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A monthly report of news and activities of mutual interest to the individuals and organizations within the framework of the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology at the University of South Carolina and for the information of friends and associates of the Institute.

ROBERT L. STEPHENSON, EDITOR
EDITOR'S PAGE

This issue of the NOTEBOOK is a "catch-up" attempt to get back on a regular schedule of issues. It is not satisfactory to combine issues this way but it seems the only feasible means of getting back on schedule. This will be the last issue of Volume II, 1970, and will combine numbers 9-12. Beginning with Volume III we will issue the NOTEBOOK every two months and make every effort to keep rigidly to that schedule.

These fall months have been highly productive for the Institute and we like to think that the rate of activity is the reason and not the excuse for the notebook falling behind. Staff members have continued to make talks to various groups throughout the state and out of state. We have continued to be on the move visiting sites reported to us, testing some of these sites, recording collections, and discussing prospects. An average of three or four trips a week by staff members to sites in various parts of the state has used much of our time this fall. In addition Dr. Hemmings has been at work on analyses and preparation of a report on the Fig Island Shell Ring excavation of last summer. Mr. South has been hard at work on the report of the first season of excavation at the sites of Ninety Six, working through documentary sources on those sites, and bringing together some of the results of earlier work.

The laboratory crew has been constantly at the endless task of cataloging, preserving, and processing specimen collections and record files. We started our first files of numbered archeological sites in December 1968 and now have somewhat over 900 sites recorded within the state. A good share of time this fall has also been devoted to preparing proposals for work projects in various parts of the state. These proposals are to federal, state, local, and private agencies and organizations. They take time now but should result in the means by which future work can be done.

We were pleased to have a visit during Christmas from Paul Brockington. Paul has worked in the Institute lab and field projects for several years and is now a graduate student at the University of Kansas.

Our readers may also note that on the staff page the name of Maryjane Gardner disappeared and that of Maryjane Rhett appeared. Jane was married in August to James Rhett who is employed by the State Highway Department in Columbia. Jim and Jane took a honeymoon trip west and visited the pueblos and cliff dwellings of the southwest. Our very best wishes to Jim and Jane for a long and happy married life combining highways and archeology.

Please keep sending in manuscript copy for the NOTEBOOK. We can still use your articles.

Dr. Robert L. Stephenson, Director
Institute of Archeology and Anthropology
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29208
INSTITUTE HOSTS
SOUTHEASTERN ARCHEOLOGICAL CONFERENCE

On October 30 and 31 the Institute had the pleasure of being host to the 27th annual Southeastern Archeological Conference in Columbia, with Robert L. Stephenson as general Conference Chairman. Good attendance, many good papers, and abundant participation made it a most successful conference. One thing that adds greatly to the S.E.A.C. is the meeting of the Conference on Historic Site Archeology that is held the day before at the same place.

There were 159 paid registrants and 14 unpaid for a total of 173 people from 22 states plus Canada. All meetings were held at the Wade Hampton Hotel except for an Open House at the Institute. The Friday morning session, chaired by Bettye Broyles from West Virginia, was devoted to reports of current field work. Friday afternoon the session, chaired by Ripley Bullen from Florida, was built around "Variations in Settlement Patterns in Indian Culture." Friday evening was the annual banquet followed by a most useful session on "What Do We Know Now That we Did Not Know in 1938?" This symposium, lead by Charles Fairbanks from Florida and Joffre Coe from North Carolina, reviewed the status of archeology in the Southeast from the time of the beginning of the Southeastern Conference to the present. It clearly showed a vast progress of knowledge and many changes of basic concepts in our understanding of the more than 10,000 years of the history of man's occupation of the Southeastern United States.

The Saturday morning program was devoted to "Archaic-Transition-Early Woodland in the Southeast" and was chaired by Tom Hemmings of the Institute. Following lunch a business session lasted an hour and the rest of the afternoon was a session of general "Contributed Papers," chaired by Pete Faust of the National Park Service. Altogether 36 papers were presented.

On Thursday evening preceding the Conference an Open House was held at the Institute and was well attended by over 150 persons. During the sessions the University of Georgia Mobile Carbon-14 Laboratory was on display. This was the best attended Southeastern Conference that there has ever been and attention to the productivity of past conferences was observed. In the lobby of the Wade Hampton, there was a photographic exhibit of "Nostalgia" illustrating the programs and pictures of past conferences and their participants. We hope that this exhibit will continue at future conferences.

The 1971 Southeastern Conference will be in Macon, Georgia where the National Park Service will be host. We look forward to an even more productive Southeastern Archeological Conference there.
ALKALINE GLAZED POTTERY FROM SOUTH CAROLINA TO TEXAS

by Stanley South

Mrs. Georgeanna Greer of San Antonio, Texas, paid a research visit to the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology regarding her study of alkaline glazed pottery. From her research into the history of nineteenth century potters in Texas, she has found that in the early part of the century a number of these craftsmen went to Texas from South Carolina. Characteristics of the ware made by these potters are a high-fired body and the use of glossy glazes made of ashes and clay. Mrs. Greer has found that she can duplicate these glazes by using a sandy clay, salt, and oak ashes, or any wood or grass ash, even Johnson grass ashes. The salt can be omitted and a mixture of half ashes and half clay can be used to produce the glaze so often seen on high-fired pottery from the South. The use of salt as an ingredient in a glaze, along with clay, and ashes was known as early as 1794, when they were used at Salem, North Carolina, by the potter Rudolph Christ to make a faience glaze using tin ash. Mrs. Greer is searching for answers relating to origin and distribution of the concept of using the simple ingredients, ashes and clay, to produce glaze for ware fired to stoneware hardness.

