

6-30-1975

An Archeological Preservation Plan for South Carolina

Robert L. Stephenson

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/archanth_books



Part of the [Anthropology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Stephenson, Robert L., "An Archeological Preservation Plan for South Carolina" (1975). *Research Manuscript Series*. 75.

https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/archanth_books/75

This Book is brought to you by the Archaeology and Anthropology, South Carolina Institute of at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Research Manuscript Series by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact digres@mailbox.sc.edu.

An Archeological Preservation Plan for South Carolina

Keywords

Indians of North America, South Carolina, Archeology

Disciplines

Anthropology

Publisher

The South Carolina Institute of Archeology and Anthropology--University of South Carolina

Comments

In USC online Library catalog at: <http://www.sc.edu/library/>

AN ARCHEOLOGICAL PRESERVATION PLAN
FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

by

Robert L. Stephenson
State Archeologist and Director
Institute of Archeology and Anthropology
Research Manuscript Series, No. 84

June 30, 1975

This paper has been partially funded with assistance from the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, under the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act, through the South Carolina Department of Archives and History.

Prepared by the
INSTITUTE OF ARCHEOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29208

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
<i>INTRODUCTION.</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>A BRIEF BACKGROUND OF ARCHEOLOGICAL AND ANTHROPOLOGICAL RESEARCH IN SOUTH CAROLINA</i>	<i>2</i>
Historic Records and the Early Explorers and Travelers	<i>2</i>
The Excavations of Dr. William Blanding.	<i>3</i>
Other Nineteenth Century Investigations.	<i>4</i>
The Twentieth Century to 1963.	<i>5</i>
<i>THE ARCHEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>THE CURRENT PROGRAM OF RESEARCH 1963-1975</i>	<i>11</i>
The South Carolina Department of Archeology.	<i>11</i>
The Institute of Archeology and Anthropology	<i>13</i>
Beginnings.	<i>13</i>
Goals and Objectives.	<i>16</i>
Logistics and Special Efforts	<i>17</i>
Research Efforts.	<i>20</i>
Other Archeological Capabilities in the State.	<i>29</i>
<i>A PHILOSOPHY OF ARCHEOLOGICAL PRESERVATION.</i>	<i>32</i>
The Preservation Concept	<i>32</i>
Archeological Research and Preservation.	<i>33</i>
Analysis, Interpretation, and Explanation and the Importance of Material Things.	<i>35</i>
On-Site Interpretation	<i>36</i>
Emergency and Leisurely Archeology	<i>38</i>
Professional Responsibility.	<i>40</i>
<i>A PRESERVATION PLAN FOR 1975-1985</i>	<i>41</i>
Introduction	<i>41</i>
Archeological Site Inventory	<i>42</i>
The National Register of Historic Places	<i>44</i>
Systematic Research Organization	<i>45</i>
Systematic Research Goals.	<i>48</i>
Specific Research Projects	<i>50</i>
Area Studies	<i>52</i>
Specific Site Studies.	<i>56</i>
Summary.	<i>58</i>
<i>REFERENCES</i>	<i>60</i>

*AN ARCHEOLOGICAL PRESERVATION PLAN
FOR SOUTH CAROLINA*

by

Robert L. Stephenson
State Archeologist and Director
Institute of Archeology and Anthropology

INTRODUCTION

This *ARCHEOLOGICAL PRESERVATION PLAN* is a part of the *STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN FOR SOUTH CAROLINA* and pertains to the archeological heritage of the State. It is a plan of systematic archeological research directed toward an understanding and interpretation of the human occupation of this State from the time the first people arrived here, several millenia ago, to the present time. It includes the prehistoric and the historic cultures as a single continuum of the ever-changing life-ways of human populations. It deals with the archeological remains that still stand above ground, those that lie beneath the ground, and those that lie beneath the waters of the State.

Archeology is a sub-discipline of anthropology and this plan also deals, in part, with the other sub-disciplines of anthropology including ethnology, linguistics, and physical anthropology. It uses historical data where applicable. It deals with human populations as cultural entities rather than as individuals or as social groups. It deals with the cultural process, primarily, rather than the historical process, though historical sequences of events inevitably emerge from it.

The purpose of this *ARCHEOLOGICAL PRESERVATION PLAN* is to explain the present status of archeological research in the State and to suggest a plan for future work. This is done in a resume of the past century and a half of investigations in the State and a summary of the archeological potential available. Current research being carried on by the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology at the University of South Carolina and by others in the State is reviewed and a series of statements is made as to the archeological philosophy that guides and directs this research. Based upon all of this, a systematic plan of archeological preservation for the immediate future is presented with implications for long-range planning of archeological preservation in South Carolina.

Curatorial responsibility for the records and specimens resulting from archeological research within the State is vested in the Office of the State Archeologist. These records and specimens constitute the archeological heritage of the State. They are held in trust for all of the people of the State, in perpetuity, in the repository for that purpose provided by the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology at the University of South Carolina, through its Director's responsibility as the State Archeologist. Some records and specimens resulting from research by others than the staff of the Institute are on file at the institution that sponsored the research.

All of the archeological research records and specimens in the custody of the State Archeologist are available at the Institute for the use of agencies, institutions, and individuals who have need to use them for research or other responsible purposes and who will be responsible for their safety and preservation while they are being used. These records and specimens are for use; not for storage. Their purpose, as the archeological heritage of the State, is for the increase and diffusion of knowledge. They constitute an educational resource and, as such, their fullest use in research, exhibit, and any effort leading to public understanding of their meaning is encouraged so long as their safety and integrity are not jeopardized.

These records are being used. Archeologists, curators, and specialists from Canada, Washington D.C., Idaho, Washington State, Arizona, Tennessee, North Carolina and Georgia have spent from a day or two to several weeks in the Institute laboratory studying these records. Others have used these records by correspondence and research scholars from within the State representing state and local agencies and private individuals have made extensive use of these records. Such use is encouraged so long as the records are not misused.

A BRIEF BACKGROUND OF ARCHEOLOGICAL AND ANTHROPOLOGICAL RESEARCH IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Historic Records and the Early Explorers and Travelers

The distinction must be clearly made between the archeological emphasis and the historical emphasis in the preservation philosophy. The two are intimately related and each may, and usually does, contribute to the other but they are not the same. The archeologist, in doing his research, does not become an historian but he does use the research of the historian, when he can, as one more tool with which to strengthen his archeological research. He uses this additional artifact of the culture process - the written record - even when that written record pertains to non-literate cultures such as the Indians that were met by the explorers and colonists. The historian, likewise, can use the research of the archeologist, at times, to strengthen his research. This relationship between history and archeology is illustrated by the beginnings of archeological research in South Carolina.

It has been said that a South Carolinian is part historian by birthright and it is certainly true that the average South Carolinian is more concerned about his heritage than is the average citizen of most states. There is good reason for this. South Carolina has wall-to-wall history and a degree of social, cultural, and economic isolation that has led to a tradition of fierce pride in that colorful and significant history. South Carolinians have also been able recorders of their history. The Native Americans that occupied South Carolina had no means of recording the several thousand years of their history except verbally and by the archeological record that they left buried in the ground. The European explorers and colonists, though, began recording events as soon as they arrived and, in the course of compiling colonial

history, made much mention of the native peoples such as Catawbas, Cherokees, Westos, and others. They provided numerous outstanding historic accounts.

There is thus a wealth of historic narrative about South Carolina. Many original documents are readily available; some have been reprinted and some are available in both original and reprint. Libraries, historical societies, and courthouses throughout the State are gold mines of historical data. Early land records are especially useful. The South Carolina Department of Archives and History, the Caroliniana Library at the University of South Carolina, the Charleston Historical Society, and the Charleston Museum, to name but some of the major sources, have tremendous collections of usable data.

These are historical records, not archeological nor anthropological records. Many of these historical records, though, refer to, or are even primarily concerned with recording ethnographic and linguistic details about the Indians of South Carolina and the many ethnic groups that came into the State from Europe and Africa in historic times. There is a wealth of anthropological data in these histories. The Shaftesbury Papers (Cheves 1897), for example, record much of the early colonial activities of the 1670's and of the Indian and White relationships in the early Charles Towne colony. The accounts of Henry Woodward in the Shaftesbury Papers are especially informative of Indian customs. The published works of John Lawson (1718), James Adair (1775; Williams 1930), William Bartram (1791), John Heckwelder (1818), Robert Mills (1826), John Logan (1859), Alexander Gregg (1867), and the compilation known as "The Indian Books" (McDowell 1955, 1958, 1970) are only some of the major sources for these data. These historic documents provide the raw data for ethnohistorical studies upon which archeological research can be built. Unfortunately the first century and a half of South Carolina's exploration is not well covered in readily available contemporary documents. From the early explorations of the coastal and inland areas by the Spanish and French to the beginnings of the English colony at Charles Towne the records are mostly available only in the European archives. One of the best summaries of this period, though, is The Land Called Chicora by Paul Quattlebaum published in 1956.

The Excavations of Dr. William Blanding

The first known, specifically archeological, research in South Carolina was done in the 1820's. This was an archeological investigation by Dr. William Blanding, a physician from Camden, who conducted exploratory excavations in several prehistoric Indian mound and village sites along the Wateree River in the vicinity of Camden. He described and evaluated the results of those investigations in a completed report that was later (posthumously) published by the newly established Smithsonian Institution in Washington City. This was the classic publication of Squier and Davis (1848). It was the earliest major archeological report in America and the first of a long series of scholarly publications by the Smithsonian Institution.

Dr. Blanding's investigation was among the earliest archeological research in America. It followed, by barely more than three decades, the excavation of an Indian mound in Virginia by Thomas Jefferson (1787), the earliest known

report of archeology in America. While the American Indians west of the Mississippi River, in an area of more than two thirds of the continent, were still living their prehistoric ways of life, largely undisturbed by European settlement, archeological research was already having its beginning in Virginia and South Carolina.

Other Nineteenth Century Investigations

This beginning was short-lived. Dr. Blanding's report stood alone as an example of published archeological excavation until nearly the end of the century. By the middle of the century, though, published observations about South Carolina antiquities were beginning to appear. Most of these were restatements of Lawson's, Bartram's, and Blanding's comments compiled in different contexts with new material added. Few were confined to the South Carolina area but simply included South Carolina in regional or nation-wide reports. Dr. Samuel Morton published Some Observations on the Ethnography and Archaeology of the American Aborigines (1846) in which he noted mounds in several parts of the state. Between 1851 and 1857, Henry Schoolcraft published six volumes concerning the Indian tribes of the United States including three substantial articles on the antiquities of South Carolina. In 1873, C. C. Jones published The Antiquities of Southern Indians in which he described several prehistoric Indian mounds, earthworks, villages, and burials in the state. Both Schoolcraft and Jones made extensive use of local informants and corresponded at length with numerous South Carolina collectors of antiquities. Schoolcraft included, in his fourth volume, an essay by one of these collectors, the Reverend George Howe, concerning the Congaree Indians and their antiquities. Both Jones and Morton had visited the state and had seen many of the sites reported.

With the advent of the Bureau of Ethnology at the Smithsonian Institution in 1879 (later known as the Bureau of American Ethnology), anthropological research in the southeastern United States began to receive more attention. In the 1880's and 1890's the Bureau sponsored and published several studies of archeology, ethnology, and linguistics of the Indians of the eastern United States.. South Carolina's antiquities were discussed in several of these reports and some of the scholars from the Bureau conducted field research within the State. Of the first twenty annual reports of the Bureau, South Carolina antiquities were mentioned in half. H. C. Yarrow referred to Dr. Blanding's work in the First Annual Report in 1879-80. Charles C. Royce described and discussed the Cherokee Nation at length in his excellent article in the Fifth Annual Report (1883-84) and prepared a map of the Cherokee lands that included those in South Carolina. Dr. Edward Palmer conducted excavations at the McCollum Mound Site in Chester County in 1884 and his notes are on file at the Smithsonian Institution. Cyrus Thomas published a "Catalog of the Prehistoric Works East of the Rocky Mountains" in 1891, listing 36 mound sites in 18 counties of South Carolina. Major John Wesley Powell, William Henry Holmes, and James Mooney all discussed South Carolina Indians and antiquities in the Bureau's Annual Reports in the 1880's and 1890's, and the 1894 report of James Mooney on the Siouan Tribes of the East is a classic.

In 1897 and 1898, Clarence B. Moore, representing the Academy of Natural Sciences in Philadelphia, visited the South Carolina coastal area and rivers, especially in Beaufort, Colleton, and Jasper Counties, and up the Savannah River.

This was a part of an extensive survey of prehistoric Indian sites along the coasts and rivers of the entire southeastern United States. At several of the South Carolina sites Moore conducted test excavations and recovered materials reported in Vol. XI Part 2 (1899) of his extensive series of reports.

Meanwhile local collectors of antiquities had been active in the state throughout at least the latter half, if not most, of the nineteenth century. Many of these people, no doubt, amassed fine collections and many excavated into these prehistoric sites as indicated in correspondence with the Bureau and with the Charleston Museum. They discussed their collections and offered their speculations on the meaning of these antiquities in this correspondence. Some of the collections or parts of collections were given to the Bureau. Other collections and parts of collections were given to the Charleston Museum. None, though, published the results of their work and all that remains of the efforts of these people is the surviving letters and some of the specimens at the two institutions. One collection that remains moderately intact is that of Dr. S. E. Babcock of York County who made extensive collections in that area, mostly lithic material, and apparently kept rather good records of his specimens. His correspondence with the Bureau is extensive. A large part of this collection is presently on file at the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology at the University of South Carolina, though the records are almost non-existent.

By the end of the nineteenth century archeological research in South Carolina had extended over almost eighty years and more than a score of published reports had appeared. For all this, pitifully little had been done. Blanding's work still stood as the most complete and significant report and only two other actual field excavations had been reported—one in manuscript by Edward Palmer and the publications of Clarence B. Moore. Some excellent studies of linguistics and ethnology had been written by Royce, Mooney, and Powell but most of those reports dealing with antiquities relied upon the use of early historical accounts such as Woodward, Adair, Lawson, and Bartram, and upon Dr. Blanding's report.

One should bear in mind, at this point, that the research of the nineteenth century was, in every sense, a truly pioneering effort. There were no trained archeologists or anthropologists. These subjects were only beginning to be taught in a few colleges by the end of the century, and the word "anthropology" only then came into existence. Most of the scholars who were investigating these subjects were medical doctors, clergymen, school-teachers, and others who pursued a personal interest in the peculiar earth-works and marvelous tools, utensils, and ornaments that could be found in the ground. A few scholars at the Smithsonian Institution and at the Peabody Museum at Harvard were devoting full time to this research but even most of those who worked out of the Bureau of American Ethnology were primarily occupied elsewhere, not as full-time Bureau employees. In this context Dr. Blanding's work stands out as an especially competent investigation.

The Twentieth Century to 1963

With the turn of the century there was really very little change in the archeological research being done in the southeast. If anything, it diminished as the few anthropologists in America were turning their attentions to the more

spectacular pueblos and cliff-dwellings of the Southwest. It was during this time that Frederick Webb Hodge published his two volume Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico (1907-1910) for the Bureau and included dozens of entries on South Carolina. The Charleston Museum published Laura M. Bragg's "Indian Mound Excavations in South Carolina" in 1918. This was followed in 1925 by Anne King Gregorie's "Notes on the Sewee Indians...", also published by the Charleston Museum and both contributions were by the Museum staff.

The Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation in New York, sent George Pepper to the Southeast to collect museum specimens in the 1920's. In South Carolina, Pepper exceeded his "collecting" obligations by pursuing research and making observations on the antiquities of the area (Pepper 1924).

The first excavation of an historic site in South Carolina was done by Major George H. Osterhout, Jr., U.S.M.C., in 1922-23. This was the attempt to locate and preserve the remains of "Charles' Fort" built by Jean Ribault in 1562 on what is now Parris Island. This excavation was reported in the Marine Corps Gazette in June 1923.

By this time Dr. John R. Swanton of the Bureau of American Ethnology had begun almost three decades of study of the ethnography, linguistics, and history of the southeastern Indians. These were published in B. A. E. Bulletins and elsewhere throughout the 1920's, 1930's and 1940's. Especially prominent among these are the "Early History of the Creek Indians and Their Neighbors" (1922); the report of the De Soto Expedition Commission (1932, 1939); and "Indians of the Southeastern United States" (1946).

In 1930, the Peabody Museum at Harvard sent Mr. and Mrs. C. B. Cosgrove to the Savannah River, near Augusta to excavate the Stallings Island Site (Claflin 1931) that had been tested by William C. Claflin, Jr. Warren K. Moorehead spent several months in 1932 investigating sites in the Beaufort area in conjunction with the Charleston Museum staff. The results were published by Regina Flannery in 1943.

Throughout the 1930's the various federal relief programs such as P.W.A., W. P. A., T. V. A., C.C.C., and others developed archeological projects in various parts of the country but South Carolina did not become involved with these programs. While most of the southeastern states were fielding large archeological excavation parties under these programs, South Carolina's colleges and universities were not involved in archeology and did not participate. Even after World War II, when the River Basin Surveys Program of the Bureau of American Ethnology came into being, only two brief surveys and a sample excavation were undertaken in South Carolina. The survey of the Clark Hill Reservoir in 1948 by Joseph R. Caldwell and Carl F. Miller, the partial excavation of Fort Charlotte in that reservoir by Caldwell (1952a), and the survey of the Hartwell Reservoir by Caldwell in 1953 all reported briefly on work along the upper Savannah River. These three reports are being reprinted by the Institute in Vol. VI, No. 2 of The Notebook. In addition Carl F. Miller reported an analysis of the ceramics from a site near Clark Hill (1950).

The state was, thus, almost completely by-passed by the two great national acceleration periods of American archeology: the W.P.A. in the 1930's and the River Basin Surveys in the 1940's and 1950's. Even through the mid-twentieth century the Charleston Museum remained the only in-state institution to sponsor archeology.

Some work, though, was being accomplished in the mid-twentieth century. Dr. Antonio J. Waring, a pediatrician in Savannah, Georgia, devoted his spare time for thirty years (1934-64) to competent personal efforts in southeastern archeology. Among his most prominent contributions were efforts to understand the coastal shell ring sites and the "Southern Cult" sequences of South Carolina and Georgia (Williams 1968). Dr. Arthur R. Kelly of the University of Georgia made collections along the Wateree River near Camden in the 1930's for the National Park Service and conducted test excavations at the Mulberry Mound Site in 1957. George E. Stuart, now with the National Geographic Society, began collecting artifacts as a boy in this Wateree River area and ultimately used the material from this area as his Master's thesis in 1970 at the George Washington University. A revised version of this thesis is now being considered for publication by the Institute. Joffre L. Coe of the University of North Carolina made collections in this same area in the 1950's and 1960's and made brief references to South Carolina antiquities in his definitive volume on "The Formative Cultures of the Carolina Piedmont" (1964).

Joseph R. Caldwell, then with the River Basin Surveys, reported on the site of Palachicola Towne on the Lower Savannah River, basing his report on the excavations made by Marmaduke H. Floyd some years earlier (Caldwell 1948). Dr. Caldwell also summarized "The Archeology of Eastern Georgia and South Carolina" in 1951 for the compendium volume Archeology of the Eastern United States (Griffin 1952a).

Another historic site was investigated in 1958 and 1959 by Dr. E. Lawrence Lee of the Citadel in Charleston. He conducted test excavations at the late seventeenth and eighteenth century site of the town of Dorchester. Shortly thereafter, Stanley South, then with the North Carolina Department of Archives and History, briefly excavated a building foundation at "Indian Hill" on the Citadel campus in 1962. Neither of these was published but a manuscript from the latter work is on file at the Institute. South's survey of a portion of coastal North Carolina in 1960 also included prehistoric archeological sites in Horry County, South Carolina (South 1960).

Between 1958 and 1963, Gene Waddell, a student at the College of Charleston, conducted archeological surveys of some of the coastal areas of Charleston and nearby counties for the Charleston Museum. In 1966, Alan Calmes, a student in the Department of History at the University of South Carolina, sampled several sites on Hilton Head Island including the Sea Pines Shell Ring, the Skull Creek Shell Ring, and an eighteenth century plantation house. This work was sponsored by Mr. Fred Hack and Mr. Charles Fraser of Hilton Head Island. The next year, Calmes was employed by the Camden District Heritage Foundation to do the first season of archeological excavations in the Revolutionary War fortifications at Historic Camden. The Hilton Head work was reported at the Southeastern Archeological Conference in 1967 and the Camden work was reported in the Historic Sites Conference Papers (Calmes 1967b) and was later privately printed (Calmes 1968).

