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Our move to new quarters has been completed and most of the installation of laboratory facilities has been done. We are approaching the point where things are in their proper places and work can be a bit more efficient. We still need more laboratory layout space and more space for our specimen files. We are counting on expanding down the hall here in Maxcy College soon. We are really going to be cramped for space when Stanley South brings his specimens and equipment up from Charleston but we will manage somehow. We are so pleased with the appearance of our new quarters here in Maxcy College that we cordially invite all our friends to visit us so we can show off. We owe a deeply sincere "thank you" to Vice President Brunton, and Mr. Turbeville, Mr. Mitchell and the whole maintenance gang for a beautiful job of remodeling the building.

We are also pleased with the work our student staff is doing. We have a good group of student assistants and appreciate their dedicated efforts toward our work.

Our public relations have continued this month with several radio and television appearances. I spoke to the Colleton County Historical Society in Walterboro on October 9 and visited several sites in that vicinity on the trip down there. Tom Hemmings and I made two trips to Charleston County during the month at the urging of Mr. James Turner. We recovered an impressive series of mastodon bones and other extinct fauna. There is a remote possibility of associated artifacts but more of this later when we know more.

We also made a trip to Litchfield Beach on October 18 to investigate remains of an old ship, fragments of which were dug up in 1965 when Mr. Alva Lumpkin's house was being built. There were only small fragments left in the fill and nothing of promise appeared to warrant excavation. I wish we had been there in 1965. We appreciate Mr. Lumpkin's hospitality while we were there and Mr. Roland Young's efforts in organizing the trip.

APOLOGY TO OUR READERS: We are very embarrassed by the poor quality of the half-tone illustrations in the June-September NOTEBOOK. We apologize to the readers and especially to the author. Our printer has agreed to do these plates over and we will send them out with this NOTEBOOK. The new plates can be inserted in place of the originals.

We still need manuscripts for the NOTEBOOK. We are delighted to have those that have been coming in and encourage our readers to send material to:

Dr. Robert L. Stephenson, Director
Institute of Archeology and Anthropology
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29208
EXCAVATIONS AT TOM'S CREEK

by James L. Michie

(Editor's Note: Mr. Michie, of Columbia, South Carolina, is President of the Archeological Society of South Carolina. He has been a scientifically oriented amateur archeologist for a number of years and has worked diligently for conservation of archeological sites in the state. We are pleased to publish this report of his and Mr. Fischer's work at the Tom's Creek Site.)

Introduction

In March 1969, Mr. William Fischer, a fellow amateur archeologist, from Charleston, and I were interested in excavating a portion of a large site. Our interests were to find early Indian material in stratified context. Several large sites were visited, but for varying reasons we felt that the sites would not yield early material.

After visiting the Tom's Creek Site and learning of the early Indian material that had been found in the cultivated area, we decided to test an undisturbed portion of the site. This site is situated on a small tributary of the Congaree River near Columbia, in Lexington County, South Carolina. The area we chose to examine lies in a wooded area on a small bluff overlooking the creek. (See Fig. 1)

In April 1969, we began work on the Test Pit and resumed work again on the adjacent squares in August. The recovered materials were cataloged and analyzed and the following pages report the result of our work.

SECTION I - THE TEST PIT

Because of the usual lack of stratification in the sites of the South-eastern United States, we decided first to excavate in arbitrary levels of three inches. The first six inches of soil yielded a woodland occupation which contained projectile points, potsherds, broken slate gorgets and worked stone. Even though we used three inch levels, satisfactory separation in culture could not be obtained in this woodland level. The first six inches of soil was humus, containing evidence of white man as well as Indian. Bottle caps and spark plugs were as common as pottery.

The next three inches brought us down to nine inches. Having reached this level we had gone through the dark humus zone and had gone into a dark brown sand that indicated a great deal of cultural disturbance. This six inch to nine inch level yielded nothing more than worked stone and sand tempered pottery. The next three inches (9" to 12") yielded two quartz Savannah River Archaic points and a great deal of chipped stone which was mostly quartz, although chert and slate were present.

