8-2011

Legacy - August 2011

South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology--University of South Carolina

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/leg

Part of the Anthropology Commons

Recommended Citation
University of South Carolina, “South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology - Legacy, August 2011”.
http://scholarcommons.sc.edu/leg/39/

This Newsletter is brought to you by the Archaeology and Anthropology, South Carolina Institute of at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in SCIAA Newsletter - Legacy & PastWatch by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact dillarda@mailbox.sc.edu.
The New Renovated SCIAA Research Library

By Nena Powell Rice and Keely Lewis

The core of the SCIAA Research Library, about 11,000 volumes, was the personal library of past Director Dr. Robert L. Stephenson, who donated his library to SCIAA at the time of his retirement in 1984. Albert Goodyear and Nena Rice immediately began a fundraising campaign to establish the R.L. Stephenson Research Library Endowment. When we reached $45,000, we began spending the interest to fund a student to work 20 hours per week in its maintenance. The staff of the Institute is very proud of this library, and we suspect that it may in fact be the largest archaeological library in South Carolina. 2010 and 2011 have been banner years for the SCIAA Research Library. For the past year and a half, Keely Lewis has diligently entered the entire collection of books, manuscripts, and journals into an Excel spreadsheet totaling 26,000+ holdings in this very unique non-circulating research library.

We have recently obtained $25,000 to completely restore the three rooms in which the research library is housed. Since May 31, 2011, the entire library collection was moved out of the rooms, and the walls and flooring were completely restored. New shelves were installed, and then all books, manuscripts, and journals were placed on the new shelves. The new design has left us with at least five years of expansion space. We want to thank Susan Davis who worked so hard in the arrangements of the restoration. We welcome students and the general public to come and use it (by appointment only). Anyone is welcome to come by and see the transformation. It is truly remarkable.

If anyone is interested in contributing to the Robert L. Stephenson Endowment Fund, please contact Nena Powell Rice at (803) 576-6573 (Office) or nrice@sc.edu.
Director’s Note

By Charles Cobb
SCIAA Director

The date of July 1, 2011, represented some permanent and temporary changes here, as my colleague Dr. Steven D. Smith assumed the formal position of Associate Director of SCIAA. Also, effective the same date, Steve became an interim Director of SCIAA for one year while I became interim Chair at the Department of Anthropology for the same duration. These transitions were spurred in part by the departure of Professor Ann Kingsolver from the University of South Carolina—where she has served as a terrific Chair of our anthropology department—to the University of Kentucky (we’ll seek our revenge on that university in the time-honored way: on the football field). Ann’s acceptance of her new position occurred relatively late in the school academic year, so Dean Mary Anne Fitzpatrick asked me to hold the proverbial fort in anthropology until the department can make other arrangements.

As regular readers of Legacy know, Steve is the long-term head of the Applied Research Division in SCIAA and is thoroughly immersed in the archaeology of South Carolina. Having him as Associate Director will be a great boost to our profile in historical archaeology, which is his long-term specialty. Steve has a particularly strong background in military history and conflict studies. As he described in the last issue of Legacy, his dissertation addressed the partisan community that led to the conflict studies. As he described in the last issue of Legacy, his dissertation addressed the partisan community that led to the Revolutionary War successes of General Francis Marion (the “Swamp Fox”). One of his (many) current research projects involves reconstructing the landscape of General William Tecumseh Sherman’s campaign in South Carolina, funded by a National Park Service American Battlefield Protection Program grant.

The field of anthropology has a long history of examining the causes and consequences of conflict. In fact, one of the founding members of the University of South Carolina’s department of anthropology, Harry Turney-High, published a foundational book on the topic in 1953, entitled, Primitive War: Its Practices and Concepts. Anthropology’s particular contribution to the study of warfare has been to emphasize the social milieu of conflict, rather than focus on the historical specifics of battles, campaigns, or individuals.

Archaeology in many respects has been able to straddle both the anthropological and historical dimensions of various kinds of hostilities. For example, archaeologists have been able to clarify the breakdown of General Custer’s forces during the Battle of the Little Bighorn by tracking cartridge casings across the battlefield. When a rifle ejects a cartridge it leaves unique markings, much like a fingerprint. By systematically recovering cartridges with a metal detector at Little Bighorn and plotting their locations, researchers were able to describe the movement of specific persons and document how the cohesion of certain units within the famed 7th Cavalry broke down.

While the work on Custer’s Last Stand is an example of the contributions of archaeology to historical research, Steve Smith’s work on Francis Marion is a perfect example of how archaeology can provide a larger picture on conflict in the past. Steve
was successfully able to discover several of Marion’s key encampments and discern how they supported his unique style of quick-strike tactics. But just as fascinating, Steve’s dissertation evaluates how Marion’s success relied on a flexible strategy of community networking for logistical support, related to longstanding ties of family, church, and business that preceded the Revolutionary War. In Steve’s perspective, Francis Marion developed many of the fundamental elements of what we now think of as partisan warfare.

Steve’s new position as Associate Director will allow him to devote more time toward developing his balanced perspective on conflict within our Military Sites Archaeological Research Program, which he oversees. A number of scholars at SCIAA are deeply versed in conflict and military archaeology, and we are excited that Steve’s expertise will provide further synergy in that direction.

I should add that Audrey Dawson will assume oversight of the Applied Research Division, after serving as co-Director for a number of years. Audrey also has extensive experience in South Carolina archaeology, although with a prehistoric emphasis. She is currently conducting her dissertation research, which is related to a very significant Archaic site located on Fort Jackson. We are equally pleased to welcome Audrey to her new position at SCIAA.

Aside from these shifts, I still will be haunting the hallways at SCIAA until my return. As described in the last Legacy, I am involved with a Save America’s Treasures grant to re-analyze the slave quarter assemblages from the Yaughan and Curriboo plantations. And, as reported in this issue, Chester DePratter, Chris Gillam, and myself are in the midst of analyses based on our third season of National Science Foundation supported research on Native American towns in the Savannah drainage. So Steve will be reporting from the Director’s chair in the next few issues of Legacy, but I look forward to providing updates on other facets of SCIAA research.

I’m certainly excited about this new gig as SCIAA Associate Director and thank Charlie and the Dean for the opportunity. I recognize that this opportunity also carries new responsibilities (or are those headaches), and having sat in Charlie’s chair for the last month, I now see why, every once in a while, he locked his door.

As I now sit in the infamous corner office, I see—besides the ghost files of former directors—many boxes containing 20 years of ‘applied’ work locked up in ‘grey literature’ that needs to be synthesized and made available to a wider academic and public audience. This will be my foremost research goal over the next couple of years. I hope to be able to turn out journal articles and books from this backlog of data. I see another opportunity as Associate Director to develop the Military Sites Program into a broader program in Conflict Archaeology involving USC students and outside researchers. As this current issue of Legacy indicates, a lot of SCIAA researchers are already engaged in Conflict Archaeology including my old colleague Jim Legg (Hanging Rock), Chester DePratter (Columbia Civil War Prison Camps), Jim Spirek (Charleston Harbor Wrecks), and Chris Amer and Jon Leader (Pee Dee Cannons). Two new National Park Service Grants will bring in Audrey Dawson (to assist on Sherman’s March), and Charlie Cobb (Chickasaw Mississippi) who is already recognized nationally in conflict studies. So in essence, there already is a Conflict Archaeology Program. What it needs to become a viable program is a sustained coordination of research effort and stronger academic integration actively involving students through thesis and dissertation research. I see Conflict Archaeology as taking a broader perspective than ‘battlefield archaeology.’ Hopefully, a Conflict Archaeology Program would provide knowledge useful in resolving 21st century global conflicts. (But don’t let that fool you, personally, I’m just stoked at the idea of spending a few fall afternoons metal detecting at Camden with Jim and some volunteers.)

