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The lead article in this issue is by William R. Ferris, Jr., Assistant Professor at Yale University. It departs a bit from our usual offering of field reports and analytical studies. It is a concise, résumé of the background of anthropological "schools of thought", and appropriate for these pages as the archeologist must be an anthropologist first and foremost or he is handicapped in his study of man. There is nothing really new in this article. It is simply a straight-forward review of the many kinds of thinking that have, for a century, gone into the development of modern anthropology. We hope that it will be useful, especially to readers who might not have had a course in the history of anthropology. To others who have, it might serve to stimulate some discussion of the subject. Adherents of the various "schools of thought" often get rather vigorous and vocal about their particular biases and perhaps a bias or two will show in response to this article.

One more of the RESEARCH MANUSCRIPT SERIES is published in this issue of the NOTEBOOK. This is a brief report of investigations at "An Archaic-Woodland Site (38CL4) in Calhoun County" by George Teague. Some will remember this site as George's "Mystery Village" from the newspaper headline of the same name. Two other brief articles by Teague are also included here to report some of his short survey trips. These were done at the request of Janson Cox of the South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism and are surveys of the Aiken State Park and the Lee State Park. We are pleased to conduct such surveys for the P.R. & T. Department and hope that we can gradually do surveys of all of our fine State Parks.

It is most encouraging to note the gradual increase in the Department of Anthropology and Sociology this year with addition of two more anthropologists and several sociologists.

On October 7, we had a delightful visit to the annual meeting of the Archeological Society of Virginia, in Roanoke. We gave the evening, banquet speech on "Archeological Similarities in Virginia and South Carolina".

On October 9, we (my wife, Georgie, and I) left for our first vacation in three years. We flew to Oregon, rented a car, and drove through Washington, Oregon, and northern California, flying back from San Francisco. We visited the National Park Service excavation at Fort Vancouver and spent some time with our friends out on the Oregon Desert. There we visited one of the best examples of a living Homestead I have seen. We also visited the site of the first Camp Warner (1864-5) on Hart Mountain where General Crook exposed his temperament and other poor judgements. The visit to "The City" was, of course, a delight. San Francisco is still "The City".

In the event that the reader finds any mistakes in this issue of the NOTEBOOK, please be assured that they were put there for a purpose. We try to offer something for everyone and we know that some people are always looking for mistakes.

Robert L. Stephenson, Director
Institute of Archeology and Anthropology
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina
AN ARCHEOLOGICAL SURVEY AT
AIKEN STATE PARK

by George A. Teague

At the request of Mr. Janson L. Cox, Chief Historian of the South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism, I visited the Aiken State Park area on January 26, 1972. Mr. Cox had reported to the Institute that artifacts had been found at two localities in the park and had requested that the Institute evaluate these localities. Mr. J. F. Watson, of the Parks, Recreation and Tourism Department made the artifacts available and conducted me on a visit to the sites.

Aiken State Park is located along the south bank of the South Edisto River in Aiken County, South Carolina, just south of Kitchings Mill. It is a large and beautiful park in the hardwood area just below the "Fall Line", partly in river swamp and partly in rolling, tree-covered sandhills.

Site 38AK40

This prehistoric open site is located near the largest lake within the park and to the west of the South Edisto River. The site occurs on flat, sandy terrain, now grown up in pines and used as a picnic ground. Sparse chert chipping debris, as well as one plain sand-tempered ceramic sherd, was found on the surface. A nearby road cut revealed about six inches of white sand overlying a red clay in this area.

Site 38AK41

This prehistoric open site is in the south-central portion of the park. The low rolling sand-hill terrain has recently been cleared by bulldozer but not yet replanted. Artifacts were exposed within a 200 yard long plowed firebreak and the site is probably in excess of four acres in area. Eighteen ceramic sherds were collected. Their surface treatment includes linear check-stamped, find checked-stamped, punctate, cord-marked and plain.

SUMMARY

Site 38AK41 is less disturbed and seems to have been more intensively occupied than Site 38AK40. Analysis of the ceramics from 38AK41 revealed similarities in style to the Deptford and Thoms Creek ceramic series which suggest an early Woodland Period of occupancy. This site should certainly be mapped and periodically collected. Further, the presence of two known archeological sites at Aiken State Park indicates that more intensive re-connaissance would reveal the presence of a number of other sites. I would suggest a concentration within the Edisto River bottom, as well as upon the higher ground, because of the well-developed alluvial soil profile exhibited in a river bank cut (east of 38AK40) and the congruent higher probability of in situ cultural deposits.
BIFURCATION AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

by William R. Ferris, Jr.

INTRODUCTION

The field of anthropology emerged as a self-conscious discipline during the nineteenth century and its development was closely tied to that of scientific disciplines, especially biology. As the fields of science and religion became increasingly "bifurcated", to use Whitehead's term (1960: 443), anthropology—as part of the scientific pose—increasingly stressed the need for empirical data and the use of scientific methods in its research. This emphasis on science has continued to influence anthropology to the present.

During the latter part of the nineteenth century, the field of anthropology diverged into two distinct areas—physical anthropology and cultural anthropology. Physical anthropology focused on the origin and biological evolution of man using the principles of biology, anatomy, physiology, zoology, paleontology, and other organic sciences. Cultural anthropology, or ethnology, was primarily concerned with the historical reconstruction of the cultural development of peoples and regions. Jacques Boucher de Crèvecoeur de Perthes defined the concept of ethnology first when he traced culture to the Pleistocene age. Perthes argued that artifacts such as flints and stones were not simply products of technological instinct, but fitted into the context of a culture comparable to his own (Lowie 1937: 7-8).

Essential to the development of cultural anthropology was a definition of culture which would give the ethnologist an adequate base for his study. One of the earliest and most important definitions was forwarded by E. B. Tyler in his introduction to Primitive Culture (1871). Tyler defined culture as "that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, customs, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society". Because of his empiricism and interest in cultural forms, Tyler has been called the father of modern cultural anthropology. He stressed the necessity of detailed ethnographic enquiry and comparison of circumstance before making abstract generalizations about society and its evolution. These ideas are generally accepted by all the schools of cultural anthropology which have since developed.

EVOLUTIONARY APPROACHES

The influence of biology on cultural anthropology is most apparent in the work of the cultural evolutionists who applied the theory of natural selection—popularized by Charles Darwin in his On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection—to the study of cultures. The evolutionists worked out linear schemes by which they showed how every culture moves from a state of savagery to civilization. Imbued with the sense of progress, the anthropologists felt such cultural development was natural, and the culmination of this progress was civilization as reflected in the values of nineteenth-century Victorians (Kroeber 1963: 6). In effect, cultures were judged "savage" or "civilized" on the basis of their
deviation from or resemblance to European standards. Apart from their ethnocentricity, a primary fallacy in the reasoning of evolutionists lay in their equation of modern primitive groups with the primeval savage. This attitude led to a naive underestimation of recent tribes and uncritical acceptance of racial theories (Lowie 1937: 23).

