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May began with the usual trip to the Society for American Archeology Meetings. This year it was in Norman, Oklahoma at the beautiful new Center for Continuing Education, on May 6-8. We thought the meetings were especially well run this year and many of the papers we heard were excellent contributions. It was a very worthwhile trip.

Talks to various groups, meetings, visits to prospective sites, and contacts with the news media continued as always. One especially interesting talk was to the archeology class at Augusta College on May 19. We met with the National Historic Preservation Act Review Board on June 3 and added ten more sites to the National Register nomination. We visited the Santee Indian Mound on June 22 with Janson Cox of Parks, Recreation and Tourism and State Representative Sam Manning to discuss use of the site area for Bicentennial purposes. On May 24 we visited the site of Fort Johnston on James Island with Dr. Timmerman of the South Carolina State Department of Wildlife Resources to see what new construction there might involve archeological values. Two trips were made to Camden to discuss the prospects for further work at the Revolutionary War site there.

John Witthoft and Miss Mary Ellen Didier, from the University of Pennsylvania, visited with us on May 17-18. John is preparing a section of the new Handbook on North American Indians and was collecting data for that purpose. We enjoyed the visit very much. John is always stimulating and thought provoking.

On May 19 Mr. Fred Gottemoeller of Systems Design Concepts, Inc., began working with us in regard to Interstate 77. The South Carolina Highway Department has engaged this group to do an in-depth study of the I-77 Route from Columbia to Rock Hill in order to select the best possible alignment for the highway. They are considering a two county wide corridor and appear to be doing an extremely thorough job. Our concern, of course, is with the archeological sites. Tom Ryan is working with Mr. Gottemoeller and has prepared a report based on a search of the Institute records. There are 65 sites known in the corridor. Of course the first recommendation is for a ground survey of the area to locate sites not now known. This looks like our first concrete extension into highway archeology.

We joined Bob McGimsey of the University of Arkansas, Carl Chapman of the University of Missouri, and Scotty McNeish of the Robert S. Peabody Foundation, Phillips Academy, Andover, Massachusetts, to testify at Senate Hearings on the current archeological legislation. The Senate Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held hearings on Senate Bill 1245 on June 10. The four of us testified, along with Dr. Ernest A. Connolly and Dr. John Corbett of the National Park Service in behalf of the bill. This is the bill that permits a portion of federal funds to be used for archeology on any federally funded or sponsored, earth-moving project in the country. It is one of the most significant pieces of legislation since the Federal Antiquities Act of 1906. Each of you should write your Congressman and Senator to support this bill. The identical companion bill in the House is H.R. 6257.

We still need manuscripts for the NOTEBOOK. Please send copy to:

Robert L. Stephenson, Director
Institute of Archeology and Anthropology
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina
DR. E. THOMAS HEMMINGS JOINS STAFF
OF THE FLORIDA STATE MUSEUM

On May 31, 1971, Dr. E. Thomas Hemmings resigned from the Institute staff to take a position at the Florida State Museum in Gainesville, Florida. Tom joined the Institute Staff on September 1, 1969 and was with us for 21 months. During that time he completed his dissertation and received the Ph.D. degree from the University of Arizona. He excavated profiles of the Landsford Canal, surveyed the Trotter's Shoals Reservoir, surveyed the coastal shell-ring sites, excavated a portion of the Fig Island shell-ring site, and began a statewide survey of Early Man Projectile Points. In the latter project he has been assisted by Jim Michie, Research Affiliate of the Institute, and in the shell-ring site survey, and Fig Island excavation he was assisted by Gene Waddell, Research Affiliate of the Institute. Of course, there were numerous small projects throughout these months that Tom has been engaged in, involving surface collections and site recording in various parts of the state.

Reports of the Landsford Canal excavations and of the Trotter's Shoals Reservoir survey are completed and ready for publication. The shell-ring site survey report is nearing completion and the Fig Island excavation report is in progress. Both these are promised for completion by early Fall 1971. The Early Man Projectile Point survey is being continued by Jim Michie.

Tom is spending June and July with his parents in New England and will assume his new duties at the Florida State Museum on August 1, 1971. We, here at the Institute, have enjoyed having Tom with us and wish him the very best in his new job.

TED RATHBUN AND DON SUTHERLAND
RECEIVE Ph.D. DEGREES

With the end of the Spring Semester 1971, the Department of Anthropology and Sociology at the University of South Carolina increased its stature by adding two new Ph.D. degrees. Donald R. Sutherland defended his thesis on Columbian archeology at Tulane University and was awarded the degree in June. Ted A. Rathbun defended his thesis on the skeletal remains from Hassenlu Iran, at the University of Kansas and was awarded his degree in June. Congratulations to both these men. The Department will express its pleasure in more concrete ways by providing increased take home pay and position titles.
CAMDEN REVOLUTIONARY WAR FORTIFICATIONS (38KE1):
THE 1969-70 EXCAVATIONS

by Robert N. Strickland

(Ed. Note: Robert N. Strickland received his Master of Arts degree in Anthropology in January 1971 from the University of Arizona. He was employed in 1969 and 1970 by the Camden District Heritage Foundation for excavations at the site of Camden and here reports his findings for that period.)

INTRODUCTION

During the latter stages of the Revolutionary War, between May 1780 and May 1781, the village of Camden was occupied by the British and soon fortified. A palisade was erected around the village proper, and a number of redoubts were constructed around its perimeter. Traces of these structures, along with traces of the domestic and industrial buildings of "Old Camden," before and after the War, still remain as clues to the details of the physical structure of the village and its surroundings and to the activities that were carried on by its inhabitants (Fig. 1).

Fortunately, the town of Camden has gradually shifted to the north, away from the low-lying, swampy areas surrounding the original village and toward the higher land to the north. "Old Camden" today is largely unoccupied, being the site of farmland, athletic and recreation areas, and vacant lots. Much of the outlying vicinity of the original village, where some of the British redoubts were constructed, unfortunately is occupied by low income, old and new, development housing. Present streets are also a problem; e.g., approximately two-thirds of the Northeast Redoubt is located in Bull and Lyttleton Streets or in the streets' rights of way. Also the location of the city dump in the area southeast of "Old Camden" precluded our every attempt to locate a redoubt in that area, evidence for which may have been destroyed, partially or wholly, by bulldozing operations there. Nevertheless, the undisturbed and available areas greatly outweigh the disturbed and unavailable areas. As an archeologically-preserved eighteenth century village, Old Camden is exceptional, and its military phase presents an extraordinary bonus (Fig. 1).

