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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of a one-year project to identify critically significant archaeological sites and historical properties within South Carolina. The goal of this work is to provide the Cultural Areas Subcommittee (CAS) of the South Carolina Heritage Trust Advisory Board (HTAB) with a priority list of ranked sites for possible future purchase or registration as South Carolina Heritage Preserves. In order to accomplish this task, the authors refined a set of evaluation criteria in consultation with members of the professional archaeological community in South Carolina, and then conducted a review of the statewide inventory of archaeological sites. Over the course of a year 87 selected sites were visited to gather further information. Eventually, from a total of approximately 13,000 known archaeological sites in the state, 100 were nominated for the list and were ranked by the professional archaeological community. This list of 100 sites is presented in this report. It is important to note that the list is, of course, not the final word on critically significant sites in South Carolina. Rather it reflects the current state of knowledge concerning the state’s cultural resources. As new information is learned, and new discoveries are made, the list will need to be revised. However, this effort has resulted in providing the Heritage Trust with a starting point, based on the known resources in the state.

The report is organized as follows. This chapter presents a general introduction to the project, and a brief history of the Heritage Trust’s efforts to date, to acquire important cultural (primarily archaeological) sites for preservation and the public trust. Chapter II presents a brief overview of the cultural history of the state. The purpose of this chapter is to provide context for the statewide assessment detailed in Chapters III and IV. Chapter III details the theory and methodology used in the creation of the Archaeological Site Selection Criteria and those criteria are presented. Field methods for the site visits are also detailed. Chapter IV presents the results of the field effort, including site descriptions, and also the sites, as ranked. Chapter V summarizes this work and makes recommendations for future priorities for the Cultural Areas Subcommittee.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE HERITAGE TRUST’S EFFORTS TO PRESERVE CULTURAL AREAS

The following is a brief history of the efforts of the Heritage Trust concerning the acquisition of cultural properties. This is not a complete history of the Trust, but rather an attempt to discuss, in historical perspective, some of the reasons why the Trust’s efforts to protect cultural areas through acquisition have not been, to date, as successful as the protection of natural areas. It is important to note that this is not intended to indict the efforts of past committee members (which are actually to be commended), but rather to identify past and present problems which the authors feel can be addressed in the future.

The Heritage Trust

In 1974 the Heritage Trust was created in South Carolina, the first state in the nation to create a program to protect its natural and cultural heritage through site acquisition or registration (Bennett and Murphy 1986: 24). The act made it public policy to:

secure for the people, both present and future generations, the benefits of an enduring resource of natural and cultural areas and features by establishing a system of Heritage Preserves and Sites; protecting this system, gathering and disseminating information regarding it; establishing and maintaining a listing of Heritage Preserves and Sites; and otherwise encouraging and assisting in the preservation of natural and cultural areas and features of this State (51-17-20, S.C. Code of Laws).

The Heritage Trust, a division of the South Carolina Wildlife and Marine Resources Department (SCWMRD), was established to preserve those aspects of South Carolina, both natural and cultural, that are important to the state’s heritage. This program is a way of ensuring that these areas will survive for the benefit and enjoyment of future generations of South Carolinians.

The Heritage Trust is composed of an Advisory Board (HTAB), Natural and Cultural Areas Subcommittees, a Budget Subcommittee,
and staff who work both as part of the Heritage Trust and the Nongame and Endangered Species Section of the Wildlife and Marine Resources Department. The Heritage Trust Advisory Board presides quarterly to establish where staff effort and Trust monies will be allocated. It is made up of six expert citizens, one from each congressional district, and the following representatives or their designees:

- Director, South Carolina Department of Archives and History
- Executive Director, Wildlife and Marine Resources Department
- Chairman, South Carolina Wildlife and Marine Resources Commission
- Director, South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology
- Director, South Carolina State Museum
- Director, South Carolina State Development Board
- Executive Director, Land Resources Conservation Commission
- Executive Director, Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism
- State Forester, South Carolina Forestry Commission

Under the Trust's program, three different protection mechanisms are used: 1) Dedication, 2) the Trust, and 3) Registration. Through Dedication, some interest in the site is conveyed to the State. Through the Trust, all interest in the land is conveyed to the State. This is where the major effort is made, in that the best protection of important natural and cultural areas is by acquisition and maintenance of a property that contains a significant element. Through Registration, the State receives no interest in a site, but the landowner agrees to make management decisions in conjunction with the State's interest in protecting the site.

Progress in the acquisition of properties was slow in the initial years of the Trust, primarily due to funding restrictions. In 1981 the Check for Wildlife tax checkoff was introduced into South Carolina, the seventh of its kind in the country. This program provided stable funding for the acquisition of heritage preserves both natural and cultural. In 1985, the establishment of the Heritage Land Trust Fund Act enabled the acquisition of properties worthy of state level protection through appropriated funds (Bennett and Murphy 1986:26). These sources of income have greatly facilitated acquisition of Heritage Preserves. In 1990, $772,000 was spent to acquire 3,239 acres of land, while in 1989 over $3.7 million was spent to acquire 7,760 acres of land. To date, 28 Heritage Preserves amounting to 37,000 acres have been acquired by the Heritage Trust Program (Greeter 1991).

Since February 23, 1982, it has been the Cultural Areas Subcommittee of the Heritage Trust that recommends the acquisition of particular cultural properties to the HTAB. However, prior to the subcommittee's first meeting, the full HTAB had taken some steps to preserve cultural sites. For example, they named the State Archaeologist and the State Historic Preservation Officer to serve as members of the Board. In 1977 the HTAB approved its first cultural project, the Thomas Heyward Burial Site, which eventually was donated to Jasper County (more detailed information concerning the properties noted in this chapter can be found in Chapter IV). In 1978 Middleburg Plantation (3BBK38), located on the east branch of the Cooper River in Berkeley County, and the Pacolet River Soapstone Outcrops in Spartanburg County, became approved projects (Ferguson 1978). Registration was planned for Middleburg, an important historic plantation containing the oldest woodframe house in South Carolina. An agreement between the landowner and the Trust could not be reached and this project has remained inactive. The Pacolet River soapstone outcrops, a natural formation of soapstone that was used by prehistoric Native Americans, was planned as a Heritage Preserve. The project was approved pending additional information, which has yet to be fully prepared.

During these early years the South Carolina Heritage Trust Program (SCHTP), staff and board members worked hard to refine the program, and develop workable policies and procedures. In 1978 the staff of the Heritage Trust developed a position paper, its first objective being to "provide a common approach to dealing with cultural and natural area projects," and to also set eligibility criteria for acquisition and registration projects (SCHTP 1978:1). This paper introduced the term "element" defined as "a single occurrence of a special plant or animal species, a plant community, a special habitat, an historic building, an archaeological feature, or any other classifiable 'thing' of interest to the program" (SCHTP 1978:1). (The element is the object, natural or cultural, which the Heritage Trust seeks to preserve for the future by acquisition of the property where the element survives. For cultural resources, such as archaeological properties, an 'element' is the equivalent of an archaeological 'site' or historic property. This report will use the term 'site' throughout.) The paper's significance to the Heritage Trust's
cultural effort was that it first recognized that seeking a joint cultural and natural evaluation process was not useful, and called for a process for evaluating cultural acquisitions "comparable to the existing process for natural acquisitions" (SCHTP 1978:7). This position paper had the effect of delineating the Heritage Trust's efforts into two separate paths or roles, a natural and a cultural effort, leaving the effort of identifying and evaluating cultural sites, appropriately, to archaeologists and preservationists, or more specifically the SCIAA and the SHPO (SCHTP 1978:4, Stephenson 1978:1).

In 1979 the Deputy SHPO, Mrs. Christie Fant, proposed nine priority areas to the HTAB. These nine were:

1) Georgetown County Rice Plantations
2) Pendleton (Historic) District
3) Broad, Saluda, Congaree, Columbia Canal Area
4) Welsh Neck, Long Bluff, Society Hill Area
5) Liberty Hill (Historic) District
6) Camden Restoration Area
7) Snow's Island
8) Santee Canal
9) Ashley River Conservation District

(Minutes HTAB March 1, 1979)

These nine areas were proposed because they were large areas that needed protection which could not be achieved through other means. Members of the Heritage Trust Advisory Board responsible for cultural areas assumed that there were more appropriate means to protect small single sites (see below further discussion of this assumption) and that the Trust's efforts should be toward the protection of large areas which were beyond the reach of such protection mechanisms as the National Trust for Historic Preservation or the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. The Board however, approved only the Ashley River Conservation District as a priority area. Dedication was planned for that area. Over time it became evident that it would be very difficult to reach a common agreement with the numerous landowners in the area. Progress on this project eventually reached a standstill. The National Trust for Historic Preservation owns only one site in South Carolina. The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 protects only the data contained within a site through excavation not preservation in place.

Despite this strategy some small sites were approved as protection projects in 1979. During that period Flagg and Grove Plantations, (38BK149) (Hartley and Stephenson 1975; Herold and Scruggs 1975; Herold 1976) was approved as a Heritage Trust project. This area contained brick kilns and docks dating to the early 1700s. The area was planned for registration, however, again differences concerning the size of the area to be registered eventually caused the site to not be registered. Also, that same year the Heritage Trust, the SCIAA, The Nature Conservancy, the Department of Archives and History (SHPO), and the U.S. Department of the Interior's Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service sponsored "Choosing Our Future: Gaining Ground in South Carolina," a workshop to discuss land protection opportunities. The workshop was useful in sharing preservation and protection strategies among these preservation agencies.

In 1982 the Heritage Trust completed a five-year review of the program from 1976 to 1981 (HTAB 1982). This review made several recommendations to the Trust. Concerning the Trust's efforts toward the acquisition of cultural areas, the review commented that it should "work closely with those agencies that use other established means of protecting areas containing significant cultural and historical elements" (HTAB 1982:6). Further, the review concluded that the HTAB staff and cultural agencies should develop a memorandum of agreement spelling out each of their areas of responsibility. Finally, the review recognized that the cultural agencies had a problem finding the time to commit to cultural projects in order to complete them. In essence, the review recommended to further separate and define the roles of the SCWMRD and SHPO/SCIAA staff. At the same time it recognized that the SHPO/SCIAA did not have full-time staff available to carry out the decisions made in committee. In hindsight, it was appropriate to leave the responsibility of cultural site identification and acquisition to the cultural agencies, yet to successfully do so, required a commitment of unavailable staff. The review also recommended that standing subcommittees (natural and cultural) should be created. Despite the lack of staff for the cultural effort, this decision was an important positive step in defining a cultural role for the Heritage Trust by creating the Cultural Areas Subcommittee.

The Cultural Areas Subcommittee

From the very first meeting of the Advisory Board in 1977, the Heritage Trust had turned to the listed inventory of significant cultural sites (National Register) as defined by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as the working
list of cultural properties to be considered for possible acquisition as required in Section 4(2) of the Act (Minutes, HTAB April 19, 1977). This was further reinforced by the Cultural Areas Subcommittee in their first meeting (Minutes, CAS February 23, 1982). Finally, at the May 3, 1984 meeting of the Advisory Board, the South Carolina National Register of Historic Places list was formally adopted as the Heritage Trust's cultural inventory. While this decision was well-intended, it had several unintended consequences which slowed the subcommittee's progress. First, the list had the effect of creating a false impression that the Heritage Trust cultural inventory correctly represented the actual cultural preservation needs of the state. In fact, the National Register list was not developed via a systematic inventory, or to insure that the state's cultural variety is represented, although these goals are recognized by the National Register as desirable, and more recently steps have been taken to complete a statewide inventory of standing structures. For instance, the Register had at that time few archaeological properties listed. Note that the first list of proposed large area projects described above contained only a handful of archaeological sites. In fact, one of these sites, Snow's Island, is on the National Register of Historic Places only as the historically documented location of Francis Marion's Revolutionary War camp. The actual physical location (archaeological site) on the island has not been discovered yet. Second, National Register eligible archaeological sites discovered through modern compliance law are not regularly listed but rather 'declared eligible' and steps are taken to minimize adverse impact, which often includes excavation. The value of archaeological properties, as determined by the National Register criteria, is considered to be in the information that would be lost by site disturbance or destruction. Thus, sites are 'preserved' more often by excavation, rather than by acquisition under the National Historic Preservation Act. The practical result is that the site is gone (except for the data, carefully recorded) rather than saved for future research or future education. Third, using the National Register as the Heritage Trust cultural inventory technically required the Trust to wait until a site was placed on the National Register. This severely restricted the Heritage Trust from moving forward in acquiring archaeological sites until an additional bureaucracy reacted. Fourth, the list of National Register Properties continues to expand and thus dilute the value it might have for use within the goals set for the mandate of the Heritage Trust. This concern was expressed by the Heritage Trust staff at least as early as 1984, when there were 766 National Register sites listed (Minutes, Cultural Areas Subcommittee, April 5, 1984). The intention of the Heritage Trust was to discover the most critically important sites, the "creme de la creme." Fifth, the National Register was not a prioritized list, which would give impetus and direction to the Cultural Areas Subcommittee's efforts.

On a more philosophic level another difficulty persisted. It was assumed by the HTAB and the members of the Cultural Areas Subcommittee that many important cultural sites being, or going to be, protected through other efforts, like those within the National Trust for Historic Preservation and the National Historic Preservation Act. Therefore, the Heritage Trust's active efforts could be more toward natural areas, while the cultural area effort would be toward assisting other cultural programs in a passive role (HTAB 1982: 4, 6). This assumption was false. The National Register as discussed above, does not regularly preserve the physical location of archaeological sites. It affords some protection to sites if the federal government is involved in actions which will lead to the sites possible destruction. The National Trust does assist in and actively work toward archaeological site preservation, but its funding is limited, and it's emphasis is on a nationwide front like The Archaeological Conservancy and The Nature Conservancy. Actually only the South Carolina Heritage Trust provides funding for the acquisition of South Carolina's critically important archaeological sites. Recently, the South Carolina Palmetto Trust has been formed, which will hopefully assist these efforts in the future, in the manner of The Nature Conservancy. The Nature Conservancy does purchase important habitats, and then finds appropriate organizations to manage the property. However, funding for the Palmetto Trust is based on private contributions and its success will be measurable only in the future.

Recognizing some of the above problems with the selection criteria, an attempt was made to redefine the Heritage Trust Cultural Criteria in 1987. In November of that year, "Criteria for Selection of Archaeological Sites As Cultural Areas or Features in the South Carolina Heritage Trust Program," by Albert Goodyear and Bruce Rippeteau was adopted by the HTAB as its selection criteria. These criteria were broader in scope than the National Trust criteria and
included the educational and exhibit value of sites as part of the selection decision, along with considerations which had been mentioned by Dr. Robert Stephenson, former Director of SCIAA and member of the Heritage Trust Board, in his response to the 1978 position paper (Stephenson 1978). In 1988, Mr. James L. Michie of the SCIAA further refined these criteria and made the first attempt to rank sites based on his criteria. Michie's work centered around ranking sites within types. For instance, Michie ranked 16 known shell rings in the state. Barrow's Shell Ring (38BU300) and Patent Shell Ring (38BU301) received top scores according to his criteria (Michie 1988a). Michie also ranked the known South Appalachian Mississippian mounds in the state. The data from evaluations performed by Mr. Michie have been incorporated into this report.

Despite the problems mentioned above, the Cultural Areas Subcommittee achieved some noteworthy successes from 1982 to 1991. The Sandoz Chert Quarries (38AL23), chert sources for prehistoric Native American stone tool manufacturers, were approved for registration in 1985. The registration is currently pending. In 1987 the Nipper Creek site (38RD18), a well-stratified prehistoric site dating as far back as 10,000 to 12,000 years ago, became the first cultural Heritage Preserve to be purchased (Goodyear and Poland 1988). This site was rated using the Goodyear and Rippeteau criteria. In 1988 a portion of Snee Farm, an 1750s plantation site, was purchased, in conjunction with Friends of Snee Farm, through the Heritage Trust and the property will be managed by the National Park Service. In 1991 Green's Shell Enclosure (38BU63), a Native American site dating to about 1300 AD, became the third cultural site to be acquired by the Trust. In addition to these acquisitions, several new properties were added as approved projects. Mitchelville/Fish Haul (38BU805), a Native American site and Freedman's village, was approved in 1987 for Dedication but is currently an inactive Heritage Trust project. Croft Soapstone Quarries has been protected by the South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism, and a Registration agreement has been completed. In 1988 the Lawton Mounds (38AL11) were approved as a Dedication project.

Recently, a new problem has emerged and hindered a systematic approach. Purchases and registration of cultural properties in the latter half of the 1980s have been driven by crisis rather than planned action. Many of these crisis situations are the result of the rapid development of the coast. The Heritage Trust has been forced to act quickly to preserve cultural sites along the coast prior to a statewide evaluation of cultural resources. While the sites purchased were worthy of preservation, it has been impossible to evaluate coastal properties in relation to the state's overall cultural acquisition needs. Further, coastal property values are considerably higher than those elsewhere in the state. Questions concerning the commitment of large sums of limited funds to a single coastal site, in comparison with less costly up-country sites have arisen. The answers to these questions and to the question of site comparisons are difficult and complex. Whatever the answers to these problems are, they have caused apprehension and stress to the Trust and its desire to act in a systematic planned program. In fact, during the course of this project, the Principal Investigators were called upon to act on a number of projects and provide expert evaluations of sites prior to the completion of the inventory.

SUMMARY

In summary, from the beginning of the Heritage Trust, there have been some difficulties encountered in the acquisition of cultural sites. These difficulties may be distilled into one major problem which is that there has been no staff available with archaeological or historical expertise. This was understandable since the Heritage Trust was within the SCWMRD. However, the lack of cultural staff made it impossible for the projects initiated by the HTAB and the Cultural Areas Subcommittee to be evaluated, undertaken and completed in a timely and systematic manner. The staff work necessary to complete these projects was delegated to the already overworked staff within the State agencies responsible for cultural protection (SHPO, SCIAA), to be completed as they could manage.

A secondary but critical problem was the need to recognize that the National Register of Historic Places list of sites within South Carolina was not suitable to Heritage Trust needs. The National Register would also not provide adequate protection for small area sites. Once it was recognized that the Heritage Trust needed its own criteria, and that the Cultural Areas Subcommittee was going to have to look beyond the Register, cultural protection projects began to be carried to completion.

The issues discussed above were recently recognized by the Cultural Areas Subcommittee, and in 1990 the HTAB approved funds, matched
by a grant from the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, to conduct a one-year Statewide Assessment of Cultural Sites in the State. This report presents the results of that one-year study. This report hopefully will create a useful criteria system and a priority list of sites which will guide the future activities of the Subcommittee. The authors also hope that the report will demonstrate the value of a systematic and comprehensive effort toward preservation. Key to this approach will be a concerted effort on the part of the Cultural Areas Subcommittee, The HTAB, the SCIAA and the SHPO to devote staff time toward carrying out the recommendations made herein.
CHAPTER II
AN OVERVIEW OF SOUTH CAROLINA CULTURAL HISTORY

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents an overview of South Carolina prehistory and history. It is provided as background, as a contextual framework for the evaluation of resources described in chapter IV. Archaeologists evaluate cultural resources based on their potential to provide new information about the archaeological and historical past. Thus, what we know today about the past provides a context from which to evaluate both known and newly discovered sites. This chapter very briefly summarizes what we know about South Carolina's cultural history. It is important to understand that the following overview is not a definitive statement on South Carolina's past, which would fill several volumes, but is a very brief sketch. It is not intended to be comprehensive, or to satisfy research needs, but rather to present some broad themes which currently guide archaeologists and cultural resource managers in their preservation thinking. It is written for the lay reader and for that reason it is far less technical than those appearing in most archaeological reports. Those interested in further details are directed to recent overviews by Anderson and Joseph (1988), Goodyear and Hanson (1989), Wallace (1984), and Kovacik and Winberry (1987). Wallace (1984) and Kovacik and Winberry (1987) served as the major sources for the discussion of the historic period.

THE PALEOINDIAN PERIOD

Human groups have occupied the land mass now known as South Carolina since the end of the Pleistocene period or for approximately 12,000 years. The Late Ice Age inhabitants of South Carolina are called the Paleoindians by archaeologists. Very little is known about how these people lived. They were probably very similar to the Upper paleolithic cultures of Europe who used a blade and burin industry and are responsible for the famous cave paintings in France and Spain. Paleoindians in America lived a nomadic way of life and hunted now extinct megafauna such as the woolly mammoth and the mastodon. The predominant archaeological evidence of this culture in eastern North America is manifest, almost exclusively, in chipped stone projectile points (a projectile point is a term used by archaeologists to describe arrowheads, spear tips and even stone tools used as knives). The most common type of projectile point that was manufactured, used, and discarded by Paleoindians is known as a Clovis Point. Fluted Clovis points are found throughout the continent East of the Rocky Mountains. The only true diagnostic artifacts of this period in South Carolina are these fluted lanceolate projectile points. Several different types are found in South Carolina, such as Cumberland, Quad, Clovis and Suwannee. There is a tendency for these points to decrease in size through time in the Paleoindian Period (Gardner 1974:18; Goodyear et al 1979:90-96; Morse and Morse 1983:60-68; Anderson and Joseph 1988:99).

Prehistoric tool makers manufactured projectile points from a number of different lithic (stone) raw materials that occur in the state. The Paleoindians appear to have been fond of very high quality rocks from which to fashion tools. They chose what geologists refer to as cryptocrystalline rocks over other types. Cryptocrystalline rocks have a crystalline structure (made up of crystals) which is so fine that the individual particles that make up the whole cannot be distinguished except under a microscope. One example of a cryptocrystalline rock that occurs in, and adjacent to, South Carolina is Coastal Plain Chert (sometimes referred to as Allendale chert). Rocks such as these can be found in small cobble form in stream and river beds, but chert and other rocks also occur in larger forms in rock outcrops. Archaeologists refer to outcrops obviously utilized by prehistoric groups as quarry sites. Outcrops, like those at Allendale, are places where the normally buried bedrock appears on or near the surface, due to weathering and erosion. In the Paleoindian Period, a large amount of our knowledge concerning the Paleoindian way of life has been obtained by studying quarry sites, and the distances materials gathered from these quarries have traveled (Michie 1977; Charles 1986; Goodyear et al 1989). Data for these studies have been drawn for the most part from surface finds in private collections around the state.

The physical environment at the close of the Ice Age was drastically different than that of present day South Carolina. From palynological studies (the study of pollen) scientists have determined that climate and vegetation have
undergone a series of changes. By 16,500 B.P. (B.P. stands for time before present and is accepted as before A.D. 1950) climatic improvement has continued in favor of human populations (Delcourt and Delcourt 1985:19; Goodyear et al 1989:19). A transition occurred around 12,500 B.P. when broad-leaved forests grew with species including beech, hickory, hornbeam, oak, elm, and ash. From 13,000-9,500 B.P. the climate in South Carolina was moist and cool much like present day New York State (Watts 1980:197; Goodyear et al 1989:20). After 9550 B.P. hickory, beech and ironwood were replaced by pine and oak. From 9,500-7,000 B.P. oak was dominant. After that time pine became dominant over oak and the forest matrix we see today established itself (Watts 1980:194; Goodyear et al 1989:20). These environmental changes described above are important because they probably affected the manner in which Paleoindians obtained food and shelter. Currently we do not have enough archeological evidence of Paleoindians in South Carolina to know what changes occurred. For this reason, the study of the past environment is important in the study of the Paleoindians. The discovery of an intact Paleoindian site would be of critical significance to understanding South Carolina’s past and worthy of protection as a Heritage Preserve. A number of potential sites are discussed in Chapter IV.

THE ARCHAIC PERIOD

The Archaic Period is the longest of any period of human history in the state. It lasts for some 8,000 years and is broken into three discrete periods; Early, Middle, and Late. The Archaic period is a time of gradual warming in eastern North America. This warming trend is known as the Holocene. In terms of human evolution in South Carolina, this environmental change resulted in a new and different lifestyle among the early South Carolinians, known as the Archaic Period. It is because of these changes and developments that archaeologists can separate time periods into meaningful units of study. The development of chronologies (time-ordered units) is a basic objective of archaeology (Thomas 1989:251). For instance, the mammoth and mastodon were no longer available for food and skins so hunters turned to other animals which required differently shaped stone tools. A polished stone tool technology developed during the Archaic. This process involved pecking and grinding stone blanks into the desired form and then subsequently polishing them into finished pieces. Axes and adzes were manufactured and used for a variety of woodworking activities such as forest clearing, house construction, and dugout canoe making. Grinding stones and mortars (sometimes called manos and metates in archaeological literature) were used to prepare vegetable foods, particularly nuts. Nutting stones, stone anvils with concavities in which to hold the nuts prior to cracking them with a hammerstone, are commonly found on sites of this period. The availability and diversification of food resources appear to have allowed time to pursue a variety of cultural interests. Archaeologists find pendants, beads, and decorative atlatl weights, which are not seen in the Paleoindian Period (this, of course, may be due to the fact that so few Paleoindian sites have been studied). The atlatl is a prehistoric weapon which is thought to be the first compound weapon made by human groups. The earliest evidence of the atlatl is found in the Upper Paleolithic Period in Europe some 35,000-40,000 years ago. This weapon is made from a wood stick approximately two feet in length. One end of the atlatl has a handle or grip while the opposite end is grooved or notched. The butt of a dart or spear rests in the groove and then is held along with the stick. As the holder extends his arm and the stick forward the dart is propelled forward with great velocity and accuracy.

An important Archaic period site is the Nipper Creek site in Richland County, which was the first South Carolina Heritage Trust cultural preserve (Wetmore 1986; Wetmore and Goodyear 1986). This site contains evidence of occupation from the Early, Middle, and Late Archaic, and is thus important for its ability to build on the chronology of this period of human history.

Early Archaic

Early Archaic Period Indian sites (about 10,000-8,000 B.P.) are common in the southeastern United States, and South Carolina is no exception. Evidence of Early Archaic settlement has been observed in a wide variety of microenvironmental zones (Anderson and Joseph 1988:111). This period is distinguished from others on the basis of the type of chipped stone projectile points found on sites dating to that period. In South Carolina these include from earliest to latest; Dalton points and Hardaway-Dalton points (10,500-9,900 B.P.), Taylor side notched points (10,000-9,500 B.P.), Palmer and Kirk corner notched points (9,500-8,800 B.P.), and bifurcate (divided into two branches or parts).

Middle Archaic

The end of the Early Archaic and the beginning of the Middle is marked by an episode of global warming about 8,000 B.P. (Anderson and Joseph 1988:110). The Middle Archaic period is defined, like the Early Archaic, on the basis of the types of chipped stone projectile points found. These points have all been given names and from earliest to lastest they are known as Stanly, Morrow Mountain I and II, and Guilford (Coe 1964; South 1959; Blanton 1983; Sassaman 1983; Blanton and Sassaman 1989). Dr. Joffre Coe places the start of the Middle Archaic at the time when tool makers shifted from the notched hafted projectile points of the Early Archaic to stemmed projectile points. He bases this observation on extensive research in the North Carolina Piedmont carried out since the 1930s (Coe 1952, 1964). In South Carolina, Stanly points are much rarer than either the Guilford or Morrow Mountain. Here in South Carolina, unlike North Carolina, there has yet to be found a complete Middle Archaic projectile point sequence (Stanly > Morrow Mountain I and II > Guilford).

The Middle Archaic is the most abundant Archaic site type recorded in South Carolina (Canouts and Goodyear 1985; Blanton and Sassaman 1989:59). There is evidence that the Indians of this period chose to live in certain locations and for a longer time than earlier groups. Archaeologists call this settlement pattern semi-sedentary. Also at this time, there is evidence of a shift towards procurement of resources available locally, increased sociopolitical complexity, and the first evidence of exchange networks for elite items.

Late Archaic

The Late Archaic Period (5,000-3,000 B.P.), like most periods in human prehistory, was a time of adaptation and innovation. During the Late Archaic there is a shift towards the manufacturing of containers from raw materials like soapstone (also known as steatite) which is a rock composed of talc (Loomis 1948:244-245). This rock is very soft and was used by Native Americans to fashion pots, pipes, cooking disks (or net sinkers) and decorative amulets. Sources of soapstone can be found in several different areas of the state. A number of soapstone quarries have been identified by Ferguson (1978), including the Croft Soapstone Quarry in Spartanburg County and the Pacolet River Soapstone Quarries in Spartanburg and Cherokee Counties. In the latter part of the Late Archaic Period Native American craftsmen began to shape and fire clay into containers and pipes.

The most well-known phase [archaeologists use phase to mean a practical and intelligible unit of study as defined by (Willey and Phillips 1975:22)] of the Late Archaic is called the Stallings Island phase, named after a site excavated on Stallings Island in the Savannah River near Augusta, Georgia. At this site a large and deep shell midden was investigated that produced an enormous and varied cultural assemblage. Midden refers to the accumulated refuse from various human activities (basically garbage) that includes soil, food remains (animal and plant), shell and discarded artifacts. Middens often produce a rich array of archaeological material for the reconstruction of past behavior and therefore are extremely useful to archaeologists. From such middens archaeologists can reconstruct the human behavior that created the archaeological deposits. Sites with intact middens are often considered highly significant and worthy of protection or acquisition. In South Carolina, the Fish Haul Site (38BU805) on Hilton Head contains an important Stallings Island phase component (Trinkley 1986). Other Late Archaic sites on the critically significant site list include the shell rings, Albert Love (38AL10) and Mims Point (38ED9).

THE WOODLAND PERIOD

This period is marked by a subsistence change as well as by changes in ideology that evolved out of the Archaic period (Hudson 1976:55). Changes in subsistence reflect a more efficient exploitation of wild foods available locally. For instance the collection and use of nuts, and the storage of nuts and seeds in large quantities are observed during this period. The use of storage areas and the associated need to guard stored supplies may have led to the semi-sedentary nature of Woodland Indians noticed by archaeological investigations. The use of pottery becomes extensive during this time and many different techniques for decorating pottery vessels were developed. Burial customs become more elaborate during this period, including the construction of earthen and sand burial mounds. These features and artifacts indicate a greater complexity in the societies that existed then.
SOUTH APPALACHIAN MISSISSIPPIAN PERIOD

The Mississippian Period in South Carolina is called the South Appalachian Mississippian by archaeologists because it is viewed as a variant of true Mississippian culture. The period is known as the Mississippian because the earliest evidence of this way of life is found on the Mississippi River near East St. Louis. South Appalachian refers to a type of Mississippian lifeway that occurs in South Carolina, Georgia, and contiguous portions of Alabama, Florida, North Carolina and Tennessee (Holmes 1903; Ferguson 1971; Williams and Shapiro 1990).

