

# ARCHEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

## 2

### PREHISTORIC PERIOD

The prehistoric cultural sequence for Central Texas can be divided into three broad periods: Paleoindian, Archaic, and Late Prehistoric. The terms Neoarchaic (Prewitt 1981, 1985) and Post-Archaic (Johnson and Goode 1994) have been used at times in place of the term Late Prehistoric. Thorough overviews of these periods are provided by Black (1989:25–32), Collins (1995), and Hines (1993), the latter focusing more on the chronological sequence of the prehistoric cultural resources in the area surrounding Camp Stanley. A prehistoric cultural-historical framework incorporating more-discrete temporal and technological units has been delineated and defined by Prewitt (1981, 1985) (Figure 2). More recently, Johnson and Goode (1994) and Collins (1995) have presented revised cultural chronologies of the region and at the same time discontinued the use of the term “phase” to describe each cultural-historical unit. Johnson and Goode (1994) and Collins (1995) have opted for named intervals or patterns based on diagnostic projectile point styles and associated radiocarbon assays (e.g., Martindale-Uvalde interval) within each period or subperiod. More applicable to the Camp Stanley area is a series of local prehistoric periods for the upper Salado Creek drainage basin defined by Black and McGraw (1985:321–326) (see Figure 2). Although these sequences chronologically group and order archeological assemblages (primarily projectile point styles) and site components, a common criticism is that these temporal-stylistic units, intervals, or patterns do not specifically address cultural process such as the adaptive strategies utilized by certain groups in a particular territory at a certain period of time (Black 1989:35; Collins 1995:362; Ellis et al. 1995). Despite this criticism, the following summary of the three periods of Central Texas prehistory is based on Collins’s (1995) sequence, with appropriate references to the local periods of Black and McGraw (1985).

### Paleoindian Period

The Paleoindian period (11,500–8800 B.P.) represents the earliest known cultural manifestation in North America. Sites and isolated artifacts of this period are fairly common across Central Texas. The period is often described as having been characterized by small but highly mobile bands of foragers who were specialized hunters of Pleistocene megafauna. However, a more accurate view of Paleoindian lifeways probably includes the utilization of a much wider array of resources. Recent investigations at the Wilson-Leonard site (41WM235) support this view and have challenged the fundamental defining criteria of the Paleoindian period, that of artifacts in association with late Pleistocene megafauna (Masson and Collins 1995).

Environmental conditions during the Paleoindian period were quite different than today, presenting the early inhabitants with a much different array of resources. Nordt et al. (1994) view this period as a transition between cooler, moister late Pleistocene conditions and warmer, drier Holocene conditions. They estimate that warm-season, or  $C_4$ , grasses steadily increased in number throughout this period. Toomey et al. (1993) also see this time as a period of transition with summer month temperatures increasing rapidly, but still 2–3°C below modern values. Toomey et al. (1993) suggest that effective moisture decreased around 14,000 B.P. and then increased, peaking at ca. 10,500 B.P.

Collins (1995) divides the Paleoindian period into early and late subperiods. The early subperiod consists of two projectile point style intervals, Clovis (local period 1) and Folsom (local period 2). Clovis chipped stone artifact assemblages, including the diagnostic fluted lanceolate Clovis point, were produced by bifacial, flake, and prismatic-blade techniques on high quality and oftentimes exotic lithic materials (Collins 1990). Along with chipped stone artifacts, Clovis assemblages include engraved stones, bone and