One of the primary sources of evolutionary study in cultural anthropology was among the German-speaking ethnologists. Gustave Klemm, a native of Saxony, anticipated Tyler by defining culture as the "transmission of past experience to the new generation" (Lowie 1937: 12). Klemm presented his work on progressive development before the appearance of Darwin's Origin of the Species. He recognized three stages of development--savagery, tameness and freedom--and divides humanity into active and passive Races which he likens to man and woman (Lowie 1937: 13-14).

Theodore Waitz, a professor of psychology at the University of Marburg, focused his work on psychological questions and the race question. He argued for monogenism against the polygenism of ethnologists like Klemm, pointing out that all races start as "Natural Man", devoid of any culture. Differences in cultural achievement were due to natural surroundings and historical contact with other groups, rather than to differences in intellectual endowment. Waitz argued against the "psychic unity of mankind" as any explanation of cultural similarities and instead pointed to the role of diffusion through historical contact. In stressing the importance of cultural diffusion, he laid the foundation of the historical approach to cultural anthropology which will be discussed later (Heine-Geldern 1964: 408, 410).

In contrast to Waitz, Adolf Bastian argued in favor of the psychic unity of mankind and explained cultural parallels in terms of Elementargedanken (elementary ideas) which are inherent in every people. Bastian used the term Volkergedanke to explain cultural changes which are due to historical contact with other cultures and diffusion rather than to innate ideas of the particular culture. Though this form of multilinear, parallel evolution of cultures is termed "evolutionism", it is contrary to Darwinian evolutionism which did not recognize the independent development of animals from the Old and New World. In his work Der Mensch in der Geschichte (1860) Bastian made an important differentiation between cultural and physical anthropology by coining the term Volkerkunde which referred to ethnology while the meaning of "anthropology" was restricted to physical anthropology (Heine-Geldern 1964: 410).

The Swiss jurist, J. J. Bachofen, like Bastian, emphasized the field of ethnology in his study of evolutionism. In Das Mutterrecht (1861) he presented a vision of ancient culture as a single unit. Bachofen rejected the study of a single aspect of civilization and connected social structure with religious practice (Lowie 1937: 40-43). In attempting to relate the various aspects of a culture to each other, he laid the groundwork for functionalism which will be discussed later.

The most elaborate scheme of cultural evolution was developed by an American lawyer, Lewis H. Morgan in Ancient Society (1877). Morgan argued that man has developed in a "progressive" way--from savagery to
civilization—and the nature of this progress was predetermined by the "natural logic of the human mind" (Morgan 1963: 18). Since all men share this natural logic, each society's culture parallels those of other cultures. Morgan defined three stages of development—savagery, barbarism, and civilization—through which he analyzed culture. He applied this linear concept of progress to eight aspects of culture: inventions, subsistence, government, language, family, religion, house architecture and property. Morgan felt the Semitic and Aryan cultures were the most advanced and based his entire system on the divine plan of God (Morgan 1963: 563).

Apart from his evolutionism, Morgan is principally known for his topological and distributional studies of kinship systems (Lowie 1937: 62-63). The use of kinship systems was further developed by W. H. R. Rivers who regarded genealogical evidence as the most direct way of dealing with the native cultures. Rivers argued that the genealogical method offered the best way of analyzing social organization. Rivers also shared Morgan's views of primitive cultures and describes the native as the "puzzled child of nature" (Rivers 1910: 10).

The theories of Edward B. Tyler, professor of anthropology at Oxford University, stand in sharp contrast with Morgan's dogmatic evolutionism. Tyler stressed the importance of cultural diffusion and described civilization as "a plant more often propagated than developed". He contrasted "the small part of art and custom which any people may have invented or adapted for themselves" with "the large part which has been acquired by adopting from foreigners whatever was seen to suit their own circumstances" (Lowie 1937: 74-75).

Tyler stressed the complexity of cultural phenomena and the necessity of careful documentation of theory. In his explanation of teknonymy (the custom of naming the parent after the child) he accepted more than one determinant for the same effect and thus substituted the mathematical concept of function for the antiquated metaphysical concept of function (Lowie 1937: 80-81). Like Morgan, Tyler affirmed the doctrine of progress and described anthropology as "essentially a reformer's science" which was "active at once in aiding progress and in removing hindrance" (Lowie 1937: 83).

The most extensive application of evolutionism to magic and religious practices was in the work of Sir James Frazer's The Golden Bough (1890). Frazer analyzed magic in primitive beliefs and argued that many of our present cosmological beliefs and social institutions evolved from them in a linear fashion. Frazer's influence, however, was primarily in the field of literature and intellectual thought, rather than cultural anthropology.

More recent approaches to the problem of evolution have been made by Leslie A. White and Julian H. Steward. White developed a theory of evolution based on four stages of technological progress—human energy, fire, fuel and atomic energy. White feels culture is primarily a mechanism for harnessing energy to serve man's needs and the degree of cultural development is directly related to the efficiency of the tools employed (White, 1949).
Julian H. Steward defends the evolutionary theory as a valuable means of complimenting the historical approach emphasizing diffusion. He argues that certain basic or constant institutions persist in every culture and should be distinguished from those secondary or variable features which give the culture its uniqueness. Steward then defines five eras of cultural development which embody the various stages of his basic institutions (Steward 1949). Both Steward and White utilize Morgan's concept of progressive cultural eras, but reject his racial views and belief in divine will.

These modifications follow in the wake of a major reaction against evolutionary anthropology which centered around diffusion and historical anthropology. This shift was based on the expansion of ethnographic knowledge which clearly showed that cultural traits often shifted from one society to another through diffusion. The historical school felt that since each culture experiences a distinctive set of influences through contact with its neighbors, the basic problem of anthropology is to study this intercourse. The implications of this approach were a skepticism about human originality and a de-emphasis of distance or continuity as a limit to cultural diffusion (Lowie 1937: 157-158).

HISTORICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

The first attack on German evolutionists was made by Friederich Ratzel in his Volkerkunde (1885-88) which emphasized the importance of cultural contacts. Ratzel's work was carried further by two of his followers, Heinrich Schurtz and Leo Frobenius. In 1895 Schurtz published Das Augenornament und verwandte Probleme, a paper in which he related art styles of the Northwest Coast tribes of America to those of Indonesia and Melanesia. In the same year Leo Frobenius published a series of papers attempting to show cultural contacts between Africa and Indonesia. Frobenius significantly refused to explain the similarities between the two cultures in terms of the "psychic unity of mankind" (Heine-Geldern 1964: 411).