Through these decades of the 1940's to 1960's several local collectors were making considerable collections in various parts of the state. Robert La Faye and Donald MacIntosh were collecting along the Santee River and La Faye established a small, but good, museum on the Santee River near the town of Santee. He has made his collections and voluminous notes available to the Institute for study and MacIntosh has donated the bulk of his ceramic collection and notes to the Institute. Elias Bull has done extensive research on the Indian and European settlements of Charleston and adjacent counties and made his notes and materials available to the Institute. Wesley Breedlove, Jr. has amassed a large collection from sites in Oconee and Pickens counties and nearby areas and has offered to make these available for study. Dr. and Mrs. Lattimore have been ardent collectors in the lower Savannah River area. Mr. D. H. Sullivan has collected extensively in the Saluda River drainage and has made his collections available for study. James Michie has collected from various parts of the state and especially from sites in the Port Royal area where he excavated an early midden and published the results (1974). Except for Michie's reports none of these collections has been published.

Two books remain to be mentioned from this period. Chapman J. Milling, a physician in Columbia, published perhaps the most comprehensive summary available of the native peoples of South Carolina. This is Red Carolinians (1940) and, while it deals but briefly with the period of pre-European contact, it covers most of the known Indian history of the post-contact period. The other is The Catawba Indians, the People of the River by Douglas Summers Brown published in 1966. This book deals in detail with the origin, history, and development of the Catawba people.

This brief review of archeological research in South Carolina up to the middle 1960's clearly points out the minimal effort that has gone into this subject. An initial thrust, one of the earliest in the nation, was followed by almost a century and a half of only incidental efforts by a few out-of-state institutions and an occasional effort by an interested in-state person. The Charleston Museum has been the repository for some collections and the only in-state institution to do archeological research.

This neglect is remarkable in view of the deep and abiding concern with history and such careful recording of history by so many South Carolinians. It is also remarkable because of the extensive archeological efforts within the nearby states of Georgia, Florida, North Carolina, Alabama, and Tennessee.

One need not speculate on the reasons for this. There were many. Suffice it to say that by the middle 1960's South Carolina remained an archeological *terra incognita*. There is some advantage in this. Once a site is excavated it is destroyed unless preserved in the very best records that can be made of it. The methods and techniques of scientific recording and interpreting of sites have slowly been developing over the past century and far better methods are available today than have ever been before. Future methods should certainly be better than those of today. Areas other than South Carolina have been the testing grounds for archeological theory and method and South Carolina's sites have almost accidentally been preserved for excavation by methods that have been tested elsewhere. South Carolina's archeological resources have also benefited because industrialization and development of the land has also lagged behind that of most of the nation. The building of dams and reservoirs such as

Lakes Murray, Marion, Moultrie, Wateree, Hartwell, and Clark Hill have taken heavy tolls of archeological resources but economic growth as reflected in industrial development has been minimal, and has had but limited effect upon the archeological resources.

Since World War II the economic and industrial growth of the State has accelerated at an alarming rate, alarming for archeological sites. These sites have been preserved for centuries, mainly by neglect, but nevertheless preserved. That is now changing and every archeological site in the State is in some form of danger from this economic growth. Highways, housing developments, small and large industry, sewer and water lines, and airports all change the surface of the ground and all are potential threats to archeological sites.

By the middle 1960's the necessity for a systematic program of research was thrust upon South Carolina. Fortunately it did not come earlier, but nevertheless it did come. The stage was set for the development of a research facility that could and would preserve the archeological resources that had so long been preserved by historical accident. The methods and concepts of archeological research were maturing so that the archeologist could do a better job than he could have done earlier. National concern for archeological preservation was accelerating as demonstrated by increasing congressional action that made several kinds of funding available for archeology. And the people of the State were becoming aware of the need for archeological investigations. All of this, combined with the growing threat to archeological resources brought about by economic growth, demanded that a systematic program of competent archeological research be developed. Such a program was to develop from the University of South Carolina.

THE ARCHEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

By the early 1960's the stage was set for the development of a systematic program of archeological research in South Carolina. One might ask, though, what was the archeological potential? If so little work had been done here since Dr. Blanding's early examination of sites in the Wateree Valley, while abundant research had been carried out in the surrounding states, could it be that there simply was not much to be done? Was it possible that this was a relatively uninhabited area or an area, at least, of low population density compared to the surrounding areas? Clearly and emphatically the answer is "no!"

The archeological potential in South Carolina is as great as that in any other part of North America. The brief references to this potential in the dozens of reports that were mentioned in the previous section emphasize that within the borders of this State lived considerable numbers of peoples of varying cultures from the period of the earliest occupation of the southeastern part of the continent to the present. A concise summary of the evidence for this is presented in Caldwell's review (1952b). It may be said with truth that there is hardly a square mile of South Carolina that does not contain at least one archeological site of some degree of significance. Perhaps the same could

be said of all or most of the continent but it is certainly true in South Carolina.

An abundance of sites is to be found, examined, and preserved on all parts of the land. They are also to be found, examined, and preserved beneath the waters of the rivers, inlets, and off the shores of the state. The underwater potential, though, was barely known in the early 1960's and no thought was given to it as an archeological resource except by an occasional diver who had recovered submerged antiquities or a treasure hunter in search of a fortune from a sunken ship. Underwater archeology anywhere in America was a new field of research and in South Carolina it did not exist. The known archeological potential in the early 1960's was primarily in land archeology but it covered all of the temporal periods into which archeologists usually sort culture complexes.

There were Paleo-Indian Period sites of 9,000 or more years ago, represented by surface finds of fluted and other lanceolate forms of projectile points, through the state. Archaic sites were known to be abundant, especially in the Piedmont but also extending over the coastal plain. Projectile points defined from North Carolina by Coe (1964) as being of this period, such as Palmer, Kirk, Stanly, Morrow Mountain, Guilford, and Savannah River were abundantly represented in the collections from South Carolina. Caldwell (1954a, b) had defined a complex of quartz artifacts of the Archaic Period in north Georgia and sites of this period were well represented in the Piedmont of South Carolina.

The Transition Period from Archaic, pre-ceramic, hunters and gatherers to the Woodland farmers was represented by the beginnings of pottery-making and semi-sedentary life in the shell ring and other sites along the coast (Williams 1968) and at the Stallings Island Site (Claflin 1931). These shell rings appeared to be some of the earliest known forms of community-built structures and contained some of the earliest pottery known in North America with Carbon 14 dates of 3,400-3,800 years ago. Sites of this culture were known along the coast and up the major rivers.

The Woodland Period of semi-sedentary farming cultures with well developed pottery, burial mounds, and substantial village sites was abundantly represented at sites from the coast to the Piedmont. The final prehistoric period known as the Mississippian was recognized at numerous village sites but primarily at several large ceremonial centers containing temple mounds. Such sites as the Santee, Adamson, and Mulberry Mounds on the Santee and Wateree Rivers, the McCollum Mound on the Broad River, and the Irene, Hollywood, and Lawton Mounds on the Savannah River, represented this period.

Ethno-historic sites where the Indians had lived who were here when the Europeans came were known from historic records to be abundant but few had been specifically located. The villages of Cherokees, Catawbas, Saludas, Sewees, Westos, Congarees, Kiawahs, and others had been mentioned and even described by the early travelers and in other documents.

Historic Period sites of Europeans, of course, were present all over the state. The Spanish settlement of San Miguel de Gualdape of 1526 in the Winyah Bay area (Quattlebaum 1956), if specifically located, would be the earliest on

the North American coast. Spanish and French settlements in the Port Royal area, the English colony at Charles Towne, French Huguenot settlements on the Santee, and the Dutch and German settlements inland were only some of the colonial sites to be investigated. Plantation complexes with their Black communities, forts of the French and Indian War, the American Revolution, and the Civil War, mansions and slave cabins, urban and rural, courthouse towns, jails, iron furnaces, and canals were all kinds of sites available for archeological study and preservation.

Indeed there was an archeological potential in South Carolina in the early 1960's!

*THE CURRENT PROGRAM OF RESEARCH
1963-1975*

The South Carolina Department of Archeology

A program of systematic archeological research in the state developed in 1963 that was to become the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology at the University of South Carolina. By Act of the General Assembly of 1963, the *South Carolina Department of Archeology* was created to conduct archeological research within the State and whose director was to be designated as the *State Archeologist*. Dr. William E. Edwards, then on the faculty of the Department of Anthropology and Sociology at the University of South Carolina was named Director and State Archeologist. This new Department was a separate State agency, only tenuously related to the University by the ties of its Director, who retained a part-time teaching appointment in the University. His reporting accountability was directly to the Governor and budgeting was directly through the State Budget and Control Board.

Dr. Edwards provided the initiative to develop a separate archeological research facility and shepherded it through the General Assembly. He had much help, though, from knowledgeable people throughout the State, both in and out of the General Assembly. Preservationists, historic site developers, amateur archeologists, and others provided strong support. The urgent need was recognized for an archeological research facility with the time, staff, and funds to do more research than could be done within the framework of an academic teaching department of a university. The need was for the freedom to do full-time research without the restrictions of teaching commitments and with funding that was tied not to numbers of students to be served, but to the research needs.

The teaching Department of Anthropology and Sociology at the University of South Carolina had been organized only a few years before by Dr. Harry Turney-High, a respected anthropologist, whose interests were mainly in ethnology and social anthropology. It was the only combined department in the United States in which the name includes anthropology first. In 1960 Dr. Turney-High hired Dr. Edwards to teach in his department. It was a small department with only two anthropologists and sociology soon became dominant. It was in this setting that Dr. Edwards, with Dr. Turney-High's encouragement,

created a separate research facility for archeology. The University provided space for the new State agency and reduced Dr. Edwards' teaching commitment. The Department of Archeology was housed at first in McMaster College on the University campus. Later, space was made available in the basement of University Terrace, a married students' housing facility on the campus.

In its first four years the South Carolina Department of Archeology engaged in a number of research projects, most of which were funded, at least in part, by the regular state appropriation. Dr. Edwards excavated a unit of the late prehistoric site of the Tugaloo Village on the Savannah River in Stephens County, Georgia with partial funding from the University of Georgia. Mrs. Erica Fogg-Amed was engaged to conduct an archeological survey of the coastal areas of parts of Georgetown and Horry Counties. In 1964 the Star Fort Historical Commission provided funds for Dr. Edwards to begin an excavation of the eighteenth century historic site of Ninety Six and the Star Fort in Greenwood County. The United States Forest Service funded a test excavation at the Sewee Shell Ring Site in Charleston County where early ceramics of some 3,500 years ago were found. In 1966 a small excavation was carried out at the Theriault Site in Burke County, Georgia, just across the Savannah River where Paleo-Indian material was recovered. Several weekends were spent in partial excavation of an historic building foundation beneath the Cameron Burn home in Mount Pleasant. This was partially funded by the City of Charleston and the Town of Mount Pleasant. A large test excavation was conducted at the site of Fort Moore and Old Savanno Towne near North Augusta.

The major undertaking of this period was Dr. Edwards' project in the area of the Duke Power Company's Keowee-Toxaway Project in Pickens and Oconee Counties. For this he arranged a contract with Duke Power Company to survey the areas to be inundated by a series of proposed, power-generating reservoirs on the Keowee River and its tributaries, and to excavate selected sites there. As a part of this large project, John D. Combes was hired from Washington State University to become Assistant Director of the Department and to excavate the mid-eighteenth century site of Fort Prince George. Five other archeologists were also hired, along with assistants and crews for the project.

In 1967 Dr. Roger Grange excavated the I. C. Few Site, a late prehistoric site; Bernard Golden excavated the Wild Cherry Site, another late prehistoric site; and Prentice Thomas tested the Rock Turtle Site, an historic trading post associated with Fort Prince George. In 1968 Joseph Mulligan tested the Tree Nursery Site, a late prehistoric site; Don Robertson tested the Toxaway Site, a proto-historic Cherokee village; and Dr. Edwards and, later, John Combes tested the Keowee Site, another Cherokee village. While Combes was at work on the Fort Prince George Site he was also in general charge of the other excavations. Prentice Thomas and Don Robertson also conducted some general surveys of the area and briefly tested several sites under Dr. Edwards' direction in both years.

Logistic and administrative problems developed and a thorough survey of the Keowee-Toxaway Project area was never completed. Combes later returned to survey the upper reaches of the Jocassee Reservoir, the northernmost part of the project and spent considerable time pulling together the data for a general survey record of the project.

In 1964 an archeological project was carried out on the Groton Plantation, in Allendale and Hampton Counties, by a crew from the Peabody Museum. Dr. James B. Stoltman, then a graduate student at Harvard, surveyed the area, sampled several sites, and partially excavated one. The main excavation was at the Rabbit Mount Site, a stratified occupation area of the Transitional and later culture periods (Stoltman 1974). Subsequent work at Groton Plantation was done by Dr. Drexel Peterson in 1969. Both projects were supported by the landowners, the Winthrop Family, and both resulted in Doctoral Dissertations (Peterson 1971).

Meanwhile administrative problems at the South Carolina Department of Archeology became more acute and it seemed appropriate to transfer the responsibility for archeological research to some other state agency. In Governor McNair's State of the State address in 1967 he recommended a change. The General Assembly considered that the University of South Carolina would be better able to evaluate such a program than would the Governor's office and they transferred the Department of Archeology to the University as of July 1, 1967.

The University of South Carolina was already developing research bureaus and institutions under President Thomas F. Jones' administration and, as the old name was obviously no longer appropriate, the name was changed to the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology. Administration of this new Institute was assigned to the Vice President for Advanced Studies and Research, Dr. James A. Morris. The Institute, thus, remained independent of any department or college and retained its identity as a separate, full-time, research unit of the University. Dr. Edwards continued as the Director and State Archeologist and John Combes continued as the Assistant Director.

The Institute of Archeology and Anthropology

Beginnings

By the fall of 1967, Dr. Edwards had developed interests that took him out of state for considerable periods of time and John Combes was still at work at Fort Prince George. The University felt that the new Institute should have the benefit of an outside review and evaluation. Accordingly Vice-President Morris invited Dr. William Sears from Florida Atlantic University in Boca Raton, Florida to examine the structure and accomplishments of the Institute and to make recommendations for future direction of its work.

Dr. Sears recommended that the structure and concepts of the Institute were ideally suited to productive research and that the Institute continue as a separate, full-time research facility of the University with accountability to the Vice-President for Advanced Studies and Research. He recommended extensive changes in archeological procedures and programming of research and suggested improved space and facilities. The review served as a healthy boost to the Institute and was encouraging to the University.

In the spring of 1968 Dr. Edwards was invited to join the staff of Temple Buell College in Colorado and in August he left Columbia to take that position. During that spring and summer his efforts were devoted to other matters preparatory

to leaving. John Combes turned his efforts toward administering the Institute while completing his work at Fort Prince George where he had spent 28 months in the field.

The University began a search for a new Director for the Institute that spring. In June Dr. Robert L. Stephenson, then Coordinator of the Nevada Archeological Survey at the University of Nevada in Reno, accepted the position to begin on September 1, 1968. Dr. Stephenson had done his graduate studies at the University of Oregon and the University of Michigan. Prior to his going to the University of Nevada in 1966, he had spent twenty years with the Smithsonian Institution in the River Basin Surveys Program of the Bureau of American Ethnology. He had acquired valuable experience in administering archeological research programs at the Bureau and at Nevada.

In September 1968, the potential for productive research at the Institute was indeed encouraging. Space, staff, equipment, and facilities were limited but the organizational position of the Institute was ideal and the archeological resources for research were unlimited. All of the field and other temporary staff had completed their field assignments and had been terminated. Only the one permanent staff member, John Combes, remained. Laboratory and office equipment included a new IBM Selectric typewriter, two vehicles, and little else. Field equipment consisted of a new station wagon, a new pickup, and a modest inventory of worn-out tents, shovels, camp gear and other expendables. Temporary space was assigned in Davis College consisting of two small rooms and a section of unfinished basement, about 1400 square feet in all.

Archeological specimens from the several excavations of the past four years were on temporary shelves in the basement rooms at University Terrace. Some had been catalogued but most remained in the original field bags. Such catalogs and records as existed were in the containers with the specimens. There was no site file or inventory of sites recorded in the state. Field notes and photographs were not to be found and the results of only one excavation of the past four years had been compiled into a report. This was the excavation at the Sewee Shell Ring Site (Edwards 1966).

The Institute was funded by a line item in the University budget appropriated by the General Assembly. One contract budget was also on hand, consisting of about half of the original budget of the Duke Power Company contract. The Tricentennial Commission was beginning to activate programs for the celebration of South Carolina's 300th birthday and funds for archeological excavation were anticipated from that source. The Star Fort Historical Commission was continuing its program of historic preservation and archeological work was needed there. The Camden District Heritage Foundation, too, wished to continue archeological research in its preservation program. The National Park Service was in need of investigation of the proposed Trotters Shoals Reservoir on the Savannah River between Clark Hill and Hartwell Reservoirs.

In addition to these specific projects, strong support and cooperation were offered from many federal, state, and local agencies for the research program of the Institute. The University of South Carolina, the State Department of Archives and History, the State Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism, the National Park Service, the United States Forest Service, the Charleston Museum, Mr. Cameron Burn of Charleston, and other agencies and individuals provided a cooperative atmosphere for a viable, state-wide research program.

Most of all the strong support given to the Institute by Dr. Thomas F. Jones, President of the University of South Carolina, made the development of the program possible. His enthusiasm and the capable guiding hand of Dr. James A. Morris, Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research, and of Dr. Morris' successor in that post, Dr. H. Willard Davis, provided the strength so necessary to begin such a program. Dr. William H. Patterson has continued to support the Institute since he became president of the University in 1974.

In the fall of 1968, the Institute had abundant support and unlimited research potential but few of the tools with which to work. Staff had to be developed, space in which to work had to be acquired, equipment had to be purchased for both field and laboratory, and research goals and objectives had to be set. The following year was devoted largely to those matters but specific research was also begun almost immediately. John Combes had spent 28 months in the field on the Keowee-Toxaway Project and immediately began the laboratory analysis of that material. In October the Tricentennial Commission requested research at the 1670 historic site of Charles Towne and that project was started in November. Stanley South was borrowed from the North Carolina Department of Archives and History for the first two months of the project and Combes broke away from his other research to help on that. In April 1969, South resigned from his North Carolina position and joined the Institute staff. He returned to the Charles Towne Site and continued the field excavations through October 1969 with temporary crews that ranged from 5 to 6 to as many as fifty people. Nine and a half months were spent in the field. The historic 1670's fortifications were excavated and partially reconstructed. A sixteenth century Indian ceremonial center was excavated, as were parts of an earlier Woodland village site, two historic tar kilns, and camp debris of a series of minor, sporadic Indian occupations of the period of 6,000 to 4,000 years ago.

Meanwhile, in the fall of 1968, a secretary and three laboratory assistants were hired and an inventory of field, laboratory, and office equipment began to develop. By August of 1969, the Institute moved into spacious new quarters that the University had completely renovated, on the ground floor of Maxcy College on the University campus. Combes continued his research on the Keowee-Toxaway material. The specimens resulting from Edwards' excavations began to be washed, catalogued, and organized into systematic files.

A systematic state-wide inventory of archeological sites was begun in January 1969. The system was based upon the River Basin Surveys system of site inventory. Each site was assigned a trinomial designation. This consisted of a number for the state (South Carolina is 38), a county designation of two capital letters (e.g. Charleston County is CH), and a number for the site. The Charles Towne Site, for example, is 38CH1; the Wild Cherry Site in Pickens County is 38PN22. Every note, record, map, photograph, and specimen pertaining to any one site has that site number attached to it. All records pertaining to any one site except specimens, photographic negatives, and large maps, are filed in one or more 8-1/2 x 11 manila folders and these are filed by the county. Photographic negatives are filed in envelopes by site and county. Maps are filed similarly in large map file drawers. Specimens are filed similarly in flat boxes (21" x 25" to 8" deep) with telescope lids. All of the sites for which any data were on hand were incorporated into this file system. Then, site information from the Charleston Museum, private collectors in the State, and the Universities of North Carolina and Georgia were solicited for information on South Carolina sites. Records of some

700 sites became available quickly and the State-Wide Archeological Site Inventory was well under way.

A publication program was established with the first issue of The Notebook in January 1969. This was designed as a bulletin to publish very brief archeological articles and to report the activities of the Institute. It was begun as a monthly but soon became a bi-monthly. It is distributed free of charge to those interested in the archeology of the State. A monograph series of major technical reports and a popular series of short interpretive reports were both anticipated to begin later.

Dr. E. Thomas Hemmings from the University of Arizona joined the staff in September 1969 as the fourth archeologist. A photographer, an administrative clerk, a research clerk, and a typist were added to the support staff.

Goals and Objectives

Along with the staff, the physical facilities, and the field and laboratory research, the Institute developed a conceptual framework for research and preservation goals. This was an outline of the objectives toward which the Institute was to strive for the next several years (Stephenson 1970a). It included not only the research and preservation goals but also several objectives that the University of South Carolina and the South Carolina Department of Archives and History had asked the Institute to help accomplish.