The twelve to fifteen inch level became increasingly interesting, for earlier material was found. This level produced seven Guilford points and the same amount of worked stone. Pottery was not present. Two Morrow Mountain Points were also found in this level. Down further to eighteen inches, the
Morrow Mountain Points became the dominant projectile point type. At this level (15"-18") a total of seven Morrow Mountain Points were found. Quartz and chert continued into this layer as it had in the upper levels. It is interesting to note that a projectile point of chert had not yet been found.

At the bottom of this layer, the sand begins to change to a lighter color. The troweled bottom still indicated cultural disturbance and we expected to find material below this layer. The next three inch layer (18"-21") produced the same as the above layer. However it only yielded four of the Morrow Mountain Points and they were found at the top of this level. The material remained the same.

Our next level 21" to 24" yielded perhaps the most interesting level we had found. The bottom of the layer is a clean white sand that showed occasional evidence of disturbance; we found a Palmer Point and an end scraper. The Palmer was corner-notched, basal ground, serrated and slightly beveled. The point was made from chert. An early archaic occupation was evident.

We were still confident that material underlay the twenty-four inch level. Once again we cleaned the screen and began on the next three inches. Having taken this soil and passed it through the screen we found material was still present in the 24" to 27" level. Again quartz and chert chippings were present, but the quantity was considerably smaller. The troweled surface again gave a clue to occupational disturbance and a hint that something was below this layer.

The 27" to 30" layer passed through the screen with no results other than chipped quartz and chert. It was becoming clearer that the chance of finding a projectile at this depth was slim. However, the troweled level of 30" indicated occupation.

As we began work on the 30" to 33" level, we found a layer of yellow ochre at 32". We troweled down to this level and noticed an interesting feature, that this thin veneer of ochre showed evidence of occupation. That is, the veneer showed disturbance of being lived upon. We also noticed that chipped stone was on this veneer. However, no artifacts were found. Underlying this ochre was a thick layer of chalky, coarse white sand. The white sand contained nothing. The pit was abandoned.

SECTION II - THE EXCAVATIONS

Having excavated the test pit we knew the site had been occupied for a long time. Material that had been found below the Palmer level suggested that there were occupations in the area at a time before 8,000 years ago.

We decided to excavate a series of 5' x 5' squares, with the test pit included as part of the series. It was our intent to complete, by the end of fall, an area that would measure 20' x 20'.

Beginning from the edge of our test pit we measured in a westward direction, toward the creek ten feet. This brought us to the edge of the creek. We then measured from the opposite edge of the test pit, five feet.
FIGURE # 2
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These measurements, including the test pit, provided us with two twenty-foot lines. The lines were adjusted to parallel the remaining sides of the test pit. Using this established 5' x 20' we then laid our 20' x 20' grid system. (See Site Layout, Fig. 2)

Knowing that Pit 2-B (Test Pit) was productive we moved to Pit 2-C, 2-D and then Pit 2-A. The results were rewarding. In the upper levels, we found several post molds and fire pits. In lower levels, we located a few more fire pits. It is interesting to note that neither organic material nor charcoal was found in these hearths, nor did we find these hearths lined with stone. Generally speaking, the hearths were small and shallow, being some fifteen to twenty inches in diameter and some four to eight inches deep. Although organic material was absent in the hearths, we occasionally found projectile points and stone chippings.

Our first 5' x 20' gave us practically the same information that was given in our test pit. The lower levels gave us Palmer Points and end scrapers, the middle layers produced Morrow Mountain and Guilford Points and the Upper level provided us with Woodland material. The material was consistently in its proper level and sequence.

In August 1969, we decided to extend our work but this time in a different direction. Using our original test pit, we measured south five feet from the edge of the pit and ten feet from the north edge. We then ran our lines parallel with the edges of the pit and established a right angle to our first trench. We began work on pit 3-B and worked north to Pit 1-B and O-B.

This trench produced the same information as our first trench and produced more fire hearths and post molds (See Fig. #6). The sequence remained the same. Material earlier than Palmer had not been found.

At a later date Pits 3-A, 3-C and 3-D were completed. Pit 3-A was virtually sterile except for woodland material which is always present. Evidence of Guilford and Morrow Mountain was present in Pits 3-C and 3-D. (See Fig. #5).