In June, 1969, I was persuaded to continue archeological investigations of "Old Camden,"1 with particular emphasis on the military structures,

---

1 I agree with most professional archeologists that our buried heritage should be inviolable except by the best archeological techniques possible (e.g. Noel-Hume, 1969:15). It seemed unwise that I, a relative novice to archeology and to Colonial artifacts, should undertake this excavation. It was only after some persuasion, from both within and without myself, that I accepted this responsibility. The work needed to be done, the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology urged me to undertake it and agreed to provide direction and consultative advice, the Camden project urged me to take it, there was no one else available as all of the Institute staff were at work on other projects, and I really did want to do it. That errors in judgement would be made was almost inevitable but I accept the proprietorship of my shortcomings in the work during this period. I have learned much from my errors and, in general, believe that most of them have been, or can be, rectified in further work at this site.
FIGURE 1
1781 PLAN OF CAMDEN SUPERIMPOSED ON A MODERN STREET MAP OF CAMDEN (ADAPTED FROM CALMES, 1968) FEATURES OF 1969-1970 EXCAVATIONS ARE INDICATED: NORTHEAST REDOUBT, CORNWALLIS HOUSE, EAST TOWN WALL, SOUTH TOWN WALL, SOUTHEAST REDOUBT.
a task begun a few years earlier by Dr. Alan Calmes and others. The history of the Camden Revolutionary War Fortifications and the history of their excavations through the summer of 1968 have been presented elsewhere (Calmes 1968a, 1968b, 1968c). The purpose of this report is merely to bring the accounts of excavations up to date.

For the most part, I have tried to work within the framework established by Dr. Calmes, using his definitions whenever possible, since it was he who conducted the first extensive excavations of Old Camden. A major exception, however, is in his reference to each area of investigation as a distinct site; e.g., the Powder Magazine and the Cornwallis House were referred to as the Powder Magazine Site and the Cornwallis House Site, respectively. I preferred to think of Old Camden as a single site, with the various areas within and surrounding it as "localities." Thus, with counsel from the University of South Carolina's Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, I settled on a single site designation — the Camden Revolutionary War Fortifications, with the Institute's site number 38KE1.2

During the period June 9, 1969, through August 22, 1970, excavations were conducted in four localities. The first summer's field season was concentrated on the Northeast Redoubt (Fig. 1,2). In addition, excavation was continued there on a part-time (Saturdays only) basis from September until the New Year. A second locality, the South Town Wall, was opened in February 1970 (Fig. 1,3). Work was concentrated there on Saturdays through May, full time during June, and concurrently with other localities until the end of the season. Concomitant with the later excavations on the South Town Wall, the 100 foot section of the East Town Wall that was adjacent to the southeast corner of the wall was also excavated. Excavation during July and August was concentrated on a fourth locality — the Cornwallis House. Substantial effort was also allocated during this same period to reconstruction at the other localities.

NORTHEAST REDOUBT

General

Calmes discovered the Northeast Redoubt3 by extending a north-south test trench through this area. He later excavated the portion of the moat lying within his test trench and discovered the outline of the south portion of the moat's horizontal limits by stripping the affected area of

---

2 In keeping with the River Basin Surveys site numbering system, 38 refers to the state of South Carolina (alphabetically, the 38th state in the Union, excluding Hawaii and Alaska); KE refers to Kershaw County; and 1 indicates that this is the first site to be recorded in this county by the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology of the University of South Carolina.

3 This instance demonstrates that at least some luck is involved in archeology, for if Calmes' test trench had been as few as three feet farther west, it would have literally come through the entrance of the redoubt and missed the ditch completely.
its topsoil (Fig. 2). Since material from the moat was Colonial and since the sides of this feature formed a general V-shape, it was correctly assumed that this feature did, in fact, represent the ditch surrounding this fortification. In addition to the moat, Calmes' test trench revealed three other features. These trench-like features, parallel to each other and to the moat and about one foot in width, were apparently first discovered at the top of the red clay zone. Calmes indicated that these represented trenches that contained vertically-placed retaining palisades, each row being successively lower and serving to hold back the earth of the parapet and two banquettes (firing steps) within the redoubt. This hypothesis was suggested by a cross-section sketched in one corner of a 1781 plat of Camden. The 1781 plat of Camden appears to indicate that there was a building within each redoubt (Fig. 1) and, although no evidence of the remains of such a structure was found by Calmes' crew, there was a high concentration of brick fragments in the northern-most area of the test trench.

The goal in 1969 was to find out as much as possible about the structure of the redoubt that once existed on this spot. The plan was to continue work on the features found by Calmes, to determine their horizontal shape, to record them in cross-section, and to excavate them as discrete units. Overburden and disturbed soil was to be stripped to investigate additional features in the parapet and interior areas. Of particular interest was possible evidence of a structure within the redoubt. All artifacts, of course, would be saved and recorded according to their horizontal and vertical provenience but it was the features and the artifacts within the features that were our primary concern.

Techniques of Excavation and Stratigraphy

The site, located at the southeast corner of Bull and Lyttleton Streets, was occupied by a house at the time that Calmes first tested it. Later the house was moved away but its (presumed) well still lies just to the south of the redoubt. By the beginning of our work there, the site had become grown over by weeds, the ubiquitous honeysuckle vines, and the hackberry and chinaberry trees that paralleled Bull Street. The first task of our four-plus-one man crew was to clear the site of this vegetation and to remove the backdirt of the previous excavation from the interior of the site. On Monday of the second week, we laid out our grid system and began stripping the area of its topsoil (Zone I).

Excavation of Zone I material (previously defined by Calmes) was done in terms of 20-foot-square units. The material was not screened, but all artifacts found were saved. A sterile yellow-brown sand (which, when dry, 4 During the first summer's work, the crew consisted of myself as director and four to six inexperienced high school students or recent graduates. October, 1969, to May, 1970, Saturdays-only work was accomplished with a larger crew of eight to ten students. The summer, 1970, season involved nine to 11 students and an adult field assistant.
was white and cemented) underlay Zone I (topsoil) to the south, while
to the north, near Bull Street, these two layers sandwiched a gray sand
occupation zone. The yellow-brown sand was, in turn, underlaid by a
red sand/clay zone (Calmes' Zone III). Calmes defined everything between
Zone I (topsoil) and Zone III (red clay) as Zone II, and consequently the
two intermediate strata were designated Zone II (yellow-brown sand) and
Zone II (gray-brown sand). The two strata of Zone II have little in
common, as the gray-brown sand was an occupation zone and the yellow-
brown sand was sterile (Fig. 3a,5c).

