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Divers are concerned about increased restrictions on collecting imposed by the new legislation, especially quantity limits. Surely archaeologists would rather have artifacts and fossils recovered from the rivers and the ocean. Aren't we doing your job for you?

No, you are not doing our job. To obtain the maximum amount of scientific information from an artifact or fossil it is important not only to "recover" it, but to map its location accurately and to conduct a historical and archaeological survey of the local area to see what other documents, artifacts or structures can supplement the "story" a find tells. When hobby divers report artifacts this provides part of the story. We (archaeologists) try to work out the rest of it by comparing the report with other hobby reports from the area and our background knowledge of the area's history and archaeology. This is why we have a licensing and reporting program which provides a means for us to try to work together. Divers are allowed to keep their finds, and archaeologists get the information from hobby reports.

Since the public hearings, we have deleted the quantity and weight restrictions for finds - except on shipwrecks (ten a day). These are the reasons for putting them in originally: Judging from hobby reports, most sport divers do not collect more than ten artifacts a day. Remember this is a license for recreational activity. Our experience with the program is that divers who collect vast quantities of artifacts or fossils are often abusing the intent of the program, turning this into a full-time business activity while rapidly depleting areas for recreational activities for other divers. Secondly, artifacts and fossils are a finite, non-renewable resource. We feel that we should leave something behind for future generations of sport divers and scientists. Maybe in a hundred years time archaeologists will have the technology or knowledge to derive more information from artifacts or sites than archaeologists today.

Are we currently allowed to sell our finds under a hobby license?

If you have reported all your fossils and artifacts to the Institute and not heard from us within sixty days, all finds belong to you. You can do whatever you want with them, including sell them. However, the intent of hobby diving is recreational not commercial. Collecting antiquities should not be a regular means to earn or supplement your income. These are more blatant examples of how a hobby license can be misused for commercial intent: A diver who goes diving almost every day to
Pipes - Emory Vaughn: Emory recovered two pipes from the Lewisfield Plantation area and sent a photograph of these finds to the Institute to be identified.

Answer: The smaller pipe bowl in the background dates from around 1720 to 1820. The sturdier bowl in foreground dates from around 1640 to 1700. Kaolin pipes like these are valuable clues to the date of a site. Pipes were manufactured, imported, smoked and thrown away often within a year or two. A good information reference for pipes is Ivor-Noel Hume's A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America.

Lewisfield Plantation is located at the upper end of the west branch of the Cooper River. This part of the river was used extensively as a transportation route for shipping commerce related to the rice culture in the 1600's, Revolutionary War activities in the 1700's, cotton in the late 1700's and for a variety of raw products and staples travelling back and forth to coastal ports like Charleston. Lewisfield Plantation was originally a tract on the Fairlawn Barony granted to Sir John Colleton in 1678. Baronies, a relic of the English feudal system, were subdivisions of land consisting of 12,000 acres. Plantation activities included cultivation of rice and subsistence crops such as corn and sweet potatoes. The small bay facing the Cooper River would have been used for loading shipments of agricultural products bound for Charleston.

Revolutionary activity in the vicinity of the plantation is also represented by a period shipwreck located by sport divers and excavated by SCIAA in 1986, 1988, and 1989. A report on the results of the project will be available later this year according to Christopher Amer. Our knowledge of plantation life and commerce on the rivers is also complemented by the reports and photographs of artifacts like these two pipes. Everyday use artifacts tell us more about the people who lived at the plantations and travelled the riverine highways of the state.

Stoneware jug and wine bottle - Shannon Mills: Excellent photographs of a stoneware jug and a wine bottle found near Moncks Corner in the Cooper River were received by SCIAA from Shannon Mills. We were very impressed with his use of rulers as scales in the pictures which gave us a good idea of the dimensions of the artifacts. He also included pictures of a fossil tooth which we sent on to Michael Ray at the State Museum.

Answer: The stoneware jug in the photo appears to have an alkaline glaze which creates a shiny greenish surface tint. This type of glaze is specific to Edgefield ware (first manufactured between 1810 and 1900 in the old Edgefield district which included Aiken, Edgefield and Greenwood counties). It became a widely used ceramic type all over South Carolina and later spread to neighboring states such as North Carolina and Georgia. From archaeological information we know it is being found as far west as Texas, but not any further north than North Carolina.