Through research and archeology conducted by Stanley South, Archeologist, with the Institute, into the ware made at Salem, North Carolina, by potters Gottfried Aust and Rudolph Christ, it appears that the alkaline glazed ware may have been introduced into Salem by William Ellis in 1774. Ellis was a potter who had worked at the Bartlam factory in Charleston, which was begun in 1770.

Mrs. Greer, accompanied by her daughter, paid a very profitable visit to the Charleston Museum, where she was able to study a number of fine pieces of the alkaline glazed ware, many with dates and names of the makers from the early nineteenth century. Mr. South accompanied Mrs. Greer to the Pottersville Museum in Edgefield, owned by the family of Ralph McClendon, where a number of fine pieces of alkaline glazed ware are on exhibit. Photographs were taken of some of the vessels for comparison with examples known to have been made in Texas by potters who went there from the Edgefield district of South Carolina. A kiln site of a potter of the mid-nineteenth century was visited, and several fragments of the kiln wasters were collected.

The visit of Mrs. Greer (who is a pediatrician) is a most important one to those interested in the history of colonial ceramics in the South. The alkaline glazed ware is known to have been made extensively in South Carolina in the nineteenth century, as well as elsewhere in the South. The origins for this type glaze appear to have been in the Carolinas, possibly with South Carolina potters of the English tradition. Much more research must yet be done to answer some of the questions being asked by Mrs. Greer, and through the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, the South Carolina story will be compiled by Stanley South and coordinated with Mrs. Greer's research. From this cooperative effort, more information should emerge on this most fascinating inquiry into the past.
Fig. 1. A jug and jar of alkaline glazed ware made in South Carolina (from the collection of Mrs. Georgeanna Greer).

(Fig. 2. Mrs. Georgeanna Greer of San Antonio, Texas, examines an alkaline glazed vessel with John Combes, Assistant Director of the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology (center), and Stanley South, Archeologist (right).
Mrs. Greer returned to South Carolina in October to attend the Conference on Historic Sites Archeology and present a paper on this alkaline glazed pottery. At this time she left some type samples of the material at the Institute for study and comparative research.

DR. PRICE AND MR. RATHBUN JOIN DEPARTMENTAL STAFF

The Department of Anthropology and Sociology has indeed taken a major step forward this year by adding two anthropologists to the staff with an additional one to be added at the second semester. This brings to three, the number of anthropologists in the department including Mr. Donald R. Sutherland who has been the only anthropologist on the staff for the past three years. Beginning this fall semester the department has 17 anthropology majors and is growing rapidly. The additional staff and prospects has required that the curriculum in anthropology be completely revised and this is being done. Revisions are already in effect and the complete revision will be ready for next fall.

Dr. Thomas J. Price joined the departmental staff in September as Associate Professor of anthropology. He received his Doctorate in anthropology from Northwestern University and taught for several years at Queens College. Recently he has been Chairman of the Department of Anthropology at Williams College in Massachusetts. His basic research interest is in general ethno­logy. He specialized in Afro-American studies and secondarily Latin American studies, and has worked with Negro communities in Honduras, Colombia, and Surinam. He has immediately embarked upon a study of Negro communities in the South Carolina Sea Islands.

Mr. Ted A. Rathbun joined the departmental staff in September as Instructor. Ted comes to us from the University of Kansas where he expects to receive his Ph.D. in 1971. He is a physical anthropologist with strong interests in archeology and middle Eastern ethnology. He has done research in physical anthropology on Plains Indian materials from the River Basin Surveys Program and has spent two seasons in middle Eastern research. In the latter he assisted Dr. William Bass in cemetery excavations at the site of Hassenlu in Iran and is assisting in the analyses of the skeletal remains.

We welcome both Tom and Ted aboard and are pleased to be able to add them to the Institute's staff of collaborators.

Donald Sutherland has defended his dissertation and will receive his Ph.D. from Tulane this May. Congratulations, Don.
EUGENE WADDELL - RESEARCH AFFILIATE

The Institute takes pleasure in announcing the appointment, in September, by the University of South Carolina, of Mr. Eugene Garland Waddell of Florence, South Carolina, as a Research Affiliate of the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology. Mr. Waddell is a native of South Carolina, attended McClenaghan High School, and graduated from the College of Charleston in 1967 with a B.S. in English. He did volunteer work at the Florence Museum in 1958 and 1959 and during the summers of 1961 and 1962 he was employed by the Charleston Museum to reorganize the Indian collections and conduct archeological surveys. During these surveys he recorded over 200 sites in 27 counties. He has been Director of the Florence Museum in Florence, South Carolina, since February 1969.

Mr. Waddell has been a serious student of Indian lore and prehistory for more than a dozen years and has developed a sincere scientific attitude toward archeology. His main interests have been in the study of prehistoric pottery of South Carolina. He is one of the few people who is well acquainted with this phase of archeology in the state. He has published articles in both the Newsletter and the Proceedings of the Southeastern Archeological Conference on South Carolina pottery. His interests have also gone to other aspects of archeology and he has published an article on South Carolina Fluted Points in Proceedings of the Southeastern Archeological Conference.

Gene is a newly elected member to the Board of Directors of the Archeological Society of South Carolina. He has cooperated actively with the Institute in several projects, especially in the coastal shell ring projects. He actively assisted Dr. Hemmings of the Institute staff in a survey of all of the shell ring sites and at the excavation of the Fig Island site.