All material beneath Zone I (topsoil) was excavated in ten-foot-
square units and screened through one-fourth inch or one-third inch mesh
hardware cloth. Discernible features were excavated as units. I would
like to believe that all features were discovered, but the recognition
of features in dirt archeology depends on the perceptions of the excavators
(which often improve with experience) and, further, on the conditions
of the soil which make features more and less discernible. Later, in our
work at the Cornwallis House, we were extremists, recognizing and record-
ing all features, regardless of how significant or insignificant we might
have considered them at the time. For the most part, all features were
given a specific designation, regardless of whether they resulted from
natural processes or from human activity. Exceptions were posts or post
molds superimposed upon larger features, such as the retaining palisade
trench.

On July 23, 1969, by which date we were certain of the features in
the area, the trees located within the redoubt were removed by a D-8
caterpillar.

Features

Of the features uncovered in the course of our excavations, only
those in Figure 2 will be discussed here. Feature 1 identifies the dry
ditch (or moat) which presumably surrounds the redoubt, however, for
working purposes we considered the portions east and west of the entrance
as being separate (Features 1(E) and 1(W), respectively). Likewise,
Features 2, 3, and 4 have possible counterparts on each side of the redoubt
but here the relationship is asymmetrical. The east side of the redoubt
appears to support the documentary evidence of the 1781 plat. This plat
suggests (via a cross-section cut-out) that the Northeast Redoubt utilized
three different levels of vertical retaining posts to hold back the earth
of the parapet, and two banquettes. The features which appear to support
this hypothesis were designated F-2(E), F-3(E), and F-4(E). The west side
of the redoubt does not seem to support this view. Nevertheless, F-2(E)
and F-4(E) appeared to have western counterparts in F-2(W) and F-4(W),
respectively. This is not unequivocally true, however, since F-2(W) does
not make a turn to the north5 and since F-4(W) appeared to be somewhat

5 It is actually terminated near the central root system of a massive
chinaberry tree. Test trenches 1 and 4 were excavated to ascertain
whether this feature might have continued on to the north, but the
results were negative.
FIGURE 3a
NORTHEAST REDOUBT (38KEI)
PROFILE ACROSS FEATURES 4(E), 3(E), AND 2(E) AT N76° FROM E120 TO E134

FIGURE 3b
TOWN WALL (38KEI)
PLAN OF CORNER OF SOUTH TOWN WALL AND EAST TOWN WALL

FIGURE 3c
SOUTH TOWN WALL (38KEI)
PLAN OF FEATURE 6 IN RELATION TO FEATURE 1 SHOWING PIT IN WHICH MUSKETS WERE FOUND

FIGURE 3d
GENERAL PLAN OF SOUTH AND EAST TOWN WALLS (38KEI)
deeper than would have been necessary to support timbers protruding only about one and one half to two feet above the surface of the ground. Feature 11 (which was nearly identical in form with F-10) may be the western counterpart of F-3(E), but its function is not clear. The reason why the British would have used retaining palisades is problematical. These structures certainly required a great deal of extra work. To my knowledge, there is no reference to such a type of construction in the literature and apparently this was not the redoubt design used at Yorktown. 6

When we began work on Features 2, 3, and 4, we were unaware of the advantage of taking photographs and cross-sections at various intervals, thus, our primary task, it seemed at this juncture, was to remove the fill in order to reveal the pattern of each feature as a whole and in relationship to each other and the locality. Unfortunately, to dig out the fill was no simple matter. The features began, vertically, at the top of the yellow-brown sand zone and extended just into the red clay zone. The problem was that the fill was basically a yellow-brown sand, practically indistinguishable from the subsoil until the red clay zone was attained. Calmes' test trench had been taken down to the top of Zone III, and it is this fact that seems to me to indicate that it was at the top of that zone that these features were first identified. If this is the case, I can certainly understand how his crew could have missed these features in the yellow-brown sand, which they fortunately removed, despite its being sterile. We were unable to ascertain the pattern of these features at the top of the yellow-brown sand zone, and it was only after excavation that these features were drawn and photographed.

Excavation of Features 2(E), 3(E), and 4(E) was accomplished in the following manner. Since we were aware of where these features were in the clay zone, we simply began at the bottom and worked up. At no time did we remove any clay but only the yellow-brown sand. As long as we had a clay base with which to work, we felt that we had a good basis on which to continue. Features 3(E) and 4(E) were thus completely excavated to N760 in this manner, while excavation of F-2(E) was discontinued after proceeding east from E115 to E130, at which point the feature barely protruded into the clay zone and was difficult to follow. In the fall of 1969, we completely excavated Zone II in the eastern interior of the redoubt, and thus exposed these features, all three of which showed up well at the top of red clay. Profiles were later photographed and drawn at N760 (Fig. 3a).

Zone II material was either thin or non-existent on the western half of the redoubt, but then working from the surface of a red clay subsoil, we found that the fill of the features was clay, not sand, thus, we ran into virtually the same problem we had in the east side. Nevertheless, the fill of Features 10 and 11 was a mottled clay and was easily detectable

6 Thor Borrenson makes no mention of retaining palisades for either parapet or banquette in his final report on Yorktown's Redoubt No. 9. Conversely, he indicates the utilization of sloping to protect against erosion.
and, although Features 2(W) and 4(W) consisted of fill identical in color to the subsoil, we had no problem in removing this material since it was loose and not compacted like the subsoil. As F-4(W) approached N760, the fill changed to a sand. Consequently, the cross-section at N760 produced a striking contrast between feature and subsoil. At no time were we able to identify any post molds in any of these features, although small pieces of decayed wood (with grain in vertical position) was recovered in the southeast corner of F-2(E) and the southwest corner of F-4(W). There was also a knot of wood in F-4(W) at N760, which caused me to look especially close for a post mold, but still none was apparent.