The dark green wine (not black glass!) bottle appears to date to the 1800's judging by the long, slender shape. It also has a fairly deep pontil depression in the base which also suggests that it dates to the early 1800's. The mold seam (difficult to see in this photograph reproduction) running along the length of the bottle from base to neck indicates that it was made using a two-piece mold. This manufacturing process was used from 1800-1899.

Pre-historic pottery and stone tools - Jimmy Moss: Jimmy recovered numerous Native American pot sherds and stone tools in the Cooper River. He also enclosed several good photographs of these finds. We hope to be able to look at his collection this summer and to visit the site with him. The stone tool photographs will be included in the next Goody Bag issue.
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collect antiquities specifically for the purpose of sale, a diver who registers himself/herself as an artifact or fossil selling business, a diver who employs other hobby divers to collect fossils or artifacts for the purposes of financial profit, or a hobby diver who buys finds from other hobby divers on a regular basis. If you want to conduct commercial operations of this kind you need to apply for a salvage license. As soon as divers start large scale depletion of underwater areas we require that a more controlled type of operation is conducted with archaeological standards set by the salvage license.

What do archaeologists do with all the information about our finds? You probably just want to publish research papers and become famous! At least our finds can be displayed for the public in private homes, whereas only divers can view them underwater. Why haven’t we got a maritime or shipwreck museum in South Carolina?

Archaeological information is used not only for archaeological research publications but also to write history books, give public presentations and set up museum exhibits. Artifacts are as important a source of information as historical documents. Surely, The Swamp Fox written by Robert Bass, Richmond Hill Plantation by Jim Michie, and numerous books on the Civil War and naval history by William Still are useful contributions to South Carolina’s history. The Brown’s Ferry vessel recovered and reconstructed by SCIAA will also soon be displayed to the public and provides important information about shipbuilding in South Carolina (guided tours of the vessel in the conservation lab were also offered to divers in the October issue of the Goody Bag). If you want to find out more about the results of our work you might also attend the Annual Archaeological Society of South Carolina Conference each April which specifically caters for the public who are interested in the results of archaeology both on land and underwater. This year in the Underwater session at least two presentations dealt with archaeological work on sites reported by hobby divers.

South Carolina does need a maritime museum. It’s fine to have some mantelpiece mementoes in your home, but museums do have a valuable role. Only your friends and family see the finds that are displayed in your home. What about tourists who want to see South Carolina’s heritage on display, school groups who tour museums or handicapped people who need special facilities? SCIAA is not supposed to be a museum service; we are primarily an educational and research facility. You need to approach personnel in local museums. By the way, we do try to display a few of the hobby diver artifacts loaned to us. We have had small showcases of divers’ finds from the General Sherman, fossils and currently a display of items from the William Lawrence. If you really want a museum, why don’t you get together as a concerned group of citizens and push for one? Until we have a museum, maybe your local dive club or store could get together and make a small museum area to show your finds.

The new law requires that salvage license applicants hire a full-time archaeologist to supervise their work. This is preposterous. This is your job anyway. In fact, you should be paying the salvor to excavate the site for the state. You are just a bunch of dictators and bureaucrats!

Under the current legislation salvors are required to adhere to certain archaeological standards when excavating a site. The problem is that most salvors have difficulties in meeting these standards without some formal training or the equivalent experience. In other words, we (and the general public) are not deriving any useful historical information from many salvage projects. As we also have to work on our own projects - priority sites which we have selected specifically and have obtained research grants to study - we do not always have time to help you on.

Answer: (A) is a pot rim with no surface decoration. This could be colono-ware made by African American slaves rather than native Americans. A distinctive feature of colono-ware is its lack of decoration. Colono-ware dates to the 1700’s and is associated with plantation sites. (B, C) This could be punctate surface treatment, a decorative technique used between 1800BC and 500BC. It was made by making punctuations or indentations with various instruments including sticks, hollow reeds or fingers on the sherd surface. Spacing of punctuation ranges from haphazard to carefully patterned designs. (D) This sherd has fabric impressed surface treatment. An impression of fabric was applied with a fabric wrapped paddle. The pattern varies with the type of fabric used. This decorative technique was used between 100BC and 1200 AD.
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the site that you selected. Of course, we do have the option of saying no salvage at all. Instead, we are giving you conditions for salvaging sites. You are also not restricted to hiring an archaeologist from SCIAA. As long as the monitoring archaeologist meets certain requirements set by SCIAA he/she could be from anywhere in the country or world. What or whether you pay the archaeologist is between you and the person you hire. Our main concern is that we do not want to lose valuable information about South Carolina’s underwater heritage.