Since taking over directorship of the Florence Museum, he has proven himself to be an able museologist and over the last year has visited numerous museums in the United States and Europe to develop better museum techniques. He is a founding member of the Board of Directors of the South Carolina Federation of Museums.

We look forward to a long and pleasant association with Gene and welcome him to our staff.

ARCHEOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The Society has continued to be active throughout the fall months. Meetings are held on the third Friday evening of each month at the Columbia Science Museum at 8:30. The 1970 membership reached 129 and it is now time to renew for 1971. Attendance at meetings has ranged from the low 40's to the upper 60's. The meetings continue to be good with enthusiastic participation by all attending. New officers have been elected for 1971 and these are:

President: Thomas Edwards of Florence
Vice President: James L. Michie of Columbia
Secretary: Patricia Nakaji of Columbia
JOHN COMBES RETURNS TO KANSAS

Mr. John D. Combes, Assistant Director of the Institute, has been on leave of absence last year to complete work toward his Ph.D. in anthropology at the University of Kansas. He returned to the Institute for the summer months and at the end of August went back to Kansas to serve his final year as a Ph.D. Candidate. John will complete his classwork this year, take his comprehensives in the spring, and complete his dissertation this spring and summer. He anticipates the degree being granted next August. His wife Joan is working with computers for the geologists in Lawrence, Kansas and John, too, has been immersing himself in computer techniques. When John returns to the Institute next fall we will, in all probability, be punched into computer cards or data sheets.

We look forward to seeing something of John and Joan this summer while he is working on the dissertation and are eager to have him back to full time duty in September as Dr. Combes.

CALICO HILLS CONFERENCE

An invitational conference of archeologists, geologists, and geochronologists was held at the Calico Hills Site on October 21-24, 1970. The L.S.B. Leakey Foundation and the San Bernardino County Museum were the hosts both at the Museum and at the site some 90 miles north of San Bernardino, in south central California. Dr. Robert L. Stephenson was an invited participant in this conference.

At this site stone artifacts attributed to Early Man have been found in geologic context in a giant alluvial fan that appears to be very old. The age is in doubt but may be 50,000 to several hundred thousand years old. This may be the oldest evidence of man in the New World. There is speculation as to whether the chipped stone specimens are man-made or chipped by nature and there is question of the identity and age of the geological formations. In short there is considerable difference of opinion on this site and the next issue of the NOTEBOOK will have an article giving one of those opinions.
INSTITUTE REPRESENTED AT 30TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR STATE AND LOCAL HISTORY

by John D. Combes

Mr. and Mrs. John Combes attended the 30th Annual Meeting of the AASLH held in Kansas City, Missouri, on September 22-26, 1970. Many topics were covered during the convention and many tours were arranged to the numerous historic sites of the region. A highlight of the gathering was a reception at the Harry S. Truman Library in Independence, Missouri which included a special exhibit of art by the famous artist Thomas Hart Benton.

Of particular interest to historical archæology was a session chaired by Marvin Kivett of the Nebraska State Historical Society and consisting of Ivor Noel Hume of Colonial Williamsburg, Thomas Barr of the Kansas State Historical Society and Jackson W. Moore of the National Park Service, that dealt with historic site archæology and the State and Local Historical Societies. There seems to be a great need for further communication between historians and archæologists, and perhaps the AASLH is the place to develop this close relationship that must continue to grow. Hopefully, the future will see more sessions at these meetings dealing with this interrelationship in the proper development of so many of our historic sites.

INSTITUTE HOSTS
CONFERENCE ON HISTORIC SITE ARCHEOLOGY

On October 29 the Institute had the pleasure of being host to the Eleventh Annual Conference on Historic Site Archeology in Columbia with Stanley South as general Conference Chairman. Stan is the founding chairman of this conference and the group has always met jointly with the Southeastern Archeological Conference on the day preceding that conference. This works out well as a means of coordinating historic and prehistoric archeological thinking. This was the best attended of the past eleven years with 93 paid registrants and 7 unpaid representing 18 states and Canada.

On Wednesday evening there was a Welcome Party at the Wade Hampton Hotel where the conference was held. This was jointly sponsored by the two conferences as was the Open House at the Institute on Thursday evening.

The meetings began with a short business session followed by four papers in the morning session. These papers ranged from a report on a plantation excavation in Georgia to that of a French Colonial well in Canada and included papers on alkaline glazed pottery in Texas and South Carolina and a settler's cabin in West Virginia.

The afternoon sessions consisted of six papers to include a bibliography of historic site archeology, a report on the excavations at Ninety Six, South Carolina, a mission site in Florida, a pipe-Tomahawk from Tennessee, gunflint analysis from Michigan, and analysis of historic Indian trash pits in Georgia.

For the first time there were so many papers that an evening session was necessary. This was devoted to three papers on Civil War Period archeology. The 1971 Conference on Historic Sites Archeology will be held in Macon, Georgia.
During the last two weeks of July and first two weeks of August, 1970, the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology excavated at an early pottery site on the North Edisto River estuary south of Charleston, S. C. (Fig. 1). The weather was remarkably fine until heavy rains and high tides of the second week in August all but washed us away. At least we avoided the awesome hurricanes which can strike the coast at this time of year.

The site has been called Fig Island after the local name for the nearest high ground in this salt marsh area. Actually, it is part of Edisto Island, one of the string of sea islands stretching from the central coast of South Carolina to northern Florida.