Prior to excavating Feature 1, we made several attempts to locate it, horizontally, by skimming and trowelling the surface of the pertinent areas but these attempts were only partially successful. We had an especially difficult time trying to locate the western portion of the ditch and, despite the use of water (which generally makes color differences more apparent), we could not ascertain the feature in that area. While waiting for the trees on the site to be removed, we began excavation in the west ditch since this area would not be affected by the bulldozing operation. Thus, our first excavations began in what was later designated Unit 16 (Fig. 2). Unfortunately, I had not yet made the decision to limit the size of the primary units of excavation, and I spread the crew over a 26 foot section of F-1(W). We were certain that we were removing the fill from F-1(W), since it was a loose, red clay in the north part of Unit 16 and a sandy clay (in a sandy clay subsoil) in the south part. In neither case was it the fill that we would have expected to find as Zone III. Eventually, it was recognized that this area was an interesting variation of the general pattern of F-1(W). Instead of having a general V-shape, the ditch in this area is slightly wider at the top, with both east and west sides dropping nearly vertically for a couple of feet, at which point each side becomes horizontal, forming a platform, or step, within the ditch. These platforms are wider to the south than to the north. A somewhat charred and fire-hardened layer of clay was found just above and resting on these platforms and, below, the characteristic V-shape was present in the lower portion of the ditch. The misfortune of not having maintained a control balk for the purpose of recording stratification in this area was soon recognized, for without such a record, it may be difficult or impossible to determine whether we have here a single structure built by the British, or two non-contemporaneous structures, one being the fortification ditch and the other being a pit which was fortuitously dug into the ditch sides and fill. Either possibility is plausible. The asymmetrical shape of the platform favors the latter interpretation, while the unlikelihood of one feature being superimposed over another feature in such a parallel fashion favors the former. Without documentary or archeological evidence to the contrary, it seems to me that the single structure idea is the less plausible. The remainder of Feature 1 was excavated using approximately nine-foot-long "primary excavation units," with the exception of Unit 16 (Fig. 2, 5c). One-foot-wide balks were left between primary units in order to preserve a record of the stratigraphy.
Most of the material from the moat was screened through one-half or one-third inch mesh hardware cloth, but sometimes (e.g., when dealing with very wet clay) it was more efficient to sort the material by hand. The predominant fill in the moat was red clay, often mixed with yellow-brown sand. Generally, the west ditch contained a pure, homogenous red clay without stratification, while the fill of the south and east ditches consisted of a more or less sandy clay. The only marked stratification was at the southwest corner of the ditch, and this stratification dipped only a foot or so below the top of Zone III. The absence of stratified material (except for a few inches at the base) in this feature, along with the fact that all artifacts appear to be of the Revolutionary War period, seems to indicate that the ditch was deliberately filled in a short period of time.

Test trenches 1 and 4, (Fig. 2) were excavated in attempts to determine whether or not F-2(W) might continue past the chinaberry tree. The results were negative. Test trenches 2 and 3 were excavated in an attempt to discover evidence for the hypothetical structure (magazine) located within the redoubt. As mentioned earlier, the general area west of Calmes' test trench and just south of Bull Street contained a concentration of brick fragments, but there was no further information to indicate that these fragments have any relationship with a British magazine, except that more musket balls were found in this area than anywhere else in the redoubt's interior. It should be noted, however, that little of the redoubt's interior was involved in our excavation, since virtually all of it lies within the street's right-of-way.

SOUTH TOWN WALL

On Saturday, February 14, 1970, excavations were begun in the vicinity of the South Town Wall (Figure 3d,5,6). In order to locate the evidence for this structure, we dug five north-south test trenches. Test trenches 1 and 2 were excavated with mattock and shovel. The technique of screening material through one-third inch mesh hardware cloth was abandoned early in our excavation of TT-1 (TT = test trench) at the request of William Byrnes and Victor Hogg in an attempt to reduce the time required for excavation. Screening of material was never resumed at this locality nor at the East Town Wall, because of the concrete-like nature of the material excavated in Meeting Street. Test trenches 3, 4, and 5 were excavated using a tractor-drawn "double-buster plow" -- the type used for plowing fire breaks in forests. Control was considerably less than anticipated, thus, the use of this type of machinery in archeological investigations is not recommended.

The palisade trench (Feature 1) was first identified in TT-2 as a yellow-brown sand in a red clay subsoil. After more intensive excavation, the palisade trench was identified in the other test trenches, as well as in eight slit trenches which were excavated to aid in determining the location of the palisade trench at various points between TT-1 and TT-2 (Fig. 6a). Test trench 3 seemed to indicate that the palisade trench was wider there than at any other place. This anomaly was not fully investigated until the season was nearly over and, at that time, it seemed to be independent of the palisade trench and was thus given its own designation as
Feature 6. Subsequently, a trench (Feature 1 Trench) was superimposed over Feature 1 to a depth which barely exposed the surface of the feature, however, a balk was left to the east of each test/slit trench for the purpose of recording north-south stratigraphy of overburden, feature, and subsoil.

On June 1 we began working full-time, and practically that entire month was spent continuing the work on the South Town Wall. Feature 1, the profile of the north face of Feature 1 Trench, and north-south sections of the west faces of the slit/test trench balks were recorded in photographs and drawings. I felt that a record of the south face would merely duplicate the information carried by the north face, for the most part, and would add little to our knowledge. Thus, considering the large amount of time and energy involved in preparing and recording a single face of the trench, only one was recorded. Considerable time was also invested in the excavation of the fill of Feature 1. This was a relatively simple task, since it almost always consisted of material quite distinct (either in soil type, color, or compactness) from the subsoil. Generally, the fill of the palisade trench was a mottled yellow-orange-red clay, with varying amounts of yellow-brown sand (Fig. 6). Initially, the technique of removing the fill of the palisade trench was to skim thin horizontal layers to reveal evidence of post molds. Eventually, it became advantageous to remove as much as 0.2 to 0.4 of a foot at a time, depending on the projected depth of the feature. The palisade trench appeared to have been originally about three feet deep (Fig. 6a). Portions of the palisade trench contained numerous post molds and occasional fragments of timber. These were generally flush with the outboard (south) side of the palisade trench. The occurrence of artifacts in the palisade trench itself was rare, the single outstanding find being a large case bottle.

The topography of the area has changed in the nearly two hundred years since the British occupation. In 1780 this area was not so level as it is today. Evidence indicates that both the Market Street and Broad Street ends of Meeting Street were higher than at present, while a depressed area lay about 100 feet west of Market Street. Evidence of this change in topography is found in the fact that the greatest depth of both the palisade trench (3.3 feet) and the overburden (3.7 feet) occurs in the hypothetical depressed area (compare Fig. 6a with Fig. 6b).

