other contemporary communities of the region through historic research has its difficulties, differences do exist. The Equality Colony was set apart by its commitments to egalitarian and cooperative ideals. I have offered suggestions as to how these may be reflected in the material culture. Archaeological exploration of the former Equality Colony may reveal other possibilities that I have not considered. I do think that it would be interesting to compare an archaeological assemblage from the Equality Colony to a contemporary non-socialist utopian community from Washington State. Further, as discussed, Washington State was home to four other utopian experiments in the late 1800s/early 1900s. If archaeological survey of any of those communities was possible, it would be interesting to compare an Equality Colony assemblage to one from another Washington State socialist utopia. Similarities and difference in these assemblages could be very illustrative of the nature of community and cooperation.

In particular, I would be interested in seeing the Equality Colony assemblage compared to either the Burley Colony or Home. The Equality Colony and the Burley Colony had a lot in common. They were founded around the same time by overlapping groups of American socialists. Ideologically they seem to have been very similar. Comparing the material culture of these two Colonies would give an interesting perspective on the negotiation of ideology put into practice. Home was also founded around the same time as Burley and Equality but was not a socialist community; rather it was anarchistic. An anarchist community is a bit of an oxymoron, as anarchists believe in the absolute freedom of an individual and as discussed, being a community member puts limitations on individuals. A comparison of Home and the Equality Colony might illustrate the differences and similarities between anarchism and socialism as they play out in utopian communities.
Placement of the Equality Colony Infrastructure on the Modern Landscape

The work previously done on the historic Equality Colony was carried out by historians. By combining historical research with archaeological methods and applying an anthropological theoretical framework to this history, this project offers a new perspective on the Equality Colony and explores aspects of this community that have previously been overlooked. An excellent example of this is the map analysis of the Equality Colony carried out as part of this project. Very little was known before this project, about where the Equality Colony buildings and infrastructure existed on the modern landscape. As part of this project, the Skagit County assessor records and the 1899 plat map drawn by an Equality Colony member were used to place the Equality Colony infrastructure on the modern landscape. This is important archaeologically because it helps inform the researcher on the area(s) best surveyed. Beyond that, the placement of buildings and other infrastructure provides insight into the social and political structure of the Equality Colony. However, the current placement of the 1899 plat map on the modern topographic map has limitations and is very much preliminary.

As discussed, not much is known about the methods used in creating the 1899 plat map and so it is difficult to judge its accuracy. Some of the written records and photographs seem to support the accuracy of the 1899 plat map. For instance, the 1899 plat map indicates that most of the Equality Colony infrastructure was grouped in one area. This is supported by the data in the historical records and the photographs of the Equality Colony. However, there were many noted inconsistencies between the photographs, the written records and the 1899 plat map as well. Further archaeological survey would be very beneficial to refining the placement of the 1899 plat map on the modern topographic map.

During this project, I was able to archaeologically survey a portion of the high activity area, two parcels. My colleagues and I found little in the way of surface artifacts during these surveys but where we found them is interesting; the fact that we found ceramic sherds and glass fragments along fence lines, under trees and in garden areas may indicate buried deposits.

The structure of this project made it prudent to investigate where I could gain access to former Equality Colony land sites. I had very little control in selection. I was able to gain access to an area inside
the high activity zone which seems advantageous. However, from a research design point of view, it is worth considering whether looking within the high activity area or looking around the edges of the high activity zone is likely to be more archaeologically fruitful.

In discussions with the Stowe family during the pedestrian survey of their property, it was discovered that a cabin they believed to have been built by the Equality Colony had existed in the very northeast corner of their property. My placement of the 1899 Equality Colony plat map on the modern topographic map also shows a cabin in that location. It is very likely that when the Equality Colony land was sold the Herz family, Equality Colony members, had purchased the Stowe property.

Historical records indicate that while the Equality Colony existed the Herz family lived in one of the middle log cabins built near Apartment House 2. This is exactly the cabin shown in the northeast corner of the Stowe property in the current placement of the 1899 plat map. All of which would seem to indicate the accuracy of the 1899 plat map and my placement of it on the modern topographic map. However, the photograph of the cabin provided by the Stowes does not look anything like the log cabins built by the Equality Colony adjacent to Apartment House 2. The cabin in the photograph looks more likely to have been built in the Equality Colony New City. As I have said, I believe that archaeological survey could be very beneficial in refining the placement of this map. Further, I think that knowing how the Equality Colony infrastructure was placed on the landscape would provide meaningful data about the social structure of the Colony.

The 1899 plat map of the Equality Colony did not include the New City. Historical records indicate that the New City was located higher on the hillside than the Village and to the southeast of the schoolhouse. No maps of the New City were found during this investigation. As discussed in Chapter Six, one photograph, taken by Hegg in 1901, shows the location of the New City in relation to the Village and two other photographs are possibly of New City buildings. This investigation has focused primarily on the Village because it was documented in the 1899 plat map but archaeological survey work could help to locate the New City on the landscape as well and indeed it may be the only way to do so.
Refining the placement of the 1899 plat map could have an extra benefit. During the community archaeology portions of this project, I observed that if I knew something about a person’s property this seemed to encourage their willingness to participate in an archaeological survey. Intuitively, this makes sense. If a person believes there is something intriguing about their property this increases the likelihood they will want to know more about its history. Refining the placement of the 1899 plat map would give myself or other researchers something meaningful to share with landowners about their property which may lead to further survey.

**Community Archaeology and Access to the Equality Colony**

The community archaeology approach stems from recognition that the archaeological past matters for many communities and from the acknowledgement that archaeologists need to engage with other interested groups in their work. It is apparent that the archaeology community is interested in this approach. However, there is still more work to do in establishing the guidelines and support for this method. This project joins a growing pool of examples of this method at work. Through the practice of community archaeology, archaeologists can continue to refine the methods employed in this approach.

This project can be considered a successful use of the community archaeology method because the goal of gaining access to a portion of the historic Equality Colony property was met. Just as important as the successes of this project are the places where there is room to improve. Both of these pieces are useful to consider. The November 14, 2013, public talk was well attended and well received. I consider it a success. However, it is worth noting that neither of the landowners who later hosted an archaeological survey attended this talk. The December 17, 2013, landowner meeting was not well attended and it was received with far less enthusiasm. However, one of the landowners who later hosted an archaeological survey did attend this meeting. After the November 14, 2013, public talk I would have predicted that I would have gained access to far more than two properties. I have spent some time considering why I had a drop of interest in the project between the two events.
First, my timing for the December 17, 2013, landowner meeting may not have been well designed. December 17 is right in the middle of the winter holiday season. People are generally preoccupied with family and holiday events. However, people did not contact me asking me to move the meeting to a more convenient time.

Second, people have their own lives and schedules to consider in general. Participation in this project was voluntary and compelled only by a landowner’s own interest level. A landowner could be interested in the project but too busy to participate. In fact, Warren Bingham at one point almost forewent the archaeological survey of his property because of his own schedule.

Third, perhaps if I had been more decisive and a stronger leader for the project I might have attracted more volunteers for archaeological survey. My own vision for this project was of a collaborative model. I wanted feedback from the landowners and for them to play a real role in the project. I was not ready to schedule people for archaeological survey on November 14, 2013, and that was perhaps a mistake. I could have organized the November 14, 2013, talk in such a way that I met with landowners who were present that night. I did ask landowners to leave their contact information with me but perhaps I could have set it up more formally. In general, this was my project and I needed to be the proponent pushing it along. I may have let my desire for a collaborative project get in the way of doing this at times.