What will the division of the artifacts between the state and salvor be in the new law?

This will be the same as the current law - a salvor must receive no less than 50%. With a hobby license you receive 100% if 60 days after you submit a report SCIAA has not contacted you about your finds.

The new law will set limits on the number of artifacts recovered from a shipwreck, prohibit destruction of the vessel’s structural integrity and require a higher standard of reporting for these finds. If I can only visit a particular site twice a year, for example, I want to be able to take as much as I can from the site. Divers will have to provide a map showing where the artifacts were located in relation to the shipwreck. The average diver does not have the training to do this. Will we then be considered criminals?

The proposal that quantity limits be maintained on shipwrecks was supported by a large number of divers at one of the public hearings. Some private dive charters like the Hurricane Dive Center are already realizing the benefit of setting collecting limits on shipwrecks which are located out of state waters like the supposed “Governor.” Once everything has been recovered and the structure of the shipwreck has been torn apart, there will be no much reason to take divers back to the site. In a sense sport divers are already understanding the value of managing their own recreational sites.

We do not expect detailed scale maps of shipwreck sites from hobby divers - just a drawing of the general layout of the site and where you found the artifacts. This means the location of your find in relation to other artifacts or wreckage on the site. We do not expect you to do more than you feel you can adequately manage. So if you feel you simply cannot work out accurately where the artifact came from, you will certainly not be considered a criminal. This information would just be extremely valuable to help us learn more about the shipwreck site.

We have heard that the federal government might soon extend the state’s jurisdiction up to twelve miles offshore. Is this true? This will mean that the most popular shipwreck sites that sport divers visit like the Hebe, General Sherman and Fred W. Day will fall under state law.

Yes, a bill is currently in the federal Senate. It is not supported by South Carolina State underwater archaeologists. We have almost too much to manage within the current three nautical mile limit with our limited budget and staff. We feel that this proposal is unlikely to go into effect. We would rather encourage divers and charter groups who enjoy diving on these offshore sites to take the responsibility of managing these resources themselves. This might be done by trying to persuade other divers not to be destructive on the site. It would also be great if a group of divers could get together by themselves to map these sites and inventory the types of finds that are being recovered. Although we can’t dive on these out-of-state waters sites on a state budget, we would be more than willing to give you advice and ideas if you’re interested.

There were also a number of favorable comments by divers about the new legislation. These pertained mainly to: 1) allowing the use of metal-detectors, magnetometers and other remote sensing equipment without any license; 2) less paperwork as a result of quarterly instead of monthly hobby reports; 3) allowing dive stores to process weekend hobby licenses; and 4) optional underwater archaeology educational programs offered by the state which include the newsletter, fieldschools and literature.

[See Page 8 for bill’s current status]

LAND ARCHAEOLOGY: FACT OR FICTION?

Guest Columnist: Chris Judge

[Ed. Note: Underwater archaeology doesn’t take place in a vacuum (if you’re lucky). Many things occur throughout the entire archaeological community that have a direct bearing on the practice of underwater archaeology. Other things (like the column below) don’t directly affect our field but are interesting for comparison. Although most of the underwater sites in SC are already under state jurisdiction, the majority of land sites are on private property - only sites on state parks are protected. Chris Judge’s column illustrates one way the problem of protecting and preserving important archaeological sites on private land is being dealt with.]

The SC Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology was awarded a grant from the South Carolina Wildlife and Marine Resources Department and the SC Department of Archives and History to conduct a statewide assessment of cultural sites for the SC Heritage Trust. Heritage Trust was established in 1976 to preserve unique natural and cultural areas around South Carolina.

A list of the top 100 archaeological properties is now being prepared following five months of fieldwork. A ranking system has been developed to assess rarity, threat, integrity, research value and educational value of the sites under consideration.

The ultimate goal is to provide the Heritage Trust with a prioritized list of the significant sites for registration purposes and future potential acquisitions by the Trust. Currently three archaeological sites, Nipper Creek, Snee Farm, and Green’s Shell Enclosure, have been acquired for the Heritage Trust.
THE DAY THE JON BOAT WENT UP THE MOUNTAIN
by Carl Naylor

The sun was hot and overbearing. The Wateree River was especially low as a result of a lingering summer drought. The work was exhilarating and exhausting. It was a day like any other day in the world of South-Carolina-style underwater archaeology—except of course for when the jon boat went up the mountain.