Edward Hahn focused his study on the development of economy and decided that pastoral nomadism, rather than preceding agriculture, was derived from it through a process by which the people gave up agriculture and devoted themselves to animal breeding exclusively. Hahn felt that the domestication of animals, the wheel, the plough and higher civilization in general originated in the Near East and spread around the earth. Though Hahn often overstated his positions, his extremism served to upset the complacent followers of the doctrines of Elementargedanken.

Fritz Graebner is best-known for his theory of Kulturkreise (culture circle), a term created by Frobenius, which Graebner used to explain the various cultural strata of Oceania and Australia. Grouping several culture traits into a culture circle, Graebner then traced the movement of these traits to explain cultural diffusion. At one point he claimed to have followed a culture complex through five continents. He later admitted, however, that similar traits in different regions of the world do not necessarily imply that the traits belong to the same culture complex (Heine-Geldern 1964: 412-413).
The Kulturkreis theory was popularized in Austria by Father Wilhelm Schmidt who taught in St. Gabriel, a school for missionaries near Vienna. An outstanding scholar, Father Schmidt shifted from the school of Elementargedanken to that of Kulturkreis, rejecting Bastian's ideas as being aprioristic. He also added several culture circles to those listed by Graebner (Heine-Geldern 1964: 413-414).

The English diffusionist school was headed by G. Elliot-Smith and W. J. Perry and attempted to explain all civilization in terms of Egyptian culture. As this civilization spread, they argued that it became diluted and decadent. The extreme statements of Elliot-Smith and Perry which derived all civilization from Egypt rendered their position unacceptable to most anthropologists (Lowie 1937: 168).

The strength of the European historical schools lay in their treatment of man's history as one unit. They erred, however, in mistaking analogies for homologous features (Lowie 1937: 184). Though critical of parallelism, they introduced evolution in terms of their own system. Recognizing cultural change in time and defining single traits as organically related was to admit the possibility of a definite sequence. Their system is thus no more empirical than that of Morgan (Lowie 1937: 190). The principal value of European diffusionism lies in its initial postulate that man at one time occupied a restricted area, and when he spread he carried with him some of his culture (Lowie 1937: 193-194).

The American diffusionist school was developed under the leadership of Boas and Kroeber whose research exposed much valuable data on the processes through which the borrowing occurred. The distributional studies of the American school differed from those of the continent in two respects. They were empirical, moving from data to conclusions, and they were concerned with distributions of specific phenomena in restricted areas (Herskovits 1945). This emphasis was largely due to the influence of Boas who insisted on a thorough-going description of cultural data as the sole warrantable scientific attitude. He emphasized that a knowledge of native languages was an essential key for an appreciation of other cultures (Lowie 1937: 131-132).

A. L. Kroeber made significant advances in refining the concept of cultural diffusion through concepts such as "stimulus diffusion" and "the superorganic". Kroeber defines stimulus diffusion as "new pattern growth initiated by precedent in a foreign culture" (Kroeber 1940: 20). The process is essentially the transference of a complex without content, as seen in the invention of porcelain in eighteenth-century Europe through contact with China. The original invention is dependent upon culture contact and is an example of diffusion as well as invention. Kroeber suggests that the idea of writing in cultures like those of Egypt, Mesopotamia, and China, may also have acted as a stimulus toward an original but induced invention (Kroeber 1940: 1-6).

Through his term "superorganic" Kroeber defines that which separates man from animals, and is passed on from generation to generation in the form of civilization. The superorganic is the sum total of psychic operations of a mass of individuals and is independent of the birth of
particular personalities (Kroeber 1917). Kroeber's distinction between "organic" and "superorganic" is essentially the difference between the fields of physical and cultural anthropology. Kroeber stressed the omniscience of the superorganic in his studies of styles and fashion which reveal recurring patterns regardless of the individualism of designers. The regularity of these patterns is evidence, for Kroeber, that civilization has an order which is as objective and concrete as that of the inorganic (Kroeber 1919). He also analyzes styles as a reflection of socio-political tensions in that during such periods the style works against the basic pattern expressed in periods of calm and stability (Kroeber 1957: 22).

Kroeber's "superorganic" has been criticized by Edward Sapir who feels it is wrong to completely eliminate the influence of individuals on the course of history. He argues that the social and inorganic cannot be separated, as Kroeber tried to do, because the social is a selection from the total mass of phenomena resolvable into inorganic, organic, and psychic processes (Sapir 1917: 441-444).

Boas' emphasis on reliable cultural data in the development of theory is echoed in the work of Margaret T. Hodgen who stresses the importance of dates in documenting theories. Using methods similar to those used by Kroeber in his work on style, she shows how dated distributions are most expressive of cultural change, an especially important consideration in the field of cultural diffusion. Miss Hodgen, like Kroeber, argues that change occurs in an orderly fashion, and during the early period of change, points of change are more distant geographically than in later periods (Hodgen 1950: 462).

**FUNCTIONALISM**

Such quantitative studies of culture tended to give a static picture of a living society which led to a reaction against the historical school. Critics felt the reconstruction of history on any level was impossible to achieve and therefore undesirable to attempt. Their new movement, which was termed "functionalism" de-emphasized the problems of dynamics in the study of culture and focused on inner structure, forms of organization, and the relationship between a culture and its carriers (Herskovits 1945: 149). Like the evolutionists the functionalists drew upon biology and the concepts of morphology, physiology, and development in dealing with society as an organism. Each part of society could thus be classified and studied in terms of its genesis and relation to the rest of the social organism (Radcliff-Brown 1935: 396).

The work of the functionalists was thus carried on without a sense of historical depth and change, and instead emphasized the functioning of each phase of that culture to other phases. Bronislaw Malinowski laid the groundwork of functionalism in his study of the Kula system of trade among the natives of the Trobriand Islands near eastern New Guinea. Malinowski (1961: 25) felt the functional method was necessary to avoid judging native cultures with the preconceptions of Western European cul-
ture. He felt the goal of the anthropologist should be "to grasp the native's point of view, his relation to life, to realize his vision of his world". Malinowski effectively showed how the native views of magic, trade and labor were fundamentally different from those of his own culture and could only be understood through the functionalist approach. Malinowski's method was to organize the basic structure or anatomy of the culture and then fill in each area of the scheme with detailed ethnographic information (Malinowski 1961: 24).

These methods were further developed by Raymond Firth (1964: 17-18) who adopts Malinowski's operational procedures in his Elements of Social Organization. He again stresses the need for anthropological studies that are "holistic in implication". Like Malinowski, Firth organizes the basic structure of the culture in terms of major areas--economics, art, morals and religion--and shows how each area is related to the society as a whole. Religion, for instance, is "a framework for social relations through the application which individuals make of it to their personal circumstances" (Firth 1964: 246).

