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We now end the first year and the first volume of the NOTEBOOK. Judging by responses we have had from many of you, both verbally and by letter, this first year of publication has been a successful one. We have been printing a thousand copies each time and the regular mailing list is about 800. It is probably time now to evaluate the NOTEBOOK and we would appreciate any comments that our readers might care to make along the lines of general improvement. What are we doing wrong? What should we add or delete? One thing we are sure of, the price is pretty good. We hope that we can continue free distribution and we will do so as long as we are able. Our only real repayment for the NOTEBOOK is in good will, dissemination of knowledge, and spreading the word of what we are doing in South Carolina. So long as we are sure that we are doing these things, we can probably justify free distribution.

The final issue of Volume I contains a commentary on federal legislation THAT IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT TO AMERICAN ARCHEOLOGY. We hope you will read it carefully and that you will write to your Congressman asking him to support it.

This issue also contains an index to Volume I that should be of some use to those who really use this publication. One question that has been raised about the NOTEBOOK is who writes the unsigned items? The Editor does. Anything appearing in the NOTEBOOK without a byline is from the pen of the Editor.

We still need manuscripts for the NOTEBOOK. Send them to:

Dr. Robert L. Stephenson, Director
Institute of Archeology and Anthropology
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29208
The December meeting of the Society was held on the 19th at the Science Museum in Columbia. Mr. Leland Ferguson spoke on "Temple Mounds and Complicated Stamped Pottery in the Carolina-Georgia Area." Mr. Ferguson, from the University of North Carolina, is working on research on this subject. He has visited most of the known sites where these traits are found in this area during the past year. His talk was excellent, there was a good attendance, and the meeting was, as usual, a good one.

The Society has now distributed its second issue of SOUTH CAROLINA ANTIQUITIES, the quarterly bulletin of the Society. This is Volume I, No. 2, 3, and 4. It contains an article on Aiken County Historic Sites by Walter and Pauline Joseph, an article on Site Selection by Tom Edwards, and a reprinted article on collecting by Marie Wormington among other worthwhile items. Join the Society and get on the mailing list.

The new series of Archeological Seminars at the Florence Museum are proceeding well. The second Seminar was held on January 5 with a good attendance. While the Seminars are not, technically, a part of the Society's official functions, they are held in conjunction with the intent of the Society. It is great to see this excellent sparking of interest in the Florence Area.

SOUTH CAROLINA ARCHEOLOGICAL SPECIMENS IN THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

by E. Thomas Hemmings

During a recent trip to the Smithsonian Institution, U. S. National Museum, I had the opportunity to examine the South Carolina archeological collection housed there. This collection is not of great size, but includes prehistoric and early historic material from 29 of Carolina's 46 counties. A number of specimens are of interest to research programs now underway at the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology. These include sherd collections, charred maize cobs, grave lots, and many artifacts from known archeological sites in South Carolina. There are, in addition, several specimens particularly suitable for museum display, such as atlatl weights, birdstones, pipes, celts and grooved axes, primarily from up-country counties, and several fine chunkey stones from Charleston County. Whole ceramic vessels from the state are not well represented in the Smithsonian collection. Visits to other institutions are planned, as time permits, for the purpose of locating South Carolina Archeological and ethnological collections. Like many areas rich in remains of their aboriginal inhabitants, South Carolina has lost some valuable specimens to distant collections, although some have been preserved by passing into museum collections. These are a valuable resource for understanding South Carolina's Indians and prehistory.
NEW ANTIQUITIES LEGISLATION
IN THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS
NEEDS YOUR SUPPORT

by Robert L. Stephenson

In the May issue of the NOTEBOOK, Vol. I, No. 5, we printed and discussed the Federal Antiquities Act of 1906. This is the basic law under which we all operate in the conservation of our American heritage. There has always been a problem of where to obtain funds to comply with the obligations of the law when archeological sites are to be destroyed by the "progress" of civilization. Since 1946 the River Basin Surveys Program made funds possible for this archeological salvage in reservoir areas by funding through the National Park Service. More recent legislation has made funding possible in areas of highway construction and where federal power projects were operating. In P.L. 86-523 of June 1960, conservation of sites was specific and funds for that conservation were made available from the construction agency in areas where reservoirs were to be built, thus taking some of the burden from the National Park Service funding.

