Andrew White Joins the Research Archaeological Staff at the Institute

By Andrew White

I am very excited to begin working at SCIAA as a Research Assistant Professor. My research interests include hunter-gatherers, human cultural and biological evolution, lithic technology (especially of the Paleoindian and Early Archaic), and complex systems theory. I have been involved in archaeology in the Eastern Woodlands since I was an undergraduate at Indiana University in the early 1990s, receiving my M.A. from Southern Illinois University in 1999 and my Ph.D. from the University of Michigan in 2012. I will do my best to capitalize on the legacy that so many before me at SCIAA have worked so hard to produce, combining the ideas and the experience I’ve acquired from 20 years of working in the Midwest with the archaeological, institutional, and personal resources that will be available to me.

I am a strong proponent of involving the public in archaeological work for both practical and philosophical reasons. I maintain a website (www.andywhiteanthropology.com) about my research, and I write a blog where I discuss North American prehistory, human evolution, and whatever else interests me. I look forward to working with the interested public in South Carolina and sharing ideas, information, and enthusiasm about prehistory.

Andrew White in the field at the Kosko site (12-Ko-492), Kosciusko County, Indiana, pointing at a buried A horizon that was present beneath the plow zone. (Photo courtesy of Andrew White)
Director’s Note

By Steven D. Smith
SCIAA Director

Congratulations to Chester DePratter who has, at long last, been promoted to a full Research Professor! All SCIAA researchers are greatly encouraged by his promotion. Years ago, the title “Research Professor” at SCIAA was largely honorary. Under the leadership of College of Arts and Sciences Dean Mary Ann Fitzpatrick, a formal system for review, recognition, and promotion of research professors from Assistant to Full Professor was established in the college. Our own Adam King served on this committee. We can now call Chester, Professor DePratter, in recognition of his long career of scholarly contributions.

The SCIAA welcomes Dr. Andrew White, our new Research Assistant Professor, who will join us this summer of 2015 (see front page). Andy has already established a distinguished resume of research and publication, and we are excited to have him continue SCIAA’s tradition of cutting edge lithic (get it?) and hunter-gatherer studies. Andy recently made news in an NPR anthropology blog discussing human evolution. We also welcome archaeologist Elizabeth Bridges, Andy’s spouse, who will join us as a research affiliate. A recent Ph.D. graduate, Dr. Bridges will be looking for opportunities in South Carolina archaeology. Finally, I also want to welcome Dan Brown to the underwater team. His story is on Page 5.

Summer in South Carolina brings forth the seasonal emergence of beautiful flowers, hummingbirds, peaches—along with 100 degree temperatures, fire ants, venomous reptiles, and poison ivy. Thus, it is a perfect time to begin some archaeological fieldwork. So in May, SCIAA archaeologists James Legg, Jon Leader, Andy Holloway, USC graduate student Kelly Goldberg, undergraduate students Ellan Hambright and Larry Lane, volunteers Brad Posey and Brett Cullen, all joined me for two weeks at Fort Motte, South Carolina. Our 2015 field season was surprisingly successful and has significantly altered our understanding of that Revolutionary War period fort. Jim
It has been a privilege to serve with my colleagues on the Archaeological Research Trust Board (ART) for several years now. We convene to conduct SCIAA business and review the many worthwhile grant requests submitted to us for funding. The latter is a daunting task, as we are seldom able to approve all requests. However, among the most rewarding experiences we have is visiting a field site (or field school) where our archaeologists engage and mentor our students. We find them in the midst of a great adventure—diligently at work, with shovel and trowel in hand—you know, the truly glamorous part of archaeology! They find remarkable treasures, which enhance learning, science and history. Whether the artifact is two hundred, or, two thousand years old, the students’ reactions are something to behold. For, it is here we see why—WHAT WE DO MATTERS!

Tucked inside this issue of LEGACY you will find a return envelope. Rather than look past it, won’t you take a moment, join our great adventure, and tuck in your best tax deductable gift? Your participation this month will help facilitate our important summer and fall (SCIAA) projects and make it possible to continue this vital work of research and preservation.