In the end though, I did gain access to the properties. Further I was able to offer education and information to the Skagit Valley community. Offering education and information about the archaeological record and shared heritage is so important in community archaeology. Sharing my own knowledge of Skagit County’s history, both pre and post contact, and receiving information on the same from members of the community was perhaps my favorite part of this project. I was able to connect with many different communities within the Skagit Valley community. I spoke with groups and people who had an active interest in the history of the area and those who did not. I spoke with adults and with school children. School children are a particularly interesting demographic in community archaeology. They have a lot of potential to grow up with an understanding of their heritage, what a shared past can mean for a community and what archaeology can offer those things.
Over the course of this project, many of the adults I spoke with expressed concern about their property rights and how having an archaeological survey on their property might affect those rights. It has been my experience in working as an archaeologist outside of this project that this is a fairly common concern, best dealt with on an individual bases. Having a documented archaeological site on your property can affect the way that you are legally required to manage that property in Washington State. I have found it helpful to be honest and open with people, to really listen to their concerns, to provide them with applicable information including state laws, to be creative in suggestions for management, and to look for ways to point out the value of the archaeological record.

For this project, I was very careful to respect people’s privacy. I strove to be upfront about my intentions for this project. I was also careful to include the community members that I worked with in every step of the process of this project. In particular, I tried to check in with Warren Bingham and Peggy Stowe at regular intervals. I recognized that in this thesis I share a lot of information about their properties. To respect that I sent drafts of this thesis to both landowners and I always checked in with these two before presenting any aspect of my research publically. I worked to maintain transparency in my research.

The concerns of landowners about property rights are one of the reasons that I think that the community archaeology approach is such a powerful method. It is my belief that sharing information about the goals of archaeology and the results of archaeological survey can go a long way in creating good stewards and community members who are excited about heritage, our shared past and the archaeological record.

The benefits of community archaeology for this project went beyond creating opportunities for archaeological survey. As I became involved with members of the Skagit Valley Community, I was able to access a network of information and people. Community members regularly made suggestions about resources I could access or people that I should speak to. Some of these suggestions were very helpful and pointed me in directions that I may not have otherwise gone.
**Directions for Future Research**

In comparing the 1899 plat map of the Equality Colony, historic records, and historic photographs, several inconsistencies arose. Archaeological survey has tremendous potential to refine the placement of the 1899 plat map on the modern topographic map. Very little is known about the methods for creating the 1899 plat map; making it unclear how accurate this map is. Colony Creek and the edge of the hillside were used to place it on the modern topographic map but no other adjustments were made. There is certainly a lot of room for interpretation in this method. If even one building could be identified archaeologically, it could go a long way to understanding the 1899 plat map’s relationship to the modern landscape. This would both provide meaningful data and be potentially beneficial in furthering community engagement in archaeological investigation of the Equality Colony.

The analysis of the lidar image provided in this thesis was limited and it would be worthwhile to revisit some of the shapes apparent on the lidar image, as they could potentially represent former Equality Colony building foundations. None-evasive archaeological methods such as analysis of the lidar image, magnetometer survey, resistivity survey and further pedestrian survey would be the most logical next step for continued archaeological work at the former Equality Colony land and likely the most welcomed by the landowners.

In general the Equality Colony warrants further archaeological survey. If and where landowners of former Equality Colony land are willing to allow archaeological survey of their land, it would be worth doing. There is still so much to know about this interesting piece of history as demonstrated in the discussion of research questions in this chapter. Not only does my research raise questions that would be of interest to historical archaeologists, but also to the local community and those who study utopian or intentional communities. Archaeological survey is also warranted by the evidence that there is likely to be some material culture remains from the Equality Colony and, although it is hard for me to state with any certainty at this point, there seem to be indications that these remains could have some archaeological integrity.
As discussed, Peggy Stowe and Warren and Diane Bingham continue to be interested in possibly hosting archaeological survey. If archaeological excavation could be carried out on both of these properties it would be extremely interesting to compare assemblages of these two properties. The current placement of the 1899 plat map on the modern topographic map shows three of the log cabins on the Stowe property. Additionally, the Stowe property is adjacent to the printery. An archaeological assemblage from the Stowe property should reflect residential activities. As suggested above, in the research questions section of this chapter, the archaeological record would likely reflect the ideological shift undergone by the Equality Colony when members began to have individual kitchens. The Stowe property would be an excellent place to investigate this.

The Bingham property, on the other hand, should have a very different assemblage. Fort Bellamy and the cereal coffee factory would have been on the Bingham property so the assemblage should reflect cooperative production, both of meals and of products – cereal coffee. With these two assemblages, the Bingham property’s and the Stowe property’s, it would also likely be possible to examine shifts in the social structure of the Equality Colony that may have occurred when the social center of the Colony moved from Fort Bellamy to the Printery.

The artifacts observed at the Stowe and Bingham properties were only preliminarily analyzed. Some, in particular the horse shoes, might be worth a deeper look.

The Fredrick Smith Papers at the Center for Pacific Northwest Studies at Western Washington University in Bellingham, Washington, hold quite a few photographs that could be potentially interesting. Further research into these photographs was outside of the scope of this project but may very well turn up more information. It might be interesting and worthwhile to involve Skagit County or Blanchard community members in this process. In my experience, Blanchard has quite a few residents with a remarkable working knowledge of the history of their community.

This project suggests that community archaeology can be a powerful approach for gaining access to private property for archaeological survey. As discussed, there has been limited research on the
community archaeological approach and private property. This project, at the very least, suggests that more is warranted.

As discussed, best practice guidelines have not been established for community archaeology. Speaking from my experiences with the community archaeology approach in this project, I would say that establishing these will be very difficult due to the flexibility required of an archaeologist in a community archaeology project. I will suggest, however, that best practice guidelines for community archaeology include the following. Number one is honesty; the archaeologist should always be as honest as possible with the people they are working with, which includes admitting to the limitations of their own knowledge. Community archaeology should be as much about receiving information as giving it. Number two, the archaeologist should think beyond the current project. Engaging in education opportunities with the community or communities involved in a project may not always directly affect the current project. It is important that archaeologists recognize the long term benefits to archaeology as a discipline and/or to the communities involved, beyond the current project. Number three, the benefits of community archaeology should be reciprocal. Archaeologists engaging in community archaeology should always be thinking about ways to benefit the communities they work with. Archaeology has so much to teach communities about the past, shared heritage, culture and more. Community archaeology practitioners should always strive to bring the benefits of archaeological research to the communities they work with and in. In is also worth saying that archaeologists need to really listen to the communities that they work with. The community needs to be able to perceive the benefits of archaeology, not just be told that archaeology is a benefit.
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APPENDIX 1: PHOTOGRAPH INVENTORIES

The Peter L. Hegg Equality Colony Photographs, PH Coll 728 located at the University of Washington Libraries, Special Collections Division.