There has been no provision, though, for funding archeological salvage of antiquities to be destroyed by urban development, industrial expansion, military bases, airport construction, land leveling agricultural projects, or many other earth-changing advances of modern civilization. Salvage had to be done by the state agencies, universities, museums, individuals or others who were themselves destroying the sites but who were concerned enough to try to save one of Americas greatest non-renewable resources -- the evidence of the past.

Now a new measure is before our United States Congress to place the responsibility for salvage of archeological remains directly upon whatever agency is making the salvage necessary. This bill amends the 1960 legislation to broaden the coverage beyond dams and reservoirs and extend it to all areas where federal funds are spent in disturbing archeological sites.

The main points of the new proposed legislation are: (a) Any federal agency, or agency using federal funds, whose activities threaten to damage or destroy archeological sites, is authorized (not required but authorized) to spend funds to recover, protect, and preserve the data. (b) Such agencies also may transfer funds (up to 1% of the total cost of the agency's project) for this purpose to the Department of the Interior. (c) Costs of archeological salvage are, thereby, related directly to the cost of the project and are born by the agency making the archeological salvage necessary.

This is one of the most important pieces of legislation concerning archeology that has come before our United States Congress in many years. It is not only important to you and me as archeologists or as persons interested in archeology, it is of even greater importance to future generations of Americans who will have to depend upon us today to have unraveled the thousands of years of
our American heritage. This legislation has been endorsed by the Executive Committee of the Society for American Archeology.

Officially this is SENATE BILL 2893 (as amended) and has been introduced December 17 by Senator Moss of Utah and 26 co-sponsors including our own Senator Thurmond. An identical bill listed as HOUSE BILL 15453 is being introduced in the House of Representatives in January by Congressman Bennett of Florida. The bill will be heard by a subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee before it comes to a vote. Having identical legislation going through both Houses of Congress at the same time ensures quicker consideration than if it had to be considered by one chamber at a time.

YOU CAN HELP THIS BILL PASS! Please write your Senator and your Congressman urging support of this measure. Senators and Congressmen do their best to pass legislation that is in the best interests of the country and that their constituents want passed but they cannot know what we want if we don't let them know our opinions. WRITE NOW! Be sure to mention the bill by number! SENATE BILL 2893 and HOUSE BILL 15453.

Here is the full wording of the proposed legislation:

91st CONGRESS
1st Session

S. 2893

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

September 12, 1969

Mr. Moss (for himself, Mr. Allen, Mr. Bible, Mr. Cranston, Mr. Eagleton, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Goldwater, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Packwood, Mr. Pell, Mr. Scott, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Young (of Ohio), Mr. Bayh, Mr. McGee, Mr. Church and Mr. Goodell) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT
in the nature of a substitution to

A BILL

To amend the Act of June 27, 1960 (74 Stat. 220), relating to the preservation of historical and archeological data.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historical and archeological data (including relics and specimens)
which might otherwise be lost as the result of the construction of a dam", approved June 27, 1960 (74 Stat. 220), is amended to read as follows:

"That it is the purpose of this Act to further the policy set forth in the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461-467), and the Act entitled "Am Act to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 915), by specifically providing for the preservation of scientific, prehistorical, historical, and archeological data (including relics and specimens) which might be adversely affected as the result of (1) flooding, the building of access roads, the erection of workmen's communities, the relocation of railroads and highways, and other alterations of the terrain caused by the construction of a dam by any agency of the United States, or by any private person or corporation holding a license issued by any such agency; or (2) any alteration of the terrain caused as a result of any Federal, Federally assisted, or federally licensed activity or program.

"SEC. 2. Before any agency of the United States shall undertake the construction of a dam, or issue a license to any private individual or corporation for the construction of a dam, it shall give written notice to the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") setting forth the site of the proposed dam and the approximate area to be flooded and otherwise changed if such construction is undertaken: Provided, That with respect to any floodwater retarding dam which provides less than five thousand acre-feet of detention capacity and with respect to any other type of dam which creates a reservoir of less than forty surface acres the provisions of this section shall apply only when the constructing agency, in its preliminary surveys, finds, or is presented with evidence that scientific, prehistorical, historical, or archeological materials exist or may be present in the proposed reservoir area.