The Fig Island site was selected for excavation after an archeological survey of 150 miles of the coast of South Carolina and Georgia was conducted by the Institute during the spring. This survey was specifically concerned with locating "shell rings," large, circular, prehistoric, shell middens which were known to exist in this area from earlier archeological research. Surprisingly, we were able to locate and examine eighteen such shell rings, including several previously unrecorded, and have reason to believe that as many as four others in this area remain to be visited. As a result of the survey, nine shell ring sites in South Carolina have been nominated by the Institute for protection under provisions of the National Register of Historic Places.

Shell rings are of particular archeological interest because they represent living sites of the earliest pottery-making inhabitants of the Atlantic coast of the Southeast, pre-agricultural people who subsisted largely on the resources of the estuaries and tidal creeks. Where shell rings have been spared the effects of coastal erosion, their level rims and overall symmetry lead to the conclusion that they were systematically planned and constructed rather than haphazard accumulations of refuse. Naturally, there has been a good deal of speculation about the purpose of shell rings. It is frequently suggested that they served a ceremonial purpose because of the apparent planning and labor involved and the obvious similarity to an open court or amphitheater. Thus, our coastal counterpart to England's monumental stonehenges and woodhenges may be the "shellhenge." Other theories for the use of shell rings suggest that they merely provided habitable areas above the wet marshes or that they were used as fish traps of some sort. Neither of these theories can account for the occurrence of some sites as much as 10 feet above the high water mark, nor for their uniformity in size and impressive circular symmetry. Our limited excavations at Fig Island did little to resolve the question of use of these structures, although we feel sure habitation was on or very near the ring perimeter.

The Fig Island shell ring is about 250 feet in diameter and stands 3 to 5 feet above the surrounding marsh (Fig. 2). The 30 to 40 foot wide rim is composed almost entirely of shell, largely oyster, the estimated volume of which is no less than 375,000 bushels. At the center of the ring is a half acre, flat, marshy area devoid of shell. Fig Island was chosen for
excavation because it represents one of the largest, most intact, shell rings known, and because it lies near the midpoint of the coastal distribution of these sites. Moreover, a segment of a second, eroded shell ring lies only 75 feet off the complete ring, and others may have been present in the marsh nearby, where a large shell midden has been damaged in historic times by the borrowing of shell for construction. Thus, the Fig Island site appears to be a complex of rings, only one of which remains well preserved.

Our excavations consisted of two 5 foot wide trenches, one 40 feet long cutting through the southern edge of the ring and the other 125 feet long passing from the center out through the eastern edge (Fig. 3). More work planned for the interior of the ring was prevented by flooding, since the center lies approximately at the high water mark. Both trenches reached the old surface on which the ring was built. From the shell rim we obtained a collection of about 30 bone, antler, and shell artifacts, 2400 pottery sherds, and a large quantity of animal bone.

The most remarkable find was an intricately engraved deer antler tine or point, an unusually early example of prehistoric fine art from the Southeast (Fig. 4). The use of this 4 1/2 inch object is problematical, but it apparently was fashioned for attachment to other components. The entire outer surface was decorated with engraved geometric designs, somewhat reminiscent of scrimshaw work. In addition to this unique antler artifact, a number of bone pins were recovered, some also decorated by engraving.

The pottery made by Fig Islanders was rather simple, and probably was designed solely for everyday cooking. Deep, straight-sided, wide-mouthed vessels were most often decorated on the exterior with rows of punctations made by a sharp tool on wet clay. The vessels were fired, but remained fragile, and consequently are known to us only in the form of sherds, and usually small ones at that.

The animal bone consists of thousands of specimens which have been sent to experts for identification. However, a large part of this material is fish remains among which we recognize drum teeth and catfish otoliths and pectoral spines. Also present are remains of deer, raccoon, opossum, and turtle. The final result of study of this collection should be an interesting view of the environment of Fig Island at the time of occupation and the way it was being utilized. It appears now that the Fig Islanders were specialists on the food resources of their estuary. Undoubtedly, they would be appalled at the condition of some of our estuaries today.

Samples of oyster shells were collected from the shell deposit as an additional source of information on past environment (Fig. 5). Since the valves of these molluscs reflect certain aspects of their habitat, we suspect much can be learned from this abundant basic constituent of the shell ring. The oysters selected by Fig Islanders seem to surpass in quality the crowded clusters of "coon oysters" found along the creeks today, although the same oyster pests and predators, including man himself, were present. A study of other molluscs, present in small quantities, will add to this ecological picture.

Radiocarbon dates for the Fig Island shell ring have not yet been obtained, although charcoal samples were collected for this purpose. We would
expect the time of occupation to fall between 3100 and 3900 years ago on the basis of dates obtained for four other shell ring sites in South Carolina and Georgia.

Present evidence indicates that pottery-making first appeared on the Atlantic coast of the Southeast around 2000 B.C., and one theory holds that it was introduced from the south at this time by coastal voyagers who were mollusc gatherers and fishermen. Perhaps the most intriguing aspect of shell rings is this possibility of long distance coastwise travel long before the high civilizations of the New World came into being. The only shell ring now known beyond the South Carolina-Georgia coastal strand is Puerto Hormiga, located on the Atlantic coast of Colombia in South America, and it is a remarkably similar structure. Furthermore, vegetal fiber-tempered and sand-tempered pottery, comparable to types occurring in the earliest pottery sites of the Southeast, including shell rings, was recovered at this Colombian site. Puerto Hormiga has been dated between 4500 and 5000 years ago, adding to the plausibility of northbound voyagers. Evidence for the shell ring-early ceramic complex on the intervening coasts of Central America, the Caribbean Islands, or Mexico is practically non-existent, but some archeologists now firmly support the theory for early coastal voyages. If they are right, our shell ring sites are the work of some uncommonly intrepid colonists.