Pits 1-D, 1-C and 1-A were completed by the fifth of October. Pit 1-A produced a fire pit near 18". In the area around the fire pit, several Morrow Mountain Points were found. As always, the fire pit was represented simply by darkened earth.

After the completion of Pit 1-A, plans were made for extension of our work.

Beginning with Pit O-A we worked in a westerly direction towards the creek. These series of pits produced the same results as the others except for Pit O-A. This particular square produced a Taylor Point. The point was discovered on the 24" level during troweling. It was a single find and was in no association with a hearth.

Generally speaking, the excavations were productive and the site
contained an interesting projectile point sequence. The excavations have indicated that the stratification is due to cultural deposit and that much of the deposit was laid down by the Guilford and Morrow Mountain people. The work has yielded fire pits, post molds and a strong ceramic complex. We have also learned that the inhabitants of the excavated area made use, primarily, of quartz and chert.

In closing this section, I would like to remind the reader that our work represents only a very small portion of this large site, and that our findings have not necessarily been a true representative of the past history of the site, because of this fact.

SECTION III - PROJECTILE POINTS

Although projectile points were found at all levels, the majority were found in the middle layers of the excavations. Because of this fact, I would first like to discuss the greatest number.

The Morrow Mountain Point is the dominant type. It is found consistently at the 15" to 18" level. This point type is usually 1" to 1-3/4", by metric scale this would be 25mm to 45mm in length. These points appear to be made by percussion and pressure flaking. Some of the points still retain their original striking platform seen, of course, at the base. I should like to mention that no basal grinding has been observed, although Joffre Coe has mentioned that these points may be ground or smoothed at the base. It is interesting to note that these points are usually found in clusters around fire pits and that they are rarely found singly.

The Guilford Point represents the second greatest number of point types found. The Guilford is somewhat larger than the Morrow Mountain and its length is generally two inches, although they may vary from 1-3/4" to 2-1/4" (40mm to 55mm). The point is apparently made by direct percussion and finished by secondary chipping along its edges. Guilford Points are also found in clusters in this site, just as the Morrow Mountain Points are and they are associated with fire pits.

Woodland points are consistently found in the first 9" of soil and may be classed as two types, triangular and stemmed. Of the two types, the triangular is the more popular type. These triangular points would fall into three basic types; Badin, Yadkin and Clements. The stemmed point could be placed in the Randolph class, for many of them are made from older, broken points. More often than not, they are irregular in shape.

Palmer Points were found and they follow Joffre Coe's description very closely. The points are found singly and without association with any other artifacts or features. However, it is important to mention that these points were found in the 18" to 24" level and were found closer to 24" than 18".

Although Savannah River Archaic Points were found, they were few in number (See Fig. #8). Those that were found came from 6" to 12" and were

*2. See bibliographic reference.
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found nearer the 12" level. The points are somewhat smaller than the ones described by Joffre Coe, being some 45mm to 60 mm in length, however they follow the same technique of manufacture.

One point type, described by the author in 1964, deserved mention because it was found on the 24" level. This point type is the Taylor Point. At the 24" level in Pit O-A, the point was found while the level was troweled smooth. A description of the point is as follows: "a basal ground, serrated, beveled, side notched point, with the basal edges being square and a slight basal concavity." Although only one of these points was found, it is important for it was found below Palmer Points.

This section on projectile points has been brief, mainly because the point types fit so closely with the descriptions in Joffre Coe's book, The Formative Cultures of the Carolina Piedmont, that a word by word description was not necessary.

It is interesting that there is such a gap between Morrow Mountain and Palmer. The Kirk series and the Stanley Point have not been represented at all.

SECTION IV - WORKED STONE

Worked stone, found in the excavation include projectile points, scrapers and slate gorgets.

Scrapers are placed in two categories, end scrapers and side scrapers. The end scrapers were found in the lower levels and appear to be associated with Palmer Points. The side scrapers are mostly associated with Guilford and Morrow Mountain Points. They were usually found near fire pits.