It was in this lowest point that a most significant find was made. Here the palisade trench was interrupted by a large rectangular pit, measuring 18.5 feet east-west, six feet north-south, and 3.7 feet in depth (Fig. 3c). The fill of this pit (Feature 6) was a mottled clay, underlain successively by coarse sand and gray mud zones. This feature, which was not excavated until the last week of the season, contained a higher intensity of Colonial artifacts than any other area excavated. Included were several muskets (unserviceable at time of disposal) and bayonets (Fig. 5a), along with numerous musketballs, gunflints, and gun parts. It is probable that this feature was filled with water when these artifacts were discarded. This feature represents a problematical structure, but one reference to a southeast gate may indicate its identity.
EAST TOWN WALL

The East Town Wall had been discovered by Calmes, and it was a simple task to relocate it. Here four slit trenches, 25 feet apart, were excavated to provide east-west stratigraphic control. Following the procedure at the South Town Wall, we then superimposed a five-foot-wide trench (Feature 1 Trench, East Town Wall) and extended it to the depth exposing the top of Feature 1 (Fig. 3b,d). This section of the palisade trench contained abundant post molds, as well as several small remnants of vertical timbers.

THE CORNWALLIS HOUSE

Excavation was begun at the Cornwallis House locality on June 26, 1970 (Fig. 4,7). "Cornwallis House," of course, is a misnomer, since the house was built by Joseph Kershaw and was in the Kershaw family for years and since General Cornwallis made his headquarters there for only a short period. However, this designation has been made hallowed by use and to change the name would invite possible disaster. The problem is side-stepped for the present. Our initial purpose was to excavate the entire yard area of the house in an attempt to discover evidence of outbuildings and the palisade constructed by the British. The house itself and portions of the palisade trench had been excavated by Calmes. In the end, this turned out to be a more ambitious undertaking than anticipated. Priorities were switched during the latter part of the field season in that reconstruction was deemed more crucial at that stage than additional excavation, and this command decision was largely responsible for our failure to attain our initial objective. This turned out to be, though, a judicious choice in light of the commitment to complete Phase I of the Historic Camden project by November, 1970.

Our first operation was to dig two test pits, one each at the expected southeast and northeast corners of the area to be excavated. These pits were excavated in arbitrary levels, and the material therefrom was screened through one-fourth inch mesh hardware cloth. All material except soil, small brick fragments, unworked stone, and recent plant material was saved. All features, natural and man-made, were recorded by drawings and photographs both before and after their excavation. These techniques were used throughout the excavation of this locality, except that vertical units were subsequently recorded in terms of natural strata.

The stratigraphy of this locality consisted primarily of four layers: a sandy topsoil (Zone A); a dark brown clayey sand (Zone B), which occurred only at the northeastern extremity, the lowest part of the area; a yellow-brown sand which, when dry, was white and cemented (Zone C); and a red clay basement. Only Zones A and B contained artifacts. Zone A was the only layer excavated, for the most part, since it was at this point that sterile soil or Revolutionary War period features were encountered. Exceptions existed in the south test pits and three other units which were carried down to red clay to confirm that Zone C was sterile.
FIGURE 4
PLAN OF FEATURE 18
PALISADE AROUND CORNWALLIS HOUSE
(38KEI)
The first series of horizontal units excavated connected the original test pits and provided a north-south stratigraphic profile of the site. We had anticipated that these units would be outside the house palisade, but the palisade proved to have extended an additional 30 feet to the east.

In view of the time limitation, our modified purpose at this locality was to trace the extent of the palisade trench (Fig. 4). This in itself turned out to be a major undertaking and was barely completed by season's end (Fig. 7a,b). The pattern of the palisade was unlike that shown on the 1781 plat. As Figure 4 shows, the palisade was better designed militarily than the plat indicates. The palisade trench was not excavated (Fig. 7b). Once this feature was uncovered and recorded, it was covered with polyethylene (Fig. 7a). Subsequent reconstruction has resulted in the leveling of the area by filling all excavated units.

SOUTHEAST REDOUBT

At the recommendation of the staff of the University of South Carolina, Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, further machine excavations were carried out to search for the Southeast Redoubt (Fig. 1). Results of these excavations were negative.

ARTIFACTS

In accordance with an agreement with the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, all artifacts and other specimen materials were deposited with that agency for identification, preservation, and storage. These will later be described and analysed and a report of the artifact materials will be prepared at a later date.
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FIGURE 5

a. Musket barrels in situ in Feature 6 of South Town Wall
b. Excavation trench of South Town Wall, looking east
c. Excavation trench of Northeast Redoubt showing balks revealing the profile of the ditch.
FIGURE 6

a. Excavation trench and balks in South Town Wall, looking west
b. Excavation trench and balks in South Town Wall, looking east
c. Excavation trench showing dark outline of corner of East and South Town Walls, looking north
FIGURE 7

a. Excavation of a section of the palisade around the Cornwallis House
b. Excavation area around the Cornwallis House showing dark stain of palisade trench corner.
c. Trash filled pit behind the Cornwallis House.
EXCAVATIONS BEGIN AGAIN
AT THE SITES OF NINETY SIX

The archeological explorations at the several sites of Ninety Six last spring and fall have been analyzed and Stanley South has prepared a manuscript report on the initial phases of the work there. A new agreement between the Institute and the Star Fort Historical Commission was signed in May for work at these sites for the second year.

This second year of work began the last week in May with the establishing of the camp in the town of Ninety Six on Mr. W. Bruce Ezell's property. We are deeply grateful to Bruce for his hospitality in making this excellent camp spot available. A crew of 23 men was hired, and on June 7, the excavations under Stanley South's direction began at the site of Holmes' Fort (38GN2) on the hill overlooking the Star Fort. This location is the site of both Williamson's Fort of 1775 and Holmes' Fort of 1781.

Here on November 19-21, 1775, in rude fortifications, said to have been constructed in three hours and made of fence rails, straw bales, and cowhides, the Whigs defended themselves under Andrew Williamson against the Royalist's attack in the first battle of the Revolution in the south. Not a great deal of the remains of this fort can be expected to be found archeologically but the 40 foot deep well should be recoverable.