We were conducting a survey of the Wateree below Camden near what is known as the Mulberry Site. Located on a high bluff overlooking the river, the site was that of an old Indian village, suspected to be one that Hernando deSoto visited in the year 1540. We had spent several days in the small ravine just below the high bluff, knee deep in the cool waters of Big Pine Tree Creek, oohing and aahing every time someone came up with a large piece of burial urn or other form of Indian pottery. So far we had retrieved, all very scientifically mind you, several hundred pieces of pottery. The small mountain of pot sherds sitting on the make-shift table of our field station was destined to be transported back to SCIAA headquarters in Columbia where it would be separated and sorted, washed and labeled, as well as analyzed and categorized. In other words, they would become a small mountain of pot sherds sitting on the table in the Institute’s wet lab.

This particular day we had decided to do a reconnaissance of the river bottom both up and down stream from the site, ostensibly to determine the extent of artifact scatter resulting from the erosion of the site into the river, and for that we needed the jon boat. This meant trouble from the start. We had brought two engines for the jon boat, and you might figure this was wise planning, however, I remember a conversation that went something like this: “One of the engines doesn’t work too good.” “Which one?” “Dunno, can’t remember.” As it turned out neither engine worked too well. Each performed for a short time before its particular malfunction mysteriously shut it down. This meant yanking it off the stern and replacing it with its partner that had been slumped in the bottom of the boat and running that one until it shut off. And, when neither engine felt like functioning, we pushed and pulled the boat along in the shallow water.

It was almost like taking a break when we would bully the jon boat onto a sand bar and Joe Beauty and I would scoot along the sandy bottom of the deep areas of the river in scuba gear. Chester DePratt and Chris Amer would walk the exposed sand bars, and Chris’s German shepherd Shane would bark at birds and every so often chase cows that had been trying to find shade in the tree line next to the river. When the water was too shallow to allow diving, Joe and I alternated between motoring the boat and changing the engines. By this time we had come up with fond names for the two engines. One was son-of-a-something and the other was mother-something, although which was which I don’t remember and we probably didn’t make any real distinction at the time.

When we came to the I-20 bridge, Joe and I decided to don our scuba gear and dive the deep areas under the bridge. You never know what those darn Indians might have thrown off bridges back in the sixteenth century. Poking around the base of a bridge abutment I came across a rather large stainless steel kitchen knife. I surfaced to find Joe examining a 9mm. semi-automatic pistol he had just found. We began conjuring up all sorts of horrible crimes that could have been committed with the two weapons: stabings and mutilations committed by a person with a kitchen knife, shootings and assassinations committed by a person with a semi-automatic pistol, mass murders committed by a person with a kitchen knife and a semi-automatic pistol. This was all brought back to earth when someone pointed out that natives in 1540 committed very few mass murders, especially with kitchen knives and semi-automatic pistols.

Anyway, after changing engines, pushing and pulling the boat, and envisioning all sorts of horrible murders using a pistol and a kitchen knife, we were exhausted by the time we got back to the site. And we still faced the chore of getting the jon boat and all the equipment, including the two engines, up the steep bluff to our vehicles.

Now, about this bluff. Despite cavorting with a bunch of Spaniards wearing heavy metal armor during the middle of the summer, these Indians were no fools. They had picked this site for their village with great care. More like a small mountain, the top of the bluff stood a good 75 feet above the water and it was nearly straight down. Just getting up it meant pulling ourselves up a rope tied to a tree at the top. Taking equipment to the top meant a leapfrog-type maneuver, where you put the piece of equipment as far up in front of you as you could, then pulling yourself ahead of it with the rope, reach back for the piece of gear and again place it in front of you until you made it to the top. For days we had been hauling gear up and down this way. This included scuba gear, pumps, hose, screens, and all sorts of technical underwater archaeological gear designed to be functional as well as heavy and awkward. The jon boat presented a new problem ... er, challenge.