These photographs were taken by Peter Hegg.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Order Number</th>
<th>Negative Number</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brotherhood of the Co-operative Commonwealth carpentry shop, Edison, ca. 1898</td>
<td>SOC0027</td>
<td>UW11238</td>
<td>Located in Edison, WA not at the Colony.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brotherhood of the Co-operative Commonwealth national headquarters and printer, Edison, summer 1898</td>
<td>SOC0028</td>
<td>UW11241</td>
<td>Located in Edison, WA not at the Colony.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brotherhood of the Co-operative Commonwealth printer, Edison, ca. 1900</td>
<td>SOC0029</td>
<td>UW11240</td>
<td>Located in Edison, WA not at the Colony.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Colony hotel freedom interior, ca. 1898</td>
<td>SOC0093</td>
<td>UW2273</td>
<td>Located in Edison, WA not at the Colony.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Colony apartment house, ca. 1898</td>
<td>SOC0069</td>
<td>UW10540</td>
<td>This is likely not one of the apartment houses located at the Equality Colony but rather the ‘Hatchery,’ the building built on the Lewis property and used as transitional lodging by the Colonists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Colony apartment house, May 1898</td>
<td>SOC0070</td>
<td>UW11243</td>
<td>Same as photograph D-13-20011 located in the Skagit County Historical Museum located in LaConner, Washington. Caption reads, ‘No. 14 Equality Colony. Apartment House No. 3’. Hegg counted the hatchery building on the Lewis property as an apartment house. Keeping with the labels used by the Equality Colonists themselves, I refer to the building as Apartment house No. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Colony cabins, spring 1898</td>
<td>SOC0072</td>
<td>UW11237</td>
<td>On verso of image: ‘Built 1897. Photo early spring 1898.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Colony creamery interior, ca. 1898</td>
<td>SOC0074</td>
<td>UW11248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Colony dining hall and kitchen, 1898</td>
<td>SOC0075</td>
<td>UW11236</td>
<td>On verso of image: ‘Later 1898 dining hall extended north and this became waiting room.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Colony grounds, ca. 1900</td>
<td>SOC0077</td>
<td>UW11242</td>
<td>A lane or throughway of some kind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Colony grounds, spring 1898</td>
<td>SOC0078</td>
<td>UW11234</td>
<td>Verso of image: 1898 (about March). These bldgs. probably part of abandoned logging camp. Site of later mill (Fall 1898), Colony Creek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Colony kitchen, ca. 1898</td>
<td>SOC0079</td>
<td>UW11247</td>
<td>Same as photo D-13-23010 in the Skagit County Historical Museum collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Order Number</td>
<td>Negative Number</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Colony sawmill showing donkey engine and crew at work, ca. 1898</td>
<td>SOC0081</td>
<td>UW11275</td>
<td>Same as photo D-13-27 B009 in the Skagit County Historical Museum collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Colony showing interior of group meeting room, ca. 1900</td>
<td>SOC0084</td>
<td>UW11239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Colony showing lumber yard, ca. 1900</td>
<td>SOC0085</td>
<td>UW11244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Colony showing men working at the sawmill, ca. 1898</td>
<td>SOC0086</td>
<td>UW11235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Colony ca. 1898</td>
<td>SOC0088</td>
<td>UW2274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Colony grounds and buildings, April 1, 1900</td>
<td>SOC0089</td>
<td>UW11245</td>
<td>Caption on image: Equality Colony, Equality, Wash., April 1, 1900. General view of village looking southeast from garden. Hot-house, bakery and ironing-room obscured by other buildings. Shingle-house and saw-mill to left.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Colony grounds and buildings, ca. 1900</td>
<td>SOC0092</td>
<td>UW11246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Colony grounds and buildings, ca. 1900</td>
<td>SOC0091</td>
<td>UW10541</td>
<td>View north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Colony, May 1898</td>
<td>SOC0094</td>
<td>UW11255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Equality Colony photographs from the Social Issues Collection located at the University of Washington Libraries, Special Collections Division.

The photographer is unknown for these photographs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Order Number</th>
<th>Negative Number</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.k. Hanson, Equality Colony, 1903</td>
<td>SOC0001</td>
<td>UW11277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Colony members at Chuckanut, ca. 1900</td>
<td>SOC0080</td>
<td>UW11256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Colony school outing, ca. 1901</td>
<td>SOC0082</td>
<td>UW10116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Colony school, 1898</td>
<td>SOC0083</td>
<td>UW11249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Colony showing two men with crosscut saw, ca. 1898</td>
<td>SOC0087</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Bezemer, Equality Colony, 1906</td>
<td>SOC0245</td>
<td>UW11257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lulu Ault, Equality Colony, n.d.</td>
<td>SOC0255</td>
<td>UW11258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the Equality Colony at Warren, Maine, 1897</td>
<td>SOC0264</td>
<td>UW11280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.W. Giles, Equality Colony member, 1914</td>
<td>SOC0375</td>
<td>UW11271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.W. Giles, member of Equality Colony, ca. 1900</td>
<td>SOC0376</td>
<td>UW11276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Colony children, ca. 1900</td>
<td>SOC0073</td>
<td>UW11254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Colony, grounds and buildings, ca. 1898</td>
<td>SOC0090</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuckanut Dr., Skagit County, ca. 1900</td>
<td>SOC0051</td>
<td>UW11260</td>
<td>This photograph is not taken at the Equality Colony. This area must be associated with the Equality Colony in some way. Possibly a landing point for the sloop Progress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Equality Colony collection photographs located at the Skagit County Historical Museum.

