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November has continued to be busy for the Institute, though things are settling down more to orderly progress of work and direction toward specific objectives. Our time has been spent in meetings, trips, seminars, talks, and routine work. The trip to Macon took a week out, but a profitable one, and the excavations at Charles Towne were finally closed down for the year on November 18.

We had a pleasant visit from Dr. William Edwards and his wife on November 5-9. Dr. Edwards, past Director of the Institute, is now at Temple Buell College in Denver, Colorado. He was here to get the last of his personal belongings that he had stored with us.

We participated on November 8 as a member of the Review Board for The National Register of Historic Places at the State Department of Archives and History. The Board adopted a "consensus list" of 11 districts and 53 individual sites for designation as Historic Landmarks. Included among these are two Indian mound groups and seven prehistoric shell ring sites.

We did not get to go to the Eastern States Archeological Federation meeting in Morgantown, West Virginia this year much as we would have liked to, but the Archeological Society of South Carolina was formally accepted to membership in that Association at the meeting.

We have made several speeches and radio and television appearances this month. A talk to the Five Points Civitan Club on November 10 in Columbia went well and two guest appearances on Bill Benton's radio show covered general archeology of North America. On November 21 I taped two, ten minute, shows on the archeology of the Charles Towne Site for Harvey Teal's "History of South Carolina" series on Educational T.V. On November 25 I spoke to the Greenwood Rotary Club on "What is Past is Prologue or You Ain't Seen Nothin' Yet." Following this talk, I drove to Charleston to confer at length with some of the underwater salvage people regarding licenses.

On November 1 we had nearly finished reconstruction of the earthen parapets at Charles Towne and the nurserymen had laid all but the last load of sod. It looked beautiful and then we got seven and one-half inches of rain in one afternoon. The earthen parapets had not had time to stabilize and about thirty percent of it slumped and caved into the moat. Now we have a rebuilding job again but we will get it done.

We have had a couple of letters from John Combes this month. He is finding graduate school at the University of Kansas is a full-time job and a half and he says he really has his nose in the books.

Keep sending manuscripts to us for use in the NOTEBOOK. Send them to:

Dr. Robert L. Stephenson, Director
Institute of Archeology and Anthropology
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29208
On November 3 the Florence Museum in Florence, South Carolina, was host to the first monthly Florence Archeological Seminar. James L. Michie, President of the Archeological Society of South Carolina, and I drove over for it. There was a 4:00 P.M. television show in the afternoon on which Gene Waddell, Director of the Florence Museum, Tom Edwards, Assistant Editor of "South Carolina Antiquities" and James Michie and I participated. After an enjoyable cookout at Gene Waddell's "cabin", we began the meeting at 8:00 P.M. at the Museum.

This series of seminars was initiated by Gene Waddell and Tom Edwards as a part of the amateur archeological activities of the state and in conjunction with the State Society. It is to be strictly informal with no membership, officers, or dues but designed entirely to give the local people of Florence County and the surrounding area a chance to get together and discuss archeology. Its connection with the State Society is that its leadership is from the Society and those who attend are encouraged to join the Society even though they may not be able to get to all the Society meetings in Columbia.

The program consisted of five parts. Tom Edwards introduced the Seminar. I spoke on the subject of cooperation and assistance between amateur and professional archeologists. James Michie spoke on the kind of support that the amateurs of the state should be receiving and giving to a state archeological program. Gene Waddell spoke on the support of archeology by local people. Senator Eugene Zeigler offered remarks on the needs for archeological research in the state and the ways this is being brought about. There was then a general discussion of archeology in the state and in the Florence area.

It was a most worthwhile effort and is now planned as a regular event for the first Monday evening of each month at the Florence Museum. Everyone is welcome so come if you can. There were about 50 people at this first Seminar.

GROTON PLANTATION PROJECT - A PROGRESS REPORT

by Drexel A. Peterson

(Editor's Note: Mr. Peterson is a graduate student at Harvard and spent this past summer directing a Peabody Museum excavation at Groton Plantation in South Carolina. The work was sponsored by the owners of Groton Plantation, Mr. Frederick Winthrop and his brothers. We deeply appreciate the landowners' generosity and also Mr. Peterson's contribution to the NOTEBOOK.)