The anthropology section of the Department of Anthropology and Sociology was weak after Dr. Turney-High's retirement in 1967 and Donald R. Sutherland was the only remaining anthropologist. A baccalaureate degree in anthropology was not available to University of South Carolina students. The University asked the Institute to assist in developing a viable Department of Anthropology. The University also asked the Institute to assist in the educational process by providing research training and experience to students and by providing seminars and individual guidance to students in research projects. South Carolina had no state museum and the University asked the Institute to begin measures that would lead to the development of a comprehensive state museum that would not be a part of the University, but a separate, state-wide institution.

The 1968 General Assembly had passed a law regulating underwater antiquities in the waters of the state and vested the administration of that law in the Department of Archives and History. The Department asked the Institute to take over that administration and the 1969 General Assembly made the appropriate change in the law. No funds, though, had been appropriated for the purpose either year. The Department of Archives and History also asked the Institute to assist with its State-Wide Historic Preservation Plan and work with the Department under the terms of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Several local amateur archeologists also asked the Institute to assist in developing a workable state-wide amateur archeological society. The purpose was to bring professional and non-professional archeologists together for mutual assistance and a better public understanding of South Carolina archeology. All of these things the Institute undertook to do, or to help do, in addition to its objectives of research and preservation.

Over the next five years, since the original "Statement of Goals" was prepared, a few of these goals were achieved, most of them were well along toward achievement, some were only started, but all of them were in some stage of progress. Other goals and objectives developed in response to new concepts, methods, and perspectives. New needs and opportunities arose, too, from the accomplishment, or even partial accomplishment, of the original goals and objectives and from increased national and state concern with preservation and environment. The efforts of the Institute to achieve these goals and to set others are summarized in the following pages.

Logistics and Special Efforts

In order to accomplish effective research of any kind there must be staff, equipment, facilities, and space as well as funding. The beginnings of these at the Institute have been mentioned above but as work increased and the funding developed, so did the staff, equipment, facilities and space. The laboratory space in Maxcy College was expanded twice to take in the entire ground floor except one room. Now that space is entirely too small and expansion is again essential to the Institute. The photographic darkroom and studio was expanded and space was acquired in the ground floor of an adjacent building for equipment storage and a conservation laboratory. Additional equipment storage space was acquired in the football stadium and a vehicle parking area was developed near the baseball field. Each research project provided some additional equipment for both field and laboratory and the basic budget provided office and laboratory equipment. A National Science Foundation equipment grant in 1973 provided a large inventory of field and laboratory equipment. That same year considerable federal surplus equipment became available and the Institute took advantage of that opportunity to increase its inventory.

Staff additions were also made to meet the research needs. Hemmings joined the staff in September 1969 and resigned to go to the University of Florida in August 1971. He was replaced in June 1972 by Dr. Leland G. Ferguson from Florida Atlantic University. In October 1971, Richard F. Carrillo joined the staff from the University of Kansas as a staff archeologist. Thomas Ryan and George Teague joined the staff as assistant archeologists in February and September 1971, respectively, and resigned to finish their schooling in September 1972. The state's first underwater archeologist, Alan B. Albright, came to the Institute from the College of the Virgin Islands in July 1973 and the first professional archeological conservator, Elizabeth Sanford joined the staff in August 1974 from the University of London. In September 1974 Dr. Kenneth E. Lewis was hired as the archeologist for the Camden project and Dr. Albert C. Goodyear as the highway archeologist.

Richard Polhemus was employed as laboratory supervisor in February 1970, stayed to become an assistant archeologist and resigned to return to school in March 1973, being replaced as laboratory supervisor by Leslie Beuschel in March 1973. Gordon H. Brown has been the Institute photographer since March 1970 and R. Darby Erd was appointed full-time illustrator in September 1974 having been preceded by part-time illustrators of whom James Frierson had the longest tenure. Maryjane Rhett became the research clerk in January 1971 and Carleen Sexton was hired as accounting clerk in June 1969. Betty Williams

joined the staff as secretary in October 1968 and remained until November 1971. She was followed by a succession of secretaries until Myra L. Smith assumed the position in July 1973. Several typists and stenographers were a part of the staff throughout these years.

A research assistant program was initiated in September 1972 when six graduate students were hired for full-time research. The purpose of this program was to provide a training program in full-time research for students, that would permit them to decide whether they wanted to go on to get advanced degrees, and to provide a group of people who could serve as research assistants to the staff archeologists. Of the first group of six composed of David Miller, David Mullis, Page Luttrell, Travis Bianchi, Susan Jackson, and Richard Kimmel, only Kimmel and Jackson elected to continue schooling in anthropology, the others deciding to go into other jobs. Wayne Neighbors replaced Mullis and after a year decided to go to law school; Michael Hartley replaced Luttrell and has now gone to graduate school in anthropology; David Anderson replaced Miller and he, too, has returned to graduate school in anthropology; Robert Asreen replaced Kimmel for a year. This has been a successful program but is temporarily suspended due to lack of current funds, as all of these positions are funded from contracts and grants.

One other staff member since July 1973 has been Dr. Francis A. Lord, a military historian who, while not employed by the Institute, has had his office here and has provided access to his extensive collection of military objects of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries.

The Institute has also had a temporary, part-time staff of student assistants in the laboratory numbering from 6 to 20 throughout these years. Temporary field assistants have depended upon the projects under excavation but they, too, have numbered from as few as 6 to as many as 50 at any one time. Approximately 100 students have thus received laboratory training in archeology and slightly over 225 have had field training in archeology. Some have had both. Many of these appointments, especially in the laboratory, have been under the national Work-Study program, but most of them have been funded on contract and grant money. This has been a highly successful educational aspect of the Institute's work and many of these students have gone into anthropology or continued an anthropology major into graduate school.

The anthropology section of the Department of Anthropology and Sociology has developed from the single anthropologist in 1968 to a substantial and viable section with eleven full-time anthropologists and an anthropology degree-granting program. In July 1975 the Department will separate and an independent Department of Anthropology will begin with a senior anthropologist, Dr. Karl M. Heider, as its head. The Institute has played a minor role in this development avoiding any dominant role in affairs of the department but offering encouragement and suggestions at every opportunity, especially in matters of recruiting and in liaison with the University administration. Dr. Stephenson and Dr. Ferguson hold joint appointments in the Department. 6

In 1969 the Institute began efforts toward a state museum and initiated a study of the possibilities by bringing Dr. Eugene Kingman from the Joslyn Museum in Omaha, Nebraska to assess the assets and liabilities of the state. During a full week's visit, Dr. Kingman visited several parts of South Carolina and

met with most of the museum people in the State. His report was enthusiastic. In 1971 the Institute was instrumental in helping to develop a South Carolina Federation of Museums that is now a viable, active organization. That same year the General Assembly appointed a State Museum Study Committee and, the next year, a State Museum Commission. The Study Committee recommended proceeding with a State Museum that would be one of excellence. The Commission spent a year in searching for ideas as to the best procedures to pursue and for a director who could be relied upon to accomplish the task. In October 1974, Dr. William Scheele was appointed Director of the South Carolina State Museum and that project is now well on its way to completion. The Director of the Institute served as a consultant to both the Study Committee and to the State Museum Commission; as Director of the University of South Carolina Museum from 1971 to 1974; as President of the South Carolina Federation of Museums, 1971-1973; and still serves on the advisory committee to the University of South Carolina Museum.

In 1969 the South Carolina Department of Archives and History organized its Board of Review for the screening of nominations to the National Register of Historic Places and for other aspects of administration of the National Historic Preservation Act. Charles Lee, Director of the Department of Archives and History served as the State Liaison Officer, now State Historic Preservation Officer. Dr. Stephenson was asked to serve as the archeologist on the Board of Review and has served in that capacity to the present. A close liaison between the Department and the Institute developed by the fall of 1968 and the two agencies have worked closely together on historic and archeological preservation throughout these seven years.

The Institute has continued to administer the South Carolina Underwater Archeology Law since 1969. In 1972 the General Assembly made its first appropriation for this purpose and in July 1973 Alan B. Albright was appointed Underwater Archeologist. He had had extensive experience in this field for a decade with the Smithsonian Institution and four years with the College of the Virgin Islands. A conservation laboratory was immediately begun and in August 1974 Miss Elizabeth Sanford, with an M.A. in classical archeology from Brown University and a Diploma in the Conservation of Archaeological Material from the Institute of Archaeology at the University of London as well as experience in archeological conservation in the Mediterranean area, was hired as conservator. The archeological conservation laboratory is now developing into a regional center for conservation. The underwater archeology program, in addition to administering the law, which has taken most of Mr. Albright's efforts, is developing a systematic search and inventory of underwater sites in the rivers, estuaries, and off the coast of South Carolina.

Under the auspices of the Institute, an Archeological Society of South Carolina was re-established in January 1969 as a means of bringing together the non-professional collectors and amateur archeologists with the professional archeologists for their mutual benefit and for the preservation of the archeological heritage of the state. The society now has some 200 members, meets regularly each month, operates field projects, and has a useful series of publications.

Staff members of the Institute, each year, have been contributing participants in international, national, regional, and state professional meetings and conferences. In 1970 the Institute was host to the joint meetings of the

regional *Southeastern Archeological Conference* and the *Conference on Historic Site Archaeology*. Stanley South is the founding chairman of the latter organization and editor of its journal The Conference on Historic Site Archaeology Papers. The Board of Directors of this Conference are Institute Staff Members.

The Institute was host, in January 1975, to the joint meetings of the *Society for Historical Archaeology* and the *International Conference on Underwater Archaeology*. John Combes is serving a three year term as editor of the *Society for Historical Archaeology* journal Historical Archaeology.

Staff members of the Institute are serving also on archeological advisory boards and committees to the Tennessee Valley Authority and several state and local historic preservation groups as well as, intermittantly, to out of state preservation organizations.

Research Efforts

The research programs of the Institute over these past seven years have been primarily devoted to the research and preservation of historic period sites but emphasis has also been placed upon prehistoric sites. The Keowee-Toxaway project field work was completed in 1969 and the analysis and report of the excavations there of the site of Fort Prince George is being prepared as a Doctoral dissertation by John D. Combes. This is a French and Indian War fort of the 1750's and 1760's on the Cherokee Frontier. In conjunction with this report, Combes and Susan Jackson are studying the South Carolina Cherokee towns of the eighteenth century, one of which, Toxaway, was partially excavated by Combes and Edwards as part of the Keowee-Toxaway project. Other parts of the Keowee-Toxaway project are also being analyzed preparatory to publication of reports. Dr. Roger Grange, now of the University of South Florida, analyzed the material he recovered from the I. C. Few Site and has prepared a report that is now being reviewed for publication (Grange n.d.). This was a late prehistoric site of the sixteenth-seventeenth century with apparent ceremonial implications. The Wild Cherry Site excavated by Bernard Golden and the Rock Turtle Site excavated by Prentice Thomas are now being analyzed by Leslie Beuschel preparatory to reporting. Both these are also late prehistoric sites in Pickens and Oconee Counties. Combes has also brought together the overall Keowee-Toxaway survey, begun by Dr. Edwards, and incorporated the site data into the Institute's continuing state-wide archeological site inventory. The Keowee-Toxaway Project was funded, in large part, by the Duke Power Company.

Stanley South completed the field assignment at the Charles Towne Site, though several more seasons of extensive excavation are needed at that site, and is analyzing the results of nine and one half months of field work. A preliminary report was prepared in 1969 (South 1969) but an extensive analytical report is now in progress. The Charles Towne Project was funded in large part by the Tricentennial Commission.

Dr. Hemmings undertook exploratory excavations along the site of the Land's Ford Canal in Chester County in 1969 and this investigation was continued by Richard Carrillo in 1972. This was the site of an 1820's barge canal on the Catawba River and the project was funded in part by the South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism with funds from the National Historic Preservation Act (Hemmings 1972a; Carrillo 1974a).

In 1970, Paul Brockington, then a University of South Carolina student employee of the Institute, analyzed and reported on some of the material from the Theriault Site recovered by Dr. Edwards (Brockington 1971). This was a multi-component site of Paleo-Indian to Woodland occupation. This analysis and report were funded by the Institute.

Stanley South spent two field seasons in 1970 and 1971 in exploratory excavations at the sites of Ninety Six and related sites in Greenwood County funded largely by the Star Fort Historical Commission. Here were the sites of Goudey's Trading Post and associated fortifications of the French and Indian War Period; the eighteenth century town of Ninety Six and its associated forts of the Revolutionary War Period including Holmes' Fort, Williamson's Fort, the Star Fort and siegeworks, and Kosciusko's mine; the town palisades and earthworks; and the post-Revolutionary War town of Cambridge. Dr. Edwards had done some excavation at the town of Ninety Six and at the Star Fort previously. South spent one season in exploratory trenching of the entire complex (South 1970a) and the second season excavating most of the site of Holmes' Fort and Williamson's Fort and a section of the town of Cambridge (South 1971a). South prepared two preliminary reports of this work and Steven G. Baker, a field assistant on the crew, prepared a report on excavation of a cellar of the town of Cambridge (Baker 1972a,b). Funds were not available in 1972 for further work. Early in 1973 the Commission, with consultation of the Institute, hired Michael Rodeffer as archeologist-director of the project. He undertook, in 1974 and 1975, excavation of the siegeworks and of the Ninety Six jail, and completed the portion of the Holmes' Fort-Williamson's Fort area that remained to be done.

Early in 1969 the Kershaw County Historical Commission asked the Institute to assist as advisors in continuing the excavations begun by Alan Calmes at the Revolutionary War Period site of Camden (Calmes 1967, 1968). In April the Institute suggested that Robert Strickland, then a graduate student at the University of Arizona, be hired to continue excavations. Strickland spent parts of the next four years in those excavations during which time he also completed his Masters degree at the University of Arizona. He prepared one report of this work (Strickland 1971) and is now working on a second report. This site includes the Kershaw House and its palisaded yard, the palisaded town of eighteenth century Camden, a powder magazine, and six outlying redoubts, all of the mid- to late-eighteenth century. In September of 1974 the Institute hired Dr. Kenneth Lewis to continue the excavations that fall and again in the summer of 1975. Calmes had excavated at the powder magazine and the foundations of the Kershaw House. Strickland excavated the Kershaw House yard and palisade, one of the redoubts, and a portion of the town palisade. Dr. Lewis is excavating additional sections of the town palisade and portions of the town itself.

In October 1970, John Combes began a two year leave of absence to complete his academic work toward a Ph.D at the University of Kansas.

Stanley South undertook a brief excavation in May 1970 of the outbuildings surrounding the Price House, built in the 1790's, in Spartanburg County, sponsored in part by the Spartanburg County Historic Preservation Commission (South 1973a). In September 1971 South also undertook a brief examination of the Pawley House on Pawley's Island in Georgetown County, sponsored by the owner, Mr. Alan T. Calhoun (South 1973b).

Dr. Hemmings, with assistance from Mr. Gene Waddell, then Director of the Florence Museum, conducted a survey of the coastal shell ring sites from the mouth of the Santee River to the mouth of the Savannah River. These shell ring sites are prehistoric structures consisting of uniformly built up circles of oyster shell and midden refuse. They are about 100 to more than 200 feet in diameter. The ring itself is usually 5 to 20 feet wide and 2 to 8 feet high with a flat, shell-less circular area in the center. Waring, Calmes, and others have tested these rings in past years and Carbon 14 dates of 3,100 to 3,900 years ago have been obtained from them. Hemmings and Waddell recorded 22 shell rings in their survey.

Following this survey, Hemmings devoted a month in the summer of 1970 to exploratory excavations at the Fig Island Shell Ring. Little more was learned of these structures than was known before and Hemmings' reports are not yet completed although he prepared a general report on the Formative Period on the South Carolina Coast (Hemmings 1972b).

The test excavations of Dr. Edwards at the site of Fort Moore and Old Savanno Towne near North Augusta were re-examined in 1971 and additional areas were excavated there in 1971-72. Stanley South began the work and Richard Polhemus carried it out, largely on weekends and with the help of members of the Augusta Archeological Society and the Archeological Society of South Carolina. Polhemus excavated a trading post cellar and several associated features that were a part of the early- to mid-eighteenth century Fort Moore complex. He is completing a report of this work now. Polhemus also spent portions of three months in 1972, again mainly on weekends and with some assistance from the members of the Archeological Society of South Carolina, excavating at the site of Newington Plantation. This historic plantation complex of the early eighteenth century on the Ashley River near Summerville was burned in the Yemasee War and rebuilt at least twice. Both the Fort Moore and the Newington projects were largely unfunded but salary for Polhemus was provided by Historic Preservation Funds.

Polhemus also conducted an exploratory excavation at the site of the John Fox House in Lexington in February 1971 with funds provided by the Lexington County Historical Society (Polhemus 1972) and located original building foundations for historic interpretation. He also devoted several months of laboratory research to the analysis of a large collection of unusual Delft ceramics recovered from a drainage excavation near the Exchange Building in Charleston in 1970. A manuscript reporting this work is now ready for publication (Polhemus n.d.).

Under the auspices of the National Park Service, Dr. Hemmings conducted a survey of archeological sites on the South Carolina side of the Savannah River in the area to be flooded by the proposed Trotters' Shoals dam (now called the Richard B. Russell Dam). The University of Georgia had just finished a partial survey of the Georgia side of this area between Lake Hartwell and Clark Hill Lake. Hemmings recorded 38 sites in South Carolina (Hemmings 1972c) and a similar number was recorded by the Georgia team. More survey was required on both sides and John Combes conducted a second survey of the South Carolina side in 1973-74. Based upon the recommendations of these three surveys, the Institute has been asked to continue work for the National Park Service at Trotters' Shoals.

Combes is to begin two projects in the fall of 1975. One is the completion of the survey on the Georgia side of the reservoir area. The other is an exploratory testing project in selected sites on the South Carolina side. In the latter project there is an excellent opportunity to learn a great deal about the poorly known, small Archaic sites. Additional excavations of selected sites will be recommended following completion of these two projects. All of these are sponsored by the Corps of Engineers and the National Park Service.

The South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism asked the Institute to begin a long-range excavation program at the historic town and fort of Dorchester in Dorchester County in 1970. Richard Carrillo had been employed by the Institute to conduct exploratory excavations at the eighteenth century site of Fort Hawkins in Macon, Georgia under the auspices of the city of Macon (Carrillo 1971). He completed this work in September 1971 and joined the regular Institute staff that October. Carrillo began the excavations at Fort Dorchester in the spring of 1972 (Carrillo 1973) and continued a second season there in the summer of 1973. Fort Dorchester, on the Ashley River stood at the edge of the town of Dorchester and was built in the mid-1700's. Its main use came during the Revolutionary War. It is one, if not the only, of the few eighteenth century forts with tabby walls still standing 6 to 8 feet above ground. Three seasons of excavation were planned here, to be followed by a several-year program of excavation in the town of Dorchester. A report of the 1972 and 1973 seasons of work at Fort Dorchester is nearing completion.

Meanwhile, Carrillo spent a month excavating at the site of Pinckneyville, in Union County. This was a late eighteenth century courthouse town and the Union County Historical Commission wanted details of the town's layout for possible exhibit. Little was actually found as a major portion of the town appears to have been on land not now owned by the County (Carrillo 1972a).

During this time various members of the Institute staff were frequently occupied in small projects of a day or a few days duration, mainly generated by informants describing a site that appeared to be worth investigating. Stephenson and Combes tested a small, multi-component site on the Savannah River in Allendale County known as the Bostick Site, where an Early Archaic occupation was overlain by a Woodland village. Stephenson and Combes also made a brief survey of Spring Island in Beaufort County and located several small shell middens, a Woodland village and an historic plantation house with tabby walls still standing. Hemmings assisted James Michie on several occasions in the partial excavation of the Daw's Island Site in Beaufort County, a Transitional Period prehistoric site. Stephenson and South examined a location in Charleston where remains of the track and tressel of the "Best Friend of Charleston", the earliest self-propelled passenger train, began its service in the 1820's. South tested a site on Lake Marion where early ceramics and "Poverty Point baked clay balls" were recovered. These clay balls were first identified at the Poverty Point Site in Louisiana and subsequently were found at the Charles Towne Site. The Lake Marion Site added materially to the distribution of these Transitional Period objects (South 1970b).

Thomas Ryan began a series of brief but wide-ranging site investigations in the spring of 1971. He made a cursory study of the corridor for the proposed route of Interstate Highway 77 between Rock Hill and Columbia recommending that

when the precise route is selected a full archeological survey can be conducted (Ryan 1971a). He made a survey of an area along the Broad River near Leeds for the Atlantic Richfield Company in April 1971. That company was planning industrial development of that piece of land. Actually this was the first Environmental Impact Statement done by the Institute but it was not at that time known by that term. Ryan also conducted brief surveys of a few days each in the area of Wahee Neck in Marion County, along the Savannah and Broad Rivers for pre-historic fish traps, at a Woodland burial site in Hampton County on the Savannah River, at a mound site in Lancaster County, and at several sites reported in 1898 by C. B. Moore in Jasper and Beaufort Counties (Ryan 1971b).