These people lived in wattle and daub houses occupied throughout the year and relied on an agricultural economy. This strategy was dependent on the successful harvesting and storage of crops such as corn, beans, squash and pumpkin. A sedentary lifestyle was unavoidable once humans began to rely on agriculture. Their way of life was contingent on a stratified social organization and was much more specialized than hunter-gatherers. Floodplain lands, suitable for agriculture, were not plentiful, and thus had to be marked out and defended. Villages were fortified to prevent attack, and food had to be kept safe from weather (sunlight, moisture and freezing), rodents, and invaders.

Public architecture in the form of pyramidal earthen mounds, dikes and embankments were built. The mounds at this time were somewhat like the ones built in the Woodland period throughout the Southeast, but in this later period the mounds took on new meaning. Although people still buried their dead in mounds, only persons with elite status appear to have been interred. Early European explorers to this area noted that the tops of mounds were reserved for the houses of chiefs and in some instances temples were discovered built on mounds.

Mississippian pottery was manufactured in many different forms and decorated in a number of ways. Rim decoration also became more complex at this time. Pottery was no longer manufactured only for utilitarian purposes as for preparing, cooking, serving and storage of food and water, it also was manufactured for a number of non-utilitarian purposes. Zoomorphic (animal) and anthropomorphic (human) effigies are found appended to pottery vessels at this time.

The Green’s Shell Enclosure (38BU63) on Hilton Head Island is a shell heap shaped like a 'V', that is believed to have been occupied by Irene people, a South Appalachian Mississippian Culture named after a mound site at the mouth of the Savannah River in Georgia.

THE CONTACT PERIOD

According to some scholars, European contact with Native American populations began in A.D. 1526 with the establishment of a settlement on the coast of South Carolina by the Spanish under Lucas Vasquez de Ayllon. This attempt at colonization was to claim the area for Spain and to establish a slaving operation. Ayllon arrived with 500 colonists on six ships. To date, no evidence of this site has been located. Recent research by Hoffman (1990) places this site on Sapelo Island in the vicinity of the mouth of the Savannah River.

The next European contact with Native Americans was fourteen years later when Hernando de Soto crossed through the state on his expedition. He was searching for an overland route to the riches of Mexico, and for precious metals in the interior of the Southeastern United States. De Soto landed in Tampa Bay on March 25, 1539 and wintered among the Apalachee Indians near present day Tallahassee, Florida. After the winter he proceeded across Georgia and on into South Carolina (Hudson 1990; Hudson et al. 1984).

As de Soto left Apalachee he headed across Georgia to the Chiefdoms of Toa on the Flint River, Ichist on the Ocmulgee and Ocute on the Oconee River. De Soto’s army was dependent on Indian villages for food to feed the men, horses, dogs, and pigs. After a great distance he reached Cofitachequi, near present day Camden, South Carolina where he was met by the niece of the chieftainness. She greeted de Soto and invited him to host the army offering several stores of grain amounting to several thousand bushels.

The Chiefdom of Cofitachequi was also visited by an expedition led by Juan Pardo from the Capital City of Santa Elena (38BU161/51) located on present day Parris Island Marine Base (Hudson 1990). Pedro Mendendez de Aviles, after settling St. Augustine, Florida headed north along the Atlantic coast and established the Town of Santa Elena. Three forts were eventually built, one of which, Fort San Felipe, was burned by local Indian groups in 1576 (South et al. 1988).
THE COLONIZATION PERIOD

With the arrival of Hernando de Soto in 1540, the cultural and natural landscape of South Carolina began a process of enduring change. From this time, Europeans and Africans, and later Euro-Americans, enlarged their occupation of what became the State of South Carolina. Meanwhile, the Native American population began a decline due to the incursion of the European colonization and its resulting diseases and wars, like the Yemassee War of 1715. By as early as 1775, Native Americans were reduced to isolated populations of Catawbas and Cherokees in northern parts of South Carolina (Kovacik and Winberry 1987:62).

Despite Ayllon's attempt at settlement, and the later occupation of Santa Elena, the major thrust of Spanish presence in South Carolina was toward exploration. Permanent European settlement was begun and dominated by the English, beginning with the arrival in 1670 of three English ships in Charlestown harbor, loaded with around 200 colonists. They settled at first at Albemarle Point on the Ashley River; ten years later they would move to Charles Towne on Oyster Point. The Lords Proprietors, who sponsored the settlement, attempted to set the stage for settlement of South Carolina by developing a Fundamental Constitution, specifying a county system which divided the land among the Proprietors, nobility, and commoners. But settlers generally followed a pattern of occupying land along the rivers first, and on lands already cleared by Indians. During this early period, from 1670 to 1730, colonists were concentrated around the Charleston area, especially the three rivers named the Cooper, Ashley and Edisto (Kovacik and Winberry 1987:68-69; Rogers 1984).

The settlement of South Carolina was encouraged for the purpose of resource exportation back to the European market. As such, deerskins, naval stores (lumber) and other readily available resources were first exploited, along with the rapid development of a livestock industry. Trade with Native Americans for deerskins led to the settlement of trading posts and forts inland, like Fort Congaree in 1718 (Michie 1989). Along the coast, rice and indigo began to be cultivated as early as the 1690s, spreading North and South of Charles Towne.

The successful cultivation of rice and indigo had a dramatic effect on the population and landscape along the coast. Large rice plantations developed, especially in the Georgetown area and along the east branch of the Cooper River, and the swamps and marshlands were drained and controlled by canals and dikes. Rice became the most important crop of colonial South Carolina. By the 1730s some 40,000 barrels of rice were being exported from South Carolina (Kovacik and Winberry 1987:73). The labor for this vast effort was supplied by African slaves whose importation increased dramatically as the plantations grew until, at the beginning of the Revolution, the black population outnumbered the white population two to one (Stampp 1956:24). Indigo was also cultivated with much financial reward until the Revolution, but afterwards was abandoned. Geographically, rice cultivation dominated the coast and tidal rivers, while indigo spread inland as far as the lower Piedmont. The coastal plantations though, were quite financially successful, and their wealth was demonstrated by great houses as seen along the Ashley and Cooper rivers, and in second homes in old Charleston. Plantations, however, were also the reluctant homes of the enslaved. These plantations have a special significance to South Carolina's history and culture. Sites like Drayton Hall (38CH255), Middleburg (38BK38), Medway (38BK56), to name just a few, contain not only important architectural features, but also the archaeological remains of early South Carolina industry (brick and timber) and agriculture. Archaeological sites also contain evidence of a large and important slave culture. Determining the acquisition merits of a particular plantation must take into account the value of all these different cultural features (Stoney 1938).

By the 1730s, the interior settlement of South Carolina had begun in earnest. The coast was solidly established, the Native Americans had been temporarily subdued, moved, or destroyed, and a colony had been established in Georgia providing a buffer from the Spanish. Settlers from the European continent began to arrive in large numbers. These included Swiss colonists who settled along the Savannah at Purrysburg in 1738 (to spread north very quickly), German Swiss in Orangeburg County around 1735, Germans in the Saxe-Gotha (Lexington) area in 1735, and Welsh on the Pee Dee in 1736 (Wallace 1984:149-156). A large number of Huguenots had settled along the Santee as early as 1685 (Wallace 1984:63; Kovacik and Winberry 1987:78-82). While all of these colonists accepted the dominant English social and political milieu of the South Carolina colony, they provided a rich multi-cultural diversity which helped shape the history of the...
state, and which archaeologists and cultural historians seek to discover. These early settlements therefore, are also important to preserve.

While these settlers were moving inland from the coast, the upper Piedmont, or 'backcountry' of South Carolina was being inundated by Scotch-Irish migrating down the Appalachian Mountains from Pennsylvania and Virginia (Kovacik and Winberry 1987:80). This migration would become a flood of humanity in the 1760s. Differences in the politics, culture, and the needs of these independent subsistence farmers and those of the large, often aristocratic plantation owners along the coast, would have a tremendous impact on the character and politics of South Carolina throughout its history. This is especially evident during the American Revolution.

The American Revolution in South Carolina could be described as a civil war, as loyalists and patriots raided and ambushed each other throughout the state. After an unsuccessful attempt to subdue the rebellion in the North, the British turned to the southern theater in the 1780s. Beyond raid and ambush, a large number of conventional battles occurred in South Carolina like those at Cowpens, Kings Mountain, Ninety-Six, Camden, Fort Moultrie, Fort Watson, and Eutaw Springs. Parts of many of these battlefield sites are provided some form of state or federal protection, although the campgrounds, and staging areas are almost always overlooked. In learning about the lives of these soldiers and partisans, their campgrounds will provide the best resource, and therefore such sites are important in any preservation plans of South Carolina. Francis Marion's camp on Snow Island for instance, would be a site of some importance to the state if it could be located.

THE ANTEBELLUM PERIOD AND THE CIVIL WAR

The Antebellum period of South Carolina's history (1785-1865) revolves around the development of cotton production, which increased from 20 million pounds in 1801 to over 60 million pounds in 1830 (Kovacik and Winberry 1987:89). During this period, the majority of the populace was involved in agriculture, either as part of a farm or plantation, or working in the processing of the raw materials. On the eve of the Civil War, farm size in South Carolina followed a general pattern of large (over 550 acres) rice and sea island cotton plantations along the coast, moderate (approximate 550 acres) cotton plantations in the midlands (with the exception of large plantations around Camden) and small (less than 50 acres) farms in the upcountry (Kovacik and Winberry 1987:102).

With cotton as a viable crop, the plantation system spread inland. Cotton's success created a need for attendant processing and transportation industries. Cotton manufacturing was slow to develop, but in the 1830s some mills, like the Saluda Factory in Columbia (1832), DeKalb near Camden (1838), and the Pendleton Factory in Pendleton (1838) did start (Wallace 1984:450; Kovacik and Winberry 1987:98-99). During the early part of this period and up to the 1820s transportation was enhanced by improving the navigability of the rivers and the development of canals like the Santee, Columbia, and Landsford canals. In the 1830s the means of transporting goods to market changed to railroads. By the Civil War over 1,000 miles of railroads were available (Wallace 1984:450) and the major lines ran from Charleston to Savannah, Florence, Augusta, and Columbia, and from Columbia up to Spartanburg and Greenville (Jones 1984:156). As development increases statewide, it will be important to save a sample of these plantations, factories and transportation facilities.

While the Revolution was fought throughout South Carolina, Civil War military activities were concentrated mainly along the coast, at least until the final years. Union forces captured Beaufort and Hilton Head early in the war and sieged Charleston from 1863 (Wallace 1984:533; Trinkley 1986). The remains of these camps and battlefields are now under severe threat from coastal development. Large scale warfare came to the Piedmont only in 1864 when Sherman's Army marched from Savannah, Georgia and Beaufort to Columbia. Eventually, Georgetown, Sumter and Camden would also be occupied (Wallace 1984:525-554). It is difficult to overstate the impact of this war and its influence on the landscape and people. The population, economy and social patterns of the state would be tied to the recovery from the war. There are many important Civil War sites; it is essential to find methods of preserving them. Part of battlefields like Secessionville (38CH35, 38CH1271), the largest battle in South Carolina in terms of troops, and Honey Hill are still in existence. One critical coastal area is James Island, which was the site of Secessionville and also extensive Confederate earthworks and bat-
eries. Other smaller islands in that vicinity, like Long Island, Folly Island, and Coles Island, all had Union army camps (Legg and Smith 1989).

THE RECONSTRUCTION PERIOD AND MODERN SOUTH CAROLINA

The most dramatic impact stemming from the war was the change in the status of the black population. While slavery ended with the completion of the Civil War, the plantation system did not. The devastated plantation economy of South Carolina still needed labor, and some freedmen were organized into gangs to work for wages, while other agrarians developed a tenant/landowner system. Over the course of the latter part of the nineteenth century, tenant arrangements between plantation owners and both black and white farmers slowly changed the landscape from concentrated settlements to more dispersed settlement. Tenant farms were ubiquitous throughout South Carolina up until World War II. These sites are rapidly disappearing from the modern landscape (Brockington et al. 1985; Orser 1988; Joseph et al. 1991).

Ironically, South Carolina became even more dependent on cotton in this period than during the antebellum period, as up to 40 percent of the improved farmland in the state was devoted to the crop (Kovacik and Winberry 1987:105). As soil became depleted in the low country the focus of cotton production shifted more to the Piedmont. Also in the Piedmont, a textile industry developed and as a result mill towns arose. The period from the 1880s to 1910 was the period of the industrial revolution for South Carolina. Cotton-related industries continued to grow, including gins and cottonseed oil production. Rice production declined during this period. In the twentieth century tobacco replaced cotton in the eastern counties. While most industries in South Carolina during the twentieth century were cotton related, a large phosphate industry developed along the coast (Wallace 1984:584; Kovacik and Winberry 1987:116; Mappus 1935).

The characteristics of the population changed from the 1870s to the 1940s also. Slowly the black population lost its majority status, there was a shift of population density from the coast to the upland, and also from rural to urban areas (Kovacik and Winberry 1987:122). During the 1930s there was a major outmigration of blacks to the northeastern states seeking employment opportunities. During the depression, many poor whites became sharecroppers and took up residence on farms formerly occupied by blacks.

Today, South Carolina's urban centers continue to grow as more and more people find employment in nonagricultural occupations. During the 1950s tenancy declined as agriculture consolidated and South Carolina began to diversify its industry. Recently the tourism industry has increased along the coast, along with a continual migration of people from the northern states into South Carolina. As the population increases, the limited natural and cultural resources along the coast come under increasing threat of destruction and loss.

SUMMARY

This very cursory look at South Carolina's cultural history does highlight the major trends in the human occupation of the state of South Carolina. This overview has been illustrated by specific archaeological sites that serve as examples of the physical manifestation of this cultural history. There are other sites, some known and some yet to be discovered. Still, these examples are each unique in that they provide a microcosm of the major trends discussed and are thus useful in defining and refining what South Carolinians understand as their past. It is important to note again, that unlike some natural resources, these cultural sites are not renewable. They become extinct through erosion, vandalism and even through archaeological excavation. Careful consideration must be made as to the management of these sites. The next chapters discuss the methods used to evaluate these examples (sites) in ranking them, and a more detailed discussion of some of the known examples visited during this project. Throughout the report, it is this general cultural context described above which guide our methods, results and recommendations.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND SITE SELECTION CRITERIA

INTRODUCTION

As stated in chapter one, the goal of this project was to establish a representative sample of critically significant archaeological resources of the state of South Carolina to be used by the South Carolina Heritage Trust Cultural Areas Subcommittee as a planning tool and for the possible acquisition of such sites as Heritage Preserves. A list of the known 100 most "Critically Significant" archaeological sites was to be assembled using criteria developed by the Principal Investigators during this project. This chapter discusses the criteria, how they were developed and how they were used to evaluate a number of diverse cultural resources.

PROJECT DESIGN

Since the primary goal of this project was the identification of critically significant sites for protection, the overriding criterion for determining "Critical Significance" was the degree to which a particular site could provide an understanding of the state's cultural past, and therefore, be of crucial value to public heritage. While acquisition of new archaeological knowledge was not a goal of this project, the protection of such knowledge was, as it is potentially represented in the sites identified. Therefore the Principal Investigators designed the project around the need to obtain and evaluate information about a large number of archaeological properties. This was accomplished by completing a three-phased project. The different phases described below were sometimes conducted simultaneously, in order to complete the tasks within the time allotted.

Phase 1: Inventory and Professional Survey

In this first phase two major goals were achieved. First was the development of a list of criteria to evaluate archaeological sites, and the second was to review the known archaeological records for potential sites to be listed.

Task 1: Develop Criteria for Critical Significance. The first major task was to develop criteria for determining the critical significance of each site. The Principal Investigators had at their disposal a number of previously developed site criteria systems. There were of course the significance criteria of the National Register of Historic Places (King, Hickman, and Berg 1977). It was, however, immediately apparent that these criteria were inadequate for an undertaking of this kind. These criteria were skewed towards historic structures and events, rather than specifically developed for archaeological sites. Criterion d of the National Register of Historic Places criteria, which is often used to evaluate archaeological sites, was viewed as being vague (36 CFR 60.4). Therefore it was necessary to develop specific criteria which would be tailored to the needs of the Heritage Trust. This included a rating or point system which would determine the registration and purchase priorities of the Cultural Areas Subcommittee of the Heritage Trust in the future. While an attempt was made to derive a balance of site types and cultural periods, important sites were not necessarily cut from the list because they contained a cultural component already archaeologically well known. However, such a site probably received a lower rating in the point system. The results of this task are described under a section of this chapter entitled "The Ranking System."

Task 2: Records Search. The South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology maintains the state's official Archaeological Site Files which currently contain approximately 13,000 recorded sites. This inventory had recently been reviewed by Mr. Tommy Charles of the Institute who had culled from the site files a number of potential archaeological sites for this project. This list of potentially important sites was checked and reviewed. From that list many sites were earmarked for possible site visitation as part of the next phase.

Task 3: Professional Survey. The Project Archaeologist developed and distributed a formal survey to the state's archaeologists, as well as those outside of the state who had knowledge of the state's archaeological resources. This included all members of the Council of South Carolina Professional Archaeologists (COSCAPA), non-council member professionals working in the state, and select members of the Archaeological Society of South Carolina (ASSC). The purpose of this survey was twofold: 1) to identify potential sites not
recorded in the state's files, but which were believed to be of Critical Significance to the state, and 2) to gain feedback from the professional community concerning protection needs for the state's cultural heritage. After the results of this survey had been analyzed, a limited number of archaeologists were invited to participate in a workshop. In this workshop, the preliminary list of sites was discussed and refined according to the criteria developed below. From this workshop the criteria were also reviewed and refined. At that point, the Project Archaeologist had a list of approximately 80 sites which were potentially eligible for listing. Dr. Linda France Stine, then State Historic Preservation Office archaeologist, also published a short article about the program in Preservation News, the newsletter of the State Historic Preservation Office (Stine 1990). A number of sites were submitted by three individuals of the preservation community in response to this article.

Task 4: Field Survey Preparation. Based on the results of the survey and inventory above, the Project Archaeologist determined which sites should be field checked for further refining of the final site list. To this point in the process, the actual physical status of each site had not been considered. By conducting a field check of the potential sites, their physical status was evaluated to determine the threat to the sites and if they still actually existed. Many of the sites had not had a visit by professional archaeologists in a number of years.

Phase II: Field Survey

Task 1: Fieldwork. The Project Archaeologist divided the state into convenient field survey sections, and sites within each section needing field evaluation were field checked with the assistance of a field archaeologist. The primary objectives of the fieldwork were to assess site condition and integrity, and to determine cultural components and boundaries. Arrangements were made with landowners for these site visits and if access was denied, the site was not visited. At only one site was the survey denied access. Archaeological field methods varied at each site. Sites which were published and well known archaeologically were often only visited and a random surface collection of artifacts was made. Essentially these sites were simply visited to check their immediate preservation status. Other sites less well known were shovel tested and borders discovered using standard archaeological survey and testing procedures including transect surveys and shovel testing. Since the purpose of the project was to access as many sites as possible to derive a list of 100, field methods at these sites were not aimed at providing the level of detail necessary for determining National Register of Historic Places eligibility. The artifacts collected were washed, cataloged, sorted, and analyzed according to standard procedures at the SCIAA. Site descriptions were written and this information is provided in Chapter IV. All artifacts are curated at the SCIAA.

Phase III Final List and Report Writing

Task 1: Site List. Based on the professional survey, fieldwork, and analysis, a final site list was developed. Final evaluation forms were sent to the appropriate professional archaeologists for rating the sites about which they had expertise. Some sites visited were ranked by the Principal Investigators. The Principal Investigators were careful not to review the ranked site forms as they were returned so that their own ranking would not be biased.

Task 2: Report Preparation and Presentation. This report was prepared as part of the requirements of the grant. The Project Archaeologist made two presentations to the Heritage Trust Advisory Board. The list of sites was presented at the May 30, 1991 meeting of the HTAB. A paper on the Heritage Trust Project was presented at the 1991 Society for American Archaeology meeting in New Orleans (Judge and Smith 1991). The report and the list will be used to guide the future activities of the Cultural Areas Subcommittee.

THE WORKSHOP

A workshop was held after the deadline for receiving site nominations. This workshop brought together a number of professional archaeologists who were intimately familiar with the archaeology of the state. Two goals were set for the workshop participants. The first was to review the criteria developed by the authors to rate the Heritage Trust 100 archaeological and historic sites. The second goal was to refine the initial list of sites submitted in order to ensure that a representative sample of sites was considered using this system.

The workshop was held on July 27, 1990 at the South Carolina Wildlife and Marine Resources Department. Sixteen participants representing 11 organizations were in attendance (Table 1).
Table 1. Workshop Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David G. Anderson</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Beard</td>
<td>SCIAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Bennett</td>
<td>Wildlife and Marine Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Crass</td>
<td>SCIAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley M. Drucker</td>
<td>Council of South Carolina Professional Archaeologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James R. Errante</td>
<td>Heritage Trust Archaeologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leland G. Ferguson</td>
<td>Department of Anthropology, University of South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee Dee Joyce</td>
<td>College of Charleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Judge</td>
<td>Heritage Trust Archaeologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lawrence</td>
<td>Department of Geology, University of South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan McGahee</td>
<td>South Carolina Department of Archives and History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth E. Sassaman</td>
<td>SCIAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven D. Smith</td>
<td>SCIAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda France Stine</td>
<td>South Carolina Department of Archives and History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Trinkley</td>
<td>Chicora Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Zierden</td>
<td>Charleston Museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The morning of the workshop was spent presenting the project to the participants and introducing the criteria. These criteria had been developed by the authors in consultation with Dr. Chester B. DePratter and Dr. Linda France Stine. Stan South and Jay Mills also provided written comments on earlier drafts. The afternoon was spent nominating sites and testing the draft criteria. The workshop stimulated the minds of many to nominate more archaeological sites and was very useful in testing the draft criteria. As a result of this effort, several revisions were made. The workshop had the secondary effect of building support for the project and the Heritage Trust among the professional community.

THE HERITAGE TRUST "CRITICAL SIGNIFICANCE" CRITERIA

The Evolution of the Criteria

The Project Archaeologist conducted a national survey to identify similar programs and to solicit advice on the development of workable criteria. All 50 states were contacted by a survey letter and of those, 31 responded. As it turned out only five states of those that responded were actively inventorying and assessing cultural properties, through their Heritage Trust type programs. These states are Delaware, Kansas, Kentucky, Tennessee, and South Carolina. Twenty-six states responded that they did not include cultural areas in their inventories. Of these 26, two responded that they have archaeological sites but that they are ancillary to natural areas or preserves. Three of the states that responded negatively envisioned including cultural areas sometime in the future, and one program responded that it also inventories paleontological sites (Table 2).

The state of Delaware has a program called The Natural Heritage Program (Ron Vickers, personal communication July 1990). The legislation mandating this program specifically addresses archaeological sites. Currently, nine of the 74 sites listed in their Natural Areas inventory are archaeological sites which fall under the definition of "Natural Area" in the Delaware Natural Areas Preservation System. The Delaware program is mandated to secure resources for scientific research as well as for public education and recreation and protects unique features of the state from encroachment and development. Management and interpretation of archaeological sites in the Natural Areas inventory is aimed toward linking human interaction with the environment.

In Tennessee there is no Heritage Trust program, but like Delaware, there is a Natural Heritage inventory program within the Division of Ecological Services (David Eager, personal communication July 1990). This division also oversees the Division of Archaeology, which in turn works with the Tennessee Historical Commission. The Department of Conservation administers a Natural and Cultural Areas Acquisition Program and various divisions nominate sites to be targeted for acquisition. The Tennessee program is funded by the Tennessee Natural and Cultural Areas Acquisition Fund. This fund is set up to identify and acquire significant natural, historic, and archaeological sites in Tennessee. Since its beginning in fiscal year 1984-85, seven cultural areas and nine natural areas have been acquired or funds have been encumbered to do so. Also, funds have been appropriated to restore an historic site (Gill 1988:1). In ranking cultural areas and natural areas together, the first two of the top six priority sites in Tennessee were archaeological (Gill 1988:1). These rankings are based on a structured evaluation process using the following resource assessment criteria.

(1) Level or scale of significance (rarity, uniqueness, representation on registers of state, regional, or national significance, etc.).

(2) Potential for loss or irreparable damage.
Table 2. Survey of Heritage Trust Programs in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ancillary</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Paleontological</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) Availability of protection options other than the use of this fund.

(4) Manageability, i.e. scope and scale of management required to successfully protect the site (size, configuration, and location of tracts; adjacent land use implications).

(5) Fiscal requirements (operation costs and future capital as well as maintenance needs).

(6) Range and diversity of benefits, i.e. extent to which site can provide a variety of public benefits and uses.

(7) Economic impact (local, regional, and state) (Gill 1988:5-8).

Once this initial portion of site nomination has been accomplished, the staff then assess the feasibility of acquiring a given piece of property that contains an important natural or cultural resource. Five items are addressed:

(1) Willing seller, i.e. extent to which owner is inclined to sell the site to the state.

(2) Complexity of title (clouds, number of owners, number of tracts, absentee ownership, divided interests, outstanding rights, etc).

(3) Cost impact on fund, i.e. cost relative to benefits.

(4) Encroachments and other associated survey/boundary issues.

(5) Partnership opportunities (cost sharing in acquisition and/or other management) (Gill 1988:8).
Sites are then ranked based on a score and presented to the Commissioner of Conservation, who in turn confers with the Governor's Office to establish recommendations.

Beginning in 1985, the Kansas Natural and Scientific Areas Preservation Act has been administered by the Kansas Biological Survey (Craig Freeman, personal communication July 1990). The act provided for the establishment of a Natural Areas System and a Natural Areas Register to identify significant biological, geological, and/or archaeological features. Sites can be nominated by anyone, but the nominations must be processed by the Natural Heritage Program Survey. While most nominated sites are biological in nature, all are reviewed to assess geological or archaeological concerns. Nominations are then reviewed by an 11 member board. Few sites have been nominated solely on geological or archaeological merit.

The Kentucky Heritage Council is the only State-run program in the country similar to the South Carolina Heritage Trust. The Kentucky Archaeological Registry:

...provides cost-effective site protection to significant archaeological sites by educating landowners about their site's significance, involving them in site stewardship, and providing management assistantship and advice on stronger protection options (Henderson 1988a:v).

The Kentucky archaeological community has been asked to rank their top 20 archaeological sites from a list of 47 possible sites, and were asked to "write-in" any that were not on the list. General selection criteria included:

1. Sites have to have contributed to or have the potential to contribute to an understanding of Kentucky's prehistoric or historic past.
2. Sites must be in a good state of preservation.
3. National Register of Historic Places Status
4. Ownership: public, corporate or private
5. Site type
6. Cultural Period
7. Threat
8. Site owner disposition towards archaeology
9. Site location
10. Location in relation to other preserves (Henderson 1988b:25)

To date, 27 landowners had been contacted. A total of 16 agreed to participate in the program resulting in the registration of 18 archaeological sites.

On a national level, a program similar to the South Carolina Heritage Trust is The Archaeological Conservancy (LeBlanc 1979). The Archaeological Conservancy is "a national, non-profit conservation organization dedicated to acquiring and permanently preserving the best of the nation's remaining archaeological sites" (Severo 1982). The Archaeological Conservancy is funded by membership dues, private contributions and corporate sponsorship, as well as aid from private foundations. The Conservancy's efforts are to establish a national system of preserves to ensure that a representative sample of archaeological sites are preserved in place. They acquire sites through gifts, purchase, or bargain sale for charity. Once acquired, the Conservancy draws up individual management plans to suit the needs of each site. Archaeological investigations on Conservancy properties are strictly monitored and interested researchers must seek a permit to conduct investigations.

The results of the national survey indicated that South Carolina appears to be far ahead of many states in their attempts to preserve their archaeological resources through acquisition. Furthermore, only a few states had attempted to systematically discover their most important sites and rank them to prioritize their efforts. Archaeological sites in most states only had federal or state level compliance protection measures in place. With this information the Principal Investigators turned to efforts within the Trust itself in developing criteria.

Critical Significance

As stated in previous chapters, two systems had been previously prepared for use by the South Carolina Heritage Trust and portions of those were incorporated into the present criteria system. The first of these was "Considerations for the Significance of Cultural Resources: Potential Criteria for the Heritage Trust," by James L. Michie (1988a). The second was "Criteria for Selection of Archaeological Sites as Cultural Areas or Features in the South Carolina Heritage Trust Program," authored by Albert C. Goodyear III and Bruce Rippetoe. Goodyear and Rippetoe's criteria were adopted by the Cultural Areas Subcommittee of the Heritage Trust Advisory Board on November 19, 1987.
Furthermore the significance criteria developed by Glassow (1977) and within the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, 36CFR 60.6 were reviewed for their appropriateness for the Trust. All of these criteria include, but are not limited to, public values, research values, threats, and site integrity.

After reviewing and thoroughly discussing the above criteria, it was decided that the project should use elements of all these lists, but that the Principal Investigators needed something further, which could rank sites using a numbering system. The Principal Investigators created the term "Critical Significance" to describe a site which meets the criteria for protection by the state through the Heritage Trust. A critically significant site (CSS) is one that exhibits some or all of the following attributes:

1) A CSS must contain archaeological integrity, that is, it must be at least partially intact, having survived some or all of the post-depositional processes affecting sites. The site must have intact architecture, features, deposits, and/or living surfaces that can help archaeologists better understand past behavior in a static (archaeological) context.