Both Malinowski and Firth err in their dogmatic treatment of culture as a closed system for a science of culture must record every item of social tradition, correlating it with other aspects of reality, whether that lies within the same culture or outside (Lowie 1937: 235). Consideration of cultural change was forcibly brought to the attention of functionalists when they moved from isolated cultures to areas where societies had been influenced by European customs. Understanding of such cultures required that the problem of cultural change be added to that of cultural integration. The essential difference between the two positions is that those who emphasize the historical approach are primarily concerned with cultural change, while those who accept the non-historical, approach their study in terms of cultural stability (Herskovits 1945).

SOCIOLOGICAL APPROACHES

As problems of culture study became increasingly complex, cultural anthropologists began to develop liaisons with other disciplines such as sociology, psychology and linguistics, attempting to achieve more depth through specialized studies (Goodenough 1966: 5). The study of sociology was formulated by Emile Durkheim as a reaction against the idea of a unilinear evolution. In Les Regles de la Methode Sociologique (1894), Durkheim pointed to a number of distinct types of societies and argued that they could not be united continuously (Lowie 1937: 201).

Durkheim's work was further developed by A. R. Radcliffe-Brown who studied at Cambridge and is known more for his formulation of theory than for his field work. Radcliffe-Brown accepted the functionalist concept of society as an integrated unit in which every element has a distinct function, but was also aware of selective borrowing. His concept of cultural evolution was that wide integrations tended to supersede those of narrower scope. Radcliffe-Brown felt anthropology should focus on the formulation of abstract laws rather than focus on individuals as Malinowski
had done. An example of his work is his study of The Mother's Brother in South Africa (1924) which showed that the distinction between matriarchal societies is not absolute (Radcliffe-Brown 1924: 542). This form of sociological study has influenced some American anthropologists like Robert Redfield who has done extensive studies on peasant culture and its relationship to the larger culture of its country (Redfield 1965: 46).

The principle emphasis among Americans using the sociological method has been on the gathering of ethnological data in the tradition of Boas. It was felt that cross-cultural theory could not be made until adequate information on various societies had been gathered. This approach was particularly stressed by George Murdock who organized the Cross Cultural Survey in 1937 whereby a mass of information on family, kinship and marriage was gathered in numerous societies and filed. On the basis of this data, Murdock published his Social Structure (1949), a comparative study using data from 250 societies, which became a landmark in refining concepts such as kinship classification, principles of residence, and relationships of family and kin-group organization. This approach to the comparative method has continued to be refined in the areas of kinship and residence by anthropologists such as Ward H. Goodenough (1966) and Paul Bohannan (Goodenough 1964: 6-9). As Fred Eggan has pointed out, however, this approach can tend to picture culture as a mere aggregation of traits brought together by the accidents of diffusion and must be balanced with an awareness of the regularities behind the apparent diversity of cultural phenomena (Eggan 1954: 744, 759).

PSYCHOLOGICAL METHOD

Shifting from the field of sociology to psychology, we find a fusion of interests between anthropologists and personality psychologists which first became widely known through Ruth Benedict's Patterns of Culture (1934) and has been further developed by Irving Hallowell, Clyde Kluckhohn and others. The basic approach of this group was to apply the theories of Gestalt psychology to culture as a whole rather than a single person and thus focus on the underlying, pervasive attitudes of the "covert culture". The principal source for this information was projective tests—Rorschach and Thematic Apperception tests—designed by psychiatrists to reveal traits of personality and a detailed examination of modes of child training. In analyzing distinctive group features the anthropologists focused on symbolic meanings and the emotional significance of cultural features, and concluded that the cultural component affects perception, motivation and learning as much as biological stimuli (Nadel 1963: 42-43).

Benedict (1932) compared her theory to that of Malinowski in the sense that it interprets human culture as an organic, functioning whole. Individual traits are related to the whole culture and reflect fundamental configurations that pattern its existence. Using this approach Benedict contrasts the Pueblo and Plains Indians as "Apollonian" (characterized by sobriety) and "Dionysian" (characterized by emotional excesses).
The individual behavior is thus patterned by the prevailing culture configurations.

Hallowell (1941) emphasizes culture as that which distinguishes man from the rest of the animal kingdom and feels it should be related to other fields such as sociology, psychology and morphology. He criticizes the structural approach as insufficient in defining a human level of existence. Hallowell (1956: 89-99) applies his theory to the Freudian concept of anxiety and uses culture to explain the relation between anxiety and neurosis. He applies his methods to the Ojibwa Indians to show how they view the world in personalistic terms. By approaching the world views of the Ojibwas internally, Hallowell (1960: 21, 45) shows how their view of a "person" transcends the individual and must be understood in terms of social organization.

Sapir (1924: 411-424) further develops his theme of the relationship between individual and group culture in a study of our own society. He defines a genuine culture as one which gives its bearers a sense of inner satisfaction and argues that American culture lacks this satisfaction. The cultural fallacy of industrialism is that in harnessing machines to our uses it has been unable to avoid harnessing the majority of mankind to its machines. Industrialism has forced an extreme differentiation of function on man which menaces his spirit.

Morris Opler (1946: 198-202) redefines the cultural phenomena which Benedict described as "patterns" and labels them "themes". Opler feels these themes become most conspicuous when they are violated. The interplay of theme and countertheme is the essence of what has been termed "structure" in culture and has important implications for social theory. Anthropologists have given the psychological approach a qualified approval due to their generalizations about personality based on arbitrarily-selected traits. Although there are definitely cultural leitmotifs which should be defined, an adequate definition of these patterns is yet to be made (Lowie 1937: 279).

PROCESSUAL APPROACHES

Each of the above schools has dealt with aspects of culture (function, psychology, history and sociology) but none has successfully explained the nature of change in culture. Cultural change appears through innovations which are introduced from within and from without; those changes initiating from within take the form of inventions or discoveries and those from without are borrowed. In either situation, the critical question is whether or not the new element will be accepted or rejected. If accepted, we must examine the process by which the new trait is incorporated into the existing body of culture. It is to this problem of culture-contact and the study of different cultural streams which are in the act of influencing each other that the processual approach addresses itself (Herskovits, 1945: 150-151). A. L. Kroeber (1963: 4, 8) focuses on this problem in his definition of culture and suggests that it represents a broader approach to anthropology than these we have discussed earlier. Kroeber states that
"anthropology looks for such general and recurrent processes as may occur in the multifarious events of history and in diverse societies, institutions, customs and beliefs of mankind. So far as such processes can be extricated or formulated, they are generalizations.... Culture, then, is all those things about man that are more than just biological or organic, and are also more than merely psychological". By processes, Kroeber means "those factors which operate either toward the stabilization and preservation of cultures and their parts, or toward growth and change" (Kroeber 1963: 152).