I will say more about the program in the future, but with Charlie’s enthusiastic introduction, I would be wise to be brief. Just a few more thoughts; some people may be wondering with this leadership change if there are any major changes on the horizon at SCIAA. The short answer is that we hope for a lot of change, but not because I am holding down Fort SCIAA for the year. Charlie and I are on the same page as to SCIAA goals, so anything...
The Battle of Hanging Rock was fought on August 6, 1780, near the present Kershaw-Lancaster County line (see sidebar, page 5). It was one of the largest battles of the Revolution in South Carolina. Nearly 2,000 participants, most of them Americans on one side of the rebellion or the other, fought to an exhausted standstill after a complex, shifting engagement that lasted some three hours and exacted heavy casualties on both sides. While the battle took its name from the unusual outcrop called Hanging Rock, the fighting was not in the immediate vicinity of that landmark. Exactly where it did take place has been something of a mystery, thanks to the difficulty of imposing vague and contradictory 18th century accounts onto the modern landscape.

For nearly 30 years, Columbia businessman and Revolutionary War researcher, John Allison, has been interested in the Hanging Rock problem. He has conducted what is probably definitive historical research on the subject, but the history alone was not adequate to locate and interpret the battlefield. With the cooperation of nearly all of the landowners in the vicinity, Allison conducted metal detector surveys over an area of several hundred acres, finding and mapping physical evidence for the Battle of Hanging Rock. This artifact evidence, mostly fired and unfired musket balls and rifle balls, appears to define at least two of the three major components of the battlefield as understood from the historical record.

John Allison is far from being the first non-professional to pursue what is essentially an archaeological question through metal detecting. Even non-research oriented detectorists can become intensely interested in understanding the sites that they collect from, and they are sometimes quite successful in figuring things out for themselves. Unfortunately, that is typically as far as they take the process. Their methods remain unsystematic, their data (if any) is informal, and their artifact collections are ill-provenanced, at best. There is almost never a publication or an archived record resulting from these endeavors, and as a whole they constitute a huge loss of irreplaceable information. John Allison’s work on the Hanging Rock battlefield will have a much more useful and durable outcome.

In September, 2010, John convinced me that he was on the right track, and we agreed that it was time to bring his Hanging Rock project in from the cold. I applied for an Archaeological Research Trust (ART) grant that would allow me to devote three weeks of my time to the project, with the lofty goal of “advancing the project from the realm of a relatively informal, personal effort to the level of a professional archaeological research project.” More specifically, we proposed three major tasks:

1. Intensive, systematic metal detector survey of the several areas where battle artifacts had already been recovered, in order to “confirm and characterize these areas as battlefield components.”

2. Metal detector reconnaissance across the remainder of the battlefield vicinity, “not only to ensure that no major battlefield components are missed, but also to provide negative evidence—a matrix of negative landscape, where little or no battle material is found, is necessary to define
The Battle of Hanging Rock

By James Legg

Immediately after the fall of Charleston to the British in May 1780, the victors began a campaign to subjugate the interior of South Carolina. The task did not appear to be a serious challenge. The only remaining “Rebel” force of any importance was a ragged little army of South Carolina and North Carolina militia, commanded (after June 15th) by Thomas Sumter. This force consisted largely of upcountry riflemen, most of them mounted. They were far too few in number to directly oppose the British occupation. Lord Cornwallis’ strategy for returning South Carolina to the Crown was two-fold. First, he established a chain of fortified posts in the interior, the most important of which were at Augusta, Ninety-Six, and Camden. Secondly, he expected a general popular uprising of loyalist citizens to present themselves for service with a royal militia. These two developments would surely convince any remaining holdouts that their cause was lost, and Cornwallis might turn his attention to reconquering the remainder of the Southern colonies.

The British interior posts were quickly established, but the effort to raise a loyalist militia was poorly organized and supplied, and the turnout was less than overwhelming. More ominously in the summer of 1780, the Rebels became increasingly active and dangerous beyond the frontier of British control. Small posts and patrols of loyalists were variously captured, disarmed, ambushed, and slaughtered. A large uprising of loyalists in southern North Carolina was completely crushed. While there was still clearly no American force that might oppose a British field army, British authority in the backcountry was almost non-existent.

Several smaller, outlying posts supplemented the major British post at Camden. About 20 miles north of Camden, an extensive camp complex was established along the south bank of Hanging Rock Creek, north of the remarkable conglomerate outcrop called Hanging Rock. The garrison there may have totaled as many as 1,300, including loyalist militia and provincial troops—the latter were “semi-regular” British units whose personnel were recruited in the colonies. A small detachment of Royal Artillery was also present. These forces were dispersed among three camps arrayed from west to east (or southeast) on cultivated high ground south of the creek. Contrary to some sources, the positions were apparently not fortified.

On July 30th, Thomas Sumter’s force attacked a smaller, heavily fortified British post at Rocky Mount, about 15 miles west of Hanging Rock. The Americans were repulsed after a severe action. That same day, North Carolinians under William R. Davie, who was serving under Sumter, cut off a loyalist column nearing the Hanging Rock camps. The loyalists were massacred, without quarter, within sight of the camps.

On the morning of August 6th, 1780, Sumter threw his entire force of at least 600 (probably many more) against the post of Hanging Rock. Attacking from the west and north, the Americans surprised and immediately overran the left (western) camp, which was held by several hundred North Carolina loyalists under Col. Samuel Bryan. Bryan’s men fled in disorder, and Sumter’s men turned their attention to the second of the three camps, where the defenders were mostly British provincials. The defenders employed light artillery firing canister, and launched at least two determined infantry counterattacks against the Americans, but Sumter’s riflemen nearly annihilated the musket-wielding British. After a fierce struggle, the second camp was also overrun, and the defenders retreated to the vicinity of the third camp. There they formed a formal infantry square, and awaited their fate.

By this time, however, Sumter’s men were nearly exhausted, and were almost out of ammunition, including what they had captured. Many had left the ranks to loot the enemy camps, and some had made liberal use of captured rum. When a small reinforcement of provincial cavalry arrived from Rocky Mount, the American advance halted, and Sumter’s men began a gradual withdrawal. Casualty figures for the battle vary widely—it suffices to say that losses were serious on both sides.

The attack on Hanging Rock was well planned, savage, and sustained. While it was not a complete American victory, it must have given the British something to contemplate. But for the timing, Hanging Rock might have a more substantial place among the battles of the Southern Campaign. As it was, it was followed on August 16th by the destruction of the new regular American army in the South, at the Battle of Camden. Two days later, Thomas Sumter’s militia army was routed and dispersed at Fishing Creek. Once again, it must have seemed that there was little to interfere with the British reconquest of the South.
the positive areas.”

3. Analysis of new and existing artifact collections, given that “definitive analysis of the artifacts is required before they can be of any interpretive value. Small arms ammunition (lead shot) is particularly useful in a battlefield study, assuming it has undergone informed analysis.”

In spite of this tortured language, I was awarded the grant, and in January, we began field work. We spent a total of about two weeks on the battlefield in January, with an interruption for heavy snow, and we worked additional weekends through the spring. Our final effort was the very hot long weekend of June 12-14. John Allison arranged for an impressive turn-out of volunteers during the January work, including several experienced metal detectorists, and others who assisted me with GPS mapping of artifact locations and search areas. On several days we had crews of six or eight individuals in the field. Throughout the project, some detector operators were given reconnaissance tasks, while others undertook intensive (100%) coverage of formally delineated areas. We logged a total of 209 person-hours of actual detecting, exclusive of other field activities.