2) A CSS must already have produced, or must have the potential to produce, significant scientific data towards understanding past cultures. That is, a site must be important enough to produce information to answer anthropological questions posed by problem-oriented research. Here potential is used in the same regard as when evaluating "significance" for the National Register of Historic Places.

3) A CSS may also be a site that is a rare site type, or the best preserved site of a specific type, or the only surviving example of a once numerous type. It may also contain deposits or features that are considered to be rare or unique by the professional community.

4) A CSS may be a site which is currently in an area that is, or potentially is, threatened by urban expansion or rural development, or is subject to vandalism or looting.

5) A CSS may reflect special interests of the public, such as sites of ethnic or historical importance, such as a church associated with the civil rights movement.

Many other considerations were used during the evaluation process. For instance, in the future, the Trust will want to preserve the full range of the diverse prehistoric and historic site types, lifeways and cultures. It will want to evaluate which sites in South Carolina are most likely to disappear from the landscape in the future if actions are not taken now. It will have to decide which sites have the most to gain from state protection rather than from continued private protection. Also, it will want to consider the possibility of future developments in analytical techniques, which may alter the course of current research or methodology. Finally, it must fully recognize that this current approach is site specific, and that perhaps a more regional approach to site preservation should be taken in the future (Stephen Loring, personal communication 1990). Also, the approach of acquiring large areas for conservation may be necessary to preserve diverse archaeological regions. Further, thematic approaches may need to be considered in the Trust's evaluation procedure.

Rating System

With this definition in mind, the identified sites were ranked according to the following rating system. The authors fully understand that ranking sites, and thus comparing them against one another, is anathematic to archaeology and archaeologists. However, for Heritage Trust purposes, a system of ranking was necessary to prioritize the efforts to acquire and protect the sites. In other words, given a finite budget, where should the Trust invest its time and funds? A ranking will allow for a planned, systematic approach to site acquisition. Therefore, if site A is "ranked" higher than site B, it does not imply that A has greater value. It simply means that site A has certain attributes which make it more important to acquire (or at least attempt to acquire) before site B.

Given the above, the following ranking system has been devised as discussed below. The system was based on five general criteria categories. Within each category were subcategories. Sites gain points based on how they were evaluated against these categories. The maximum points a site could obtain was 400. The system was used to evaluate sites within each major, traditionally accepted cultural period: Paleoindian, Archaic, Woodland, South Appalachian-Mississippian, Proto-historic, and
Historic. Archaeologists were asked to rank sites relative to other similar sites with which they were familiar. Subdivisions within this group may be necessary in the future to ensure that the Trust has represented the full range and diversity of South Carolina cultures. Within each of these cultural periods the following general categories were used:

1. Rarity
2. Threat
3. Integrity
4. Research Value
5. Educational Value

(1) Rarity: Sites were evaluated based on a total of 75 points. A site nationally unique (or which had a major role in the national or world system) received 75 points. A site of state uniqueness (or had a statewide impact or influence) received 50 points, and a site locally unique received 25 points. A site may receive only one of four possible scores 0, 25, 50, or 75 when scoring under this criteria. It is important to point out that this rating should not be confused with National Register criteria.

(2) Threat: Sites received a cumulative maximum of 75 points. Sub-categories included:

A. Development and Vandalism 25 points
B. Impending Natural Processes 25 points
C. Current and Future Land Use 25 points

Development and vandalism gauged the potential future disturbances to the site, if protective measures are not taken in the immediate future. Development included both direct impacts and indirect impacts, like increased danger of vandalism due to easy access or increased local population. Natural processes were evaluated also and included erosion, or the effects of neglect. Current and future land-use measured the effects of human activities occurring presently, like plowing. Each site was evaluated in all three sub-categories based on the following point breakdown:

Very High 25-21 points
High 20-16 points
Medium 15-11 points
Fair 10-06 points
Low 05-01 points

(3) Integrity: Sites received a cumulative maximum of 100 points based on the following sub-categories:

A. Site Structure Maximum 50 points
B. Disturbance Maximum 25 points
C. Clarity Maximum 25 points

Integrity gauges the current physical condition of the site as it relates to an archaeologist's ability to interpret the site. Most important was site structure, a measure of the quantity and variety of the site's physical characteristics such as architecture, stratigraphy, features, and midden. A site with a large quantity and variety of intact features is assumed to have great interpretive value. Disturbance was a measure of the degree to which past natural and cultural processes have disarranged the site. Notice that the point breakdown was reversed, ie. a heavily disturbed site receives fewer points. Clarity measures the quality of the site's physical structure in regard to an archaeologist's ability to "read" the archaeological components of the site (Glassow 1977).

(4) Research Potential: Sites received a cumulative maximum of 100 points in this category. Each sub-category was also further broken down into the above described high to low point system. Sub-categories were:

A. Chronology Maximum 25 points
B. Lifeways Maximum 25 points
C. Process Maximum 25 points
D. Heritage Maximum 25 points

This category assessed the site's ability to produce significant, non-redundant information about past societies, that can be used in the reconstruction of human behavior. The "Chronology" sub-category was based on the ability of a site to alter, build-on, or improve
existing cultural chronologies, or construct new ones. "Lifeways" was the ability of the site to contribute information about the daily life of the occupants, such as subsistence, technology, or economy. "Process" was the ability of the site to produce significant information concerning the dynamics of change through time of past cultures or to aid in an understanding of regional archaeological issues. "Heritage" evaluates a site's ability to provide information on state heritage, ethnicity, status, style, or other issues important to heritage interpretation. (The authors recognized that some very important historic sites may not score high in the sub-category "Chronology." However, prehistoric sites may not automatically score high in "Heritage." If a consistent bias is seen after all sites are rated in the future, some adjustment may be necessary, such as the creation of separate historic and prehistoric lists).

(5) Educational Value: In this category, sites received a cumulative maximum of 50 points. Again, sub-categories were broken down into the high to low point system as above. Sub-categories were:

A. Interpretive Value Maximum 25 points
B. Display Value Maximum 25 points

Sites were evaluated based on their ability to be interpreted by a non-archaeologist. Examples would include high visibility sites like a South Appalachian-Mississippian temple mound, or a plantation complex with a number of visible ruins. Display value was the ability of a site to produce material culture which can be used to construct museum exhibits.

FINAL COMMENTS

In summary, the object of this project was to evaluate a limited number of the most critically significant sites in South Carolina with the ultimate goal of placing them in State trust for their preservation. The Cultural Areas Subcommittee will use this target list to guide their efforts over the next few years. However, the Principal Investigators recognize that priorities will change in the future. Therefore, it is important to note that this project's final list and recommendations will not be the final word in the preservation of South Carolina's archaeological heritage. As our knowledge about the past changes the Trust will continue to evaluate newly discovered sites and remain flexible to meet the unknown future. The next chapter details the ranked list of the 100 critically significant sites in South Carolina.
CHAPTER IV
100 CRITICALLY SIGNIFICANT SITES IN SOUTH CAROLINA

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the current Heritage Trust list of 100 critically significant sites in South Carolina. A ranked list of all 100 sites appears in Table 4. Following the list is a brief sketch on each of the sites, and in most cases a statement of the significance of the site by the scholar who has ranked the site for the Heritage Trust Program. In some cases these sketches are brief, while in others they are somewhat lengthy. In the latter cases, it is an indication that very little had been known about a site and the project archaeologist and the field archaeologist conducted archival and/or field research on a site. The sites are broken into convenient time-ordered or functionally-related categories for ease of presentation.

From the beginning of the project, we made an attempt to establish a representative list that included as many site types as possible. One of the first exercises was to construct a list of possible site types within given time periods. These data are presented in Table 3. This table gives the reader some indication of the site type universe. Not all of these types have been identified in South Carolina, but research elsewhere indicates their possible presence. The Heritage Trust 100 list of Critically Significant Sites does not include all site types listed in Table 3; it is provided as a guide for the future activities of the Cultural Areas Subcommittee.

As can be seen there are 149 site types listed in Table 3. The following pages present the listed 100 Critically Significant Sites in South Carolina, as established by the professional archaeological community in 1990/1991. A list of the ranked sites is presented in Table 4.

In some cases more than one researcher ranked a site (Table 5). This was conducted as a test of the system, to see how close two individuals would rank a site. At the end of each of the sections in this chapter is a table of all ranked sites in that particular section. In those tables, if a site has been ranked by two researchers, both scores appear in the table.

The first group of sites presented are prehistoric sites (Table 6). Archaeologists distinguish between prehistoric, protohistoric, and historic sites. Prehistoric sites in South Carolina are pre-European contact. This period, thus, would end in 1521 when Spanish ships sailed into Winyah Bay. The protohistoric period is the time of initial contact and exploration. The historic period would begin with the establishment of Santa Elena on Parris Island, South Carolina in A.D. 1566.

PREHISTORIC SITES

The Manning Site (38LX50)

The Manning site is located on a bluff overlooking Congaree Creek in Lexington County, South Carolina. This site is multi-component in nature with materials ranging from Paleoindian on up to the 18th century A.D. Projectile points typed Clovis-like, Simpson, Suwannee, Dalton, Taylor, Palmer, Kirk, Lecroy, Stanly, Morrow Mountain, Guilford, Savannah River, Otarre, Yadkin, and unnamed triangular points of the South Appalachian Mississippian period have been recovered from this site. Additionally, polished atlatl weights and groundstone axes have been recovered from the Manning site (Michie 1977).

The Manning site was ranked by Albert C. Goodyear who gave it a score of 330 and James L. Michie who gave it a score of 180. In Michie's assessment of the site:

Similar to Taylor site [see below], but deeper. Improved vertical stratigraphy, but may be lacking in Paleoindian assemblages. Plowing and subsequent erosion have affected surface. Intact components immediately below plowzone for a depth of 24 inches. The Manning site has greater depth [than the Taylor site, see below] but fewer Paleoindian materials. However, it does have a nearly complete cultural sequence capable of adding greatly to our knowledge of chronology. Neither Manning nor Taylor have faunal remains.

Goodyear commented in the following way about this critically significant South Carolina site:

This is a very rare multi-component fairly stratified fall-line habitation (?) site which
Table 3. Some Site Types and Features within Sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period Type</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paleoindian Period Site Types (n=11)</strong></td>
<td>Quarry</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>Extraction</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Rock Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarry</td>
<td>Campsite</td>
<td>Extraction</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Rock Shelter</td>
<td>Cave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Rock Shelter</td>
<td>Cave</td>
<td>Shell Ring</td>
<td>Shell Midden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submerged</td>
<td>Shell Midden</td>
<td>Shell Midden</td>
<td>Earthwork</td>
<td>Mound</td>
<td>Earthwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archaic Period Site Types (n=15)</strong></td>
<td>Quarry</td>
<td>Seasonal Camp</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Cave</td>
<td>Shell Midden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarry</td>
<td>Seasonal Camp</td>
<td>Extraction</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Shell Midden</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Rock Shelter</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Fish Weir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submerged</td>
<td>Surface Find</td>
<td>Shell Ring</td>
<td>Earthwork</td>
<td>Mound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Weir</td>
<td>Ceremonial</td>
<td>Earthwork</td>
<td>Earthwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td></td>
<td>Earthwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Woodland Period Site Types (n=18)</strong></td>
<td>Quarry</td>
<td>Seasonal Camp</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Cave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarry</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Rock Shelter</td>
<td>Cave</td>
<td>Shell Midden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>Submerged</td>
<td>Shell Ring</td>
<td>Fish Weir</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submerged</td>
<td>Surface Find</td>
<td>Earthwork</td>
<td>Earthwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Weir</td>
<td>Ceremonial</td>
<td></td>
<td>Earthwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Earthwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Appalachian Mississippian/Contact Period Site Types (n=21)</strong></td>
<td>Quarry</td>
<td>Seasonal Camp</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Cave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarry</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Rock Shelter</td>
<td>Cave</td>
<td>Shell Midden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>Submerged</td>
<td>Shell Ring</td>
<td>Fish Weir</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submerged</td>
<td>Surface Find</td>
<td>Earthwork</td>
<td>Earthwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Weir</td>
<td>Ceremonial</td>
<td></td>
<td>Earthwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td></td>
<td>Earthwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Earthwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16th Century Site Types (n=11)</strong></td>
<td>Spanish Fort</td>
<td>French Fort</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Landing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Village/Town</td>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submerged</td>
<td>Tavern</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17th Century Site Types (n=13)</strong></td>
<td>English Fort</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Privy</td>
<td>Barn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn Crib</td>
<td>Kiln</td>
<td>Slave Structure</td>
<td>Submerged</td>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Find</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Tavern</td>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18th Century Site Types (n=28)</strong></td>
<td>Fort</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Slave Structure</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smokehouse</td>
<td>Barn</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Mill</td>
<td>Tannery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tackhouse</td>
<td>Dock/Landing</td>
<td>Privy</td>
<td>Corn Crib</td>
<td>Courthouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orangerie</td>
<td>Pottery Kiln</td>
<td>Brick Kiln</td>
<td>Corn Crib</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENHOUSE</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>COURTHOUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail</td>
<td>Tavern</td>
<td>Trading Post</td>
<td>BATTLEFIELD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthwork</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Submerged</td>
<td>SURFACE FIND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19th Century Site Types (n=32)</strong></td>
<td>Fort</td>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Slave Structure</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smokehouse</td>
<td>Barn</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Mill</td>
<td>Tannery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tackhouse</td>
<td>Dock/Landing</td>
<td>Privy</td>
<td>Corn Crib</td>
<td>Courthouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orangeirc</td>
<td>Pottery Kiln</td>
<td>Brick Kiln</td>
<td>Corn Crib</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>COURTHOUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail</td>
<td>Tavern</td>
<td>BATTLEFIELD</td>
<td>EARTHWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad</td>
<td>Dump</td>
<td>Tobacco Barn</td>
<td>HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submerged</td>
<td>Surface Find</td>
<td>Tenant Farm</td>
<td>CEMETERY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Heritage Trust 100 Sites List.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38BU1110</td>
<td>Penn Center</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU1069</td>
<td>Rhodes</td>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CK2</td>
<td>Coopersville Iron Complex</td>
<td>T. Ferguson</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38AL135</td>
<td>Smith’s Lake Creek</td>
<td>Goodyear</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU805</td>
<td>Mitchelville/Fish Haul</td>
<td>Trinkle</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CR1</td>
<td>Santee Mound</td>
<td>Barker</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38AK497</td>
<td>Landrum-Miles</td>
<td>Steen</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38DR1</td>
<td>Old Dorchester</td>
<td>Barker</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38JA158</td>
<td>Puryrsburg</td>
<td>Elliott</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU858</td>
<td>Dean Hall Diamond Gate</td>
<td>Newell</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH</td>
<td>Scanlonville</td>
<td>Drucker</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38SP12</td>
<td>Soapstone Quarries</td>
<td>T. Ferguson</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38AL11</td>
<td>Lawton Mounds</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38KE12</td>
<td>Mulberry Mounds</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BK38</td>
<td>Middleburg</td>
<td>L. Ferguson</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Benedict College</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CK73</td>
<td>Cowpens Iron Furnace</td>
<td>T. Ferguson</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38KE11</td>
<td>Adamson Mounds</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH1271</td>
<td>Secessionville</td>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU162/BU52</td>
<td>Santa Elena</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38LX50</td>
<td>Manning</td>
<td>Goodyear</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38KE6</td>
<td>Belmont Neck Mound</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU8</td>
<td>Ford’s Skull Creek</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH45</td>
<td>Sewee Shell Ring</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38LX319</td>
<td>Fort Congaree</td>
<td>Michie</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Honey Hill</td>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38AL23/AL139</td>
<td>Topper Quarry</td>
<td>Goodyear</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH42</td>
<td>Fig Island Shell Ring</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Evans Clinic</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU102</td>
<td>Fort Frederick</td>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>James Is. Civil War Sites</td>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH24</td>
<td>Stratton Place Shell Ring</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU1206</td>
<td>Altamaha</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BK202</td>
<td>Fairbank Plantation</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38OC186</td>
<td>Chattoooga</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH1</td>
<td>Charles Towne Landing</td>
<td>Barker</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH58/CH482</td>
<td>Willtown Bluff/Mt.Hope</td>
<td>Stine</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Benjamin Davis Plantation</td>
<td>Rinehart</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38MA93</td>
<td>Dunlap</td>
<td>DePratter</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38DA66</td>
<td>Buzzard Isle</td>
<td>Tippett</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH23</td>
<td>Dubois-Copes-Wannamaker</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Old Sheldon Church</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU1124</td>
<td>Allen University</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>McLeod</td>
<td>Zierden</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH679</td>
<td>Molasses Creek Powder Mag.</td>
<td>Drucker</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH912</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Goodyear</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38LX1</td>
<td>McCollum Mound</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CS2</td>
<td>Lighthouse Pt. Shell Ring</td>
<td>Trinkle</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH112</td>
<td>Tavern Rock Shelter</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CK51</td>
<td>Paul Pritchard Shipyard</td>
<td>Beard</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Willington Academy</td>
<td>Blythe</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH62</td>
<td>Spanish Mount</td>
<td>Barker</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH1213</td>
<td>Folly North</td>
<td>Zierden</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU581</td>
<td>Sam’s Tabby Complex</td>
<td>Drucker</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (cont’d).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38YK3</td>
<td>Spratt’s Bottom</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38LX68</td>
<td>SAM</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU300-303</td>
<td>Daws Island Shell Ring</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Bull-McIntosh</td>
<td>Blythe</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38OC186</td>
<td>Tomasee</td>
<td>DePratt</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38GN1-5</td>
<td>Ninety-Six</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU1113</td>
<td>Fort Fremont</td>
<td>Grunden</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BK202</td>
<td>Lesesne Plantation</td>
<td>Drucker</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38ED9</td>
<td>Mims Point</td>
<td>Elliott</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38UN1</td>
<td>Pinckneyville</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38LX42</td>
<td>Saluda Factory and Dam</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Folly Island</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38AK172</td>
<td>Hitchcock Woods</td>
<td>Steen</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Combahee Fort and Camp</td>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH</td>
<td>Charleston Beef Market</td>
<td>Zierden</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38MC322</td>
<td>Badwell Plantation</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BK261</td>
<td>Limerick Settlement</td>
<td>Babson</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38ED11</td>
<td>Pottersville</td>
<td>Steen</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU1289</td>
<td>Stony Creek Battery</td>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH41</td>
<td>Auld Shell Ring</td>
<td>Stine</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Bee’s Creek Battery</td>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BK416</td>
<td>Tanner Road Settlement</td>
<td>Babson</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU29</td>
<td>Chesterfield Shell Ring</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU7</td>
<td>Sea Pines Shell Ring</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38KE18</td>
<td>Ferry Landing</td>
<td>DePratt</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Cherry Hill</td>
<td>Blythe</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH1022</td>
<td>Andre Michaux</td>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38AL15</td>
<td>Rabbit Mount</td>
<td>Sassaman</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38AL10</td>
<td>Albert Love</td>
<td>Trinkley</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Snow Island</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>New Bordeaux</td>
<td>Blythe</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU1124</td>
<td>Old Sheldon Church</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH24</td>
<td>Stratton Place Shell Ring</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38MC428</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>not rated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Double Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38CR1</td>
<td>Santee Mound</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38DR1</td>
<td>Old Dorchester</td>
<td>Sigmon</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU102</td>
<td>Fort Frederick</td>
<td>Grunden</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU300-303</td>
<td>Daws Island Shell Ring</td>
<td>Michie</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH62</td>
<td>Spanish Mount</td>
<td>Sassaman</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH12</td>
<td>Lighthouse Pt. Shell Ring</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38ED9</td>
<td>Mims Point</td>
<td>Bates</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38LX50</td>
<td>Manning</td>
<td>Michie</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38LX1</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Michie</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was used repeatedly by Paleoindian-Woodland groups. This is perhaps one of the most important sites that are critical to understanding Archaic lifeways through settlement analyses in South Carolina. It really needs to be dug. It also has an outstanding Mid-18th century homestead occupation, partially excavated by the Archaeological Society of South Carolina and the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology. There should also be found archaeological evidence there of Cherokee visits. It's been plowed and collected, but much site structure still exists below the plowzone, including historic features.

The Taylor Site (38LX1)

The Taylor site is a mixed Paleoindian, Archaic and Woodland period site on an ancient river terrace near the Congaree River in Lexington County, South Carolina. This terrace is flat and lies low, made up of silts, clays, and fine sands. The Taylor site is shaped like a triangle, being bordered by two seasonal creeks (Michie 1977:100). The site is described as containing sparse material in a cultivated field of some 35 acres. The site has been plowed and collected for many years. According to Michie, the site has produced more Paleoindian period projectile points than any other site in South Carolina. He estimates that 12-15 Clovis-like points and approximately 200 Dalton points have been collected. Other specimens recovered include chipped stone projectile points (Palmer, and Kirk), hammerstones and unifacial scrapers. Soapstone fragments and fire-cracked rock (FCR), artifactual evidence of indirect cooking techniques, are also present. Prehistoric ceramic types recovered include fabric, check stamped, and plain wares. In addition, alkaline glazed stoneware, pearlware, wine bottle fragments, gun flints, and brick have been collected.

Excavations by Michie in 1970 and 1971 have revealed that early prehistoric materials and occupational features are present beneath the plowzone. Michie's research indicated clusters of artifacts at 5 locales within the site (Michie 1988b:1), each of which yielded bifaces (Clovis-like and Dalton), in association with end scrapers. Michie's excavations resulted in the opening of 8,000 square feet of excavation. Dalton and Palmer assemblages were the most predominantly represented periods. The possibility of buried floors under 14 inches of flood deposited sediments is high (Michie 1977:102). The importance of this critically significant site is stated in Michie's 1988 report:

The significance of these patterns is presently unrecognized. The shallow character of the site, however, offered little or no indication of vertical/temporal separation. Generally, the lithic components occurred from immediately below the plowzone to a depth of about 6-7 inches. Within this zone of cultural debris both Dalton and Palmer materials coexisted in either the upper or lower portions. Therefore, the site is not significant in terms of its ability to segregate components vertically, or to preserve organic materials; its significance lies in the horizontal stratigraphy of Early Archaic assemblages (Michie 1988b:3).

Goodyear in his evaluation of this site under the Heritage Trust Critically Significant Site Selection Criteria gave the site 305 points while Michie gave the site 155. Goodyear stated the following in his assessment:
Figure 1. Tavern Rock Shelter (38CK51).

The main significance is that it is a buried, reasonably well-preserved Paleoindian and Early Archaic site, a probable basecamp/village of the period 11,000-9,000 B.C. on the Fall Line. Excavations of sub-plowzone portion would be valuable. Its a rare site, albeit not in real great shape due to plowing, erosion and heavy collecting.

Tavern Rock Shelter (38CK51)

The Tavern Rock Shelter (a.k.a Broad River Rock Shelter) is located in Cherokee County, South Carolina (Figure 1). This site was excavated over a period of years by Wofford College. These excavations indicated that Early Archaic (Kirk) through Mississippian artifacts were present within the shelter (Novick and Cantley 1979). Rock shelters were used by prehistoric people, particularly nomadic groups, for shelter from the elements and wild animals. They provide a rare opportunity for the recovery of organic materials such as ethnobotanical, faunal, and coprolite remains, which can be used in the reconstruction of diet.

This site was rated by Mr. Wayne Roberts of the South Carolina Department of Highways and Public Transportation, who gave the site 300 points. Mr Roberts states:

This site is important because it is one of only two or three rock shelters investigated in the state and the only one with any published information. It is the only one with a stratified deposit representing the Early Archaic, Middle Archaic, Late Archaic, Early Woodland, Middle Woodland, and Mississippian periods.

The site is immediately adjacent to a public road making it easily accessible to vandals. However, no evidence of vandalism was observed. It is located on the property of a Duke Power Company hydro-electric generating plant. This means it is possible that plant expansion could easily damage the site. Improvements to the adjacent public road could easily adversely affect the site. Natural processes which could impact the site include erosion and roof collapse.

The site is a stratified deposit with a depth of at least four feet. The projectile point seriation (Novick and Cantley 1979:Fig. A) clearly shows a stratigraphic sequence for the eight 0.5-foot levels. This is in spite of one-half foot levels which would have obviously afforded the possibility of mixing. With excavation levels in smaller increments, greater clarity would probably result. The greatest disturbances seem to be the result of prehistoric cultural disturbances and archaeological excavations.
Much of the research potential of the site should be obvious from previous comments. The site represents a stratified deposit of four feet with components dating from the Early Archaic through Mississippian periods. In addition, the faunal preservation is good because of the protected nature of rock shelters. Animal bone was recovered from all eight levels with the greatest amounts from Levels 3 and 5. Faunal preservation is a great factor in the reconstruction of past lifeways. Flotation and pollen analysis should also yield good results at this site. Such a stratified site should readily lend itself to studies of culture history, culture process, and past lifeways.

The site should be ideal for educational value. It is readily visible. Any member of the public could easily visualize the ability of the shelter to provide protection for the occupants. With the deep stratified deposit, the site easily lends itself to museum displays of both chronology and lifestyles through time. Perhaps the owners, Duke Power Company, could provide funding for such an endeavor.

**SAM Site (38LX68)**

The SAM site (SAM is an acronym for South Appalachian Mississippian) is located in Lexington County, South Carolina. This is a large site which encompasses several acres along a creek leading to a major river. While it is predominantly a Mississippian period occupation, early Archaic materials and later 18th century materials have been recovered by investigators (Anderson 1974:148). This site is a non-mound village and has the potential to contribute information about lifeways away from ceremonial centers. Limited subsurface testing at the site by the 1990 Heritage Trust project indicates buried remains. However, subsurface integrity has yet to be identified at this site. This site has been nominated to the National Register of Historic Places, however, its full archaeological potential remains unknown.

This site was ranked by Judge who gave it a score of 280 points.

This site has the potential to tell us something about Mississippian lifeways at a non-mound site. We really have no idea about lifeways at mound sites in South Carolina either. Instead we borrow our ideas from other parts of the Southeastern United States. While the integrity of this site cannot be demonstrated, surface collections indicate a fairly dense occupation.

**Ferry Landing (38KE18)**

This site is located close to an abandoned Ferry Landing on the east bank of the Wateree River near Camden, South Carolina. It is located on a terrace edge. According to Stuart (1975:41-44) the site has been collected for many decades. Evidence of early prehistoric through historic times is recorded in collections from this site. In the 1970s Goodyear and Anderson conducted research at this site as part of ongoing research for a proposed Camden Beltway. The project was halted on the drawing board and a draft report is on file at the SCIAA. A computerized map of surface collected materials from this site also appears in Goodyear (1975).

In December of 1990, construction was halted at this site when human burial remains were encountered. Dr. Chester B. DePratter of the SCIAA and Dr. Ted Rathbun of the Department of Anthropology at the University of South Carolina investigated the site. Their report is pending. Dr. DePratter rated the site and gave it a score of 234 points, stating:

Ferry Landing is a large village site with a strong Mississippian component, though surface collections indicate other components are present. This site, with abundant features, may be related to the nearby Adamson mound site.

**Dunlap Site (38DA66)**

The Dunlap site is located in Darlington County, South Carolina. This site is a Late Woodland/Early Mississippian village. This site was recorded by Mr. Tommy Charles of the SCIAA during the Collectors Survey. It is located on an old channel of the Pee Dee River. This site occurs in a plowed field of approximately one acre. The site is very dense in artifacts (Charles 1984:site file). In 1984 Dr. Chester DePratter of the SCIAA conducted test excavations at Dunlap. Dr. DePratter rated this site and gave it a score of 314 points stating:

Dunlap is a transitional Woodland to Mississippian village. It is fairly well preserved with slight damage due to agriculture. The site contains abundant features with outstanding bone preservation.
Rabbit Mount (38AL15)

The Rabbit Mount site is a 15-acre site on a natural sand knoll which sits 20 feet above the surrounding swamp, in the Savannah River drainage. The site is adjacent to an oxbow lake which at the time of the site's occupation by prehistoric peoples would have been a tributary of the Savannah River. It would have provided access to transportation, communication networks, as well as subsistence resources, particularly shellfish. The site was excavated as part of doctoral dissertation research by James B. Stoltman (1974). His research indicated a predominant occupation during the Late Archaic period, based on the recovery of Stallings Island and Thom's Creek series ceramics and Savannah River projectile points. A number of features were also evident. A second significant occupation appears to have occurred during early South Appalachian Mississippian times based on the recovery of Savannah Complicated Stamped, Cord Marked, Check Stamped and Burnished ceramics (Stoltman 1974:63,75). Smaller quantities of pottery were recovered from all Native American ceramic producing cultures in the area.

This site was rated by Dr. Kenneth E. Sassaman who gave it a score 225 points. In his evaluation of the site under the Heritage Trust's Critically Significant Site criteria, Sassaman states:

Rabbit Mount is important because of (1) variety of small shell middens in interior; (2) chronology of Stallings Island Fiber-tempered pottery; (3) subsistence remains; (4) evidence for structures, and other features. Little threat of vandalism or natural damage.

Spanish Mount Shell Midden (38CH62)

The Spanish Mount site, on Edisto Island, is a large Late Archaic/ Early Woodland period shell midden on high land on a peninsula along the edge of salt marsh (Figure 2). It was said to be one of the largest shell middens on South Carolina's coast, and is in close proximity to a large shell ring site (Sutherland 1974:185). In 1973, Sutherland conducted a five-week field school and program of excavation at this site. These excavations were carried out in order to explore questions of site structure, subsistence, cultural chronology and culture history. A profile of the mound along the creek bank was cleaned and mapped, and a trench was excavated across the width of the deposit. Two radiocarbon samples dating 3820±185 B.P. (1870 B.C.) and 4170±550 B.P. (2200 B.C.) were generated by the research. Artifacts recovered include incised bone pins, a Savannah River projectile point, and numerous Thom's Creek ceramics, although some Stallings Island fiber-tempered wares were also noted (Sutherland 1974:194). The former are found in association with ceramics of the Awendaw/Horse Island types (Trinkley 1973;1974:179 Sutherland 1974:194).

The site has suffered considerably from tidal fluctuation-induced erosion and other disturbances. However, the site remains significant because the size alone has preserved much integrity. The site was rated by two different archaeologists. Donnie Barker gave it a score of 295 while Ken Sassaman gave it a score of 255.