"SEC. 3. (a) Whenever any Federal agency finds or is made aware by a responsible authority that its operations in connection with any Federal, federally assisted, or federally licensed activity or program affects or may affect adversely significant scientific, prehistorical, historical, or archeological data, such agency is hereby authorized to expend program or activity funds for the recovery, protection, and preservation of such data (including preliminary survey, analysis, and publication) and shall provide the Secretary with copies of such publications; or it shall notify the Secretary, in writing, that such data is or may be adversely affected and shall provide the Secretary with appropriate information concerning the program or activity. (b) The Secretary, upon notification by any such agency or by any other Federal or State agency or responsible private organization that scientific, prehistorical, historical, or archeological data is or may be adversely affected by any such Federal, federally assisted, or federally licensed activity or program, shall, if he determines that such data is or may be adversely affected, immediately conduct a survey or other investigation of the areas which are of may be affected and recover and preserve such data (including its analysis and publication) which, in his opinion, should be recovered and preserved in the public interest. The instigating agency is hereby authorized to transfer to the Secretary such funds as may be necessary, in an amount not to exceed 1 per centum of the total amount appropriated in connection with such activity or program, to enable the Secretary to conduct such
survey or other investigation and to recover and preserve such data (including analysis and publication).

"(c) The Secretary shall keep the instigating agency notified at all times of the progress of any survey or other investigation made under this Act, or of any work undertaken as a result of such survey, in order that there will be as little disruption or delay as possible in the carrying out of the functions of such agency.

"(d) A survey or other investigation similar to that provided for by subsection (b) of this section and the work required to be performed as a result thereof shall so far as practicable also be undertaken in connection with any dam, activity, or program which has been heretofore authorized by any agency of the United States, by any private person or corporation holding a license issued by any such agency, or by Federal law.

"(e) The Secretary shall consult with any interested Federal and State agencies, educational and scientific organizations, and private institutions and qualified individuals, with a view to determining the ownership of and the most appropriate repository for any relics and specimens recovered as a result of any work performed as provided for in this section.

"SEC. 4. In the administration of this Act, the Secretary may--

"(1) accept and utilize funds transferred to him by any Federal agency pursuant to this Act;

"(2) enter into contracts or make cooperative agreements with any Federal or State agency, any educational or scientific organization, or any institution, corporation, association, or qualified individual;

"(3) obtain the services of experts and consultants or organizations thereof in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; and

"(4) accept and utilize funds made available for salvage archeological purposes by any private person or corporation.

"SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act."

AM-ARCS OF NEVADA

Perhaps it is well to look around once in a while and see what some of the many amateur societies over the country are doing. I am starting with a good society, that I have a special interest in, because I had a hand in helping get them started. The AM-ARCS OF NEVADA.

This is a well organized, well run, effective, and productive society, meeting monthly at 645 E. Plumb Lane, Reno. They were organized in January 1967.
Donald Tuohy of the Nevada State Museum is their professional advisor and doing a grand job. Mary Rusco of the Nevada Archeological Survey is also lending great professional help.

They have had eight professional and four amateur archeologists as speakers this year, ranging in subject matter from Oregon to Peru. They had an "Amateur Achievement Night" in July. They have a quarterly newsletter called CHIPPINGS. They have had numerous field trips to a complex of sites in one small area near Reno where they have been excavating for over two years, as well as field trips to other parts of the state. They have had exhibits in the Sparks, Nevada, Library (near Reno). They have established scholarship fund for anthropology students at the University of Nevada, and they are now incorporated.

Field work is followed up with laboratory processing, cataloging and writing up their material. Congratulations to the Am-Arcs for real accomplishment.