Slate Gorgets occur in the first six inches of soil and were found in Pits 2-C, 1-C and 0-D. (See Figure #4.) All of the gorgets are fractured. The fracture consistently occurs across the hole, which was drilled through the face of the gorget.
The fire pits that were found appear to represent the Guilford and Morrow Mountain occupations. Several of these pits contained projectile points and stone chippings. The pits varied from 15" to 20" in diameter and 4" to 8" in depth. They were neither lined with stone nor did they contain organic material. They were simply represented by black earth.

Post Molds, like the fire pits, were also represented by black soil. Because of black humus soil and because of the network of tree roots, it was impossible to detect features in the first 6" of soil. However, when we passed through the roots and humus layer, features became noticeable. Generally, the 12" level produced the first clean features. These post molds varied considerably in depth. Some would disappear at the 24" level, while others would continue farther. It is odd that Pit 3-A did not contain a post mold, for both the 12" and 18" levels contain interesting patterns. Perhaps Pit 3-A did have a post mold, that may have been removed in the first 12" of soil. Pit l-D may have also contained a feature, but intrusions in that area may have destroyed it. (See Figure 6.)

Pit 3-B contained a Woodland fire pit from which pottery and chippings were recovered. This pit disappeared at the 12" level.

SECTION VI - POTTERY

A total of 351 potsherds were recovered from our excavation. All of the sherds were sand tempered, being check stamped, cord marked, plain or punctate.

In general the sherds were very small, varying from 10mm to 30 mm at their widest point. Only rarely did we find sherds larger than this.

Although fiber tempered pottery is reputed to have come from the site, no such pottery was in our excavations.

Due to the smallness of the sherds, one cannot do very much with comparison or analysis. Also, the few identifiable pieces were thoroughly mixed in the 0" to 12" levels, so that separation could not be obtained. Therefore, this writer offers a simple chart for those interested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POTTERY TYPES</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Check</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deptford Linear</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cord Marked</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctate</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentifiable</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>351</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>0&quot; - 6&quot;</th>
<th>6&quot; - 12&quot;</th>
<th>12&quot; - 18&quot;</th>
<th>18&quot; - 24&quot;</th>
<th>24&quot; - 30&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chert</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartz</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slates</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIG. #7**

PERCENTAGE OF STONE AT 6" LEVELS

(CHIPPED STONE)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPTH</th>
<th>PROJECTILE POINT TYPES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0&quot;-6&quot;</td>
<td>WOODLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6&quot;-12&quot;</td>
<td>SAVANNAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12&quot;-18&quot;</td>
<td>GUILFORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18&quot;-24&quot;</td>
<td>MORROW MOUNTAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PALMER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HARDAYAY SIDE NOTCHED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAYLOR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure #8**
- Projectile Point Distribution -
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIT</th>
<th>BADIN</th>
<th>YADKIN</th>
<th>CLEMENTS</th>
<th>RANDOLPH</th>
<th>SAVANNAH</th>
<th>RIVER ARCH.</th>
<th>GUILFORD</th>
<th>MORROW</th>
<th>MOUNTAIN</th>
<th>PALMER</th>
<th>HARDWAY</th>
<th>SIDE-NOTC.</th>
<th>TAYLOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-D</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-B</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-A</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|        | 12    | 7      | 3      | 5      | 4      | 17     | 51     | 12    | 1      | 1     | 113     | broken or unidentifiable | 39 |
|        |       |        |        |        |        |        |        |       |        |       |         | TOTAL 152     |      |

**Figure #9**

- Projectile Point Location -
SECTION VII - COMMENTS

It should be noted that the first 8" of soil was extremely hard to excavate, for it contained network of tree roots. Some of the roots were so large that a bush ax was utilized. Generally, a bush ax is intended for bushes, however, it works well for clearing roots.

Another comment I would like to make concerns the excavation. Unfortunately, the first series of pits were backfilled. It was our intent to do a complete exposure type excavation, but the landowner requested we fill the holes. Ten of the pits were backfilled, but then during a later conversation with the owner we were granted permission to leave our work exposed.