Mims Point (38ED9)

Mims Point is a Stallings Island phase midden site located in the Edgefield Ranger District of the Sumter National Forest (Elliott 1983). This site has been subjected to vandalism, and in 1984 Dan Elliott conducted test excavations to determine the extent of the damage, evaluate the integrity of the site, and to stabilize it by preventing easy access to this important site (Elliott 1984a:1). Elliott described the site as containing a midden which was fairly large, although shallow; some plow disturbance was noted. While the vandals had damaged a fair amount of the site, there still were intact remains. Ceramic, lithic, bone and shell were recovered and features were present (Elliott 1984a:10).

When this site was visited by the Heritage Trust project in 1990, recent looting was evident. The Forest Service is in the early stage of planning more salvage work at this site.

This site was rated by two archaeologists. Dan Elliott gave it a score of 275 points stating:

The site is extensively disturbed by looting, data recovery is the best alternative, not a good candidate for purchase.

James Bates gave it a score of 215 points stating:

The Mims Point site has been subjected to vandalism and relic collecting with major disturbances in the past ten years. However, salvage excavations at the site
conducted by Dan Elliott in 1983 indicate that undisturbed areas containing features and intact cultural deposits remain on the site. The site contains components from the Early Archaic, Middle Archaic, Late Woodland and Mississippian periods. Faunal remains preservation is good. Elliott considered the site to be eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places.

Site 38MC428

38MC428 is located within the Sumter National Forest. It is a multi-component site prehistoric site recorded by Daniel T. Elliott. This site may possibly be an upland Mississippian hamlet, however, not enough information is known about this site, therefore, it was not ranked.

PREHISTORIC QUARRY SITES

In order to make tools for everyday tasks necessary for survival, prehistoric peoples made use of the materials available to a pre-metallurgy society. They used wood, bone, antler, and stone. The study of stone tools is of particular interest to archaeologists because they preserve much better than organic items. One way of researching this technology is to study quarry sites. As an analogy, these sites can be compared to modern-day factories. Quarry sites are where raw materials were turned into usable items. The debris created by such activities can tell scientists about the manner in which tools were manufactured and used, and ultimately about the persons that used those tools. Two types of quarries are dealt with in this study: chert and soapstone (Table 7).

The Allendale Chert Quarries (Flint River Formation)

As Goodyear and others have noted (Goodyear and Charles 1984; Wilmson 1970; Gardner 1977), prehistoric human groups, particularly during the Paleoindian and Early Archaic Periods chose the best fine-grained flints and cherts to fashion tools from. While archaeologists in other parts of the country have observed such patterns and developed models of this phenomenon, such behavior in the Southeastern Coastal Plain is not as well documented. Throughout the Southeastern Coastal Plain of Eastern Alabama, Georgia and South Carolina, Coastal Plain cherts are the lithic materials most frequently found by archaeologists (Kelly 1954:14; Charles 1981:49; Goodyear and Charles 1984). In South Carolina, Paleoindian tool makers often used Allendale Chert for their projectile points, the only diagnostic tool of this period (Goodyear et al 1989:27-29).

The Allendale Chert quarries provided the best source of high quality cryptocrystalline lithic raw materials for prehistoric peoples (Goodyear 1979). The Allendale Chert is part of
Table 7. Quarry Site Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38AL135</td>
<td>Smith's Lake Creek</td>
<td>Goodyear</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38SP12-13</td>
<td>Soapstone Quarries</td>
<td>T. Ferguson</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38AL23</td>
<td>Topper Quarry</td>
<td>Goodyear</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the Flint River formation best known archaeologically from its outcroppings in Allendale County, South Carolina and adjacent outcrops along Brier Creek in Burke County, Georgia, across the Savannah River (Cook 1936; Goodyear et al. 1989:30). Allendale cherts, like other Coastal Plain cherts are tertiary (the earlier of the systems comprised in the Cenozoic group) in age. Two processes of silicification create two basic forms. The first form is brittle when worked for tools—it is opaline in makeup and was formed in marine sediments. It is not as suitable for stone tool raw material as the other form. The second form is chemically and physically stronger and is made from replaced limestone formed by the groundwater transport of silica originally formed in diatoms (tiny single-celled plants that live in fresh and saltwater) (Upchurch et al. 1981:38-40; Goodyear and Charles 1984:2). Allendale cherts are often found in a thermally altered state. Native American tool makers somehow realized if they heated this type of rock, its ability to be worked was greatly improved.

In 1983 Goodyear and Charles received a grant from the South Carolina Department of Archives and History to conduct a survey to locate chert quarries in western Allendale County. As a result, 14 quarries and quarry related sites were nominated as an archaeological district to the National Register of Historic Places (Goodyear and Charles 1984:7). Two of these sites received further research by Goodyear and his colleagues and were nominated to the critically significant site list: the Smith's Lake Creek site (38AL135) and 38AL23/AL139.

Smith's Lake Creek Quarry (38AL135)

The Smith's Lake Creek site is a deep stratified site. A broken Paleoindian preform was recovered from a creek bank during a reconnaissance of this site. Upon closer inspection the site was discovered to have been partially destroyed by stream dynamics. The site was tested with a backhoe, bucket auger, and 2-meter square test pits on its terrestrial portion. Underwater archaeology reconnaissance and airlift techniques were applied adjacent to the bluff. A large number of quarry and preform manufacturing debris was recovered on both land and under the surface of the water.

The Smith's Lake Creek site was rated by Albert Goodyear who gave the site a score of 375 points. Goodyear states in his ranking, "This is the only 'pure' Paleoindian quarry site I know of in the Southeast. It may be the only pure Paleoindian site, period, in the Southeast."

Topper Quarry (38AL23/AL139)

This site is located in Allendale County on an oxbow lake, former channel of the Savannah River. During a survey of chert quarries in Allendale County in the middle 1980s, this was the site that appeared to have the best potential, and testing confirmed that assumption. The site is a quarry (AL139) with a related habitation site (AL23). The 38AL23 site has good integrity, deep stratigraphy and has evidence of numerous occupations (Goodyear and Charles 1984:93).

Dr. Albert C. Goodyear, III rated the Topper Quarry and gave it a score of 325 points. Goodyear states: "This is the best multi-component (stratified) chert quarry I've seen in South Carolina. It has virtually all time periods."

Soapstone Quarries

The soapstone quarry sites (Table 7) represent the physical remains of prehistoric soapstone procurement by human groups, particularly during the Archaic Period. Late Archaic Period inhabitants of South Carolina fashioned soapstone into cooking disks (Figure 3). These disks are roughly circular about the size of an adult's palm and have a small hole drilled through the center of the long axis. These disks were heated and dropped into water-filled skin or clay-lined pits to boil water for cooking. Later, humans began to fashion bowls of this material (Figure 4). Pipes made from soapstone are also recovered from prehistoric sites.
Figure 3. Soapstone disk from Mim's Point (38ED9).

Figure 4. Soapstone boulder.
Soapstone, as described by Ferguson in his report to the Archives and History, is:

a hydrous magnesium silicate, occurs geologically by the alteration of certain ultramafic igneous intrusives, generally peridotites. The soapstone in the study area is composed of varying amounts of talc, tremolite-actinolite, chlorite, biotite, magnetite, and hematite (Bohanon 1975:96-98). The soapstone occurs in the form of small circular to irregularly shaped bodies and dikes within and generally undistinguished from hornblende gneiss units (Overstreet and Bell 1965).

During 1978 and 1979, 18 prehistoric soapstone quarries, considered to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), were recorded in a 16 square kilometer area east of Spartanburg, north of the town of Pacolet along the Pacolet River (Ferguson 1978). This study was conducted to determine the nature and extent of archaeological materials related to quarrying behavior and to determine the eligibility of these resources under the criteria for eligibility to the NRHP (Ferguson 1978:4-5). A number of these sites were nominated to the Heritage Trust for acquisition prior to the beginning of the 1990 Statewide Assessment of Cultural Sites. However, they were again visited by the Heritage Trust survey with Dr. Terry Ferguson of Wofford College. The sites are still in an undeveloped area along the Pacolet River, however residential development is encroaching.

The soapstone quarries were nominated together and it is hoped that they can be purchased as a single Heritage Preserve, even if the parcels of land are non-contiguous. Dr. Ferguson ranked the Soapstone Quarry sites and gave them a score of 350 points. In his 1978 report on the Soapstone Quarries Ferguson noted:

The soapstone quarries located in Spartanburg and Cherokee Counties are distinct, well-preserved examples of a once numerous but now rapidly vanishing specialized procurement site. These quarries are important archaeological resources, which due to their location, preservation and intact context offers data amenable to research problems in five major areas: I. The delineation of regional patterns of cultural development; II. The reconstruction of lithic technological subsystems of cultural systems; III. The interpretation of economic and subsistence subsystems of cultural systems; IV. The study of site formation processes; V. Interdisciplinary studies (Ferguson 1978:42).

LATE ARCHAIC/EARLY WOODLAND SHELL RINGS

Twenty Late Archaic/Early Woodland shell rings are known to exist on the coast of South Carolina (Trinkley 1985:102). Of these 20, 10 were nominated to the critically significant site list (Table 8). The Heritage Trust site survey was able to physically visit five, however, all 10 are discussed below. The shell rings may be the most unique of all archaeological site types compiled by this survey. The only other place they occur in the United States is Georgia. The limited number of this site type, and the fact that they occur in the most rapidly developing geophysical area in South Carolina, cannot be stressed highly enough. It is extremely important for the Heritage Trust to act quickly to preserve a number of these sites and to look into the possibility of site stabilization at ones endangered by erosion. Preservation plans for natural area habitats and archaeology should be able to merge at these locales.

Shell Ring Description

These shell rings all occur on the outer Coastal Plain and are in close proximity to tidal creeks. These features range from 130-250 feet in diameter and from 2-10 feet in height (Hemmings 1970). Hemmings conducted a survey of coastal areas in South Carolina and Georgia to identify and record the shell rings.

All are believed to date early in the second millennium B.C., and they contain some of the earliest pottery known in North America. Only very limited excavations have been undertaken in a few of these rings. The function of the ring shape is unknown, although the rings appear to be carefully planned and systematically deposited structures. As such, they also present one of the earliest records of sedentary life among people who must have lived entirely by foraging. The shell rings can be expected to yield valuable information about past habitats on the coast, both from their rich content of food refuse and from their relationships to modern environments (Hemmings 1970a).

While there are a number of explanations for their construction and function, the most reasonable is presented by Trinkley from his research at Stratton Place (38CH24) and Lighthouse Point (38CH12).
Table 8. Late Archaic Shell Ring Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38BU8</td>
<td>Ford's Skull Creek</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH45</td>
<td>Sewee</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH42</td>
<td>Fig Island</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH24</td>
<td>Stratton Place</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH12</td>
<td>Lighthouse Pt.</td>
<td>Trinkley</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH12</td>
<td>Lighthouse Pt.</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH23</td>
<td>Buzzard Isle</td>
<td>Tippett</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU300-303</td>
<td>Daw's Island</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU300-303</td>
<td>Daw's Island</td>
<td>Michie</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH41</td>
<td>Auld</td>
<td>Stine</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU29</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU7</td>
<td>Sea Pines</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

shell rings were gradually formed habitation sites, with occupation taking place on the rings. The rings were formed from kitchen refuse, particularly shellfish and animal bone. Large steaming pits and postholes are found in the midden areas, whereas roasting pits are found on the edges of the rings. The relatively clear interiors appear to function as areas of communal activity (Trinkley 1985:117).

These rings were formed during the Late Archaic period 5,000 - 3,000 B.P. (Anderson and Joseph 1988:154). Archaeological research directed at the shell rings indicates that Late Archaic period human groups were making extensive use of coastal resources particularly shellfish (Anderson and Joseph 1988). Recently, David Lawrence of the Department of Geological Sciences at the University of South Carolina, prepared a compilation of shell ring reports along with an extensive bibliography (Lawrence 1989a). Lawrence states:

shell rings are among our earliest records of coastal zone utilization by humans in the Southeastern United States. These rings are arcuate and confined topographic highs, constructed by humans from shell fish remains, which may not completely enclose a central region (1989a:1).

These sites are important from a research as well as a public education standpoint. They are the habitation sites of the earliest pottery makers in North America (Hemmings 1970c:9). The shell rings are highly visible sites. This aspect provides the public with easily interpreted features and strong educational benefits.

Daw's Island Shell Rings (38BU300-303)
(Christopher Judge and James Errante)

Daw's Island is located where the Broad and Chechessee River join and form Port Royal Sound, in Beaufort County, South Carolina. It is safe to venture a guess that this site represents the most pristine habitat visited during the five-month Heritage Trust site survey. There are a number of important sites on this island, all of them prehistoric in nature. Daw's Island is described by archaeologist James L. Michie as follows:

Daw's Island for the most part is long, narrow and very flat, except for the occasional rise of small aboriginal shell middens. The majority of the island's surface is covered with marsh peat, which is represented by a black organic mud that contains vegetable matter. This veneer varies considerably in thickness from perhaps a few inches to several feet. The marsh peat supports mostly tall marsh grass, snails, fiddlers, and some shellfish. Palmetto trees are usually found growing out of the sparsely distributed shell middens (Michie 1973:123).

The first site, Barrow's Shell Ring (38BU300), is named for a former owner of the site, David Barrow. Michie reports this site to be 100' by 75' and is shaped like an oval. Stallings Island fiber-tempered ceramics (Clafin 1931) and Thom's Creek wares have been recovered from this site. This site needs to be both mapped and tested to access its full archaeological integrity.

The second site is known as Patent Shell Ring (38BU301) and if it was once circular it is
now horseshoe or crescent shaped. This site also needs to be mapped and tested.

The preservation of these sites is enhanced by difficult access to the island. To get on the island without a helicopter requires arriving and leaving at the high tide. This requires a short visit or a tide-long visit. For this reason it is hard to loot. Second is that the island does not sit very high topographically, which impedes residential or industrial development of the island. This site represents the most intact of all of the shell rings on the coast of South Carolina.

Although a number of researchers have visited Daw's Island, the archaeological potential is yet to be fully understood (Brockington 1971; Michie 1974, 1976; Lawrence and Wrightson 1989). The information available to date suggests a complete Indian sequence, from Paleoindian through Woodland times.

**Paleoindian Period 11,500-9,900 B.P.** The paleoindian occupation of Daw's Island is represented at 38BU14, located on the eastern portion of the island. At this site a complete assemblage of projectile point types, extending from Paleoindian to Savannah River are found. The best points in the area are found on this site (Senator James M. Waddell, personal communication 1991).

**Archaic Period 9,900-3,000 B.P.** The entire Archaic period is well represented on Daw's Island particularly at 38BU14, located on the eastern portion of the island. At this site a complete assemblage of Archaic point types can be found at this site. The Late Archaic/Early Woodland shell rings are discussed above. Fiber-tempered ceramics are present at 8 sites on Daw's Island. This type of ceramic is the first produced by aboriginal hands in North America. There are two shell midden sites on the island 38BU9 and 38BU108 that contain fiber-tempered ceramics.

**Woodland Period 3,000-1,200 B.P.** There are six sites classified as Woodland by archaeologists on Daw's Island. One of these, 38BU325, is a multi-component site that includes a mixture of Archaic and Woodland materials. 38BU320 is believed to be a habitation site containing a rather large Wilming­ton/Cape Fear shell midden.

The Daw's Island Shell Rings were ranked by James L. Michie who gave them a total of 260 points. Michie states:

Daw's Island Shell Rings are unique because they have not been vandalized, but suffer destruction through continued erosion and future development. As real estate values increase along the coast the island will be developed!

**Fig Island Shell Ring (38CH42)**

The Fig Island Shell Ring is located in Charleston County, north of Edisto Island (Figure 5). Three separate shell features are present at this site. This site was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1970. E. Thomas Hemmings of the Institute of Archaeology excavated at this site in July and August of 1970. This site had been recorded during a coastal survey aimed specifically at locating "shell rings." In all, 18 were located and subsequently 9 were nominated to the NRHP. The site was excavated in the 1970s and good organic preservation was noted.

This site was rated by Judge who gave it a score of 325 points. He states:

This site is a large, well-preserved shell ring. Testing in the 1970s indicates the excellent preservation of organic remains. Vandalism does not appear to be high, but the potential is always there. Visibly an excellent site for public education, as well as an excellent site for research.

**Auld Shell Ring (38CH41)**

The Auld Shell Ring (38CH41) is located in Charleston County (Gregorie 1925). This site is also referred to in archaeological literature as the Yough Hall Plantation Shell Ring. Auld Shell Ring was mapped by Hemmings and Waddell in 1970. The average diameter of the ring is approximately 174 feet with a maximum diameter of 184 feet. Oyster shell collected by Antonio J. Waring in 1960 was dated to 1820±130 B.C. (Crane and Griffin 1964). The integrity of this site is said to be excellent (Lawrence 1989b:18). The site based on the analysis of its ceramics by Anderson, is placed in the Awendaw series. The Awendaw ceramic series is thought to be a variant of Thom's Creek phase ceramics (Trinkley 1976). Dr. Linda France Stine rated this site, giving it a total of 251 points.

**Buzzard's Island Shell Ring (38CH23)**

This shell ring is located in Charleston County, South Carolina. The diameter of the ring averages 178 feet with a maximum diameter of 202 feet. The cultural affiliation for the site,
based on ceramic data, is the Stallings Island, Awendaw, and Thom's Creek phases. The site first enters the archaeological literature in 1925 when Laura Bragg reported on the archaeology of the site in notes of the Charleston Museum (Bragg 1925). This shell ring was rated by Mr. Lee Tippett who gave it a score of 310 points. Mr. Tippett states, "This site represents an ecological and cultural time capsule of tremendous value."

Sewee Shell Ring (38CH45)

The Sewee Shell Ring (38BU45) is located in Charleston County within the Francis Marion National Forest. It is on an elongated mudflat adjacent to a small tidal creek. This ring is not a complete circle due to historic period shell removal. About half of the southeastern portion has been removed by erosion while the northwest quarter has been borrowed for road fill (Hemmings 1979d). In 1965, Dr. William Edwards reported on his excavations at this site (Edwards 1965). Edwards recovered approximately 10,000 pottery sherds, the majority of which fall in the Awendaw Ceramic Series (Trinkley 1976). Lawrence's research indicates that approximately half of the site is intact. During the Heritage Trust visit in late 1990, evidence of recent vandalism was obvious. Dr. David Lawrence rated this site and gave it 326 points.

Chesterfield Shell Ring (38BU29)

The Chesterfield Shell Ring was visited on October 22, 1990 by Chris Judge and Jim Errante. The ring is located in Beaufort County, along the Broad River. Chesterfield was the first ring studied professionally in South Carolina. In 1932 Woldemer Ritter excavated here and in 1933 Warren K. Moorehead conducted a study. Moorehead's research was written up after his death by Regina Flannery (1943).

At the time of this early work, investigators noted erosion, particularly along the western edge of the ring. Even in the 1990's erosion is still wreaking havoc on this site, as is development. A private residence was built directly adjacent to the east side of the ring, and unfortunately support posts for a deck added after initial house construction penetrate into the ring feature. The landowner is currently considering building a pool in the middle of the feature. This site was rated by Judge who gave it a score of 250 points. He states:

The integrity of the site has been severely compromised by both natural and cultural processes. The river has taken a large portion of the western side of this feature. The eastern side has been impacted by deck construction on the owner's home. He is currently planning a pool in the interior of
the ring. Not a good choice for protection by Heritage Trust, with other better examples existing.

Sea Pines Shell Ring (38BU7)

The Sea Pines Shell Ring is located on Sea Pines Plantation residential community on Hilton Head Island, South Carolina (Calmes 1967). This shell ring was first investigated when Alan Calmes placed a five foot square into the site in 1967. This ring is now an attraction within the Sea Pines Forest Preserve, and is maintained by staff of Sea Pines. Tours are led to the site on Sundays, when some 100 or so people have been known to go to the "Indian Sites." The staff have also prepared a brochure entitled "Sea Pines Forest Preserve Indian Shell Ring." This brochure explains the what, why, where, when and who. While the brochure indicates the site is undamaged, numerous potholes were evident during the Heritage Trust site visit. This site was rated by Judge who visited the site in 1990. Judge gave the site 250 points.

Ford's Skull Creek Shell Ring (38BU8)

Ford's Skull Creek Shell Ring is in close proximity to the Green's Shell Enclosure Heritage Preserve. This site consists of two superimposed rings (Trinkley 1985:105) which lie approximately 150 feet from Skull Creek, on bluff land several feet above high tide (Calmes 1967:7). Calmes called this site donut shaped. The site was almost entirely destroyed for road fill in the 1930's (Calmes 1967:7). Dr. David Lawrence rated this site and gave it 328 points stating, "The time to protect this locality is now!"

Lighthouse Point (38CH12)

The Lighthouse Point shell ring site is located on James Island in Charleston County, South Carolina. It was first described by John Drayton at the turn of the 18th century as:

It is of a circular form measuring around two hundred and forty paces. Its width at the top is ten paces; and at its base from sixteen to twenty; and its height is from eight to ten feet (Drayton 1802:56-57).

This site has a documented history of disturbance beginning with Drayton's notation that shells from this site were burned to make lime for St. Michaels Church in Charleston. In 1960 shell from the ring was used for road fill and in 1975 the remaining portion of the ring was bulldozed into the central area of the feature (Drayton 1802; Trinkley 1975:2).

Following the destruction of the site in 1975 the Research Laboratories of Anthropology, at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill conducted an excavation which recovered 12,000 artifacts (Trinkley 1975:3) Included were lithics, pottery, shell, bone pins, and antler artifacts (socketed antler tine and beams). Faunal remains indicated that subsistence included deer, raccoon, opossum, mink, rabbit, fox, squirrel, bird, turtle and fish. The final category included 13 types of shellfish.

In his report of the 1975 excavations, Trinkley indicated that although the site had been disturbed, it is located on high ground, and therefore high water levels have yet to impact the site. In his assessment of the site, Trinkley gave it 301 points, stating:

The single greatest weakness in Lighthouse point is the category of "heritage," which by definition, has only limited applicability to prehistoric sites. Next in concern is disturbance—which is heavy at this site. Regardless, previous archaeological work has documented the site's ability to contribute significantly to research questions. Further, disturbance is limited to site "movement" with the basal levels exhibiting a high degree of integrity.

The site was also rated by David Lawrence who gave the site 252 points. Lawrence included the following thoughts with his rating:

Interpretive value is low because of surface (not subsurface) disturbances. Threat is low because the damage has already been done. Despite low points, someone should offer to take this property from the homeowner's association.

Stratton Place (38CH24)

The Stratton Place shell ring is located in Charleston County. The site is one of the sites that is to be nominated to the National Register of Historic Places following Lawrence's research on South Carolina Shell Ring sites (Lawrence 1989b:11). The site was collected in the early part of this century by the site owners who donated their collections to the Charleston Museum (Lindsay 1970). Anderson's (1975a) analysis of ceramics indicates that the assemblage
recovered from this site is within the Awendaw type, a regional variant of the Thom' Creek ceramic series. The site was excavated by Trinkle (1980). This site was ranked by Judge who gave it a score of 320 points.

**Conclusion**

It is important that the Heritage Trust take the lead in the preservation of these shell ring archaeological resources, even though all are listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Shell Ring sites as a whole are threatened for a number of reasons. First they occur along the coast which continues to develop rapidly. Secondly, their location adjacent to tidal creeks exposes them to the erosional processes associated with tide dynamics and weather. Lawrence states the shell ring dilemma in the following manner:

The rings have not fared well in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Natural geologic processes, shell borrowing for construction and use in lime kilns, and developmental pressures along the Southeastern coast have all contributed to information losses at many sites. These losses are significant because the rings are not numerous (about 20 are known in S.C.) and we still understand little about the role of those features in aboriginal culture. Clearly, these sites deserve our increased awareness, study and view towards preservation. (Lawrence 1989a:i, part 3).

To Lawrence's list we would add site looting as a significant contributor of information loss at the shell ring sites. Of particular interest to pothunters are the engraved bone pins and soapstone disks sometimes found at these sites. Careful preservation management would be required to ensure these architectural features survive, even if the Heritage Trust takes one or more of them into its trust. Site management plans will need to address site stabilization as well as protection.

**SOUTH APPALACHIAN MISSISSIPPIAN MOUNDS**

Nine South Appalachian Mississippian mound sites are included on the Heritage Trust 100 list (Table 9).

**Lawton Mounds (38AL11)**

The Heritage Trust Project 1990/1991 was unable to visit this important South Appalachian Mississippian site. However, a group of archaeologists from the SCIAA along with Mr. Stuart Greeter, Land Acquisition Coordinator for the South Carolina Heritage Trust, visited this site in 1989. A member of this visit was Dr. David G. Anderson, currently with Interagency Archaeological Services, National Park Service Atlanta. He rated the site with a score of 345 points. In his doctoral dissertation, Anderson (1990) had the following to say about this site:

The only major Mississippian center currently identified in the lower Coastal Plain portion of the Savannah is the Lawton Mound Group (38AL11), located in western Allendale County, South Carolina. Located on a terrace in a dense hardwood swamp forest overlooking the river swamp, the site covers approximately three-and-a-half acres and includes two flat-topped platform mounds and an associated village area surrounded by a fortification ditch and embankment. Analysis of collections indicates it was occupied for about two centuries from ca. A.D. 1150 to 1350, during the Savannah and Hollywood phases. Lawton has seen limited archaeological examination, first in 1898 by C.B. Moore (1898), and again in 1970 and 1989 by archaeologists from the SCIAA (Anderson n.d.). Moore directed his 1898 effort to the north mound and, finding no burials, elaborate artifacts, or evidence for construction stages in the fill, soon abandoned work. In 1970 SCIAA archaeologists prepared a map of the site, cleaned up and profiled several potholes, and made a small artifact collection. Except for a brief reconnaissance in 1989, the site has seen no other professional investigation. The 1970 and 1989 investigations indicate the mounds were built in stages, and evidence for a wattle-and-daub structure was noted in the upper part of the south mound. Extensive midden debris was observed in the area around the mounds, indicating the area saw considerable use, and that domestic structures might be present.

**Adamson Mounds (38KE11)**

The Adamson Mounds site (38KE11) is located along the Wateree River near Camden, South Carolina. First recorded by Blanding (1848) the site has been visited by many archaeologists, but only a limited amount of investigation has taken place at this mound (Fohl 1944; Stuart 1975; DePrater 1983; DePrater and Judge 1990; Judge 1991). The large mound at this site is relatively intact, while the smaller mound has been almost completely removed by
Table 9. South Appalachian Mississippian Mound Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38CR1</td>
<td>Santee Mound</td>
<td>Barker</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38AL11</td>
<td>Lawton Mounds</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38KE12</td>
<td>Mulberry Mounds</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CR1</td>
<td>Santee Mound</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38KE11</td>
<td>Adamson Mound</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38KE06</td>
<td>Belmont Neck Mound</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CS2</td>
<td>McCollum Mound</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU23</td>
<td>Little Barnwell Island Mound</td>
<td>not rated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38FA48</td>
<td>Blair Mound</td>
<td>not rated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

either vandals or antiquarians (see Fohl 1944:14-15).

The site is believed to date from approximately A.D. 1250-1300 based on analysis of ceramics (DePratter and Judge 1990:56-57). This assessment is based on controlled surface collections and limited subsurface testing at this site in 1985 (DePratter 1985; DePratter and Judge 1990; Judge 1991). This site was rated by Judge who gave it a score of 340 points:

Adamson Mound is a rare and significant site. Most mounds in South Carolina have been heavily disturbed, with the exception of Lawton and until recently Santee Mound. This site would make an excellent Heritage Preserve because of its visibility and interpretability, not to mention its high research potential. The connections to European exploration in the 16th century also warrant its consideration as a Heritage Preserve.

Mulberry Mounds (38KE12)

This site is located along the Wateree River just south of Camden, South Carolina. Research by ethnohistorians indicates that the site was quite possibly the center of the Province of Cofitachequi, a chiefdom level society visited by Spanish Explorers Hernando de Soto in May of A.D. 1540, and again in the 1566-1568 explorations of Juan Pardo from the Spanish Capital of Florida-Santa Elena (DePratter et al 1983; Hudson et al 1984; Hudson 1990). The first archaeological research was conducted at this site in 1894 when Henry Reynolds of the Smithsonian Institution trenched in both Mounds A and B (Thomas 1894:326-327). In the summer of 1952, the University of Georgia and the Charleston Museum conducted a joint project at Mulberry under the direction of A.R. Kelly (Ferguson 1974). Beginning in 1979 and continuing through 1982 and again in 1985 and 1990 the Department of Anthropology at the University of South Carolina has conducted a fieldschool with a long term research design (Ferguson and Green 1984). Five M.A. theses have been written on the investigations at Mulberry (Merry 1982; Smith 1982; Sutton 1984; Grimes 1986; Judge 1987). This site was also rated by Judge who gave it a score of 345 points.

The Mulberry site is the most investigated Mississippian site in the Wateree Valley. Yet still, we have only scratched the surface of this large, deeply buried, significant site. Like other sites in the vicinity of Camden (i.e. Ferry Landing and Adamson) it has been collected quite heavily for many years. However, the site still is eligible for inclusion in the Heritage Trust 100. Ethnohistorical research indicates that this site was the paramount village of the chiefdom of Cofitachequi, associated with Spanish exploration in the interior and the Coastal settlement of Santa Elena.

Santee/Scott's Lake Indian Mound and Fort Watson (38CR1)

The Native American occupation of this site is dealt with in Appendix I of Leland Ferguson's 1975 report while the majority of the report deals mainly with the Fort Watson era occupation (1975). Both mounds at this site were tested, with more emphasis towards Mound A because of the British military occupation of the mound summit in 1781.

Archaeological investigations by Ferguson included both excavation and surface collection. Two structures were identified, one on the summit of mound A and another to the northeast of mound A. The mound A structure was somewhat disturbed by the subsequent British occupation, however it manifested itself in the form of daub concentrations, postholes, and
artifacts (Ferguson 1975:83-84). Artifacts recovered from this site included thousands of pottery sherds, clay pipes, beaver incisors, pottery beads, triangular points, shell, bone, and a number of sherd and stone abraders. Because these abraders were found in a statistically significant association with conch shell fragments, they were interpreted as shell working tools (Ferguson 1975:89-90). A human burial was also uncovered on the summit of mound A.