The 1970 officers and directors are:

President: Noble L. Crew, 1125 Brentwood Drive, Reno
Vice Pres.: Jean Myles, 2055 Regent Street, Reno
Secretary: Mary Hollingsworth, 4850 Idlewild Drive, Reno
Treasurer: Kitty Rose, 3259 Cashill Boulevard, Reno
Director: Jess Ralphs, 731 W. Pueblo, Reno
Director: George Phelps, 2091 Holman Way, Sparks
Director: Dorothy Dansie, 2070 Gridley Avenue, Reno
Director: Louie Sabini, 1960 Simpson Avenue, Reno
Director: Robert Hunt, 1915 "B" Street, Reno
Editor: Doris Cerveri, 1264 Patrick Avenue, Reno

Past officers and Directors, also, include Peter C. Ting, J. Sloan Olin, Ethel Hesterlee, Alma Smith, Marvel Guisti, Carlos Brown, Art Champagne, Mary Dick, Leo Pistone, and Buck Wheeler.

A NOTE ON THE BOSTICK SITE

by Robert L. Stephenson and Paul Brockington

In the March NOTEBOOK we reported a trip to Estill, South Carolina, to visit a site on the Savannah River. At the invitation of Mr. Gene Bostick of Estill, John Combes and Dr. Stephenson visited the site on March 12, made a surface collection of artifacts and dug a small test pit. Paul Brockington has now cataloged and identified the artifacts.

The Bostick Site (38HA1) is in Hampton County, South Carolina, about a mile from the Savannah River along a small creek. It is a large village site covering approximately an acre of high ground along the edge of the creek. It is heavily wooded with large trees and moderately dense underbrush. The site
was first reported as being a "mound" but no evidence of a mound was found. Abundant pottery was reported as was a conch shell "hoe." On the March 12 visit, a small test excavation was made 3 feet by 2 feet to a depth of 5 feet. This pit revealed a black, sandy, humus from the surface to a depth of 24 inches. Below that was a clean yellow sand to the limit of excavation. The humus layer produced abundant potsherds along with several chert chips and a nondescript scraping tool. At a depth of 37 inches a projectile point and three chert chips were recovered from the yellow sand. In the small test pit, no stratigraphic differentiation could be seen within the 24 inches of the humus layer but clear distinction was obvious between this and the yellow sand below.

There were 165 pottery sherds collected from the site. One of these appears to be a sherd of Deptford Simple Stamped type and 16 of Deptford Check Stamped type, suggesting a Deptford occupation of 1500 B.C. to 20 B.C. Two Brewton Hill Complicated Stamped Sherds are identified representing the period of 500 B.C. to A.D. 0. The Napier Series of 600-700 A.D. is represented by two sherds of Napier Stamped type. Seven Etowah Stamped Sherds of around 1200 A.D., three Lamar Stamped Sherds of about 1400 A.D. and three Savannah River Check Stamped Sherds of about 1500 A.D. were also found. The remainder consist of 27 net-marked sherds (perhaps Etowah series), 35 cord-marked sherds (perhaps Etowah or Savannah River series'), one fine-incised sherd and 68 unidentifiable plain sherds.

The single projectile point appears to be a good example of the type Palmer Corner Notched as described by Coe (1964, "The Formative Cultures of the Carolina Piedmont" by Joffre Lanning Coe, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. 54, Pl. 5). Coe dates these at between 6000 and 7000 years B.C.

Apparently the site has an Early Archaic occupations with a considerable time span between the Early Archaic and the first ceramic occupations.

SPECIAL RESEARCH PROGRAM

In August, Mr. Paul Brockington, Senior student in anthropology, successfully applied for participation in the Independent Study and Research Program established by a grant from the Ford Foundation, for the fall semester of 1969. He chose as his research topic "Determination of an Early Prehistoric Sequence for the Southeastern United States," using previously excavated materials from the Theriault Site (9BK2) as his research basis. Under this plan, he was to spend the entire semester on this research gaining a full semesters' academic credit for it with no other classwork.