Survey and Testing at Camp Stanley Storage Activity

YEARS B.P. A.D./B.C.	CENTRAL TEXAS ARCHEOLOGICAL PERIODS & PHASES (Prewitt 1981, 1985)	CENTRAL TEXAS ARCHEOLOGICAL ERAS, PERIODS & PROJECTILE POINT STYLE PATTERNS (Johnson & Goode 1994)	CENTRAL TEXAS ARCHEOLOGICAL PERIODS, SUBPERIODS, & PROJECTILE POINT STYLE INTERVALS (Collins 1995)	UPPER SALADO CREEK WATERSHED LOCAL PERIODS (Black & McGraw 1985)
0	HISTORIC		HISTORIC	
1000	NEO-ARCHAIC Toyah Austin	POST-ARCHAIC ERA Triangular Perdiz Scallorn Edwards	LATE PREHISTORIC Perdiz Scallorn-Edwards	11 10
2000	LATE ARCHAIC Driftwood Twin Sisters Uvalde	LATE ARCHAIC PERIOD II Darl, Figueroa Ensor, Frio Marcos Castroville Montell Marshall Pedernales Bulverde	LATE ARCHAIC Darl Ensor-Frio-Fairland Marcos-Montell-Castroville Lange-Marshall-Williams Pedernales-Kinney Bulverde	9 8
4000	MIDDLE ARCHAIC San Marcos Round Rock Marshall Ford Clear Fork			MIDDLE ARCHAIC PERIOD I Nolan, Travis La Jita Unnamed Styles Early Triangular Merrell Calf Creek/Bell (Martindale, Uvalde)
6000	EARLY ARCHAIC Oakalla Jarrell San Geronimo Circleville	EARLY ARCHAIC PERIOD Early Barbed Series Early Split-Stem Series (Hoxie)	MIDDLE ARCHAIC Nolan-Travis Taylor Bell-Andice-Calf Creek Martindale-Uvalde Early Split Stem Angostura	4 3
8000				PALEOINDIAN ERA
10000	PALEOINDIAN		EARLY PALEOINDIAN Folsom Clovis	2 1

Figure 2. Prehistoric cultural sequences of Prewitt (1985), Johnson and Goode, 1994, Collins (1995), and Black and McGraw (1985).

ivory points, stone bolas, and ochre (Collins 1995:381; Collins et al. 1992). Analyses of Clovis artifacts and site types suggest that Clovis peoples were well-adapted, generalized hunter-gatherers with the technology to hunt larger game but not solely rely on it. In contrast, Folsom tool kits, consisting of fluted Folsom points, thin unfluted (Midland) points, large thin bifaces, and end scrapers, are more indicative of specialized hunting, particularly of bison (Collins 1995:382).

Spanning the end of the early and initial late Paleoindian subperiods are several projectile point styles for which the temporal, technological, or cultural significance is unclear. Included are Plainview points (representing Black and McGraw's [1985:322] local period 3), a type name typically given any unfluted, lanceolate dart point. However, Collins (1995:382) has noted that these points do not parallel Plainview type-site points in thinness and flaking technology. Also problematic are the chronological position and cultural significance of Dalton and San Patrice dart points. The succeeding late Paleoindian subperiod includes three projectile point style intervals spanning the period from ca. 10,000 to 8800 B.P.: Wilson, Golondrina-Barber, and St. Mary's Hall. Components and artifact and feature assemblages of these three intervals appear to be Archaic-like in nature and in many ways may represent a transition between the early Paleoindian and succeeding Archaic periods (Collins 1995:382).

### Archaic Period

The Archaic period (8800 to 1300–1200 B.P.) is generally believed to represent a shift toward the hunting and gathering of a wider array of animal and plant resources and a decrease in group mobility (Willey and Phillips 1958:107–108), although such changes probably were well under way by the beginning of the Archaic. Throughout the ca. 7,600-year-long period, major climatic changes probably presented Archaic populations with varying subsistence challenges. The Archaic is generally divided into early, middle, and late periods (Black 1989; Collins 1995; Story 1985:28–29). Each subperiod includes several temporal-stylistic units or intervals based on diagnostic projectile point styles and associated radiocarbon assays (Collins 1995).

Early Archaic (8800–6000 B.P.) sites are small and their tool assemblages very diverse (Weir 1976:115–122), suggesting that populations were highly mobile and densities low (Prewitt 1985:217). It has been noted that early Archaic sites are concentrated along the eastern and southern margins of the Edwards Plateau (Johnson and Goode 1994; McKinney 1981).

This distribution may be indicative of climatic conditions at the time, as these environments have had more-reliable water sources and a diverse subsistence base. Microfaunal records and sedimentary evidence from stream valleys and along the eastern Edwards Plateau depict a climatic regime in flux, from mesic conditions during the beginning of the early Archaic to extremely xeric and back to mildly xeric conditions at the end of the subperiod (Collins et al. 1990; Toomey et al. 1993). Three projectile point style intervals are recognized: Angostura (local periods 3 and 4); Early Split Stem, including Gower and Jetta (local period 4); and Martindale-Uvalde (local period 5). Manos, metates, hammerstones, Clear Fork and Guadalupe bifaces, and a variety of other bifacial and unifacial tools are common to all three intervals. The construction and use of rock hearths and ovens reflect a specialized subsistence strategy (exploitation of roots and tubers?) during the early Archaic. These burned rock features most likely represent the technological predecessors of the larger burned rock middens extensively used later in the Archaic period (Collins 1995:383).