As DePratter has noticed, the Scott's Lake mound was abandoned shortly after A.D. 1450 when a "dramatic series of changes occurred in the distribution of centers with mounds" (DePratter 1989:141). Following these changes, the Wateree Valley was heavily occupied, the Savannah, Broad, and Saluda River Valleys were virtually abandoned, and the Oconee River was heavily occupied prompting DePratter to suggest population movements east of the Savannah to the chiefdom of Cofitachequi and west of the Savannah to the chiefdom of Ocute on the Oconee River (DePratter 1989:141; and Figure 7.3:A).

The Santee Indian mound was ranked by two different archaeologists. Mr. Donnie Barker, archaeologist with the South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism, who manage the site, gave the site a score of 365, while Dr. David G. Anderson rated the site as 340 points. Dr. Leland Ferguson had the following to say about this site:

One of the most important facts is that the site has hardly been disturbed. Most archaeological sites in the Southeastern United States have suffered from plowing, wind and water erosion, or the effects of relic hunters. Scott's Lake has never been plowed, there is little evidence of natural erosion, and there is minimal destruction by relic hunters. Apparently, the only significant damage has been rendered by wave action along the shores of Lake Marion.

The unusual preservation means that the zones of Indian and British occupation are much the same today as they were when they were deposited hundreds of years ago: a most perfect situation for archaeological research. The site is well preserved and fortunately it is under the protection of the state of South Carolina and the United States Department of the Interior (Ferguson 1975:8).

The state of South Carolina's involvement in this site stems from the fact that the S.C. Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism leases the site from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Recently the site was damaged by unmonitored logging of the site in the aftermath of Hurricane Hugo (Anderson 1990b). S.C. Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are taking steps to rectify that situation.

**Belmont Neck Mound (38KE06)**

The Belmont Neck Mound is located along the Wateree River below Camden, South Carolina. This site was first recorded by Blanding in 1848, who records a 15 foot high mound at the site. While other scholars have written about this site (Stuart 1970, 1975) the first actual archaeological research was conducted at this site in 1985 when DePratter and Judge made systematic surface collections at the site. In 1990 the Heritage Trust conducted an instrument-mapping program at the site. Based on surface-collected materials, DePratter and Judge have indicated that this site represents the earliest known South Appalachian Mississippian occupation of a mound site in the Wateree Valley. This site more than likely dates to a period approximately A.D. 1200-1250. The mound has suffered considerably from plowing, but alluvial deposits are thought to bury the surrounding area (potential village). This site was ranked by Judge who gave it a score of 330 points.

This site represents a rare opportunity to look at developing Mississippian chiefdoms in the Wateree Valley. To my knowledge vandalism at this site is much lower than at other similar sites in the vicinity.

**McCollum Mound Site (38CS52)**

The McCollum Mound site is located along the Broad River in Chester County near Lockhart. This site was first tested by Edward Palmer of the Bureau of American Ethnology in 1884. One mound is present at the site and investigations by the Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology in 1971 under the direction of Thomas M. Ryan indicated an associated village of several acres (Ryan 1971:107). Ryan's research documented a largely undisturbed, buried midden in the over 500 square feet of excavations (Anderson 1989:109). Ceramics recovered from this site are classified as predominantly Pisgah. Another well-represented ceramic type was an oval, complicated stamped design that Ryan compared as being similar to Pee Dee
Complicated stamp (Reid 1967). Small quantities of Savannah Check Stamped, Savannah Fine Cord Marked, and Savannah Burnished Plain were also recovered in Ryan’s excavations. These ceramic types are all types that were no longer made by A.D. 1450, when DePratter hypothesizes that the Broad River was abandoned by human groups (1989:141). A burial of a child with a string of shell beads around its neck was excavated from an oval pit (Ryan 1971:106). This site was ranked by Judge who gave it a score of 305 points stating:

This site is the only known mound (with the possible exception of Blair) to exist in the Piedmont region of South Carolina. The site has aspects of Pee Dee, Lamar, and Pisgah, and therefore can help provide information to understanding the connections between these similar cultures.

**Blair Mound (38FA48)**

The Blair Mound is located on a low terrace along the Broad River. While the primary occupation of the site is within the South Appalachian Mississippian period, Archaic period remains were also revealed. A structure made of wattle and daub was built and later burned here about A.D. 1300. One hundred and twenty-six square meters of excavation were opened by George Teague in the late 1970’s. Nearly 6,000 artifacts were recovered, most of which were ceramic sherds. They are thought to be associated with the Etowah-Lamar and Irene Complexes, when looking at design elements and like Pisah and Pee Dee in terms of technology and style. Other artifact classes recovered include stone, bone, antler. The site was probably abandoned by A.D. 1450 (Teague n.d.). The present condition of this site is unknown and it therefore was not rated.

**Little Barnwell Island Mound (38BU23)**

This site is located on a small island in a river near Beaufort, South Carolina. This site was first investigated by C.B. Moore who reported on this work in 1903. Hemmings and Ryan visited the site in 1971 and made some surface collections. The site is believed to date to the Savannah-Irene phase of the South Appalachian Mississippian period. The mound is an earthen and shell structure approximately 20 feet high, with the eastern edge eroding to some extent. It is elliptical, 150 feet north/south by 100 feet east/west. The site was nominated to the NRHP in 1973 based on the unique architectural feature observed by Moore. Excellent preservation was reported for the daub walls of a structure in the mound. The current condition of this site is unknown, although the 1990 Heritage Trust site survey made a short unsuccessful visit to the island to see this mound.

**HISTORIC AND MODERN NATIVE AMERICAN POPULATIONS**

The 1980 census listed 5,000 and the 1990 census listed 8,246 Native Americans residing in South Carolina. Native Americans lived in South Carolina for nearly 12,000 years before any European visitor set foot on the shores of Chicora. Yet the history of these native peoples is not taught in schools and is not elaborated upon in most textbooks. It is through archaeology and ethnohistory that anthropologists are reconstructing indigenous lifeways and cultural processes, and thus writing a history for those who were disenfranchised, enslaved, and oppressed.

Currently there are four organized groups of Native Americans residing in South Carolina, the Catawba, Pee Dee, Santee, and Edisto. At the time of contact by Europeans there are said to have been as many as 40-50 tribes (Chester B. DePratter, personal communication 1991). Many other groups who once inhabited our state long ago amalgamated with the Catawba, and other tribes outside of the Carolinas. They are more likely to be remembered only when we think of certain towns, streets and rivers that are named for the groups that once lived in their vicinity. Towns such as Tomasee and Yemassee, rivers such as the Santee, Wateree, Saluda, and islands called Edisto and Kiawah.

The Catawba Indians who until this day still have a reservation in York County, South Carolina are a resilient group and represent what is left of many different groups prior to European contact and disruption. Historical documentation reports that many once powerful and independent groups joined with the Catawba, particularly in the 18th century after the Yemassee War. Conflict with whites and the diseases they brought had greatly reduced the indigenous populations causing these mergers, which in essence enabled their ultimate survival into the 20th century.

With the exception of the Cherokee, archaeological research aimed at Historic Period Native Americans in South Carolina is in its
infancy. However, in the summer of 1991 archaeological projects were conducted on the Cherokee, Yamasee, and the Catawba. One of the more interesting research questions being asked is what are the effects of acculturation by European contact with Native groups. A number of these sites was nominated to the Heritage Trust program (Table 10).

Catawba Towns

Cheraw Town (38LA126). This is a Catawba Indian Town in Lancaster County, South Carolina. The Cheraw merged with the Catawba sometime after the Yemassee War of 1715 (Addair 1775:235-6). The site was plotted by Steve Baker on the modern landscape based on historical research and using the Glenn Map (Baker 1975). The site was collected and recorded by Fred Fischer, however, the location of his collections is unknown. Shovel testing by the Heritage Trust project in December of 1990 indicated sub-plowzone features with good organic preservation. More research is needed. This site was rated by Judge who gave it a score of 290 points, and states:

The Cheraw are extremely well documented from the 16th to the 18th century in historical records. Archaeology of the Sara in North Carolina has been conducted by the Research Laboratories of Anthropology. This site has great potential to contribute to our understanding of Native American culture change due to European contact.

Spratt's Bottom Site (38YK3). This is another of the sites that was plotted by Steven Baker from the 1740s documentation and the Glenn map. This site has seen sporadic visitations by archaeologists, however, no written report exists. Janet Harris, a graduate student in the Department of Anthropology at the University of South Carolina, test excavated the site some years ago and then moved out of state with the artifacts. No report has ever been written and her thesis is not yet complete.

This summer a joint project of the Schiele Museum of Natural History, the Museum of York County, and the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, was conducted at Spratt's Bottom. This fieldschool project revealed that a portion of the site is undisturbed, and that cultural features indeed may be intact. This research indicates that the site is multi-component in nature with Middle and Late Woodland as well as historic components. A fair number of trade beads were recovered along with kaolin pipe stem fragments. This site is in close proximity to historically documented Native American trails (J. Alan May, personal communication 1991). This site was rated by Dr. J. Alan May who gave it a score of 280 points.

Weyanne (38YK148). This site was plotted by Steven Baker on modern United States Geological Survey maps from historical documentation and the Glenn Map. Fred Fischer recorded the site in the South Carolina State site files. Limited testing by the Heritage Trust project in 1990 was inconclusive as to whether this was indeed an 18th century historic Indian town. The site, therefore, was not rated.

Cherokee Towns

Tomassee (38OC186). Tomassee (38OC186) is an 18th century Cherokee Indian Town in Oconee County, South Carolina. Tomassee and Chattooga (see below) are known, with other sites in South Carolina, as the Lower Towns. Although some of the Lower Towns have been investigated, very little appears in the written literature (Smith et al 1988; Beuschel 1976; Harmon 1986; Kelly and De Baillou 1968; Kelly and Nietzel 1961; Schroedl and Riggs 1989,1990).

Table 10. Historic Native American Towns Ranking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38BU1206</td>
<td>Altamaha</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38OC18</td>
<td>Chattooga Town</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38LA126</td>
<td>Cheraw Town</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38YK3</td>
<td>Spratt's Bottom</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38OC186</td>
<td>Weyanne</td>
<td>DePratter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38YK148</td>
<td>Tomassee</td>
<td>not rated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Catawba Towns

Cheraw Town (38LA126). This is a Catawba Indian Town in Lancaster County, South Carolina. The Cheraw merged with the Catawba sometime after the Yemassee War of 1715 (Addair 1775:235-6). The site was plotted by Steve Baker on the modern landscape based on historical research and using the Glenn Map (Baker 1975). The site was collected and recorded by Fred Fischer, however, the location of his collections is unknown. Shovel testing by the Heritage Trust project in December of 1990 indicated sub-plowzone features with good organic preservation. More research is needed. This site was rated by Judge who gave it a score of 290 points, and states:

The Cheraw are extremely well documented from the 16th to the 18th century in historical records. Archaeology of the Sara in North Carolina has been conducted by the Research Laboratories of Anthropology. This site has great potential to contribute to our understanding of Native American culture change due to European contact.

Spratt's Bottom Site (38YK3). This is another of the sites that was plotted by Steven Baker from the 1740s documentation and the Glenn map. This site has seen sporadic visitations by archaeologists, however, no written report exists. Janet Harris, a graduate student in the Department of Anthropology at the University of South Carolina, test excavated the site some years ago and then moved out of state with the artifacts. No report has ever been written and her thesis is not yet complete.

This summer a joint project of the Schiele Museum of Natural History, the Museum of York County, and the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, was conducted at Spratt's Bottom. This fieldschool project revealed that a portion of the site is undisturbed, and that cultural features indeed may be intact. This research indicates that the site is multi-component in nature with Middle and Late Woodland as well as historic components. A fair number of trade beads were recovered along with kaolin pipe stem fragments. This site is in close proximity to historically documented Native American trails (J. Alan May, personal communication 1991). This site was rated by Dr. J. Alan May who gave it a score of 280 points.

Weyanne (38YK148). This site was plotted by Steven Baker on modern United States Geological Survey maps from historical documentation and the Glenn Map. Fred Fischer recorded the site in the South Carolina State site files. Limited testing by the Heritage Trust project in 1990 was inconclusive as to whether this was indeed an 18th century historic Indian town. The site, therefore, was not rated.

Cherokee Towns

Tomassee (38OC186). Tomassee (38OC186) is an 18th century Cherokee Indian Town in Oconee County, South Carolina. Tomassee and Chattooga (see below) are known, with other sites in South Carolina, as the Lower Towns. Although some of the Lower Towns have been investigated, very little appears in the written literature (Smith et al 1988; Beuschel 1976; Harmon 1986; Kelly and De Baillou 1968; Kelly and Nietzel 1961; Schroedl and Riggs 1989,1990).
Using 18th century maps, Marshall "Woody" Williams located Tomasssee on the modern landscape along with the other lower towns in Oconee County (Smith et al 1988:3). In 1984 Dan Elliott recorded the site in the state site files. Late in 1984 the site was deep plowed with feature fill soils appearing at the surface. Subsequently, the site was systematically looted.

The LAMAR Institute, a non-profit, tax exempt organization that conducts archaeological research and public education, and the SCIAA fielded an eight day joint effort to salvage the site and assess the damage. While the vandalism was high, some subsurface integrity is preserved. Features were found from both the Cherokee and earlier Conestee occupation of the site. Dr. Chester B. DePratter rated this site and gave it a score of 277 points stating:

This is a fairly well-preserved 18th century Cherokee town. It has suffered some damage through vandalism and deep plowing. Features are abundant and easily "read."

Chattooga Town (38OC18). Chattooga Town is located in Oconee County, South Carolina. This site is a late 17th/early 18th century lower Cherokee site in the Sumter National Forest (Myster et al. 1989:1). Due to its small population and remote location, historical documentation of the site is limited. Only 90 individuals resided at Chattooga, the smallest of the lower towns. (Schroedl and Riggs 1990:2). It was abandoned in the 1740's or 1750's.

In early 1984, Dan Elliott surface collected and conducted limited testing of the site. Archaic, Woodland, and Cherokee material assemblages were identified (Elliott 1984b). Beginning in 1989, the Department of Anthropology at the University of Tennessee and the United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service entered a cooperative program to conduct archaeological investigations at the site (Schroedl and Riggs 1989). This project was designed as a multi-year program including controlled surface collection, test pits, magnetometer, and soil chemistry studies (Schroedl and Riggs 1989:1). This program of less invasive, less destructive techniques minimally damages the subsurface integrity and permits careful selection of subsurface units. The overall goal is to locate and interpret patterns of site occupation in order to develop a comparative database to interpret the lower towns (Schroedl and Riggs 1989:2). The 1990 investigations uncovered approximately 20% of a council or town house which was more than likely destroyed by fire. (Schroedl and Riggs 1989:6). This site was ranked by Judge who gave it a score of 315 points stating:

Based on the University of Tennessee's excavations over the past three summers, this site ranks very high as one of the best researched historic Native American Towns in South Carolina. The Council House revealed here is of great importance to our understanding of public architecture and ceremony.

Yamasee Town

Altamaha (38BU1206). According to Swanton (1946:208) Francisco de Chicora a Native American who was picked up by the Allyon expedition in 1521, told of a province in the coastal area of South Carolina called Yamisscaron. By the latter part of the 17th century the Yamasee were living among the Apalachee of Florida and among the Spanish missions of Coastal Georgia. During the winter of 1684/85, offended by the Governor of Florida, they came to live on the westside of the mouth of the Savannah River, on lands given to them by the English colonists. At this time the Yamasee are said to have been made up of two sections of five towns each (Upper and Lower). The upper was headed by the town of Pocotaligo and the lower by Althamaha (Swanton 1946:209). By 1708, 500 Yamasee warriors were reported, and the census of 1715 listed 413 warriors with a total population of 1,215. In 1715 sparked by abuses by white traders, the Yamasee headed what became known to history as the Yamasee War. This rebellion was halted by Governor Craven and the Yamasee fled to St. Augustine, Florida.

The Altamaha site was rated by William Green who is excavating the site as part of M.A. thesis research. This site received a score of 319 points. Green states in his evaluation and ranking of the site:

The Altamaha site (38BU1206) was the main town of the lower Yamasee; a group that occupied the Port Royal area of South Carolina from 1684-1715, and whose origins can be traced back to the 16th century central Georgia Chiefdom of Altamaha/Ocute. The site's greatest strength is its research potential. Information obtained from this site will have a direct bearing on our interpretation of the effects of European contact on
Native Americans. Additionally, questions concerning acculturation, migration, lifeways of late 17th/early 18th century Native Americans, and chronology, can all be addressed using data obtained from this site.

Presently, the land on which this site is located is owned by a real estate consortium which leases the property to a timber company for timbering activities. This activity will eventually destroy the site’s integrity. Also, being located on a prime piece of real estate in Beaufort County, one of South Carolina’s most rapidly developing areas, puts this site in imminent danger of future construction and development.

In sum, this is a unique site with tremendous research potential. Its destruction would leave a large void in our knowledge of protohistoric/historic Native Americans in the Southeast, and its loss would be tragic.

AFRICAN-AMERICAN SITES

According to one African-American scholar, Charles Joyner, we are only just beginning our studies of African-Americans during slavery times. While a number of historical works have appeared in the literature in the last two decades (Genovese 1974; Wood 1974; Blassingame 1979; Littlefield 1981; Joyner 1984; Rosengarten 1986), the archaeology of African-Americans during the slavery period in South Carolina is scattered in numerous chapters, contract reports, professional papers and Master theses, and as yet no synthesis of these works has appeared (Drucker and Anthony 1979; Wheaton et al 1983; Ferguson 1980, 1985a, 1985b; Ferguson and Babson 1986; Ferguson et al 1989; Adams 1990, Affleck 1990; Connor 1989; Errante n.d.).

Nine African-American sites are included in the Heritage Trust 100 list (Table 11).

**Penn Center: An Integral Feature of the “Port Royal Experiment”**

The Penn Center, the first school in the South for the newly freed African-American peoples, which was founded by Quakers after the Union forces overtook Port Royal Sound, is not recorded in the South Carolina State Archaeological Site Files. Perhaps this is because no archaeology has ever been conducted at this extremely important African-American educational center. Perhaps it is because the school is still occupied and run as an entity here in the late 20th century, and therefore archaeology has not seemed necessary, yet. Regardless, this is an important feature in the critically significant site list being developed here because it received the highest rating of any of the 100 sites, and it also received a perfect score of 400 points. The National Trust for Historic Preservation has listed the 19 buildings on 50 acres of land on St. Helena Island, near Frogmore, South Carolina, as one of the 11 most endangered historic sites in the United States (Schneider 1991:22). The school was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1974 as an historic district.

At the time of the Union invasion of the Port Royal Sound and vicinity, there is said to have been as many as 10,000 slaves on St. Helena Island. Elaine Nichols rated this site; bestowing 400 points in her evaluation. She states:

Penn Center is a unique cultural facility that played a major role in the life and history of Sea Island Blacks. It was established as a public school for freed slaves in the early years of the Civil War. Almost one hundred years later, Penn Center was a critical meeting place for Civil Rights leaders like Martin Luther King, Jr.

Penn Center is currently at risk of being consumed by development. That region of the Low Country has become a prime target for real estate development for resorts. Faced with a dire choice of survival or development, the center has of necessity chosen survival over growth. The structures, mostly post Civil War and early 20th century have been neglected as a result of the financial crisis.

The integrity of the site has been maintained. There has been very little disturbance of the site from natural or cultural processes. A number of schools for African-Americans were started after the Civil War, Penn Center was the first. Studies on this institution as well as similar institutions can provide comparisons and contrasts for schools designed to teach Blacks academic and vocational skills. There is potential for regional comparison of education, social, and economic institutions that developed in the South as a means of helping African-Americans adjust to changes in status.

The site has a number of period buildings that can be used to interpret the archaeological data. In addition to archaeological data, there is a large body of historical research that can supplement the archaeological data. Penn Center has established a museum and archives for
collection and interpretation of artifacts related to the St. Helena Gullah culture.

In 1988, Penn Center director Emory Campbell began a campaign to raise $3.2 million dollars to remodel the buildings and start a Penn Center endowment. As of May 1991, he had raised only $130,000. South Carolina Democrat, Senator Ernest "Fritz" Hollings, pledged to acquire $1 million in Federal grants (Schneider 1991:22). Recently those funds were approved, by vote of a Congressional panel (The State, July 26, 1991).

Mitchelville (38BU805)

Mitchelville is one archaeological component of the Fish Haul site (38BU805) located on Hilton Head Island, Beaufort County, South Carolina (Trinkley et al 1986). Mitchelville was a Freedmen's village made up predominantly of sea island blacks, which was occupied from 1862-1880, as part of the "Port Royal Experiment." This experiment was a plan by philanthropic northerners to assist newly freed slaves in their education, welfare and employment. The greatest importance of this site is that archaeological research by the Chicora Foundation has revealed otherwise neglected aspects of the transition from slavery to freedom including data on social status, wealth, and lifeways.

Twenty thousand Union troops arrived in the Port Royal Sound area in November of 1861, and on November 7th they began attacking the Confederate army at Fort Walker on Hilton Head Island. After the Confederates retreated, the Union army took and occupied Hilton Head Island for the remainder of the War. Within two days of the attack, newly freed African-Americans began arriving at the outpost to escape their masters and to seek protection. To this end, General Sherman made repeated requests to the Lincoln Administration to assist in dealing with what became known as "contraband negroes." Housing these peoples was an immediate problem which was solved when the army set up camps as holding areas, until other places and jobs could be worked out. By 1864 the U.S. Treasury Department called such camps "Freedmen's Home Colonies." On Hilton Head Island these colonies or "barracks" were protected by a guard (Moore 1866:313; Trinkley et al 1986:76-77).

In October 1862 this approach was deemed unsuitable because of overcrowded conditions and the army created a second housing scenario. Mitchelville was built at least by March 1863 although it had not yet been named (Anon. 1863:309-310) and it may have been laid out by military order. According to Reid (1866) Mitchelville was set up as a Freedmen's village, divided into districts for the election of councilmen, sanitary and police regulations, and government. By 1863, Norduff reported 100 houses at Mitchelville (Norduff 1863:11).

In 1986, the Chicora Foundation was funded by the Environmental and Historical Museum of Hilton Head Island and site owner Mr. Louis Jaffe, to conduct archaeological investigations at this site. While there is a fair amount of historical research in print concerning the transition from slavery to freedom, Chicora's research is the first attempt to conduct archaeology in association with historical research on this topic in South Carolina.

Dr. Michael B. Trinkley, President of the Chicora Foundation ranked the Mitchelville/Fish Haul site and gave it 375 points. Dr. Trinkley had the following to say:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38BU1110</td>
<td>Penn Center</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU805</td>
<td>Mitchelville</td>
<td>Trinkley</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH900</td>
<td>Scanlonville</td>
<td>Drucker</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Benedict College</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BK38</td>
<td>Middleburg</td>
<td>L. Ferguson</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Matilda Evans Clinic</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Dubois-Copes-Wannamaker</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Allen University</td>
<td>Nichols</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH679</td>
<td>McLeod</td>
<td>Zierden</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. African-American Site Ranking
Judge and Smith

Fish Haul, as a multicomponent site, tends to range very high in most categories. It is especially prone to vandalism, because it is in an area of high potential development and would be very expensive to handle through traditional compliance data recovery (which suggests that it would be threatened even by a compliance project based on low bid archaeology). Previous work has documented very high site integrity, coupled with high research potential. The site's importance to Black history cannot be overstated. It's current "interpretive value" is only moderate, although this figure could be increased by a carefully planned program of site enhancement and on-site displays. Artifact display value is very high—-we are working with both the Hilton Head Museum and Smithsonian in this area.

**Middleburg Plantation (38BK38)**

The archaeology of the slave settlement on Middleburg Plantation, a site on the National Register of Historic Places as well as a National Historic Landmark, is part of a much wider scope of research directed towards understanding African-American lifeways during the slavery period on rice plantations along the East Branch of the Cooper River (Ferguson 1986:1). This research has been directed by Dr. Leland G. Ferguson of the Department of Anthropology at the University of South Carolina and his students. These plantations were settled by French Huguenot and English planters along with numerous African-American and Native American slaves.

Middleburg Plantation was one of the earliest of these plantations on the East Branch of the Cooper River, established in the early part of the 1690s by French Huguenot, Benjamin Simons, Sr. A frame house still standing on this site was built around 1697, and served as the main house during Middleburg's rice culture heyday. Ferguson's research has been aimed at revealing the slave quarters on Middleburg and to better understand the immense contribution to rice planting and harvesting technology made by Africans.

Leland Ferguson ranked Middleburg giving it a score of 342. He had the following to say about Middleburg and its wider context on the East Branch:

As you know I chose Middleburg and the entire East Branch for its great National significance as well as the excellent state of preservation. I think it's one of the most important sites in the state.

Authors' note: Adjacent to Middleburg Plantation is an active Bald Eagle nest.

**Scanlonville Freedmen's Village**

Scanlonville was a freedmen's village on Molasses Creek, near Mount Pleasant, South Carolina. On January 14, 1868 the 124 delegates to the "Convention of the People of South Carolina" included 76 African-Americans. One of them, Rev. Richard H. Cain, a Virginia born free mulatto, who had been sent to Charleston by the African Methodist Episcopal Church, proposed a resolution to petition Congress for a $1 million dollars to buy land for the newly freed slaves. When the resolution was voted upon, 101 were in favor while five, including some blacks, voted against it (Bleser 1969:19-20; Proceedings 1868, Vol. 1:117). On March 27, 1869 the state legislature of South Carolina created a state agency known as the Land Commission (Bleser 1969:28). Sometime afterward a group of free blacks formed the Charleston Land Company.

About one hundred poor colored men of Charleston met together and formed themselves into a Charleston Land Company. They subscribed for a number of shares at $10 per share, one dollar payable monthly. They have been meeting for a year. Yesterday [Jan. 23, 1868] they purchased 600 acres of land for $6,600 that would have sold for $25,000 or $50,000 in better times (Proceedings 1868:Vol. 1:117; Bleser 1969:18).

Some of this land is believed to have been along Molasses Creek. The Charleston Land Company bought 600 acres of land at Remley's point along Molasses Creek (Martin et al 1987:31; Charleston County 1870: Plat Book D). The area in the post-bellum period appears to have been occupied by black yeomen farmsteads identified as archaeological sites 38CH900-903, 38CH905, 38CH907-911 (Martin et al. 1987:34).

Archaeologist Dr. Lesley M. Drucker rated this site giving it a score of 350 points stating: "Site remnants are severely threatened and surrounded by housing and vandals."

**The Dubois-Copes-Wannamaker House**

The Dubois-Copes-Wannamaker House is located on the campus of South Carolina State
College in Orangeburg, South Carolina. This site was rated by Ms. Elaine Nichols at 310 points out of a possible 400. Ms. Nichols elaborates:

The Dubois-Copes-Wannamaker house has been classified as a one-of-a-kind original for the state of South Carolina. It is extremely rare. This site is very vulnerable to vandalism and is not considered valuable, except for a few experts. The College is eager to sell or demolish the structure and has actively sought to sell the structure.

Severe neglect and deterioration of the structure has already occurred. The house is very dilapidated. Windows are broken and the wood exterior is decaying. The school is more committed to upgrading the property where the house stands, rather than preserving an historic landmark. The cost for renovating and preserving the structure may prohibit the school from investing much-needed funds in the salvage of the building.

The integrity of the site has been compromised by the lack of attention and the development of the site. Land around the site is highly disturbed by development. Research from the site can probably help to establish a new chronology for structures of this type.

**Matilda Evans Home and Clinic**

The Matilda Arabella Evans House and Clinic (The Palmetto Leader 1930:1) are located in Columbia, South Carolina. She was born in Aiken County, and attended the Schofield School there. Later she attended Oberlin College in Ohio and received her M.D. degree from the Women's College of Pennsylvania, where she was the only African-American in her class. Dr. Evans was the first woman doctor in South Carolina, and served the African-American community in Columbia for 37 years before her death in 1935 (The Palmetto Leader 1935:1).

This site was rated by Ms. Nichols who gave it a score of 324 points stating:

The building has been razed and part of the site has been paved over. It is overgrown with weeds. There are no architectural features on the site that were related to the medical facility. The present structure is a small used car dealership.

In addition to the Columbia Clinic Association, a public health clinic for African American children, Dr. Evans founded Taylor Lane Hospital (corner of Taylor and Two Notch Roads), the Negro Health Association of South Carolina, and the Negro Health Journal of South Carolina (1916 issued several numbers). She was the founder and superintendent of St. Lukes Hospital (802 Sumter Street) after the Taylor Lane Hospital burned down. She was the first doctor to initiate medical exams as a part of the public school program in Columbia.

**Allen University (no site number)**

Allen University is a predominantly black college located in Columbia South Carolina. The University was founded in 1870 by African-Americans for African-Americans.

Ms. Elaine Nichols ranked this site and gave it a score of 309 points. She had the following to say about Allen University along with her ranking:

Allen University is one of the earliest schools of higher learning, established and administrated by African-Americans. The school was founded in July 1870. Several of the older buildings are boarded up and are in serious disrepair. There is a potential threat of vandalism and neglect in at least one instance, the boards have been removed from the windows. All of the buildings that were constructed during the initial founding (1870) have been razed. Remaining architectural structures date from 1881, 1906, 1925, 1941 and from the late 20th century. There has been some disturbance from development and growth of the campus through renovation of older structures and construction of new ones.

Data collected from the site can provide baseline data on the developmental history of early black institutions of higher learning. Information from this site can reveal information about a significant African-American institution as an educational, religious, and social entity that was an
important structure within the community and the state. Likewise, the lifestyle of African-American students from the post-Civil War period until now can be demonstrated.