He chose the Theriault Site because he had worked as a student assistant on the excavation of the site under the direction of Dr. William Edwards in 1966, and the material was on hand and represented a significant sample of an important stratified site. The specimens were on hand and almost half of them had been cataloged and the catalogs were on hand. The other half of the specimens had to be washed and cataloged. The notes, maps, and other records, except the data preserved on the original paper bags, were not available.
A base map of excavations was established by inventory of the specimen bags and consultation with others who had been on the crew. After the specimens were all washed, processed, and cataloged the material was sorted by levels and again inventoried. He has been concerned to a considerable degree with weight variation distributions of the chert flakes by square and level and has been doing some statistical analyses of these. This has been largely successful so far. Stone tools, pottery, and other artifacts remain to be studied and a trip will be made to the site to check site map, profiles, and feature locations.

Dr. Edwards is still anticipating a full report of the work at the Theriault Site and the present study is a project of special research on the material.

ARCHEOLOGICAL WORK AT LAND'S FORD CANAL

by E. Thomas Hemmings

Under an agreement with the South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism, exploration of the Land's Ford Canal on the Catawba River was carried out from December 8-20, 1969 by the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology under my direction. This canal is one of four which were designed to open the Catawba-Wateree river system to navigation in the early 1800's. Land's Ford Canal, northernmost of the four, was completed in 1823.

The canal is located on the west bank of the Catawba River and bypasses two miles of shoals. The northern two-thirds of the canal bed passes through terrain where bedrock closely underlies the surface, while the southern or downstream third lies on a narrow alluvial floodplain. At the upstream end of this southern section and near the outlet were two pairs of masonry lifting locks. Together these pairs of lifting locks accounted for most of the canal's 32 feet of fall in a nearby two mile course. In the northern section of the canal, near the intake, was a masonry guard lock to protect it during high water stages. Other structures along the canal course included two bridges and six culverts which passed streams draining the high ground to the west under the bed.

In December, eight backhoe trenches totalling about 670 feet in length were cut at right angles to the canal course at selected locations. The profiles revealed by these trenches were intended to provide information on the canal bed shape and grade and the construction of adjacent berms. All of the trenches in the section of canal constructed on floodplain revealed evidence of extensive scouring and filling by the Catawba River. Apparently the river had frequently gone over its banks since the canal was completed, and had damaged most of the southern section. The canal shape was poorly preserved at most locations trenched, although the grade could be inferred from the elevations of lock structures. Some construction information was obtained, but primarily these profiles contained a record of successive cuts and fills, the result of seasonal floods.

A trench across the canal bed just upstream from the northern pair of lifting locks gave some interesting data on construction in this area. A
lower portion of the canal bed was preserved in the profile as well as a berm on the riverward side. The core of this berm consisted of rammed red clay extending down into a trench in the underlying ground surface. Probably this clay core served as a barrier to water seeping from the canal bed toward the river.

Plans are underway for a comprehensive archeological investigation of the canal, including additional trenching of the bed and excavation of the lock structures. Ultimately, the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism would like to restore Land's Ford Canal to working condition as one of the state's outstanding public attractions.

As a separate part of the agreement with the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism, Mr. Kenneth W. Mixon was hired by the Institute, in July and August 1969, to do a documentary search of data pertaining to Land's Ford Canal.

A DUGOUT CANOE FROM SUMTER COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA

by William Gettys

(Editors note: Mr. Gettys is now a graduate student in geology at the University of South Carolina and has worked from time to time with the Institute. He was asked to summarize his recollections of the salvage of this canoe and we are pleased to have this brief report.)

Excavation

During the last week of September 1966, Dr. W. E. Edwards, then State Archeologist, and the writer investigated a reported dugout canoe on the Wateree River. Due to the operations of the Wateree Dam, about fifty miles above the site, the canoe was exposed from Sunday morning until late Monday afternoon. The canoe was found to be protruding out of a bank of clay-like, muddy silt. By digging into the bank the length of the craft was found to be 187 inches. About 4 feet of the canoe stuck out of the bank.

It was thought that there would be little trouble in removing the canoe, so on the following weekend a crew of about eight persons went to the site. The excavation proceeded well for about three hours and it was thought that the canoe would be out and in Columbia by nightfall. However, at this time digging below the water level began and the sides of the excavation rapidly gave way. The crew redoubled its efforts but to no avail. Late Sunday night the attempt was abandoned.