The photographer is unknown for many of these photographs. The photos taken by Hegg are identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D-13-27 D026</td>
<td>Possibly abandoned logging camp buildings along the Alger logging railroad, ca. 1900</td>
<td>The character of these buildings suggests that they were not built by the Equality Colonists. The curve in the railroad indicates this is not part of the Great Northern track.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-13-27 H025</td>
<td>The saw and shingle mill, ca. 1900</td>
<td>In the photograph some of the logs are on a wheeled cart that appears to be on a track. This is likely the tram which ran near the saw and shingle mill in line with the bridge to the hillside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-13-27 C024</td>
<td>Logs in the foreground, men and an oxen team in the background, ca. 1900</td>
<td>These logs could be floating in water, possibly they are in the sawmill pond created by damming Colony Creek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-13-27 F023</td>
<td>Men and oxen logging in the wood, ca. 1900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-13-27 G022</td>
<td>Two men on spring boards with a saw, ca. 1900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-13-27 I021</td>
<td>Men and an oxen team with logs in the water, ca. 1900</td>
<td>The body of water is likely Samish Bay. The oxen are on a plank or corduroy road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-13-27 J020</td>
<td>Men and an oxen team in the woods, ca. 1900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-13-27 K018</td>
<td>Overview of the Equality Colony infrastructure and landscape, ca. 1900, view southeast.</td>
<td>The buildings in the foreground are related to the saw and shingle mill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-13-14017</td>
<td>Overview of the Equality Colony from the Great Northern railroad line, ca. 1901, view east</td>
<td>This is a Hegg photo but it is not included in the University of Washington collection. The barn is visible on the far left and the partially built New City is visible to the right. This photo can be ‘matched’ with D-13 SSH-3991016 at the barn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-13 SSH-3991016</td>
<td>The Equality Colony mill buildings from the lane, ca. 1901, view north/northeast.</td>
<td>This is a Hegg photo but it is not included in the University of Washington collection. The barn is visible on the far right. This photo can be ‘matched’ with photo D-13-14017 at the barn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-13-36 A015</td>
<td>New arrivals to the Equality Colony walking the five miles from Belfast on the Great Northern railroad line, July 1900.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-13-39 B014</td>
<td>Herz family in front of their log cabin home.</td>
<td>Likely one of the three cabins built in the winter of 1898/1899.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-13-20011</td>
<td>Apartment House No. 2, partially finished.</td>
<td>Same as photograph SOC0070, UW11243 in the Peter L. Hegg Equality Colony Photographs, PH Coll 728 located at the University of Washington Libraries, Special Collections Division. Caption reads, ‘No. 14 Equality Colony. Apartment House No. 3’. Hegg counted the hatchery building on the Lewis property as an apartment house. Keeping with the labels used by the Equality Colonists themselves I refer to the building as Apartment house No. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-13-27 B009</td>
<td>Equality Colony sawmill showing donkey engine and crew at work, ca. 1898</td>
<td>Same as photograph SOC0081, UW11275 in the Peter L. Hegg Equality Colony Photographs, PH Coll 728 located at the University of Washington Libraries, Special Collections Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-13-23010</td>
<td>Equality Colony kitchen, ca. 1898</td>
<td>Same as photograph SOC0079, UW11247 in the Peter L. Hegg Equality Colony Photographs, PH Coll 728 located at the University of Washington Libraries, Special Collections Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-13-35 B013</td>
<td>Equality Colony kitchen staff</td>
<td>These women are holding different tools for their work in the kitchen. The building behind them is likely Apartment House No. 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-13-27 A</td>
<td>Loggers in the woods, ca. 1900.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-13-30B</td>
<td>Buildings on the hillside (possible post-Colony).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-13-38B</td>
<td>Apartment building showing fire escapes and windows well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Photographs in the Fredrick Smith Papers located at the Center for Pacific Northwest Studies, Western Washington University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folder</th>
<th>Total photographs</th>
<th>Number of repeats from other collections</th>
<th>Number of non-Equality Colony photographs</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/3 Buildings circa 1900-1910 undated</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4 Freeland Colony photographs on Whidbey Island. 1 photograph from Edison. 2 photographs could not be positively identified as Equality Colony photographs.</td>
<td>Two photographs showing Equality Colony buildings post-Equality Colony are potentially interesting. Very few labels on photographs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4 Landscapes 1900, 1969 undated</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 photographs from the Deception Pass area. 7 photographs could not be positively identified as Equality Colony photographs. They could be photos from times Fredrick Smith revisited the Equality Colony property but it is not clear.</td>
<td>With more research some of the photographs of landscapes could be revealed to be from the Equality Colony land and could be of interest. Very few labels on photographs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/5 People circa 1898-1900 undated</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21 6 are versions of photographs found in other collections</td>
<td>1 photograph of Mother Jones in Seattle. 7 photographs from Edison. 3 Freeland Colony photographs on Whidbey Island.</td>
<td>Several photographs of the portable sawmill used in 1898. Very few labels on photographs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/6 People circa 1900, 1908, 1941, 1969</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Most of the photographs could not be confirmed as Equality Colony photographs.</td>
<td>These photographs seem to be family photos. Some are labeled with Equality Colony names but many are not. Very few of these photographs would be useful for an archaeological project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/7 Negatives circa 1900-1906, 1970</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Not gone through for this project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Welcome, my name is Julia Rowland and I am a graduate student at Western Washington University. Thank you all for being here tonight.

Tonight we are going to talk about my thesis work at WWU, archaeology in our community, some Equality Colony history and then we will circle back around and talk about my thesis project again.

I am going to talk for around 45 minutes after which I will take questions from you. I have put paper and pens around the room for your use. If a question or comment comes up for you please jot it down and share it with me after the talk.
My thesis project is an archaeological exploration of the Equality Colony, a socialist utopian community that existed right here in Blanchard from 1897 to 1907.

No archaeology has ever been done at the historic Equality Colony and none is planned now. What I am doing is first, creating an archaeological research design for the Equality Colony. This means I am answering the questions preliminary to an archaeological survey. Where should we look? Where are we likely to find material remains of the Equality Colony? Where were they doing stuff that is likely to have left evidence behind? What kinds of material evidence do we expect to find from the Equality Colony based on the historical records? What kind of stuff might we be surprised to find? What kinds of material objects would we not expect them to have? What are the questions that we might be able to answer archaeologically? Are there gaps in the historical records? Are there conflicting records? In what ways can we enrich this history with the archaeological record?

As I said not archaeological survey is currently planned for the Equality Colony. The second part of my project is to engage my local community. I say my local community because I was born and raised in the Skagit Valley and I continue to live and work here. However, I recognize that within the Skagit Valley community there are communities of which I am not necessarily a part, for instance the Blanchard Community. In engaging you, the community, I would like to know is this a project you are interested in pursuing? Is the Equality Colony history interesting to you? Do you think that the archaeology of this place is potentially interesting and worthwhile? As we explore this I want to have many meaningful conversations about heritage, preservation, history
and archaeology. Not as abstract ideas but what they mean to us in this community and what we want them to mean and how we want them to work for us.

- So getting started, the first thing I am going to do is ask you to close your eye and let a picture form in your head of what you first think of when I say archaeology. I am going to guess that for a lot of us that picture is going to look something like this:

- In my experience this is pretty common. When people think of archaeology they think of exotic peoples, faraway lands, and ancient dates. We are not wrong when we think this. Archaeology is these things. Archaeology is ancient projectile points. Archaeology is Machu Picchu. Archaeology is temples in Egypt. Whether Indiana Jones is doing archaeology is a debate for another time but somehow, this picture seems worth including.

- So archaeology is all of these things but archaeology is also a lot more. Archaeology is happening all over the world including right here. Archaeologists are interested in studying the material culture, the physical stuff that people leave behind, of all people in all time periods. In the 1970s there was even a project in Tucson Arizona where archaeologists studied modern landfills.

- I work full time as an archaeologist right here in Western Washington in Island, Snohomish, Skagit, Whatcom, King, and Mason counties. I, in fact, have never worked outside of Western Washington. The work I do looks a little more like this:
I like to think it is still pretty glamorous.
I work for a small cultural resource company that is based in Mount Vernon. The company employs around four archaeologists full time and several more part time. My company is not the only company in the area either, there are plenty more. We are working right here in your neighborhoods. We could literally do archaeology in your backyard. People have been living in Western Washington for at least 10,000 years and in that time they have been living in the same areas where we like to live now and leaving behind plenty of stuff for us to find.
- We are not just looking your neighborhoods, we are finding stuff too.
- According to the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation only 1% of Skagit County has been surveyed by an archaeologist and in that 1% over 400 sites have been recorded. Over 400! Think of the potential in Skagit County alone. There could be over 40,000 sites just in Skagit County.
- This slide shows examples of the types of things that we are recording. One thing that you will notice is that not all of these things are ancient. As I said before archaeologists are interested in all time periods. To potentially qualify for state and federal protection an object only needs to be 50 years old. This does not mean that every 50 year old object is protected but some are and archaeologists are interested in them.
Typically we divide archaeology into two categories, prehistoric and historic. Prehistoric or Pre-contact archaeology meaning archaeology of cultures that did not have written records. In the United States this is the archaeology of cultures pre-Euroamerican contact. Historic archaeology meaning the archaeology of cultures with written records. In the United States this is usually the archaeology of cultures post-Euroamerican contact. This can be a very blurry line but in Washington State prehistoric archaeology is usually pre-1800s and historic archaeology post-1800s.

I think that it is intuitively easy to understand why we do prehistoric archaeology. They didn’t leave us written records so if we want to know about them we have no choice but to look at the stuff they left behind. Why we do historical archaeology I think can be a little harder to understand right off. So I am going to share with you my favorite reasons we do historical archaeology. There are lots of others but I think these two are really powerful.