Will you join me this month in sharing a monetary gift? Together, let’s keep the shovels and trowels in the ground—and support these fine student archaeologists and their mentors! Thank you for your generosity, and, please contact us if you have a question or would like to join us on a future site visit.

Bill Bridges. (Photo courtesy of Williamson Evans, Greenville, SC)
The aim of the project is to conduct geophysical and archaeological survey of the seafloor 11-16 miles offshore of North Myrtle Beach and Winyah Bay to explore the possibility of developing future WEAs (Figure 1). The first year of the project consists of a remote sensing survey utilizing a suite of electronic instruments consisting of a side-scan sonar, multi-beam, sub-bottom profiler, and magnetometer. Certain areas of the survey will be refined for paleolandsides, shipwrecks, and objects of archaeological/historical significance to be ground-truthed later by members of SCIAA’s Maritime Research Division (MRD) and BOEM for further investigation. The initial survey phase commenced earlier this spring.

As interest in WEAs has increased all along the east coast, BOEM seeks to explore the archaeological potential of prehistoric and historic sites submerged along the Outer Continental Shelf. BOEM is responsible for managing offshore
energy interests and the organization has participated and funded similar surveys off Massachusetts, Maryland, North Carolina, the Gulf of Mexico near Florida, and the Pacific coast. Since the 1980s, evidence of drastic prehistoric sea level change has fueled speculation on the existence of submerged prehistoric habitation sites and technological advances in remote sensing are beginning to make detection of those sites a reality. As a result, scientists, along with divers and fishermen, continue to discover evidence of prehistoric habitation along the now submerged Atlantic OCS before sea levels rose to modern levels around 6,000 years ago. Other surveys aside, remote sensing and underwater survey off South Carolina has revealed potential for evidence of prehistoric habitation and technological advances in remote sensing are beginning to make detection of those sites a reality. As a result, scientists, along with divers and fishermen, continue to discover evidence of prehistoric habitation along the now submerged Atlantic OCS before sea levels rose to modern levels around 6,000 years ago. Other surveys aside, remote sensing and underwater survey off South Carolina has revealed potential for evidence of prehistoric habitation, including ships; subway cars; concrete tubes and structures; and even decommissioned armored personal carriers.

Some, however, are unconfirmed historic wrecks, such as the British built blockade-runner Princess Royal. Commissioned in 1861, the Union Navy captured the notably fast vessel in 1863. The navy decommissioned Princess Royal in 1868 and sold her to a private company who renamed her Sherman; on January 6, 1874 she sprang a leak off Cape Fear, North Carolina, finally sinking four days later somewhere in Long Bay. The ASD lists this vessel under both names in two locations 43 miles apart. Which is the actual blockade-runner, the survey hopes to answer. Among the handful of known historic wrecks within the survey area is the side-wheeled steam packet North Carolina, a mail carrier that collided with its sister ship, SS Governor Dudley in the early hours of July 26, 1840. Both mail ships operated between Wilmington, North Carolina, and Charleston, South Carolina, traveling the same route in opposite directions. Despite a clear, calm night and fair warning, both vessels saw the other miles away, one of the vessels deviated from protocol and Governor Dudley rammed the quarter of North Carolina. Crew and passengers evacuated, and the vessel sank within 15 minutes; no lives were lost but newspapers reported the shipment of mail and personal cargo, including congressional payroll of $15,000 to $20,000, was lost. With the hundreds of known shipwrecks off the Carolinas, what other vessels lay buried beneath the depths offshore the Grand Strand is a mystery the survey hopes to solve. Look forward to updates regarding the SC-BOEM Project as fieldwork continues through the summer of 2015.