*Benedict College (no site number)*

Benedict College is located immediately north of Allen University in Columbia, South Carolina. This is also a predominantly African-American school. This site was rated by Ms. Nichols at 340 points. Ms. Nichols elaborates:

This is the second oldest predominantly black college in South Carolina. The Presidents house, a late 19th or early 20th century brick structure is terribly in need of repair. The structure is vacant and deteriorating rapidly.

*"OLD TIMEY TOWNS"*

There are a number of old towns and settlements in South Carolina which would all be forgotten if it were not for history books, and of course, archaeology. These towns for the most part represent the initial settlement of a frontier area which never flourished or flourished and died. A number of these old places were visited by the statewide assessment of cultural sites survey. A number which were not visited appear here as well (Table 12). Huguenot settlement figures prominently in this section of the report. The earliest old Euroamerican town in South Carolina and the second earliest old town have yet to be discovered. They are the site of San Miguel de Gualdape (1526) and Charles Fort (1562).

*San Miguel de Gualdape*

While the modern landscape has yet to reveal the location of this earliest European settlement in the South Carolina region, it is dealt with in this study. This is done as an example of a site which has not appeared on the initial 100 ranked list, but which could easily be propelled to the top 5 should it ever be located and contain significant archaeological integrity.

San Miguel de Gualdape was settled by the Spanish under Lucas Vasquez de Allyon, a Spanish official in Santo Domingo (Hudson 1990:6). In 1521 two ships, one owned by Allyon, had anchored off the coast of either South Carolina or Georgia (Hudson 1990; Hoffman 1990). They encountered a group of indigenous people and took 60 of them against their will back to Santo Domingo (Quinn 1979:248; Hudson 1990:6). On the way one ship sank and many died who happened to be on the other. It is not certain how many Native Americans survived the trip but at least one survived who the Spanish called Francisco de Chicora. Chicora is a Spanish translation of a native word used to refer to Francisca's homeland. Hoffman translates Chicora as "frog boy" (Hoffman 1990). Allyon took Francisco, who learned Spanish, to Spain. Based on his accounts of Chicora Allyon planned a settlement. Allyon signed a contract with his sovereign to colonize and explore the Southeastern coast of North America on June 12, 1523 (Hoffman 1990:34). He gathered together six ships and approximately 600 people (Hoffman 1990:60), and departed Puerto Plata in mid July of 1526 arriving either at the South Santee River or in Winyah Bay in August of that same year. The colonists quickly discovered the area to be unsuitable for a settlement (Hoffman 1990:67). They moved southwesterly to the Savannah River and made a settlement that lasted less than a year, in which many of the colonist died of starvation and disease. Allyon was one of the nonsurvivors. The survivors, numbering only about 150 made it back to Santo Domingo (Hudson 1990:6-7). Some scholars believe the site is near Winyah bay while other believe it may be on Sapelo Island, Georgia. Eventually a combined effort of historians, archaeologists, and possibly underwater archaeologists will reveal evidence of this sparse settlement.

*Charlesfort*

In February 1562, Frenchman Jean Ribault led two ships with 150 men from Le Havre, France on an expedition that would take them to the southeastern United States. A difficult eight week crossing landed the expedition on the east coast of Florida on April 30th. (Quinn 1979:II, 287-290; DePratter and South 1990:6; Salley 1927; South 1982b). Ribault and company set out on the first of May and headed north along the coast, exploring briefly in the St. Johns River. They then sailed up along the sea islands of the Georgia coast and finally into Port Royal Sound on the 17th of May 1562.

The expedition entered Port Royal Sound to attend to their ships and to seek supplies of water, food, and other supplies (DePratter and South 1990:4). Ribault also used this week to explore the Broad River. They found no large Indian villages, however they did trade with the few Natives that they encountered. The
Table 12. Old Towns Site Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38DR1</td>
<td>Old Dorchester</td>
<td>Barker</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38JA158</td>
<td>Purrysburg</td>
<td>Elliott</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU162/BU51</td>
<td>Santa Elena</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38DR1</td>
<td>Old Dorchester</td>
<td>Sigmon</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38LU319</td>
<td>Fort Congaree</td>
<td>Michie</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38GN1-5</td>
<td>Ninety Six</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38UN1</td>
<td>Pinckneyville</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>New Bordeaux</td>
<td>Blythe</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

expedition set up a stone column that they had brought with them to mark the lands they had claimed for France, possibly on Daw's Island where the Broad and Cheechessee River join to form Port Royal Sound (Quinn 1979:II, 293,297; DePratter and South 1990:5). At this point Ribault decided that the Port Royal area was to be the site of a French Colony. He gathered the expedition members together and asked for volunteers to stay behind and man a fort they were to build, while Ribault and the remainder of the crew sailed to France to seek aid and recount the expedition's moves to the Crown of France. Twenty six volunteers were selected and a leader was chosen, Albert de la Pierria (Quinn 1979:II, 294; DePratter and South 1990:5). Ribault sailed for France, however because of the civil war on-going he was unable to seek the aid he needed for his American outpost. Back at Charlesfort, Ribault's long absence, food shortages, a fire in Charlesfort that destroyed most food and possessions, and a mutiny led to an effort to build an evacuation ship and sail to France. All but one man put to sea on an ill-fated journey back to France. Lack of food and water, non-favourable winds, and a less than adequate ship bode the French soldiers no luck. They resorted to cannibalism as their food and water ran out and their comrades began to die. They were finally picked up by an English ship near the coast of France.

Stanley South and Chester DePratter have mounted an effort to locate this fort but have yet to find it. An archaeological signature produced by the burning of the fort should have produced archaeological remains, as should have the eight cannons left behind and other artifacts. This site, if discovered, has the potential to be propelled to the top of the Heritage Trust list of critically significant sites in South Carolina.

Santa Elena (38BU162 and 38BU51)

Santa Elena was a Spanish settlement located on present day Parris Island, South Carolina from 1566-1587. Soon after Columbus encountered the Southeastern United States and the Caribbean, Spain set up colonies on the four major Carribbean Islands- Cuba, Hispaniola, Jamaica, and Puerto Rico (Hudson 1990:5). From these outposts they explored the Southeastern United States and Central America. Limited initial successes in the Southeastern United States (see for instance San Miguel de Gauldape above) caused the King of Spain to cancel all exploration in the Southeastern United States. That all changed when the French established Charlesfort in Port Royal Sound in 1562 (see Charlesfort above). Pedro Menendez de Aviles, captain-general of the Indies fleet since 1554, was charged by Philip II King of Spain with setting up colonies, forts and missions on the continent (Hudson 1990:15). He was also directed to rid the French presence in Port Royal Sound.

Since 1979, Stan South of the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology has conducted 13 projects at Santa Elena (South 1979; 1980; 1982a; 1984; 1985; South and Hunt 1986; South et al. 1988).

Purrysburg (38JA158)

The Purrysburg site is located on the Savannah River near Hardeeville, South Carolina. Following the Yemassee War of 1715, the colonial government in South Carolina wished to increase the Euroamerican population of South Carolina. The area which now includes Jasper County was available for settlement in 1717 and at the urging of Jean Pierre Purry, a Swiss Huguenout from Neuchatel, Switzerland, was opened in 1731 for Swiss refugees who had been persecuted for the religious convictions in
their homeland (Elliott 1985:10; Low Country Council of Governments 1979:24). By December of 1732, the first group of settlers numbering less than 100 people arrived at Purrysburg. During it's peak it had 100 houses and as many as 600 citizens (Smith 1909:189-207; Elliott 1985:12). Originally the settlers had planned to culture silk at Purrysburg but after meeting a minimum of successes they became involved in rice and indigo. By 1804, there were reported to be 60 houses at Purrysburg (Elliott 1985:14; Evans 1938:112).

In 1985, archaeological investigations were conducted at Purrysburg by Garrow and Associates, Inc. (Elliott 1985; Smith 1985). Elliott's research involved a 20 percent sample of a 1,500 acre tract, utilizing surface collection techniques and systematic shovel testing in areas of high potential. This program resulted in identifying 19 previously unrecorded sites, two of which are thought to be associated with the Swiss Huguenot settlement of Purrysburg (Elliott 1985:56).

A portion of the Purrysburg site was evaluated for the Heritage Trust by Mr. Dan Elliott, an archaeologist working out of Athens, Georgia. Elliott had the following to say about Purrysburg in his evaluation for the Heritage Trust:

This site is one portion of Purrysburg that has been examined by systematic archaeological survey. Other portions of the town to the north also may warrant purchase. This site has potential for long term research that will be of immense public interest: both state and international. Features are known to be present and the site contains numerous colonial house sites. This town played a major role in the colonization of South Carolina but its importance has been understated by previous histories of the state. Archaeology can remedy that.

Fort Congaree (38LX319).

Old Fort Congaree is located near the Congaree River just outside of Columbia, South Carolina. Following the Yemassee War in 1715, the British Colonial government of South Carolina began plans to establish two garrisons in the interior of South Carolina, one at the Indian town of Savano on the Savannah River called Fort Moore (Joseph 1971), and one among the Congarees near where the Broad and Saluda Rivers join and form the Congaree River. The purpose of these two forts was to foster trade between the British in Charlestown and the Cherokee and Catawba who occupied the piedmont region of South Carolina, and to protect colonial ventures in the interior.

Fort Congaree was completed in the fall of 1718 (Michie 1989:1). In 1722 after four years of trade, the commissioners turned their interest in the trading post over to newly arrived settlers in the region. Sometime shortly after that, the trading center ceased to operate and a new fort was built in 1748 near the town of Saxe-Gotha. In the 1960s and continuing into the mid part of the 1970s, archaeologists and historians began trying to accumulate all data on the fort and began trying to reveal the fort's location on the modern landscape. These investigations centered on an area in Lexington County along the Congaree River and its tributary, Congaree Creek (see Gay 1974; Trinkle 1974; Anderson 1975b). The exact location of the 1718 fort has only recently come to light through the efforts of James L. Michie (1989).

Mr. James L. Michie, Associate Director of the Waccamaw Center for Historical and Cultural Studies at Coastal Carolina College, evaluated Old Fort Congaree and states:

Old Fort Congaree is the only remaining example of an early 18th century trading post, and by virtue it is extremely important. It is relatively intact although the northern portions have been affected by floods and cultivation. Extremely rare!

Old Dorchester (38DR4)

Dorchester was established as a town in 1696, one of the earliest settlements outside of Charleston, and one of the earliest in the state. The site is owned and managed by the South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism. Archaeological features contained within this park include the town ruins, standing church tower, and the ruins of Fort Dorchester, made of tabby.

In 1696, 1,800 acres were obtained from the colonial government of South Carolina by Congregationalists from Dorchester, Massachusetts. These colonists built the town of Dorchester between the Ashley River and Dorchester Creek (Walker 1941:50; Carrillo 1973:5-6). By 1719, when Dorchester became part of St. George's Parish, 115 families with a total of 500 persons inhabited the town, along with 1,300 slaves. At this time a church was also planned at Dorchester. A remnant of St.
George's Church exists today at Old Dorchester State Park.

This site was rated by two different people. Mr. Donnie Barker, archaeologist with the South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism, gave it a score of 360 points. Barker asserts that recreational boat traffic along the Ashley River in the vicinity of Old Dorchester is causing serious erosion to the site. The second researcher to rank this site is Mr. Ray Sigmon. Sigmon, who is Executive Director of the Historic Columbia Foundation, is researching the site as part of ongoing M.A. thesis research. He states:

The ruins of the Colonial village of Dorchester, and St. George's Church, while protected within the boundary of a state park, is under direct attack from urban and commercial development on all sides. The park rangers do provide security from most vandalism, but the park's visitors aren't always model citizens. Just the impact of minimal visitation takes its toll on the site.

While some archaeological investigation has taken place, it hasn't scratched the surface of the site's potential. Combined with the research to date on the village and its citizens, any archaeology will yield important materials for the interpretation of the lifeways and lifestyles of the period.

While there are sites which I am sure are critical, because of strong impacting pressures, Dorchester will at some point have a lot to offer from its history.

**Ninety-Six (38GN1-5)**

For a long time the name 96 was believed to be called such because it was 96 miles from the Cherokee Indian Town of Keowee, located in the Foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains in present day Oconee County. A number of Indian paths intersected at Ninety Six, and the place was a very good location to set up trade between the Native population and their counterparts in Charleston. White traders were interested in leather and pelts which they traded to Native hunters for firearms, alcohol, and other goods. It quickly became an important political and economic hub in the South Carolina backcountry.

Around 1751, Robert Gouedy a businessman, established a trading post at Ninety Six. Gouedy carried cloth, shoes, beads, sugar, tools, rum and gunpowder. He was also a farmer growing tobacco and grain while raising cattle. Soon settlers were attracted to the area along with blacksmiths, millers and other trades. By 1772, a courthouse and a jail had been erected opposite Gouedy's trading post. By 1775, more development had occurred in and around Ninety Six.

The first land battle of the Revolutionary War in the south was fought between November 19-21, 1775 at Ninety Six, when 1,800 Loyalists attacked a third that number of patriots. The battle ended in a truce. Currently this site is owned by the United States Department of the Interiors National Park Service, who operate the National Historic site as a National Park of some 1,000 acres. This site was ranked by Judge who gave it a score of 275 points stating:

The site of Ninety Six is well preserved and for the time being is well protected by the National Park Service. Its greatest contribution is in the form of contributing knowledge of the Revolutionary War Period, and 18th century trading in the upper part of South Carolina.

**New Bordeaux (no site number)**

The New Bordeaux site is located on the Little River in McCormick County, South Carolina. This site is a French Huguenot site that was established on November 14, 1764 by Rev. Jean Louis Gibert (Moragne 1857:18-19) (see Badwell Plantation). This is the only Huguenot settlement in the piedmont (see Perryburg). This site was ranked by Mr. John Blythe of the Savannah Valley Authority who gave it a score of 200 points. Mr. Blythe states:

Site of 1764 Huguenot town in upcountry South Carolina; other French settlements were in coastal areas. Residents scattered to surrounding area in late 1700s. Part of town site is believed to be under waters of lake; land area shows significant erosion along shoreline. No visible remains, except for commemorative marker erected in early 20th century. One of three colonial planned settlements (all extinct) in present-day McCormick County (others were Londonborough and the Calhoun settlement). The site is owned by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and/or the U.S. Forest Service.

**Pinckneyville (38UN1)**

The Pinckneyville site is located in Union County, South Carolina (Figure 6). Established
in 1791 as a judicial district in the Backcountry, the site is located in close proximity to the Broad and Pacolet Rivers. After the first location proved to be too low and was destroyed by a freshet in 1792, Pinckneyville was located on a bluff. Here a courthouse and a jail were built. After a nine year period, Pinckneyville was abandoned. Exploratory archaeology was conducted in the 1970s (Carrillo 1972). Further archaeology would doubtless be extremely fruitful, given the short range of occupation. This site was rated by Judge who gave it a score of 275 points:

The Pinckneyville site presently is in sad shape due to heavy vandalism including arson, brick robbing, neglect, and graffiti. In 1975 the storehouse at Pinckneyville was in good shape; it is now in ruins. This site is a rare time capsule of the Late Eighteenth century Piedmont.

17th CENTURY SITES IN SITES IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Charles Towne Landing (38CH11)

This site is within a state park operated by the SCPRT. Charles Towne Landing is the site where the English colonists of the Port Royal Expedition settled after deciding against the Port Royal Sound area. They built a fortified town to provide defense against the Spanish and Native Americans. Archaeological investigations were first performed by Miller (n.d.). Later in late 1968, Stanley South and John Combes of SCIAA conducted more extensive exploratory archaeology on the tip of Albemarle Point (South 1969, 1989; Hartley 1984:54). This work revealed the fortifications built by the English to withstand attacks by the Native Americans. However, as South has pointed out (1969:48-49) and as Hartley has reiterated:

South has recommended that further archaeological investigations on the high ground to the north of these fortifications be carried out, pointing to the documentation which indicates that this is the site of the village, substantiated by the presence of oyster shell in some abundance in this area (Hartley 1984:54).

This site was rated by Mr. Donnie Barker who gave it a score of 315 points.

"Cap Bull"/Ashley Hall Plantation (38CH17)

"Cap Bull" refers to Stephen Bull who arrived as Lord Ashley's deputy aboard the
Table 13. 17th Century Euro-American Sites Ranking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38CH1</td>
<td>Charles Towne Landing</td>
<td>Barker</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH679</td>
<td>McLeod Plantation</td>
<td>Zierden</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH238</td>
<td>Governor Morton</td>
<td>not rated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH17</td>
<td>Cap Bull</td>
<td>not rated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BK56</td>
<td>Medway</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carolina with the first settlers in 1670. He held a number of important positions including Surveyor General, Commissioner of taxes, assistant judge and the military position of Colonel. He was also chosen to Parliament and the council of the colony. Bull died sometime soon after his will was written in 1706, and is buried at Ashley Hall (Cheves 1897; Hartley 1984:57-60). This site was not ranked due to insufficient data.

Governor Morton (38CH238)

This site was formerly owned by Governor Joseph Morton, who played a major role in the Carolina colony, particularly as they pertained to the Spanish presence in the South (Hartley 1984:37-38; Crane 1981:31; Salley 1904:108). The site is believed to be the site of a Spanish attack in 1686 (Salley 1904:108). This site was not ranked due to insufficient data.

McLeod Plantation (38CH679)

McLeod Plantation on James Island, in Charleston County, South Carolina, is listed in the South Carolina State site files as "Morris" 38CH679. The site is called "Morris" because it appears as such on the 1695 Thornton-Morden map. This map is dedicated to the Lords proprietors by John Thornton and Robert Morden from a survey conducted ca. 1685 by Maurice Mathews (Hartley 1984:1). This places a late 17th century initial Euro-American occupation at present day McLeod Plantation within 15 years of the founding of the colony in 1670.

While conducting a survey on McLeod Plantation, archaeologist Michael Hartley found what he described as "a heavy concentration of seventeenth century artifacts, as well as remains from the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth century occupations of the site" (Hartley 1984:46). Hartley's investigations suggest a 17th century locus west of the main house and south of the slave street. Extant architecture at the site includes a main house and associated outbuildings including a kitchen/washing room, gin, privy, dairy, barn and a slave street all said to have been built around 1854 (although the National Register of Historic Places nomination form lists it as 1858). McLeod was built by William Wallace McLeod whose grandson William Ellis McLeod lived to be 104 years of age and died in 1988.

McLeod Plantation was occupied by both the Confederate and Union forces during the Civil War. An adjutant's office was located on the second floor of the main house. Adjutant is a staff officer position in the army who assists the commanding officer particularly in areas of administration. A hospital was also set up at McLeod. After the war, 20,000 newly freed blacks were camped at McLeod awaiting land grants.

McLeod Plantation is unique among sites presently being considered by the Heritage Trust project. The fact that it contains cultural remains from Native American, African-American and Euro-American components alone is important. The continuous occupation of the site from the 17th century to the present allows anthropological research to address many questions of process, change, and acculturation on an agricultural plantation over a period of 300 years. Hartley makes the following recommendations for McLeod Plantation:

"Morris" 38CH679, is an excellent site for consideration of seventeenth-century English activities in the proximity of the harbor. Located on the James Island side of Wapoo Creek the site lies in an agricultural field on McLeod Plantation, an unusual condition for a site in the neighborhood of the harbor. The site has returned a wide range of seventeenth century material in the surface collection and should contain much data. It is recommended that testing procedures be undertaken there... These resources exist here in the Charleston area in a way that does not exist elsewhere in the region. The remains are unique and finite and
require care and consideration (Hartley 1984:38).

Native American Occupation of McLeod Plantation. There is a small collection of Deptford phase pottery in one of the rooms on the first floor of the main house. The NRHP nomination form suggests that an Indian site is located at the intersection of Country Club Drive and Oak Avenue. The Deptford phase dates from about 500 B.C. to 600 A.D. (Milanich and Fairbanks 1980:72-73; Trinkley 1981:53-54).

At the death of William Ellis McLeod in 1988, Historic Charleston Foundation acquired by devise from the will a one-third undivided interest in McLeod Plantation.

Heritage Trust Investigations at McLeod. The Heritage Trust survey project visited McLeod Plantation on a number of occasions (Figure 7). A permanent datum was placed at the base of an oak tree southwest of the main house. This tree has a bell in it. Two shovel tests were placed on either side of the road leading to Wapoo Creek, at the point where it meets Country Club Road. This was to investigate the possible presence of a Deptford period site. A number of pottery sherds were examined which are in one of the rooms in the main house. Mr. Frampton, nephew of the late Mr. McLeod, also indicated a possible location for a slave cemetery (Figure 7). This site was rated by Martha Zierden who gave it a score of 308 points.

COMMENTS ON EDGEFIELD DISTRICT POTTERY SITES
by Carl R. Steen

The Heritage Trust 100 list includes three kiln sites where alkaline-glazed pottery was manufactured (Table 14).

Landrum-Miles (38AK497)

The Landrum-Miles site is the most important pottery site in the Edgefield District. It is the site where, I believe, most of the development of the Alkaline Glazed Stoneware (AGSW) tradition took place. Edgefield’s most famous potter--Dave--is supposed to have worked here. If I had to choose one site to save or excavate it would be this one. It has the advantage of being one of the first, if not the first pottery site in the district, and also stayed in operation for a long period. Thus "chronology" (of AGSW), "process" and "heritage" can be strongly addressed. Since the site is part of a rural industrial complex which includes a mill as well as a working plantation, the site at large can tell us a great deal about "lifeways" as well as "process." For the same reason the site has a very high interpretive value--discussions of rural life, Anglo- and African-American life, the development of industry in the back country--all major themes in the development of modern culture--and dozens of other areas can be accessed through this site. In terms of "display value" the site has the potential to produce reconstructable vessels in copious numbers. Vessels of previously unseen form and decoration have already been found, and more are to be expected.

The site ranks high in all areas of integrity, although some disturbance has occurred. Relative to the other AGSW production sites in the area, it appears to be in very good to excellent condition. AGSW vessels are highly collectable and this site stands a very real chance of being "mined" for pots at any time. One of the most interesting areas of the site is presently being used as a horse pen, and thus lacks vegetation, making it susceptible to erosion. Land use and natural processes combine to form a serious threat.

I have given the site a full 75 points for rarity, because, first, all AGSW production sites are rare in the extreme. Second, relative to the other AGSW sites, Landrum Miles is a rare site because it seems to have been one of the earliest of these sites, if not the first, and it seems to be the site where a great deal of experimentation and development of the tradition took place.

Table 14. Alkaline-Glazed Pottery Kiln Sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38AK497</td>
<td>Landrum-Miles</td>
<td>Steen</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38AK172</td>
<td>Hitchcock Woods</td>
<td>Steen</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38ED11</td>
<td>Pottersville</td>
<td>Steen</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hitchcock Woods (38AK172)

The Hitchcock Woods site has produced some extremely interesting artifacts, but I am not sure that it is even a pottery site. In fact, my impression was that the wasters were dumped there rather than having been made on the site. At any rate, the logical spot for the kiln has been lost to erosion. I would like to study the artifacts from this site at length, but I would not put a high priority on obtaining it. It is already part of a land preserve.

Pottersville (38ED11)

Pottersville is almost completely destroyed (Figure 8). In terms of research potential there is still information that can be gained, but if I had to choose one site to save, this would not be it. On the other hand it is right by the highway and right next to the Pottersville Museum. Thus an interpretive exhibit could easily be set up.

MEDWAY PLANTATION
38BK56

The full archaeological potential of the Medway Plantation remains largely unknown at this time. This is due to the fact that no formal archaeological investigations have been conducted to date. One significant factor hindering investigation is the size of the plantation: 7,600 acres. However, the potential of the site to produce significant archaeological remains is viewed as high for the following reasons.

The site is located along the Back River as well as being bisected by Prioleau Creek. The adjacent high ground above the swamp that parallels both river and creek can certainly be viewed as having a high potential to produce prehistoric as well as historic sites.

A number of historic period components have been identified through surface reconnaissance by the Heritage Trust archaeological survey, with the plantation foreman, Bob Hortman as a guide. On this one-day visit Hortman escorted the crew to a well located immediately south of the main house in the vicinity of the grave of Landgrave Thomas Smith, an early owner of Medway; a school house immediately northeast of the main house (Linda Stine analyzed the collections from this site and places a 19th century date for them); a surface scatter of multi-component historic period nature east of Hortman's house on Medway; a slave cemetery on a knoll northwest of the main house (which also may contain a prehistoric component); a midden deposit, possibly the location of a structure dating to the 19th/20th century; Pine Grove Plantation a parcel added to Medway around 1930; and a brickyard and boatlanding on the Back River, due north of the main house (See map in site files).
Sites known to exist on Medway but not visited include a slave quarters area, brick kiln, and boatlanding southeast of the main house and Spring Grove plantation added to Medway ca. 1930.

These' findings have the potential to contribute non-redundant research information in a number of areas of interest in archaeology. Ongoing research on 18th century rice planters and slave lifeways are in their infancy in South Carolina. Medway may contain archaeological deposits related to both. A possible location for the slave quarters has been identified above. Subsurface archaeological investigations in this area and other suitable locations may offer undisturbed evidence of this disenfranchised culture.

Some of the historic period components have been disturbed by the progress of Medway. The brick from a rice mill at Pine Grove Plantation was robbed to help restore Medway while cypress for the living room was taken from the antebellum Pine Grove main house.

Other historic period aspects have been identified but need more in-depth study. For instance, the well behind the main house has been filled in with refuse, possibly from the kitchen of the main house. This feature could produce information about diet, status, and other aspects of historic period lifeways.

Very little is known about boatlandings and commerce along the low-country rivers of South Carolina. Two boat landings have been identified on Medway and are associated with the brick making operations of the 18th century, during which time Medway owner Peter Gaillard Stoney is said to have sent bricks to Charleston to build Fort Sumter.

There is a plat map of Medway by surveyor John Purcell dating 1792 in Mrs. Gertrude S. Legendre's (site owner) office at Medway. This map has yet to be examined for information it may provide of Medway's history and archaeology.

There is an elderly black man who worked on the plantation and is a descendant of former slaves on Medway who is still alive and remembers much about Medway. This oral informant can supplement the historical documentation of the site.

There are two other plantations on the Heritage Trust archaeological survey that also contain 17th century components. These are Middleburg Plantation on the East Branch of the Cooper River in Berkeley County and McLeod Plantation on James Island in Charleston County. These may be considered as better examples of 17th century South Carolina, if Medway cannot be arranged for the Heritage Trust.

The full archaeological potential of Medway can be ascertained only through systematic survey and sub-surface testing in areas of high site probability. Based on very cursory site evaluations the archaeological potential of Medway is viewed as high but not yet demonstrated. There are better examples of the types of sites on Medway that may be in greater danger and that would probably rate higher on a priority list. This site was ranked by Judge at 265 points.

**POST 17TH CENTURY EURO-AMERICAN HISTORIC PERIOD SITES**

The Heritage Trust 100 list includes seventeen post-17th Century Euro-American sites (Table 15).

**Badwell Plantation (38MC322)**

Badwell Plantation is the site of the residence of numerous members of the Pettigrew, Gibert, and Allston families of South Carolina. The property remained within the ownership of members and descendents of these families from 1768 to 1963. The site today consists of a extant spring house/dairy, foundation of the main house, foundation and chimney from an unidentified structure, fieldstone smokehouse foundation, and numerous outbuilding foundation remnants (Drucker et al. 1984).

On March 10, 1768, Rev. Jean L. Gibert, founder of New Bordeaux (also on the 100 list) bought this parcel and it eventually became known as Badwell. This site was rated at 263 points by Mr. Ronald Anthony, an archaeologist with the Charleston Museum. Mr. Anthony provided the following in his assessment of this critically significant site:

**Badwell, located on U.S. Forest Service property, is presently situated in a secondary wooded environment. Characterized by several above ground structural remnants, the site is highly visible and**
## Table 15. Post 17th Century Euro-American Historic Period Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38CH202</td>
<td>Fairbank Plantation</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH58/482</td>
<td>Willtown Bluff</td>
<td>Stine</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38MA93</td>
<td>Benjamin Davis Plantation</td>
<td>Rinehart</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Willington Academy</td>
<td>Blythe</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU581</td>
<td>Sam's Tabby Complex</td>
<td>Drucker</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH202</td>
<td>Lesesne Plantation</td>
<td>Drucker</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Bull McIntosh House</td>
<td>Blythe</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Charleston Beef Market</td>
<td>Zierden</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38MC322</td>
<td>Badwell Plantation</td>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BK261</td>
<td>Limerick Settlement</td>
<td>Babson</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BK416</td>
<td>Tanner Road Settlement</td>
<td>Babson</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38SU9</td>
<td>Milford Plantation</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Cherry Hill</td>
<td>Blythe</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH1022</td>
<td>Andre Michaux</td>
<td>Joyce</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38GE200</td>
<td>Laurel Hill</td>
<td>Drucker</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38GE202</td>
<td>Oaks Plantation</td>
<td>Drucker</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Rosemont</td>
<td>not rated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

locally well known, thus subject to ongoing vandalism.

Past investigation (Drucker et al. 1984) demonstrated intact subsurface remains, and probably midden deposits, both with relatively high artifact density and diversity; a situation uncommon in South Carolina Piedmont contexts. Virtually all Plantation research to date in South Carolina has focused on Coastal Plain sites, thus Badwell has the potential for yielding significant and needed information on Piedmont rural 19th century lifeways, which are expected to represent different behaviors known from Low Country Plantations.

### Andre Michaux (38CH1022)

The Andre Michaux site is located in Charleston County, South Carolina. The site is associated with botanical gardens and was one of the earliest in the United States. It is related to Drayton Hall through plant exchanges.

This site was ranked by archaeologist Dee Joyce at a score of 225 points:

The Michaux garden site is nationally unique—it is the third botanical garden established in the United States and the second oldest garden with archaeological features intact. The garden served as a botanical processing center for the collection and world-wide distribution of botanical specimens. The site was the center of an international scientific experiment and its owner, Andre Michaux, was a significant figure in the scientific and intellectual community of the 18th century.