In this same location on June 8-18, 1781, "Light Horse Harry" Lee besieged a substantially built fort called Holmes' Fort for ten days and captured it. This 1781 engagement was a part of the long siege of Ninety Six that included Holmes' Fort, The Star Fort, and the town of Ninety Six.

The 1971 excavations went especially well during June and with so large a crew more was accomplished than had at first been anticipated. The original plan was to work through June, then return in September and October for a second session. By the end of June, the plan was changed to continue on into July and make the fall session only a minor one or abandon it altogether.

Both Williamson's Fort and Holmes' Fort were revealed in the excavations, the former to a far greater extent than had been thought possible, though the well has not been found. Holmes' Fort has been revealed in great detail. The early drawings of the outline of this fort indicated a square structure with corner blockhouses. Archeology clearly showed that this was not the case. Instead it was a mitten-shaped "Hornwork." Here is another demonstration that documents must be checked for accuracy by archeological excavation of the physical remains in the ground.

A third feature excavated in this same location was a large, artifact-filled cellar hole of a building in the town of Cambridge that overlay the sites of the two forts and dates from about 1785 to the early nineteenth century.
THE SOUTHERN COASTAL FRONTIER OF SOUTH CAROLINA AT PORT
ROYAL, BASED ON THE GASCOIGNE MAP AND SURVEY JOURNALS OF
1728-1731

by Alan Calmes

(Ed. Note: Dr. Calmes holds a Ph.D. in History from the University
of South Carolina. He is presenty teaching in the Department of
History at Roanoke College, Salem, Virginia. His past work in South
Carolina includes excavations on Hilton Head Island and at Camden, as
well as documentary search of contemporary records of eighteenth century
South Carolina.)

The map and journals of the Gascoigne survey of Port Royal, made in
1728-31, give a good impression of the problems of maintaining the southern
coastal frontier of South Carolina at Port Royal and how the problem
of defense was practically solved by 1731. This could have allowed the
colony of South Carolina to slowly expand south of the Savannah River, if
the province could have continued and extended its system of coastal de-
fense. During the period of 1728-1731, however, the crown assumed control
of Carolina from the Lords Proprietors and there was some confusion over
who was responsible for frontier defense.

Captain John Gascoigne was given command of H.M.S. Alborough and
commissioned by the British Admiralty to survey the Bahama Islands, Coast
of Cuba, Gulf of Florida, Windward Passage, Charlestown Harbor, and Port
Royal, South Carolina.¹ Two journals were kept on the Alborough during
the surveying commission: one by the captain, "A Copy of a Journal of
the Proceedings of his Maj: ty's Ship the Alborough Between the 29:th
August 1728 and the 12:th July 1734, kept by John Gascoigne," and the
other kept by the captain's brother and lieutenant of the ship, "Alborough,
Journal of the Proceedings of the said Ship By Lieut James Gascoigne
Between the 29:th August 1728 and the 15:th July 1734."²

On November 24, 1728, H.M.S. Alborough, accompanied by the sloop,
Happy, reached the coast of South Carolina, as the captain steered her
into Edisto Inlet, mistaking it for Charlestown harbor. James Gascoigne

¹ BPRO, Calendar of State Papers, Colonial, 1730, p. 317. W. E. May,
"The Surveying Commission of Alborough, 1728-1734," American Neptune
XXI (1961), 260-278.

² The originals are housed in the National Maritime Museum, Greenwich,
England, and were seen during the summer of 1966 by Dr. George Rogers of
the University of South Carolina, who encouraged the writer to study a
microfilm copy of the journals which the South Carolina Archives Depart-
ment bought. There is a long discussion of the various printings of the
map in William P. Cumming, The Southeast in Early Maps (Chapel Hill:
noted this was a common mistake of mariners, sometimes resulting in shipwreck, and thus testifying to the need of more accurate charts of the Carolina coast. The mapping of Port Royal began on December 29, 1728, and was continued until May 21, 1729. A second period was required to complete the work and lasted from October 10, 1731, until November 5, 1731. On December 29, 1728, Captain John Gascoigne wrote, "I went ashore to Hilton-head on Trench's Island to begin the Survey: We met with Abundance of Fresh Tracks of Bears Tygers & Deer on the Sand in Several Places." The Survey party set up flags and beacons along the mouth of Port Royal sound, which were used for sighting purposes in making the map. A copy of the May 15, 1776 printing of this map is available at the Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina. It is titled "A Plan of Port Royal in South Carolina" surveyed by Capn John Gascoigne."

On December 31, 1728, the surveyors met inhabitants of the region when, "At noon one of the Scout Boats came down from Beaufor, these Scout Boats, in number two, are maintained by the province, to guard the Rivers & Inlets from Indians, they are both periagua's one with ten oars & the other with eight, they sail & row very well." According to John Gascoigne's description, a scout boat was made by creating a regular dug-out canoe from a large cypress log, then splitting it fore and aft. A split log would be added between the two canoe halves, so a greater breadth was achieved. The South Carolina Council had instructed the commanders of the scout boats stationed at the Beaufort garrison to assist Captain Gascoigne in his survey. The general instructions of the scout boat command was to patrol rivers, creeks, and the coast below Port Royal, look for run-away slaves, and report the movements of Indians and Spaniards.

During most of the colonial period of South Carolina, especially from its beginning in 1670 until the settlement of Georgia began in 1733, two nationalities along the South Atlantic coast, the Spanish of Florida and the English of Carolina, sought to eliminate one another, or at least aggravate each other's frontier by fostering Indian raids. For example, in 1702, the colony of South Carolina launched a major expedition against Saint Augustine. The town was captured but the English were unable to take the fort. In 1706, the Spaniards, with the aid of a French fleet, attempted to take Charlestown, but failed, because the French ships were driven back. Each time Spain and England opposed one another in Europe, such as during the War of Spanish Succession (1702-1712), which prompted the two invasions mentioned above, the New World colonists had official sanction to intensify their rivalries.

3 James Gascoigne.
4 January 14, 1728/29.
5 Council Journal, South Carolina Archives, Vol. IV, November 4, 1728.
6 Ibid., August 3, 1727.
8 Ibid., p. 87.
The Province of South Carolina, which spread out from Charlestown, consistently sought to erect a barrier between themselves and the Spanish: 1684-86, Scotch Stuartstown along Port Royal Sound; 1686-1715, Yemassee Indians occupied the land around Port Royal; 1716-1721, Beaufort Garrison; 1721-1727, Fort King George on the Altamaha River; 1727-1733, Beaufort again. Four out of five of these efforts centered on maintaining the Port Royal region as a buffer between the main English settlement and the Spanish controlled Indians to the southward, as well as the Spaniards of Saint Augustine.9 Mixed with the major buffer efforts were minor defensive measures such as scout boats and look-out posts along the coast and inland water-ways.