The first is flawed written records. This not to say all written records are fabricated or false. It is more that as human beings we cannot help but write things from our own perspective. It colors the way we see things and how we records them. We can’t help it. If any of you are journal keepers you know what I am talking about. We know that plenty of things don’t get written down because they seem obvious and common place and boring at the time. We also know that people omit things that are embarrassing and/or could get them into trouble. We also know that some written records are fabricated purposefully for various reasons. Through archaeology we can take a deeper look at the things recorded in the written record and gain a fuller understanding. The written record is not really at odds with archaeology the two can work together to create a fuller story of the past.
• The second reason which ties heavily to the first is that we know that in the past, and arguably today, the written record was being recorded by a very select group of individuals; mostly Euroamerican, mostly male, mostly mid to upper socioeconomic class, and mostly middle aged. Like I said before they wrote the historical record from their own point of view, they couldn’t help it. Archaeology can give voice to the women, children, minority groups, and the politically and economically disadvantaged through the things they leave behind. It gives them a chance to tell their part of the tale and I think that is well worth doing.

### Survey types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of survey</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archival research</td>
<td>A search of published and unpublished literature on the area including looking at previously recorded sites in and near the project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian survey</td>
<td>A systematic walk around the project area to look for surface features and/or artifacts and indicators of subsurface features and/or artifacts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Subsurface testing| This can include:  
- Shovel testing: systematically digging holes typically 50 cm wide by 1 meter deep. Material from the hole is screened through mesh.  
- Units: laying out squares typically 1 meter by 1 meter and excavating by layer. |
| Monitoring        | An archaeologist is onsite during the project observing project activities.                                                                   |

• Now that we have an idea about what archaeology is and why we do it. Let’s talk about how we do it. These are some common survey types. They are often all done in a single project and build on each other.

• Archival research is a search of published and unpublished documents on the project area including looking at previously recorded archaeological sites. This is done first. Basically if I am going to go out in the field to look for something I don’t want to go blind. I want to have all the information available to me about the area.

• Once I have all the available information and actually go in the field. The first thing I’ll want to do is a pedestrian survey. A pedestrian survey is a systematic walk around the project area to look for features and artifacts that are visible on the surface and/or indicators of subsurface features and artifacts. So during a pedestrian survey I might record an old homestead foundation or a stone tool scatter that is on the ground’s surface. I will also be on the lookout for any landscape features that don’t look natural, any unusual humps or depressions. These might indicate good areas for subsurface testing.
• This is an example of a feature that was recorded through pedestrian survey. It is a loading tree. These were commonly used during logging to help load logs onto railcars or trucks. This one was recorded off of Highway 2 near Skykomish.
Subsurface testing can include shovel tests and excavation units. Shovels tests are, as the name implies, dug with shovels. They are typically 50 cms wide and a meter deep. The dirt removed from the hole is screened through mesh to give us a second chance to identify small artifacts. Shovel tests are typically dug on a grid system intended to systematically test an area. Excavation units are typically 1 meter by 1 meter square and one meter deep. These are typically laid out in areas where archaeological deposits are known to occur. They are dug with trowels rather than shovels. They slower pace means that the archaeologist can record a lot more detail about the deposit. The material removed from the unit is still often screened. In the slide we see an example of a shovel test to the left. On the top right we see an archaeologist measuring and recording a shovel test. The screen visible in the foreground is used to screen the material removed from the hole. Bottom right we see me excavating in what is actually two adjoined units. You can see I am working with a trowel removing material one dustpan at a time. Something else to note is that the unit wall profile visible in this picture is very important in archaeology. We learn a lot from looking at how the dirt and other sediments were laid down.
Lastly, we have monitoring. Monitoring is typically done when a planned project is potentially going to disturb archaeological materials. In that case we will post an archaeologist on site to record the information and potentially to collect any artifacts that maybe uncovered. It really depends on the project. Sometimes in archaeology the archaeologist is trying to preserve the information from the site but not the site itself. Archaeology is not interested in stopping progress but we are interested in seeing that history and the archaeological record are considered while progress marches on.

In the photograph we have an archaeologist screening material while a track hoe digs.
Now that we have some understanding of what local archaeology is we can talk more specifically about this project.

Archaeologists have shown increasing interest in the archaeology of planned communities like the Equality Colony in the last two decades. In fact in 2006 the Journal for Historical Archaeology, the publication for the largest professional organization for historical archaeologists in the U.S., dedicated a whole volume to the archaeology of utopian communities.

In archaeology we typically define community two ways, natural and imagined. Natural communities are defined spatially. People living in close proximity to each other share life experiences through their contact and therefore can be understood as a community. Natural communities are households, villages, a neighborhood, a workplace. Imagined communities are understood cognitively rather than spatially. The imagined community is comprised of people whom a person cognitively identifies with. Imagined communities are political parties, ethnic groups, extended families, co-workers and social groups. Both natural and imagined communities allow archaeologists to examine kinship, socioeconomic systems, hierarchal structure, and the development of subsistence activities.

Utopian communities are interesting because they are both natural and imagined communities. Members identify with each other both because of their choice to live spatially close and because of their shared values.

So let’s look at a couple of examples of how archaeology has contributed to the study of utopian communities. Two archaeologists, Preucel and Pendery, examine the architecture of the East Coast utopian settlement, Brook Farm. They looked at how ideology was inscribed in the landscape and architecture of Brook Farm in order to reinforce group values. So the people of
Brook Farm were purposefully choosing their material culture because of their values and then that material culture was in turn reinforcing those values.

- Another example is Van Wormer and Gross’ examination of the refuse of the Theosophical Society, a utopian settlement in San Diego, California. Van Wormer and Gross compared the Theosophical Society assemblage to other contemporary non-utopian community assemblages. They found that the medical and dietary choices of the Theosophical Society were significantly different from that of the other non-utopian communities. They attribute this to the Theosophical group’s desire to reinforce their ‘otherness’ from the dominant culture through their consumer behavior. They wanted to be different and they selected things that proved they were.

- Lastly we have Van Bueren’s discussion on the Los Angeles utopian settlement, the Llano del Rio Cooperative. Van Bueren compares the historical record and the archaeological record of Llano del Rio. In the historical record the group professes a strong egalitarian ideal and a desire to express their ideology with a circular plan for their colony. The archaeological record indicated that the buildings were primarily on a grid pattern similar to that utilized by the dominant culture. Van Bueren postulates that the members desired the circular pattern but were more familiar with the grid pattern so they were using the grid pattern to establish the colony with the idea that they would move toward their idealized circular pattern later. This illustrates their negotiation of their changing ideology.

- It is worth noting that it is not the goal of the archaeology of utopian settlements to point out the fallacies of idealized living. The goal of this study is to deepen the understanding of human communities and of the way of life of those people who were bold enough to live these very human experiments.
Enough archaeology for now. Let’s switch gears and discuss the history of the Equality Colony for a bit.

The Equality Colony was started by a East Coast group known as the Brotherhood of the Cooperative Commonwealth (BCC). They were an American socialist group formed by Norman Wallace Lermond. On the slide is a photograph of Lermond at his home in Maine. The BCC was a national organization with over 1,000 members enrolled across the U.S. Like most American socialists at the time, they did not want a revolution but wanted instead to lead by example. They thought if they created an example of perfect living through socialism then of course people would join up.
They chose Washington for their first colony for many reasons. Euroamerican viewed Washington as a sparsely populated frontier state. Washington has not yet achieved statehood, that happened in 1898, so it was perceived as a blank slate filled with readily available resources. Plus Washington had a populist governor, John R. Rogers, who supported the BCC and their project.