Archeological excavation at Fig Island was conducted by myself with Mr. Gene Waddell, Director of the Florence Museum, Florence, S. C., collaborating, both during survey of coastal shell rings and the excavation project. Overall supervision of scientific and administrative aspects of the dig was provided by Dr. Robert L. Stephenson, Director of the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology and South Carolina State Archeologist.

Our student excavators and their institutions are as follows:

Paul Brockington, field foreman, University of Kansas
Wade Carpenter, Wofford College
Jim Jackson, University of Arizona
John Larson, University of South Carolina
Bob Mills, St. Andrews High School, Charleston, S. C.
David South, North Carolina State University

We are grateful to Mr. J. G. Murray of Edisto who directed our attention to the Fig Island site and materially assisted during the project.

Mr. John E. Meyer of Botany Bay Plantation granted us permission to excavate at Fig Island and provided us with finer facilities for a field camp than we are likely again to experience. Not the least of the pleasures of this field season was the beauty of the creeks and marshes of Botany Bay and their abundant birdlife. Naturally, we hope to return to Fig Island and expand our initial search into the record of shell ring dwellers.
Fig. 1. The Fig Island shell ring looking northeast toward the North Edisto River estuary.
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Fig. 2
Fig. 3. A trench cutting through the southern edge of the ring's rim.

Fig. 4. Perspective view (a) of an elaborately engraved antler tine tool, and its design layout (b).
Fig. 5. A close-up view of the shell deposit exposed in the eastern trench.
I am glad to have the opportunity of addressing historic site administra-
tors on historic site research, development, and preservation as seen by
a historical archeologist. The historical archeologist usually works closely
with the site administrator in achieving mutual goals. These usually relate
to (1) the restoration of standing structures, (2) the location of hidden
features once forming an important part of a historic complex, (3) the re-
covery of details of past life styles such as artifacts, useful in inter-
preting past cultures, and (4) relating the story learned through documents
and archeology to the public through museum exhibits and on-site explanatory
exhibits, such as the replacing of palisades in their original ditches,
opening fortification ditches, and replacing the accompanying parapets in
their original location. Such interpretations have been carried out at James-
town, Virginia; Brunswick Town, North Carolina; Fort Frederica, Georgia;
Bethabara, North Carolina; Fort Raleigh, North Carolina; and, most recently,
at the site of the 1670 settlement of Charles Towne, South Carolina.

Such archeologically documented preservation and development of historic
sites is quite a different animal from the tourist attractions in the form of
forts, log cabins, and fake rebuilt towns that are springing up on all sides
as money-making ventures. The responsibility of historic site administrators
and archeologists lies in insuring that interpretations and explanatory ex-
hibits on competently researched, examined, and developed historic sites are
of the highest standards available in our time. The fifth, and most im-
portant goal to the archeologist from a professional point of view, is the
recovery of data of value in comparative studies and the addition to our
accumulation of basic knowledge which can have a feed-back into succeeding
excavations.

Returning to the fourth goal of competently researched and developed
historic sites, it would seem to be obvious that administrators should always
put the integrity of the historic site and the responsibility to history fore-
most in any decision, and not expedience and financial convenience. However,
it is often on this very point that the historical archeologist runs afoul
of the goals of the historic site administrator. For instance, when an arche-
ologist learns that a curator of a well-known museum is conducting "house
cleaning," has piled large quantities of Indian artifacts in a high pile on
the museum floor, breaking whole Indian pots in the process, and has offered
them to collectors and others for the taking, the archeologist becomes some-
what disturbed, to say the least, at this curatorial procedure. When he
learns that Indian pots taken from this grab bag of artifacts by responsible
people have been found to be among the most important dated Cherokee vessels
from the nineteenth century in existence, vessels providing invaluable data
to the understanding of Cherokee ceramic development in the late period, he
can only look on such curatorial practices as being grossly incompetent.
There are times, therefore, such as in this instance, when the archeologist
feels that his goals are definitely not related to those of the curator. In
general, however, there is a seeking to achieve mutual goals relating to
historic site development.

My discussion here is not oriented, however, to the preservation of the artifacts which result from the work of the archeologist on historic sites, although to many curators and administrators this is the only reason they can see for having historical archeology done; rather, it is designed to illustrate the value of historical archeology in research and development of architectural data present on almost all historic sites. The point I hope to make is that the historic site administrator and archeologist have a responsibility to the wealth of data stored as a treasure beneath the soil of every historic site. I hope to make clear the necessity for doing historical archeology on any site being developed so that parking lots, museums, pump houses, septic tanks, roads, and pavilion structures designed to interpret the site will not be carelessly placed, resulting in the destruction of important data waiting to be revealed by means of the archeologist's trowel.

Throughout America, historical societies which have never had more than a few hundred dollars in their treasury, are finding that grants from foundation and federal agencies have resulted in their becoming involved in a business where hundreds of thousands of dollars are available. Some of these restoration-sponsoring groups have done an outstanding job of research and development with their funds in bringing to reality their dream of creating a bridge for understanding between the past and the present.

Other groups often begin spending the funds they have suddenly acquired in a rapid manner, sometimes without proper regard for historical and archeological research to insure the authenticity of the restorations they are undertaking.