When the Gascoignes were in the Port Royal region in 1728-31, it was still a frontier and South Carolina's most southerly outpost. The Captain wrote, "From the Accounts of the Officers of the Garrison at Beaufort & the inhabitants about the Settlements give men, that there is a good deal of reason to apprehend by Boats (might) be attack'd by the Indians & Spaniards of St. Augustine, who have come frequently in large arme'd Periaguas & Cut off the inhabitants of these settlements."10

In view of such a threat, it is understandable why the inhabitants of Granville County petitioned, in 1727, for the King's Independent Company, a military force supported by the crown, to be removed from Fort King George to Beaufort. The Fort on the Altamaha River was abandoned not just to satisfy the petitioners, however, but because England and Spain were at war in Europe (War of the League of Hanover), and the English colonists of Carolina could expect more action against South Carolina by Saint Augustine. Fort King George was too far away from the English settlement and would be too difficult to maintain during a war. Furthermore, the more immediate southern frontier around Port Royal needed to be reinforced, because a coercive Indian policy was planned, which could bring about Spanish-Indian reprisals.11

The fear of enemy raids on Port Royal were well founded for Gascoigne's survey party was attacked during the second period of mapping, as shown by the Captain's words, "I continued my way Down Beaufort River (without going out of the Boat) & at 6 got on board the Happy. She & the Cruizer lying against the Look-out in Port Royal harbour & gave notice to Cap. Billop of my arrival together with Orders to forbear making reprizals on the Spaniards till further Orders."12


10 January 3, 1728/29.


12 October 11, 1731.
The "Look-out," which Gascoigne mentioned, was a small warning Garrison situated along Look-out Creek (now named Station Creek) between St. Phillips Island and St. Helena Island. A "look-out" or "Watch-house" was first placed on Port Royal in 1685, as a limited defense against Indians and Spaniards, and to provide a warning against attacks made on the English colony. It is uncertain where this first English outpost at Port Royal was located, but it could have continued to exist in the same place to be mentioned in the act below, for the system of coastal defense was improved in 1707, when "An Act for Appointing Look-outs and providing Necessaries for the Same," was passed. "Capt. Thomas Nairne shall and is hereby required to appoint a watch upon the Island commonly called Watch Island, on the River May, consisting of four white men and six Yamasees; and likewise another watch at the mouth of Port Royal River, consisting of two white men and two Cusabo Indians."

The look-out which was designated as being "at the mouth of Port Royal River," was probably on the north end of Pinckney Island (called Mackey's Island at the time of Gascoigne's survey), as indicated in John Barnwell's Journal of the 1721 expedition to erect Fort King George, for Barnwell wrote "July 7th. This morning we proceeded to passage fort & took Capt. Palmeter & 7 of his men and his Boat, and changed Some of mine, with Some more of his & left them at that Garrison under the charge of Mr. Dawson, I having Settled Divers affairs there we proceeded within Land, to the mouth of the Savana River." The garrison which Barnwell visited had to be on the south side of Port Royal Sound, because, as soon as he left it, he "proceeded within Land," which meant he went down the inland water passage of either Skull Creek or Mackey's Creek. Another reason for assuming the garrison was on the north end of Pinckney Island is because John Gascoigne saw an abandoned fort there. "There had been a Fortification here to defend this passage which runs down into Dawfoskee River by the West side of this Island as Scull-Creek does on the East side of it."

---

13 John Gascoigne, February 11, 1728/29.
15 Ibid., 300-302. 16 Ibid., 300.
17 Joseph W. Barnwell, "Fort King George, Journal of Colonel John Barnwell (Tuscarora) in the Construction of the Fort on the Althamaha in 1721," The South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine (October, 1926), 195.
18 February 10, 1728/29. Some printed editions of Gascoigne's map, such as the 1777 DeSartine (see Cumming, p. 175) have the northern end of Pinckney Island (Mackey's Island) marked with the words, "Ruins of an Indian Fort." For some reason, this designation was misplaced on the maps, for the Indian oyster-shell-ring, refuse mound, which the Gascoignes saw, was on the other side of Port Royal Sound. James Gascoigne wrote on February 11, 1728/29, "the Captain went away with all the Boats, to Survey the Look-out-creek At the Mouth of this Creek on the NQ side, Stands the Ruins of an old Indian fort, is a Circle of Oyster-shells, thrown up without any sort of Cement, of 15 foot thick & 8 foot high the SW part has been beaten down with the Stroke of the Sea," and on the same day, the Captain wrote, "At Break of Day went away to view the Look-out-creek between Phillip's Island & St. Hellena."
The look-out mentioned in the 1707 act as being on the River May was probably the southern tip of Pinckney Island, for a plat of the Island made in 1710 designated its southern end as "the Look-out point."\(^{19}\) A surface collection taken at that site brought forth a clay pipe fragment with a bore hole diameter of seven sixty-fourths of an inch, which according to the Harrington method of pipe dating, was made sometime between 1650 and 1710.\(^{20}\)

Both look-out garrisons on Pinckney Island had been abandoned by the time the Gascoignes visited Port Royal, for they only found remains of a fortification on the northern end of Pinckney Island and, when John Gascoigne was in the immediate vicinity of the southern tip of the Island, he stated that the colony should have an outpost there to protect the entrances of both Skull Creek and Mackey's Creek. It would appear negligent of the provincial government of South Carolina not to maintain outposts on strategic Pinckney Island, which controlled the inland water passages from the south into Port Royal sound.

John Gascoigne found the scout boat crews inadequately provisioned and sent them to the Beaufort garrison, where the royal contingency called the King's Independent Company was stationed, to secure supplies; but, probably because the scout boats and crews were supposed to be provided for by the province and not by the crown, the men were unable to obtain provisions at Beaufort.\(^{21}\) Therefore, Captain Gascoigne sent the two scout boats to Charleston for supplies, but again they returned without any provisions. The Captain had no choice but to send the men to Beaufort "where most of them are inhabitants until there is some care taken about victualing them."\(^{22}\) This is not only an example of how the Port Royal frontier was isolated and neglected by the rest of the colony at the time when the crown was assuming the proprietorship of Carolina, but may serve to indicate a confusion between imperial and provincial responsibility for protecting the region and perhaps helps to explain why the creation of the March colony of Georgia in 1733, independent of Carolina, was favored by the British Board of Trade. John Gascoigne reported his observations to the British Admiralty and once stated that the Savannah River region could prove to be "a much more useful place than Port-Royal-harbour for his Mag:ty service."\(^{23}\)

\(^{19}\) Loose Plat, 1710, Pinckney Island, 29K, South Carolina Archives.