The BCC sent member Ed Pelton, an experienced woodsman, to Washington to scout a spot for their first Colony. Pelton met Carey Lewis, a socialist, in Edison. Lewis has a site in mind for the Colony which Pelton fell in love with and purchased for the BCC. Lewis and his wife joined the BCC and donated their land to the cause.

Pelton originally purchased 300 acres but later added additional acreage to the south and west. That land combined with the land donated by joining members brought the Equality Colony to over 600 acres.

The first wave of colonists arrived in 1897. They came from all over the U.S. Missouri, Massachusetts, California, Louisiana, Alabama and many more. The Colony attracted established Americans and recent immigrants to the country alike. People with all manner of skills came; carpenters, fishermen, printers, farmers and more.

The photograph on this slide is the very first building constructed by the Colonist at the Equality Colony. It was the community Kitchen and dinning room. They called it Fort Bellamy because it would fortify them against poverty and hunger and after a American socialist author who greatly influenced their work.
The first year was one of great excitement at the Colony. One Colonist was heard remarking, ‘the time for talk has passed, Socialism is now a live word.’

Indeed the Equality Colonists were very busy in that first year. They cleared over a hundred acres of land, purchased livestock, constructed buildings and rerouted the creek that flowed through their property. They had their own mill, pictured on the slide.

At its peak, the Equality Colony was home to over 300 people at one time. Thousands of people visited or stayed over the course of the 10 years it existed.
The guiding principal of the Equality Colony was socialism. Its members were all socialist who shared the ideals of cooperation and equality. They believed that these attributes would allow them to live a better life in their utopia.

Communitarianism was not necessarily an ideal of the Colonists but it was necessary in the first couple of years. The Colonists had planned for each family to have their own house but a lack of resources and an abundance of members lead them to build apartment houses first to house as many people as possible. Even with the community style housing some people still had to stay in tents.

Once a week all the Colonists gathered to form the General Assembly, their main governing body. Everyone over 18 was given a vote, men and women. Keep in mind that women did not get the vote in Washington State until 1910 and nationally not until 1920. Eighteen year olds did not get the vote in the U.S. until 1971. All decisions were made by the General Assembly.

The Equality Colony sustained themselves through industries such as a saw and shingle mill, a cereal coffee mill, a fishing boat and over 100 cultivated acres of land. They were able to produce much of what they needed and extras were available for sale to non-members.

Labor was organized into departments. Individuals could choose what department to join. Men were expected to work eight hours a day and women six. They were paid the same rate. The eight hour work day was basically unheard of in Washington State at this time. A 10, 11 or 12 hour work day was much more common. In truth many Equality Colonists volunteered hours outside of their required eight because there was so much work to be done.
• It wasn’t all work though. Every Saturday night a social event was held at the Equality Colony and members and non-members alike gathered for dances, lectures, and debates. The Equality Colonists firmly believed that education and recreation were important throughout life.

The Brotherhood board members vs. the Equality Colony members (1898)
Lack of strong leadership and a clear vision (Pelton’s death in 1901)
Free riders
Alexander Horr and anarchism (1905)
Barn arson (1906)

• The Equality Colony only lasted 10 years so obviously it wasn’t all good. Why did the Colony fail?
• There is no right answer. We can only speculate about what lead to its demise.
• One possible factor is that the BCC and the Equality Colony members did not see eye to eye. With the exception of Pelton, the BCC board of directors never lived at the Equality Colony. Lermond ran the BCC from Maine for a time and when he did come to Washington State he did not move to the Colony but lived in Edison in a hotel, pictured on the slide. The BCC wanted to establish more colonies but the Equality Colonists wanted to get their colony into good shape first. The BCC handled all the money and spent a significant amount on their own room and board. The Equality Colonists grew more and more resentful. Before the first year was over the Equality Colony had separated their finances from the BCC.
• Historians have suggested that the death of Edward Pelton in 1901 left the Equality Colony without leadership and without clear direction. Although the Colonists operated as equals they still needed visionaries to lead the way.
• Free-riders. Fredrick Smith, a historian who wrote the most in depth history of the Equality Colony that exists, suggested that many people came to the Equality Colony not because they were socialists who believed in the principals but because they were down on their luck or because they were bachelors who liked the idea of someone doing their laundry. These free-riders would come to the Colony eat their fill, stock up at the Colony store and leave again without
having given back to the Colony infrastructure. These people surely taxed the Colony reserves and the spirit of the members.

- By 1905 the Equality Colony was flagging. Alexander Horr was invited out as a way of reviving the Colony. What the Colonists did not know was he was not a socialist at all but rather an anarchist with a very different vision for the Equality Colony that the one that the Colonists held. Some of the Colonists were attracted to Horr’s message and some were not. The Equality Colony members began to splinter into factions at odds with each other.

- In 1906 the barn burned in a suspected arson. Buildings, hay, cattle and other livestock were lost. This was the last straw. The remaining members petitioned the court for a receiver and on June 1, 1907 the bulk of the property was sold to George Peth. Some Equality members purchased smaller pieces of the land.

The ideas of the Equality Colony did not end with the Colony, both literally and symbolically.

- Literally, a group of Equality Colonists left the land in Skagit County and relocated to Whidbey Island where they established another socialist utopian settlement, the Freeland Colony.
- Some members did not leave the area and their descendents may still live in the area.
- The BCC did not just call members to move to the Equality Colony, they also told them to populate Washington State to be ready for the time when Washington would socialize. There is no way to know how many people move to Washington because of this.
• A lot of their ideas that were radical at the time are widely accepted today – the eight hour work day, women’s equality and voting rights for 18 year-old for example.

• So to bring it back around to this project. The Equality Colony’s main holdings were located about five minutes east of here on both sides of Colony Road.
• In this map I have traced the Skagit County parcels that were once part of the Equality Colony land. The red dashed square in the middle is the high activity area for the Colony where most of the buildings and infrastructure were located.
In 1899 an Equality Colonist drew a map of the Equality Colony buildings and infrastructure. I traced this map and overlaid it on a modern topographic map using the position of the hillside and Colony Creek. So that we can begin to see where the Equality Colony buildings would have been located on today’s landscape.
I’d like to leave you with two final thoughts.

The first is from an archaeologist Jodie O’Gorman and I think it really sums up why we should study communities, in particular utopian communities. She said, “The evolution of community is an integral part of humankind’s past, present, and future. Our behavior, place in the world, and mortality are shaped by, and at the same time shape, our communities and our community interactions.” Our communities are important. They are part of who we are and they are worth examining.

The second is from a local community member, Anna Ferdinand, who writes, “Utopia is buried in the ground, but preserved in the layer of clay beneath our feet, always ready to sprout up anew.” This quote to me is so perfect for archaeology. Yes, it is gone from the surface but in the ground we can find and explore and understand it anew. Also our past has a way of circling back around. Its influence is not always acknowledged but it is there.
Many thanks and much gratitude to Equinox Research and Consulting International (ERCI), The University of Washington Special Collections and The Skagit Valley Historical Society for the use of their photographs.