We began coverage on a mostly wooded ridge that previous finds suggested was the camp of Col. Bryan’s North Carolina Loyalists. That camp was the first position attacked and overrun by the Americans, with Bryan’s men fleeing in disorder after a brief resistance. Almost immediately, on the crest of the ridge, we encountered a heavy scatter of unfired musket ammunition and several buttons that I believe define Bryan’s camp. Also on the crest, we recovered a number of fired rifle balls that are very probably artifacts of the American attack. This component of the battlefield is more than a mile from the Hanging Rock.

We found a thin scatter of artifacts stretching nearly half a mile from Bryan’s camp to another location in a large plowed field. This scatter included fired lead shot, iron case shot balls and small gun parts, and is very likely evidence for the contested American advance from Bryan’s camp to the central British provincials camp. That camp was also captured after heavy fighting. Unfortunately, the field where the central camp was located has been heavily metal detected for decades, and relatively few artifacts remain. Nevertheless, we found more than enough to confirm the site.

After they were driven from the second of their three camps, the remaining defenders of the Hanging Rock post rallied to form a defensive infantry square for a last stand. Participant accounts suggest that this position was at or near the third of the Hanging Rock camps, but the location is uncertain. By that stage of the battle, Thomas Sumter’s Americans were
exhausted and nearly out of ammunition, and when a small reinforcement of enemy cavalry appeared, the attack on the third position was abandoned. We cannot claim to have located this third and final position. There is a broad, very thin scatter of fired ammunition stretching for hundreds of yards beyond the center camp position, but we found no meaningful concentration. Some areas have been heavily impacted by relic hunting, while others have undergone severe soil erosion. More work is needed on that part of the battlefield.

While an additional round of field work is certainly in order, we have decided to call it a finished season, and to stop and digest what we have so far. Analysis and report preparation are underway. I will report our results in more detail in the next issue of Legacy, together with any plans for a second field season.

Acknowledgements.
Warm thanks to the Archaeological Research Trust (ART) Board for my funding, to the several owners of the Hanging Rock battlefield for access, to our volunteers for much of the field effort, and to John Allison for being persistent and correct.

Fig. 5: Systematic coverage in the center camp. (Photo by James Legg)

Fig. 6: Artifacts from the Hanging Rock battlefield. Top Row (left to right), unfired .50 caliber rifle ball, unfired .60 caliber rifle (?) ball, unfired .69 caliber buck and ball musket load, .75 caliber musket ball; Second Row, fired rifle and musket balls; Third Row, civilian coat button and British musket ramrod pipe; bottom, civilian (rifle?) trigger guard fragment. (Photo by James Legg/Christopher Gillam)
Civil War Prisons
By Chester B. DePratter

With funding provided by the Archaeological Research Trust (ART), in February, 2011, I initiated a search for Camp Sorghum, one of the prisons in the Columbia area where Union officers were held during the Civil War [see Legacy 15(1) for historical background]. James Legg and Kalla DePratter have ably assisted me in research on the prisons.

Although Camp Sorghum was in operation only 150 years ago, its exact location is not currently known. There have been at least three postulated locations provided by historians, but no archaeology has ever been done to determine precisely which proposed location is correct. There was never a stockade wall built around this “prison,” and there were only dugouts and hastily built log structures inside a surrounding line of guards. After two months of use, Camp Sorghum was abandoned, and it quickly faded from memory.

Our first prospect was at the Riverbanks Zoo Botanical Garden. With the gracious permission of Satch Krantz, zoo Director, Jim Legg and I spent a day metal detecting around the perimeter of the brick wall-enclosed gardens and over the entire knoll on which the gardens sit. During this search, we did not find a single artifact that we could relate to the prison or for that matter an occupation during the mid-19th century. I imagine that Satch breathed a sigh of relief when we had completed our work, and we were forced to move on to another likely target.

Just outside the West Columbia entrance to the zoo is a large grassy knoll beneath a set of power lines. This knoll and an adjacent cemetery are a common area associated with the Saluda Mill development that was one of the Mungo Company developments completed in the past couple of decades. At least one published source placed Camp Sorghum at this location, so it was the second area on which we focused our search. While we were negotiating with the Saluda Mill Homeowner’s Association, I obtained permission to work on a small parcel of land on the north edge of this supposed camp location. Once again, Jim Legg and I spent a day metal detecting and mapping this small tract where we felt that, based on documentary descriptions, the Camp Sorghum hospital might be located. We found a small collection of artifacts that dated to the mid-to late 19th century, including a South Carolina uniform button (Fig. 1) that had been flattened and that was perhaps used as a counter or checker, but we did not find any clear indication of either the prison camp or the adjacent hospital.

We eventually received permission to work on the Saluda Mill community common area, thanks to the good graces of Nina McKaughman and the other members of the homeowner’s association, and we started work there in March 2011. Before we did any work in the vicinity of what was a known cemetery, I spoke to the Lexington County Coroner’s Office, informed them of the limited extent of our work, and made sure we were well within the limits of the law in our search on the property. With that behind us, Jim, Kalla, and I spent parts of two weeks working on this tract. We mapped the entire four acres, metal detected the one-half of the tract that did not have a thick layer of recent fill on top of it, and excavated three trenches to check for the holes that the prisoners dug to live in (Figs. 2, 3, 4). All of this work resulted in recovery of a few iron objects and a handful of lead shot dating to the Revolutionary War era, but nothing that indicted the use of the site as a Civil War prison. The homeowner’s association breathed a sigh of relief, and we moved on to the next prospect.

So just where was Camp Sorghum? At this point, we are not sure of its precise location. About a mile down the Saluda River from the zoo is another location that has been proposed by historians as the camp’s location. Our reading of an extensive collection of period documents suggests to us that the camp is close to the proposed location beneath a series of TV towers, but that it is actually beneath the nearby subdivision. Given the fact that...
we do not have a precise location means that the next step in our search will involve going door-to-door to obtain permission to metal-detect and dig small test holes in the yards of multiple homeowners. We have not begun this part of the search, but we hope to begin later this year.

On another front, the State Mental Health property on Bull Street in Columbia is in the process of being sold after a long series of negotiations. Camp Asylum, where the prisoners were moved to from Camp Sorghum on December 12, 1864, is located on that tract. The developer, Mr. Bob Hughes of Greenville, who bought the property, knows of the importance of Camp Asylum, and we hope to obtain access to that site in the coming months.

Michael Hudson, an independent filmmaker from Beaufort, South Carolina, is documenting our work on the prison camp search. While we were in the field, he recorded all aspects of our search for use in an educational piece that will show the search process as well as larger excavations once we begin that work. Allen Roberson, Director of the Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum in Columbia, has expressed an interest in having an exhibit on Columbia’s Civil War prisons in place in late 2014, and it is likely that some portion of this film will be used as a component of that exhibit.

We have recently assisted Allen Roberson with the purchase of an amazing series of artifacts connected with Camp Sorghum. The collection, consisting of a cat briar root pipe (Fig. 5), an 1865 poster depicting Union prisons in the south including Camps Sorghum and Asylum, and several letters relating to the person who carved the pipe. The pipe, carved by Lt. John Terrell Robeson of the 7th Tennessee Cavalry, has a lizard whose tail is carved as a snake wrapped around the bowl. The carved inscription tells of Lt. Robeson’s capture at Union City, Tennessee, and documents his stay in prisons in Virginia, Georgia, and South Carolina including Camp Sorghum. This collection was purchased with funds from a private donor and is now in the permanent collection of the Confederate Relic Room.

