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Beginning now, with Volume III, THE NOTEBOOK will appear on a bi-monthly basis with six numbered issues per year and the pages numbered consecutively throughout the volume. We hope that this will keep us on a regular, up-to-date schedule.

We have had some disappointments in January and February along with our regular work. We proposed an archaeological survey of Spartanburg County for one year to be funded by Industry. The Deering Milliken Company looked favorably upon our proposal but, due to the economic situation of the textile industry this year they felt that they could not support it. We do, however, appreciate their consideration. We also proposed a project at the Old Cherokee Iron Works at Cherokee Falls on the Broad River and that seems to have fallen through but discussions are still taking place.

The South Carolina Federation of Museums continues its activities in behalf of Museums in the state. The Federation initiated a Concurrent Resolution in the South Carolina General Assembly to establish a study committee for a State Museum. This should be a major step toward a sound, professionally oriented plan for the state.

The Institute recently received, by transfer from the South Caroliniana Library, two important collections. The Robert Wauchope Collection of pre-historic artifacts and the W. G. Mazyck Shell Collection. The former consists of documented artifacts collected in South Carolina in the 1930's, and a few random groups of archeological materials from outside the state. It is a most useful collection made by Dr. Wauchope while he lived in Columbia. The second is a documented collection of marine and fresh water shells from all over the world collected in the early 1900's by Mr. Mazyck. These two collections add materially to our research capabilities here in the Institute. We deeply appreciate the good offices of the South Caroliniana Library in housing them over the years and in transferring them to the Institute for research.

We have continued to pursue public relations through Dr. Hemmings on Educational Television, January 14, talking about the Shell Rings' Project, and various of us talking to local groups about various aspects of archeology in the state. We had a pleasant visit to Rock Hill early in February to visit the York County Nature Museum. This is certainly a fine exhibit of, among other things, African mammals, some of the most unique specimens in the United States.

Late in February Dr. Hemmings, Tom Ryan, and I met with the landowners and the Historical Society at Hilton Head Island to discuss archeological research on the island, particularly the program for excavation of the shell rings. Mr. Fred Hack and Mr. Charles Fraser (represented by Mr. Glen McCaskey), principal landowners, were most helpful. From them we borrowed the collections excavated in 1966-67 by Alan Calmes, for comparative study. Dr. Hemmings and Tom Ryan remained for two additional days to conduct a site survey of the island recording nine sites. On Saturday evening we spoke to the Hilton Head Historical Society on "Archeology in South Carolina."

Dr. Robert L. Stephenson, Director
Institute of Archeology and Anthropology
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina
THOMAS M. RYAN JOINS
INSTITUTE STAFF

On February 22 Thomas M. Ryan joined the staff of the Institute on a temporary appointment for six months. Tom is completing his thesis for his M.A. at Louisiana State University and will expect his degree in May. He is a native of New Orleans and has worked for Bob Neuman in the Plains in South Dakota, and in Louisiana on several projects. He has shown his competence there in site survey work as well as in excavation. Most recently he has been excavating a house site at Marksville, Louisiana.

After a few days of orientation here in the laboratory, he was thrust into field work with Dr. Hemmings in the survey of Hilton Head Island. His main responsibilities will be to develop further, the statewide site inventory and check out leads on sites throughout the state. Tom has taken hold of his job quickly and we are all pleased to have him with us. Welcome aboard, Tom, and thanks to Bob Neuman at L.S.U. for recommending him to us.

WILLIAM S. AYRES JOINS
DEPARTMENT STAFF

Mr. William S. Ayres has joined the teaching staff of the Department of Anthropology and Sociology at the University of South Carolina as of February 1, 1971, the beginning of Spring Term. This brings the number of anthropologists in the teaching department to four. We are proud of our department as it expands and develops a substantial undergraduate program in anthropology. Dr. David Hatch, a sociologist, is chairman and is to be warmly congratulated on his development of the department.

Mr. Ayres is an instructor in the department. He received his B.A. in 1966 from the University of Wyoming and is expecting his Ph.D. from Tulane University in the fall of 1971. His field research has been primarily archaeological in the areas of Wyoming, New Mexico, Easter Island and Hawaii. He has done some linguistic work along the way. His primary interests have settled pretty much in the Pacific area, especially Easter Island and Hawaii and he has most recently been archeologist on the staff of the Bernice P. Bishop Museum in Honolulu.

We welcome Bill to the teaching staff and especially to the staff of Collaborators of the Institute. It is good to continue to develop diversification of interests, specialties and areas. It broadens all of our perspectives.
THOUGHTS ON THE
CALICO MOUNTAINS SITE*

by Robert L. Stephenson

In the course of a general archeological survey of the Pleistocene Manix Lake Basin by the San Bernardino County Museum, Miss Ruth De Ette Simpson recovered some chipped stone material, in 1963, that appeared to be quite old. She interested Dr. L.S.B. Leakey, of Nairobi, Africa, in the site and excavations were begun in 1964 that continued from mid-Fall to mid-Spring of each of the next six years. The work was sponsored by the San Bernardino County Museum and funded by various agencies including the Museum, the National Geographic Society, the University of Pennsylvania, the L.S.B. Leakey Foundation and others. Miss Simpson has been in charge of the archeological work throughout and Dr. Leakey has been her constant advisor and consultant, visiting the excavations frequently. Dr. Thomas Clements has served as the Project Geologist.