\(^{21}\) January 4 and January 6, 1728/29.

\(^{22}\) January 18, 1728/29.

\(^{23}\) November 2, 1731.
Territory south of Port Royal was in the process of being settled when the Gascoignes made their survey, for example the map shows a few houses scattered on the island. On October 25, 1731, the Captain met a party of surveyors who had been "Running out Lands near the River May." The Captain himself must have realized the speculative value of taking up new lands, for he purchased 2,476 acres in Granville County.24

When the Gascoigne brothers visited the Beaufort area in 1728-31, they found it to be a frontier where Spaniards and Indians often attacked. However, after a long delay, and in spite of continued harassment by the Indians and Spanish, South Carolina was on the point of pushing its frontier beyond the Savannah River, if the province could continue and extend its southern coastal defense.

A system of coastal defense had evolved, which took into account the nature of the terrain and the enemy. Indians and Spaniards made sudden swift, hit-and-run raids up the coast by traveling in large canoes (periaguas) through inland water passages. The English scout boats patrolled the passages and coast. If the enemy was sighted, coming toward the settlements, the scout boats were probably rowed as quickly as possible to where a gun shot could be heard at the nearest look-out (perhaps the southern end of Pinckney Island). The shots would then be relayed to the next look-out (northern end of Pinckney Island), and so on up the coast to Beaufort and Charlestown. In this way, people who lived on plantations and farms could either be prepared to defend their place or flee to the garrisons for protection. Some of the forces at the Beaufort garrison would probably hasten to meet the enemy. After the scout boats had completed their first mission to warn the province, they could either engage in battle, or flee to meet the forces coming from the garrison, or, if the enemy outnumbered the English, they might all take refuge in the garrison at Beaufort, picking up the men at the look-outs in the course of their retreat.

It is unimaginable how this system functioned in 1728-31, however, if the look-outs had been abandoned, except perhaps one on the north side of Port Royal, and the scout boats and crews sent home by John Gascoigne because they had no provisions. Furthermore, there may have been some confusion over who should be held responsible for maintaining the frontier on the very rim of the British Empire in North America, the crown or the colony. Consequently, when the Trustees of Georgia proposed to carve a new colony out of the southern portion of South Carolina, which would be basically a military establishment, the British government approved the charter of Georgia in 1732.

The South Carolina Federation of Museums was organized in December 1970 (Notebook, Vol. II, No. 9-12, p. 21) and has been active now for a half a year. In that first half year the Federation has adopted by-laws, regulations for membership, dues, officers, and generally set out on a program of being of assistance to all members and member organizations. One of the basic goals of the Federation is to provide direction and professional advice to the state in the development of a State Museum. To this end it has been instrumental in getting a bill through the General Assembly to establish a Study Committee to consider a State Museum (Notebook, Vol. III, No. 1, p. 1).

On June 15, the Federation held its First Annual Meeting in the Columbia Science Museum. The business session was held from 11:00 - 12:00 followed by a buffet luncheon, compliments of the South Carolina Arts Commission and the Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism. At the business session President John Craft opened the meeting with a cordial welcome; Secretary Jack Morris presented the revised By-Laws and obtained their approval; Treasurer Nancy Wingard reported on the financial solvency of the organization, and Vice President Bob Stephenson reported on the Legislative Study Committee. The latter report stated that Lt. Governor Earl Morris had appointed Senators Eugene N. Zeigler of Florence, Dr. Frank C. Owens of Columbia, and Gordon H. Garrett of Charleston to the Committee. Speaker Sol Blatt and Governor West have not yet made their appointments.

The business session was completed with the nomination and election of Officers and Directors for the coming year. The new Officers and Directors are:

- **President:** Dr. Robert L. Stephenson, Director, University of South Carolina Museum
- **Vice Pres:** Mr. Jack A. Morris, Director, Greenville County Museum of Art
- **Vice Pres:** Mrs. Herbert T. Ulmer, Director, Calhoun County Historical Museum
- **Treasurer:** Mr. Hurley Badders, Director, Pendleton District Historical and Recreation Commission.
- **Secretary:** Mr. Sam Kimbrell, Director, Harbortown Museum and Gallery
- **Director:** Dr. Theodore S. Stern, President, College of Charleston (one year)
- **Director:** Mrs. Sidney Brandon, Curator, The Gallery, Spartanburg (one year)
- **Director:** Mr. Gene Waddell, Director, Florence Museum of Art (two years)
- **Director:** Mr. Dennis Lawson, The Rice Museum, Georgetown (two years)
The afternoon was devoted to a symposium entitled, "Why, How, What: A State Museum?", with Jack Morris and Bob Stephenson as Co-Moderators. Participants in the symposium represented experience and training in three museum disciplines and represented three of America's leading figures in the arts, history, and the sciences.

Dr. William A. Burns, Executive Director of the San Diego Natural History Museum and former Assistant Director of the American Museum of Natural History discussed the urgent need for a great museum of excellence within the state, the resources available in South Carolina and the value to residents and visitors, adults and children, scholars and laymen that such a museum would offer.

Mr. Budd H. Bishop, Director of the George Thomas Gallery of Art in Chattanooga, Tennessee, and President of the Tennessee Association of Museums, outlined the way Tennessee has gone about developing a State Museum. He described methods and procedures, pitfalls and advantages, successes and failures on the road to such a development.

Dr. Carl Guthe, President Emeritus of the American Association of Museums, past Director of the New York State Museum and of the University of Michigan Museum was the wrap-up speaker. Calling on his experience especially in a six-year study of and visit to the Museums in North America, he emphasized the necessity of professional competence and scholarly approach to a State Museum; the uses that this can have in conjunction with state development; the value of University research efforts in the program; and the multitudes of benefits that a strong, professionally competent central museum can offer to all of the other museums and exhibits in the state.

It was an excellent symposium and was followed by a lively question and answer session from the sixty persons present.
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