Ryan also conducted a month of excavation at the McCollum Mound Site on the Broad River in Chester County in 1971 (Ryan 1971c). In 1972 he spent a month in exploratory excavation on the land being developed for the Riverbanks Zoo on the Saluda River in Lexington County (Ryan 1972).

In 1968 John Combes, working with Mr. Marshall W. Williams of the University of Georgia, began development of the use of an electronic resistivity device to test archeological sites (Combes 1969). This provided a means of testing the subsurface of a site for differences in compaction to locate pits, trenches, postholes, and other features that had long been buried without excavation. On the basis of the differential resistivity, excavations more economically can be planned on predicted features. Combes and Williams have continued, sporadically, to improve the use of this additional tool and are now using it in combination with computer print-outs that provide a picture of the subsurface features.

George Teague began a survey in 1972 of the area along the Broad River near Parr Shoals where the South Carolina Electric and Gas Company was planning an expansion of its Parr-Frees power-generating plant. A survey was made of the proposed area of the water impoundment and two sites were excavated. One was a late prehistoric mound site known as the Blair Mound. The other was a small rockshelter known as Parr Cave. This work was sponsored by the South Carolina Electric and Gas Company.

In the summer of 1970 John Combes returned to the area of the Keowee-Toxaway project in Pickens and Oconee Counties to complete the survey of sites in the upper reaches of the Jocasee Reservoir. Following that survey, Combes stopped at Paris Mountain to excavate a charcoal kiln and to test a small cemetery at the request of the South Carolina Department of Parks Recreation, and Tourism (Combes 1974).

In the summer of 1971, before he joined the Institute staff, Dr. Leland Ferguson conducted a survey of certain areas along the Savannah River in Allendale and Barnwell Counties. This was done for the Florida Atlantic University in cooperation with the Institute.

Both South and Ferguson had been invited by the Smithsonian Institution to contribute sections to the planned multi-volume revision of the Handbook of North American Indians. In 1971 Ferguson completed his sections on "Upper South Atlantic Coastal Plain" and "Late Archaic: Transitional Period 4,000-1,200 B.C." and South completed, in 1972, his section on "Tribes of the Carolina Lowland".

Leland Ferguson began the first of a series of seasons of excavation in the summer of 1972 at the site of the Santee Indian Mound or Fort Watson, now known as the Scott's Lake Site on Lake Marion. Here a large, late, prehistoric Indian temple mound and ceremonial complex was used by the British in the Revolutionary War. The British fortified the mound, camped at its base, and were there besieged by the Patriots in 1781. Ferguson's excavations in the summers of 1972 and 1973 were largely restricted to the 1780's occupation and a report of this work has been completed (Ferguson 1975a). Several additional seasons of excavation are anticipated to excavate the ceremonial complex of the prehistoric period. In preparation for the prehistoric investigations there, Ferguson conducted test excavations of the Mulberry Mound Site on the Wateree River near Camden in 1973. His report of this excavation includes the synthesis and reporting of all previous work at this site from Dr. Blanding's work in the 1820's through the investigations of Caldwell, Kelly, Coe, and Stuart in the mid-twentieth century (Ferguson 1974).

During 1969-1971 Stephenson completed two major monographs that he was working on when he joined the Institute staff. One is a study of a large, late, prehistoric earthlodge village site that he excavated in South Dakota as a part of the River Basin Surveys Program (Stephenson 1971). This was the Potts Village Site. The other was a study of three rockshelter sites and two large village sites that he had excavated in the Whitney Reservoir in central Texas. This monograph also reported briefly on the sixty-eight other sites that he surveyed in the Whitney Reservoir for the River Basin Surveys (Stephenson 1970b).

Members of the Institute staff have steadily been at work, when time allowed, on various methodological and theoretical problems designed to make the interpretation of archeological data more useful. South has prepared a mathematical formula for dating of early historic ceramics (South 1971b). Carrillo has prepared a somewhat similar formula for dating of historic glass bottles (Carrillo 1972b). South has also prepared a series of conceptual statements pertaining to the handling of archeological data and the scientific methods of data explanation including a pottery taxonomy for the coastal area of South Carolina (South 1973c).

Other members of the staff have prepared exhibits of archeological materials for the Columbia Science Museum, the United State Forest Service, the Chester County Tricentennial Committee, the Charleston Museum, the National Park Service, and others.

Combes with the assistance of Susan Jackson has been at work on a study of the proto-historic Lower Cherokee towns in the South Carolina area. Several town sites can now be pinpointed with some certainty and others are known in the general area of their locations. This is in addition to the several Cherokee towns that were inundated by the Keowee-Toxaway reservoirs. Combes has also begun a study of cemetery remains, especially in Charleston and Beaufort Counties.

In the winter of 1972-73 South undertook an exploratory excavation of the Indian Springs Site on Hilton Head Island where prehistoric occupation of the Woodland period was found, overlain by nineteenth century historic occupation. In March 1973, he excavated portions of the "Horseshoe", an area on the University of South Carolina campus, revealing the evidence for early- to mid-nineteenth

century wells and building foundations. Later that same spring he undertook a detailed excavation of building and fortification foundations at Fort Johnson on Charleston Harbor for the College of Charleston and the South Carolina Department of Wildlife and Marine Resources. Interpretive reports of all three of these projects are nearing completion.

The National Park Service requested three studies of their areas at Kings Mountain National Military Park in York and Cherokee Counties. One was an examination of the archeological remains around the Howser House site, an early colonial dwelling in this area. The second was a survey of the archeological remains that might be affected by new park road development (Carrillo 1974b). The third was an investigation of the presumed burial location of William Chronicle. Richard Carrillo undertook all three of these projects in 1974-75.

Richard Carrillo also undertook a multi-disciplinary project in 1974 at the site of Brattonsville in Chester County. This was a log building of the Revolutionary War period and the site of an historic engagement of the war. An historian, an architect, and an archeologist collaborated on the project (Wilkins, Hunter, and Carrillo 1975).

Stanley South completed another National Park Service project in the fall and winter of 1973. This was an exploratory excavation at the site of Fort Moultrie in Charleston County with the primary purpose being to identify the location of the original Fort Moultrie of 1776. The project became larger than originally anticipated but the fort location was found partly beneath the present Fort Moultrie. The report of these excavations, entitled "Palmetto Parapets", was published by the Institute as Anthropological Studies No. 1 in December 1974 (South 1974).

After more than a year of discussion and negotiation, an archeological program for the South Carolina Highway Department was developed in February 1974. Albert C. Goodyear was hired to head this program for the Institute and several highway projects have been developed. The archeological survey of the Southeastern Beltline around Columbia has been a major effort in highway archeology (Anderson, et al. 1974; Anderson 1974). This project was begun with the assistance of the Archeological Society of South Carolina. Another major project has been the line of the proposed beltline around Camden. Construction on Interstate 77 between Rock Hill and Columbia, briefly investigated in 1971 by Ryan, is the next major project in this program. There have also been several smaller highway projects completed such as minor road alterations or widenings.

In the winter of 1972-73 the program of preparation of Environmental Impact Statements began in earnest. The National Environmental Policy Act makes it mandatory that any person, firm, or agency using federal funds for a project that will affect the environment, file a statement as to the effect that project will have on archeological and historic resources. In nearly all instances an archeological survey is required before such a statement can be made. The Institute has made nearly two dozen such Environmental Impact Statement surveys for such varied firms and agencies as the Westinghouse Electric Company; the Economic Development Administration; the Soil Conservation Service; the South Carolina Electric and Gas Company; the Hilton Head Company; Hussey, Gay, and Bell, Consultants; the Duke Power Company; Lyles, Bisset, Carlyle, and Wolff Company; the Institute of Ecology of the University of Georgia; the United States Army Corps

of Engineers; Sea Pines Plantation; Dames and Moore Consultants; the Seaboard Coastline Railroad; and Horry County Development Board. This Environmental Impact Statement program is a growing one and will increase in the immediate future by a factor of several times.

A Bicentennial development is anticipated at the Colonial courthouse town of Long Bluff on the Pee Dee River near Society Hill in Darlington County. The Institute was asked to examine this area for archeological remains and in the fall of 1974 Dr. Kenneth Lewis spent a month in exploratory excavations there (Lewis 1975).

In 1974 the Institute undertook a survey for the Corps of Engineers, via the National Park Service, of the area to be affected by the Cooper River Rediversion Canal in Berkeley County. Leland Ferguson, assisted by Robert Asreen, undertook this survey and located a large number of sites in the construction area (Asreen 1974). Several were recommended for extensive excavation and, since the canal route has been changed, additional survey will be required.

A request from the United States Atomic Energy Commission for an archeological survey and inventory on the Commission's Savannah River Plant resulted in a contract in January 1973 for the Institute to undertake such a survey. A part of the plant area was surveyed that year under the direction of John Combes. A second contract was undertaken in 1974 that completed most of the area, and a third contract has been negotiated for completion of the final part of the survey. More than 130 sites were recorded but the expected late prehistoric sites in the area were not as abundant as anticipated.

The United States Forest Service is developing a parcel of land adjacent to the Savannah River Plant and a contract has been negotiated for a survey of that area in 1975-76.

The archeological preservation of submerged antiquities within the waters of the state has been pursued by the staff underwater archeologist, Alan B. Albright. One aspect of that preservation has been to control the private divers of the state within the framework of the licensing provisions of the underwater archeology law. Albright has been working with the several dive clubs and individual divers to educate them as to the requirements of the law and the historical significance of the things that are found. He has issued over 70 Hobby Licenses to these people and obtained their cooperation in adhering to the law in most instances. Some do not adhere to the law and the policing capability of the Institute is very limited. Most of the divers have learned that adherence to the law is advantageous to them and benefits the historic preservation efforts of the state.

In addition to the Hobby Licenses, eight Underwater Salvage licenses have been issued of which six are presently in effect. These are for recovery of submerged antiquities at a known site and these licensees are working cooperatively with the Institute.

A large portion of Albright's time since he joined the Institute in July 1973 has been devoted to pursuit of the facts of an elusive claim of sunken Spanish treasure ships in South Carolina waters. Preservation of this kind of site, apart from any potential intrinsic value, requires full archeological

techniques for recovery and is not subject to a "salvage" license. The Institute has stood firm in not allowing the claimant a license to salvage the site and the claimant has refused to divulge the location. In pursuing the facts of this case, a large part of the waters of Georgetown County and a portion of the waters of Horry County have been searched by side-scan sonar.

An inventory of underwater sites is thus being developed by these searchers, by the reports from the licensed divers, and by Albright's own research dives. Sites of shipwrecks, of refuse deposits in rivers, of sunken craft other than shipwrecks, and of any other submerged antiquities are gradually being recorded. In addition to the sporadic inventory development a systematic search of the coastal waters of the state is now being planned and will use side-scan sonar equipment, magnetometer, and individual divers.

The conservation laboratory is being developed into a high capability center for conservation of archeological materials. It has developed primarily as a result of the underwater programs but has capability for archeological materials from land sites as well. The capabilities for conservation at present extend mainly to metals and ceramics but leather, wood, and other capabilities are developing.

The archeological site inventory has now grown to a total of just over 2,000 sites within the state including prehistoric and historic sites on land and beneath the waters of the state. This archeological inventory includes only sites of archeological value or potential value. It does not include the historic sites where no archeological work would be expected to be done.

It will be noted, in this summary of the work of the Institute, that new field projects of major scope have been fewer in 1974-75 than in previous years. This has been intentional, as a means of permitting the staff archeologists time to catch up on laboratory analyses and reporting of the numerous projects undertaken in previous years. Field projects have developed on the heels of each other until the archeologists have barely had time to get out of the field from one project before being asked to undertake another. Regardless of the nature of the site, analysis and reporting usually take at least three times as much time as does the field work. To plan any less is to leave a project but partially done. It is to leave it unreported and is little better than leaving it unexcavated. The Institute is now catching up and will be able to resume full scale field work next year.

Approximately 120 projects have been briefly summarized here. Some are large, several months' projects; others are small and of but a few days' duration. Over the seven year period this is an average of approximately 17 projects per year that the Institute has undertaken.

In addition to these projects the Institute has developed a staff of 21 full-time research people serving in various capacities from archeologist to typists; has developed a well-equipped laboratory facility with reasonable stock of both laboratory and field equipment; has a viable publication program in operation; and is taking a leading role in the theoretical and methodological thinking of the national archeological community.

Other Archeological Capabilities in the State

The archeological preservation efforts of the Institute and its predecessor, the South Carolina Department of Archeology, have been extensive in the past dozen years but have not been the only archeological efforts in the state. Gradually other archeological capabilities have developed. Some of these have been the direct result of the projects of the Institute. Some have developed independently. All have functioned in some relation to the office of the State Archeologist and the Institute.

The Charleston Museum

As has been mentioned before, the one institution in the state that has maintained even a sporadic interest in archeology in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is the Charleston Museum. The three most recent past directors of the Museum, Paul Marshall Rea, Laura M. Bragg, and E. Milby Burton, have been especially interested in archeology. The present director, Donald Herold, continues an even keener interest and his wife, Dr. Elaine Bluhm Herold, with a Ph.D in anthropology, has begun a research program for the Museum. Dr. Herold has conducted several small emergency excavations in the Charleston area in connection with proposed construction projects that threatened archeological sites. She has also conducted one Environmental Impact Statement survey in cooperation with the Institute. Her main research effort has been in the excavations of the Hayward-Washington house in Charleston. Here she has been excavating the cellar, yard, and foundations of one of the historic eighteenth century houses in downtown Charleston and has recovered a tremendous quantity of artifact material.

The Charleston Museum also has a curator of anthropology, Mr. Alan Liss, with an M.A. in anthropology, who has been developing the museum collections into a usable research resource. For the past year, Liss has been working closely with David Anderson, research assistant on the Institute staff, in an analysis of the prehistoric South Carolina coastal ceramics.

The Star Fort Historical Commission

Resulting directly from the excavations of the Institute at the sites of Ninety Six, in Greenwood County, the Star Fort Historical Commission hired an archeologist-director for the Ninety Six project early in 1973. Michael J. Rodeffer, with an M.A. in anthropology, has continued excavations in the approach trenches to the Star Fort, the remaining section of the Holmes' Fort and Williamson's Fort area, and the jail in the town of Ninety Six. He has been assisted by his wife, Dr. Steffanie L. Rodeffer who has recently earned her Ph.D in anthropology. The Star Fort Historical Commission is one of the few county agencies in the country that has undertaken a full-scale archeological project.

The Department of Anthropology and Sociology at University of South Carolina

On the main campus of the University of South Carolina, the Department of Anthropology and Sociology has two archeologists with the Ph.D degree in anthropology. Dr. Donald R. Sutherland, whose specialty is northern South American archeology, has conducted two seasons of archeological excavations at the Spanish Mount Shell Midden Site on Edisto Island. This prehistoric midden is of the Transitional Period of coastal archeology (approximately 3,000-4,000 years ago). This work was done in the summers of 1974 and 1975 and was co-sponsored by the Department and the Institute. Dr. William S. Ayres, whose specialty is South Pacific archeology, has also indicated an interest in archeological research and preservation in South Carolina.

The Lancaster Campus, University of South Carolina

The Lancaster Regional Campus of the University of South Carolina has Robert N. Strickland teaching anthropology on its faculty. Strickland conducted the excavations at historic Camden from 1969 to 1973 and is now preparing a final report of his work there. This work was done in collaboration with the Institute and Strickland is using the facilities of the Institute in preparation of his report.

The Coastal Carolina Campus, University of South Carolina

The Coastal Carolina Regional Campus of the University of South Carolina, at Conway, has two archeologists on its staff. Dr. Reinhold Englemayer has undertaken brief excavations at a site near the coast in extreme east Horry County and is presently excavating at sites on the Arcadia Plantation and De Bordieu Colony in Georgetown County. These appear to be Middle Woodland camp or village sites of some 1,200 to 1,500 years ago. Mr. Newell Wright, now completing his Ph.D in anthropology, is the second archeologist on the Coastal Campus and has indicated an interest in South Carolina archeology.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation

In the fall of 1974, Mrs. Lynn Herman, M.A. in anthropology, was sent by the National Trust for Historic Preservation to conduct archeological excavation at the Drayton Hall Plantation. This consists of research mainly in the area of the plantation house preparatory to historic restoration of Drayton Hall. Mrs. Herman has coordinated her work with the Institute and the sponsorship has been from the National Trust.

Council of South Carolina Archeologists

An informal organization of the professionally trained archeologists in the state is now being formed under the auspices of the Office of the State Archeologist. This will serve as a means of communication and coordination between the several professional people working in the state. It will be a peer review group to insure competent archeological research planning and competent reporting of results. It will be an advisory board to the State Archeologist. Membership will be based upon professional qualifications as established for the National Registry of Archeologists by the Society for American Archeology.

The Archeological Society of South Carolina

In addition to the professionally trained archeologists in the State there are two groups of non-professional hobbyists that are developing capabilities in various aspects of the state-wide archeological preservation effort. One of these is The Archeological Society of South Carolina, that organized in January 1969. The purpose of the Society is to bring those people who have a sincere interest in archeological preservation, but little or no formal training, together with the professional archeologists for the mutual benefit of archeology. Within the Society a number of individuals have developed the capability of serving as assistants on field and laboratory projects, through their association with the Institute and the Society activities. Some are able to initiate and carry out projects of their own with professional direction. All of the Society members serve as a "preservation force" to report sites for the state-wide inventory and to report potential dangers to sites from construction, natural erosion, vandalism or other endangerment of the archeological resources.

These people have aided the Institute in work at the Fort Moore Site in Aiken County, at the Southeastern Beltline around Columbia, at the Newington Plantation Site in Dorchester County, and elsewhere. One Society member, James L. Michie, is taking course work to become an archeologist. He has undertaken competent excavations at the Daw's Island Site in Beaufort County, at the Taylor Site near Columbia, and at the Thom's Creek Site also near Columbia and has prepared reports of the results (Michie 1969, 1973). Other members of the Society, working with the Institute, have also done creditable work in the State. Mr. and Mrs. Walter Joseph excavated the Coker Springs Site in Aiken County; Robert Parler and Sammy Lee excavated the Cal Smoak Site in Bamberg County, D. H. Sullivan has reported scores of sites for the inventory; and Tom Edwards has tested several sites in Darlington County. The Society has over 200 members.

The South Carolina Dive Clubs

The other group of hobbyists that have developed some preservation philosophy and capability is the hobby diving community. Dive Clubs in Charleston, Georgetown, Greenville, North Augusta, Beaufort, Florence, Myrtle Beach, and Columbia are working with the Institutes underwater archeologist in efforts to preserve the underwater heritage of the State while pursuing their hobby. Over 125 divers are licensed and reporting to the Institute and several of them are actively working on projects with the Institute.

A PHILOSOPHY OF ARCHEOLOGICAL PRESERVATION

The Preservation Concept

"Archeological Preservation" is the protection and understanding of the archeological heritage of South Carolina for the benefit of peoples of the present and the future. The "archeological heritage" is that unwritten record of past human activities that is contained in or on the ground. It is the fragmentary remains of towns, villages, camps, buildings, pits, ditches, ships, trails, trash, garbage, artifacts, and even the bones of the people themselves. A part or all of this is in some state of decay from disuse and is buried, or partially buried, beneath the surface of the ground or lies in disuse upon the surface of the land or beneath the waters of the state. It includes the material remains of all of the things once in use by peoples of past generations. It is the unwritten record from the ground.

The archeological heritage includes both the historic and the prehistoric remains whether they be on land or beneath the water. It is the material remains of human cultures in their environmental settings whether the members of those cultures left written records or not. Literate or not, all peoples of all cultures have left a record in the earth for the archeologist to recover and interpret. A written record (often called "history") is only one additional kind of artifact that some cultures have left behind. It is that *unwritten* record - the evidence from the ground - that the archeologist uses to interpret the cultural processes and life-ways of peoples of the past (South 1974). If the culture he is studying happened to be a literate one, he has one more kind of artifact, and a most useful one, to assist in the interpretation. In archeology there can be no philosophical distinction between the prehistoric and the historic either in theoretical approaches or in methodological techniques. The archeologist simply uses all of the tools available to interpret his data. If written documents are available he uses them as an interpretive tool. As in the use of any other interpretive tool, he must understand the proper use of the written document and be capable in the techniques of historic research. But he is still only using another interpretive tool - another kind of artifact of the culture.