The Calico Mountains Site is approximately 150 miles northeast of Los Angeles, and 15 miles east of Barstow, in southcentral California. It is situated on a segment of a large outwash fan derived from the Calico Mountains at the edge of the Manix Lake Basin in the southwestern extremity of the Great Basin physiographic province. Within that fan, at depths of from a few feet to nearly 30 feet, chipped stone specimens have been found in quantity. Several hundred have been set aside as possible artifacts, and all of the other stone material from the excavation pits had been saved and are available for future study. Well toward the bottom of the excavations are two clusters of rocks arranged in a vaguely circular pattern that have the appearance of being hearths.

This site has become somewhat controversial since the chipped stone specimens are very crude and extreme antiquity has been suggested for them. In order to try to resolve some of the questions raised by the site and to obtain as much objective, firsthand opinion as possible, the San Bernardino County Museum, the L.S.B. Leakey Foundation and the University of Pennsylvania sponsored a three day conference at the site in October 1970. Archeologists, geologists, climatologists, and others from all over the world were present. Many views were expressed, but unfortunately not enough opinions were expressed and discussed openly during the meetings. Most of us were absorbing all of the information we could at the site and in the specimen exhibits and really, I suppose, arguing with ourselves. Unless one is handling discreet, analytical data, I believe, some reflection and time to mentally analyse what he has been shown, weighting the pros and cons very carefully, is required before he makes a judgment on such controversial material. I have weighed the evidence that I saw and reflected upon it at considerable length and offer these thoughts on what the material appears to me to represent.

*This is an expanded version of a paper that I presented at the Southeastern Archeological Conference in Columbia, South Carolina on October 31, 1971.
My first visit to this site was in August 1968. During that two day visit Miss Simpson gave my wife and me a grand tour of the site, site area, and opened up all of the collected specimen materials for examination. I again visited the site and examined the collections as a participant in the Calico Mountains Site Conference in October 1970. During the latter visit Dr. Thomas Clements gave us, in the field and conference rooms, a most lucid and ably presented discussion of the geology of the site and the locality. Miss Simpson gave us one of the best oral presentations of the archaeology of the site that it has been my privilege to hear. This three day conference allowed all of us time to adequately see, hear and digest aspects so far known of this site.

During this conference many of the most competent specialists in the world were present to view and discuss the site and the materials related to the site. There was no question, I believe, in anyone's mind as to the excellence of the excavations, the recording of the data, and the preservation of the recovered materials. There was, though, great divergence of opinion as to the interpretation of the data. These divergent opinions related to both the archeological and the geological interpretations. I found myself consistently expressing a minority opinion among the group but was pleased to have some very good company in this minority view.

Since I am an archeologist, and involved with geology primarily as it relates to specific archeological sites, I shall first discuss the archeological aspects of this site, as I see them, and follow this with briefer comments on the geology. Basically, since the field excavations are agreed by all to have been done with the utmost competence, there are, for the present purposes, but four archeological questions. First, are the recovered specimens artifacts or not? Second, are the two rock clusters hearths or not? Third, is there any other evidence of man's having been at this site? Fourth, what is the age of the recovered specimens? The fourth question, of course, is basically geological; but, if the answer to any of the first three could conceivably be "yes," then it must certainly be asked as an archeological question as well.

Let me, at the outset, very clearly say that I am firmly convinced that several hundred of the recovered specimens are chipped stone tools of extremely primitive characteristics, chipped by man at what one might call a quarry site, at least a site where raw materials were gathered and made into artifacts. Many of these tools are so primitive that it is conceivable that they could have been chipped by natural agencies. In fact someone at the Conference found one specimen that, when placed beside a published illustration of a specimen known to have been chipped by natural agencies, compared very favorably. This demonstrates nothing, however. It is comparable to placing a rough stone sphere known to have been made by a lapidary beside a selected illustration of a concretion to demonstrate that both are concretions. The form may be the same but the manner of deriving that form is not demonstrated. It isn't even questioned. It is only falsely assumed. I find it quite beyond the range of expectability, even if every one of these specimens could conceivably have been chipped by natural forces, to find so many in such a small, concentrated area. There are several hundred and they represent the chips as well as the core material. Such a concentration and the quantity of the chips does not seem reasonably explainable by any agent other...
than man.