We attacked this challenge with great vigor. We looked at all the logistics, considered all the circumstances, perused all the possibilities, and studied all the strategies. With knocking off for the day and going to dinner the next item on the agenda, I’d say we took all of five minutes. Then someone suggested putting all the equipment into the jon boat and pulling the jon boat up the bluff using the heavy duty winch on the front of the dive truck? Heads nodded. Tired muscles applauded. Joe went for the winch control.

Once the jon boat was loaded with all the gear, hooked up to the winch cable, and pointed in the right direction, everyone pulled themselves up the rope to the top of the hill. There was either a sense that the idea would work perfectly or that it would be better to be at the top of the bluff in case it didn’t. Joe engaged the winch and slowly the jon boat and its contents crawled up the face of the bluff. Steadily it came, foot by meter, with hardly a groan from the winch motor. Just as the boat was nearing the top of the slope, and we were patting ourselves on the back for having come up with such a great idea, we heard the ominous sound of

Continued on Page 6
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the winch taking a serious strain, and then what sounded like four or five shots from a .22-cal. rifle.

Looking over the edge of the bluff we saw immediately what had happened. When the boat reached just below the top of the slope the angle of the winch cable changed from almost straight up to more sideways toward the winch. Since the jon boat couldn’t change with it, the bow of the boat simply dug into the side of the bluff. The strain popped four or five of the rivets holding the flat bow of the boat to its front platform, pulling the bow out a good bit. Instead of the square bow the boat now had a sizable vee bow.

After hauling the equipment out the boat we finally got it over the edge of the bluff and onto its trailer, although with its newly-configured bow it doesn’t sit quite right on its trailer anymore. We’re often asked about the change in the jon boat, and we usually respond with a version of the “special archaeological modification” story. And that works quite well, too, except for the time when Joe had to go the boat registration place and explain why we now have a 15 ft. jon boat instead of a 14 ft. jon boat.

EDITOR’S NOTE: Joe subsequently turned the pistol over to the State Law Enforcement Division (SLED), and the bow of the jon boat has been put back somewhat to its original state, although the dock Joe collided with looks a little worse for wear. Shane was last seen chasing birds (and Chris) in a Columbia park. Chester DePratter has been spotted walking the halls of the Institute wearing a big button that says, “Hernando Who?” Carl Naylor is known to be hiding out somewhere in Charleston.

--- This report cleared by SCIAA censors ---

CAROLINA WATERCRAFT
by Mark M. Newell

The barge is one of the least glamorous of our local boats - yet is probably the oldest type of European craft to be built here and the most widely used.

The first barges to be used here were almost certainly those adapted for use as ferries. The earliest roads in the Colony were those in the coastal lowlands where rivers had to be crossed every few miles. We have accounts of barge construction for ferries dating back to 1754. I’ll talk about ferry craft in the next column.

Doubtless barges also began to be used to float cargoes on tides from early plantations close to Georgetown and Charleston - but we have yet to see archival evidence of this.

Extensive barge-building probably began during the rise of the tidally irrigated rice plantation. We have accounts of swamp-land being sold for rice cultivation as early as the 1730’s. These were the plantations that relied on networks of canals to both irrigate and travel around the flooded rice fields.

Clearing the swamplands for rice produced huge amounts of lumber - a lot in the form of sizeable cypress trees. These were used to carve the massive “chine-girder” barges that were common to the rice culture. These barges used sides that were carved from a single cypress log. I have seen them 8 inches thick, 3 feet deep - by 40 feet long! A big cypress tree would be split down the middle, hollow carved and pine planks put between the two sides. The finished barge was usually about 14 feet wide. These are among the most massively made craft in local waters. One was found in the Black River by sports divers Ed Dingle and Gene Baker - they found another one in Mingo Creek. Hamp Shuping has found one in the Waccamaw River and there’s yet another one in the Cooper River near Middleburg Plantation. Stuart Pabst is storing one that was found semi-afloat in the Waccamaw that is unique - it is 3 feet wide by about 27 feet long - a floating pencil that may have been used in rice field quarter ditches.

An interesting question about these boats is - who made them? Similar boats in Europe were made 400 years before the colonization of America. Africans imported here as slaves did come from a culture familiar with living on the water and building riverine craft - and of course Native Americans were already hollowing out cypress logs for canoes. Probably all three ethnic influences were involved in the making of these neat craft.

There is a good account of how they were made and launched on page 45 of David Doar’s 1936 rice planting book available at the Charleston Museum.