Archeologists often refer to "historical archeology" and to "prehistoric archeology" but this is simply a terminological designation to distinguish between specialties in the field of general archeology. One may similarly distinguish between "lithic archeology" and "ceramic archeology" in precisely the same way. The terms simply serve to identify a specialty, in this instance those who specialize in the archeology of indigenous native cultures or the archeology of cultures of European origin; those who specialize in the study of cultures that used stone tools and not pottery or those later cultures that used pottery. It does not distinguish between *kinds* of archeology. All archeology is historical because it deals with, among other things, historical sequences in a continuum of the ever-changing life-ways of human populations. To separate historic from prehistoric archeology would imply that the prehistoric cultures *had* no history - an absurdity at best.

The "preservation" of the archeological heritage is that effort made to keep safe from *further* injury, harm, or destruction, the already deteriorating remains of human activities. An archeological site is, by definition, already partly destroyed yet within it lies, to varying degrees of completeness, the record of the peoples that once used that site. "Preservation" of that site is its *protection* from the natural forces of *additional* erosion and deterioration as well as the cultural forces of destruction, epitomized by "the bulldozer."

Preservation of the archeological heritage is not, though, a passive concept. It has a dynamic dimension that implies that with the protection from further harm to the site there will be at least some effort to understand what the site once meant to the cultural continuity and historic development of the area in which it is located. This is synonymous with archeological research. It is this effort to understand, through research, that provides whatever benefit the site is to have for peoples of the present and future.

Archeological Research and Preservation

There might seem to be a conflict of terms to say that archeological research is synonymous with the dynamic dimension of archeological preservation. Archeological research usually implies excavation and excavation, by its very nature, is a destructive process. How, then, can this often destructive process be a part of protection from destruction?

In an earlier section it was emphasized that the archeological heritage of South Carolina has, to a great extent, been preserved by accident; by being subjected neither to archeological research nor to the destructive processes of industrial and economic development of the land. This is only the passive aspect of preservation and is not even very good passive preservation because the destructive forces of nature are constantly at work on all archeological sites. Wind, rain, floods, temperature changes, vegetation, all take their erosional and depositional tolls. The cultural forces of agricultural destruction have also been at work. Furthermore, in this passive aspect of preservation, without archeological research, nothing is known of the archeological heritage. Even the actual existence of most sites is unknown and those sites that are known are rarely understood. Legends and myths develop about them and they become a part of folklore rather than cultural and historic reality.

Archeological research is not always destructive and does not always imply excavation. The simple locating of sites, recording what can be seen on the ground, and interpreting the data thus collected is a part of archeological research. This kind of archeological reconnaissance can be done with no disturbance to the sites at all. This is little more than inventory of the archeological resources but it does include some interpretation of the time period and cultural significance of the sites. It provides minimal understanding with maximum preservation, provided every effort is made to actually protect the site from the destructive forces of nature and man. Such protection, however, is often not possible.

Excavation *is* a major part of the archeological research at many sites and it *is* a destructive process but by the very fact of its being archeological research it is also a part of preservation. The destruction occurs with every

shovelfull of earth removed in the excavation. Being removed by archeological techniques, though, implies the systematic recording of the removed earth and of all of the artifacts and other information contained therein. The parts of the site that are physically destroyed by the archeologist's shovel are thus simultaneously preserved on paper and film (maps, notes, sketches, photos) by that same archeologist and the material objects that can be recovered are preserved for study in association with those notes and records. From these specimens and the associated records, an understanding of the site and its meaning in the lifeways of a people can be developed. The excavated portions of the site can be interpreted, and in some situations might even be reconstructed from the archeological record. Archeological excavation, using professional competence and all available theoretical and methodological tools of data recovery and interpretation, may be thought of as really *more* than preservation. It is, in a sense, reincarnation. If the excavation is total and enough data are recovered to make reasonably complete interpretation possible, the physical reconstruction of the site might even be feasible. Properly done archeological excavation does *not* deprive a site of its integrity, *it enhances that integrity*.

Of course, not all sites need to be excavated either in whole or in part. Seldom should a site be totally excavated except for some very specific purpose such as proposed restoration or reconstruction or to save it from destruction by natural or cultural forces. Not even all important sites should be excavated. Some of the most important should be left as an intact data resource for future use of better techniques than are available today (Lipe 1974). This implies, though, that a method of preservation of those sites is available by which the sites will, without question, be preserved intact without further deterioration from either natural or cultural forces. To leave a site for future excavation and find later that it has been eroded away in a flood, vandalized by pothunters, or erased by the bulldozer amounts to the antithesis of preservation.

Sampling is the key to archeological excavation of any site (Mueller 1974). In general, any one site should be sampled by excavation of stratigraphically selected areas to provide as broad a view of the total site as possible with the minimum disturbance to the site. The sample may vary in size from as low as 10% or less to as high as total excavation depending upon the nature of the site, its future destiny, and the questions that the archeologist may expect the excavation data to answer. Total excavation is usually undesirable because of expense and diminishing data returns after the first half or two thirds of the site has been excavated.

Sampling is also the key to selection of which sites to excavate. Some representative site or sites of each culture complex certainly should be excavated as a means of understanding broad culture patterns and continuities. Within any given area, if one cultural complex predominates and considerable understanding of that complex appears to be attainable from excavation, then probably more sites of that complex than of others should be excavated there. Sites of *apparently* minor complexes in that area, though, should not be ignored. The excavation of selected samples of those sites may lead to previously unsuspected inter-cultural relationships (Goodyear 1975). As with intra-site decisions of excavation patterns, inter-site decisions are guided by the determinants of pre-excavation research plans and the exigencies of the ground.

Archeological excavation, whether it be total or a sample of the site, and the selection of the sites to be excavated, must be based upon a sound research plan devised beforehand. No two sites are alike and therefore the archeologist must establish the purpose and objectives of his site selection and excavation before he begins to excavate. Once the excavation is begun, in accordance with this research plan, there must be enough flexibility exercised that the realities of the data in the ground can determine, in part, the course of the excavation without losing sight of the goals of the research plan.

Analysis, Interpretation and Explanation and the Importance of Material Things.

The excavation and subsequent analysis, interpretation, and explanation of the archeological heritage is the business of the archeologist. Throughout these steps in his research he is dealing with material things. Some of these, such as the pottery fragments and other small artifacts can be taken from the site for laboratory study. Other material things such as subtle changes of soil color or texture, stratigraphic profiles, posthole outlines, or large objects such as building foundations, fireplace chimneys, or piles of ships' ballast stones are not so easily removed to the laboratory, if they can be at all. They must be studied and recorded *in situ* and are, in the course of that study either destroyed or left in place. They are, though, an important part of the basic subject matter of the archeologist (Hole and Heizer, 1969).

It is not these material things themselves, however, that are his objectives. He is not a collector of objects primarily for the sake of the objects. The archeologist collects objects for what they can tell him about culture and the processes of culture. An identifiable fragment of an object may be as useful for archeological interpretation as is a whole specimen. The most elaborate carved stone figurine may be of less use to him than the poorest looking fragment of a specific kind of pottery. It is the information that the objects can generate about the lifeways of people that constitutes the importance of the objects for archeology, not the quality of the object itself.

These material things are useful for archeological interpretation only in direct relationship to the context in which they are found. It is for this reason that only the soundest of archeological techniques of excavation and recording can be acceptable for the preservation of the archeological heritage. A group of objects collected from the surface of a site and put together in a single container has limited usefulness. It says only that a culture (or cultures) that possessed those objects existed at that place at some past time. An excavated collection with no field records is no better. Nothing is learned of the stratigraphic sequences, the relationships of objects to each other, of the contemporary environment, or of the scores of other cultural and historical details that can be learned by proper scientific archeological techniques of excavation, recording, analysis, interpretation, and explanation.

Excavation is but one part of archeological preservation. The materials excavated must be cleaned, cataloged, preserved, and systematically organized for analysis. They must be analyzed in conjunction with all of the excavation records and compared with materials from similar sites known in other localities.

These analyses are frequently complex and highly sophisticated. They include chemical, physical and statistical analyses, and are quantitative as well as qualitative (Watt 1969). These analyses must be done with scientific rigor while recognizing the humanistic qualities of the data. Archeology is a science and the scientific methods and principles apply to its data yet those data also have humanistic qualities that must be taken into account in treating the data scientifically. Scientific principles should not be applied in archeological analysis for the sake of "being scientific" but as a means of systematically interpreting and explaining a mass of data resulting from human activity (Jelks 1975).

Interpretation and explanation must follow and result directly from the data analysis. This, too, is a rigorous process. The interpretation is the description of how people lived at this archeologically excavated place at a particular time or sequence of times. The activities of the people are pieced together from the scraps of data that were excavated and analyzed. The explanation goes a step further and attempts to bring forth an understanding of *why* a group of people, as a culture, did the things that they were interpreted to have done according to the excavated data. Were their patterns of doing things found to be as expected or were their habits, customs, and living patterns found to differ from the expectable and why? What has the study of this site *explained* about human lifeways? To what extent can what was learned from this site help in an understanding of other archeological sites and of other cultures?

These, post excavation processes of archeological research are time consuming but essential. There is no purpose for excavation if the research stops there. The nature of the site and of the materials recovered, of course, determines the extent of the laboratory research but, in general, it takes approximately three months of post-excavation research for every month of excavation. Usually that is a minimum to produce a sound archeological report. That analytical, interpretive, and explanatory report is just about the only real product the archeologist has to offer. But that report *is* archeological preservation.

On-Site Interpretation

The published report is *almost* the *only* product of the archeologist but there are two other products that he has or may have. One is the recovered artifacts, and the notes, and records of his excavation. These must be preserved and systematically curated as a part of the preservation of the site. They have use as interpretive museum exhibits and displays and they must be retained and made available for other archeologists to use. The collections and the records from any site have a continuing value in later research as tools for interpretation of the data from that site or for comparisons in interpreting other sites.

The other product of the archeologist's excavation is the three-dimensional reconstruction, restoration, or stabilization of the site itself. This is often thought of by the sponsors of archeology as the real purpose of the excavation. Reconstruction, the total replacement of the structures that were once on the site in their assumed original condition, is rarely feasible. Archeological data, even

supplemented by good documentary data, are seldom sufficient to permit the details of above-ground structures to be rebuilt. The reconstruction is too apt to be highly conjectural. There are exceptions but they are rare. Pre-historic sites are more amenable to reconstruction than are historic sites because their architectural details are so much simpler but even these must be considered as partially conjectural.

Restoration, the replacement and repairing of parts of existing structures on the site, is more feasible than reconstruction and is sometimes warranted where buildings are still standing. This, of course, is more feasible in historic sites than in prehistoric sites. Again caution is urged in attempting restoration unless a great deal of the data for restoration can be obtained from archeology and from documentary evidence.

Stabilization, the exposure of features and use of various preservative techniques to strengthen and protect them from deterioration is usually the most feasible procedure. This does not involve the replacement of nebulous missing parts, and can usually be done with accuracy and integrity.

This does not mean that on-the-ground interpretation of the site should not be done. There are many highly desirable methods of such interpretation. There can be very informative, interpretive signs, dioramas, models, photographs, and other outdoor exhibits. The stabilization techniques can often be used and sometimes restoration or reconstruction. The basic principle in guiding decisions about on-site interpretation is that of integrity. If, from all of the data available from the ground and from documentary sources, there is sufficient evidence for architectural details to permit any one or more of these interpretation methods, then that method should be used. Conjectural interpretation must be confined to a minimum or the interpretation will be misleading and the integrity of the site will be destroyed.

Whatever on-the-ground interpretation is done is a part of the archeologist's responsibility. He should not have to actually do the work himself. He is not a sign maker, dioramist, stabilization expert, architect, or other specialist in these techniques. The work should be done by specialists. However, the archeologist must *direct* the work. Only he can determine what is or is not interpreted in terms of the integrity of the evidence. This cannot be overstressed. The archeologist must *insist* that any interpretation be in accordance with the evidence. He may have conflicts on this with the project sponsor but he must stand firm. Any sponsor who wants to reconstruct, restore, stabilize or otherwise interpret any site according to some local myth or some conjectural misconception, despite archeological or documentary evidence to the contrary, must be opposed with all force possible (Stephenson 1974). It is the archeologist's responsibility to assure the integrity of the site's interpretation and he cannot afford to sidestep that responsibility. A false interpretation is a lie that misleads the public and is the antithesis of preservation.

Emergency and Leisurely Archeology

Most archeological preservation today is done on the basis of some sort of emergency situation. A reservoir is to be built and many sites are to be flooded. A highway construction project is to obliterate a site. A housing development, an airfield, a harbor dredging, a waste-water treatment facility, or some other construction is about to destroy a site. Agricultural development with its deep plowing, or natural agencies such as stream bank erosion, coastal wave action, or wildfires are all potential threats to archeological resources creating urgent needs for emergency preservation. The archeologists of South Carolina must be ready, willing, and able to meet these emergencies. It is only rarely, today, that the archeologist can select a site for excavation and proceed with research on that site at his leisure. There is no shortage of sites for leisurely archeology but there is a shortage of archeologists. In order to preserve the data base, with so many sites in danger of destruction, nearly every available archeologist is, or soon will be, involved in some form of emergency preservation of archeological resources. At the present rate of site destruction, *all* archeological research in America is defacto emergency archeology (Lipe 1974).

The concept of leisurely archeology may be applied to archeology that is often called "academic" or "problem oriented" archeology. It is usually done by university professors and their students who have but a month or two of research time in the summer and occasional spare hours through the rest of the year to do their research, usually on very limited budgets. It has been called "problem oriented" archeology because there is ample time to plan ahead for the kinds of problems the archeologist wishes to solve with the data he expects to recover. In fact the problem usually dictates the site to be researched. He can then take as many years as suits his convenience to do the work because there is no pressure on him from potential destruction of the site. He has, though, very little time in any one year specifically available for research because of academic teaching commitments for nine months of the year. This is a highly desirable way to do archeology but it is slow because it is only part-time research. Despite that obvious disadvantage, a great deal of really excellent archeology has been done in North America in this manner. There has also been a substantial amount of very poor and/or unreported archeology done as "academic" archeology.

The concept of emergency archeology is that archeology that is often called "contract" or "salvage" or "sponsor oriented" archeology. It, too, is often done by academicians on a part-time basis but is more often done by full-time research archeologists from museums, research facilities, the National Park Service, the Smithsonian Institution, or other similar agencies. Emergency archeology has operated under several very real handicaps. Time frames have been so short as to prevent proper pre-excavation planning; it has been the "race with the construction company's bulldozer". Restrictions on the boundaries of the research area have been too limiting. Time and funds have been inadequate for proper analysis, interpretation, explanation, and reporting. Funds have not been available for adequate publication of results and only minimal for the excavations. Despite these obvious handicaps, a great deal of really excellent archeology has been done in North America in this manner. Just as with academic archeology,

there has also been a substantial amount of poor and/or unreported archeology done as "salvage" archeology.

Regardless of whether archeology is done in a leisurely (academic) framework or an emergency (contract) framework, the real issue is *how* it is done. There can be no compromise with competent, well conceived, and properly carried out research.

Thanks to an increasingly enlightened public awareness of the national and state heritage, especially as reflected in recent Congressional action and the Acts of State Legislatures, the roadblocks to productive archeological research are being removed. Land developers and agencies that are endangering the archeological resources are being required to adequately consider the national heritage before they can change the surface of the land. Lead time before a project starts is becoming available so that a research plan with adequate consideration of cultural problems can be prepared. Increased sources of funding for all phases of the research are developing. No less than a dozen Acts of Congress, Executive Orders, and Federal Departmental Legislation provisions have come into being in the past decade to implement these improvements (McGimsey 1972).

The General Assembly of South Carolina has been especially far-sighted in these matters. Legislation establishing the Institute and providing a funding base for it has enabled this state to have a full-time professional archeological research facility of excellence, associated with a university but not tied to teaching commitments that restrict the research function. This is, in fact, a model that other states are beginning to follow. Other agencies of the state government, through leadership support and budget transfers, are supporting the archeological preservation effort.

This support has made it possible for, in fact has required, the emergency archeologist to take the lead in improving archeological approaches to the research data. He has improved lead time to prepare a well-considered research plan. His area of research concern on any contract project is more flexible than it has been before. He has improved opportunity to determine what archeological preservation is required in an endangered research area and what theoretical approaches and methodological techniques are required for proper preservation. He has increased influence in requiring that those approaches and techniques be carried out. He has improved time and funds for adequate excavation, analysis, interpretation, and explanation and sources of funds are developing for publication of the results. He can now do a better job of productive research than he ever could before (Lipe 1974). Even the academician working under contract in emergency archeology, despite his handicap of being a part-time researcher, has many advantages in this improved situation.

Every situation, of course, is different and many contract projects are not ideal. Notification is still sometimes late and funding is still only in the developing stage. The newer laws have required guidelines and procedural directives that are only now beginning to develop. The state and federal agencies and the many units in the local and private sector that sponsor archeological preservation under the law are not always clear as to the implementation of the law and conflicts sometimes arise. The efforts are being made, though, and the administrative and procedural conflicts are being resolved. The time is approaching

when the archeologist will be able to carry out the kind of research he knows needs to be done to preserve the national heritage. He will no longer have to "race the bulldozer" to save whatever he can of the archeological data base.

Professional Responsibility

It is now pretty much up to the archeologist to determine what really needs to be done in a realistic plan of archeological preservation and to help in setting the guidelines that will make that possible. He does *not* have *carte blanche* to do anything he wants but he does have the opportunity to do what *professional responsibility* requires, and to do it well. He must be willing and able to accept that professional responsibility and be able to produce a professionally competent research product or his opportunity may be denied him.

The professional responsibility of the archeologist cannot be over-emphasized. He is responsible to his professional colleagues for collecting, analyzing, interpreting, and explaining the maximum of useful data from his work. It is those colleagues who will have the most use for the data in the future. They will use the data for their own research on other sites or in research on different aspects of the same site. The data must be available to them in usable form and this includes specimens, notes, records, analysis, and written reports.

He is responsible to the sponsoring agency for cooperation and mutual assistance so long as the sponsor is cooperating with him in providing lead time for the work, the funds to carry it out, and the freedom to do the work in the best professional manner that he can. He cannot delay or block the sponsor's project so long as the sponsor does not delay or block the archeological preservation. His responsibility also extends to insuring that the sponsor's goals are not antithetical to the integrity of the archeological preservation.

He is also responsible to the public who, directly and indirectly, will be paying the bill for his research. He owes the public a full explanation and interpretation of what he is doing and why he is doing it. As was stated in the first paragraph of this plan, this whole concept of archeological preservation is for "the benefit of peoples of the present and the future". The archeologist is *not* working solely for the enlightenment of other archeologists. His responsibility to other archeologists is to increase their capacity to add to the data bank of knowledge so that all archeologists may better contribute to "the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men" - to the public understanding of the human heritage.

These three responsibilities are of equal importance. They are met by sound, scholarly research methods; by reasonable attitudes of cooperation and mutual assistance; by systematic preservation of the specimens, records, and other excavation data; and by concise, lucid writing of the published reports. The latter is especially important because the report is the archeologist's main product. Clear, intelligible writing, uncluttered with contrived jargon, is necessary to fulfill the responsibilities to colleagues, sponsors, and the public alike. Even the archeologist's erudite colleagues can read and appreciate well-written English.

A PRESERVATION PLAN FOR 1975-1985

Introduction

A ten-year preservation plan for the archeology of South Carolina must be built upon the base that has previously been developed and it must be as idealistic as possible while remaining realistic enough to be achievable. The plan outlined here attempts to be that. In order to be both idealistic and realistic it must be a flexible plan, the parts of which can be shifted from one year to another depending upon availability of funding and improvements in archeological knowledge.

This plan discusses the state-wide inventory of archeological sites and the National Register of Historic Places, and it proposes guidelines for maximum use of both. It proposes specific site excavations as well as regional studies. It proposes investigations of total culture complexes as well as of specific manifestations of those complexes. It stresses the interdisciplinary requirements of archeological research with especial emphasis on the relation of environment to culture. The contributions that archeology can make to other disciplines are pointed out as are the educational functions of the work for students, non-professionals, and professional archeologists. Emergency and leisurely archeology are both parts of this plan as are the responsibilities for synthesis and summation.

This plan is based upon the "Statement of Goals" of the Institute prepared in 1970 (Stephenson 1970a) and upon the work outlined in the earlier sections of this report. This proposed plan should clearly reveal the growth in intellectual concepts and the increase in knowledge that have taken place in South Carolina archeology since 1970. This is, in no sense, a final or complete archeological preservation plan for this State. It is only what seems, at this time, to be the most reasonable plan of action for the next ten years. Archeological preservation and research planning will continue in South Carolina for many decades. Steadily improving methods of using data to interpret and explain the ever-changing human life ways of the past will be required for longer than can be presently foreseen. The present plan, if successfully carried out, should provide a greatly improved understanding of South Carolina heritage of more than a dozen millenia.