Kroeber is concerned with a metaphysical approach to culture and explains change in terms of culture or the "superorganic" rather than the individual. In the above definition of his approach we note the emphasis on the abstract concept of "progress" rather than on particular individuals or societies. He reduces the role of the individual to a minimum and instead focuses on culture as the "product of men in groups". This de-emphasis of the individual leads Kroeber to reject the concept of invention which we shall define as the formulation of some new object or new idea (Herskovits 1945: 152).

Kroeber said the goals established by culture determine the direction of inventions. Once these goals are established, it is only a matter of time until the results are achieved, and such inventions "are not a single act but a cumulative series of transmitted increments plus a series of new elements when these become possible in the culture in which they appear". A concrete example of this form of invention by stimulus was discussed earlier in connection with Kroeber's "stimulus diffusion". Similar views toward invention have been suggested by H. G. Barnett (1942: 14) who feels unconscious inventions often occur through contact with differing cultures.

Ralph Linton and Anthony F. C. Wallace narrow the processual base of operation by suggesting that stimulus for change can occur within a culture without contact with other cultures. Linton describes such change as a "nativistic movement" and defines it as "any conscious, organized attempt on the part of a society's members to revive or perpetuate selected aspects of its culture". Such movements focus on particular elements of culture rather than on culture as a whole (Linton 1943: 230). Wallace (1956: 264-266) further develops this concept, redefining it as a "restitution movement". He feels the concept is a unique explanation of cultural change because it represents a deliberate, conscious effort by the members of the society to construct a more satisfying culture. Such changes allow the individual to create a more effective mental image or "mazeway" through which he organizes his experience. Wallace feels that Christianity, Muhammadanism, and possibly Buddhism originated in revitalization movements.

A somewhat different approach to internal change is suggested by William F. Ogburn (1957: 167) in his theory of "cultural lag". A cultural lag occurs when "one of two parts of culture which are correlated, changes before or in greater degree than the other part does, thereby causing less adjustment between the two parts than existed previously". Where such cultural change appears, the cause is usually a scientific discovery, with the exception of India where religion motivated change (Ogburn 1957: 170-171).
Ward R. Goodenough has focused on the principal area of culture change which is the cross-cultural contacts between native cultures and Euro-American traditions. Recognizing the inevitability of such change, Goodenough suggests that the most effective means of achieving it is through "cooperation" between both parties. In contrast to the processual approaches discussed earlier, Goodenough focuses on the individual as well as the overall culture and argues that sound cultural theory must incorporate both in its approach. He feels this consideration of individuals is even more important for development agents who should "try to see each community in all its individuality" (Goodenough 1966: 381). Goodenough's consideration of both individual and cultural levels of processual change somewhat balances the other approaches which deal with culture apart from the individual.

STRUCTURAL IDEALISM

From the time of its creation, the field of linguistics has been closely related to that of anthropology and, under the leadership of Franz Boas, American anthropological linguistics has focused on a description of languages in terms of their structure and semantic categories. Such research required a sound knowledge of the culture as well as linguistic analysis. Boas was the first to suggest that linguistics was a means of understanding the psychology and fundamental ethnic ideas of a people. Sapir's research showed that linguistic structure relates to the perceptive and cognitive faculties of men and aids in understanding differing behaviors among people of varying backgrounds (Nadel 1963: 45).

On the basis of the advances made in the field of linguistics in categorizing and analyzing cultures comparatively, anthropologists have felt that similar methods should be applied in dealing with culture as a whole. As we have seen, anthropologists tend to deal either with the general concept of culture at the expense of the individual or vice versa. Anthropologists such as Ward H. Goodenough feel that the methods of linguistics may provide a means of dealing effectively with both. Goodenough points out the difference between the comparative ethnographer who seeks common principles in many different universes and the ethnographer who directs his theory at a particular social universe. Although they operate on different levels of abstraction, both are engaged in theory construction and should be able to coordinate their work. Goodenough believes that linguistics with its comparative philology has a model which cultural anthropologists should translate into a descriptive ethnography (Goodenough, 1956: 37). Through similar research in behavior, cultural anthropologists could determine a minimum number of perceptual entities that would account for cultural behavior in any society. Thus the distinctions of phonemic and phonetic could be given cultural equivalents which would provide anthropologists with a common basis for their work and eliminate some of the differences we have discussed during the course of this study.

CONCLUSIONS

The format of this study should not lead the reader to believe that anthropologists are ranged in hostile camps, for their differences of
opinion often resolve themselves into differing emphases. Anthropologists stand uniform in agreement on most of the major issues, as is seen in their rejection of environmentalism, racialism, the idea of prelogical primitiveness, primitive intellectualism, and the three-stage theory of economic progress. There is also agreement that promiscuity exists nowhere and that the family is the basic social unit (Lowie 1937: 51-52).

Returning to our opening point that anthropology emerged as part of the bifurcation between science and religion, we can see that this emphasis has continued to the present through the field's ties with biology, sociology, psychology, and linguistics. This placing of cultural anthropology in the scientific channel may explain why some related disciplines have not been included in its scope. It is surprising, for instance, that the study of culture has not utilized aesthetics in dealing with its materials. Such work might provide a basis of understanding and appreciating the art of diverse cultures which would be comparable to the methods developed in linguistics. In so broadening his field the cultural anthropologist would be following in the cultural tradition of countries like India which emphasize synthesis in their thought. Alan Lomax has made a beginning in such synthesis by relating folk song styles to their societies and making cross-cultural comparisons based upon Murdock's Ethnographic Atlas. He has shown how folk song styles reflect cultural patterns, such as morality and economic complexity. He published his results in 1968. Alfred North Whitehead has stressed the need for a similar system in philosophy that would combine eastern thought which "makes process ultimate" with the western attitude which "makes fact ultimate" (Whitehead 1960: 11). In Process and Reality Whitehead attempts to achieve this through a philosophy of process that includes both the particular and the general. He sees all of life as a state of flux in which every event effects the overall situation and is in turn affected by events in other parts of the flux. This approach to philosophy has important implications for cultural anthropology in areas such as Kroeber's cultural processes and Goodenough's idea of cultural "emics" and "etics".
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**AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR STATE AND LOCAL HISTORY**

The annual meeting of the American Association for State and Local History was held at Providence, Rhode Island on September 19-23, 1972. The Institute was represented by Richard Carrillo. This Association, under the leadership of Bill Alderson, with its headquarters in Nashville, Tennessee, is really doing a great job of pulling together the multitudes of people who are interested in the subject. Both professional and non-professional interest, nationwide, in history, historic restoration, historic museums and related matters has expanded tremendously in recent years. This Association serves well as coordinator of these interests with its publication "History News" and its several seminars each year.
In September arrangements were made by the University of South Carolina to secure the Francis A. Lord Military Collection, as a loan, and with it the services of Dr. Lord to curate and exhibit the collection.