Through the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology at the University of South Carolina, we are providing needed archeological assistance to local societies and commissions, and, in this capacity, we have encountered examples of projects where entire seventeenth century villages have been on the drawing board and in the model-making stage, with a million dollars reserved for the project, before any thorough research or archeological work was undertaken. Needless to say, we had quite a struggle in convincing the supporters of the "Jamestown Village" type interpretation that there was a need to keep such unauthenticated constructions off the original village site until proper study had been undertaken, and then we could support it only if documents and archeology had abundantly demonstrated that a valid construction of this type could be competently undertaken.

Another example illustrating how not to go about planning a restoration project was seen when the interpretive museum for an archeological site was proposed to be constructed directly on top of a documented plantation house, the ruins of which were clearly visible. Again we were placed in the role of trying to protect the historical sanctity of an archeological site from the developers who were determined to destroy a relic of the past, ironically, in the name of "preservation of our heritage." The fact that a million dollars was planned for the construction of the museum seemed to be sufficient cause to destroy a pile of brick and stone from an old ruin. Fortunately, we were able to convince the sponsors to move the museum site and thus save the ruin.
The site to which the museum was planned to be moved had no history of early occupation by man. At the meeting at which the archeologist was asked to explore the new site for possible ruins someone made the remark that it might be risky to allow the digging to take place on the new pavilion site because the archeologist might find an Indian pavilion on the site and ask that the museum be moved again. Everyone, including the archeologist, had a laugh over this suggestion. However, the archeological work did reveal an Indian pavilion or ceremonial center two hundred feet square, with an adjoining one-hundred-foot compound with a circular bastion attached. No such ceremonial center with a temple ruin, ceremonial sheds, and circular bastion tower had ever been discovered before, and the archeologists set about trying to save the site by attempting to point out the unique significance of the discovery. If the pavilion construction could be moved over only two hundred feet, the Indian structure could be saved and new posts placed in the original postholes would make a most impressive explanatory exhibit for public enjoyment and education. However, in spite of a great outcry from the public, including news coverage on the Huntley-Brinkley Report, this historic Indian structure was destroyed, ironically by a structure designed ostensibly to interpret the history of the site.

Another restoration group, dealing with a Revolutionary War site on which ruins of nine military fortification features and an entire palisaded town are located, felt it necessary to use their restoration funds to buy log cabins, dismantle them, and reassemble them on the historic site, using exposed California redwood in the process. Another commission, involved with a site on which is located a standing Revolutionary War fortification and six other fortifications from the French and Indian War period and the Revolutionary War, is also planning on hauling log cabins to the site, a site already incredibly blessed with historic archeological treasure. This is being done, it is said, in order to provide the public with something of interest to look at. My question is, how many log cabins can the public absorb on historic sites before they begin rejecting as bogus pseudo-history all such attempts to interpret the past? Will we not reach the saturation point with such efforts? Is not the public now more sophisticated than to require a log cabin on every historic site it visits? We are all working toward a dream of competently researched historic sites through archives and archeology, with the resulting authentic restorations and reconstructions. The evaluation as to whether our efforts will have a permanent educational and beneficial result depends on whether, in bringing our dream to reality, we maintain a high standard of values anchored in thorough research and then translated into competent restorations and on-site explanatory exhibits.

Somewhere between our visionary projection into the future, and the historic sites and structures we see today, the dream meets the reality. Our responsibility to the future lies in first having a dream worthy of our striving and in reaching for its conversion to reality through the most competent means at our disposal. We must take care not to spoil the dream in eagerness to bring its fuzzy edges too quickly into the sharp focus of reality. To do so is to warp our understanding of history through the creation of distorted images that do a disservice to the past as well as to the future. We must constantly, in our role as stewards of the past, be aware of this responsibility. All our efforts should be directed toward achieving the greatest degree of accuracy in our historical and archeological research to
insure the closest correlation between the reality of the past and our explanatory exhibits. These parapets and palisades, cabins and ruins, and restorations and reconstructions are the bridges leading the minds of men to greater appreciation of our heritage. We must not fail in our role as historical engineers shaping the attitudes and understanding of generations yet unborn. For it is only through what we do today in developing our historic sites that the future can know the past through them. If we, in our enthusiasm and in the name of history and restoration, damage, destroy, and distort the clues that have survived rather than competently interpreting them, we have burned the bridges behind us and the future can no longer build on the true evidence, but must forever depend on our interpretation. We, the researchers and developers of historic sites, are the only ones who have the opportunity of observing the maximum amount of historical and archeological evidence. Once the pages in the earth have been revealed through archeology, there is never another chance for those pages to be read, for the archeological process itself is a destructive force, erasing as it reveals. In an excavation there is but one opportunity to recover the data. There is no second chance!

We should guard against first-impulse planning and development, against the log cabin syndrome where the countryside is stripped of log cabins to be planted in a cluster like pseudo-historical mushroom towns springing up overnight, regardless of the historical focus or archeological merit a site might otherwise possess. In our enthusiasm, we may go so far as to use California redwood in our "restorations," implying thereby trade routes and resources undreamed of by our forebears. Yet, the minds of children and unsuspecting adults are shaped by such distortions that are springing as full-blown creations from the forehead of our own age rather than anchored in the past through research and archeology.

Let us guard against the pitfalls of creating "instant history" insufficiently rooted in the rich humus of our heritage of people, their things, and the historic sites that were the stage for their drama. Rather, as we engineer our explanatory exhibits in the form of parapets and palisades, ruins and cabins, and restorations and reconstructions on historic sites, we should be constantly aware of our role as creators of historical images to become burned into the minds of men. If our efforts to interpret history on historic sites are insufficiently documented by research and archeology and we find that the restoration we built must be taken down in favor of a more accurate presentation, the damage has already been done, not only in wasted effort and funds, but also in the false images carried away by all those who viewed the bastard child.