Archeological research in South Carolina, during the past dozen years, has added greatly to the understanding of the past but the research has been spotty and on a project to project basis. What has been most urgently needed by a sponsoring agency and most readily funded has been done. The research that might be most urgently needed to understand cultural sequences has had to be fitted into this framework rather than the other way around. It has been this period of opportunity to do the sponsor-initiated projects though, that has provided a capability to develop a systematic plan of archeologically initiated research into which the sponsor-initiated research can be fitted.

As has been said before, most archeology of the present and future is, and will continue to be, initiated for non-archeological reasons. It will be sponsored by land developments and other agencies and by historic site planners and

developers. It is now possible to fit these sponsor-initiated projects into one or more of the several systematic long-range research programs that are archeologically - initiated. That could not be done a decade ago, or even five years ago, because the data base had not been sufficiently developed. There can no longer be any tolerance of a dichotomy between "problem-oriented" and "sponsor-oriented" research. Sponsor-oriented or sponsor-initiated research is what is going to be done and it will have to be done in a framework of problem orientation and systematic archeologically-initiated research plans (Lipe 1974). It is this welding of the emergency necessities with systematic research goals that this archeological preservation plan for 1975-1985 is designed to accomplish.

Archeological Site Inventory

The state-wide archeological site inventory, more often called the archeological site survey, is the basic file of all known information on each site on record within the State. It lists, as sites, all of the known localities where archeological remains of some kind of human activity, have been found. It includes historic and prehistoric sites on land and under water. It does not include historic sites that, at least at present, do not appear to warrant archeological investigation. Any such site can readily be added to the inventory if or when archeological investigation may seem to be needed. The inventory does not include isolated artifact finds unless there is reason to believe that the isolated artifact actually represents a larger context of human activity at that particular place. The inventory is a list of all of the known localities where realistic archeological research has been done, is being done, or may be done at some future time. The files for each site within the inventory contain notes, records, photographs, maps, specimens, and all other information that is known about that site.

The office of the State Archeologist maintains the South Carolina Archeological Site Inventory (or Survey) at the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology. This is the basic site file and all information is here. The data from these files are available for any other agency, organization, or individual to use for research or other responsible purposes provided that the integrity of the data will be preserved and the preservation of the sites insured. These files are *not* open to the general public because of the potential danger to the individual sites that might result from antiquity collectors, commercial or otherwise, who might begin unauthorized digging on or collecting from the sites if their locations are made known. This is an absolutely essential part of the preservation of archeological sites.

The archeological site inventory is only now beginning to be a viable research tool for the understanding of South Carolina archeology. There are presently some 2,000 sites on record in this inventory. It is entirely within reason to believe that this is little more than 1% of the archeological sites that exist in the State. It is probable that a majority of the larger, more conspicuous sites are on record but many thousands of sites undoubtedly lie unrecorded beneath the surface of the ground and covered by the heavy vegetation that is so abundant in South Carolina. Sites beneath the waters of the state are only beginning to be located and recorded.

There has been a systematic program of site recording since 1969 but a thorough program of archeological site search and survey has not been possible. The many surveys that have been made have been mainly in connection with some specific project such as a reservoir, a highway, or some other construction, or as an adjunct part of an excavation project. Only one large survey specifically for site inventory has been made. That is the survey of the Savannah River Plant in Aiken County. Many surveys, large and small, have been made throughout the state. Some have been intensive in small areas; others have been extensive over large areas and nearly all have been initiated by some emergency. The locations of the surveyed areas are not usually determined by archeological research problems. These spotty surveys have covered perhaps less than 2% of the surface area of the state and even in most of those areas additional sites probably remain to be found.

The archeological survey of South Carolina must be a continuing activity and can never really be brought to completion. There will always be additional sites to be found. Given enough archeologists and enough money to systematically examine every acre of the state, many sites would still remain buried and unrecorded. Of course, neither the archeologists nor the money will ever be available for this kind of thorough search - nor is such a search necessary. Systematic sampling procedures can be used that eventually will provide sufficient information on site locations so that total inventory is not needed. These sampling procedures must be determined by archeological research goals rather than by random emergency goals. This does not mean that emergency surveys should not continue to contribute to the site inventory. It means that the archeological research goals must be formulated in such systematic patterns that all of the surveys, of whatever nature, will contribute to one or more of the patterns of the broad archeological goals as well as contributing to the basic data bank of the site inventory.

The plan for the archeological site inventory for the period 1975-1985 is for continuing small and large surveys, generated by every means possible, to increase the inventory of sites in all parts of the state. These surveys will be initiated by Environmental Impact Statements, by regional archeological site planning, by specific site excavation, by special research needs for surveys in specific areas, and by interested local individuals reporting sites. It is also a part of this plan to formulate broad archeological research goals into which the site survey data can be incorporated as a viable research tool. Such formulations are discussed in a later section of this plan. It is anticipated that by the end of this ten year period the site inventory will have been increased by at least three or four fold. Records from this increased number of sites, systematically incorporated into continuing research plans, will contribute materially to the understanding of all aspects of the cultural complexes of South Carolina. It is also a part of the present plan to incorporate the basic data of the site inventory into a computer storage system with easy data retrieval procedures so that any portion of the data in the inventory may be readily retrieved for whatever purpose it is needed. It is hoped that this computerization of the inventory data can be accomplished within the first two years of this ten year plan, or by June 30, 1977.

The National Register of Historic Places

The National Register is a protective inventory of irreplaceable resources of American history, architecture, archeology, and culture. It is an official listing of the nation's cultural property that is worth saving (U.S.D.I. 1971). According to the general criteria for entry on the National Register, all of the archeological sites listed in the State-Wide Site Inventory are potentially eligible for nomination to the National Register. The criteria include sites "...that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history" (U.S.D.I. 1971). Any archeological site on the Inventory is on the Inventory for that very reason. Indeed, it has yielded or may be expected to yield information of this kind.

This suggests that perhaps all of the sites on the State-Wide Site Inventory should be nominated for the National Register. This is somewhat impractical. There are already some 2,000 sites on the Inventory. Each nomination requires, at very minimum, two days of work in documentation and preparation of the nomination forms plus a topographic map and at least two pictures of the site. This alone would be a \$150,000 project taking more than 4000 man-days of work and would be a continuing project with new sites being added to the Inventory continuously. The State Board of Review then must act on each nomination and that action is not a simple rubber stamp. Each nomination must be realistically reviewed. A position on the Board of Review would become nearly a full time job. Once passed by the Board of Review, all of these nominations then go to the Department of the Interior for acceptance and that is a realistic review process. The mechanics of putting all sites on the National Register, if not impossible, are certainly not feasible. Clearly some sort of selection must be made.

The Institute makes the assumption that any archeological site in the State-Wide Inventory is, by virtue of its being listed in the Inventory, sufficiently significant to be eligible for nomination to the National Register. Criteria for actual nomination then can be selected on the basis of archeological preservation needs because potential eligibility for the National Register provides a measure of protection of the site from deliberate destruction. The criteria for nomination are based upon preservation needs. These are: (1) A site of such obvious major significance that it should be protected at all costs. It is well preserved; it is unique or nearly so; its proper study will provide a major increment of knowledge of history and of culture process; and it is suitable for future use in public education as a stabilized, restored, or even reconstructed site. (2) A site that has public visibility and is known to be of major significance. Because of its public visibility it is susceptible to being vandalized or to other potential destruction. It particularly needs the added protection of National Register status. (3) A site that may be endangered by natural elements or by some man-made development of the land and that if not accorded National Register status may be destroyed. (4) Other sites as their importance becomes clearer and time and facilities become available for nominating them.

The National Register is not to be used as a weapon to stop any kind of man-made development of the land. It is a means of insuring that land developers do meet their obligations under the law, as well as their moral obligations to posterity, in the preservation and conservation of the American heritage. It is

to be used judiciously, when necessary, and for supportable archeological reasons. It may also be used as a means for developing protective measures for sites that are being endangered by the forces of nature such as stream erosion, vegetational erosion, or other natural agencies.

The Institute anticipates submitting nominations to the National Register at a considerably accelerated rate in the next decade than has been the case in the past. The rate will depend upon the needs.

Systematic Research Organization

Systematic archeological research for South Carolina may be organized in various ways; by time period, by culture complexes, by geographic area, by site projects, etc. For the present purposes a combination cultural-temporal organization seems to be best suited to the known data. This kind of organization also has specific implications for particular geographic areas. For example: the Transitional Culture Period identifies a particular culture complex within a specific time frame that is exemplified by sites in a restricted geographic area. These cultural-temporal periods are the traditional categories that are more-or-less recognized throughout North American archeology (Griffin 1952).

The Paleo-Indian Period is represented by the earliest occupations of the continent by small bands (families?) of nomadic hunters and gatherers usually associated with the megafauna such as mastodon, mammoth, giant bison, and others (Wormington 1957; Haynes 1969, 1971). The index artifact is the fluted projectile point and related projectile point forms. This period began sometime prior to 12,000 years ago in South Carolina and appears to have developed into the next (Archaic) culture period some 10,000 to 9,000 years ago. Few sites of this period are identified within the state but the index artifact, as surface finds, is distributed over most of the state.

The Archaic Period is represented by somewhat larger bands of nomadic hunters and gatherers living on small game and vegetal foods (the megafauna had become extinct) and occupying smaller subsistence territories in seasonal migratory patterns. The index artifacts are stemmed projectile points usually of large size and, toward the late part of the period, ground and polished stone tools and stone bowls. The Archaic is usually divided into Early, Middle, and Late sub-periods. It extended from some 10,000 or 9,000 years ago to approximately 3,000 or 2,000 years ago. Sites of this period are found abundantly throughout most parts of the state and the Archaic appears to have lasted somewhat longer in the upper parts of the state than along the lower coastal plain (Coe 1964).

The Transitional Period is represented by increased size of the individual communities of hunters and gatherers who subsisted, in large part, on fish and shell fish and while still nomadic tended to occupy individual communities for longer periods of time. Index artifacts are the earliest forms of pottery (tempered with sand and with fibers) and engraved bone tools or ornaments. This appears to be a transition from the nomadic Archaic to the semi-sedentary Woodland Period to follow and lasted from approximately 4,000 years ago to some 3,000 or 2,500 years ago. It is known from sites along the coastal islands and

along some of the major rivers as far inland as the Fall Line. These are mainly shell midden and shell ring sites but are not confined to that (Stoltman 1974; Williams 1968).

The Woodland Period is represented throughout the state by semi-sedentary villages and communities dependent upon hunting and gathering and horticulture for subsistence. The villages were both small and large and dwellings were semi-permanent to permanent structures lasting several years. Seasonal hunting and gathering cycles meant temporary abandonment of the villages but gardening required return to the villages for part of the year. Horticulture developed in this period and social, religious, and political organization evolved into dominant forces. Index artifacts are cord-marked and check-stamped pottery, small triangular arrow points (first use of the bow and arrow), burial mounds, and specific village patterns. Like the Archaic Period, the Woodland Period is usually divided into Early, Middle, and Late sub-periods. The Woodland extended from approximately 2,500 years ago to some 900 or 800 years ago, and even later in some parts of the state (Griffin 1952b).

The Mississippian Period is represented in South Carolina by a new lifeway originating in the Mississippi valley several centuries before it appeared in South Carolina and Georgia. This change involved living in sedentary villages as well as in semi-sedentary hamlets surrounding large ceremonial centers. The people depended largely on an agricultural subsistence base supplemented by hunting and gathering. Socio-political organization was elaborate but even that was overshadowed by an extensive religious organization focused upon ceremonial centers with great temple mounds and elaborate rituals for the dead. Index artifacts in South Carolina are complicated-stamped pottery, large burial urns, and elaborately carved shell ornaments. This period appears to have begun in South Carolina some 800 or 700 years ago and was still in existence when the earliest Europeans arrived some 450 years ago but seems to have faded away a century or so thereafter. Mississippian Period sites are located throughout most parts of the state but the ceremonial centers seem to be confined to rather widely separated locations along the great water courses such as the Savannah, Santee, Wateree, and Broad Rivers (Ferguson 1971; 1975b). One moundless ceremonial center is known at the mouth of the Ashley River (South 1969).

The Ethno-Historic Period is represented by the named tribal groups living in the state during the times of European exploration, colonization, and settlement until the Indian removal in the 1830's. It includes the Cusabo, Yamasee, Catawba, Cherokee, Congaree, Westo and numerous other groups and sub-groups. This was a period of fragmentation of socio-political alliances of a century or so earlier and realignments of the groups interacting with European influences and pressures. It includes the terminal phases of Mississippian and Woodland cultures and there is some evidence that these fragmentations and realignments had begun sometime prior to European influence. The Period began in the mid-sixteenth century with the early contacts by Spanish and French explorers (Quattlbaum 1956). It continued through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as a period of gradual but accelerating deterioration of Native cultures with attendant changes in all aspects of Indian life. By the 1830's the only remaining Indian group of any real strength, the Cherokee, was forcibly removed to Indian Territory (Oklahoma) and most of the remaining, small groups were amalgamated into the Catawba Nation in the Catawba River area. Here most of the remaining Indians of South Carolina reside today (Brown 1966).

This is more of a time period than a culture period but has some cultural unity in the disruptive effects of European influence. The index artifacts are the various trade objects of European manufacture such as glass beads and metal objects as well as "Colono-Indian" pottery of Indian construction but European form. Archeological sites of this period are extremely variable because of the shifting cultures involved but have a certain unity of content due to the dominant "foreign" pressures. For example, economy shifted, regardless of tribal affiliation, from a local farming-hunting-gathering economy to an inter-cultural trade economy (Milling 1940).

The Historic Period is represented by the sites of European and African explorers, colonists, and settlers of the sixteenth to the twentieth centuries A.D. It temporally overlaps the Ethno-Historic period but culturally represents an influx of peoples of entirely different ways of life derived from Europe and from Africa. Archeological sites of this period range from the Spanish and French exploratory efforts of the sixteenth and seventeenth century, through the English colonization of the late seventeenth century, the colonial settlements, plantations, forts, shipwrecks, and trash accumulations in the rivers of the eighteenth century to the American settlements, towns, houses, industries, etc. of the nineteenth century and even some sites of the twentieth century. It includes sites of African cultural dominance as well as those of French, English, Spanish, German and other European ethnic groups (Oliphant 1969).

These seven temporal-cultural periods form the basis framework of a systematic research plan. They have both temporal and spacial dimensions but are primarily categories of the broadest cultural complexes. They are the major divisions within which the constantly changing cultural processes have operated. Each may be sub-divided in accordance with the research plans for any proposed survey, site study, or area study, and upon any of the theoretical or methodological perspectives that are chosen for the research.

Obviously these periods are not mutually exclusive nor do any of them begin or end at any one moment in time. The Archaic Period, for example, appears to have lasted longer in the upper part of the state than elsewhere and, in all probability, existed contemporaneously with the early development of the Woodland Period. The Mississippian and Woodland Period occupations, likewise appear to have overlapped and certainly the Ethno-Historic and Historic Periods were nearly contemporaneous. The Transitional Period was confined largely to the coastal areas and up the major rivers as far as the Fall Line but there is no evidence of it at all in the Piedmont.

As cultural-temporal periods they represent an evolutionary sequence of cultural development. As one way of life (Period) developed into another or was altered by outside influences or even whole culture movements, the older way of life persisted in parts of the area until it was gradually replaced by the newer way of life. Thus we are not dealing with discreet entities at any one time or place but a cultural continuum.

Systematic Research Goals

None of these cultural-temporal periods in South Carolina archeology is adequately understood despite the past decade of efforts in their study. They have been unevenly studied and more is known of some than of others. For example the Historic Period has had two or three times as much effort devoted to it as have any of the others and almost no work has been devoted to the Paleo-Indian Period. One research goal for the next decade must be an effort to expand the work in those periods where so little is known while maintaining the research efforts in the better known periods.

Specific sites that promise to provide extensive data on particular aspects of archeological research are known throughout the state and are representative of each of the cultural-temporal periods. It will be a goal for the next decade to select certain ones of these known sites for extensive excavation.

The importance of environmental influences on each and every cultural complex has long been recognized by American archeologists (Vayda 1969). The influence of contemporary environment in South Carolina on the cultures of all periods is especially significant because of the wide variety of environments and their determination of the available food resources (Ferguson 1975). Another goal of research in the 1975-1985 period is a series of detailed studies of contemporary environments in their relation to the cultural complexes that developed within them.

No cultural complex ever existed exclusively in a single site nor can a culture complex be understood by study of a single site no matter how well that site represents the culture. For this reason, another goal of the next decade will be to identify zones or areas within which a cultural complex operated and design research plans that will explore all of the many facets of that complex within that zone. This will include the total settlement pattern as expressed in small and large sites of the complex that were occupied for varying purposes.

As has been mentioned before, the contracts for emergency archeology are, and will continue to be, the major sources of funds and the locations of the majority of research projects will be determined by emergency situations. Some of these emergency studies will generate great numbers of small increments of data such as surface surveys or minor tests of a number of sites with little data generated from each site. Other emergency studies will generate large amounts of data from a single site. These varied increments of data must be systematically integrated into the total research plans for each cultural complex and they must be collected by comparable techniques so that the information generated by them will be usable in systematic inter-site studies (Lipe 1974). To achieve this systematic integration of varying sized increments of data into the total research plan is another goal of this decade.

Mechanical and theoretical tools for quicker analysis and study of data are becoming more readily available to archeology. Among these tools is the use of the computer in data retrieval and manipulation (Watt 1969). Another goal of this decade will be an accelerated use of computer technology to deal with archeological data.

Inter-disciplinary approaches in archeological research plans constitute one of the most neglected aspects of present-day research. Specific involvement, in archeological projects, of geologists, geographers, historians, architects, soil scientists, chemists, botanists, zoologists, and others of related disciplines must be brought into the planning and carrying out of archeological projects. These projects must be so planned that the non-archeologist, cooperating scholar has attainable goals and results of his own to be derived from the project (Stephenson 1967). These inter-disciplinary approaches constitute one more goal for this decade.

Still another research goal is the fuller integration of productive non-professional archeologists into the total research plan for the state. Archeological Societies and Dive Clubs constitute a very real asset to South Carolina archeology if dealt with frankly and cooperatively. The non-professional requires training and supervision but, with his cooperation and the efforts of the professional, the archeological capability is vastly increased.

The limited number of professional archeologists in South Carolina suggests another goal for the 1975-1985 decade. Efforts will be made to establish capable professional archeologists in research positions throughout the state. Regional campuses, private colleges and universities, museums, and a few state agencies could well afford to employ professional archeologists. At least a dozen such positions should become available in the next decade.

Education in all of its facets is, of course, a continuing goal of archeological research. Every survey or excavation project employs students or others as crewmen both in field work and in the laboratory. Every one of these projects is an educational experience for the participant. Field schools are to be encouraged at some specific projects. This means a field school for students where a full research project is undertaken and not a field school for only the purpose of training students. The latter, regardless of how desirable the training may be, is an intolerable desecration of a source of archeological data. Any field school project must be carried out as any other research project would be. Education also is carried out by various student research projects and class work at the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology or any professionally directed archeological facility in the state. Of course the ultimate educational responsibility is to the general public in generating archeological data in reports and publications, museum exhibits, and on-site interpretations. Archeological synthesis, interpretation and explanation presented clearly, concisely and understandably, is a responsibility to the public that every archeologist must accept.

In cooperation with the new Department of Anthropology at the University of South Carolina, the Institute is now discussing course offerings in a Public Archeology Program. This would be a post-baccalaureate program of specialized archeological courses designed to prepare the student for the responsibilities of a career in emergency or contract archeology. If successful at the "program" level, this specialized educational opportunity could develop into a Master of Arts or Master of Science degree offering followed by a one year internship in research at the Institute. This program is only in its initial stages of discussion but has potential as another goal of the Institute in the next decade.

With these broad goals in mind we may now turn to some of the specific research projects that, if carried out, will attain a measure of the fulfilment of these goals.

Specific Research Projects

Listed here are some of the specific projects and programs that are now being considered in one stage or another of the state-wide archeological planning. This is in no sense *the* plan for 1975-1985 but only some of the projects and programs that are *now* in the planning stage. Some of these may not be possible; some may become unnecessary. Certainly many others will develop during the decade.