Jim, Kalla, and I will be presenting a paper on the prison camp research at the annual Civil War Symposium hosted by the South Carolina Department of Archives and History. That symposium will be held on November 5, and it is open to the public so please join us if you want to learn more about this prison research.

Research continues on archival sources relating to Columbia’s military prisons, with available documents including numerous diaries, letters, and first-hand accounts. In August 2011, Kalla and I traveled to Gettysburg and Carlisle, Pennsylvania, to look at three new diaries relating to my research. I have been quite surprised and pleased to find so much information pertaining to the prisons and their inhabitants. In the end, this research will result in a very interesting book. I would like to thank the Archaeological Research Trust (ART) Board in funding this initial research.
For the third year in a row, a Maymester field school was held at the colonial era Indian town of Palachacolas. These field schools have been supported in part via funding from the National Science Foundation, and they have been supervised by a group that includes archaeologists from USC Columbia and USC Lancaster. This research is part of a larger project to document the migration of Native peoples to the Savannah River region after the establishment of Charleston by the English in 1670, and to explore the consequences of the resulting trade systems on both colonials and Indians.

Last year our research focused on what historical records suggest was the core of Palachacolas Town, a community of Apalachicola Indians from eastern Alabama who moved to the banks of the Savannah River in South Carolina sometime around 1708. Those excavations revealed an activity area likely associated with one or more households (i.e., lots of glass beads and ceramic fragments), as well as what we believe may be a trench associated with a fortification wall. In 2009, we worked on what we hypothesize was a small habitation contemporary to, and possibly associated with, Palachacolas Town that was about a mile inland from the river. Perhaps this was a family group that splintered off from the main community.

We started our investigations this year with some additional shovel test units at the site of our dig last year at Palachacolas Town. This work revealed additional pit features likely associated with living areas. We may have also discovered part of another fortification line, one that appears to be distinct from the one found last year (Fig. 1). We were joined for one day by our colleague, Dan Elliott, from the Lamar Institute in Georgia, who brought his ground penetrating radar unit (Fig. 2). Much of Palachacolas Town today is overlain by an asphalt parking lot. However, his radar picked up a linear anomaly underneath the asphalt that may be part of the fortification trench that we identified in 2010. One of the exciting implications of his work is that we are now optimistic that some archaeological features may still have survived the construction of the parking lot.

Our core excavations this year were placed about one-half mile south of Palachacolas Town and also near the riverbank. In our shovel test probing and metal detector survey in the larger area around Palachacolas last year, we located a ridge top (Fig. 3) with a number of indigenous ceramics and several pieces of lead shot. The co-occurrence of the two suggested yet another distinct colonial period Native American habitation in the region.
Compared to the last two years, our field school this year was distinguished by an earlier onset of summer temperatures and a lack of natural shade (Fig. 4). Despite the challenging conditions, our field school students and volunteers (Beckee Garris, Charlie Darden, Amy Worthington, Noah Atchley, Rick Fogle, Kalla DePratter) did a remarkable job, excavating over 130 1 x 1 m units in a three-week period (Fig. 5). Despite the large area uncovered on the ridge top, there was a surprising lack of soil features, such as storage pits or house wall post stains, that we associate with Native American occupations.

On the other hand, we did get a great sample of artifacts. Over 1,000 Native American ceramic fragments were recovered, although we only found a handful of contemporary European pieces of pottery. Although Indians rapidly adopted many elements of European technology in this era, the strong persistence of indigenous pottery may speak to a similar persistence in a reliance on Native foods and food preparation vessels. Glass beads were scattered throughout the site, and we believe these were important as clothing ornaments. The discovery of additional lead shot this year may be a reflection of the growing importance of European firearms over bows and arrows.

We also found some hand wrought nails, which may have been adapted to indigenous building styles. However, many European objects were altered to other purposes, and it is possible that our lab analyses will disclose that nails could also have been used for perforating and working softer materials, such as deer hides. We know, for example, that glass fragments from bottles were often re-used as hide scrapers on many Native American settlements. So the issue of re-cycling is an important one in our research. Finally, we continued to find European kaolin clay smoking pipe fragments this year, common on our previous field schools. These are particularly interesting because they demonstrate the fusion of traditions as multiple cultures come together—in this case, tobacco, an American domesticated plant, with European smoking technology. European and Native American alike rapidly adopted the practice of smoking tobacco in these kinds of pipes.

In light of the work in our previous two years, our field school this year emphasizes that Native American towns by the early 1700s had significantly altered their general pattern of spatial organization. Before the arrival of Europeans sizable settlements were typically nucleated or clustered. For reasons not altogether clear, by the mid to late 1600s, Native Americans increasingly lived in highly dispersed towns that could often stretch out over a mile alongside a river. These were not continuous settlements. Instead, they were scattered pockets of communities held together more by a common background or identity, rather than living next to one another.

It is interesting that these new kinds of towns often contained several tribal groups. Due to population losses from warfare, slavery, and Old World diseases, many Indian groups forged new alliances that led to thriving, multi-ethnic communities. The well-known Creek confederacy in the Southeast, for instance, was a broad regional association that contained numerous language groups and peoples. One of the questions we will be addressing in our laboratory analyses is whether there are several ceramic traditions evident from our three seasons of field work, thus indicating that Palachacolas represented this new type of dispersed, culturally plural community.

This issue, and other questions of dynamic culture change during the colonial period in Carolina, will continue to drive our work for many more years to come. This was our last season on
NSF support, but we hope to continue to attract research funds to maintain a long-term study in the region. In addition to our intrepid students, I’d like to thank my comrades-in-arms for our several successful field seasons: Chris Judge, Chester DePratter, Chris Gillam, Kim Wescott, as well as Maggie Needham. The South Carolina Department of Natural Resources has also been an invaluable partner in our efforts, and a special thanks goes to DNR archaeologist Sean Taylor for his support, and to the staff at the DNR Webb Wildlife Center for being such gracious and welcoming hosts.

Fig. 5: Kalla DePratter and Noah Atchley wishing they were digging in sand somewhere else, like Hilton Head. (SCIAA photo)

Fig. 6: Beckee Garris, a Catawba Tribal Spiritual Advisor, conducts a blessing ceremony for the field school, which also honors the Native American founders of Palachacolas Town. Beckee was a participant in the field school as a USC Lancaster student. She also is with the staff of the Catawba Indian Nation Tribal Historic Preservation Office. (SCIAA photo)

SCIAA has been awarded two National Park Service American Battlefield Protection Program (ABPP) grants for 2011-2012. This continues a long history of success with this program that began with a GPS study of Civil War batteries in 1999 by Steve Smith and Chris Clement and continues today. In 2010, Jim Spirek was also awarded an ABPP grant to evaluate the protracted naval conflict around Charleston during the Civil War.

This year, Steve Smith received a second year of funding from ABPP for the study of General William T. Sherman’s 1865 campaign through South Carolina during the Civil War. Last year’s funding concentrated on historic research and mapping of Sherman’s route between Savannah, Georgia, and Columbia, South Carolina. The second phase awarded this year will focus on Columbia and the route north to the North Carolina line. Most of the work will concentrate on fieldwork to investigate and map locations of various march activities using GPS and GIS technology. Audrey Dawson will head up much of the fieldwork.