Groton Plantation covers over 35 square miles of the South Carolina side of the Savannah River in Allendale County. It includes both the Savannah River swamp and "uplands." It has also been the scene of two archaeological projects. In both 1964 and 1969 through the interest and generosity of Mr. Frederick Winthrop and his brothers, the owners of Groton Plantation, archaeological survey and excavation have been carried out. In 1964 James Stoltman of the Peabody Museum established the presence of 21 sites and excavated extensively at one of them, GR-1 or Rabbit Mount. During this past summer
(1969) I have conducted a further survey increasing the site total to 43 and excavated at four sites, most extensively at GR-23 or Pendar and GR-2 or Clear Mount.

Before detailing my recent work, I will present a short summary of Stoltman's findings since I found myself stepping off from his work. Stoltman accomplished three major objectives -- (1) the isolation and dating of an important Stallings Island component at GR-1; (2) the recording of the 21 sites with collections from each; (3) a general cultural sequence for the area with an attempt to explain some of the cultural variation.

Rabbit Mount (GR-1) has yielded the earliest dates yet for pottery in North America (ca. 2500 B.C.). These dates push back the age of fiber-tempered pottery in Georgia - South Carolina about 400 years. The entire "Stallings Island Culture" assemblage was also recovered.

The recovery of collections from 21 sites in various areas of the Plantation is not an end in itself, but it leads to the third objective -- cultural sequence, cultural variation, and some explanations. Stoltman suggests six phases in the pottery sequence at Groton; they follow those first defined about thirty years ago for the mouth of the Savannah: Stallings or fiber-tempered, Deptford, Wilmington, Savannah I, Savannah II, and Irene. The definition and dating of these phases is well beyond the scope of this brief report. One obvious gap must, however, be mentioned. Stoltman could not fill the apparent gap between Stallings and Deptford that has plagued archaeologists for so long.

Stoltman also gave some explanations for the changes in culture as reflected in the pottery and the settlement patterns as seen from the site survey. Stallings material is restricted to a riverine environment with reliance on shellfish resources. Deptford shows a pattern of small occupations both in the swamp and in the uplands. Wilmington material, however, is relatively absent from the swamp sites but is most common in small sites dotting the uplands. Stoltman infers the beginning of slash-and-burn agriculture. Savannah I, by its unclear definition everywhere, is a bit hard to judge, but by Savannah II times the major occupations are again in the swamp suggesting the importance of river traffic and trade and possible wetland or flood agriculture.

Despite these accomplishments Stoltman was the first to recognize that more work was needed. Not only was the transition from the Stallings to the later phases unclear, but the Deptford, Wilmington, and Savannah I phases remained little more than descriptions of pottery types. Dating in other than the most general relative terms was also not improved. Certainly any increase in the number of sites and collections might clarify both the sequence and the interpretation of settlement patterns.

With these problems in mind another season of work was begun on Groton Plantation in 1969. The first priority was the evaluation of sites for excavation -- both those known to Stoltman as well as any new sites that could be located. Happily several new sites were known to the Chapmans. With

their knowledge of the Plantation and their help, all the sites were easily located and collected. Then an excavation crew of four and later five boys (ages 13 to 15) was assembled.

The first site chosen for excavation was first found in 1968 during the construction of a small dam. This site, GR-22, located below Stephens Shed, looked very promising from surface indications. It was hoped that a clear stratigraphic sequence from Stallings to later phases might be uncovered. Such was not the case -- at least not after the bulldozers and the dam construction. The site was located by the bulldozer but also destroyed by it. Pits in four different areas of the site failed to find any stratigraphy. The site is, however, still important; there was clearly another substantial Stallings occupation there although this could only be determined from the surface collections.

Unsatisfactory results from a second site must also be reported. Six pits were put in at the site called Stephens Shed, GR-6, in an attempt to find any evidence of structures or to improve the definition of either or both of the Deptford and Wilmington phases. No significant deposit, let alone structural remains, could be located.