Editor's Note: The preceding article is a shortened version of the paper presented by Mr. South at the Southeastern Museums Conference in Columbia, October 22, 1970.
TOASTMASTERS INTERNATIONAL AND A TRIP WEST

Dr. Robert L. Stephenson, Director of the Institute, represented South Carolina at the 45th Annual Toastmasters International Convention in Portland, Oregon, on August 10-14, 1970. Dr. Stephenson, Sr. Lt. Governor of Toastmasters for South Carolina, was accompanied by his wife Georgie and the South Carolina District Governor, Mr. Harold Dickinson and wife Lillian.

Toastmasters is an educational organization of speakers throughout the world devoted to speech training in more than 3,500 Toastmasters Clubs. If there is a club near or in your town, why not try this educational opportunity to improve your ability to communicate?

Following the convention Dr. Stephenson and his wife Georgie rented a car and drove through Oregon and northern California visiting their old home in Lakeview, Oregon. Among the most interesting sites that they visited were the Fort Rock Cave and the Cougar Mountain Cave in the eastern Oregon desert. Dr. Stephenson was a student of Dr. Cressmen on the excavation of the Fort Rock Cave over 30 years ago. Another interesting visit was made to the early-day homestead of the Godons near Fort Rock. Here is a living homestead exhibit that is the finest example of homestead spirit to be found anywhere. The Godons have lived here continuously since the very early 1900’s and have retained fully the homestead atmosphere. The Oregon Historical Society should consider this place as a future project.

Still another worthwhile visit was made to an old friend in Lakeview, Mr. Robert Ogle. Mr. Ogle has one of the finest collections of ethnographic materials of the North American Indians that I know of in any private collection. This consists of hundreds of baskets (e.g. 87 Pomo), buckskin dresses, beaded clothing, feather headdresses, pottery, katchinas, blankets (several Chilkats), and many other objects. Every piece is a museum exhibit specimen and he has notes and records on the origin, owners, makers, etc. of most of these specimens. Mr. Ogle is now in the process of the tremendous task of preparing a fully annotated catalog of these materials.

EXHIBIT AT CHESTER

Chester County’s Tricentennial Week of September 27 to October 4 featured a display of local Indian and early American cultural material representing in chronological sequence the past 5,000 years of human history of the area. This exhibit, initiated by Mrs. Louise G. Knox of the Chester County Historical Society, was prepared by Mr. Richard Polhemus of the Institute staff under the direction of Dr. Robert L. Stephenson. It was based upon the large Gatlin Collection of Indian Artifacts owned by the Society and upon the collections of miscellaneous historic American objects in the Society’s possession.

The exhibit consisted of a series of "table-cases" beginning with projectile points and other artifacts of the Palmer, Kirk, Stanley, etc. periods and progressing chronologically through the pottery periods to the
historic and culminating in Civil War Period. The exhibit of specimens was supplemented by sketches and charts. The considerable numbers of visitors seemed to derive a great deal from it.

SOUTH CAROLINA FEDERATION OF MUSEUMS

A meeting of the professional museum people of South Carolina was called on December 18, 1970, at the Columbia Art Museum in Columbia. Twenty-one people attended and three others wrote regretting to have to be absent but offering their support. At this meeting the SOUTH CAROLINA FEDERATION OF MUSEUMS was formally organized, a set of bylaws was (in part) adopted, a committee was appointed to reconcile the differences of opinion on the parts of the bylaws that remained unresolved, and Officers and Directors were elected.

Officers and Directors elected were as follows:

President: Dr. John R. Craft, Columbia Art Museum
Vice President: Dr. Robert L. Stephenson, Institute of Archeology and Anthropology
Vice President: Mrs. Helen C. McCormack, Gibbes Art Gallery
Treasurer: Mrs. Nancy Wingard, Lexington County Historical Museum
Secretary: Mr. Jack A. Morris, Jr., Greenville Museum
Director: Mr. E. Milby Burton, Charleston Museum
Director: Mr. Lee Settlemeyer, York County Nature Museum
Director: Mr. Gurdon Tarbox, Brookgreen Gardens
Director: Mr. Eugene Waddell, Florence Museum
Director: Mr. Francis W. Bilodeau, Gibbes Art Gallery
Director: Mr. Charles E. Lee, Director of State Archives

Some concern was expressed that this Federation not be dominated by art museum concepts. It was fully agreed that the Federation is to represent all museum concepts within the state. This would include history, archeology, earth sciences, physical sciences, natural history, art, and all other museum concepts.

Some concern was also expressed in regard to the matter of a State Museum. It was the emphatic consensus that this Federation, representing as it does the professional museum people of the state, be available to the legislature and any other interests for advice and consultation on the matter of organization of any State Museum. To that end Vice President Stephenson was appointed to indicate to the legislature the earnest desire of the Federation to work with them on this matter.

One of the significant aspects of this meeting was the congenial "getting acquainted" of the South Carolina museum people with an organization for mutual benefit. Another is expressed in the section of the bylaws stating that "The Federation shall act in alliance with the objectives of the American Association of Museums and the Southeastern Museums Conference to represent accepted professional standards and procedures among its membership."
An exploratory archeology project was carried out at Ninety Six from October 5 until just before Thanksgiving with the goal of further defining the archeological features at Holmes' Fort. Archeologist Stanley South was assisted by Crew Chief Steven Baker and a crew of five men. Bruce Ezell again provided camp ground facilities for the mess tent, equipment tent, bunk tent, and trailer for the archeologist. Toilet and shower facilities were installed in the equipment tent and one of the crew members was chosen to serve as cook for the expedition.