The Institute also received an ABPP grant to evaluate a major military engagement between the Chickasaw Indians and French forces near present-day Tupelo, Mississippi. In 1736, two French armies attempting a pincer movement on the Chickasaw Nation were decisively beaten at the battles of Ackia and Ogoula Tchetoka. These battles are of particular interest to South Carolina because some historians believe that a large Chickasaw immigrant community living along the Savannah River played a key role in providing strategic information as well as weapons to their sister towns in Mississippi. The grant will be used to define the battlefield locations and to collate historical documents related to the conflict. Charles Cobb is the Principal Investigator, and Steve Smith and Chester DePratter are collaborators on the project. We are very pleased that the Chickasaw Nation will be partnering with us. We will be joined by Dr. Brad Lieb, Tribal Archaeologist with the Chickasaw Nation.
Sea Island Secrets: A Journey Through Time

By Chester DePratter

Sea Island Secrets: A Journey Through Time is an hour-long video that documents my research and partnership with Gibbes McDowell in South Carolina’s coastal marshes. The camera follows our search for archaeological sites in the marshes as well as my follow-up excavations. We partner with a pair of geologists to look at the formation of the marshes and hammocks east of St. Helena Island near Beaufort. At the end of the film, there is an interesting fireside discussion about the past and future history of those marshes.

The video premiered at The Beaufort International Film Festival in February, 2011, and it aired on SC ETV on May 5, 2011. Mike Hudson and Gibbes McDowell of Beaufort co-produced the video, and we all hope to work together on other projects, including a documentary on my Civil War prison research.

Copies are available through SC ETV or directly from Michael Hudson for $24.95 at the following address: Archaic Productions, c/o Michael Hudson, 38 Marsh Drive, Beaufort, SC 29907-1324.

Horse Creek Valley…
A Tale Worth the Telling

By Chester DePratter

This video details the history of the Horse Creek valley, which extends from Edgefield County and down through Aiken County to the Savannah River. Al Goodyear speaks on camera about the earliest occupations of the valley, and I have several segments talking about the later Indians who resided along Horse Creek and nearby parts of the Savannah River. Subsequent history details the founding and growth of Hamburg and the development of local industry extending up to the time of the Graniteville train disaster in 2005.

I attended a premiere in Aiken on June 9, 2011, at the Aiken County Historical Museum, and the finished piece was ultimately aired on SC ETV in July 2011. Elliott Levy of the Historical Museum is the Executive Producer with Chris Saxon Koelker and Anthony James Koelker as co-directors and producers. We all appeared on Walter Edgar’s Journal on July 8, 2011, and that hour-long interview is available as a podcast on the SC ETV/Radio webpage. This video will be shown on SCETV on September 22, 2011 at 9:00 PM.
The Hagood Mill Petroglyph Site

By Tommy Charles

Built in 1825 by Benjamin Hagood, Hagood gristmill is the centerpiece of a National Register property owned by Pickens County, South Carolina. The Hagood Mill Historic Site and Folklife Center is managed by the Pickens County Museum, and the mill and several surrounding acres serve as a public park that attracts thousands of visitors annually.

Hagood Mill is located at the head of a small floodplain and adjacent to a boldly flowing creek entering the valley from hills lying to the north. Approximately 75 meters north of the mill, a boulder extends across the creek, creating a small cascade. This boulder extends westward onto land, becoming considerably larger in that direction. Remnants of a road constructed during the 1820’s, the first public road from Pickens, South Carolina, to Rosman, North Carolina, cover the westernmost portion of the rock. This rock contains a number of recently discovered petroglyphs.

In January of 2003, Michael Bramlett, a volunteer with the South Carolina Petroglyph Survey, was passing near Hagood Mill on a rainy day and decided to inspect the rock under those conditions. Although only faintly visible, Mike was able to determine that a number of small human figures were carved into the rock. We followed up on Mike’s discovery by visiting the site at night to inspect the rock with lights. By using lights to skim the rock’s surface, we were able to better define the carvings. Examination of the rock resulted in discovery of several additional petroglyphs that were eroded almost to extinction.

Returning to the site during the day, we removed a small portion of the old roadbed and discovered several additional human figures buried beneath the soil.

In January of 2003, Michael Bramlett, a volunteer with the South Carolina Petroglyph Survey, was passing near Hagood Mill on a rainy day and decided to inspect the rock under those conditions. Although only faintly visible, Mike was able to determine that a number of small human figures were carved into the rock. We followed up on Mike’s discovery by visiting the site at night to inspect the rock with lights. By using lights to skim the rock’s surface, we were able to better define the carvings. Examination of the rock resulted in discovery of several additional petroglyphs that were eroded almost to extinction.

Returning to the site during the day, we removed a small portion of the old roadbed and discovered several additional human figures buried beneath the soil. Encouraged by discovery of these buried petroglyphs, we requested and received permission from the Pickens County Museum to remove the remainder of the roadbed. Prior to excavation, we used a steel rod to probe and determine the rock perimeter and soil depths; we then removed the shallow soils by hand.

A backhoe loaned to us by the City of Pickens was used to remove the thicker and harder packed roadbed and to place a trench around the exposed rock. Loose soil was then shoveled into the trench by hand and the rock washed with a hose to remove the clay residue. After cleaning, the rock was again examined with lights at night. Eight petroglyphs were found beneath the road fill and a total of 31 were discovered on the entire rock.

Eighteen are human figures, predominately male forms. Four of the...
male figures are enclosed in separate "boxes," or structures; all of these were located beneath the old road that covered a portion of the site. None of the human forms on the portion of the rock that was not beneath the road are similarly enclosed. There are nine abstract motifs, a single “deer track,” a cupule and two historic carvings consisting of a name and a set of initials. The name and initials are scratched into the rock, as opposed to all of the other carvings, which are pecked and believed to be prehistoric.

All but one of the buried carvings was in a better state of preservation than those that were exposed. The discovery of the carvings buried under the roadbed indicates that they were there prior to its 1820s construction and supports a probable prehistoric origin for most of the glyphs. The historic period name and initials are on a portion of the rock that was never covered by the road.

A new South Carolina Rock Art Interpretive Center is now in construction and should be completed by December 2011. The center will be a two-room structure built directly over the mill site’s petroglyphs for their permanent protection and display. The center will be located about 200 feet upstream from the old Hagood Mill. One room will house the rock and viewing platform. Artifacts, photographic images, and displays from the 10-year South Carolina Rock Art Survey will occupy the second room. The building exterior will echo the historic mill with lap siding and rock foundation. We also encourage the public to visit Hagood Mill on the third Saturday of each month, register for the numerous field school classes offered each year, and walk the tremendously diverse nature trail.

In South Carolina and the Southeast, the South Carolina Rock Art Center will be a unique experience of Native American art and culture, worthy of academicians and tourists. It will become a significant site for academic field trips, suitable for every third or eighth grade South Carolina history class in the state. The facility will serve to protect and preserve a significant piece of our cultural and archaeological history in a manner that also makes it accessible and easily available to the public.

The Pickens County Museum is operated by the County of Pickens and is recognized by the South Carolina Secretary of State’s Public Charities Division as a Charitable Non-Profit Institution. As such, this contribution to the Museum and Rock Art Center is fully tax-deductible. It is our hope that you will enjoy the opportunities to be made available through this wonderful endeavor as well as the many programs and field school offered through the Hagood Mill Historic Site and Folklife Center and the Pickens County Museum of Art and History.

Part of this article has been taken from a brochure printed by Pickens County. For more information on the South Carolina Rock Art Center, please contact the Pickens County Museum, 307 Johnson Street, Pickens, SC, 29671, (864) 898-5963, http://www.co.pickens.sc.us/CulturalCommission/CurrentEvents.
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700 Greene Street Curation Facility Renovation Underway
By Jonathan Leader

The Institute’s curation facility located at 700 Greene Street is undergoing expansion and renovation. The finished space will almost double the current size and will meet all federal regulations. Completion of the work is projected for 2012. Funding for the project was provided by the South Carolina legislature.