During the middle Archaic period (6000–4000 B.P.), the number and distribution of sites, as well as site size, increased, probably due to increases in population densities (Prewitt 1981:73; Weir 1976:124, 135). Macro-bands may have formed at least seasonally, or an increased number of small groups may have utilized the same sites for longer periods of time (Weir 1976:130–131). A greater reliance on plant foods is suggested by the presence of burned rock middens toward the end of the middle Archaic, although tool kits still infer a strong reliance on hunting (Prewitt 1985:222–226). Three projectile point style intervals comprise the middle Archaic: Bell-Andice-Calf Creek (local period 5), Taylor (local period 5), and Nolan-Travis (local period 6). The Bell-Andice-Calf Creek and Taylor intervals reflect a shift in lithic technology from the preceding Martindale-Uvalde interval (Collins 1995:384). Johnson and Goode (1994:25) suggest that the Bell-Andice-Calf Creek interval represents an influx of bison hunting groups from the Eastern Woodland margins into the Central Texas region during a slightly more mesic period. Bison disappear as more-xeric conditions return during the later Nolan-Travis interval; this change led to another shift in lithic technology (Collins 1995:384; Johnson and Goode 1994:27). Prewitt (personal communication 1997) postulates that the production and morphology of Travis and Nolan points are similar to projectile points from the Lower Pecos region. Such characteristics as beveled stems and overall morphology may have originated in the Lower Pecos, since their presence there predates their

appearance in Central Texas. The accompanying change to more-xeric conditions bears witness to the construction and use of burned rock middens. Johnson and Goode (1994:26) believe that the dry conditions promoted the spread of xerophytic plants, such as yucca and sotol, and that these plants were collected and cooked in large rock ovens by late middle Archaic peoples.

Both Collins (1995) and Johnson and Goode (1994) recognize a period of extreme aridity in Central Texas during the Archaic period and postulate that the construction and use of burned rock middens were probable responses to these xeric conditions. However, Collins (1995) (as well as Nordt et al. [1994] and Toomey et al. [1993]) views these xeric conditions as the culmination of a continual decrease in effective moisture since the end of the Pleistocene, while Johnson and Goode (1994) do not. In addition, Johnson and Goode (1994) believe that the period of aridity (their Edwards Interval) occurred slightly later, at ca. 4250–2550 B.P., compared to Collins's (1995) much longer Altithermal climate at 8500–6800 and 5500–3000 B.P. (also cf. Nordt et al. [1994] and Toomey et al. [1993]).

During the succeeding late Archaic period (4000 to 1300–1200 B.P.), populations continued to increase (Prewitt 1985:217). The establishment of large cemeteries along drainages suggests strong territorial ties by certain groups (Story 1985:40). Xeric conditions continued, but became more mesic ca. 3500–2500 B.P. The late Archaic period is comprised of six projectile point style intervals (Collins 1995:376): Bulverde (local period 7), Pedernales-Kinney (local period 7), Lange-Williams-Marshall (local periods 7 and 8), Marcos-Montell-Castroville (local period 8), Ensor-Frio-Fairland (local period 9), and Darl (local period 9). Johnson and Goode (1994:29–35) divide the late Archaic into two parts, Late Archaic I and Late Archaic II, based on increased population densities and evidence of Eastern Woodland ceremonial rituals and religious ideological influences. Middle Archaic subsistence technology, including the use of burned rock middens, continued into the late Archaic period. Collins (1995:384) states that during the Pedernales-Kinney interval the construction and use of burned rock middens reached its zenith; their use declined during the latter half of the late Archaic. However, there are mounting chronological data that midden formation and use culminated much later, during the Ensor-Frio-Fairland and Darl intervals, and that this high level of use continued into the early Late Prehistoric period (Black et al. 1997; Kleinbach et al. 1995:795). A picture of prevalent burned rock midden use in the eastern part of the Central Texas region after 2000 B.P. is gradually

becoming clear. This scenario parallels the widely recognized occurrence of post-2000 B.P. middens in the western reaches of the Edwards Plateau (see Goode 1991). The use of burned rock middens appears to have been a major part of the subsistence strategy as a decrease in the importance of hunting, inferred by the low ratio of projectile points in relation to other tools in site assemblages, may have occurred (Prewitt 1981:74).