Many of these specimens are bifacially chipped along one or more edges, and on some of them the chipping alternates from side to side of the edge. Many have clearly distinguishable bulbs of percussion. Some of the chips are concavo-convex, clearly having been struck from already existing bulbs of percussion by well-placed secondary blows. A few specimens are chipped on several sides and edges by numerous blows requiring that the specimen be repeatedly struck from several angles. A few specimens are chipped on all surfaces of one end to form a point while the opposite end is not chipped at all and tends to be rounded. These resemble hand axes. I suggest that the chance of any of these having been formed by natural forces is extremely remote and to find so many of them together in one small locality is virtually impossible. The hand axe-like specimens, for example, would have to have been caught by one rounded end in a crevice or some such holding device and repeatedly struck on all exposed surfaces by literally a score or more of blows administered by rocks or other hard objects that happened to be passing by with rather violent force.

The geologists at the Conference seemed to concur that the fan in which these specimens were found, the Yermo Fan, was formed as a mud flow or series of mud flows. Now a mud flow is, as I understand it, a rather gently moving phenomenon and not a violent one. It carries with it the mud itself which serves as a sort of cushioning agent for the tumbling and moving rock inclusions. The included rocks, of course, do strike each other and rub and grind as they move along with the mud, but repeated, violent contact of rock on rock is not a feature of a mud flow due to this cushioning. Natural fractures, of these included rocks, are expectable and chips are expected to be broken from them in the course of the mud flow action. Repeated attacks on any one rock are not expectable and several scores of chips broken from a single rock would be unusual. Here in a very small area, several hundred rocks have each had several scores of chips removed and I suggest that this could hardly have resulted from the natural action of a mud flow.

A critical point made by a number of my colleagues at the Conference was that there seems to be no "pattern" to the Calico specimens. The term "pattern" may have more than one meaning in this regard but it became apparent that most of those with whom I discussed this matter meant that there were no "artifact types." They meant that the amassed collection of Calico specimens was not amenable to being separated into known typological categories such as scrapers, choppers, bifaces, projectile points, anvils, etc. I suggest that we cannot be bound, in our identifications, to the several preconceived typological categories that we have, on the basis of previous experience, been able to identify and define from other collections of specimens. Not all artifacts necessarily fit neatly into preconceived categories or typological pigeonholes. We may make as many new types as we like, to accommodate the data. Typological categories are mental constructs designed to be useful aids in understanding and dealing with data. They are not ends in themselves nor determinants of the data.

Furthermore, if this is what is meant by "patterns," I suggest that there are patterns in the Calico specimens. Specific groups of these specimens chipped on one or more faces of one or more long edges by several scores of
chipping blows, clearly indicate to me the "pattern" of side scraper. Other groups of specimens seem equally clearly to have the "patterns" of end scrapers, hammerstones, anvils, and hand axes. Admittedly these are of crude, primitive form but they are nonetheless "patterns" in this sense.

Now if "pattern" means a systematic series of chips removed in some regular fashion from a particular specimen, I submit that this kind of "pattern," too, is present in the Calico material. Systematic, repeated, alternating edge chipping is one "pattern." Repeated unifacial chipping along one edge of a specimen is another. Systematic removal of chips from all sides of one specimen to form a pointed end with a rounded, unchipped opposite end is still another. I could go on with still different "patterns" and these all seemed quite obvious to me in my examination of the specimens from Calico.

During the Conference I argued that if these Calico specimens had been found in a known Archaic workshop site along with a few other more easily recognizable specimens such as projectile points, they would arouse but slight comment. They would be sorted into the "junk" category of poorly made or partially made artifacts from the site and but briefly mentioned in the report. Responses to this argument were in agreement. The individuals to whom I put this argument agreed that under those circumstances they, too, would have no hesitation in calling these specimens crudely made artifacts "but here they are in too old a context to be artifacts." Are we to assume that what a thing is depends upon where it is found? I think not. If a specimen is an artifact in one set of circumstances, it is an artifact in any set of circumstances. If we were to find a Coke bottle under a foot of undisturbed Crater Lake pumice, there could be no argument that it would be still a Coke bottle. The problem would be not that it is in too old a context to be a Coke bottle but to determine how it was introduced into that context. Is it really Crater Lake pumice? Is it really undisturbed? Is Crater Lake pumice really as old as it is thought to be, etc.? This is an extreme example, of course, but it is exactly the same problem.

Of course these are all opinions argued from reason. They are not empirical proofs of anything. So are the opposing arguments that the Calico specimens are not artifacts. Much laboratory work with these specimens will be required in order to demonstrate clearly that these are or are not artifacts. That laboratory work has hardly begun. If anything further is to come of this material, every analytical technique available must be brought to bear on these specimens. John Witthoft has made a brief start on this and indicated some of the directions of these analyses in a brief preliminary paper passed out at the Conference under the title of "Technology of the Calico Site." High powered microscopic analyses of all of the chip scars of these specimens must be made. A search must be made for evidence of wear scars or use abrasion on specimen edges. Witthoft recognized some use abrasion on a few specimens. Lithologic and chemical analyses might prove highly useful. Statistical treatment of fracture angles, bulbs of percussion and other physical features are essential. Some of the new computer techniques for determining morphological consistencies and clearly isolating repetitive patterns would be abundantly useful. Simple counting of flake scars on each specimen and comparisons of the fracture angles on any one specimen as compared to other specimens should provide the kinds of evidence required to solve some of these problems. I trust that the next phase of the Calico Project will
address itself to these and any other detailed laboratory analytical techniques known.