This collection of military weapons and accoutrements is both extensive and varied and considered by experts to be one of the best in the United States. Although all of the American wars are well represented by basic military weapons and other impediments, the collection is especially impressive in its offerings of materials from the 1861-1865 period. Included is an extensive and well-balanced assortment of everything a soldier wore or carried—certainly one of the best such collections of Civil War items in existence. There are many personal items of identified officers and soldiers, from General Benjamin Butler's field chest of Tiffany silver to a soldier's locket with his baby son's hair in it. From music to religious tracts, bad knuckles taken from a Confederate prisoner at Gettysburg to rings of bone carved at Andersonville by an Union soldier. This collection runs the gamut of the interests of everyone, whether military or civilian.

The items are so varied and so unique that they have formed the basic photographic and textual material for three standard works on Civil War artifacts written by Dr. Lord. These are: Civil War Collector's Encyclopedia; Civil War Suttlers and Their Wares; and Uniforms of the Civil War. Also included in the collection is a good selection of reference books, current monographs, and photographs as well as original military documents, maps, lithographs and soldiers' letters.

Dr. Lord began collecting these items at the age of 14, before the great popular interest in military history spawned a vast number of collectors. His interest was stimulated by his grandfather, a Civil War veteran, and other members of the family who served in later wars added to what became the nucleus of a collection that could not be duplicated today. The collection has expanded over the years by purchase from reputable dealers and in constant trading with other collectors. Some excellent items have been acquired on trips to Europe and the Far East.

Parts of the collection have been on display in the Washington, D.C. area and in Camden, but this will bring the entire collection together for the first time as a loan to the University of South Carolina.

Dr. Lord has been, for the past four years, Director of the Lancaster Regional Campus of U.S.C. and Professor of History. He retires from that position next June 30 to become Distinguished Professor of History at the Columbia Campus. He will also devote half-time to curating, researching and displaying his collection in the University Museum. He and the collection will be housed at the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology and Dr. Lord will be a part of the research staff of the Institute as well as of the Museum and the History Department. We are all very fortunate to have this tremendous research asset available to us.
INTRODUCTION

On November 23, 1971, I visited a prehistoric site on the Congaree River at the request of Mrs. Herbert T. Ulmer of the Calhoun County Museum, St. Matthews, South Carolina. A large number of ceramic sherds was found within a plowed field on land owned by Mrs. F. C. Kellers of St. Matthews, South Carolina. The site had been reported to the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology in 1969 and had been given the designation 38CL4 at that time.

Because of local interest and the site's size and productivity, as well as the probability of in situ deposits from a sparsely known ceramic component, I returned on January 5 and 6, 1972 and performed testing operations, assisted by Mrs. Kellers, Mrs. Ulmer, Jim Bozzard, Randy Fogel, Ray Sigmon and Nancy Verdery.

SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The site area is a 20 acre plowed field with artifacts occurring generally, but focused within a one hundred meter square area in the center of the field. The field itself is at an elevation of about 250 feet above mean sea level, 2,000 feet southeast of the Congaree River, which is 150 feet lower in elevation. Ft. Motte, South Carolina, is located to the southeast of the site. The area of the site is well drained and ready access to nearby springs, as well as to the Congaree River, is available.

METHOD AND TECHNIQUE

Since the purpose of excavation was to ascertain depositional sequence and determine the character of the site, interest focused on the surficially productive center of the field. Within an area 180 by 110 meters, 4 stratigraphic slots and 8 test trenches comprising 54 square meters were excavated. The slots and trenches were positioned non-randomly at intervals which would allow selected coverage of the field center. The slots and trenches were aligned on a north-south axis and plotted on a master map by chain and compass reference to a base datum point. Excavation was accomplished by skimming and bagging recovered artifacts by natural stratigraphic units.
INTRA-SITE STRATIGRAPHY AND CULTURAL DEPOSITS

All excavation units displayed a consistent stratigraphic sequence wherein an upper 10 cm of plow zone overlies a thin, brown, often rich, organic layer. These units were underlain by more than 1 meter of stratified yellow alluvially deposited sand.

Artifacts from a Woodland component were scattered throughout the plow zone and were within the underlying brown sand, which is probably basic to the upper cultural component. One corner notched point was found within the yellow sand at a depth of 30 cm below the surface in Test Pit 7, indicating an earlier, probably Archaic Period, occupation.

FEATURES

Three structural features were found.

Feature 1 (Test Pit 4)

In association with the brown sand/basal plow zone were found one probable postmold 15 cm in diameter and one firepit 10 cm deep and 35 cm in diameter. Structurally integral charcoal was found and sampled in the fire pit.

Feature 2 (Test Pit 3)

A burned area 45 cm in diameter was found at the plow zone base, as well as two 10 cm diameter disturbances. This was recorded as a feature but upon excavation revealed the characteristics of a burned tree. The smaller disturbances were ephemeral and are questionably definable as postmolds.

Feature 3 (Test Pit 5)

An elliptically shaped disturbance covering over 3 square meters of area was found at the brown sand/yellow sand contact. The disturbance appeared as organically rich sand 10 cm deep at the center and feathering out at the edges. A large amount of charcoal was included, as well as over one hundred ceramic sherds. The function of this disturbed area is uncertain without further excavation, but the general configuration, as well as lack of postmolds, suggest that it may be a trash pit.

ARTIFACTS

Except for the corner notched point within the yellow sand in Test Pit 7, all stone items recovered were from the Basal Plow Zone/Brown Sand level. A summary follows:
Lithic Occurrence by Provenience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Test Pit 4</th>
<th>Test Pit 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Flakes, chert</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Flakes, quartzite</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Flakes, chert</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Flakes, quartzite</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biface Fragments, chert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, from the surface were recovered 2 triangular, straight base, chert projectile points and one concave base, triangular, chert projectile point.

All ceramic fragments were recovered from either the plow zone or plow zone/brown sand contact zone. The ceramics were manufactured by coiling and then treating with a hammer and anvil technique.

Ceramics were of one technological group, that of a fine, sandy paste with coarse sand-temper and occasional large particle inclusions. Firing produced a buff to red color. Sparse fire-clouding was noticed. The formal range indicates both jar and bowl form. Within the group, four surface treatment varieties were recognized; a summary of which follows.