A lot of barges were made with planks as well. Just as with the chine-girder barges, we see all kinds of variations in the way these barges were built and fastened together. This again makes an interesting area of study since we can tell a lot about the purpose of the barge, the craftsmanship and ability of the builder and the age of the barge from features such as the thickness of the planks to the type of nails that are used.

Plank barges were used for ferries, plantation craft, phosphate carriers and even granite scows for building the Charleston jetties. The earliest plank barge I have documented dates to about 1860 and is at Friendsfield Plantation on the Waccamaw. The latest one studied is a barge used by Santee Cooper to repair eroding dikes on the Cooper River in the 1940’s. There are earlier ones out there but I haven’t recorded them yet.

The basic chine-girder barge is made of few pieces - two chine-logs, bottom planks, inner stringers or keelsons and “header” logs at each end. Plank built barges are more complicated, using side planks supported by interior battens and a “chine keelson.”

If you would like to try your hand at recording barges I will send you a brochure giving step by step instructions.
WATERCRAFT continued

then more keelsons, supporting knees for the ramps and header boards. They usually had two supports in the center of the craft running across it from side to side. Planks were laid across these so that the crew could walk on them and pole the boat along. There is a good picture of this type of barge in Heyward’s book *Seed from Madagascar*.

Since there are so many barges out there - we could really use some help on the preliminary recording of these craft. Billy Judd of Charleston has done a lot in this area - at one time he spent every weekend finding barges on the Edisto River and making measurements of them. As an electrical draftsman, he was able to produce some pretty good drawings of the craft. If you would like to try your hand at this contact me by mail or phone and I will send you a brochure giving step by step instructions on how to measure a barge.

---

CAUSEWAYS AND CRIBBING: NOW YOU CAN GET THERE FROM HERE
by David Beard

Introduction

Much of South Carolina's history, prior to the Civil War, revolved around a plantation economy. In coastal areas, the Lowcountry, rivers and creeks were the major arteries of transportation.

Often the high ground was separated from navigable water by vast expanses of tidal marsh. Canals were generally impractical because of silting and fluctuating water levels. The problem of getting people, produce and supplies to and from the waterways was solved by constructing causeways across the marshes and then constructing fixed piers or wharfs where vessels could tie up. Readily available slave labor made these engineering feats quite economical.

This report seeks to begin the development of a typology for these landing structures based on such variables as age, function, construction materials and techniques, and associated artifacts. This research will hopefully enhance the scope of research designs concerning South Carolina's Lowcountry plantations by adding a long overlooked, but significant cultural resource to the equation.

The Research

Recent work along South Carolina's rivers and creeks has brought to our attention an overlooked aspect of this state's maritime heritage: causeways and landing structures. For years these sites have been popular with divers who are in search of artifacts to collect under South Carolina's Sport Diver licensing program. Much attention has been given to the artifacts collected at these sites, but very little to the structures themselves. The Underwater Archaeology Division of the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology has therefore undertaken a research project which attempts to answer questions about the function of individual causeway and landing sites based upon construction techniques, fill materials used, age, and associated artifacts.

To date we have investigated three examples which represent three different uses: a general-use plantation landing, a brickyard landing, and a shipyard landing. Each exhibits distinct differences in fill materials and associated structures. As of yet, no systematic recovery of artifacts from these sites has been conducted, nor have the structures themselves been studied in any great detail. Other landing sites have been documented as well, but not investigated in the field.

Based on our observations we have been able to formulate some general site characteristics which may be used in developing a causeway/landing typology. These are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Construction Techniques:</em></th>
<th><em>Associated Artifacts:</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Packed Fill</td>
<td>Function-Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packed Fill Around Punchions</td>
<td>General Types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filled Cribbing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Age:</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colonial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antebellum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postbellum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Currently, we have some good indicators which can be used to infer the function of particular causeways and landing structures. The Cedar Grove Plantation causeway appears to have been used for general plantation purposes. The causeway fill is packed and consists mostly of soil, but includes some shell, gravel, and a small amount of brick rubble. The pier/wharf structure at its terminus seems to have been lightly built, consisting of a series of small pilings and finished timbers, possibly representing a fixed pierhead. A possible canal running along the upstream side of the causeway may have been used as a staging area for loaded or empty barges or other vessels.