We were shown two clusters of rocks during the Conference, each of which appears to be situated in a circular pattern of systematic form resembling the rocks in a hearth. There is no apparent visual evidence of ash, charcoal, or burning of the rocks in or around either cluster. They simply have the physical appearance of rocks placed around a fireplace. These may or may not be hearths, but they certainly look like hearths.

One rock was removed from one cluster and tested for differential magnetism. The tests showed differential magnetism on the end near the center of the cluster from that away from the center of the cluster suggesting greater heat toward the center of the rock cluster, hence fire, hence a hearth. One test is not enough. Several rocks from each cluster should be tested, and identical tests should be made on other rocks not associated with the clusters, but from the same level of the deposit. The question of the "hearths" is still open, but visual appearance and one test, tends to indicate that these may well be hearths.

Three other scraps of evidence suggest the presence of man at the Calico Site. One is a fossil gastropod that is said to have its closest source of origin some eighty or ninety miles to the west along the California coast. If this is true and there is no source for this kind of fossil within the source material of the Yermo Fan, we are obliged to attribute its presence in the Calico Site to man. Witthoft has identified two flakes of moss-agate gravel in the collections from the site and places the nearest known source of this material some one hundred miles to the east along the Colorado River outwash. These, too, could only have been introduced into the site by man if there actually is no source of this material in the Yermo Fan area. The third scrap of evidence, also identified by Witthoft, consists of five small pieces of quartz crystal, each of which has been chipped and battered from a unitary crystal. Witthoft places the nearest source of these near Needles, California, some forty miles to the east.

Here, again, we have only reasoned opinion and "best evidence" to support these three indications of man's presence. We need empirical proof and demonstration that sources for these materials are or are not available in Mule Canyon of the Calico Mountains where the Yermo Fan material had its origin. This can only be derived from detailed analyses of all of the Mule Canyon source material by every geologic and lithologic means possible.

This brings us to the questions of the geology of the area and the age of the deposits. There can be little question that the kinds of detailed geological and geochronological studies that are essential to a resolution of the questions about this site have only begun. Dr. Clements, the project geologist, has done a fine job as far as he has gone but much more is needed both in the field and in the laboratory. For example, at the Conference he was frank to say that he was not certain if the Yermo Fan is one or more than one fan. Some of the world's leading geologists at the Conference had opinions about the age of the deposits ranging from terminal Pliocene to mid-Wisconsin and added "Whatever that may mean in years."
Karl W. Butzer and Carl L. Hansen, in a brief geologic summary "A Report on the Geomorphology and Stratigraphy of the Calico Hills Site," that was passed out at the Conference, offered some sound suggestions about the sequence of events there. Their report, of course, necessarily raised more questions than it answered being based as it was on their "brief examination" of the locality. Butzer and F. Clark Howell added an appendix to the report listing five suggestions for further work, all of which are essential for understanding this complex deposit.

Butzer and Hansen are lead to "---suspect that further, detailed studies will indicate that the site is older than 'classical' Wisconsin, i.e. the main body of the Yermo Fan will prove to be greater than 30,000 years." It also, to them, "---seems improbable that the Yermo Fan is older than late Middle Pleistocene (perhaps 120,000 years)."

Obviously the detailed studies are needed. It is not enough to "suspect" that these dates will apply. We need some concrete evidence which may be very difficult to obtain. We also need a great deal more detailed studies of the lithology. It is, for example, still to be demonstrated that moss- agate, quartz crystals, and fossil gastropods are or are not available naturally in the area.

Dating of the site appears to rest squarely on the shoulders of the geologists because the usual, non-geological means of dating seem to be missing. This means that the geological determinations must be refined to their greatest precision. A range of 30,000 to 120,000 years even if demonstrated, is probably close enough for most geological problems but is not close enough for an archeological problem.

One end of the time range can apparently be closed by empirical tests already done. Near the edge of the Yermo Fan a series of shorelines of Lake Manix has been dated by Carbon-14. The upper shoreline here, almost certainly younger than the Yermo Fan, is dated at 19,750 years ago. This provides a minimal date for the deposits but the other end of the time range appears to be wide open with opinions ranging as far back as terminal Pliocene.

Throughout this brief commentary, I have emphasized the need for additional field and laboratory geology and additional laboratory study of the archeological materials. It seems essential to me that every possible effort should be made to pursue these studies to their absolute limits in every way possible. At present the Calico Site is a well excavated site, the interpretation of which is largely subjective and controversial. Empirical, demonstrable evidence that it even is an archeological site is tenuous. If it is not an archeological site, the work done there has been nothing more than an expensive exercise in field techniques. If it is an archeological site, if the specimens actually are artifacts and man occupied this locality during the deposition of the Yermo Fan, it is the most significant site yet known in the New World. The age is yet to be determined but it seems certain that it is beyond 20,000 years ago.