A site near another small dam on the Pendar section of the Plantation yielded somewhat better if still problematical results. Site GR-23 is primarily a five-acre scattering of chipping debris. There are a few finished stone tools, and the first point recovered from the surface was of a type manufactured between eight and nine thousand years ago. Other more recent projectile points and even a few potsherds also occurred on the surface, and it was hoped that one or more components could be isolated below the surface mixture.

The reason for the great amount of chipping at the Pendar site seems clear; it lies only about three miles from the Rice Chert Quarry (GR-5), almost the only local source for good "chipable" stone. There are also other sites stretching along the county road leading from the Plantation to the Rice property with much chipping debris indicating an intensive specialization around this important resource. This location proximate to the stone source is also a mixed blessing to the archaeologist. Apparently sites such as GR-23 were utilized off-and-on for centuries, even millennia, and a great amount of mixture seems inevitable.

Accepting these risks, 14 pits were sunk into the Pendar Site (GR-23) in two locations. The first two produced little, so attention was shifted to another location. Almost immediately subsurface features came to light. First, however, it must be noted that pottery was restricted to the plow zone (8-12"), but chipping debris continued for several more inches. Two features were uncovered. The first was a small pit (just over one foot in diameter) full of charcoal extending down two feet below the plow zone. To one side of this pit was a marked concentration of chipping debris -- approximately 500 chips in three or four square feet. There were no completed artifacts or other indications of age.
The second feature is equally puzzling. Again there are no certain indications of age (although the only sherd to a depth of 12" was uncovered within it, but that probably indicates only an extreme depth for the plow zone). This feature was a five-by-eight-foot oval of fired earth and charcoal encircled by the impressions of wooden posts. As yet I have no satisfactory explanation. The charcoal can be dated, and perhaps analyses of the fired soils will indicate the contents of the oval structure -- a kiln?, but no sherds; a cremation?, a hut that burned down? Resolving this question may add importance to the Pendar site, but the hoped for early occupation could not be isolated.

Much better results have come from the excavations at Clear Mount, GR-2. Most importantly the transition from Stallings to Deptford was filled in. Other important discoveries included three burials. GR-2 is a three-acre high spot or mount in the Savannah River swamp. It is only 400 yards from Rabbit Mount where Stoltman carried out intensive excavations. Neither mount is ever submerged even in the greatest floods.

Previous work on Clear Mount had indicated promise; the impetus for archaeological work on the Plantation came from the recovery of a burial on Clear Mount. Stoltman in brief tests had also found a burial, but he was unable to find any clear stratigraphy although a long history of occupation was indicated. A third burial had even been uncovered since Stoltman's work.

Sixteen pits were excavated in three areas of the site. Two areas showed very complex stratigraphy, but the third was practically without strata. The only general rule about the stratigraphy of the site was a 9-10" disturbed zone on the surface. This zone included both prehistoric and even some historic material; a hermit lived there years ago.

The first group of seven pits was complicated by two burials. The first is conditionally given that title; it contains no human bones. An urn still in shape but in 200 pieces was found set into a floor of clean sand. A circular pattern of postmolds further indicated a six-foot circular structure was constructed over the burial. The urn contained a small deposit of shells, two pieces of deer antler, and a small random collection of deer and possibly other animal bone. Nothing is particularly diagnostic, but it looks like normal midden fill. A very careful analysis of the bones and of the soil found in the urn may shed more light on the purpose of the burial. There are three possibilities -- an "empty" burial or ceremonial offering, a deer burial or offering, or an infant or fetus burial with the tiny bones destroyed by the acid soil.

The disturbance caused by this problematical burial could easily be seen in the adjacent pits. Refuse taken from the cleaned area was dumped to the side in a jumble. Also it appears that another burial was disturbed and then redeposited by the buriers of the urn. The partial remains of an eight-year-old were uncovered only a few feet from the first burial. The bones had not only been laid out in a disarticulated state, but many were missing. In their places occasionally were deer bones as if they had been
taken for human in the reburial. Most of one pottery vessel and parts of
two others were found in sherds next to the bones. They were apparently the
original grave offerings dumped in with the redeposited bones. The sherds
that are found accidentally mixed into the fill of the grave indicate that
the redeposition took place at probably the same time as the urn was buried.
The broken grave offerings, however, indicate an original burial over a
thousand years before the disturbance.