There is little current or impending threat to the Michaux site. The site is owned by the city of Charleston and is located adjacent to an Air Force radio transmitter station and near Air Force runways. The Air Force has placed restrictive covenants on the area which prohibit the construction of permanent structures on the site. The restrictions do not include land clearing; however, this threat seems unlikely. Before Hurricane Hugo, the site was open forest. The hurricane produced little damage through uprooted trees and has provided increased protection from vandals through the growth of dense understory. There is little threat from natural processes such as erosion.

Although there are no standing structures or primary growth plants from the Michaux period, the quantity and variety of features and the rich artifact content of the site make the integrity above average. Over one thousand 18th century artifacts and several features were discovered in six 5' x 5' test units. Since the 18th century, the general area surrounding the site has had multiple uses, however, the subsurface features appear undisturbed by surface construction. Those features that are undisturbed have high clarity.

Michaux purchased 80 acres containing an earlier structure in 1786. He built a house and outbuildings for a subsistence farm and abandoned the site.
eleven years later. Any features relating to the Michaux period would be sealed in an eleven year time capsule. Since there are few Charleston County sites that have such a short time range, the site could make a contribution to chronology. In addition it could provide information on lifeways at a working subsistence farm where labor was provided by hired hands and slaves. The site’s contribution to process is low but its contribution to heritage is outstanding. Andre Michaux is to botany what Shakespeare is to literature.

Since standing structures are prohibited by Air Force regulations and there are no intact structures or primary growth trees from the Michaux period, the site has low interpretive ability. The artifact concentration is high which could provide materials for off-site displays.

**Fairbank Plantation (38BK202)**

The Fairbank Plantation was evaluated for the Heritage Trust Program by Mr. Ronald Anthony, archaeologist with the Charleston Museum. Mr. Anthony gave the site 318 points and states:

Fairbank Plantation, located on Daniel Island, currently is slated for intensive direct and indirect impact from residential development, (as soon as the Mark Clark Expressway is completed). The site holds a late 17th/early 18th century (domestic) probable plantation component with previously demonstrated integrity and clarity. Our knowledge of rural domestic occupations of the late17th/early 18th centuries is virtually nonexistent in South Carolina; with the exception of South's work at Charlestowne Landing. Fairbank holds the potential of furnishing much needed information regarding lifeways of the early pioneering period of South Carolina and the South Atlantic coast.

**Lesesne Plantation (38BK202)**

This site is recorded in the South Carolina State Site Files in a complex of sites which also includes Fairbank Plantation (see above). This site was also partially excavated by the Charleston Museum and Carolina Archaeological Services in 1984 (Zierden et al. 1986). This site was rated by archaeologist Dr. Lesley M. Drucker who gave it a score of 275 points. Dr. Drucker states:

Site is threatened by increased visibility to vandals via Mark Clark Expressway-

Data Recovery conducted by Charleston Museum and Carolina Archaeological Services in 1984.

**Benjamin Davis Plantation (38MA93)**

The Benjamin Davis Plantation is an 18th/early 19th century occupation on high ground adjacent to the Little Pee Dee River in Marion County, South Carolina. There is no extant architecture at this site, however concentrations of surface artifacts may indicate the presence of intact structural features below ground surface. There is also evidence of ornamental flora present, which also may indicate the former location of buildings. A number of filled wells have been identified.

This site was rated by archaeologist Mr. Charles Rinehart who, in giving it a score of 315 points, elaborates:

The Benjamin Davis Plantation is an important site for several reasons. The site was initially documented by Gwen Davis when she learned that two possible routes of the Myrtle Beach Connector would impact the site; presently this highway project is on hold (Wayne Roberts, personal communication 1991). Ms. Davis conducted some historical archival research on the property and surface collected over 7,800 artifacts of many different categories. She also noted the presence of privies and wells.

The Davis Plantation is the only recorded plantation site in Marion County, and there are no plantation sites in the immediate vicinity of the surrounding counties. Therefore, the site would add to the plantation archaeology data base from an untapped area not directly on the coast (i.e. increasing knowledge about, chronology and lifeways, etc.).

The site integrity appears to be high, given that discrete areas of artifacts are present. The level of disturbance due to plowing activities must be evaluated by on-site inspection, but for the same reason does not appear to be high.

**Sams Tabby Complex (38BU581)**

This site was the 1786 home of William and Elizabeth Hext Sams, which is now in ruins (Figure 9). The complex includes a cemetery, chapel, well, main house, detached kitchen, cotton house, possible overseers house, milling structure, stable/barn or dairy, and a smokehouse. The smokehouse is unique to the Southeastern United States in that it is the only known
example of a pitched tabby roof (Drucker 1982a; Lepionka 1984; LCOG 1979:69). In the site file for this complex Drucker states:

The Sams Tabby Complex is a highly significant cluster of ruins that are well documented, have integrity, hold archaeological potential, and are associated with a prominent sea island cotton planter family on St. Helena island. Together with other investigations of plantation cotton planting at Dauga, this site should be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Smokehouse exhibits only known example of pitched tabby roof standing in the entire Southeastern United States (Drucker 1982b).

This site was ranked by Dr. Lesley M. Drucker who gave it a total of 287 points. She adds:

The site is surrounded, though stabilized, by housing-threat is high, accessibility to outsiders is limited—some exploration and study has already been done.

Tanner Road Settlement (38BK416)

The Tanner Road settlement was test excavated by Mr. David W. Babson for his Masters thesis research at the Department of Anthropology at the University of South Carolina (Babson 1987). This small site is thought to be a fruit tree nursery and possibly a horticultural experimental station. It is possibly the site of an overseer's house and slaves may also have lived on-site. It was part of the Old Limerick settlement of Elias Ball and was located on the hinterland of the property. Mr. Babson evaluated and ranked this site for the Heritage Trust Program and gave it a score of 250 points. He states:

The Tanner Road site is under no immediate threat, being owned by the Forest Service, as part of the Francis Marion National Forest. Some development threat, especially following Hurricane Hugo, as uses of the Francis Marion Forest change.

An immediate past "Natural Process"—Hurricane Hugo—has greatly damaged 38BK416, especially in comparison to its condition in 1986. Even if the trees are cleared off it, the site has low display value—no surface-evident ruins, etc. And, as noted, its general condition has not been improved by Hurricane Hugo. 38BK416 has, by-and-large, research value, rather than display value.

Limerick Settlement (38BK261)

This site was recorded by archaeologist William B. Lees who excavated and reported on
the Limerick Central settlement (Lees 1980). The site appears on a 1797 plat of Old Limerick Plantation as two structures. It is located above old rice fields on high ground within the limits of Old Limerick Plantation.

This site was ranked by archaeologist David W. Babson. He elaborates:

38BK261 is under no immediate threat, being Forest Service property, part of the Francis Marion Forest. Some "development" threat may occur, as use of the forest changes following Hurricane Hugo.

An immediate past "Natural Process"—Hurricane Hugo—has probably damaged the site. See statement about 38BK416—probably roughly same damage, though 38BK261 was not observed directly.

Site has higher display value than 38BK416, as it has foundations visible on the surface. At least, it had such features, before Hurricane Hugo: don't know exact condition of site.

Cherry Hill (no site number)

The site of Cherry Hill is the former home of George McDuffie (1790-1851) and is located in McCormick County between the Little River and the Savannah River. McDuffie came to South Carolina from Georgia, and was a lawyer, planter, governor, soldier, senator, and was known as "the Orator of Nullification." This site was rated by Mr. John Blythe of the Savannah Valley Authority who gave it a score of 230 points stating:

Homesites of the McDuffie and Noble families. Foundations of two residences visible; ornamental vegetation; terraces. Both families prominent in 19th century politics. Site is owned by U.S. Forest Service? Remoteness makes it a potential target for vandalism. Noble family cemetery (about 2 miles distant) is associated with homesite. Some archaeological excavations were done by an Erskine class in the 1970s (Dr. William H.F. Kuykendall, professor).

Bull-McIntosh House (no site number)

Bull-McIntosh house is located in McCormick County. This two story wooden structure was the home of General William Bull, a three term member of the South Carolina legislature. He was also lieutenant Governor of South Carolina from 1824-1826. In 1838 he was murdered by his slaves. This site was ranked by Mr. John Blythe of the Savannah River Authority who gave it a total of 275 points. Mr Blythe states:

Site of early 19th century plantation homesite and related structures. Some above-ground resources remain, although in ruins. House burned in the early 1980s. Property is posted for sale; is presently being used by a hunt club. Privately owned by an estate.

Willington Academy (no site number)

The Willington Academy is located in McCormick County, South Carolina. Sometime between 1801-1804 Dr. Moses Waddel (1770-1840) established the Willington Academy. Dr. Waddel's students built a community of log cabins, and he supervised the education of some of the South's most distinguished leaders. Among Dr. Waddel's students were Calhoun, McDuffie, Legare, Petigru, Crawford, and Gilmer (WPA Guide:456). This site was ranked by Mr. John Blythe who gave it a score of 300 points. He states:

Site of classical school operated by Moses Waddel in early 19th century. Graduates include many prominent men of the antebellum period. Academy included school building and a row of cabins built by and for the students. Property owned by Willington Presbyterian Church.

Willtown Bluff (38CH58/CH482)

The Willtown Bluff site is located in Charleston County along the Edisto River. It is said to be the second English occupied area in South Carolina next to Charleston (Herold 1980; Stine 1991). By 1717, 51 of 250 plats were laid out at Willtown. There was also an earthen fort used during the Yemassee War and again during the Revolution and the Civil War (Herold 1980:17; Stine 1991:55-56). This site was ranked by Linda Stine who gave it a score of 315 points.

Charleston Beef Market

As we all know from living in urban areas, specific places are reserved for markets, places where consumers can go and buy food. Urban Charleston in the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries was no exception. After moving from Albemarle Point (see Charles Towne Landing) a market area was set up at the northeast corner of Meeting and Broad streets as early as 1680 (Calhoun et al 1984:96). A formal market was constructed in the 1730s and again in the 1780s. Based on
documentary evidence, the Charleston Museum conducted test excavations in Washington Square Park to attempt to find evidence of the Beef Market. The archaeology revealed deposits ranging from 1720-1830, and evidence of formal stalls were observed. A dense quantity of bone was recovered and revealed that pork and venison were also sold in the Beef Market. This site was rated by Charleston Museum archaeologist Martha Zierden who gave it 264 points.

*Milford Plantation (38SU9)*

*Milford* Plantation is located in Sumter County, South Carolina, near Wedgefield. Milford was built by Nathaniel P. Potter, an architect and builder from Rhode Island, for John Laurence Manning. Manning was governor of South Carolina from 1852-1854. The plantation complex includes a number of 19th and 20th century structures. The main house is a French Greek Revival design made of brick, with six fluted corinthian columns on the front portico. Matching dependencies are located to the east and west of the main house. A bell tower which holds 500 gallons of water is located to the back of the house. A small spring house modeled after Trinity Episcopal Cathedral in Columbia, a Gothic Cathedral sits to the southwest on a small pond.

In 1860 at the Secession Convention, Manning was the richest delegate having a wealth of some 2 million dollars, and owned some 600 slaves. During the Civil War, Manning protected local women at the plantation, which was occupied briefly by Union troops under General Edward E. Potter, commander of the U.S. Army. His troops had intended to burn Milford but he would not allow it. The property was sold before Manning's death.

This site was proposed and approved as a protection project by the Heritage Trust Advisory Board in August of 1990. A joint visit by SCIAA/SHPO staff members resulted in the identification of seven new archaeological sites ranging from Archaic Indian to tenant farm sites (Figures 10 and 11). This site was ranked by Judge who gave it a score of 250 points, stating:

The Milford Plantation site, much like the Medway Plantation, is very hard to rate. First, there has been no archaeology at either of these sites. Milford is obviously a very important site from an architectural standpoint and that is why it ranked high in the site structure category. But the archaeological potential is unknown. There is also very little written on John L. Manning. The fact that he had 600 slaves would be important to our study of slave lifeways, particularly on a non-low country plantation.

*The Oaks Plantation (38GE202)*

This site is located along the Waccamaw River in Georgetown County, South Carolina. This plantation was involved in rice agriculture, naval stores, and also grapes for wine making. The site was settled in the early 1730s by Joseph Allston who in 1769 was a representative to the provincial assembly. The first Joseph Allston left the place to his grandson, also Joseph Allston. This Allston was also a politician South Carolina House of Representatives 1802-1803, Speaker of the House 1805, Governor 1812-14 (Rogers 1980; Drucker 1980; Salmon 1979). Archaeological research in 1980 confirmed structures, a rice chimney ruin, cemetery, canal and possibly a boat landing. This site was rated by Lesley M. Drucker at 219 points.

*Laurel Hill Plantation (38GE200)*

Laurel Hill is located adjacent to the Oaks Plantation along the Waccamaw River in Georgetown County, South Carolina. This site was owned by William Waties Jr. around 1732. During the Civil War the site was owned by Colonel Daniel W. Jordan. Archaeological work in 1980 recorded a number of structural ruins, an earthwork (Civil War), the rice chimney and possibly a boat landing (Drucker 1980). This site was rated by Lesley M. Drucker who gave it a score of 256.

*Rosemount (no site number)*

It is incredibly interesting that the home of Ann Pamela Cunningham would turn up on a list of sites to be preserved. Cunningham, a native South Carolinian, mounted the first historic preservation effort in the nation, when in the mid 19th century, she organized a group known as the Mount Vernon Ladies Association to purchase and restore Washington's home (King, Hickman and Berg 1977:13). Mount Vernon was built around 1790, a two story frame structure. This building burned in 1930, and ruins of the building and formal gardens are still visible today (Snipes 1990). This site was not rated because not enough information was available.
Figure 10. Complicated stamped sherd from Milford Plantation (38SU9).

Figure 11. Projectile points from Milford Plantation (38SU9).
MILITARY SITES

Fourteen military sites are included in the Heritage Trust 100 sites list (Table 16).

Secessionville

Secessionville is a Confederate Civil War earthwork located on James Island, South Carolina. A major battle was fought at this earthwork. This site was rated by Dr. Stephen Wise a military historian. Mr. Wise gave the site a score of 335 points. Information on this site was graciously provided by Mr. J. Tracy Power, Staff Historian, South Carolina Department of Archives and History (SHPO). Mr. Power writes in a recent paper on this site:

Secessionville was the most significant Civil War battle fought in South Carolina. The strategic importance of the battle, to South Carolina and to the Confederate war effort in 1862, can hardly be overstated. It crushed Union hopes for an early occupation of Charleston and buoyed Southern morale, particularly in the Palmetto State. The defenses around the city would never again be as vulnerable as they were in June of 1862; existing works would be considerably strengthened and new works built throughout 1862 and 1863. The Federals' great opportunity to overwhelm the small numbers opposing them and to occupy James Island in force had been wasted. Unable to take the city, or the island, or even the earthwork at Secessionville, they again tried the approach from Charleston Harbor. They shelled Fort Sumter and the other harbor defenses in the spring of 1863 and unsuccessfully assaulted Battery Wagner, on the northern end of Morris Island, in July of that year. Reluctantly, Union forces settled into a long siege which lasted until February 1865. Even then they would enter Charleston from the South Carolina interior and not from Charleston Harbor or the sea islands (Power 1991:21-22).

Fort Frederick (38BU1100)

Fort Frederick is located in Beaufort County, South Carolina. This fort is also known as Fort Prince Frederick and was constructed of oyster shell, lime, and timber (Wallace 1984), between 1730 and 1734 to replace the older Fort Beaufort. This fort was built to defend against the Spanish. It is a relatively small fort (125 feet by 75 feet), with only one bastion on the southwest side.

The eastern wall was lined with a battery and cannon. The interior of the fort held a barracks and a magazine. It was garrisoned by the Independent Company of Foot British Regulars until their transfer to Georgia in 1736. Provincial scout boats were stationed here periodically (Low Country Council of Governments 1979:67). This site was rated by archaeologist Ramona Grunden who gave this site a score of 303 points. In her evaluation of this site for the Heritage Trust Ms. Grunden states:

At first site Fort Frederick is not impressive and it was not the scene of any great battles. It is the oldest verifiable tabby structure in South Carolina, it was garrisoned, and General Ogelthorpe got the idea to use tabby at Fort Frederica. Its location at the Naval Hospital affords decent protection from vandalism, but it is subjected to severe erosion, no doubt exacerbated by the boat ramp. Nevertheless, it is a beautiful early to mid 18th century site with a high potential for good subsurface integrity.

Fort Fremont

Fort Fremont was built in 1899 during the Spanish-American War and was named for John Charles Fremont and explorer. This was the most expensive of the forts constructed around Beaufort, which is ironic given that no shot was ever fired here. The fort is built of concrete and has a series of gun emplacements. The fort was deactivated in 1921 (Low Country Council of Governments 1979:70-71). This site was also rated by Ms. Grunden who gave it a score of 275 points. In her evaluation she says:

I have some trouble in rating Fort Fremont. I know of no other forts of its period of construction that were not subsequently altered—it is in fact unique. However, the reason it is so rare is because it was never used, a turn of the century "boondoggle." Archaeologically speaking it can tell us very little about military lifeways at that time. The land around the fort was the site of Union encampments of a large scale throughout the Civil War and pot hunting is rampant—does this endanger the fort? (I say yes).

Snow Island (no site number)

The Snow Island site has never been located. However, similar to the sites of Charlesfort and San Migule de Gualdape, it is dealt with here.
Mr. Steven D. Smith rated this site and gave it a score of 211 points. He states:

Francis Marion is documented to have made his "famous" camp on Snow Island. There is enough documented material that the area was placed on the National Register. Further, the Heritage Trust very early in its history recognized the importance of the site. However, the actual location has not been demonstrated archaeologically.

**Stony Creek Battery (38BU1289)**

The Stony Creek Battery is a Confederate earthwork on the north side of U.S. 17/21, near Gardens Corner, in Beaufort County, South Carolina. South Carolina State site files number 38BU1289 is a number given by Trinkley to a complex of sites which includes the Civil War earthwork, a late 18th early 19th century domestic site, and a late 19th century domestic site (Trinkley 1991:9). The portion of that site that has been evaluated for the Statewide Assessment of Cultural sites is limited to the Civil War earthwork. This site has recently received attention is the media because of the South Carolina Department of Highways and Public Transportation’s attempt to destroy the site without having any archaeological or historical study conducted.

The fortifications are part of the Confederate Southern coastal defenses built in the latter part of 1861 under General Robert E. Lee. According to Dr. Stephen Wise, a military historian there is very little documentation in the *Official Records* concerning this site. The site was recently evaluated by Dr. Michael Trinkley and Ms. Natalie Adams of the Chicora Foundation. A portion of the site has already been destroyed by the initial building of U.S. 17/21. However, Dr Trinkley’s report indicates that he believes the site is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, and he recommended data recovery for the site. While avoidance would probably better suit this site, Trinkley’s assertion reveals the site’s importance and eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. This site was ranked by Dr. Wise who gave it a total of 255 points.

**Bee’s Creek Battery**

This battery was built by the confederate army to defend the railroad. There is an earthwork there. Dr. Stephen Wise rated this site and gave it a score of 251 points.

**Combahee Fort and Campground**

This site, also a battery, is located on the Combahee River. Dr. Stephen Wise ranked it and gave it a score of 267 points.

**Honey Hill Battle Field**

This site was ranked by Mr. Steve Wise who gave it a score of 325 points. It is a large earthwork and was the scene of a battle on November 27, 1864. Eight companies of the 55th Massachusetts participated. The greatest loss to the 55th occurred during this battle, 31 dead and 138 wounded (Legg and Smith 1989:28).

---

Table 16. Military Site Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38CH1271</td>
<td>Secessionville</td>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Honey Hill</td>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU102</td>
<td>Fort Frederick</td>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU1124</td>
<td>Old Sheldon</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU102</td>
<td>Fort Frederick</td>
<td>Grunden</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>James Island Civil War Sites</td>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH912</td>
<td>Molasses Creek Powder Mag.</td>
<td>Drucker</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU1113</td>
<td>Fort Fremont</td>
<td>Grunden</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH920</td>
<td>Folly Island</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Combahee Fort and Camp</td>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CH1213</td>
<td>Folly North</td>
<td>Zierden</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BU1289</td>
<td>Stony Creek Battery</td>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Bee’s Creek Battery</td>
<td>Wise</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Snow Island</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Folly North (38CH1213)

The Folly North site was revealed following Hurricane Hugo. The site is believed to be a dump associated with the Union occupation of this island during the Civil War. The site is important for a number of reasons, but it is most significant due to the outstanding organic preservation. Cow brains, coconuts, wooden objects, leather shoes, and poncho fragments have been recovered by the Charleston Museum. This site was ranked by Martha Zierden who gave it a score of 264 points.

Folly Island (38CH920, 38CH964, 38CH965, 38CH966)

During the Union siege of Charleston between June 1863 and February 1865, Northern forces utilized Folly Beach as a staging area and encampment. In 1988, the SCIAA conducted excavations after a pot hunter called their attention to the island after discovering human remains. Already impacted by erosion and coastal development, the small barrier island had been collected for many years by relic collectors often armed with metal detectors. The SCIAA excavated in a small part of the Union camp and a cemetery that contained the remains of freed and former slaves of the 55th Massachusetts Volunteer Regiment, and the 1st North Carolina Colored Infantry (Legg and Smith 1989; Anthony and Drucker 1988). These soldiers are believed to have died in regimental hospitals and were buried in their brigade cemetery. The non-cemetery sites revealed evidence of water procurement, refuse disposal, horse stabling, blacksmithing, latrines, and sutler activity (Drucker and Jackson 1988). The site was ranked by Mr. Steven D. Smith who gave it a score of 270 points.

Molasses Creek Powder Magazine (38CH912)

This site is located in Charleston County, South Carolina and was discovered during a compliance level survey, prior to residential development. Molasses Creek Powder Magazine is a Revolutionary War period feature. The site is identified as a four-sided earthwork approximately 15 x 22 meters, within a defined site area of 53 x 120 meters (Martin et al 1987:58). This magazine and guard house were used in colonial defense activities during the Revolutionary War (1776-1781). They were used to protect the city and the harbor (Jones 1987:23-32). In their assessment of the site Martin et al state:

Based on the relatively good preservation of this site, it is likely that subsurface contexts contain structural footings and/or post holes and storage deposits within the magazine embankments and occupational debris from military living areas between the magazine and the guardhouse (1987:5).

This site was ranked by Dr. Lesley M. Drucker who gave the site a score of 309 points stating:

Threat here is severe, both culturally and naturally—site is literally surrounded by housing and vandals.

Old Sheldon Church (38BU1124)

Old Sheldon Church is located in Beaufort County, South Carolina (Figure 12). The church, designed after a Greek Temple, was originally built between 1745-1755. During the Revolutionary War ammunition was hidden in the Bull Family vault in the associated cemetery. The church was burned during the war by General Augustine Prevost and his British troops in May 1779. Rebuilt in 1826, the church was burned during the Civil War by Sherman's 15th Corps, under General John Logan. This site was rated by Judge at 310 points.

INDUSTRIAL SITES

Four industrial sites are included in the Heritage Trust 100 sites list (Table 17).

Coopersville Iron Manufacturing Complex (38CK2)

This 690 acre site is located on the west bank of the Broad River in Cherokee County, South Carolina. The site is the best preserved 19th century iron manufacturing complex in Northwestern South Carolina. This complex served as the principal manufacturing site of the Nesbitt Company and afterward the Swedish Iron Manufacturing Company. The ruins of two furnaces, three structures, a system of canals and sluices, tram road and partially filled ore pits (Ferguson and Cowan 1986:33-39). Dr. Terry Ferguson of Wofford College ranked this site and gave it a score of 380 points. In their report on Ironworks in Northwestern South Carolina, Ferguson and Cowan assert:

The Nesbitt Iron Manufacturing Company site complex as a whole exhibits the most complete and intact set of sites associated with the early iron industry in
Northwestern South Carolina, with a total of four significant sites. The principal manufacturing site and factory complex on the west bank of the Broad River at Cherokee Ford, site (38CK2) is the best preserved factory complex of any of the nineteenth century iron manufacturing companies (Ferguson and Cowan 1986:90).

**Cowpens Furnace (38CK73)**

The Cowpens Furnace site is located in Cherokee County, South Carolina, and is associated with early ironworks in Northwestern South Carolina. The furnace is well preserved, although in ruins (Touney 1848; Ferguson and Cowen 1986:64-71; see also Multiple Property Submission on file Archives and History). This site was constructed about 1807 and was subsequently rebuilt by the South Carolina Manufacturing Company, who purchased the site in 1834. Dr. Terry Ferguson rated this site and gave it a score of 340 points. In their report on Cowpens, Ferguson and Cowen (1986:64,71) state:

> Its primary importance relates to its potential to yield the most information about furnace construction and style.

> The site contains one of the best preserved furnaces and associated sluice ways. The site also contains abundant slag and possible foundation remnants of unidentified structures.

**Dorn Gold Mine (38MC255)**

The Dorn Gold Mine is located in McCormick County, South Carolina. The site was recorded in the South Carolina Table 17. Industrial Site Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38CK2</td>
<td>Coopersville Iron Complex</td>
<td>T. Ferguson</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38CK73</td>
<td>Cowpens Iron Furnace</td>
<td>T. Ferguson</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38MC255</td>
<td>Dorn Gold Mine</td>
<td>Blythe</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38LX42</td>
<td>Saluda Factory</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12. Old Sheldon Church (38BU1124)
Archaeological Site Files by Dan Elliott in 1983. Mr. Elliott described the sites as

Extensive evidence of gold mine workings, including pits, tunnels, and tailings. Thought to be the earliest area of William Dorn's mining activities circa 1840-1850's.

Significant economic activity represented for historical importance to the state and to the area. Intact.

This site was rated by Mr. John Blythe of the Savannah Valley Authority, rating the site at 300 points. Mr. Blythe had this to say about the Dorn Gold Mine:

Ruins of 1850's mining operation that produced at least $1 million in gold before the Civil War. Shafts, tunnels, pits, and machinery visible. Mining was undertaken by slave labor. Surrounded by residential, commercial, and institutional development in heart of the Town of McCormick. Owned by McCormick County; mining rights are held by the McCormick Arts Council. Listed in National Register of Historic Places. Plans for tourism development have been discussed; status uncertain.

Saluda Factory and Dam (38LX42)

The Saluda Factory and Dam ruins are located in Lexington County, South Carolina along the Saluda River near Columbia. The site was recorded during a survey of the Columbia Zoological Park conducted by Thomas Ryan of the SCIAA (Ryan 1972:141-188). The factory was established in 1834 by David Ewart and Colonel Blanding for the production of cotton goods (Scott 1884:17). The largest cotton factory in South Carolina at one time, it was four stories tall and was operated by slave labor until the Civil War (Henning 1936:332). At the time of the Civil War it was enlarged employing some 1000 workers (Henning 1936:36). The factory was burned by the Union Army in February of 1865 (Scott 1884:174). The ruins consist of dam ruins on the river, power wheel, spindle room, and storage and office facilities much of which are still visible.

This site was rated by Judge who gave it a score of 275 points, who stated:

This is the only site on the top 100 of this type. The Columbia Zoo plans to develop this site as a park. The

Figure 13. Cowpens Furnace (38CK73)
cultural features could enhance such a
design, and interpretation for the
public of early industrial works
should be an important factor in this
project.
CHAPTER V
UNDERWATER ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES
by James Robert Errante

A number of properties on the 100 critically significant site list are either underwater sites or contain underwater components. While it will be impossible to acquire an underwater site, management plans for terrestrial sites with underwater components should address and protect the underwater environment. This chapter provides the reader with an overview of underwater archaeology and some detailed remarks about the underwater sites on the critically significant 100 list.

The South Carolina Heritage Trust Statewide Assessment of Cultural Sites includes a variety of sites that contain underwater components. The prehistoric period sites on the 100 list, containing underwater components, consist of four very different site types. These include a chert quarry, a shell mound, a shell ring and a mound complex. The underwater components of these prehistoric sites are primarily restricted to erosional deposits resulting from river dynamics. The underwater historic period sites entail low country plantations and colonial settlements. The underwater components of these sites mainly involve water control systems and boat landing areas. Many sites on the 100 list are currently facing erosional problems. Some of these, such as coastal shell rings, may soon contain inundated components.

The inventory's underwater components vary in their association with and their transformation into the underwater environment and may be described as either inundated sites or fall under the auspices of waterscape archaeology. Inundated sites are characterized as having experienced degradation before submergence (Purdy 1988:XI). These sites have usually undergone certain amounts of erosion and disturbance.

Waterscape sites involve archaeological components that may be partially, completely or periodically submerged but are closely associated with the terrestrial environment. The term waterscape is not limited to, but, was developed to deal with the unique cultural landscapes found along the waterfront of many 18th and 19th century rice plantations in South Carolina's lowcountry. At these plantations, boat landings and canals were constructed in order to foster river transportation. Most rice growing plantations built massive water control systems to regulate water flow (Errante 1989:74-78). The majority of the plantations investigated for the Heritage Trust contain waterscape components.

Prehistoric Sites

The number of inundated prehistoric sites in Southeastern coastal environments is believed to be much greater than what is currently documented. It is maintained that if these sites could be detected they would outnumber submerged historical sites. Many prehistoric coastal habitation sites were drowned during post-pleistocene times. This hypothesis is derived from research on ethnographic settlement patterns and the distribution of recent prehistoric archaeological sites on coastal water bodies, suggesting that coastal areas were heavily populated by humans during prehistoric times (Ruppe 1988:56-58). Unfortunately, until new detection techniques are developed, many of the completely inundated sites along the coastal zone will continue to evade detection.

Investigating the environmental and climactic dynamics that have impacted most coastal prehistoric sites is an important aspect of the research of their past and present conditions. Changes in sea level and in coastal geomorphology have severely affected the appearance of many early coastal sites and the surrounding environment. Post-pleistocene climatic shifts have resulted in a cumulative rise in sea level of up to 1.3 m. after 17,000 B.P. (Ruppe 1988:57). Michie has speculated, based on data from Daws Island, South Carolina, that an eight to ten foot rise in sea level has taken place over the past three-and-a-half thousand years (1973:123). The results of inundation, in some cases, severely distorts and damages artifacts and features, sometimes to the extent that sites may become undetectable. Sites that become subjected to undertows and wave action along the coast, as well as to the cutting action of stream and river dynamics, are likely to have been adversely impacted. Inundated sites have been found with relatively little disturbance. In situations where the context of an underwater site
has been retained, archaeologists are better able to make interpretations.