My personal opinion, and it is only a reasoned opinion, is that these
are artifacts; that this is an archeological site of more than 20,000 years ago and that it is worth every possible effort that can be made to demonstrate the validity of the specimens, or their lack of validity, and to demonstrate some empirical evidence for the age of the site within as narrow a range as is humanly possible. I do not believe that we have human occupation here in the terminal Pliocene or at any time even approaching that. I do believe that we have human occupation at this site and I would not be even slightly surprised to learn of good substantial evidence for its age being within the range of 30,000 to 60,000 years ago.

GEORGE WASHINGTON
TRAIL DEDICATION

On January 12-15, 1971 the Greater Myrtle Beach Chamber of Commerce celebrated the opening of the "Grand Strand" section of the George Washington Trail. This is the section from the North Carolina state line to Georgetown, some sixty miles. The trail commemorates the route of President Washington in South Carolina in April 1791, and has been developed by the State Highway Department, and the State Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism in conjunction with the State Department of Archives and History.

The Executive Vice President of the Chamber, Mr. Fred Brinkman, and the people of the "Grand Strand" area put on quite a celebration despite an unseasonably cold wind all weekend. On Friday they had special sales in all the stores, a golf tournament, and a folk music concert. On Saturday they had more golf, tours of houses, gardens and museums, South Carolina movies, a University of South Carolina Choir concert, and more sales. Sunday was more of the same plus a Grand Ole Opry show. Monday was the Dedication and an official tour down the "Grand Strand."

As a part of Sunday's activities the South Carolina Department of Archives and History and the Board of Review of Historic Places were invited to meet jointly at Myrtle Beach as guests of the Chamber. The meeting was held from 10:00 A.M. to 1:00 P.M. at the Thunderbird Motor Inn. A cocktail party and grand banquet was enjoyed by the group that evening hosted by the Chamber of Commerce, the Holiday Downtown Motor Inn, and the Thunderbird Motor Inn. We were most graciously housed for the three nights as the guests of the Chamber of Commerce and the St. John's Inn.

On Monday the group left by bus for the Welcome Center at Little River. Governor John West made the Dedication Address. The group then toured the "Grand Strand" along the George Washington Trail of 1791. This included stops along the way at Brookgreen Gardens for the unveiling of Anna Hyatt Huntington's newest sculpture "The Work Horse," and at Georgetown. At the latter we were treated to a delightful buffet by the Chamber of Commerce and the Georgetown Holiday Inn.

During the weekend we visited gardens, historic houses and churches and the Rice Museum. It was a most delightful weekend.
ARCHEOLOGIST OF THE YEAR

JAMES L. MICHIE

As an incentive toward further achievement by the members of the Archeological Society of South Carolina, the Institute has established an award for the amateur archeologist in the state that has, each year, contributed most toward the development of archeology. The award consists of a plaque and a year's paid membership in the Society for American Archeology. Selections are made by the Board of Directors of the Society in consultation with the Institute.

This award for the Calendar Year 1970 was made to MR. JAMES L. MICHIE, past president of the Society and was a unanimous choice. Mr. Michie's letter of award reads as follows:

Dear Mr. Michie:

It is my pleasure to present to you, on behalf of the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology and of the Archeological Society of South Carolina the award of DISTINGUISHED ARCHEOLOGIST OF THE YEAR for the calendar year of 1970.

The Institute, in making this award, recognizes your many distinguished contributions to the archeology of the state including reporting and recording of sites, excavations at the Taylor Site, publication of articles, the presidancy of the Archeological Society of South Carolina for two years, and your cooperation with both amateur and professional archeologists in the state. Your devotion and dedication to your avocation has been an inspiration to the many other amateur archeologists in South Carolina and a source of stimulation to the professional archeologists.

The Officers and Directors of the Society, with the concurrence of the Institute, have selected you as the amateur archeologist in the state who has contributed most to the advancement of archeology in 1970. My best congratulations and good wishes for many similarly productive years.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Stephenson
Director and State Archeologist
Fig. 1. Plaque awarded to James L. Michie.
STUDENT STAFF
OF THE INSTITUTE

We have been most fortunate in developing a competent, interested, and hard working staff of student assistants at the Institute during the past year or so. We run a rather "tight ship" and try to have a businesslike organization going. The diligent work of these students has made it possible for us to accomplished what we have and has made the Institute a pleasant, efficient place to work.

Paul Brockington has been a mainstay of the staff since October 1968 and we have missed him since he went to graduate school in Kansas last fall.

Karen Lindsay also came with us in October 1968 and has been doing a fine job working with the site inventory records building them up from nothing to almost 900 sites.

Pamela Morgan began in November 1968 but took a year off to go to Europe. She is back with us this year and has worked faithfully as a lab assistant. Her research interest is the Catawba Indians and she is preparing a paper on these Indians.