The primary goal of the project was to define the outline of the ditches of Holmes' Fort, which was a defensive work built by Lieutenant Colonel John Harris Cruger and his Royal Provincials in 1780 on the hill above the town of Ninety Six for protection of the town and water supply. Exploratory slot trenches were cut, and various ditches were discovered and followed during the first two weeks of the project. By the end of this time the outline of the fort was clearly understood. A major fortification ditch six to eight feet wide was found to enclose an area 80 by 100 feet, with a small bastion facing the west. At the north of this area the ditch formed a large bastion 50 by 70 feet. Accompanying these large fortification ditches, when the fort was still in use, was an embankment or parapet of earth taken from the ditch. Inside this anti-artillery embankment was a palisade ditch paralleling the major fort ditch. This ditch provided a vertical firing-wall from which the fort could be defended. From the burned palisades found in the ditch, the rotten palisade impressions, and the baked clay accompanying the ditch, it is clear that this palisade was burned. The documents indicate that this was done when the British evacuated Ninety Six after the siege of General Nathaniel Greene was lifted by Lord Rawdon on June 19, 1781. During the siege Holmes' Fort was subjected to artillery assault by 'Light Horse' Harry Lee under Greene, and on June 18th it was captured by Lee in the major assault on the works at Ninety Six. A few hours after capturing the fort, Lee had to abandon his prize because of the nearness of Lord Rawdon's reinforcements arriving to lift the siege. Before the British abandoned the fort and blockhouses, they burned everything they could so as to render it unusable by Greene had he decided to occupy the works.

The exploratory work on the site revealed that the fort was shaped like a large mitten, and was not a square fort with corner blockhouses and bastions as shown on the early maps. It is clear now that these maps were drawn many years after the fort was destroyed, and the shape shown on them was only symbolic. The "mitten" shaped fort with two bastions is typical of British fortifications known as hornworks or crownworks, all having two bastions, one often larger than the other. These were designed to protect a high point of ground not easily taken into the regular fortifications of a town, and were connected to the main fortification by means of a "covered way" or ditch inside which troops could move under cover without being subjected to fire of the enemy. Such a covered way was indicated on the early maps of the Ninety Six works, but the covered way has yet to be investigated at the site, though its location is now known.
After the first two weeks of work were accomplished and the map of the data recovered was drawn, earth moving machines were brought to the site to remove the plowed soil zone much faster than was possible by hand labor. This would allow the entire fort ditch outline to be seen for dressing and photographs, and for an additional map to be drawn from the complete fort data thus revealed. However, when the machines moved onto the site, the rain also came, and during the rainy season to follow, the crew concentrated on cutting exploratory slots into the area of the junction of the Charleston Road and the road to Augusta in the heart of Ninety Six. A blockhouse was suspected in the area, and this work was designed to reveal any ditches relating to fortification of this critical area of the approach to Ninety Six. As the project developed and weather prevented work on the Holmes’ Fort site, many fortification ditches were located. A major fort ditch was found to enclose an area inside which was found a cellar hole measuring 15 by 30 feet. Here too, was a firing wall ditch for palisade poles to retain the parapet embankment thrown from the fort ditch, providing firm evidence that the structure over the cellar was of such importance that it required heavy fortification for protection. In front of this major fort ditch was another palisade that was part of an enclosure apparently measuring some 220 by 400 feet and having a small diamond shaped bastion at the northeast corner. This palisaded enclosure surrounded the buildings of the town, the courthouse and nearby houses, and was apparently the structure referred to by Cruger when he said:

"I have Palisaded ye Courthouse & the Principal houses in about one hundred yards square, with Block House flankers..."

(Cruger to Cornwallis-Oct. 13, 1780).

In front of the entire fortification described here, in the area to the north some 55 feet away, another palisade ditch was discovered which enclosed an area some 150 by 325 feet and was probably used as an encampment area for the Royal Provincials during the siege of 28 days in May and June, 1781.

The area around the site of the jail was examined, and another fortification ditch was found here, as well as the west palisade ditch around the town. This jail fortification ditch was shaped as a bastion (similar to those at Holmes' Fort on the hill west of the jail), and clearly revealed that this building was heavily fortified with ditches, parapets, and palisades, typical of those of English origin. None of these works at the jail or at the intersection of the roads in the center of Ninety Six were shown on any map, and are now known only through archaeology.

From the exploratory work done in this area on this project, we have learned that the defensive works at Ninety Six were far more extensive and impressive than any historical record had led us to believe. The cellar may be that of a fortified blockhouse where powder and ammunition was stored. Patrick Ferguson in a report in February 1780 described and illustrated such a heavily ditch-parapet-and-palisade-protected blockhouse as an ideal anti-artillery type blockhouse that would be of important use in South Carolina, and Ferguson’s plans may have been used by Cruger for building some of the fortifications at Ninety Six. A complete map of the features discovered in this project and the Holmes’ Fort map has been printed and will soon be published along with a report. The work at Holmes’ Fort and the Ninety Six
Sites will continue in the spring and fall as further expeditions are carried out through the cooperative efforts of The Star Fort Historical Commission, The State Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism, and The Institute of Archeology and Anthropology at the University of South Carolina.

Fig. 1. Motor grader and archeological crew removing topsoil at the site of Holmes' Fort, Ninety Six, S. C.
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