Ceramic Occurrence by Provenience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Test Pit 4</th>
<th>Test Pit 5</th>
<th>Test Pit 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check Stamp</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Check Stamp</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Stamp</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, rims were characteristically straight with post-stamping, rim decoration accomplished by both horizontal, vertical and rectangular drag-incising as well as single-row "square-cane" punctations.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The area of site 38CL4 was occupied in the Archaic Period, probably by small groups of hunter-gathers exploiting the Riverine based flora and fauna which occurred nearby. Subsequently, during the first millennium A. D., a large agricultural community was situated in the area of site 38CL4. It is probable that the occupation was temporally short and rather intense. In view of cross-areal ceramic comparisons, a tentative date of ca. 500 A. D. may be assigned for this latter occupation.

The Archaic levels of the site seem to have good, intact context, and may prove of interest in the future within the context of Preceramic culture-chronology studies involving the Carolina Lowlands.

The Ceramic occupation also would give significant information regarding formative sedentarism within the province, but context is more disturbed, at least within the area tested.
CONFERENCE ON HISTORIC SITE ARCHAEOLOGY

The Thirteenth Annual Conference on Historic Site Archaeology took place in Morgantown, West Virginia on October 12, 1972. This Conference is an official function of the Institute with Stanley South serving as founder and permanent chairman. As has been true in each of the twelve preceding years, the Conference was held in conjunction with (the day preceding) the Southeastern Archaeological Conference. Representing the Institute and the University of South Carolina at the Conference were Stanley South, John Combes, Richard Carrillo, Richard Polhemus, and Gordon Brown.


The Conference, as usual, was well attended and the local arrangements made it a very pleasant meeting. The papers presented at this Conference will be published before next year's Conference as Volume 7 of the "Papers of the Conference on Historic Site Archaeology". Volumes 4, 5, and 6 of these "Papers" are still available at $6.00 per volume, though Volume IV is in limited supply. They can be purchased from the Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C. 29208. There is also an Index of all six volumes available at $1.00 per copy.

The 1973 meeting of the Conference on Historic Site Archaeology will be held in conjunction with the Southeastern Archaeological Conference in Memphis, Tennessee on October 4th. We look forward to going way out west to Memphis.
A BRIEF TEST OF THE JOHN ECK SITE (38GN17)

by George Teague

Bob Williams and I spent April 4, 1972 in Greenwood County near the town of Greenwood testing site 38GN17, which was previously recorded by Dr. Robert L. Stephenson. This site was originally brought to the attention of Dr. Stephenson by Mr. John Eck of Greenville and is located on the property of the Greenwood Mills. Appreciation is expressed to both Mr. Eck and the Greenwood Mills for their cooperation and help. We first walked the area of the site as shown on the Bradley Quadrangle, USGS map. Literally thousands of lithic items were observed within a 10 acre cleared area. Scores of artifacts have been collected from the surface of this site.

Stratigraphic sample holes were put in Dr. Stephenson's areas 1, 2, 3 and 4. Area 2 gave the greatest promise of in situ cultural materials. Area 2 is the southern-most nose of the cleared area and extends into the creek bottom. Test Pit 1, which was two meters by one-half meter in area, was aligned north-south one hundred meters west of Hard Labor Creek within the creek bottom province. The pit was taken to a depth of 40 cm overall and to a depth of 60 cm in its southern half.

Four stratigraphic zones were found. Unit 1, which extended 10 cm below the surface, was composed of dark brown silty loam. Unit 2 extended from 10 cm to 25 cm below the surface. This unit is of a mottled poorly consolidated red clay and yellow sand. Unit 3 extended from about 25 cm to 50 cm below the surface. The contact between Units 2 and 3 is not clear, but Unit 3 is more consolidated with less free sand. Unit 4 extended from 50 cm to more than 60 cm below the surface. This unit is a hard, well consolidated, red-yellow chemical weathering zone containing some unaltered parent rock.

Within Unit 1 were found four quartzite secondary flakes, one core fragment of quartzite, and one sand-tempered, plain ceramic sherd. At the contact of Unit 1 and Unit 2 were recorded three primary flakes, three secondary flakes, one triangular, pressure retouched projectile point, and five sand-tempered ceramic sherds. Within Unit 2 were found one slate primary flake, five quartzite secondary flakes, one core fragment, two sand-tempered, plain ceramic sherds, one biface blank, one Morrow Mountain projectile point fragment, and one Gilford projectile point fragment.

The upland three-fourths of the site has been subjected to severe erosion. Examination of the hasty stratigraphic cuts in this area suggests that all of the upland (knoll) terrain is an exposed, pre-terminal Pleistocene soil B-zone and does not contain in situ cultural material. As for the creek bottom area, interpretation is based on the stratigraphy of Test Pit 1. Unit 1 is a very recent (less than 200 years old) forest A-soil with a structural character suggestive of farming or other cultivation activities. Unit 2-3 is not a typical B-soil development, but rather appears to be the result of sheet wash probably initiated in pre-Holocene
times and continuing until recently. This is suggested by the presence of many non-rounded pebbles of gneissic material as well as by the mot­tled character of the upper boundary of this soil. The lower boundary contact with Unit 4 is rather abrupt, and Unit 4 itself appears to be basal for the formation.

It is my opinion that excavation at site 38GN17 would not be profit­table due to the difficulty in separating occupation levels in the creek bottom area and due to the eroded character of the knolls. I would like to add the usual disclaimer that a few test pits are hardly indicative of an entire site, and that there may be areas in the creek bottom that have sufficient stratigraphic integrity, but I am not optimistic at the moment. On the other hand, I am impressed with the site's potential in terms of intensive surface collection possibilities due to the small amount of surface collection previously done, the short time that has passed since primary disturbance, and the tremendously large size of the sample. I would suggest the preparation of a sampling design such as those that have been used by Binford (AMER. ANT. 29: 425-441; 1964) and especially by Redman and Watson (AMER. ANT. 35: 279-291; 1970) for the recovery of in­formation from surface collections.

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The Department of Anthropology and Sociology at the University of South Carolina continues to grow and develop. This fall there are twenty­one faculty members and Bachelor's degrees are offered in sociology and in anthropology. A graduate program is offered in sociology but not yet in anthropology. Dr. David L. Hatch, a sociologist is Chairman. There are 14 sociologists and 6 anthropologists on the full time faculty.

William S. Ayres (Ph.D., Tulane '72) teaches archeology and social organization with a special interest in Oceania. George C. Buelow (Ph.D., Oregon '72) teaches ethnology with a special interest in Africa. Morgan D. Maclachlin (Ph.D., Stanford '71) teaches social structure and ethnographic method with a special interest in India. Bruce L. Pearson (Ph.D., Univ. of Cal. Berkeley '72) teaches linguistics with a special interest in North America and Japan. Dr. Pearson serves as section chairman for anthropology. Ted A. Rathbun (Ph.D., Kansas '71) teaches physical anthropology with a special interest in Iran. Donald R. Sutherland (Ph.D., Tulane '71) teaches archeology with a special interest in South America.