Jim Frierson has been with us since last June as a draftsman and has developed excellent skills in illustrating artifacts and drafting maps.

Charles Jenks, with now just over a year, is a good lab assistant and has developed skills at restoration of pottery vessels.

Donny Hunt, also a veteran of just over a year, has proven his worth in the laboratory as an expert cataloger and in general specimen processing.

Alan Shoemaker, also a one year veteran, is a graduate student in biology and has been competently assisting Dr. Hemmings with the processing of the Shell Ring materials.

Bob and Carol Thompson began with us last spring and fall respectively, and are both competent in the general cataloging and specimen processing department.

Pete Reed started last fall and he, too, is a competent specimen cataloger and processor.

John Jameson began last fall with Mr. South in the field at Ninety Six and has remained with us assisting Mr. South in research and map drafting on the Ninety Six project.

We are proud of every one of these people in their assigned tasks and in their flexibility in being willing and able to do whatever needs to be done when it is needed. Besides they are all, personally, delightful people with whom to work.
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A field course in archeology was conducted during the first Summer Session of 1970 by the University of South Carolina. Attending were eleven undergraduate students at the University, including two coeds, plus a small number of interested amateurs. Taught by Donald R. Sutherland of the Department of Anthropology and Sociology, the three credit-hour course consisted of one week of classroom work, four weeks of excavation at a local site, and one week of laboratory work. Facilities, equipment, and an assistant, Mr. Paul E. Brockington, were graciously provided by the University's Institute of Archeology and Anthropology.

The excavation portion of the course took place at a site called Thom's (or Tom's) Creek. This is located on a terrace of the Congaree River in Lexington County and has been described in an earlier volume (Vol. I, No. 10, p. 17) of this Notebook by Mr. James L. Michie. The site was chosen for two reasons. First, surface refuse indicated that it was a habitation site with more than one component. Second, it was conveniently located for rapid access by vehicle, a consideration made necessary by a three hour limitation on excavation sessions. On the site itself, a further limitation was imposed by the fact that only one of the two property owners upon whose land it rested would allow excavation. For his permission, we are greatly indebted to Mr. G. Thomas Harmon.

The primary objective of the field excavation was to provide students with an opportunity to learn the various associated techniques. No effort was made to carry out a designated project but simply to train students in field methods. In order that the work have some scientific meaning, however, awareness was maintained that the site might yield information relevant to the general problem of early pottery in South Carolina and, perhaps, the Southeast in general.

The fieldwork itself consisted in the excavation of five test squares, varying in size from two meters square to three by four meters. All were located in a wooded fringe along the creek bordering the site on the north and after which it is named. No clear stratification of components was seen in any of the tests. The number of artifacts recovered, including potsherds, projectile points, a "net sinker," and other refuse, was relatively small and, upon superficial inspection, appear to be similar in temporal and cultural range to those reported in Volume I of the Notebook by Michie. A full analysis of pottery and projectile points by one of the participating students, Wayne Bell, is nearing completion. Another participating student, David Bowdoin, has already completed a history of the locale upon which the site is located.
Eventually, a thorough report on the summer field course excavation at Thorn's Creek will be completed. Meanwhile, the artifacts recovered and pertinent notes are available to interested parties at the Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology. Beyond this, no field course is planned for the summer of 1971. However, the possibilities for the summer of 1972 look promising.

FIELD TRIP TO BARNWELL AND AIKEN COUNTIES

On February 17 I drove to Barnwell and met with Mr. Bill Christensen, Recreation and Historical Preservation Planner of the Lower Savannah Regional Planning and Development Commission. Mr. Karl Hurde of the Savannah River Plant and Mr. N. M. Mann of Aiken were with him. The purpose of the trip was primarily to examine an area along the southeast edge of the Savannah River Plant for archeological sites. Mr. Christensen had phoned that there was a new industrial development that included some earth moving and that the area should be searched for sites.

We drove to the area, just north of Highway 125 at the S.R.P. gate, and examined the land in question. No streams crossed the area and there did not appear to be any archeological values endangered.

We then drove to Lower Three Runs Creek and visited a site that Mr. Hurde had previously located. This, The Meyers Site, 38BR1, is a good, medium sized village site. We collected grit and quartz-tempered plain sherds, some check-stamped sherds, and some cord-marked sherds along with some chipped stone material.

Mr. Christensen and I then visited the Silver Bluff area on the Savannah River near Jackson but were unsuccessful in pinning down any specific site.

The kind cooperation of Mr. Christensen and his office is deeply appreciated as is the interest shown by Mr. Hurde and Mr. Mann.

ARCHEOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The Society met at its regular time and place on January 15. The speaker Dr. Norman Olson, State Geologist, presented a most informative discussion of the geology of the state. The February meeting was held on the 19th with Mr. Floyd Painter of Portsmouth, Virginia, presenting an illustrated talk on the excavation of the eighteenth century well at Fort Boykin. Attendance remains in the 40-60 range. Dues are now past due for 1971. Those of you who have not paid can send checks to the Treasurer, Mr. Walter Joseph, 903 Wildwood Drive, Aiken, S. C., 29801, or to the Institute.
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A NOTE ON BAKED CLAY OBJECTS FROM THE TEXAS COAST

by Thomas Roy Hester

(Ed. Note: Mr. Hester is a graduate student at the University of California, Berkeley. He has recently been with the Texas Archeological Program. This brief note is another contribution to the Society for the Preservation of Baked Clay Objects.)