Surveys:

1. *Savannah River Plant.* Two years have been devoted to the survey of this area, funded by the Atomic Energy Commission. A third and final year is already under contract. This survey should be completed in 1976. Sites are primarily of the Archaic Period with some representation of Woodland, Mississippian and Historic Periods.
2. *Sumter National Forest Area.* A small section of the Sumter National Forest, adjacent to the Savannah River Plant, is under contract for survey. This should be completed in 1976. Sites should be comparable to those within the Savannah River Plant. This is being funded by the United States Forest Service.
3. *Lower Santee River.* The area along the Santee River and its adjacent swamps from the Lake Marion dam to the river's mouth is largely unknown archeologically. A small section of the south bank near St. Stephens has been partially surveyed in connection with the Cooper River Rediversion Canal. This small survey suggests that many sites are potentially present in this area. These are sites of the French Hugunot settlement, other eighteenth century plantation sites, rice and indigo industry sites, and underwater historic remains in the river itself. Other sites of the Ethnohistoric, Mississippian, Woodland, Transitional, and Archaic Periods are present. This combination of swamp, river-bank, coastal plain, pinewood, hardwood ecological zones promises to provide major information on culture-environment relationships. A extensive survey for the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, in connection with the Cooper River Rediversion Canal, has been requested and should be completed in 1977. The remaining area survey could be done in an additional two years.
4. *Trotters Shoals Reservoir.* This area of the upper Savannah River between Lake Hartwell and Clark Hill Reservoir has had two seasons of survey on the South Carolina side and one season on the Georgia side. Another season of survey on each side is now under contract with the National Park Service and should be completed by the end of 1976. This should complete the survey phase of work in this area. Sites are primarily of the Archaic Period and promise to yield the best data yet known of certain aspects of the Early and Middle Archaic. Woodland and Historic sites are also present.
5. *Silver Bluff Area.* A small area of the left bank of the Savannah River near North Augusta contains the site of Galpin's Trading Post of the eighteenth century and is reputed to be the location of the sixteenth century Indian village of Cofitachiqui. An intensive survey is required to identify all sites in the area and indicate the potential for Cofitachiqui. This should be done in 1975.

6. *Lower Savannah River.* Sporadic investigations along the lower Savannah River from Augusta to the river's mouth have been undertaken. A systematic survey of the entire area by several coordinated teams is being planned by the University of Georgia, the University of North Carolina, the Augusta Museum, and the Institute. This survey should extend over a five year period. Sites in this area include representatives of all of the culture periods but emphasis is placed upon the Woodland and the Paleo-Indian Periods. The ecosystems of this area hold promise of producing major data and the opportunity for geologic-botanic-zoologic-historic interdisciplinary studies.

7. *Hilton Head Island.* An intensive survey of this area has been in the planning stages for three years but has not been carried out except in small, local, increments. A total survey of the island and the adjacent mainland around Port Royal Sound should be highly productive. Data would be developed concerning, especially, the Transitional Period but also the later Woodland and the Historic Periods. This should be scheduled for a year of study.

8. *South Carolina State Parks.* The South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism has requested a proposal for detailed archeological survey of all of the state park areas. Such a survey is critically needed for park interpretation and holds the potential for adding much information to the total data bank of knowledge. The parks are scattered over all sections of the state and sites of all culture periods can be expected. This survey could be done, a few parks a year, by a small survey party extending its effort over some six years.

9. *Pee Dee River Valley.* No systematic survey of the South Carolina portion of the Pee Dee River Valley has been attempted, though several small segments of it have been briefly examined. In North Carolina this river valley has provided a temple mound and other sites of the Mississippian Period as well as basic data on the Archaic of the Piedmont. Archaic, Woodland, and Historic sites are known in this valley and a full survey should be rewarding. Ethno-historic Period sites should also be expected here. This could be done in increments over a five year period.

10. *Environmental Impact Statement Surveys.* The multitudes of E.I.S. surveys that can be expected to result from new laws, rules, and regulations concerning national environmental policy will be a major contributor to the total archeological data bank. There will be surveys ranging from a few hours or a day to several days, weeks, or even months. They will be sporadically timed, and scattered throughout the state. Some will be of less than an acre some will be of several thousand acres. They will be developed where and when a construction project, for any reason, is to disturb the surface of the ground. By definition they are surveys and they will continue to be sponsor-initiated. They will each be planned to add some systematic increment of data to some part or parts of the archeologically-initiated research organization. Many, if not most, will contribute information to one or more of the specific preservation efforts. They will continue throughout this decade. From many of these Environmental Impact Statement Surveys will come full excavation projects as a means of mitigating the adverse effects of the construction on the archeological resources.

11. *Highway Surveys.* The present program sponsored by the South Carolina Department of Highways is expected to continue throughout this decade. This program is really a part of the E.I.S. program because each highway survey generates an E.I.S. Because of the unified nature of the highway construction, and the base of funding from the Department, the work within this program is considered as a separate set of surveys. These will also be large and small surveys and will be in all parts of the state. They will generate specific data bases of their own as well as data increments that will contribute to other parts of the total research organization. They, too, will generate full excavation projects of mitigation (Goodyear 1975).

12. *Underwater Surveys.* The major effort of the underwater research program for the first three or four years of this decade will be directed toward survey and inventory of the resources available in the rivers, harbors, bays, inlets, and off shore reaches of the state. This will include use of the magnetometer, the side-scan sonar, and personal search by divers. These surveys will extend throughout the decade but should become secondary to more specific site research by 1978. Data to be generated by the surveys may be expected to relate largely to the Historic Period of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. There will also be data relating to the prehistoric periods, especially the Ethno-Historic and Mississippian Periods. There is some prospect of Paleo-Indian material being located in site locations along drowned river channels especially in relation to localities of megafauna such as mastodons, mammoths, sloth, bison, etc. The prospects are only tentative but seem good (Ruppé, personal communication).

Area Studies

From what has been learned to date in South Carolina archeology it is now feasible to develop specific studies of individual culture complexes within definable geographic boundaries. These are small geographic areas within which a number of varying kinds of sites of a single culture complex may be studied. These studies include detailed excavation of specific sites, testing of other sites, and intensive surveys to locate additional sites. Some of the studies are rather well developed with a firm data base in known sites. Others are only beginning to develop with, as yet, a poor data base and/or few known sites.

1. *Paleo-Indian Studies.* This is the least known culture period of the state. Several localities have provided tantalizing hints of Paleo-Indian material but no really substantial site has yet been identified. In 1970-71 E. Thomas Hemmings and James Michie began an inventory of surface finds of Paleo-Indian artifacts. This has not been completed but the results, so far, suggest a wide dispersal of surface finds but little real data on which to base a sound study. In 1966, William E. Edwards sampled a site in Burke County, Georgia on Briar Creek that seemed promising and some subsequent work was done there by others (Brockington 1971). This site suggests possible other sites in adjacent Allendale County, South Carolina and related areas along this section of the Savannah River. Another potential locality is on and around Edisto Island and other sections of Charleston County (e.g. Boone Hall Plantation) where mastodon, mammoth and other megafauna of late Pleistocene age have been found. Still

another area worth intensive examination is along the fall line in the vicinity of Columbia. Any study of South Carolina's Paleo-Indian culture will require a firm base in geological research and a better understanding of paleo-climatic, environmental research than is presently available. This must be an interdisciplinary study with more emphasis on geology, geography, paleontology, climate, and environment than upon archeology. These studies should continue throughout the decade.

2. *Archaic Studies.* Some of the Archaic culture complexes of the Carolina Piedmont are moderately well known from Coe's work in North Carolina (Coe 1964). One complex of the Early Archaic that is almost unknown has been tentatively identified in northern Georgia as "The Old Quartz Culture" (Caldwell 1954a, b) and may relate to the Morrow Mountain complex of North Carolina. It appears to extend over a considerable portion of the Piedmont area of Georgia and South Carolina. Sites of this and other Archaic complexes are abundant in the Richard B. Russell Reservoir Area on the Savannah River. This appears to be a good locality in which to conduct an intensive and extensive investigation of this complex and related complexes of the Archaic and to gain an understanding of Piedmont Archaic adaptations. As a part of the archeological preservation program for the Richard B. Russell Reservoir area a major research program is planned for this investigation. The sites are small with little depth, usually unstratified, and a large number of sites can be excavated to provide a broad perspective of the total complex and to relate it to other Archaic cultures. Site locations are systematically patterned in ecological niches. This study will be multi-disciplinary with related studies being done in geology, soils, botany, geography, and zoology. The work is being planned for 1977 to 1982.

3. *Transitional Studies.* The Transitional Culture Period sites are found along the coastal sea islands of South Carolina and Georgia and, to a lesser extent, up the major rivers of the coastal plain as far as the fall line. They are manifest in shell middens, some non-shell midden sites, and in the spectacular shell rings. A long-range intensive and extensive investigation of this major complex that provides some of the earliest pottery in North America, is anticipated for the period 1977 to 1984. The project involves studies of sea level changes, oyster development, botanical and zoological studies, soils investigations and other interdisciplinary approaches that should yield as much non-archeological data as archeological. The University of Florida and the University of Georgia have begun studies of these sites on the Georgia coast. The present study will be largely confined to the South Carolina coast from the mouth of the Santee River to the mouth of the Savannah River but will include some known inland sites along the Savannah and Congaree Rivers. It will focus on the cultural complexities of the shell ring sites and the socio-political implications of these large sites in relation to the smaller midden sites.

4. *Woodland Studies.* While many sites of the Woodland Period are on record in the State-Wide Site Inventory, there has not been sufficient development of studies of this important period to define an area study program. One goal of this decade will be to organize the Woodland manifestations along specific research lines so that one or more area studies of the Woodland Period can be planned.

5. *Mississippian Studies.* Ieland Ferguson has defined an aspect of the Mississippian cultures in the Carolina-Georgia region that he has called the South Appalachian Mississippian (Ferguson 1971). It includes all of the Mississippian manifestations in South Carolina. Sites of this complex are found in many parts of the state but tend to cluster around ceremonial centers, with temple mounds, along the major river systems. One of the most concentrated clusters of these sites is along the Wateree-Santee River valley from Lake Marion to Wateree Lake above Camden. At the south end of this area is the Scott's Lake Site (Santee Mound) and at the Camden end are the Mulberry and Adamson Sites. All three are ceremonial centers. Elsewhere in this valley are numerous hamlet or village sites of the period. An extensive program of intensive survey of the area and excavations at selected sites is being planned to aid in understanding the settlement patterns, the socio-economic foundations of the complex, the religious functions that were served, and to explain the ascendancy and decline of this culture. The study will emphasize soil fertility and agricultural importance, environmental determinants, and community structuring (e.g. the relations of hamlets to villages to centers and the relations of centers to each other). It is anticipated that this study will begin in 1978 and extend to 1985.

6. *Coastal Tribes Study.* Ethno-Historic tribal groups along the South Carolina coast are frequently referred to in the contemporary literature of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries and locations of their villages are noted on some of the contemporary maps. Archeological sites are known to be present in some of the places suggested by these maps and documents (Bull 1969). None of these sites has been specifically correlated with a named tribal group and excavated to learn the cultural composition of the group. It is planned that an intensive study of these documents and maps together with intensive surface investigation of the areas will be made in an effort to identify specific sites. Once identifications on the ground have been made, excavations will be undertaken for the purpose of an understanding and explanation of the interrelationships between the Native and the European cultures at a time when the former were giving way to the latter. Portions of the coastal areas of Charleston, Berkeley, and Georgetown counties provide the best documented base of data for this study. The study is planned to cover a three year period.

7. *Cherokee Settlement Studies.* As a research spin-off of the Keowee-Toxaway project in Pickens and Oconee Counties a study of the Lower Cherokee towns of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries has become a part of the research plan of the state. Several of these towns were located on the ground, identified, and partially excavated or tested. Subsequently, as time has permitted, other Cherokee towns have been identified and located. With so many of the Cherokee towns having been inundated by reservoirs in South Carolina and Tennessee the detailed study of these remaining towns is of especial importance. It is planned that these studies will continue, and accelerate, in this decade to include excavations of selected sites and sampling of others.

8. *Catawba Settlement Studies.* The Ethno-Historic Catawba Indian people have lived in the general vicinity of the upper Wateree and Catawba River valleys, since, at least, early Colonial times. They still reside in this area today as the only major Indian group in the State. Absorbed into the Catawba Nation, especially during the eighteenth century, have been a number of other remnant Indian groups. Archeological sites of Catawba villages are mentioned in the

documents and noted on some of the contemporary maps. A program, like that for the coastal tribes and for the Cherokee sites, to correlate on-the-ground sites with documented locations, identify specific villages where possible, and conduct excavations where appropriate, should be productive of major research data (Baker 1975). In addition to the cultural data to be derived from this study concerning a specific tribal group, information may be expected to emerge concerning intra-tribal acculturation of several groups joining together under stress conditions. The presence of existing Catawba people in the area would provide a basis also in this study for investigation of the ethnographic and linguistic aspects of the culture.

9. *Nineteenth Century Shipwrecks.* Numerous shipwrecks of all periods of South Carolina's history are to be found in the waters of the state. Not only do they lie off-shore but throughout the rivers, harbors, bays, inlets, and estuaries of the coastal area. The inventory of these shipwrecks is only beginning and specific projects for study of these ships, except on a sporadic basis, is to be deferred until such an inventory can be established. One exception to this is a group of Federal Gunboats of the Civil War period that lie in South Carolina waters. They are the USS Weehawken, the USS Keokuk, the USS Dia Ching, and the USS Housatonic. An underwater archeological research program for these vessels, culminating in raising and preserving the most feasible of them is being planned for the early part of this decade. The results of studies of these ships should provide an increased understanding of Naval life of the 1860's as well as of Naval ships of the period. In addition, the project is expected to provide outstanding exhibits for a maritime museum.

10. *Exploration and Settlement Studies.* The earliest exploration and settlement of the South Carolina coast began in first quarter of the sixteenth century and continued, sporadically, for a century and a half before the English permanently settled at Charles Towne (Quattlebaum 1956). Exploratory expeditions such as those of Verrazano, De Soto, or Juan Pardo, of course would leave little if any evidence for the archeologist to recover. Some settlements were made, however, that should provide significant archeological remains if located and excavated. The Spanish established a brief settlement, presumably in the Winyah Bay area (Quattlebaum 1956). The Spanish and French alternated in establishing short-lived posts in the Port Royale area.

The remains of such settlements are, for the most part, yet to be located and identified but one such settlement on Parris Island has been located and sampled (Osterhaut 1923). A systematic study of these sixteenth and seventeenth century posts, a search for their remains and, when found, proper excavation would provide an understanding of these earliest colonists and their relations with the native populations. This study would be correlated with the excavations already done at the English settlement at Charles Towne. It would be accomplished over a period of six years during the next decade.

Specific Site Studies

Archeological research remains unfinished at a number of sites throughout the state and research has been suggested or partially planned at other individual sites. Some of these are, or will become, segments of the Area Studies mentioned above. Others are more-or-less isolated examples of the cultures they represent but even these will ultimately be incorporated into subsequent area studies. These specific sites are briefly noted below with estimates of the time required for completion of work on each. In the estimate of time, a year of research is calculated on the basis of three months of field excavation and nine months of laboratory research and reporting.

1. *Charles Towne Landing*. An historic site of 1670-1680 with eighteenth and nineteenth century components and sporadic occupations from Archaic through Mississippian including a ceremonial center. The equivalent of three years of work has been done. Nine additional years of research should be planned for systematic exploratory testing of the entire area and excavation of selected segments of each culture complex represented. A full time resident archeologist is suggested to accomplish the research and develop public interpretation.

2. *San Migue^l De Guadalupe*. An historic site of 1526. The best evidence available suggests that this earliest European settlement on the Atlantic Coast of North America may be located on Waccamaw Neck in Georgetown County. An intensive search for this site should be made requiring two to six months of detailed investigation. If it is found, excavation should follow which would probably require two and a half research years. The search for the site should be combined with a thorough survey of all sites in the Waccamaw Neck.

3. *Dorchester*. An historic town and Fort of 1690's to the early nineteenth century. Two years of work has been done at the fort site and one more year is planned. At least nine more years of research should be planned for the town site. A full-time resident archeologist is suggested to accomplish the research and develop public interpretation.

4. *Middleton Place*. An historic plantation complex of the eighteenth and nineteenth century. Research should be planned for the main house and wing, the well, the tunnel, and other features. This site is well suited to a field school situation. Three years of research should be planned.

5. *Historic Camden*. An historic town and fortifications of the eighteenth century. The equivalent of four years of research has been done. A full-time resident archeologist is suggested to accomplish the research and develop public interpretation.

6. *Ninety Six*. An historic town and fortifications of the eighteenth century. Four years of research has been done. An additional seven years of research should be planned. A full-time resident archeologist has been employed to accomplish the research and develop public interpretation.

7. *Fort Moore*. An historic trading post and fort of the eighteenth century. Also includes proto-historic Indian settlement of "Savanna Towne." Sporadic research amounting to about one year has been done. Land development has destroyed

major portions of the site but one additional year of research here would be worthwhile if done soon.

8. *Edgefield Potteries*. An historic pottery producing center of the nineteenth century. Kilns and waster dumps should be investigated and studies of the pottery and its distribution made. A year of research should be planned for this.

9. *Port Royale Sound*. Historic forts of both French and Spanish origin were established in this area in the seventeenth century. An intensive search for these sites should be made requiring three to six months. This may be combined with the Hilton Head Island Survey. If found, excavations of the sites of these forts should be planned for three years of research.

10. *Scott's Lake Site*. A Mississippian Period site with an historic eighteenth century occupation. The historic component has been completed in two years of research. The Mississippian component is a temple mound ceremonial center and will be a part of the Area Study of the Mississippian Period. Research on this site should be planned for three years and integrated into the rest of the Area Study.

11. *Mutherry Site*. A Mississippian Period temple mound ceremonial center. The equivalent of about two years of research has been done. Research on this site should be planned for one additional year as a part of the Mississippian Period Area Study.

12. *Adamson Site*. A Mississippian Period temple mound ceremonial center. Only brief research has been done here. Four years of research should be planned for this site as a part of the Mississippian Period Area Study. It is such an outstanding site that it should be developed as an interpretive center for public edification.

13. *McCullum Site*. A Mississippian Period temple mound ceremonial center. The equivalent of about one half year of research has been done. One year of research should be planned for this site as a part of the Mississippian Period Area Study.

14. *Lawton Site*. A Mississippian Period temple mound ceremonial center. No research has been done. Two years of research should be planned as a part of the Mississippian Period Area Study.

15. *Ashley Hall Site*. A Woodland burial mound site. No research has been done here. A year of research should be planned for this site.

16. *Ferry Landing Site*. A multi-component village site. The equivalent of a half year or less of research has been done. Two years of research appears to be warranted for this major site.

17. *Spanish Mount Site*. A shell midden-mound of the Transition Period. Two years of research has been done. Two years of research should be planned as a part of the Transition Period Area Study.

18. *Sea Pines Shell Ring*. A shell ring of the Transition Period. Brief tests have been made equivalent to about a half year of research. Two years of research should be planned as a part of the Transition Period Area Study.

19. *Auld Shell Ring Site*. A shell ring of the Transition Period. No research has been done. Two years of research should be planned as a part of the Transition Period Area Study.

20. *Fig Is land Shell Ring Site*. A group of shell rings in a single small area. There is a uniform circle, a semi-circle, and a group of overlapping rings that form a high midden. One year of research has been done. Three additional years of research should be planned as a part of the Transition Period Area Study.

21. *Sewee Shell Ring Site*. A shell ring of the Transition Period. One year of research has been done. One additional year of research should be planned as a part of the Transition Period Area Study.

22. *Skull Creek Shell Ring Site*. Two overlapping shell rings of the Transition Period. The site has been only tested. Two years of research should be planned as a part of the Transition Period Area Study.

23. *Congarees Beltway Site Complex*. This is a complex of sites in a compact area including the historic Congaree Fort, and Mississippian, Woodland, and Archaic sites. The historic fort must be located and identified and all sites require full-scale research. One year of research has been done. Two additional years of research should be planned.

24. *Copper River Rediversion Canal*. An historic plantation site of the eighteenth century and a stratified prehistoric site form the nucleus of an ecological-archeological study of this bank of the Santee River. The equivalent of a half year of survey has been done. Two years of research are planned for this area as a part of the Lower Santee River Survey. The United States Corps of Engineers is expected to fund this research.

25. *Kiawah Is land*. An historic plantation site of the eighteenth century and several prehistoric sites of the Woodland and Transitional Periods are endangered by land development. A half year of survey has been done. Two years of research are being planned for the island to be funded by the land developers.

Summary

Specific research projects of three kinds are planned for the next decade in the South Carolina Archeological Preservation Plan. These are: Surveys, Area Studies, and Specific Site Studies. There is some overlap between the three in some instances because of the interrelated archeological components. Twelve large-scale Surveys, ten Area Studies, and twenty-five Specific Site Studies have been discussed. This is an ambitious program for the decade of 1975-1985 but one that is realistic and achievable. A total of some 168 research years is suggested but some of the studies overlap so that this may be reduced to approximately 140 research years. Projects, of course, will run concurrently and this research could be accomplished with fourteen projects a year throughout the decade. This is a reasonable work load for the capabilities that have developed and are continuing to develop within South Carolina.