I am now happy to take questions and hear from you.
APPENDIX 3: HANDOUTS FROM THE DECEMBER 17, 2013, LANDOWNER MEETING

Handout one includes examples of archaeological site types and how they relate to this project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Survey</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Archival Research | • A search of published and unpublished literature on the area including looking at previously recorded sites in and near the project area.  
• Includes looking at maps, photographs, and descriptions.  
• Consider land use through time. | This is the work I am doing right now. |
| Pedestrian Survey | • A systematic walk around the project area to look for surface features and/or artifacts and indicators of subsurface features and/or artifacts.  
• Can include vegetation scrapes – just removing the sod layer in one area approximately 18 inches long by 10 inches wide.  
• Pedestrian survey is sometimes done as a way to determine where to subsurface test. | This is the type of survey I would like to do this winter. |
| Subsurface testing | • Shovel testing: systematically digging holes (typically 50 cms wide by 1 meter deep) either in a grid pattern or in areas likely to have material. Material is screened through mesh.  
• Excavation units: laying out squares (typically 1 meter by 1 meter) and excavating with trowels by layer. Often done in area where the site is intact (undisturbed since being deposited) or in areas with lots of material.  
• Shovel testing is sometimes done as a way to determine where excavation units would be most effective.  
• All subsurface testing is recorded and backfilled. | This is the type of survey that a WWU field school would involve. |
| Monitoring | • Most often done when a development project is already planned for an area.  
• An archaeologist is present during ground disturbing activities.  
• Archaeologist can record information and collect artifacts and/or samples. | This is not part of this work. |
Handout two shows the modern Skagit County parcels once part of the historic Equality Colony.
Handout three is the 1899 Equality Colony plat map redrawn to make it more legible.
Handout four shows the 1899 plat map over a modern topographic map.
Handout five shows the 1899 plat map over a modern Skagit County Assessor’s map. *Please note that the placement of the plat map on this Skagit County Assessor’s map was further refined by the author after the December landowner meeting. I believe that the version of this image included in the map analysis in Chapter Seven is likely more accurate than this one.*
Handout six shows the 1899 plat map over a modern Skagit County Assessor aerial photograph. *Please note that the placement of the plat map on this Skagit County Assessor’s map was further refined by the author after the December landowner meeting. I believe that the version of this image included in the map analysis in Chapter Seven is likely more accurate than this one.
APPENDIX 4: THE LANDOWNER QUESTIONNAIRE PACKET

The cover letter.

Greetings!
As you probably recall from my earlier post cards, my name is Julia Rowland. I am a local archaeologist and WWU graduate student. I have been collecting information about the historic Equality Colony and the current community's interest in the Equality Colony. I have an enclosed a brief survey, an addressed stamped envelope and a consent form. If you could please take a moment to:
1. fill out the survey,
2. sign the consent form (you will see there are two copies, one is for you to keep),
3. put the signed consent form and the survey into the envelope and drop it in to the mail.

This would help me tremendously. An important part of my project is to develop an understanding of how the community feels about the Equality Colony history, local archaeology, and archaeological survey. Your name will not be attached to the survey information that you provide and I will not contact you to talk about the survey. I will use the information you provide in my thesis but, again, it will be anonymous. Please be very honest on the survey. The more honest you are the more helpful it will be for me.

Please contact me with any questions or comments.
Thank you all so much for your patience and contributions to this project,
Julia Rowland
360-630-9003
Julia.rowland@hotmail.com
The consent form that the participant returned to the researcher.

Western Washington University
Consent to Take Part in Research Study
Project: archaeological investigation for the Equality Colony

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Julia M. Rowland, graduate student, Department of Anthropology at Western Washington University. The purpose of this study is to assess the feasibility of archaeological survey on the former Equality Colony land. You have been selected as a possible participant in this study because of your association with the former Equality Colony and/or with the Skagit Valley.

If you decide to participate, you understand the following things. You will be asked questions about your knowledge of and feelings toward Washington State archaeology and/or the former Equality Colony in Skagit County, Washington. You may be asked if you would be willing to allow archaeological survey on your land. If there are any questions that you cannot answer or that you do not feel comfortable answering, please indicate this and I will move on to the next question.

Your participation is voluntary. Your decision whether to participate will not affect your relationship with Western Washington University. If you decide to participate, you’re free to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time without penalty.

Your participation will remain anonymous. Your name will not be collected and the survey responses will be maintained in a secure file cabinet or on a password protected computer. The consents will be stored in a separate location.

The development of an archaeological survey project on the former Equality Colony land has the potential to flesh out the narrative of one turn of the century utopian community in Washington State and to portray an under told story from Skagit County history. By involving community members in the process of assessing the feasibility of survey I hope to gain an understanding of their interests and desires around this project.

If you have any questions regarding the project procedures, feel free to contact Julia Rowland, (360) 630-9003, julia.rowland@hotmail.com, or Sarah Campbell, (360) 650-4793 ext. 4793, campbsk@www.edu, Department of Anthropology, Western Washington University, Bellingham, Washington, WA, 98225. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research subject, or you if you should suffer any research-related adverse effects, contact Janai Symons, (360)650-3082, in the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA, 98225. You have been offered a copy of this form to keep.

Your signature indicates that you have read and understand the information provided above, that you willingly agree to participate, that you may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty, that you have received a copy of this form, and that you are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies.

I have read the above description and understand the expectations for my participation.
I am at least 18 years old.

Participant's Signature ____________________________ Date __________

Participant's PRINTED NAME ____________________________ Researcher’s copy __________
The consent form for the participant to keep.

Western Washington University
Consent to Take Part in Research Study

Project: archaeological investigation for the Equality Colony

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Julia M. Rowland, graduate student, Department of Anthropology at Western Washington University. The purpose of this study is to assess the feasibility of archaeological survey on the former Equality Colony land. You have been selected as a possible participant in this study because of your association with the former Equality Colony and/or with the Skagit Valley.

If you decide to participate, you understand the following things. You will be asked questions about your knowledge of and feelings toward Washington State archaeology and/or the former Equality Colony in Skagit County, Washington. You may be asked if you would be willing to allow archaeological survey on your land. If there are any questions that you cannot answer or that you do not feel comfortable answering, please indicate this and I will move on to the next question.

Your participation is voluntary. Your decision whether to participate will not affect your relationship with Western Washington University. If you decide to participate, you’re free to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time without penalty.

Your participation will remain anonymous. Your name will not be collected and the survey responses will be maintained in a secure file cabinet or on a password protected computer. The consents will be stored in a separate location.

The development of an archaeological survey project on the former Equality Colony land has the potential to flesh out the narrative of one turn of the century utopian community in Washington State and to portray an under told story from Skagit County history. By involving community members in the process of assessing the feasibility of survey I hope to gain an understanding of their interests and desires around this project.

If you have any questions regarding the project procedures, feel free to contact Julia Rowland, (360) 630-9003, julia.rowland@hotmail.com; or Sarah Campbell, (360) 650-4793 ext. 4793, campbsk@wwu.edu, Department of Anthropology, Western Washington University, Bellingham, Washington, WA, 98225. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research subject, or you if you should suffer any research-related adverse effects, contact Janai Symons, (360)650-3082, in the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA, 98225. You have been offered a copy of this form to keep.

Your signature indicates that you have read and understand the information provided above, that you willingly agree to participate, that you may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty, that you have received a copy of this form, and that you are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies.

I have read the above description and understand the expectations for my participation. I am at least 18 years old.