### **Late Prehistoric Period**

The Late Prehistoric period (1300–1200 to 300 B.P.) is marked by the introduction of the bow and arrow and later, ceramics, into the region, probably from the north, by persons or mechanisms unknown (Prewitt 1985:228). Population densities dropped considerably from their late Archaic peak (Prewitt 1985:217). Subsistence strategies did not differ greatly from the preceding period, although bison became an important economic resource during the later part of the Late Prehistoric period (Prewitt 1981:74). The use of burned rock middens for plant food processing (?) continued throughout the Late Prehistoric period (Black et al. 1997; Goode 1991; Kleinbach et al. 1995:795). Horticulture came into play very late in the region, but was of minor importance to the overall subsistence strategy (Collins 1995:385).

In Central Texas the Late Prehistoric period is generally associated with the Austin and Toyah phases (Jelks 1962; Prewitt 1981:82–84); however, both phases have a much wider application. Austin and Toyah phase horizon markers, Scallorn-Edwards and Perdiz arrow points, respectively, are distributed across most of the state. Local periods 10 and 11 (Black and McGraw 1985:322) are equivalent to the Austin and Toyah phases. The introduction of Scallorn and Edwards arrow points into Central Texas is often marked by evidence of violence and conflict, as many excavated burials contain these point tips in contexts indicating they were the cause of death (Prewitt 1981:83). Subsistence strategies and technologies (other than arrow points) did not change much from the preceding late Archaic. This continuity is recognized by Prewitt's (1981) use of the term "Neoarchaic." In fact Johnson and Goode (1994:39–40) and Collins (1995:385) state that the break between the late Archaic and the Late Prehistoric could be easily and appropriately represented by the break between the Austin and Toyah phases.

Around 1000–750 B.P., slightly more xeric or drought prone climatic conditions returned to the region and bison returned to the region in large numbers (Huebner 1991; Toomey et al. 1993). Utilizing this vast

resource, Toyah phase peoples were equipped with Perdiz point-tipped arrows, end scrapers, four-beveled-edge knives, and plain bone-tempered ceramics. The technology and subsistence strategies of the Toyah phase represent a completely different tradition than the preceding Austin phase. Collins (1995:388) states that burned rock middens fell out of use, as bison hunting and group mobility obtained a level of importance not witnessed since Folsom times. While the importance of bison hunting and high group mobility can hardly be disputed, the cessation of burned rock midden use during the Toyah phase is tenuous. A recent examination of Toyah-age radiocarbon assays and assemblages by Black et al. (1996) suggests that their association with burned rock middens represents more than a “thin veneer” capping Archaic-age features. Black et al. (1996) claim that burned rock midden use, while not as prevalent as in preceding periods, played a role in the adaptive strategies of Toyah peoples.

## **HISTORIC PERIOD**

### **Native Americans**

Historical accounts of Native Americans and their interactions with the Spanish, the Republic of Mexico, the Texas Republic, and the United States throughout the region are provided by Campbell and Campbell (1981), Campbell (1988), Hester (1989), and Newcomb (1961). Collins (1995:386) divides this period into three subperiods. The first subperiod, beginning in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, marks an era of more-permanent contact between Europeans and Native Americans as the Spanish moved northward out of Mexico to establish settlements and missions on their northern frontier. There is little available information on aboriginal groups and their ways of life except for the fragmentary data gathered by the Spanish missionaries. In the San Antonio and South Texas areas, these groups have been collectively referred to as Coahuiltecan because of an assumed similar way of life; however, many individual groups may have existed (Campbell 1988). One particular Coahuiltecan group, the Payaya, has been identified as occupying the Camp Stanley area in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Campbell 1988:108–110). The Camp Stanley and San Antonio area also served as a point of contact between the southward-advancing Apaches and the Spanish, with native groups often caught in between. The inevitable and disastrous impacts to native social structures and economic systems by disease and hostile encounters with Europeans and intruding groups, such as the Apache, were already under way at this time.

The second subperiod marks the establishment of the mission system in the 1720s to its ultimate demise around 1800. Some indigenous groups moved peacefully into mission life, giving up their nomadic hunting and gathering way of life, while others were forced in or moved in to escape the increasingly hostile actions of southward-moving Apaches and Comanches. Much of the Camp Stanley area fell within the extensive Monte Galvan, a ranch that was associated with Mission San Antonio de Valero (the Alamo) (McGraw 1991:149). Many of the Payaya lived at Mission San Antonio de Valero, but due to a high mortality rate, their numbers declined rapidly (Campbell 1988:106). By the end of this time, many Native American groups had been decimated by European expansion and disease and by intrusive Native American groups. The small number of surviving Payaya were acculturated into mission life. The last reference to the Payaya was recorded in 1789 in the last days of the mission (Campbell 1988:98). By this time, intrusive groups such as the Tonkawa, Apache, and Comanche had moved into the region to fill the void. Few sites attributable to these groups, outside of mission sites, have been investigated. To complicate matters, many aboriginal ways of life continued even after contact with the Spanish. For example, the manufacture of stone tools continued for many groups even after settling in the missions (Fox 1979). The third subperiod, from 1800 to the last half of the nineteenth century, witnessed the final decimation of the Native American groups and the defeat and removal of the Apaches and Comanches to reservations by the United States.