Interesting features were photographed and are available to the reader upon request.
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HISTORY OF THE ARCHEOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

by James L. Michie

(Editor's Note: Mr. Michie is President of the Archeological Society of South Carolina, has been a purposeful collector of artifacts for some years and has been working closely with the Institute.)

Unfortunately for South Carolina, very little professional archeological work has been done. In the past, the work that was done was frequently done hastily and much of the material that was collected was carried out of state. Finally the great trauma came when people could not remember all of those who came and left. Those that could be remembered could not be contacted or were deceased. Information on past discoveries was just not available for South Carolinians. All this despite the fact that the first archeology done in the state was done as long ago as the 1820's, when Dr. Blanding examined and reported on the mounds near Camden.

It is also unfortunate that our universities and colleges failed to establish studies in the field of archeology and to hire professional archeologists in earlier days when archeological material was more plentiful. Most other states began extensive archeological programs in the 1920's and 1930's or earlier. Because of this, our state fell further behind in the field of archeology. At the same time the progress of modern civilization continued to destroy archeological sites at an ever increasing rate by reservoir construction, highways, urban development and other forces of progress.

Something had to be done about the problem of preservation. Our material had to be properly salvaged and recorded for future Carolinians.

In the spring of 1958, Dr. William Edwards, an anthropologist with an interest in archeology joined the University of South Carolina as an associate professor of anthropology. With the help of several amateurs, Dr. Edwards formed the first state archeological society. However, the road for this society was rocky and full of many pit holes. Conflict and disinterest flourished and in 1965 the society collapsed.

Not until the fall of 1968, did our state receive its first full-time archeologist, Dr. Robert L. Stephenson. After finishing a program in Nevada, Dr. Stephenson joined the University of South Carolina as Director of the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology and as State Archeologist. Several months later a group of amateurs and the new State Archeologist sat down and discussed the possibility of forming a new state society. These amateurs and the professional agreed the new society would, upon establishment, encourage scientific investigation and study of archeological remains in South Carolina. It was also noted that careless unrecorded digging of sites should be discouraged, and the proposed organization or society should try to unite all South Carolinians interested in archeology as a means of promoting the study and preservation of South Carolina's archeological remains. With these thoughts in mind, the group held an organizational meeting in January 1969, elected officers and directors and became the ARCHEOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF SOUTH
The officers for this first year are: President, James L. Michie of Columbia; Vice President, James Turner of Charleston; Secretary, Lucia L. Harrison of Columbia; Treasurer, M. Gay Suber of Columbia; Editor, Maurice J. Green of Lexington; Associate Editors, Eric Croen of Simpsonville, William Fischer of Charleston, and Tom Edwards of Florence. The Directors are: Tony Harper of Greenville, T. E. Hester of Columbia, Frank F. Hill of Columbia, Roy Lyons of Aiken, Dr. Chapman Milling of Columbia and Dr. Robert L. Stephenson of the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology.

For the past year the society has sailed beautifully through eleven meetings, all carried with competent speakers. The meetings are held on the third Friday of each month at 8:30 P.M. in the Science Museum at 1519 Senate Street in Columbia. Dues are nominal: $5.00 per year for individual members, $6.00 for family memberships, and $10.00 for institutional memberships.

Mr. Stanley South, our archeologist at Charles Towne, presented an informative program on "Historical Archeology." Mr. E. T. Hemmings gave the society a talk on "Early Man at the Murray Springs Clovis Site." The society was further graced by having Mr. Donald Sutherland, Associate Professor of Anthropology, deliver a talk on "Field Methods." Mr. Jim Batey and Drew Ruddy of Charleston presented a fine program, "Undersea Archeology." Mr. Donald Colquhoun, Director of Geology, gave an interesting talk on "Coastal Plain Geology as Related to Archeology." Jim Michie also presented two talks on "Projectile Points and Early Man in South Carolina." In addition to the monthly meetings, the Society now issues a quarterly bulletin "South Carolina Antiquities."

To say the least, the state society got off to a great start this year. We now have a membership of 183 members and the membership is still growing. With the continued efforts of the staff, we expect our Tricentennial Year, 1970, to be an even better year for the ARCHEOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF SOUTH CAROLINA.