Participant’s Signature __________________________ Date ____________

Participant's PRINTED NAME __________________________

Participant’s copy
Survey

1. Did you attend the November 17th talk Julia Rowland gave at the Blanchard Community Club?
   a) Yes
   b) No
   c) Don't know

2. Why or why not?
   a) I was busy
   b) I am not interested
   c) I like local history
   d) I was curious
   e) Because you asked me to
   f) Other ____________________________

3. Would you attend future community talks concerning the history of the Equality Colony?
   a) Yes
   b) No
   c) Maybe

4. Are you interested in having an archaeological survey on your property?
   a) Yes
   b) No
   c) Maybe

5. Why or why not?
   a) I am concerned about property rights and how archaeology might affect mine
   b) I am not interested in archaeology at all
   c) I would like to know more about the Equality Colony
   d) I am curious what might be in the dirt in my yard
   e) I find Julia Rowland off putting and that makes me hesitant to participate
   f) Other ____________________________

6. What if anything interests you about this project?
   a) I am curious about archaeology
   b) I love local history
   c) I think the Equality Colony history is fascinating
   d) Nothing interests me
   e) Other ____________________________

7. How do you feel about archaeology as it concerns this community?
   a) I think it has potential to contribute to the history of the community
   b) I find archaeology interesting but I am not sure how it fits into this community
   c) I don't think archaeology has anything to offer this community
   d) I think archaeology could potentially be harmful to this community
   e) Other ____________________________
APPENDIX 5: POWER POINT SLIDES AND SCRIPT FROM THE FEBRUARY 20, 2014, TALK AT LUCILLE UMBARGER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

ROCKS, SHOVELS AND UTOPIAS WORKING AS AN ARCHAEOLOGIST

Julia Rowland
WHO AM I? WHAT ARE WE DOING?

- I am ...
- Julia Rowland
- LU, BEHS, SCC and WWU graduate
- Grad student at WWU
- Local archaeologist
- We are here to...
- Talk about archaeology
- Local archaeology in particular

Slide 2
- Introduce myself and the topic
Slide 3 and 4

- Archaeology may not be what you think
- Introduction to the idea of ‘local’ archaeology
Slide 3 and 4

- Archaeology may not be what you think
- Introduction to the idea of ‘local’ archaeology
- Archaeology is not just foreign lands
- I do archaeology right here in Western Washington; I could literally do it in your backyard
Slide 5
- Archaeology is not just ancient dates
- What is archaeology in general?
- Cover the differences between historical and pre-contact
- Why do we do historical?
### WHAT DO WE DO? SURVEY TYPES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of survey</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archival research</td>
<td>A search of published and unpublished literature on the area including looking at previously recorded sites in and near the project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian survey</td>
<td>A systematic walk around the project area to look for surface features and/or artifacts and indicators of subsurface features and/or artifacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsurface testing</td>
<td>This can include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Shovel testing: systematically digging holes typically 50 cms wide by 1 meter deep. Material from the hole is screened through mesh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Units: laying out squares typically 1 meter by 1 meter and excavating by layer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>An archaeologist is onsite during the project observing project activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- What does an archaeologist do?
- Survey types
Slide 9 to Slide 16

- Interactive section
- First slide is an opportunity for the students to guess what it is a photo of – the second slide in each pair is a short explanation of the object
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- Interactive section
- First slide is an opportunity for the students to guess what it is a photo of – the second slide in each pair is a short explanation of the object
Slide 9 to Slide 16

- Interactive section
- First slide is an opportunity for the students to guess what it is a photo of – the second slide in each pair is a short explanation of the object

Spart tree: A tall tree that is trimmed of all branches, topped, then rigged with guy lines and blocks, and used to yard logs, moving them from where they were felled to a landing where they can be loaded for shipment to the mill.

Loading tree: Short (~50 feet) spart type tree used to provide a pulley system to load trees, equipment or other resources on to rail cars, or trucks.
Slide 9 to Slide 16
- Interactive section
- First slide is an opportunity for the students to guess what it is a photo of – the second slide in each pair is a short explanation of the object
WHAT CAN WE LEARN FROM A BUNCH OF OLD BOTTLES?

- Can help us date a site. Bottles are often highly diagnostic.
- Can give us clues about the kinds of activities being carried out in this area. Was this a home? A factory? A picnic area?
- Can tell us about medicinal and food practices of that time.
- Consumer behavior – What kinds of products did different people choose to purchase? What does this say about their ideology – what was important to them? Does their religion or other affiliations influence this?

The Odoco Ice brand was patented in 1938. Milk glass was popular for use for cosmetics and ointments from the early 1930s to the mid-20th century. Odoco patented the term B.C.

http://raughysdaily.com/tag/odoro/
Slide 9 to Slide 16
- Interactive section
- First slide is an opportunity for the students to guess what it is a photo of – the second slide in each pair is a short explanation of the object
Coastal Salish women drying shellfish in a traditional manner.

- Fish and other resources from the sea were central to the lifeways of the peoples of the Northwest Coast.
- Think about times you have eaten shell fish out of the shell – there is a lot of waste.
- Shells change the soil p.h. which changes preservation.

Slide 9 to Slide 16
- Interactive section
- First slide is an opportunity for the students to guess what it is a photo of – the second slide in each pair is a short explanation of the object.
Slide 9 to Slide 16

- Interactive section
- First slide is an opportunity for the students to guess what it is a photo of – the second slide in each pair is a short explanation of the object
Slide 9 to Slide 16

- Interactive section
- First slide is an opportunity for the students to guess what it is a photo of – the second slide in each pair is a short explanation of the object
Slide 17

- More examples of things we find
I didn’t start off wanting to be an archaeologist; I didn’t know it was an option.
I was in the right place but once I had my foot in the door I worked hard to make myself indispensable.
Through CRM there are actually quite a few job prospects in archaeology:
- Travel is a consideration
- Rain, snow, sleet, hail
- Problem solvers, investigators
- Bureau of labor statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012 median pay (year)</th>
<th>$57,420.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entry-level education</td>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of jobs in 2012</td>
<td>7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job outlook 2012 to 2022</td>
<td>19% (faster than average)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ The U.S. National Forest Service offers opportunities for all ages to participate in archaeology and cultural resource projects through their [Request a Tour](#) program. ERCI also does job shadowing.

Slide 18
- Talks about how I got this job
- Also prospects in this line of work
MY THESIS WORK

- A project that I design, implement, and write up with the guidance of my advisor. Normally a M.A. will require either a thesis or some sort of internship.
- It Takes a Community: An Archaeological Investigation of the 1897 to 1907 Equality Colony, Skagit County, WA.
- Create an archaeological research design.
  - Where should we look?
  - What might we find? What would we be surprised to find?
  - What are the questions we might be able to answer archaeologically?
- Engage my local community in the project.
  - Is this a project that people are interested in?
  - Heritage, preservation, history and archaeology

Slide 19
- Outlines my thesis work
A brief discussion on the historic Equality Colony
The first year - socialism is a live word
* Cleared over a 100 acres. Buildings were erected and the creek rerouted
* Cooperation and equality are key, communalism is necessary
* Saw and single mill, cereal coffee, fishing boat, over 100 cultivated acres
* Social events

A brief discussion on the historic Equality Colony
Slide 20 to Slide 22

- A brief discussion on the historic Equality Colony
Descendants of the Colony (Nolan, Halladay, Herz, Giles, Hart, Ault, Barry, Joslyn)
Pioneers to surrounding areas
Some of their ideas like the eight-hour work day, women's equality, and voting rights for 18-year-olds are widely accepted today.
• A brief discussion on the historic Equality Colony
Slide 23

- Brings it back to my thesis
- What is archaeology contributing to this history?
SINCERE THANKS AND CREDIT FOR PHOTOGRAPHS

- Equinox Research and Consulting International (ERCI)
- The University of Washington Special Collections
- The Skagit Valley Historical Society
- Western Washington University

Slide 24
- Photo credits and questions