Getting to this point has been a long and difficult undertaking. Space is always a premium at universities and for that matter everywhere else. There are always competing interests and needs for the limited resources necessary. In our case, three to five properties per year had been identified for potential use ever since 1989. The most promising were pursued through university channels and often with the advice of private experts who donated their time and expertise. And, in several instances success seemed assured, but was not. Two instances will suffice to highlight the obstacles that were faced and finally overcome.

The former Gibbes Museum of Art was a very likely candidate for renovation and reuse and was diligently analyzed. Site visits, discussions about best placement of researchers and staff, and architectural plans were drawn up. The building seemed to be very suitable for not only curation, but also the incorporation of all the Institute functions into a single accessible space. This is the Holy Grail for curation facilities the successful melding of operations under a single roof. However, in the final analysis the space was renovated as the new home of the University of South Carolina Police Department. While disappointing for the outlay of time and effort put in, there can be no question that the greater good was served to the university community. This scenario was the most common one encountered throughout the years.

The Catawba Street warehouse illustrates the other set of obstacles faced over the years. This 36,000 square foot over-engineered building with multiple bathrooms, showers, parking, and dedicated storage space seemed ideal. Curation would have tripled and had the added benefit of an installed two-story rack system centrally located covering half the floor. Multiple visits were made, discussions were held, and plans were drawn, and redrawn. Funds were secured for the renovation. Unfortunately, the second environmental engineering study contradicted the first one. The building was located on a “brown” site. The necessary federal and state negotiations were likely to take years with an uncertain end point. Very reluctantly, the building was relinquished. Environmental issues of lesser extent have required the abandonment of a number of otherwise suitable properties over the years.

It became clear that the “holy grail” of curation and the unified placement of all services and staff were to remain out of reach for the foreseeable future. Lowering our sights to address the core issue alone brought us to our current situation.

The space now being renovated includes what have always been our curation facility and the Institute’s storage facility next door. This has required a down sizing of the materials that had accreted from various field operations for the last 20 years or so. Fortunately, most of these materials needed to be cleaned out anyway, and this provided a final impetus to do so. The offices and bathrooms currently in the curation space are also being updated to ensure their safe usage.

Curation is a key and often-undervalued component of all archaeological undertakings. No ethical research can take place without the question of collection stewardship, documentation, protection, preservation, and access being addressed. Unfortunately, curation isn’t sexy. Donors give to fieldwork; newspapers cover the glitz and personalities, but never the nuts and bolts that allow for the others to take place. One would think that having a proper place for the preservation of the materials that ensure the integrity of the work that was undertaken would be a higher priority. However, it is a sad fact that many professional reputations have been based on interpretations of the facts rather than the facts themselves. Reanalysis of
collections has often resulted in a major reversal or shift in the presentation of the information so derived. Preserving collections makes it possible to ensure the factual accuracy and eventual self-correction of the profession.

Another issue that has become increasingly noticeable and has a direct bearing on curation is the problem of poor preparation of materials to be submitted. This is a national problem, not just a state one. However, being a state facility requires that a higher level of collections preparation be adhered to for materials collected in state. Paperwork and reports must match the materials submitted for curation. They cannot simply be dropped off with inadequate documentation as has happened in other states. Collections are designed for use, and as a preserved record of funded undertakings, they must have a clarity and integrity that makes them useful. If not, then they are simply conglomerations of stuff gathering dust on a shelf.

Part of the problem is the insufficient funding of groups undertaking fieldwork. Very few researchers have been trained in the determination of true cost accounting. They tend to weigh the cost of what they know best fairly accurately and that which they don’t very much less so. In the case of curation, the temptation is always to squeeze out that extra week of fieldwork or specialist sample analysis at the expense of the cura­tion budget. This shifts the burden of correction onto collections staff that discover the problems often after the materials are in process and on their doorsteps. This national strategy has been successful in both academia and CRM in that collections staff tend to be very dedicated professionals with an almost compulsive willingness to correct the deficiencies. The monetary cost in collections staff time and resources to correct the problems to the host institution is not small.

Beyond this issue is an infrastructural one. Most curation facilities charge a one-time fee. This means that all the costs of housing, care, protection, loan, and return in perpetuity are supposed to be covered by a one-time payment. To say that current fee structures nationally are inadequate should be obvious. If the true cost of curation were computed on a 20-year definition of “perpetual,” the cost would be in the thousands of dollars. Instead, facilities often engage in an unwise and unsupportable subvention of the costs. In the early days of archaeological curation, the subvention was seen as a necessary evil to provide the growth of the profession. In the current fiscal situation and the arrival of a mature profession being engaged on the applied and academic levels, it will be very necessary to carefully consider the realities and to implement policies that address this problem as fairly as possible. The Institute’s fee schedule has been unchanged for a very long time. It is currently not supportable at this lower level and will need to be addressed at a future time.

Curation at the Institute is embarking on a new era. We will shortly join the select few of institutions that fully meet federal regulations. This is a moment for celebration.
SCIAA Activities

Brunswick Town State Historic Site Visit

By Stanley South

On June 9-12, 2011, I traveled to North Carolina to visit colleagues and give a talk at Brunswick Town based on my recent book, Archaeology at Colonial Brunswick. On Thursday, June 9, I visited the Peace College Field School excavation on the site of Civil War Fort Anderson and talked with the 28 archaeologists excavating there. On Friday, I gave a slide show on my work at Brunswick Town from 1958-1968 to 28 archaeologists digging at the Peace College Field School. They were from many universities throughout the United States. I signed and sold 30 copies of my book on Archaeology at Colonial Brunswick. On Saturday, I gave a slide show on my work at Brunswick Town to 30 members of The Cape Fear Revolutionary War Round Table and signed more books. A representative of the National Society of Daughters of Founders and Patriots of America in Washington presented me with a plaque: “In recognition of his development of pioneering techniques supporting the science of historical archaeology.”

Recent Publications Available from Stanley South

2010  
*Talking Artifacts: the Twentieth Century Legacy*. The University of South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology. Columbia. Price: $60

2010  
*Twenty Century Artifact Function*. The University of South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology. Columbia. Price: $60

2010  
*Survival Brainstorms*. [Drawings by Jean Hartfield.] The University of South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology. Columbia. Price: $20

2011  
*Against the Wind: Relics of Sensuality*. The University of South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology. Columbia. Price: $30

2011  
*Feelings*. The University of South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology. Columbia. Price: $20
This book is the first of three that will be published by the University of South Carolina Press addressing three different international conferences that the SCIAA hosted during the past three years. *The Materiality of Freedom: Archaeologies of Postemancipation Life* conference was held in March 2009. This book uses the lens of archaeology to provide original perspectives on the painful Reconstruction and Jim Crow eras by studying the material culture inherent in the struggles for racial equality in America and the Caribbean.

Editor Jodi A. Barnes and a cast of notable scholars focus their essays on racial and social strife experienced by African Americans seeking to exercise their newly won civil rights following the Civil War. By studying material objects in a variety of contexts, archaeologists enrich historical narratives and offer grounded insights on the racial and social strife experienced by people of African descent. Building on the body of literature on African American archaeology, the 22 contributors to this volume use historical records, maps, and artifacts to examine the material-culture dimensions of churches, cemeteries, plantations, communities, neighborhoods, and towns.

The contributors to this collection assert that exploring the disheartening past of African Americans is essential to understanding contemporary issues of race and power as they delve into the archaeology of places such as the Harriet Tubman Home, the Phyllis Wheatley Home for Girls, Boston Saloon, and Alexandria, Virginia’s Contrabands and Freedmen’s Cemetery. Urban archaeology methods are also applied to prominent areas of Auburn, New York, Chicago, and the Old Salem Historical District in Winston-Salem. *The Materiality of Freedom* bridges past and present with community-based research and a combination of archaeological method and theory to highlight contemporary issues of class, gender, race, and social inequality. As these essays open new vistas on the social construction of race and racism, they also demonstrate a more hopeful view on the building of black communities and in the United States and the Caribbean.