In response to changes in sea level, the formation and reformation of geomorphological features along the coastal zone has created additional problems for locating inundated sites. During times of rising sea levels, submerged land becomes smoothed out. Sites that were associated with these areas are likely to have been buried (Ruppe 1988:57-58). While this may make locating these sites more difficult, these sites may be better preserved than others.

Sites that have become inundated by less destructive forces are likely to be in an excellent state of preservation. The underwater environment has been known to preserve organic materials not expected to survive in most terrestrial contexts. Such materials can offer information on past environments, subsistence, technologies, artistic expressions, skeletal structure and pathologies (Purdy 1988:XI).

Chesterfield Ring (38BU29), Mulberry Mound (38KE12), Smith's Lake Creek Quarry (38AL135) and Spanish Mount (38CH62). Each of these prehistoric sites has been heavily damaged by the effects of creek or river dynamics. Large portions of each site have eroded into the underwater environment, thereby becoming inundated archaeological components. This erosional effect has not been stabilized, and continues to transform these sites. Each of these sites is discussed in further detail within the Prehistoric Archaeological Sites section of this report.

Underwater archaeological techniques have been employed at Mulberry Mound (Judge 1987) and the Smith's Lake Creek site (Goodyear et al. 1985). An exceptional amount of artifacts was recovered from each of these sites, as a result of the archaeology conducted underwater. The underwater archaeology conducted by the Department of Anthropology and the Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology and reported by Judge (1987) at the Mulberry site focused on the recovery of material from the Wateree River and Big Pine Tree Creek, a tributary of the river. Underwater techniques involved the reconnaissance and dredging of portions of the creek and river adjacent to the site through the use of an air lift system. In order to establish a controlled collection, sections of the river to be dredged were set-off into units. Different sections of the dredged areas divulged temporal and functional differences in the types of artifacts that were recovered. Materials recovered from the underwater work encompassed a wide range of materials including Mississippian period ceramics, lithics and organic items. Numerous historical artifacts were also discovered (Judge 1987:35-38).

Excavations at the Smith's Lake Creek site utilized a methodology similar to that used at the Mulberry site. At the Smith's Lake Creek site, tremendous amounts of information were airlifted from the creek's bottom. Forty gallons of artifacts were recovered, all related to Paleoindian use of the associated chert quarry. It was assessed during the underwater excavations at this site that the underwater component appeared to be in-situ (Goodyear et al. 1985:1-7).

No underwater work has yet been conducted at the Spanish Mount site. Its underwater component has strong potential to contain information about Late Archaic coastal adaptations. A large amount of cultural material was recovered during a limited excavation just below the erosional area of the mound (Sutherland 1974:185-195), suggesting that additional materials from this same component extend into the creek. Sites sharing a similar erosional patterning to that found at Spanish Mount (i.e. Mulberry and the Smith's Lake Creek site) suggest significant information may have been deposited within the underwater environment.

No underwater research has taken place at the Chesterfield Ring. The entire western side of this shell ring has already eroded into the Broad River. The underwater component of this site is within a marshy area extending along the riverbank. Shell ring sites are known to provide information on coastal subsistence patterns and early ceramics during the Late Archaic and Early Woodland periods.

In addition to these inundated sites, several other archaeological sites deserve some mention. Because of their outlying coastal location, most of South Carolina's shell ring sites are currently being threatened by the dynamics of ocean waters. The erosional effects of the ocean are extremely difficult and costly to curtail. Some type of management plan (either towards preservation or excavation) should be pursued. If preservation measures are to be taken, these would likely be more effective and less costly if undertaken before heavy degradation begins.
The Waterscape Archaeology of Plantation Sites

The historic period in South Carolina has been highly documented, encompasses a wide geographical dispersion, has contributed high quantities of artifacts and features, and is generally less deeply stratified than prehistoric sites. These factors often make locating historic sites much easier than prehistoric.

South Carolina's rich historical period contributed a great deal to the underwater archaeology of the rivers, streams and coastal zone. The majority of these sites resulted from an intentional interaction with the water. Transportation systems were highly reliant on the river systems and coastal ports. Most early plantations used rivers for the transportation of people, goods, and information. Boat landings associated with these plantations potentially hold a great deal of information about the range of activities that took place there (Errante n.d.).

Early economy in the state relied heavily on rice producing plantations. Using the tidal fluctuations of lowcountry rivers in rice agriculture is believed to have begun during the 1730s (Rogers 1980:9). This agricultural technique had an immense impact on the riverine shoreline. Through slave labor, great stretches of lowcountry riverside marshes were transformed into rice fields. Water control systems were developed to accommodate the flooding and draining of rice fields. These geographical transformations radically changed the appearance of South Carolina's lowcountry riverine shoreline. These archaeological features are very evident today. Very few of the present owners of these historic plantations have taken measures to preserve these features. Forces of nature have transformed these rice fields into swampy wetlands that now foster an abundance of wildlife.

Each of the plantations listed on the inventory that contains underwater components is associated with a major coastal river system and contains vast waterscape contexts involving a variety of features associated with the underwater environment.

Dean Hall Rice Trunk (38BK858). Dean Hall Rice Trunk is a good example of a water control system employed in tidal rice agriculture. The Dean Hall Rice Trunk includes an outer gate and remnants of the trunk. This mechanism is part of the rice-growing lands of the Dean Hall Plantation (Newell 1989). Rice trunks were designed to flood and drain the rice fields with the assistance of tidal fluctuations in lowcountry rivers. Originally, this mechanism would have also contained an inner gate.

In operation, the rice gates and trunk worked as a system and involved both manual and automatic elements when functioning. For example, to initiate water movement into a field, the outer gate was manually lifted and locked in place. The inner gate was constructed to swing open and allow water to flow out of the trunk and enter the field. Once a field was flooded to the desired level, the outer gate was lowered back into place. The pressure from inside the field forced the inner gate to remain shut. In order to let water out, this process was reversed as the inner gate would have to be lifted. Of course the flooding and draining of fields had to be synchronized with tidal fluctuations of the river (Hilliard 1975:58-62).

The Dean Hall Rice Trunk is believed to be one of the few good examples of a trunk and gate system remaining in situ from South Carolina's rice growing period.

Mark Newell, Project Developer for the Underwater Division of the SCIAA rated this site (Table 18) and states:

To my knowledge, there has not been to date a single professional archaeological evaluation of the hydraulic technology of the South Carolina rice culture. Neither have there been any professional studies of specific features of this technology. Natural process and development is depleting the sites associated with this technology and opportunities for eventual study are being lost. The Dean Hall Diamond Gate is a unique example. One of the main floodgates to the rice fields of Dean Hall Plantation on the Cooper River, this structure is being undermined by river currents and is slated for destruction by the Corps of Engineers as a hazard to navigation (a man was killed when his boat struck the structure in the early eighties). Action was delayed pending examination of the site by Alan Albright—no official report has ever been published—no official recommendations have been made to the COE. I have studied the structure and an internal proposal for study and preservation has been produced. COE, Dupont Company, and the City of Charleston (Cypress Gardens) have all indicated a willingness to provide funds for archaeology on the site. SCIAA has yet to approve any action.
The site has been dated to ca. 1825 but it represents a technology dated to ca. 1735, when tidally irrigated rice fields came into use. The technology mirrors English Canal hydraulic technology introduced into that country in ca. 1760 and not imported into the U.S. until the 1780s. Thus, these sites can shed light on important questions about the invention/introduction of hydraulic technologies relevant to inland navigation in America as well as the local rice culture. Interest in this site by the South Carolina Heritage Trust might provide the catalyst that is so urgently needed to spark professional interest in this virgin area of research.

Laurel Hill (38GE200), Medway (38BK56), Middleburg (38BK38), and The Oaks (38GE202). Each of these plantations dates back to South Carolina's colonial period. As with the majority of plantations during this time, these plantations were involved with growing rice crops as a primary economic staple. Extant waterscape features associated with rice agriculture and river transportation are present at each of these sites.

All four of these plantations contained rice mills and probably provided milling services to planters not as fortunate. Each of the mills is located near and is accessible to river transportation routes. Canals were constructed at Middleburg and the Oaks Plantations to provide river craft better access to the rice mill. It is likely that all four of these plantations relied on river transportation as the major access route to and from their mills. The mill at Middleburg is documented as servicing planters from as far away as Georgetown via river transportation (Leiding 1921:81). Middleburg and the Oaks Plantations contain rice mills that were known to have been run by hydraulic power. These mills required waterways and either mill ponds or tidal fluctuations to provide water circulation.

The remnants of boat landings are present at all four plantations and it is probable that they include archaeological deposits representing a diverse range of activities. Although the archaeological research of boat landings is rare, it is believed that landings were intimately involved with the transportation of plantation products (Errante n.d.). The waterscape associated with plantation boat landings is known to contain artifacts and features resulting from trash disposal, lost items, structural items and river craft debris and remains. Research conducted at the Middleburg waterscape is presented within the African-American Sites section of this report.

Two boat landings located at Medway Plantation are believed to hold rich waterscape deposits. Both of these landings contain great quantities of locally produced brick. The Back River, which flows by this plantation, was at one time flanked by brick yards. High quantities of brick are found all along the waterscape of this river. Another boat landing at Medway, located within an old rice field, is on the plantation's property and is not easily accessed from main river sources.

Inventories conducted on Middleburg and Laurel Hill Plantations list a variety of watercraft possessed by past owners. A 1743 inventory conducted on William Waties property at Laurel Hill Plantation lists that he owned a pettiauger, one ferry boat, five canoes, and held half ownership of a sloop. A 1772 inventory conducted at Middleburg Plantation during the ownership of Benjamin Simons II lists that he owned two canoes, one (rice) flat and was the half owner of the schooner "Two Brothers" (Charleston Inventories Volumes and Microfilm:118-124). Inventories of other planters as well may contain information on the types of watercraft that were used there. Since certain types of boats were generally used for particular transportation needs, this type of information is helpful in determining the type, and intensity of river travel that may have taken place at a plantation.

The waterscape contexts of these plantations hold great archaeological potential for providing information about the range of activities and people once active there. Historical and archaeological evidence presently known about these plantations reveals that a considerable amount of interaction with the waterscape did take place. The waterscapes, which include underwater sections of the river, should be considered and dealt with as significant components of the plantation site.

Table 18. Underwater Site Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38CH1049</td>
<td>Paul Pritchard Shipyard</td>
<td>Beard</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38BUR58</td>
<td>Dean Hall Diamond Gate</td>
<td>Newell</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acquiring the Past for the Future
Boat Landings of the Old Timey Towns. Early coastal towns maintained boat landings that were very important for the transportation needs of the community. Boat landings associated with each of these sites are known to have possessed significant archaeological deposits. The archaeological deposits associated with South Carolina's early towns are known to possess a great deal of refuse disposal. Deposits of this magnitude would be able to tell us a great deal about the lives of the inhabitants. Unfortunately, the archaeological significance of these sites has been reduced by the heavy amount of unprofessional collection that has taken place there.

Charles Towne Landing (38CH1), Old Dorchester (38DR1), and Willtown Bluff/Mount Hope Plantation (38CH58/482). An informal search for the Charles Towne boat landing, conducted during the 1969 excavations there by South, was inconclusive. No artifacts or features were encountered. Portions that were surveyed of what was believed to be the location of the boat landing revealed a mucky bottom. Landings associated with other early South Carolina towns reveal high quantities of historic materials associated with their landings. It is likely that the Charles Towne boat landing may be buried and contain information about this early settlement (Stanley South, personal communication 1991).

Old Dorchester, is known for its existence as a colonial town and for its involvement in the American Revolution. During the Revolution the British established a garrison overlooking the Ashley River. At their retreat they are believed to have dumped their cannon in the river (Smith 1905:85). It is unknown if the cannon have ever been retrieved. The underwater portion of the Dorchester site is given a separate number than the terrestrial section. The river along Dorchester, according to hobby diver reports, is characterized as being heavily laden with colonial refuse. Tremendous amounts of artifacts have been reported as being retrieved from the underwater portions of the Dorchester site. Of the two boat landings located at Dorchester, structural remains from one of these landings are still visible and are currently undergoing a great deal of damage from erosion and exposure. Historic artifacts are constantly eroding from the landing area. A bridge, constructed in 1734, once connected Dorchester with land on the opposite side of the Ashley River. It is not known when or how the bridge was destroyed.

Excerpts from commercial collections taken from the underwater portion of Willtown Bluff Site suggest that a great deal of refuse has been dumped into the associated waters. Twenty-five percent of the collection made there is curated at the SCIAA. Descriptions of all artifacts collected are listed in the site files. Artifacts collected from these waters may be associated with the inhabitants as well as with several military events that took place at Willtown and a ferry landing associated with the plantation (Bull 1973a).

Fort Congaree (38LX319). The riverside location of this fort contains a waterscape context but has also suffered from erosion that has inundated part of the site. Although the fort itself is situated on high ground, a lower area nearby would have easily accommodated a boat landing. An archaeological underwater reconnaissance of this site by the SCIAA resulted in a small amount of artifacts being recovered. It is presumed that the inundated archaeological deposits associated with this site may have been buried as a result of the heavy erosional action that has taken place along the site. The underwater deposits may provide a great deal of information about the lives of the people who once lived and traded at this site. Because of its close proximity to the fort, the nearby river may have been used for refuse disposal by the fort's inhabitants.

Paul Pritchard Shipyard (38CH1049). The Paul Pritchard Shipyard, during its ownership by Rose and Steward, is claimed to have produced some of the best ships in the southeast. The site was originally granted to George Dearsley and is believed to have been in operation by 1702. The shipyard passed through several owners and by the mid-eighteenth century was owned by the outstanding shipbuilders John Rose and James Steward. In 1763 they launched the "Heart of Oak," a square rigged vessel of 180 tons and capable of carrying 1,000 barrels of rice (Petit 1976:71). Several "sloops of war" were also constructed by Rose and Steward. The shipyard, after passing through several other owners, was sold to the commissioners of the South Carolina Navy in 1778. Paul Pritchard had just acquired the shipyard before the navy bought it away from him. The navy used the shipyard for converting merchant ships into warships. A battery was constructed sometime in the late 1770s near the mouth of Hobcaw Creek to protect the shipyard. After the Revolution, the shipyard was sold back to Paul Pritchard who operated it along with his son until 1831. After this time it was never
operated again until now (Bull 1973b). Currently, several sail boats are being refurbished on the property.

A large area of the shipyard appears to have been bulldozed into a large push-pile on the site. Some remnants of the Pritchard main house and an avenue of oaks are still evident on the property. The waterscape reveals part of a log structure located just offshore, a large amount of brick and ballast stone, and a small amount of ceramics and bottle glass. Some terrestrial testing and a waterscape survey need to be conducted in order to assess the significance and extent of the archaeological remains at this site (Figure 14).

The Paul Pritchard Shipyard site was ranked by Mr. David Beard of the SCIAA Underwater Division who ranked the site at 300 points. Mr. Beard provided the following in his assessment:

I gave it the highest ranking [in Rarity] because there simply are so few Colonial shipyard sites extant. While Linn’s shipyard is also preserved, the Pritchard shipyard has far more intact features.

Development at the site is currently underway, although not full-blown as of yet. Presently there is a considerable amount of activity around the waterfront such as hauling out boats for repair. This activity is undoubtedly impacting both submerged and terrestrial features. Erosion from increased powerboat traffic is adversely affecting the log structures in the tidal zone. Future land use includes construction of houses and the attendant docks. This will undoubtedly have a very severe impact on the site as a whole.

The site has seen very little surface alteration since the early 19th century. A number of intact surface, subsurface and submerged features are preserved on the site which relate to both domestic and commercial activities. Disturbance, until recently, has been minimal. Effect of current activities at site unknown. The nature of the features noted to date and their relative integrity make the site potentially very easy to interpret.

Since the Colonial period is fairly well understood, the site can add little to the chronology. As very little work has been done on Colonial shipyards this site can contribute much to our understanding of the commercial lifeways of the occupants and laborers. Site may possibly add to our knowledge of changes in shipbuilding, but without stratified ship remains this would likely be minimal. Heritage gets fairly high ranking since there may be easily definable differences between status, etc. of the proprietors and the laborers. Also, it may be possible to
determine that slaves trained in shipbuilding were being utilized at the site.

As is, the site offers minimal visible interpretive value. Archaeological excavation followed by some reconstruction could increase the value. Display value is slightly higher. Archaeological data could be used to produce a scale model of a working Colonial shipyard.

Legal Status And Conclusions

Underwater archaeological sites are regulated and protected under a different set of laws than terrestrial sites. Legal jargon refers to all underwater archaeological sites as "submerged archaeological historic properties." A submerged archaeological property is defined by South Carolina law as any site, vessel, structure, object, or remains, that may reveal significant information to the scientific study of human prehistory, history or culture. In addition a submerged site must be embedded in or on submerged lands and have remained unclaimed for at least fifty years, may be eligible for or be on the National Register on Historic Places, and is beneath or substantially beneath the state's territorial waters or submerged at mean low tide [South Carolina Underwater Antiquities Act 1991:54-7-620 (42-43)].

Submerged archaeological historic properties have been regulated in South Carolina since 1968, with passage of the state's first legislation dealing with underwater antiquities, entitled Control of Certain Salvage Operations. One feature of this law was that it established the Hobby Diver licensing (presently controlled under the Sport Diver Archaeology Management Program). Previously, the state had declared itself owner of all underwater abandoned property. The Hobby Diver License provides recreational divers the right to collect artifacts and fossils, within certain provisions. Unfortunately, this law also gave salvors complete ownership to underwater sites that they had discovered (Amer and Steen 1988:41).

This law has been revised and amended several times since 1968 and now revised in 1991, is entitled The South Carolina Underwater Antiquities Act of 1991 (as amended, Article 5, Section 54-7-620 et seq). The current law intends to preserve and encourage the scientific and recreational values inherent in submerged archaeological historic properties and paleontological properties for the benefit of the people of the state. The state still declares ownership of these submerged properties but provides that persons who wish to remove, displace, or destroy these properties must first obtain a license from the SCIAA (South Carolina Underwater Antiquities Act 1991:1).

A variety of licenses are currently available from the SCIAA. The Hobby Diver License, the most commonly dispensed, allows individuals to conduct temporary, intermittent, recreational, small scale, non-commercial search and recovery of submerged property. Recovery must not involve mechanical devices or excavation and limits divers to ten artifacts a day from shipwreck sites. Other types of non-commercial licensing include Intensive Survey and Data Recovery Licenses. These are limited to professional individuals with educational and scientific intent. A list of criteria must be presented by the applicant as well as certain agreements established with the SCIAA. Commercial licenses include more extensive requirements, but allow the licensee to receive at least fifty percent of the recovered submerged property. Commercial licenses are much more difficult to acquire (Amer 1991:2-3).

The South Carolina Underwater Antiquities Act of 1991 substantially helps in the legal protection of submerged archaeological historic properties. Better enforcement and encouragement to follow these laws is taking place. The SCIAA has been involved with patrolling problem areas and working closer with Hobby Diver Licensees. Unfortunately, the unlawful looting of sites continues. The SCIAA has even begun attempts to block highly looted sites with barricades. This may help deter looters from destroying highly sensitive areas but also prevents honest divers from enjoying the site.

Sites that include an inundated or waterscape context are a special problem. Because many terrestrial sites are not regulated such as submerged sites are, construction activities or other disturbances on the terrestrial surface often destroy part of the component and context with which the submerged site is associated. This type of destruction may be deterred only by the owners of the significant terrestrial property. It is hoped that legislation will eventually provided the means to prevent the collection of significant underwater sites.
CHAPTER VI
PROJECT SUMMARY: SOUTH CAROLINA HERITAGE TRUST STATEWIDE ASSESSMENT OF CULTURAL SITES

This last chapter presents some final comments and recommendations for the future of the cultural areas section of the Heritage Trust Program advised by the Cultural Areas Subcommittee. To review the overall accomplishments of this project the Principal Investigators have conducted a one-year project to identify critically significant archaeological sites within South Carolina. The goal of this work was to provide the Cultural Areas Subcommittee of the South Carolina Heritage Trust Advisory Board (HTAB) with a priority list of ranked sites for possible future acquisition or registration as South Carolina Heritage Preserves. In order to accomplish this task, the Principal Investigators refined a set of evaluation criteria in consultation with members of the professional archaeological community in South Carolina. Over the course of six months, 87 selected sites were visited to gather further information. Eventually, from a total number of approximately 13,000 known archaeological sites in the state, 100 sites were nominated for the list and were ranked by the professional community. The Heritage Trust 100 list was presented in Chapter IV. Other specific objectives of this project were to provide project documentation on all of the 100 sites, present this list and a project overview at a formal meeting of the Heritage Trust Advisory Board, and provide the Heritage Trust Program and the State Historic Preservation Office with this report of its findings and recommendations for the future. These goals have been met with this report.

THE HERITAGE TRUST 100 LIST

It is important to provide some final observations and comments on the Heritage Trust 100 list. First, the Principal Investigators must emphasize once again that the list is not the final word on critically significant sites in South Carolina. Rather it reflects the current state of knowledge concerning the state’s cultural resources. As new information is learned, and new discoveries are made, the list will need to be revised. However, this effort has resulted in providing the Heritage Trust with a starting point, based on the known resources in the state.

Second, the creation of a point system was of considerable concern to the Principal Investigators, as it was to the professional archaeological community. As stated previously, archaeologists are uncomfortable in rating one site over another. Still, it was important to develop some method of measuring the ‘value’ of one site to another, if only to provide a focus and priority for future Heritage Trust efforts. All the sites listed are endangered to one degree or another. All are important. Many more equally important sites have been recorded by archaeologists. The rating system provides a systematic direction to proceed in the acquisition of sites. That is, the Cultural Areas Subcommittee, based on the ranking provided, should proceed to attempt acquisition of site A (with 350 points) before site B (with 250 points).

However, it should also be remembered that the sites toward the bottom of the list are still critically significant sites. The Cultural Areas Subcommittee must remember that this list is the 100 critically significant of some 13,000 archaeological sites known in the state. Many of these sites were initially subjectively chosen above the others based on the professional communities total knowledge of the archaeology of the state. Sites made the list based on the experience and first hand knowledge of the archaeologists who nominated and ranked them. The South Carolina Archaeological Statewide Site Inventory was also reviewed to draw out important sites.

Third, the numerical ranking of the sites is not precise. That is, a site with a rating of 350 is not of measurable greater value than one rated 349 or even 300. However, a site rated 375 certainly has greater importance to acquire before one rated 240. The degree of precision of the rating system is impossible to know. Careful readers of this report will notice a wide gap in some cases where a site was rated by two archaeologists. One way to ensure greater precision in the future will be to have all sites rated by more than one archaeologist. Therefore, the Principal Investigators recommend that all sites are rated by at least three archaeologists and that an average be projected and used. Perhaps the archaeologists from the Cultural Areas Subcommittee (SHPO and SCIAA) should rate sites along with an outside consultant,
specializing in the area appropriate to the site being considered.

Finally, all attempts at progress have unintended consequences. An unintended consequence of this rating system was the reaction from the public and the media. Despite wide media attention during the project, when the list was announced, its intentions were sometimes misunderstood. Phone calls from public and private individuals indicated various concerns for these sites. It is possible that land speculators were also involved. Many assumed that the list meant that the Heritage Trust would move immediately to acquire the sites listed. This included individuals representing agencies who we thought were familiar with the project, but when it was announced that a site on their property was on the list they expressed unfounded concerns. The Principal Investigators also received calls from individuals and public representatives who wanted to know why their county had fewer sites on the list than another county. We expected, and got calls, concerning why a certain site was rated more than another or why wasn't a particular site on the list. Most surprising was one individual who made an attempt to use inside influence to acquire the list. This action is a clear warning to the Heritage Trust and archaeology about future problems and misunderstandings concerning the goals and missions of the Heritage Trust and the Wildlife and Marine Resources Department. Still, the criteria and list serve as a useful method of focusing priorities. These unintended consequences have drawn attention to the importance of cultural properties and the role the Heritage Trust should play in the future to acquire sites.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTION BY THE TRUST

Based on this concentrated effort to systematically evaluate the state's archaeological resources, the Principal Investigators have learned a great deal about the archaeology of the state and how the Trust might assist in its preservation. Concerning the next few years, the Principal Investigators recommend the following specific actions.

First, the process of inventory and ranking should continue and be constantly re-evaluated based on newly acquired information. Despite many years of archaeological research, the best sites may not yet have been discovered. The Trust should keep in close contact with the status of archaeological research and discovery, and be ready to act accordingly.

Second, natural areas already acquired should be surveyed to gather information on possible cultural properties contained within them. The Heritage Trust may already own several of the type of sites that are important to acquire. This survey should be an on-going but high priority as it could significantly change the priorities and the list.

Third, acquired cultural properties need to be regularly visited and actively managed. During the course of this project the Principal Investigators apprehended a person who was illegally visiting a Heritage Preserve. Sites will have to be monitored as they are acquired. The system of monitoring these sites must be built into their management plans and must be proactive.

Fourth, management plans for both natural and cultural areas need to be developed to properly manage these properties. A review of the current management plans should be made after areas are archaeologically surveyed to integrate the findings into the plan.

Fifth, past approved cultural areas projects should be brought to a conclusion. The Principal Investigators found a number of unfinished projects that need completing.

Sixth, the landowners who own sites on the ranked list should be contacted to begin the process of acquisition. Some initial contacts were made under this grant, however, it was impossible to make solid contact with all the landowners involved.

Seventh, public education efforts toward the preservation of cultural resources should be expanded. This is an effort that must be made by all preservation agencies and organizations. A role should also be played by the Heritage Trust Program.

The Principal Investigators feel that these recommendations are all contingent on one major step. This is, to find the funding available to house within one of the three major state agencies (SHPO, SCIAA, or SCWMRD) a full-time Heritage Trust Archaeologist. As archaeologically significant properties are evaluated, acquired and maintained, this individual will be critical to the Heritage Trust's success. This is clearly evident based on a review of the
past efforts within the Heritage Trust to acquire and maintain sites.

Another but more abstract problem, which the Principal Investigators feel can also be solved with a Heritage Trust Archaeologist, involves providing the public and members of the Heritage Trust with a better understanding of the goals and needs of archaeological preservation. There are real and meaningful differences between the protection and management of natural and cultural resources. During the course of this project these differences became increasingly apparent. The problem can be summarized as basically a misunderstanding as to what archaeology is. The object of archaeology is no longer (if it ever was) the process of finding and collecting artifacts. Archaeology is the process of understanding the past using the material culture remains of the past. As such, the evaluation of archaeological sites is based on what they can tell us about the past.

While this concept has been repeated time and again by archaeologists, it has special and great repercussions in what the Heritage Trust does to acquire sites. For example, the Principal Investigators were often asked during the course of the project to evaluate sites based on a single one or two-hour visit. This can not be done, or can not be done with much confidence. What is or is not important about a site can only be determined by excavation, which brings on logistical and ethical obligations to the archaeologist far more complex and time-consuming than simply walking the property (A problem exacerbated by the fact that some archaeologists will occasionally do just that. Readers should note that the sites evaluated herein, generally, were based on past archaeological work far more encompassing than this project's level of effort and the Project Archaeologists simply built on that previous work). A simple walkabout on a property provides no more than a guess because the value of the archaeological site is invisible without test excavation. Sometimes historical research can assist, but until a spade is turned, such evaluation is guesswork. To provide a useful and relevant assessment of a site requires test excavation.

Another related consequence of this concept is as follows. The value of sites is discovered by archaeology during which, of course, the archaeologist destroys part of the site. Archaeological sites evaluated and recommended for acquisition within the Heritage Trust are done so that the site is 'banked' for the future. Excavation of such a site in the future will be conducted only after a very carefully thought-out plan can be developed. Continual excavation could eventually remove the site's value (the reason for acquisition). Thus, the reasons to acquire an archaeological site in the future may be slightly different than for natural resources. Archaeological sites should be acquired to protect them and hold them for the future, not to excavate within a few years.

These examples are presented simply to demonstrate the differences between how archaeologists go about evaluating and acquiring sites and those efforts of the natural areas projects. Again, future progress and quality evaluation efforts for archaeological properties rests critically on maintaining a cultural presence within the Heritage Trust Program best exemplified by a Heritage Trust Archaeologist.

Finally, the Principal Investigators might note that eventually, (far into the future) a Heritage Trust Preserve may actually be excavated away using the best scientific methods. The Heritage Trust must then decide how to treat an acquired location which no longer has the values for which it was acquired. Perhaps a similar problem may exist with natural areas that, for no reason other than nature itself, a natural element is lost. This is a special problem that should someday be considered within the Cultural Areas Subcommittee.

CONCLUSIONS

Over the past year the Principal Investigators conducted a statewide assessment of the archaeological resources of the state of South Carolina for the South Carolina Heritage Trust. This project can only conclude with the obvious statement that the state is exceedingly rich in cultural resources and that they are, for the most part, under some or great danger of being lost. South Carolina is fortunate in having one of the most well developed trust programs in the nation for natural and cultural resources. It is imperative that the 'resource' that is the Heritage Trust, be used to effectively save cultural resources that can not be saved through other means. South Carolina has the means and the will through the Heritage Trust Program to reach heritage goals only dreamed of by other states. It is up to the Heritage Trust Program to execute the program to accomplish these goals.
To reiterate, once again this list will change as archaeological sites are discovered and as others are lost due to development, vandalism, natural forces, or simply neglect. This document was constructed as a management tool for the South Carolina Heritage Trust Advisory Board. It is intended solely for that purpose and for no other reason. It is not intended for public consumption, rather its use is restricted to the Heritage Trust, SCIAA, SHPO, and professional archaeologists. The reason for this is the fact that this list in the hands of a developer or a vandal would quickly eliminate the need for such a document. It is hoped that this study will benefit the South Carolina Heritage Trust Program, and ultimately the citizens of the state as the Heritage Trust acquires the past, here in the present, for the benefit of future generations.
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