### **European, Mexican, and Anglo-American Exploration, Settlement, and Ranching**

European exploration and settlement of the Central Texas region began in the early eighteenth century with the establishment of missions by the Spanish. Settlement by Mexicans, Anglo-Americans, Germans, and others followed suit. All of these groups have had a profound and unique impact on the colorful history of the area, which is summarized by Fox (1989). Studies pertaining to exploration and settlement of the Camp Stanley area are provided by Boyd et al. (1990), Freeman (1994b), and Gerstle et al. (1978).

Spanish exploration into the Camp Stanley area began as early as 1716, when Don Domingo Ramon explored the headwaters of the San Antonio River. Mission San Antonio de Valero was established in 1718 downstream along the San Antonio River. Between 1720 and 1731, Missions San José y San Miguel de Aguayo, Nuestra Señora de la Purísima Concepción de Acuña,

San Juan Capistrano, San Francisco de la Espada, Villa San Antonio de Bexar, and presidio San Antonio de Bexar were also founded along the San Antonio River (Campbell 1988:82; Hudson et al. 1974:9). Collectively these settlements were the beginning of modern San Antonio. By the middle of the eighteenth century there was a considerable Spanish presence and movement throughout northern Bexar County along the Camino Real. The Pinta Trail, which ran northwest from San Antonio to the San Saba River following the Salado Creek valley for a portion of the trail's distance, may have been utilized by the Spanish and Native American groups as early as the mid eighteenth century (Freeman 1994b:93).

Actual settlement in the Camp Stanley area started with a land purchase by Nathaniel Lewis in 1838, but as late as 1846–1847 Roemer (1935:223) described the area as devoid of permanent settlements. Lewis subsequently sold a portion of his land in the Salado Creek-Comanche Springs area to John O. Meusebach in 1847. In turn, Meusebach sold the property in 1853 to Henry Habermann, who constructed the Comanche Springs house (site 41BX420), located just south of Camp Stanley in Camp Bullis. Meusebach moved to a new location north and farther up the Salado Creek valley, into what is today the Outer Cantonment of Camp Stanley (Freeman 1994b:47). In 1853 Meusebach was instrumental in the construction of a road from his new home eastward through modern-day Camp Bullis to New Braunfels (Freeman 1994b:49–50). Meusebach Road, as it became known, served as an important route for German immigrants moving into the region.

The end of the Civil War, the subsequent boom in the livestock industry, and the removal of the Comanches to reservations had a major impact on the settlement of the Camp Stanley area (Freeman 1994b:55). During the later half of the nineteenth century, land north and south of Cibolo Creek in the Camp Stanley area was occupied by several large cattle, sheep, and goat ranches (some with absentee landowners) and smaller stock farms possessed by German immigrant families. By the turn of the century, many of the large ranches failed and/or were subdivided and sold, leading to the establishment of more small German family farms in the area (Freeman 1994b:68). Portions of these properties were also acquired by the United States government for the creation of Camp Stanley (discussed in greater detail below). Several small family farms or ranches within the current Camp Stanley boundaries are known from the archeological and archival record (see Kibler et al. 1998). These sites date from the turn of the century to the 1940s and include properties owned by Andrew Blank (site

41BX1179), Louis Willke or Wilkie (site 41BX1186), and O. Scharmann (sites 41BX1170 and 41BX1172). Archeological remains at these sites consist of foundations and remains of houses, sheds, water troughs, wells, and other outbuildings, along with ceramic and glass sherds, wire nails, and other metal artifacts. The records suggest that these individuals were engaged in small-scale ranching and farming activities. Aside from ranching and farming, some neighboring farmsteads were contracted by Camp Stanley to break and train horses and provide cordwood and hay for the facility (Freeman 1994b:75). By the 1940s, the aforementioned properties were acquired by the military, bringing an end to the ranching and farming history of Camp Stanley.