Jodi A. Barnes is the staff archaeologist for the South Carolina Department of Archives and History in Columbia. She received her Ph.D. in anthropology from American University in Washington, D.C. Barnes is the co-editor of *Managing Archaeological Resources: Global Context, National Programs, Local Actions*.

**Contributors**

Anna S. Agbe-Davies
Douglas Armstrong
Jennifer J. Babiarz
Jodi A. Barnes
Kenneth L. Brown
Charlie R. Cobb
James M. Davidson
Kelly J. Dixon
Paul Farnsworth
Christopher C. Fennell

Leland Ferguson
Lewis C. Jones
Eric L. Larsen
Christopher N. Matthews
Paul R. Mullins
David T. Palmer
Matthew M. Palus
Theresa A. Singleton
Carl Steen
Megan Ann Teague
Laurie A. Wilkie

Available October 2011
6 x 9, 256 pages, 45 illus.
ISBN 978-1-61117-034-4
cl, $49.95s
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Scholar Commons: An Institutional Repository of All SCIAA Publications
By Nena Powell Rice

Scholar Commons is an Institutional Repository to preserve, collect, and disseminate the research and scholarship of the University of South Carolina. With scholarly content contributed by faculty, researchers, and students associated with the University, this repository will expand the visibility, access, and influence of the University. It will also support efforts to increase collaboration and cross discipline research within the University and with other organizations.

Contributions from authors include articles and books, documents, technical reports, presentations, conference proceedings, creative activities, master’s theses, open-access dissertations, and more. Scholar Commons is a service of the University Libraries that has been funded in part by the office of the CIO.

ArchSite: Part 1
By the ArchSite Committee

Background
ArchSite is the first online cultural resource information system in South Carolina. It combines data from the state’s archaeological and built heritage to provide researchers with an easy to access source for South Carolina’s historic resources.

The idea behind the development of ArchSite dates back to 1994 when the South Carolina Department of Archives and History (SCDAH) and the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology (SCIAA) matched resources to fund a small feasibility study for producing digital copies of the state’s archaeological sites. Several difficulties were identified in that pilot, which led to an opportunity to explore the constraints and best solutions through a grant from the international management think tank A. Goldratt Institute (AGI) located in New Haven, Connecticut. The result of that work made it possible to rework the premise of the project and elicit the aid of the project’s major donor, the South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT). In 1996, the SCDOT awarded a Transportation Enhancement grant to the SCIAA and the SCDAH for the digitization of the State’s National Register of Historic Places properties and archaeological sites. Thousands of paper map files were digitized and incorporated into a Geographic Information System (GIS) that was made available to consultants, government agencies, and planners at different workstations. The benefits to using GIS technology to manage cultural resource information were quickly realized and the development of additional data layers soon followed.

In 2004, the SCDOT awarded an additional grant to the SCIAA and the SCDAH to create a web-based mapping application that would provide increased access to cultural resource information in the state. The goal of the project was two-fold: to provide online access to a comprehensive source of cultural resource information and to create a digital process for archaeological site recordation. The proponents of the project met with representatives from Environmental Systems Research Institute, Inc. (ESRI) in Charlotte, NC to discuss possible solutions. A decision was made to utilize ESRI’s ArcGIS Server software because of its functionality, usability, and analytical capabilities. ESRI’s Professional Services provided grants to support ArchSite to fill two positions, the ArchSite Administrator and a Data Entry Technician. In February, Tamara Wilson became the ArchSite administrator. Peggy Hemphill is the new data entry technician. The next issue of Legacy in March 2012 will have further information on how ArchSite works in Part 2. Please check out ArchSite website (http://archsite.cas.sc.edu/ArchSite).

SMITH NOTES, From Page 3
accomplished over the next year will be the result of Charlie’s initiation in previous years. One of the most significant is that, due to Jon Leader and Charlie’s efforts, we are finally renovating the curation facility. Also a new book is coming out edited by Jodi Barnes. Jodi was SCIAA’s first post-doc research fellowship awardee, a program that Charlie began and was able to sustain for two additional years. The book, entitled, The Materiality of Freedom: Archaeologies of Postemancipation Life, is the fruit of a successful international conference organized by Jodi and held in Columbia in 2009. Another change is that over the next year many SCIAA publications will be made available online through a USC Libraries initiative called Scholar Commons. This initiative seeks to make available to other scholars the publications of university faculty and researchers including those at SCIAA. This will help SCIAA become better known across the globe. Finally, our web-based archaeological site database ArchSite is back up and running with Tamara Wilson working half-time as ArchSite Administrator, and Peggy Hemphill assisting as data entry technician. This issue of Legacy highlights these SCIAA advances and more.
SDAMP Maritime Heritage Awareness Oyster Roast
By Ashley Deming

The Sport Diver Archaeology Management Program (SDAMP) will be hosting its first ever Oyster Roast this November. This event is to help raise awareness of the needs of maritime heritage in the state of South Carolina. There are multitudes of underwater archaeological sites all over the state that range from 4,000-year-old canoes to 20th century tugboats. The state of South Carolina is blessed with waterways that served as the roads of their time and experienced early settlements, wars, agricultural growth, and technological advancements. The waters of South Carolina and the sites they hold can answer many questions about our past as Americans and as people.

The mission of SDAMP is to protect these incredible cultural and natural resources, learn from them, and share that information with the public interested in the past. The SDAMP Maritime Heritage Awareness Oyster Roast serves as a platform in the pursuit of this mission. Whether those needs be financial, material, or volunteered labor, anyone can get involved with the program and the preservation of South Carolina heritage on any level. Get involved and talk with archaeologists and other members of the public about what this state can do to further the protection, preservation, and education regarding our very own maritime heritage resources.

Join us November 19, 2011 from 4-7 PM in Charleston for an evening of fun, entertainment, and presentations about the maritime archaeology our great state of South Carolina has to offer. Tickets are on sale now for $35 per person. Oysters, purloo, dessert, a keg, and iced tea will be served, but feel free to bring a cooler with beverages of your choice.

Date: Saturday, November 19, 2011
Time: 4-7 PM
Where: Fort Johnson Marine Resource Center, James Island, Charleston, SC
Cost: $35/person
Contact: Ashley Deming at (843) 762-6105 or deming@sc.edu for tickets and more information. Please make checks payable to: USC Educational Foundation

SDAMP is a non-profit, public education and outreach branch of the Maritime Research Division of the South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology at the University of South Carolina. The program is managed in Charleston from a base at the Fort Johnson Marine Resource Center. In addition to extensive public education and outreach initiatives, SDAMP licenses divers to collect artifacts and fossils from State waters, manages two maritime heritage trails, and functions as a custodian for all submerged cultural resources in South Carolina.

ART Archaeology Canoe Trip
By Nena Powell Rice

The Archaeological Research Trust (ART) Board will offer the 2nd Annual Archaeology Canoe Trip on the Congaree River and Columbia environs on September 17, 2011. The trip will begin on the banks of the Congaree River beneath the Gervais Street Bridge at 10 AM-3 PM. Four short lectures will be delivered prior to launching. These programs will include Chester DePratter, Director of Research, on his recent investigations on two Civil War prison camps in Columbia, Sorghum and Asylum; James Stewart, Ph. D. student at the USC Department of Anthropology on his recent investigations at Fort Congaree on Congaree Creek; and Christopher Amer, State Underwater Archaeologist, on numerous maritime components in the river.