Very little undisturbed stratigraphy remained in the first seven pits,
but the first indications of the post-stallings, pre-Deptford material were
found. A small amount remained undisturbed to the edge and just below the
sand deposit of burial one.

In the second group of six pits very little stratigraphy could be noted.
Except for another burial and two small aboriginal pits, the ten to fifteen
inches of cultural deposit below the plow zone lacked differentiation. The
burial was that of a young adult (17-25 by the emerging wisdom teeth), and
again it was incomplete. Only the skull and jaw and most of the long bones
were found. There were no grave offerings, but the incidental grave fill
indicates a relatively recent date for the burial -- about 500 years ago.

The final three pits provided the clearest stratigraphy with the least
disturbance. Below 14 to 17 inches in these pits the pre-Deptford material
was isolated in three separate levels. The basal levels even included a few
fiber-tempered sherds. As far as the analysis has proceeded, the ceramics
of this period first have decoration of irregular punctation and simple
stamping. A continuity from the latest fiber-tempered Stallings pottery is
apparent in this decoration and also in the continued bowl forms. In the
later levels the punctation drops out, and the simple stamping becomes finer,
and deeper pot forms appear. With the addition of check stamping the assem­
blage becomes recognizable as Deptford. More analysis is necessary to clarify
the rest of the assemblage, but the ceramic transition is clear.

A great deal more than just the excavation of Clear Mount and the other
sites was accomplished. Several weeks were spent surveying the Plantation
for sites. A great many of these were located over the years by Joseph
Chapman, Jr. By the completion of the field season a total of 43 sites had
been located (three just off the Plantation). All but four have been
collected either by Stoltman or myself. I did revisit most of Stoltman's
original 21 sites gathering additional collections; and there are, of course,
the added collections from 18 of the newly located 22. The analysis of this
material has not yet begun, but the added sites can only help clarify the
patterns that Stoltman saw emerging from the data. With the added sites and
a more complete coverage of the Plantation, a more valid estimate of the
settlement patterns and subsistence bases for the various phases can be made.
Clearer associations for the non-ceramic materials can be made with the
ceramic phases. Especially this new understanding of the transition from
Stallings to the later phases gained at Clear Mount can be applied to the
settlement data to see exactly when the shift to upland occupation did take
place.
New problems certainly will crop up during the detailed analyses yet to come; there is a great deal of material to go over. The final results, however, promise a clearer and more detailed cultural sequence for the area, and a better understanding can be gained of the forces at work behind the changes and developments viewed in that sequence.

THE MACON CONFERENCES

The Southeastern Archeological Conference and the Conference on Historic Site Archeology were held in Macon, Georgia on November 13-15 this year. Both were excellent conferences and well attended. There were 60 at the C.H.S.A. on Thursday, November 13, and 148 at the S.E.A.C. on Friday and Saturday. All meetings were held at the Ambassador Motel in Macon.

Tom Hemmings, Stanley South, Paul Brockington, and I drove down. We stopped in Athens on Tuesday night and visited with Joe Caldwell and Art Kelly at the University of Georgia. They were kind enough to provide us with site data on some South Carolina sites for our statewide inventory of sites.

Later Wednesday we drove out to Cartersville and visited the famous Etowah Site. Tom and Paul and I had never seen it before. This is certainly a tremendous site with three large mounds, one of which is huge. Everyone interested in archeology should see this site. The view of the mounds as one approaches is nothing short of spectacular.

The C.H.S.A. meetings lasted all day Thursday with eight papers on various aspects of historic sites. These ranged from reports of excavations of slave cabins to reports on pipes, on buttons, to theory and method. Stanley, as always, was a capable chairman and presented two of the papers, one on "State and Salvage Diving Operations" and one on "Excavating the 1670 Site of Charles Towne, South Carolina."