The Lexington Kiln Site causeways had a specific purpose: a landing for loading bricks from nearby kilns. The causeway fill consists of a considerable amount of brick rubble, possibly indicating that as brick production increased the causeways were enlarged and strengthened by adding wasters from the kilns. The terminus of one causeway consists of rough log cribbing filled with brick rubble. Heavier, finished timbers were apparently used as foundations for this cribbing. Between the two causeways is a canal which, like the one at Cedar Grove Plantation, may have been used to moor brick barges which were already filled or waiting to be filled. Another possibility is that as-yet undiscovered structures may exist within these canals upon which barges could rest at low tide, making loading and unloading less dependent upon the tide. Similar structures have been documented in a tributary of the Delaware River near Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

The Linn's Shipyard causeway may have served a variety of purposes, but its method of construction shows signs of a ship-related activity. The causeway itself consists of a very heavily built, finished-timber cribbing filled almost entirely with ballast stone. This heavy construction may be the result of the availability of materials (heavy timbers used in ship construction and...
CAUSEWAYS continued

ballast stone from vessels under repair) or possibly a conscious effort to make the structure strong enough to withstand the stress of supporting the machines used to careen vessels and in other heavy lifting operations.

As has already been mentioned, some of the causeways may have gone through an evolutionary process as function and/or capacity needs changed. It may be possible through archaeology to trace the evolution of a causeway from small-scale colonial plantation use, through massive antebellum rice or cotton agriculture, to postbellum phosphate mining. Research possibly a conscious effort to make the possibility through archaeology to trace the stress of supporting the machines used to structure strong enough to withstand the direct impact. The causeways at both Cedar Grove Plantation and Lexington Kiln Site have been physically altered by development since they offer access to deep water without the need for constructing a boardwalk across the marshes. While this minimizes the environmental impact to the marsh, it does adversely affect the causeways themselves. Archdale Plantation has also been transformed into a residential development, but so far the landing area has not been impacted. Linn’s Shipyard is located on state property and is therefore not threatened by development in the near future.

Our future plans include a survey of archival maps to locate causeway/landing sites, comparison of these with modern topographic maps and aerial photographs, and physical inspection and documentation of any remaining structures. Perhaps a pattern of easily identifiable attributes will arise from this research, so that when previously undocumented examples are encountered in the field, a more accurate assessment of site age and function may be possible.

---

BILL S509 IN SUB-COMMITTEE
by Christopher Amer

Bill S-509 is currently in a sub-committee, chaired by Senator Passailagine, of the General Committee. The sub-committee has scheduled a hearing on the bill in order to give members of the interested public a final chance to turn up and voice their support or concerns for the bill. The bill is on the Senate calendar and will be considered shortly after this meeting so this is your last chance to be heard.

The hearing will be held on Wednesday May 8, 1991 at 3:00 pm in room 209 of the Gressette Senate Office Building, Columbia, South Carolina.

Lynn Harris, Steve Smith, and I want to thank all of you who contributed your thoughts and concerns about the bill, whether it be at one of our public meetings or by phone, mail, or in person. We looked at your suggestions and concerns and incorporated most of them into the amendments to S509 which were sent to all South Carolina dive shops last month. Three specific issues stood out above all others: 1) daily limits on artifact and fossil collection, 2) fees, and 3) the state’s jurisdiction.

1) Limits on collection have been dropped from the law (except on shipwrecks, where many of you agreed, limits are appropriate).

2) The new fees are now shown in the text of the proposed bill (several of you felt the fees were too low and you would be willing to pay more for a Hobby License).

3) The state retains its jurisdiction at mean low water, as in the current act.

Another issue was brought up at the meetings by some divers (and non-divers), many of whom do not apply for licenses and/or do not dive in South Carolina waters. This issue was whether the state can own the bottomlands within its territorial waters, or whether a citizen has a right to do as one pleases on state lands. By law (notonly the Underwater Antiquities Act), the state does own its bottomlands. By various laws, permits, and regulations, citizens are granted the right to perform certain activities on those lands owned by the state for the public good. Debate of these issues is largely philosophical in nature and cannot be addressed in our law.