Canoes or kayaks and several guides will be supplied by Adventure Carolina. You must register with Adventure Carolina by September 13, 2011. You can call Kevin at (803) 796-4505. Please bring a lunch, water, sunscreen, and hat in a dry bag. I would suggest having some dry clothes either in a dry bag in your boat or in your car when you disembark from the river. Bring an extra pair of shoes as well. You will get wet when we have lunch on the canal and some may choose to jump in off the canal locks ladder and float down. The cost is $30/person. Space is limited. If you have any questions, please contact Nena Powell Rice at (803) 576-6573 Office or nrice@sc.edu.
ART / SCIAA Donors Update August 2010-July 2011

The staff of the Institute wishes to thank our donors who have graciously supported the research and programs listed below.

Archaeological Research Trust (ART)
Patron ($10,000+)
Antony C. Harper
Edward and Dorothy Kendall Foundation

Benefactor ($1,000-$9,999)
Priscilla Harrison Beale
George and Betti Bell
Bill Bridges
Charles Cobb
Robert B. Haynes
Robert E. Mimms, Jr.
Francis and Mary Neuffer
Heyward Robinson
Walter Wilkinson

Partner ($500-999)
Kenneth Huggins
Robert Strickland

Advocate ($250-499)
Fat Mason
Don Rosick

Contributor ($249-100)
William A. Behan
William A. Cartwright
John G. Causey
Kimberly Elliott
Sarah Calhoun Gillespie
Albert C. Goodyear, III
Joyce Hallenbeck
Jay and Jennifer Mills
Robert L. Knight
John and Carol Kososki
Sam E. McCuen
Christina Hoefler Myers
Mary Julia Royall

Supporter ($99-50)
Mary Gregorie Burns
Ann Christie
Sarah Clarkson
Edward Cummings, III
Frederick J. Darnell
Lou Edens
Elwin Guild and Joan Geisemann
Cary Hall
Joseph and Mary Hardy
Sara Lee Simons
Desiree Celorier Voegele
Constance A. White

Regular ($49 or less)
Randy and Mary Alice Akers
Russell and Jill Altman
R. L. Ardis, Jr.
John Arena
Barbara Aycock
Lawrence Babits
Benny and Jackie Bartley
CF Consultants
Charles Baugh
Charles Baxley
Paul H. Benson
Jeff D. Broome
Thomas Casker
John Coly
Jerry Dacus
Daniel Daniels
David Donmoyer
Acie C. Edwards
Marie S. Ellis
Darby Erd
Edith Ettinger
Leland and Aline Ferguson
Joel and Lorene Fisher
Harriett Fore
Martin Witt and Sara Huggins
Glen and Joan Inabinet
Institute of Physical Therapy
Randy C. and Julie A. Ivey
Ted M. Johnson
Jack Meetze
Richard and Sarah M. Nicholas
Mike Peters
James D. Reid
Wayne W. Smith
Paul Stewart (In Memory of J. Key Powell)
Robert N. Strickland
Robert L. Van Buren
Desiree Celorier Voegele
Mildred Brooks Wall
Richard D. Wall

Allendale Archaeology Research Fund
Joseph Adami
Sally Adams
Elizabeth A. Allan
David G. Anderson
Derek T. Anderson
William Andrefsky
Eugene G. Armstrong
Robert C. Barnett
Carol Billiris
Vincent M. Boles
Glenn Bower
James Trott Burns
Martha Christy
Clariant Corporation
Tom Cofer
Robert Cole
Robert C. Costello
William and Ann Covington
B. Lindsay and Bunni O. Crawford, III
Harold D. and Cynthia Curry
Randy Daniel
Robert J. Dehoney
Ashley M. Deming
Sharon Shipp Durham
Lorene B. Fisher

The staff of the Institute wishes to thank our donors who have graciously supported the research and programs listed below.

2nd Annual ART Gala, The Palmetto Club, Columbia, SC, February 26, 2011. (Left to right): President Harris Pastides, ART Board Member Patricia Moore-Pastides, ART Board Chair George Bell, and ART Board Secretary Nena Powell Rice. (Photo courtesy Nena Powell Rice)

George “Buddy” Wingard with “Dave” pot at the 2nd Annual Gala in February 2011. (Photo by Nena Powell Rice)
Guests mingling at the 2nd Annual ART Gala in February 2011. (Photo by Nena Powell Rice)

Edward and Dorothy Kendall with Nena Powell Rice after receiving ART Appreciation Award. (Photo courtesy of Nena Powell Rice)

Guests at the 2nd Annual ART Gala. (Photo by Nena Powell Rice)

Guests mingling at the 2nd Annual ART Gala in February 2011. (Photo by Nena Powell Rice)

Guests at the 2nd Annual ART Gala. (Photo by Nena Powell Rice)
The 20th Annual South Carolina Archaeology Month
By Nena Powell Rice and Christopher Judge

The SC Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology (SCIAA) at the University of South Carolina is finalizing the coordination of the 20th Annual South Carolina Archaeology Month to be held in October 2011. The fall event focuses on cultural programs offered in every corner of the state. Each year the month-long event produces a topical poster focusing on current archaeological research in the Palmetto state. This year’s theme is entitled Making Artifacts Talk: The Archaeology of the Johannes Kolb Site, which features archaeological investigations at the Johannes Kolb site in Darlington County and the Great Pee Pee region of South Carolina. The editors of the poster articles are Christopher Judge, Assistant Director of the Native American Studies Program at University of South Carolina-Lancaster, with the assistance of Andrea Palmiotto as Copy/Content Editor, and Brittany Taylor as Designer of the poster.

On the back of the poster, Christopher Judge, will introduce us to the importance of the Johannes Kolk site, which spans over 10,000 years of continuous occupation. Geoarchaeologist, Christopher Young, will explain what he has learned from Early Archaic period (10,000-8,000 year-old) rocks and artifacts made from those rocks at the site. Chris uses geology and chemistry to tell us where the rocks used to fashion Kolb site artifacts come from. Project Principal Archaeologist, Sean Taylor, will discuss how various prehistoric artifacts were manufactured and used in the replication of hafted spears, clay pots, and other objects. We will also learn about the dynamic behavior that the static artifacts are talking to him about. Lead Project Archaeologist, Carl Steen, will combine the lifebloods of inquiry—field archaeology, laboratory analysis, and historical research—that will weave those arteries together to tell us about those who lived at Kolb in the historic period. Some names are known and others are anonymous, but his research is revealing their stories and giving them a voice, nonetheless. Archaeologist, Site Interpreter, and Project Conservator, Tariq Ghaffar, will explain how he cleans, conserves, and preserves Kolb site iron objects from the historic periods at the Camden Conservation Institute in Camden, SC. Tariq’s careful work allows these artifacts to speak up and share their unique stories. The poster will also highlight a Lecture Series.

Archaeology Month activities will begin in October 2011 with a variety of statewide events focusing on prehistory, history, culture, and historic preservation. The 24th Annual South Carolina Archaeology Field Day sponsored by the Archaeological Society of South Carolina (ASSC) will be held at Lynches River County Park in Florence County, South Carolina on Saturday, October 29, 2011. Please check the ASSC website for details: http://www.assc.net/events/fall-field-day. There will be the usual demonstrations of Native American, African, and European technology, as well as new programming, of which details are now being finalized.

For a list of scheduled events in connection with Archaeology Month, contact Nena Rice (nrice@sc.edu) at SCIAA at (803) 576-6573 for further details. Please come by SCIAA at 1321 Pendleton Street in Columbia, and pick up free posters!