The S.E.A.C. meetings lasted two full days with 18 papers and a Saturday afternoon symposium. The symposium "Whither Salvage Archeology" was ably led by Bill Haag of Louisiana State University and many of us participated extensively in it. The papers ranged from site descriptions, salvage, soil profiles, alluvial living floors, and thermal treatment of flint, to theory and method. South Carolina was well represented for the first time this year with five of the papers. Stanley South spoke on "The Kiawah Ceremonial Center at Charles Towne" and "A Method of Removing Soil Profiles." Tom Hemmings gave a paper on "Excavation and Analysis of Living Floors in Alluvial Sites." I had a paper on "Current Archeological Research Program in South Carolina" and participated in the symposium with "Some Thoughts on the Future Direction of Salvage Archeology." South Carolina was also represented by a total of eleven registrants.

At the business meeting invitations were offered for hosting next year's conference by Florida, West Virginia and South Carolina. The vote was in favor of South Carolina and I was elected chairman for next year. I was also
elected Chairman, for three years, of the Program Committee. The 1970 meetings, then, of the Southeastern Archeological Conference and the Conference on Historic Site Archeology will be held in Columbia in October (a voted change from November). The exact date has not yet been set. Everyone plan to come.

LAND'S FORD CANAL

In the February NOTEBOOK, we announced the initiation of brief archeological work to be done at Land's Ford Canal on the Catawba River between Chester and Lancaster Counties in the northern part of the state. Land clearing and contour mapping of the area have been delayed until recently but we are again at work on this project. The State Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism plans to refurbish the old canal of the 1820's and perhaps even run passengers through it again. Preliminary to reconstruction, we will cut some profiles across the canal to determine the actual shape and dimensions of the structure. Tom Hemmings and Paul Brockington visited the site on November 19 and staked out the locations of the cuts. Excavation is scheduled to begin on December 8.

Meanwhile Mr. Kenneth Mixon, graduate student in History at the University of South Carolina spent July and August researching the documentary history of the canal. He has prepared a competent report for the use of the Parks, Recreation, and Tourism Office. The latter is supporting the work from state funds.
The work of the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology at the Charles Towne Site may be separated into four phases: (1) excavation of the colonial settlement; (2) exploration of the early Indian settlements; (3) reconstruction of the colonial settlement so far as evidence permits; and (4) excavation of the 17th century Indian ceremonial center. These were not intentionally planned phases but, like so much of scientific research, the problems developed as the investigations progressed. When the work was initiated in November 1968 by John Combes and Stanley South, we assumed that our five weeks of exploratory trenching would indicate where the fortifications were located and where at least some of the houses and outbuildings had stood. None of the locations of the houses and outbuildings were found but a complex fortification system was discovered. This provided the framework for the first phase of the work—thorough excavation of the fortification system of the 1670-1680 English colony.

In the course of these first exploratory excavations numerous ancient Indian artifacts were found. Some of these represented occupation of this site as much as 3500 years before the arrival of the English colonists. Others represented the time period between then and 1670. This indicated that the site had been occupied, off and on, for a long time and provided the basis for the second phase of the archeology—the exploration of the early Indian settlements. Since the primary concern was with the 17th century English colony, however, we made no concentrated effort to pursue this second phase of the work. We simply recorded all of the data of these early periods as they were found and left any extensive search for them to be done at the later date.

The third phase of the work developed as a natural result of the first phase. The interpretation by partial reconstruction of the archeological remains of the English colony. Usually the archeologist excavates a site, records his data and interprets it in a published report. Here, though, where a visitor’s attraction to celebrate the birthplace of the state was envisioned, more than that was needed. In addition to the published report some reconstruction of the excavated remains had to be done so that the visitor could actually see what at least a portion of the colonial settlement had looked like in the 1670’s. This is not, in the strict sense, archeological work but since the reconstruction must be dictated by what is actually found in the ground and coordinated with the contemporary written records, the archeologist is the best qualified person to undertake the reconstruction.