In a recent issue of the Notebook, Stanley South described baked clay objects recovered from excavations at the site of Charles Towne, South Carolina. Similar objects of baked clay have received widespread attention, from California (Heizer 1937) to Louisiana and the Southeast (cf. South 1970: 6-7). Objects of fired clay are also present along the Gulf coast of Texas. In a forthcoming paper in Florida Anthropologist, I discuss these specimens and comment on some of the functional interpretations given them. In this note, I would like to briefly summarize the current knowledge of these baked clay pieces on the Texas coast.

On the upper Texas coast, both Aten (1967) and Shafer (1968) have reported fired clay objects. At the Jamison site, Aten notes the occurrence of numerous "clayballs"; X-ray diffraction patterns of the specimens indicated that they had been heated to 500-600°C (Aten 1967: 40). He speculates that they might be related to some form of domestic activity, including "house or shelter (daub), pottery manufacture, or fire hearth" (Aten 1967: 40). Shafer (1968) found numerous "baked clay nodules" at sites in the San Jacinto River Basin, many of which were recovered in situ as hearth components (see Shafer 1968: Figs. 7, 8, 27). They range in size up to 15 cm. maximum diameter. James Malone (personal communication) reports similar specimens at other sites on the southeast Texas coastal plain.

On the lower coast, baked clay objects have been reported by Corbin (1963) and Hester (1969, 1971). Corbin (1963: 29) advanced the hypothesis that these objects were formed by the erosion and subsequent scattering of clay-lined hearths. In 1969, H. J. Shafer and I noted a number of burned clay lumps during brief reconnaissance in Kleberg County. At one site, several of these lumps were found in a circular arrangement which we interpreted as a hearth. I have seen other such accumulations in the area. These lumps (Fig. 2, A-F) appear to have been formed from damp clay (fingerprints and grass/twig impressions are evident on a few) and were then baked, with the core of the lump turning black. In my forthcoming paper (Hester 1971), I propose two hypotheses to account for these baked clay lumps on the lower coast. The first is that they served as surrogate hearthstones, since that area of the coast has no native stone. A second hypothesis (suggested in other areas) is that they were used as cooking or boiling "stones," by being heated and placed in some form of container. If such a boiling activity was conducted in a specific area, localized concentrations of these baked clay lumps might result.

In recent months, archeological excavations in the interior of southern Texas (Hester 1970; T. C. Hill, Jr., personal communication) have revealed baked clay lumps similar to those of the coast. Since stones of all
types are available for the building of hearths in this region (intact or scattered hearths of sandstone are common at many sites), I do not yet know how to interpret these specimens.

In conclusion, it should be pointed out that none of the Texas specimens have any sort of decoration. Though some were apparently shaped by intention, there are no elaborate forms as are found at Poverty Point, Charles Towne, and other southern sites.
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Fig. 2 (Hester). Eroded baked clay objects from surface sites in Kleberg County, lower Texas coast.
The Fourth Annual Meeting of the Society for Historical Archeology met in Washington, D. C., on January 7-9, 1971. The meetings were held at the Museum of History and Technology of the Smithsonian Institution and at the Ambassador Hotel. We don't know what the attendance was but it could have been better had the Program Chairman sent out an advance program. For example some people that should (and normally would) have gone said "I am not going because I don't know what is on the program." Another person did not go because the abstract of his paper was "lost" and he was told by phone he was not on the program. Yet none of us knew what was on the program. I would not have gone had I not had other things to do in Washington.

Even after we got there all we had was an outline of a program. For example, the business session was listed on Friday "Time and Place to be announced." Friday morning I inquired about it and was told "Oh! we had that yesterday." I still don't know who was elected or what business was conducted. Can anyone fill me in? This was one of the most poorly organized, confused, and badly run meetings I have ever attended. Now, I have blown off steam about the overall planning, what was good about it?

Some of the individual session chairmen did a good job and at least some sessions were good. George Fischer put together a good symposium (and it was a real symposium) on Marine Archeology. Others were good, too, such as Bernard Fontanas panel on "Uses of Historical Archeology" and Jim Deetz's panel on the same subject. But why have two panels with identical titles?

Fortunately there were other things to do in Washington. I had a pleasant visit at the National Park Service offices and at the National Endowment for the Humanities office regarding a request for funding of work at Camden and other matters. I had some identification of specimens done at the Smithsonian. Perhaps most important, I went through all of the Smithsonian Anthropological Archives and sorted out all of the South Carolina material. Copies have been made and sent here so now we have all of that material at the Institute. There were also many opportunities to visit with old associates and that, too, was delightful.