This program is also going to require substantial funding but that, too, is attainable. The Institute has a basic staff and working facility with a funding base from state appropriations. This state funding base will require some increases but not of major proportions. Other institutions and agencies within the state have developed or are developing research capability with some basic funding. Most of the archeological preservation work discussed above will develop as emergency archeology and federal laws and regulations provide the potential for funding these projects. Such funds become available from federal, state, county, private, and industrial sources. Some of the projects, particularly the area researches, may be funded from non-emergency, granting agencies such as the National Science Foundation, the National Geographic Society and others. Funding for a program of this scope is not going to be easy but neither is it going to be an insurmountable obstacle.

This is an achievable plan. With its successful accomplishment, South Carolina's archeological heritage will be much better understood. Many of the archeological sites of the state will have been preserved, either in the ground, or on record or both and the others will be receiving protection where appropriate. Much of the culture history of the state will have been interpreted and explained. The evolution of the ever-changing ways of life of the many human populations will be better understood, as they entered the stage, played their parts, and made their exits in the perpetual drama of South Carolina's culture history. Yet, in 1985, much will remain to be done. This preservation plan will, in no sense bring to completion the archeological preservation needs. Out of each of these projects will develop new problems to be solved and new techniques for solving them. There will be new questions to ask of the data and increasingly supportable answers to those questions. This plan is but one more step in the continuing effort to understand our heritage - and therefore ourselves.

REFERENCES

ANDERSON, DAVID G.

- 1974 An Archeological Survey of the Proposed Alternate Two Route of the Southwestern Beltway Between S.C. Route 48 and Richland-Lexington Counties, South Carolina, August, 1974. Notebook Vol. VI, No. 5-6. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

ANDERSON, DAVID G., JAMES L. MICHIE AND MICHAEL B. TRINKLEY

- 1974 An Archeological Survey of the Proposed Southwestern Beltway Extension and Twelfth Street Extension Highway Route in the Vicinity of Congaree Creek. Research Manuscript Series No. 60. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

ASREEN, ROBERT C.

- 1974 An Archeological Reconnaissance of the Proposed Cooper River Rediversion Project, Berkeley County, South Carolina. Research Manuscript Series No. 61. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

BAKER, STEVEN G.

- 1972a Colono-Indian Pottery from Cambridge, South Carolina with Comments on the Historic Catawba Pottery Trade. Notebook, Vol. IV, No. 1. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- 1972b A House on Cambridge Hill (38GN2). Research Manuscript Series, No. 27. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- 1974 Confitachique: Fair Province of Carolina. Masters thesis for Department of History, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- 1975 The Historic Catawba Peoples: Exploratory Perspectives in Ethno-history and Archaeology. Department of History, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

BARTRAM, WILLIAM

- 1791 Travels through North and South Carolina, Georgia and West Florida, the Cherokee Country, the Extensive Territories of the Moscogulges or the Creek Confederacy, and the Country of the Chocktaw. Containing an Account of the Soil and Natural Production of those Regions. Together with Observation on the Manners of the Indians. James and Johnson, Philadelphia.

BLANDING, WILLIAM

- 1847 Remains on the Wateree River, Kershaw District, South Carolina. In Ancient Monuments of the Mississippi Valley. Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge, Vol. 1. E. G. Squire and E. H. Davis, ed. Washington.

BRAGG, LAURA M.

- 1918 Indian Mound Excavation in South Carolina. Bulletin of the Charleston Museum, Vol. XIV, No. 4, Charleston.

BROCKINGTON, PAUL

- 1971 A Preliminary Investigation of an Early Knapping Site in Southeastern Georgia. Notebook, Vol. III, No. 2. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

BROWN, DOUGLAS SUMMER

- 1966 The Catawba Indians. University of South Carolina Press, Columbia.

BULL, ELIAS B.

- 1969 The Problem of the Cusabo. Notebook, Vol. 1, No. 6-9, pp. 8-12. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

CALDWELL, JOSEPH R.

- 1948 Palachacolas Town, Hampton County, South Carolina. Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences, Vol. 38, No. 10.
- 1952a Archeological Investigation of Fort Charlotte, McCormick County, South Carolina. Mimeographed report of the River Basin Surveys, Smithsonian Institution, Washington.
- 1952b The Archeology of Eastern Georgia and South Carolina. In Archeology of the Eastern United States, James B. Griffin, Editor, Chicago, Illinois.
- 1953 Appraisal of the Archaeological Resources of Hartwell Reservoir, South Carolina and Georgia. Manuscript. National Park Service. Copy at the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- 1954a The Old Quartz Industry of Piedmont Georgia and South Carolina. Newsletter of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Vol. IV, No. 1 Cambridge.
- 1954b The Old Quartz Industry of Piedmont Georgia and South Carolina. Southern Indian Studies, Vol. VI, pp. 37-39.

CALDWELL, JOSEPH R AND CARL F. MILLER

- 1948 Appraisal of the Archeological Resources of The Clark Hill Reservoir Area, South Carolina and Georgia. River Basin Surveys, Smithsonian Institution. Manuscript. Copy at Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

CALMES, ALAN

- 1967a Test Excavations at two Late Archaic Sites on Hilton Head Island, Beaufort County, South Carolina. Manuscript. On file at the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- 1967b The British Revolutionary Fortifications of Camden, South Carolina. Conference on Historic Site Archaeology, Vol. 2, Part 1. Raleigh.
- 1968 Report of Excavations at the Revolutionary War Period Fortifications of Camden, South Carolina. Camden District Heritage Foundation. On file at the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

CARRILLO, RICHARD F.

- 1971 Exploratory Excavations at Fort Hawkins, Macon, Georgia: An Early Nineteenth Century Military Outpost. Conference on Historic Site Archaeology Papers, Vol. 6, Part 1. Columbia.
- 1972a Archeological Excavation at Pinckneyville, Site of Pinckney District, 1791-1800. Research Manuscript Series, No. 25. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- 1972b English Wine Bottles as Revealed by a Statistical Study: A Further Approach to Evolution and Horizon in Historical Archeology. Conference on Historic Site Archaeology Papers, Vol. 7, Part 4. Columbia.
- 1973 Preliminary Archeological Investigation at Fort Dorchester (38DR4). Research Manuscript Series, No. 39. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- 1974a Landsford Canal. Research Manuscript Series, No. 57. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- 1974b Colonial Road Survey at King's Mountain National Military Park South Carolina. Research Manuscript Series, No. 66. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

CHEVES, LANGDON (ed)

- 1897 The Shaftesbury Papers and Other Records Relating to Carolina and the First Settlement on Ashley River Prior to the Year 1676. Collections of the South Carolina Historical Society, Charleston.

CIAFLIN, WILLIAM H.

- 1931 The Stallings Island Mound, Columbia County, Georgia. Paper of the Peabody Museum of Archeology and Ethnology, Vol. 14, No. 1. Harvard University, Cambridge.

COE, JOFFRE L.

- 1964 The Formative Cultures of the Carolina Piedmont. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series, Vol. 54, Part 5. Philadelphia.

COMBES, JOHN D.

- 1969 Resistivity Revisited: New Instrumentation for Use as a Tool in Archeological Reconnaissance. Notebook, Vol. I, No. 2. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- 1974 Charcoal Kilns and Cemetery at Paris Mountain State Park. Notebook, Vol. VI, No. 1. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

EDWARDS, WILLIAM E.

- 1966 A Preliminary Report on the Sewee Mound Shell Midden, Charleston County, South Carolina. Manuscript. On file at the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

FERGUSON, LELAND G.

- 1971 South Appalachian Mississippian. Doctorial Thesis. Dept. of Anthropology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- 1974 Archeological Investigation at the Mulberry Site. Notebook, Vol. VI, No. 3-4. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- 1975a Archeology at Scott's Lake Exploratory Research 1972, 1973. Research Manuscript Series, No. 68. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- 1975b Mississippian Artifacts and Geography. Paper presented at 1975 Annual Meeting of the Southern Anthropological Society, Clearwater Beach, Florida.

FLANNERY, REGINA

- 1943 Some Notes on a Few Sites in Beaufort County, South Carolina. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 123, pp. 143-153.

GOODYEAR, ALBERT C.

- 1975 A General Research Design for Highway Archeology in South Carolina. Notebook, Vol. VII, No. 1. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

GRANGE, ROGER D.

- n.d. The I.C. Few Site (38PN2). Manuscript. On file at Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

GREGG, ALEXANDER

- 1867 History of the Old Cheraws: Containing among other things an Account of the Aborigines of the Pee Dee District of South Carolina. Richardson and Co., New York. Reprinted by The Reprint Company, Spartanburg, 1965.

GREGORIE, ANNE KING

- 1925 Notes on Sewee Indians and Indian Remains. Contributions from the Charleston Museum, No. 5. The Charleston Museum, Charleston.

GRIFFIN, JAMES B.

- 1952a Archeology of the Eastern United States. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- 1952b Radiocarbon Dates for the Eastern United States. Archeology of the Eastern United States. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

HAYNES, C.V.

- 1969 The Earliest Americans. Science 166: 709-715.
- 1971 Time, Environment and Early Man. Arctic Anthropology Vol. 8, pp. 3-14.

HECKWELDER, JOHN GOTTLIEB ERASTUS

- 1818 An account of the History, Manners and Customs of the Indian Nations who once inhabited Pennsylvania and the neighboring States. Philadelphia.

HEMMINGS, E. THOMAS

- 1970 Preliminary Report of Excavations at Fig Island, South Carolina. Notebook, Vol. II, Nos. 9-12. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- 1972a Archeological Exploration of Landsford Canal, Chester County, South Carolina. Notebook, Vol. IV, No. 2. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina.
- 1972b Emergence of Formative Life on the Atlantic Coast of the Southeast. Notebook, Vol. IV, No. 3. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- 1972c Prehistoric Subsistence and Settlement on the Upper Savannah River. Notebook, Vol. IV, No. 4. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

HODGE, FREDERICK WEBB (ed.)

- 1907 Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 30, Part 1. Government Printing Office, Washington.
- 1910 Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 30, Part 2. Government Printing Office, Washington.

HOLE, FRANK AND ROBERT F. HEIZER

- 1969 An Introduction to Prehistoric Archeology. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc. New York.

HOLMES, WILLIAM H.

- 1903 Aboriginal Pottery of the Eastern United States. In 20th Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, pp. 1-201. Smithsonian Institution, Washington.

JEFFERSON, THOMAS

- 1787 Notes on Virginia. London.

JELKS, EDWARD B.

- 1975 The Use and Misuse of Random Sampling in Archeology, JeH Publishing Co., Normal, Ill.

JONES, C.C., JR.

- 1873 Antiquities of the Southern Indians, Particularly of the Georgia Tribes. D. Appleton and Company, New York.

LAWSON, JOHN

- 1714 The History of Carolina Containing the Exact Description and Natural History of that Country, Together with the Present State Thereof and a Journal of a Thousand Miles through Several Nations of Indians, Giving a Particular Account of their Customs, Manners, etc. Reprinted in 1951 as Lawson's History of North Carolina. Garret and Mossic, Richmond.

LEWIS, KENNETH E.

- 1975 Archeological Investigations at the Colonial Settlement of Long Bluff (38DA5), Darlington County, South Carolina. Research Manuscript Series, No. 67. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

LIPE WILLIAM D.

- 1974 A Conservation Model for American Archaeology. The Kiva, Vol. 39, Nos. 3-4.

LOGAN, JOHN H.

- 1859 History of Upper South Carolina from Earliest Periods to the Close of the War of Independence, Vol. 1. S. G. Courtney, Charleston. P. B. Glase, Columbia. Reprinted in 1960 by Reprint Company, Spartanburg.

McDOWELL, WILLIAM L., JR. (ed.)

- 1955 Colonial Records of South Carolina, Journals of the Commissioners of the Indian Trade 1716-1718. South Carolina Archives Department, Columbia.
- 1958 Colonial Records of South Carolina, Documents Relating to Indian Affairs May 21, 1750-August 7, 1754. South Carolina Archives Department, Columbia.
- 1970 Colonial Records of South Carolina, Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, 1754-1765. University of South Carolina Press, Columbia.

McGIMSEY, CHARLES R., III.

- 1972 Public Archeology. Seminar Press, New York.

MICHIE, JAMES L.

- 1969 Excavations at Thom's Creek. Notebook, Vol. 1, No. 10. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- 1973 Archeological Indications for Sea Level 3500 Years Ago. South Carolina Antiquities, Vol. V, No. 1. Columbia.
- 1974 A Second Burial from the Daw's Island Shell Midden, 38BU9, Beaufort County, South Carolina. South Carolina Antiquities, Vol. VI, No. 1, pp. 37-47. Columbia.

MILLER, CARL F.

- 1950 An Analysis and Interpretation of the Ceramic Remains from 38MC6, near Clark's Hill, South Carolina. Journal of the Washington Academy of Science, Vol. 40, No. 11, pp. 350-354. Washington.

MILLING, CHAPMAN J.

- 1940 Red Carolinians. University of South Carolina Press, Columbia.

MILLS, ROBERT

- 1826 Statistics of South Carolina Including a View of the Natural, Civil, and Military History, General and Particular. Hurlbut and Lloyd, Charleston.

MOONEY, JAMES

- 1894 The Siouan Tribes of the East. Bureau of American Ethnology
Bulletin 22. Washington.

MOORE, C.B.

- 1898 Certain Aboriginal Mounds of the Coast of South Carolina.
Certain Aboriginal Mounds of the Savannah River. Certain
Aboriginal Mounds of the Altamba River. Recent Aquisitions.
A Cache of Pendant Ornaments. P. C. Stockhausen, Philadelphia.
- 1899 Certain Aboriginal Mounds of the Savannah River. Journal of the
Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, Second Series,
Vol. 11, Part 2, pp. 162-172.

MORTON, SAMUEL

- 1846 Some Observations on the Ethnography and Archeology of the
American Aborigines. B. L. Hamlen, New Haven.

MUELLER, JAMES W.

- 1974 The Use of Sampling in Archaeological Survey. American Antiquity,
Vol. 39, No. 2, Part 2.

OLIPHANT, MARY C. SIMMS

- 1964 The History of South Carolina. Laidlaw Brothers Publishers,
River Forest.

OSTERHOUT, MAJOR GEORGE H., JR.

- 1923 After Three Hundred and Fifty Years. The Marine Corps Gazette,
June, pp. 98-109.

PALMER, EDWARD

- n.d. McCollum Mound and House Site. National Anthropological Archives,
Smithsonian Institution Ms. no. 2400: (pt).

PEPPER, GEORGE H.

- 1924 Wateree Artifacts. Indian Notes, Vol. 1, No. 2. Museum of the
American Indian, Heye Foundation, New York.

PETERSON, DREXEL

- 1971 Time and Settlement in the Archaeology of Groton Plantation,
South Carolina. Doctoral thesis. Department of Anthropology,
Harvard University, Cambridge.

POLHEMUS, RICHARD

- 1972 Exploratory Excavation in the Yard of the John Fox House (38LX31).
Notebook, Vol. IV, No. 4. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology,
University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- n.d. Gillon Street Delft Site (38CH70). Manuscript. On file at
Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South
Carolina, Columbia.

POWELL, JOHN WESLEY

- 1891 Indian Linguistic Families of America North of Mexico. 7th Annual
Report of the Bureau of Ethnology. Smithsonian Institution,
Washington.

QUATTLEBAUM, P.

1956 The Land Called Chicora. University of Florida Press, Gainesville.

ROYCE, CHARLES C.

1887 The Cherokee Nation of Indians. 5th Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology. Government Printing Office, Washington.

RYAN, THOMAS M.

1971a Archeological Resources Along the Proposed Route of Interstate 77. Research Manuscript Series, No. 11. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

1971b Some Brief Field Trips in South Carolina. Notebook, Vol. III, No. 4. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

1971c Test Excavations at McCollum Site. Notebook, Vol. III, No. 5. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

1972 Archeological Survey of the Columbia Zoological Park, Richland and Lexington Counties, South Carolina. Notebook, Vol. IV, No. 6. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

SCHOOLCRAFT, HENRY R.

1851-1857 Historical and Statistical information respecting the history, condition and prospects of the Indian tribes of the United States. Collected and Prepared under the direction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Vols. 1-6. Philadelphia.

SOUTH, STANLEY

1960 An Archaeological Survey of Southeastern Coastal North Carolina. Manuscript. On file at the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

1969 Exploratory Archeology at the Site of 1670-1680 Charles Towne on Albemarle Point in South Carolina. Research Manuscript Series, No. 1. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

1970a Exploratory Archeology at Ninety Six (38GN1-38GN5). Research Manuscript Series, No. 6. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

1970b Baked Clay Objects from the Site of the 1670 Settlement at Charles Towne, South Carolina. Notebook, Vol. II No. 1. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

1971a Historical Perspective at Ninety Six with a Summary of Exploratory Excavation at Holmes' Fort and the Town Blockhouse. Research Manuscript Series, No. 9. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

- 1971b Evolution and Horizon as Revealed in Ceramic Analysis in Historical Archeology. Conference on Historic Site Archaeology Papers, Vol. 6, Part 2. Columbia.
- 1973a Exploratory Excavation at the Price House. Notebook, Vol. V, No. 2. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- 1973b The Pawley House (38GE15). Notebook, Vol. V, No. 1. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- 1973c Indian Pottery Taxonomy for the South Carolina Coast. Paper presented at the Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Memphis, Tennessee.
- 1974 Palmetto Parapets. Anthropological Studies No. 1. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- SQUIER, EPHRIAM G. AND E. H. DAVIS, (eds.)
 1848 Ancient Monuments in the Mississippi Valley, Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge, Vol. 1. Washington.
- STEPHENSON, ROBERT L.
 1967 Engineering Geology, Soils, and Archeology. In Proceedings of the 5th Annual Engineering Geology and Soils Engineering Symposium. Idaho State University, Pocatello.
- 1970a Institute of Archeology and Anthropology: Statement of Goals 1970-1980. Research Manuscript Series, No. 4. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- 1970b Archeological Investigations in the Whitney Reservoir Area, Central Texas. Bulletin of the Texas Archeological Society, Vol. 41.
- 1971 The Potts Village Site (39CO19): Oahe Reservoir, North Central South Dakota. The Missouri Archeologist, Vol. 33.
- 1974 What is a Nice Guy Like Me Doing in a Place Like This? Paper presented at Society for Historical Archaeology Meeting, Oakland California.
- STOLTMAN, JAMES B.
 1974 Groton Plantation: An Archaeological Study of a South Carolina Locality. Monographs of the Peabody Museum, No. 1. Harvard University, Cambridge.
- STRICKLAND ROBERT N.
 1971 Camden Revolutionary War Fortifications (38KE1). The 1969-70 Excavations. Notebook, Vol. III, No. 3. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

STUART, GEORGE E.

- 1970 Some Archeological Sites in the Middle Wateree Valley, South Carolina. Masters Thesis on file at George Washington University, Washington.

SWANTON, JOHN R.

- 1922 Early History of the Creek Indians and Their Neighbors. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 73. Government Printing Office, Washington.
- 1932 Ethnological Value of the De Soto Narratives. American Anthropologist, Vol. 34, No. 4.
- 1936 Early History of the Eastern Siouan Tribes. In Essays in Anthropology. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- 1939 Final Report of the United States De Soto Expedition Commission. 76th Congress, 1st Session, House Document, No. 71. Washington.
- 1946 The Indians of Southeastern United States. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 137. Smithsonian Institution, Washington.

THOMAS, CYRUS

- 1891 Catalogue of Prehistoric Works East of the Rockies. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 12. Washington.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

- 1971 The National Register of Historic Places. U.S. Printing Office, Washington.

VAYDA, ANDREW P. (ed.)

- 1969 Environment and Cultural Behavior. The Natural History Press, Garden City.

WATT, KENNETH E. F.

- 1969 Computers and the Evaluation of Resource Management Strategies. In Environment and Cultural Behavior. The Natural History Press, Garden City.

WILKINS, JOSEPH, HOWELL HUNTER AND RICHARD CARRILLO

- 1975 Historical, Architectural, and Archeological Research at Brattonsville (38YR21), York County, South Carolina. Research Manuscript Series, No. 76. Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

WILLIAMS, SAMUEL COLE

- 1930 Adair's History of the American Indians. The Watauga Press, Johnson City, Tennessee.

WILLIAMS, STEPHEN (ed.)

- 1968 The Waring Papers. The Collected Works of Antonio J. Waring, Jr. Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archeology and Ethnology, Vol. LVIII. Cambridge.

WORMINGTON, H.M.

1957 Ancient Man in North America. Denver Museum of Natural History,
Denver.

YARROW, H. C.

1881 A Further Contribution to the Study of the Mortuary Customs of the
North American Indians. 1st Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology.
Government Printing Office, Washington.