With these three phases of the work outlined by the preliminary trenching in the fall of 1968, Mr. Stanley South, who had by then joined the permanent staff of the Institute, began full scale excavations on April 1, 1969. These excavations continued for seven and a half months, ending on November 18.

In late June, the Tricentennial Commission asked us to do some test excavations about 200 yards north of the Colonial fortifications, to determine if there were any archeological remains in that area that might be damaged by the construction of a visitor’s pavilion. Initial tests clearly showed the presence of remains of a unique Indian structure of approximately the period of the Colonial settlement. This provided the basis for the fourth phase of the work at the Charles Towne Site.

We recommended to the Commission that a different location be found for the pavilion and that time and funds be made available for full excavation and reconstruction of the Indian structure. We also made an alternate recommendation, if the pavilion site could not be changed, that time and funds be provided for complete excavation of the Indian structure and that it be reproduced as a scale model. After lengthy discussion and much sincere, soul-searching debate, the Commission decided upon the alternate recommendation. They gave us six weeks and provided funds for the excavation but elected to build the pavilion upon the location of the Indian structure. This decision was not made lightly but was based upon the sound premise that any other decision would have necessitated postponing the opening celebration of the Tricentennial Year on April 5, 1970.

Now after a year of work what has been learned from these excavations? What has been provided to help us understand the state’s earliest settlement? The information found in the ground by the archeologist’s shovel and trowel has been coordinated with an exhaustive search of the contemporary records for written information of the time. A detailed story is thus being pieced together from these fragmentary scraps of evidence. It is necessarily incomplete in many places because several more years of excavation are needed and because some kinds of evidence probably never can be found. The story does tell us much of the detailed way of life of the Charles Towne Colony and of the occupation of this site prior to the arrival of the English.
Albemarle Point

Showing the Site of the Fortified Area of

Charles Towne

1670-1680
Evidence of the early Indian occupations is confined to the artifacts as none of their structures were found. These artifacts include many baked clay balls and discs, with central perforations similar to those found at several sites in the lower Mississippi Valley that are dated around 3,000 years ago. Other artifacts include fragments of pottery vessels of some of the earliest styles known in the southeastern United States such as the fiber-tempered and sand-tempered pottery of 2,500 to 3,500 years ago. Still other pottery fragments are of types of later periods extending up to historic times. Chipped stone projectile points and scrapers of a long time range were also found. It is thus clear that this location was occupied by Indians sporadically for some 3,000 years. Those Indian occupations, while not continuous, were, like the multiple cities of Troy, the work of many different groups of native peoples. It was clearly a good place to live. Much more should be learned of these earliest occupants by continued excavations.

By the 17th century, contemporary written records of the Carolina coast were beginning to tell us something of the Indians of this area. One of these groups of Indians was the Kiawah and it was the Cacique or head man of this tribe that the records say persuaded the colonists to settle at Albemarle Point (Charles Towne) instead of near present Port Royal. It was also these Indians who supplied a great deal of food and other necessities of life to the colonists in the first years of settlement. The Kiawah had lived at this place for at least several decades before the colonists came. All evidence suggests that it was a ceremonial center of these Kiawah Indians that was found at the location of the visitor's pavilion at Charles Towne.

This is a unique structure in both size and shape. Nothing similar has been found elsewhere in the United States. There were no above-ground ruins here but beneath the surface of the ground was a well preserved floor plan of a rectangular structure 200 feet by 208 feet. The walls had been made of upright posts set close together in the ground and the entire wall line could be clearly seen in the small, circular soil discolorations that indicated the postholes. The structure had been rebuilt twice. After the posts had begun to deteriorate a new wall was built very close to the old wall lines and in addition a smaller structure was built adjacent to the north wall. This was 85 feet by 105 feet and had a circular bastion or tower at one corner. A second rebuilding had taken place when these walls had begun to deteriorate and this wall was not only made of upright posts but was heavily plastered with sun-dried mud. This plastered wall surrounded both structures and at this time the smaller structure was enlarged to 105 by 130 feet and the circular bastion was eliminated.