The weather was much like the Conference Program----Bad. Washington's worst snowstorm of the year (or for several years) enveloped the place in a heavy white blanket just before we got there on January 4. The temperatures throughout the week were bitterly cold.

I certainly hope that next year's Program Chairman will accept the responsibilities of that job and make a better effort to put together a program.
THE I. C. FEW SITE

by Roger T. Grange, Jr.

(Ed. note: Dr. Grange is Chairman of the Department of Anthropology, University of South Florida, in Tampa. He was hired by Dr. Edwards in the summer of 1967 to excavate the I. C. Few Site (38PN2) in the Keowee-Toxaway Project. In 1969 the Institute contracted with Dr. Grange to analyse the material and prepare a report of the results of the work. Dr. Grange is now at work on this material and has prepared the brief interim report that follows.)

The I. C. Few Site (38PN2) was located on the Keowee River in Pickens County, South Carolina. It is but a few yards distant from Fort Prince George and was one of several sites excavated in salvage operations in the Keowee Reservoir in the summer of 1967. The area has since been inundated.

The site was a burial mound and was well known to local collectors. One of the major problems encountered was that the central area of the mound had been extensively damaged by relic-hunting excavators.

The site had also been extensively damaged by many years of agricultural utilization and the bulk of the artifacts were recovered from the plough zone. The mound must have been higher and more impressive at one time, but at the start of excavations it consisted of a low, circular mound. Subsequent work revealed the presence of a smaller contiguous mound and a third small burial mound a few feet distant. Other tests in the area produced no evidence of other burial areas.

Although the site had been subjected to the damage described above, there were a number of intact burials and other features preserved below the ploughed levels.

The site was excavated in a metric grid system, using shovels and small hand tools. The light, sandy soil made it possible to screen all material. After extensive hand excavation, power equipment was used to remove disturbed overburden and to make test exposures in other parts of the site location. Burial pits and other features were readily exposed without damage by the machinery.

A total of 120 features were recorded during the course of the excavations. These include 15 burials, 57 pits of various types, 19 hearths or burned areas and 19 miscellaneous features.

The most common type of burial was a flexed inhumation in an oval, straight-sided pit. A number of other pits were probably burials but contained no remnant human remains. All of the inhumations were in a poor state of preservation due to the soil and moisture conditions at the site. Two bundle burials, one of a child, were found. These skeletal remains were better preserved. One probable cremation was exposed, and burned areas in the site may indicate more such burials were present. Grave goods directly associated with the skeletal remains were rare but included shell beads, a shell gorget and a steatite gorget.
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A large number of post-molds were recorded but have not been fully interpreted. There is some evidence indicating that small post-supported structures were erected over some of the burial pits.

In addition to the shell beads and gorgets, a large unfinished stone pipe was found in a small cache pit. Several small clay elbow pipes were also found. Chipped stone tools include small triangular projectile points, the most common form, and a few stemmed and side-notched points. Ground stone implements include hammerstones and axes with polished bits. The most common ground stone artifact was a small, polished disc of 1/2 inch to 1-1/2 inch diameter and 1/8 to 1/2 inch thick. A nearly complete manufacturing sequence from a rough blank to a smoothed, polished example is present. The unusually large quantity of these (nearly 100) is surprising in this context. Pottery discs, on the other hand, are relatively rare in this collection. A small number of European artifacts were found including bottles and ceramics of the late 18th century. Apparently none of these were from undisturbed contexts in the site and thus all are probably late intrusive materials.

Pottery sherds are the most common artifacts recovered. Body sherds include plain, check-stamped and complicated stamp varieties. Rim forms include flared, thickened and collared forms. These materials are currently being studied and appear to represent a wide range of ceramic types.

The I. C. Few site was but one of several sites excavated or tested in the Keowee Reservoir salvage operations. When its analysis is completed, it will provide part of the story of prehistory in the area.
SPECIAL
NOTICE

This NOTEBOOK is distributed gratis as a service of the Institute to all those who are interested in any aspect of the archeology of South Carolina. We want it to be available to all of those who are interested. The mailing list has now exceeded 1,000. We would be glad to send it to any other persons, libraries, or institutions that would be interested in having it, if we have their names and addresses.

We do not, though, wish to burden anyone with this publication who does not really care to have it. It is an expense to us and a nuisance to them. We don't wish to waste copies. IF YOU DO NOT CARE TO RECEIVE THE NOTEBOOK, please let us know by TEARING OFF THE BACK COVER AND MAILING IT TO US. We would appreciate your noting a reason for not wanting it, which can simply be penned on the returned back cover. Maybe this will tell us something we are doing wrong. But in any event, reason or not, if you don't want it, PLEASE SEND THE BACK COVER TO US. We will remove your name from the mailing list.

Robert L. Stephenson
Editor
South Carolina Institute of Archaeology & Anthropology
1321 PENDLETON STREET
COLUMBIA, SC 29208

THIS BOOK DONATED BY R.L. Stephenson