A well-rounded undergraduate program is developing in anthropology and discussions are being held regarding a graduate program for the future and the separation into a department of anthropology and a depart­ment of sociology.
At the request of Mr. Janson L. Cox, Chief Historian, South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism, I visited the Lee State Park area on October 12, 1971. Mr. Cox had reported to the Institute that artifacts had been found on the park property and had requested that the Institute conduct an archeological survey of the area. The artifacts were in the custody of Mr. J. F. Watson, of the Parks, Recreation and Tourism Department, who very kindly made the collections available to the Institute and conducted me on an inspection of the areas from which they had been recovered.

Lee State Park is located along the east bank of Lynche's River in Lee County, South Carolina, just east of Bishopville and north of Interstate 20. The western section of the park is in swamp, along Lynche's River. The eastern three fourths is in timbered, rolling uplands with several cleared areas. Six archeological sites were located and surface collections were made.

Site 38LE4

This prehistoric open site is located along the southern boundary of Lee State Park, with some of the site being outside of the Park boundary on land owned by the Pee Dee Veneer Company. The site occurs on a slight elevation and is bounded on the west by a swamp of the Lynches River. Construction of Interstate 20 endangers at least a part of this site.

A 1930's period access or logging road has been cut through the elevated portion of the site to a depth of about eight feet, exposing a stratigraphic section which is characterized by an uppermost unit of a few inches of grey sandy loam underlain by at least eight feet of unconsolidated white sand. Artifacts occur generally on the roadbed as well as upon the reposing sand embankments and the surrounding ground surface. The matrix is reasonably stable at the moment, stability being aided by deciduous growth on the top of the northern embankment.

Artifacts collected were one ground stone celt fragment, one archaic end scraper, one primary flake, three secondary flakes and nine coarse grit-tempered ceramic sherds. These Early Woodland sherds include one bold check-stamped, one simple-stamped, two cord-marked, three fabric-impressed, and two plain sherds. Additionally, the PRT collection from this site contains a number of ceramic sherds similar to those described above as well as one core fragment, two unidentified bifaces, one Morrow Mountain type projectile point, one Kirk serrated projectile point, and one broken, drilled and polished stone object. This last artifact is of the class that has been categorized elsewhere as atlatl weights.
There appear to have been at least two, and probably three, occupations of this site in the Archaic period and at least one occupation in the Woodland period.

**Site 38LE5**

In the central portion of the park there have been recent minor earth removal activities which have exposed a small campsite. Occasional artifacts have been found generally upon the surrounding surface. Erosion and/or slow deposition is indicated here, as it is in succeeding sites in this series. A thin layer of white sand overlies a red clay at this site but deeper sand-hills occur in the immediate vicinity. Vegetation consists of scrubby low woods as well as some 35-40 year old pines.

No cultural material was collected, but several flakes and four coarse tempered plain ceramic sherds from the PRT collection place the occupation sometime in the Woodland period.

**Site 38LE6**

A similar site is found in the northeast section of the park. A definite site area is difficult to define here, with artifacts being found generally within a plowed fire lane. Also, artifacts occasionally are found in other open spaces of this flat sandy terrain.

No artifacts were collected, but two flakes and two plain sherds from the PRT collection again allow a temporal placement sometime in the Woodland period.

**Site 38LE7**

Another open prehistoric site is found in the center of the park. A sandy open but weed grown area is seen within the scrubby deciduous growth because of recent plowing.

One quartzite flake and four gritty, sand-tempered sherds were collected. Two of these sherds are plain while two bear fabric-impressed designs. Five additional and similar sherds as well as two check-stamped sherds are known from the PRT collection. This assemblage may be assigned to an early or middle Woodland period.

**Site 38LE8**

In the eastern section of the park is a recently cleared area within tall pines. This area, near the Park Superintendent's house, has produced two plain- and one fabric-impressed sherds (PRT collection). One sherd of coarse-tempered check-stamped pottery was collected during my visit. A middle Woodland period date is suggested for this site.
Site 38LE9

At the northeast boundary of the park, and into the area adjacent, is a low sand bluff covered with low scrubby growth. To the northeast of this is an extensive area of recent cultivation. Within this area have been recovered several flakes, four plain sherds, and one check-stamped sherd (PRT collection). Also, I collected three sherds of plain ware and one check-stamped sherd.

An early or middle Woodland time period is recognized here.

SUMMARY

Within the present-day bounds of Lee State Park, South Carolina, there have been at least five periods of prehistoric occupation. These occupations began no later than 6,000 B.C. and terminated no later than 1,000 A.D.

A plan for archeological development of this area would include additional reconnaissance, particularly along the swamp edges and within the Lynches River bottom itself, where practicable.

From among the sites known at present, 38LE4 would probably be the most profitable for testing operations and areal sequence building because of the suspected depth of stratified deposits as well as the belief that several overlapping occupations occurred at this site.

SCOTT'S LAKE SITE (38CR1) EXCAVATION

On September 5th, Dr. Leland Ferguson and a crew of ten completed the first season of 13 weeks excavation on the Scott's Lake Site (38CR1) in Clarendon County. This is the archeological designation of the site known popularly as the Santee Indian Mound and Fort Watson. The name was changed to Scott's Lake to refer to the whole site and avoid confusion with an historic fort on the site and with an historic Indian tribe that had nothing to do with the site. Scott's Lake was the oxbow lake that lay at the edge of the site before the present Lake Marion covered it.

Dr. Ferguson's 1972 excavations, the first of a projected series of 4-5 seasons, was primarily exploratory. He investigated the Revolutionary War fort atop the Indian mound and some of the embattlements around the mound as well as some of the evidence of the Indian occupation of Mississippian times.
The 29th Southeastern Archeological Conference was held in Morgantown, West Virginia on October 13-14, 1972 in conjunction with the 13th Annual Conference on Historic Site Archeology. These meetings were ably hosted by Miss Bettye Broyles of the West Virginia Geological Survey and were held at the Holiday Inn. Bettye is certainly to be congratulated on the fine job she did in arranging the meetings and the Survey deserves credit for its able assistance.

The University of South Carolina was represented by eight members of the Institute staff. These were: Gordon Brown, Richard Carrillo, John Combes, Richard Kimmel, Jim Michie, Richard Polhemus, Maryjane Rhett, and Stanley South.

A new approach was used this year in scheduling the program. There were concurrent sessions each of the two days. Concurrent sessions have their drawbacks but when there is so much participation there seems to be no other way. Highlight of the meeting was a two-day program on "Fort Ancient" chaired by Dr. James B. Griffin and arranged by Dr. Bill Haag. The other program was a two-day series of contributed papers.

We all look forward to the 30th Southeastern Archeological Conference that will be held October 5 and 6, 1973 at Memphis, Tennessee with Dr. Charles McNutt as the host.