The following two weekends saw the water level too high for excavation, as a result of rain during the week. Monday morning, October 24, found the crew at the canoe site again, this time with plywood sheets and hammers. A coffer dam was constructed around the canoe by driving the plywood sheets 4 or 5 feet into the mud. Once again things went well for a while. Then, the deeper the excavation went, the greater the pressure on the outside of the coffer dam became.
Wooden stakes were jammed between the sheets and this helped for a short time. But, by now the water was rapidly rising and soon filled in what had been excavated.

Another attempt was made Monday morning, November 7. This time corrugated iron sheets were brought. These were hammered into the mud and stakes were driven 5 to 6 feet into the mud to brace them. An earthen dam was built 6 feet from the stern of the canoe and all the water bailed out. The digging commenced. About six in the evening the canoe could be pushed from side to side but could not be pulled free. An hour later another attempt was made to pull the canoe out and about a foot of the stern broke off. This was wrapped in newspaper and carefully put aside. Two hours later everyone but Dr. Edwards was cold, wet, hungry, and ready to give up. The earthen dam gave way about ten-thirty in the evening. Dr. Edwards had everyone grab the canoe and pull. It all came, except for a portion of the bow. The crew then, in turn, got into the water and groped in the mud trying to find the remaining fragments. By 11:30 p.m., everyone gave up. The canoe was put into Dr. Edward's van for the trip to Columbia where it was unloaded and placed in the writer's garage. Here it remained, deteriorating, for almost two years. Then it was moved to the basement of a building at the University of South Carolina.

Description

The length, greatest width, and height are 187, 20, and 13 inches respectively. The average height is 12 inches. The sidewalls of the canoe slope upward from a slightly curved bottom. The interior and exterior of the 2 to 3 inch thick bottom are smooth. There is no evidence of the forming tool used in construction. However, the interior of the canoe has a charred appearance as does the exterior of the stern. The wood from which the canoe was fashioned is believed to be pine.

The shape of the canoe and its lack of any sort of a keel, as well as the way in which it was apparently formed suggests that it is of Indian origin and it well may pre-date White contact.

Samples of the wood may be sent for radio-carbon analysis but to the length of time that the canoe has been exposed to possible contamination, it seems that any radio-carbon dates might be unreliable.

It is uncertain at this time just how much preservation can be done on this deteriorated canoe that was once an almost perfect specimen. The man-hours as well as the cost would appear to be prohibitive.

Acknowledgments

The writer is indebted to Mr. Lenoir, who found the canoe and to Mrs. T. H. Perrie who informed the writer as to its locality. Thanks are also due to Miss Martha White upon whose land the canoe was found.
Fig. 1. Canoe as originally found in bank of the Wateree River.

Fig. 2. Wateree River canoe during excavation. Note coffer dam.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavations at Camden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A South Carolina State Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swift Creek and Santa Rosa in Northwest Florida, by David Sutton Phelps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 10 - Oct. - Editor's Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excavations at Tom's Creek, by James L. Michie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Archeological Society of South Carolina, by James L. Michie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 11 - Nov. - Editor's Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Florence Archeological Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groton Plantation - A Progress Report, by Drexel A. Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Macon Conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land's Ford Canal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archeology at Charles Towne, by Robert L. Stephenson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 12 - Dec. - Editor's Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archeological Society of South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina Archeological Specimens in the Smithsonian Institution, by E. Thomas Hemmings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am-Arcs of Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Note on the Bostick Site, by Robert L. Stephenson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCOVERING SOUTH CAROLINA

by Bert W. Bierer

The State Printing Company, Columbia, South Carolina, 1969

This very interesting book combines much of the studious observation of the author with his library research on the locations of mainly historic Indian villages and sites in the state. It is copiously illustrated with half tones and many maps and several color plates. The 78 pages provide a great deal of information about the state's historic Indian site locations.

RED CAROLINIANS

by Dr. Chapman J. Milling

University of South Carolina Press, Columbia, 1970

This is a reprinting of the excellent 1940 volume on the Indians of the state at or about the time of White contact. It is the best available thing on the subject, well documented, and outstandingly comprehensive. It traces Indian tribes and subgroups mainly through the 16th-19th centuries and provides clear scholarly data for research. $10.00
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