### **The United States Military**

United States military activity in the Camp Stanley area began in 1906–1907 with the purchase of 17,273.87 acres from all or parts of six ranches (Freeman 1994a:9). This area was designated the Leon Springs Military Reservation and was to be used as a maneuvers and training area for troops based at Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio. Leon Springs was praised for its sparse population and varied terrain (Manguso 1990:5). Use of the new training area started almost immediately. In July and August of 1907, the small arms range (site 41BX1188) was used for the Southwestern Rifle and Pistol Competition. The first major maneuvers were held in 1908 involving Regular Army and National Guard Infantry, Cavalry, and Artillery (Manguso 1990:11).

The Leon Springs Military Reservation continued to grow in importance in the years before World War I. With the increased tensions along the United States-Mexico border between 1910 and 1917, the reservation was increasingly used for maneuvers and training. In 1916, a large remount station was built near Anderson Hill (Manguso 1990:21). In February of 1917, the facilities at the reservation were renamed Camp Funston in honor of Major General Frederick Funston. To avoid confusion with another base of the same name, the camp was renamed in October to Camp Stanley in honor of Brigadier General David Sloan Stanley, former commander of the Department of Texas (Manguso 1990:23).

With the American entry into World War I, the facilities at Camp Stanley grew dramatically. In May of 1917, the First Officers Training Camp was established north of Anderson Hill “in a tent and temporary building cantonment” (Manguso 1990:23) to train junior officers for the 90th Division forming in San Antonio. In July

and August, these troops conducted trench warfare training to the east of Anderson Hill. Archeological remnants of this training area are represented by sites 41BX1163 and 41BX1189 (Kibler et al. 1998). Also constructed at this time was a Signal Corps branch school in the northwest corner of Camp Stanley (Manguso 1990:23–24). The northwest area of the camp was also used for cavalry units, and there was a Quartermaster area just north of the officer training cantonment. Both of these areas were connected by a rail line running into the camp from Camp Bullis to the south. Camp Bullis was established in 1917 on leased land south of present-day Camp Stanley as a cantonment within the Leon Springs Military Reservation. Training facilities at Camp Bullis included a cavalry camp, target ranges, and maneuver grounds (Freeman 1994a:14). Between World War I and World War II, specific mission differences between the two camps came to fruition with Camp Bullis developing into a large training facility used by infantry and engineering units and Camp Stanley becoming a munitions storage facility.

With the downsizing of the military after World War I, many of the structures at Camp Stanley seem to have been abandoned or removed. Camp Stanley thus began the second phase of its existence. In 1920 the northern half of the camp was given over to the Ordnance Section of the Eighth Corps Area for the storage of large stocks of surplus ammunition, despite the lack of suitable structures for this storage. In 1925 the storage area was taken over by the San Antonio Arsenal, and plans to build a proper storage facility were made. This plan was not fully implemented until 1938. That year Works Progress Administration workers began excavation and construction of the igloos and magazines

in the southern part of the camp (Manguso 1990:47).

It was also at this time (between World Wars I and II) that Camp Stanley and Camp Bullis hosted two unusual civilian activities. In 1926 two movies, *The Rough Riders* and *Wings*, were filmed at the bases. *Wings* made use of the old training trenches to the east of Anderson Hill as movie sets; it became the winner of the first Academy of Motion Pictures award for Best Picture in 1927.

As the United States entered World War II, the Army decided to enlarge Camp Stanley and Camp Bullis, and land to the north of Camp Stanley was acquired by condemnation in 1940. The condemned land included six tracts that would later make up the northern part of Camp Stanley's Outer Cantonment (Rogers et al. 1940; Freeman 1994a:65). This area contained three known ranches belonging to Andrew Blank, Louis Willke (Wilkie), and O. Scharmann.

During World War II, the Outer Cantonment of Camp Stanley was part of Camp Bullis and was used for training. The best example of this is found around the old small arms range, which was used as an antitank gunnery range with moving targets. In 1943, army combat engineers built a fortified combat training area to the east of the range (Manguso 1990:81). Also during this time, many of the farmsteads on the camp property were salvaged or were used by range wardens who patrolled the perimeter of the camp (Petsch 1942).

Camp Stanley continues to serve as a munitions storage area for the Red River Army Depot. The only major change since World War II has been the transfer of the Outer Cantonment area from Camp Bullis to Camp Stanley in 1953 and 1970 (Manguso 1990:99).