For those of you unfamiliar with Bill
S509, it essentially amends South Carolina’s Underwater Antiquities Act of 1982 by incorporating regulations that provide for the following:

- More public input in the exclusive license (ie. salvage or search license) application process by way of public hearings on exclusive license applications. These have already started informally.
- A wider range of diving and recreational activities on archaeological and paleontological sites without a license than in the present law (eg. use of metal detectors and remote sensing equipment without a license).
- An education program to be provided by the state to train divers in archaeological theory and methods. This is currently in place and very well received by many of you.
- Protection of grave sites and human remains found in archaeological sites underwater.
- Assurance that site excavation, whether for scientific or commercial interests, will be completed to archaeologically professional standards.
- Special protection for shipwrecks. Limits collection of artifacts on shipwrecks to ten items per day and prohibits destruction of the wreck’s structural integrity by removing timbers, fastenings or fittings.
- Increased license fees for administration of the act. The present fees have not changed in fifteen years, but administration costs have. The division also provides licensed divers with many more services than before (eg. newsletter, site visits, handouts on identification of your finds, workshops and conferences, consulting on finds and conservation, and partial subsidy of the annual fieldschool, video, and manual). These services were requested by the hobby divers. (See table below for proposed fees.)

We also appreciate the effort that many of you took to write letters of support for the bill. The senators really do read them and they make a difference. Turn out on May 8th (with a prepared statement) and support S-509.

### PROPOSED FEE SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LICENSE</th>
<th>IN STATE</th>
<th>OUT OF STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hobby License - 6-month</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobby License - 2-year</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional License (1-year)</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional weekend license (issued by dive stores or clubs)</td>
<td>5.00 (a portion goes to the store or club)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey License (3-month)</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Recovery Lic. (up to 1-year)</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>1000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMER FIELD PROJECTS AND SOCIAL ACTIVITIES

**HOBBY DIVERS WELCOME!**

April: *SS Lawrence* artifacts on display at SCIAA.
May: *SS Robert Martin* artifacts on display at SCIAA.
May 11: Waccamaw-Richland Hill Area Waterfront Project. Mapping barge sites and conducting search and survey operations. Contact Lynn Harris at SCIAA or Hampton Shuping at (w)248-3717 or (h) 248-3717.
May 25: Waccamaw-Richland Hill Area Waterfront Project.
May 28-31: Second Underwater Archaeology Fieldschool.
June: Underwater Division excavation of a wooden who are especially interested in learning about ship construction and shipwreck excavation techniques on land of volunteers can be accommodated on this project. Contact Lynn Harris or David Beard at 881-8536.
June 8: Waccamaw-Richmond Hill Area Waterfront Project. 
June 22: Waccamaw-Richmond Hill Area Waterfront Project.
July 20: Waccamaw-Richmond Hill Area Waterfront Project.
August 3: Waccamaw-Richmond Hill Area Waterfront Project.
August 17: Waccamaw-Richmond Hill Area Waterfront Project.
August 31: Waccamaw-Richmond Hill Area Waterfront Project.
September 28: SC Archaeology Society Fall Field Day and Evening Barbecue. Contact Nena Powell at SCIAA.
September 29: Waccamaw-Richmond Hill Area Waterfront Project.
October 13: Waccamaw-Richmond Hill Area Waterfront Project.

*THE ABOVE ARE DATES FOR PLANNED EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES MAY ARISE DURING THE EVENTS IN FUTURE GOODY BAG ISSUES.*

Advanced divers with low visibility river diving experience. sailboat embedded in marsh bank of Ashley River. Divers are encouraged to participate. Only a limited number of volunteers can be accommodated on this project. Contact Lynn Harris or David Beard at 881-8536. 

**NITE SUMMER PROJECTS. OTHER SMALL PROJECTS. DIVERS WILL BE NOTIFIED OF THESE**
SPORT DIVER PROGRAM MOVES

Lynn Harris will be moving to Charleston in mid-May. The Sport Diver Archaeology Management Program will be located in our office on the NS Savannah at Patriots Point. The address is: SCIAA Underwater Archaeology Field Office, 40 Patriots Point Rd., Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464. Phone: (803) 881-8536. Hobby Diver license applications and renewals will continue to be processed through the Columbia office, but quarterly reports and all other Sport Diver activities will be based in Patriots Point. Sport Divers are also encouraged to come and visit our field office: just ask the Patriots Point gate official to phone through to us and you won't even have to buy a ticket!

Public Hearing on Bill S509: Wednesday, May 8, 1991 at 3:00pm in Rm. 209, Gressette Senate Office Bldg., Columbia, SC (see page 8)