Within the larger structure were numerous trash deposits, human burials, and a great many postholes.
Excavated postholes indicating where wall posts once stood to form the walls of the Kiawah Indian Ceremonial Structure. Dark circles in foreground are postholes before the earth was removed from them. Wall line forms a corner of the structure in the background. Note two rows of postholes indicating reconstructed wall.

Burial pit within Indian Ceremonial Structure. Here remains of at least five individuals were "bundled" and buried in a circular pit together. Note polished stone disc in lower center.

The posthole outline of a small rectangular house occupied the center of the larger structure and apparently served as the ceremonial house or "temple" for the entire enclosure. Other small structures within the enclosure were corn cribs or ceremonial "square-ground" sheds. More than 20 human burials indicated additional ceremonial use of the enclosure. Several pottery vessels were found, some of which were unbroken. All of these vessels are of the pottery type called Irene Ware and are a type known to have been used in this area in the 17th century.

Complete lack of artifacts of European origin indicates that the structure had been abandoned prior to 1670. The two rebuildings of the walls suggest a life span of the structure of perhaps at least 25 or 30 years. One must then suggest that the date of the structure is in the mid-17th century perhaps being abandoned only shortly before the colonists arrived.

The relationship of this Indian compound to the Kiawah Indians and thus to the settlement of Charles Towne gives it added significance as does its unique size and shape. If the pavilion location could have been moved and this structure been rebuilt it would have been one of the major educational exhibits in the eastern United States, comparable to the Temple Mound at Town Creek in North Carolina or the Earth Lodge at Ocmulgee National Monument at Macon, Georgia. Such is not to be, though, and we are grateful to the Tricentennial Commission for supporting the archaeological research to preserve the record of this structure.

Reconstruction has been possible at the site of the colonial settlement. Excavation revealed a shallow ditch or moat surrounding the town the earth from which was piled in a parapet along the inner edge of the ditch. Into this parapet were set palisade posts to form a strong palisade fence around the town. The moat, parapet, and about half of the palisade has been reconstructed in the exact place where these features originally were built.

Along the southern edge of the town facing Old Town Creek and the Ashley River was a stronger fortification. Here an eight-foot deep moat had been dug and the earth from it piled in a seven-foot high parapet behind it. Along this earthen embankment were ports and platforms for eleven heavy guns aimed out across Old Town Creek and toward the Ashley River. There were no palisade posts atop this earthwork because the parapet itself was high enough for protection. Immediately in
front of this strong fortification was an even stronger gun position. This was a fan-shaped earthen and tim­
bered "redoubt", 66 feet in diameter, that provided an emplacement for a large, trail-carriage gun that could sweep the Ashley River and Old Town Creek with heavy cannon fire.

The deep moat and high parapet have been recon­
structed and the ports for the guns are in place. The redoubt has been reconstructed but without timbers and appears as it may have looked several years after the colony moved to Oyster Point in 1680.

Since none of the houses, outbuildings, or wells, of the colonial settlement have yet been located these things can not be interpreted nor reconstructed. This must come in future years as archeological planning develops for continued excavations at this most significant spot—the birthplace of historic South Carolina. In the meantime, the Institute will prepare three comprehensive technical reports of this year's excavations at the Charles Towne Site and a popular report interpreting all parts of the site will be written for the general public. The technical reports will concern (1) the earliest oc­
cupations of the site, (2) The Kiawah Indian structure, and (3) The Colonial Settlement of 1670-1680.

It has been a pleasure working with the Tricentennial Commission on this project. The Executive Director, Mr. James Barnett, was responsible for asking us to initiate the work and the subsequent financial and moral support given to the Institute by the Commission has been most gratifying. Few state agencies in any state have supported archeological research any more strongly. The individual Commissioners have agreed to our many requests and recommendations amazingly well throughout the year. Two Commissioners, though, deserve our special appreciation. These are Eugene N. Zeigler and Travis Medlock without whose perceptive­ness we might have had less to show for the year's work.

Reprinted from The University of South Carolina Magazine