A Welcome to Daniel Brown

Dan Brown was hired by the Maritime Research Division at SCIAA to work on the SC-BOEM remote sensing survey. Prior to joining the institute, Dan taught three semesters of history and anthropology at Coastal Carolina University. His areas of interest include wooden ship construction, small boats of the American Southeast, remote sensing, total station survey, public outreach, and Colonial American history. Throughout his graduate studies, Dan’s fieldwork took him from the iron hulled Civil War wrecks on the Outer Banks, North Carolina, to 18th century wrecks in the inland rivers of the Carolinas and across the Atlantic to help record the 17th-century Swedish warship, Vasa. Dan received his M.A. in Maritime Studies from East Carolina University in 2013, and B.A. in English from the University of Maryland in 2003.
So far this year, the Applied Research Division has been involved in three exciting field projects, and it is only May!

First, in collaboration with archaeologists Sean Taylor and Meg Gaillard of the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources (SCDNR), ARD’s enthusiastic crew conducted excavations on the Fort Frederick Heritage Preserve, a three-acre SCDNR property in Beaufort County. Even-interval shovel testing on the property late last year defined the spatial distribution of artifacts and cultural deposits. This effort allowed us to identify areas of high research potential to target during the more-in-depth phase of work that began in January.

One area of interest identified during shovel testing is an early 19th century trash midden associated with a settlement on the Smith plantation, a Sea Island cotton plantation owned at one time by J. Joyner Smith. Following a stratified random sampling strategy, seven units measuring 2 x 2 meters were positioned across this part of the property to test the integrity of the midden. This deposit was incredibly rich in organics and dense with oyster shell, and the crew labored tirelessly to screen and sort the shell from other remains. Their efforts were aided by a mechanical sifter constructed by Sean, who was often on hand to fix this or build that (Figure 1). It was almost as much fun to watch him approach a logistical or equipment challenge, as it was to work on this amazing property! In any event, feature preservation was superb and a number of pits, posts, and trenches were recorded below the shell zone.

Another area of interest was Fort Frederick itself, which has significance in part as the earliest documented tabby structure in Beaufort County. Built by the British colonial government in the 1730s, the Fort was constructed for the purpose of protecting Beaufort Town from the Spanish and other would-be attackers. One aim of our work was to expose the base of two sections of tabby wall to determine its overall depth and method of initial construction. We were also interested in whether any intact Fort Period deposits could be discerned from later use of the facility. To achieve both goals, we placed seven 2 x 2-meter units in a contiguous row inside the tabby walls within the southwest bastion and excavated each unit in such a way that we could correlate...
adjoining levels of the resulting 14-meter-long trench (Figure 2).

Simultaneous with our work, SCAPOD (http://scapod.org/) hosted four public days on site, and these events were very well attended despite some inclement weather. SCDNR also is working with documentarians, Jamie and Christi Koelker, and tabby expert, Colin Brooker, in further efforts to protect and preserve the site and promote its layered history. The documentary film shorts can be seen at: https://ajkoelker.wordpress.com/fort-frederick/.

Then in March, Tamara Wilson and I spent a week conducting excavations at Cannon’s Point in Glynn County, Georgia, on another late 18th- early 19th-century Sea Island cotton plantation on the Atlantic coast. In this work, we were greatly assisted by Norma Harris and Myrna Crook, as well as a number of dedicated volunteers from the St. Simons Island community. Though the no-see-ums were thick-as-thieves, it felt good to spend time on property and with people that meant so much to my undergraduate advisor, the late Morgan Ray Crook, Jr.

Our excavation strategy here was of a different sort: we were limited to the footprint of an observation tower that the Saint Simons Island Land Trust will install in the coming months. However, we were also at an advantage in that Norma Harris and Nick Honerkamp, of the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, had opened up trenches here the year before, and we were simply expanding their excavations. Thus, we knew a lot about what to expect even though we still managed a few surprises.

We excavated through a shell and refuse midden to uncover a number of well-preserved features, including several posts that marked the location of two walls of a post-in-ground structure. We think the structure is early-to-mid 19th century based on the recovery of refined earthenware in the post fill. We also recovered a fair number of pre-colonial artifacts, particularly ceramics, mixed in with the midden, and these artifacts increased in frequency with depth (Figure 3).

Having almost had our fill of shell middens, you might say we welcomed a return to the Midlands’ Sand Hills and to Fort Jackson in Richland County, South Carolina. Here, as we have done for three years now, we worked with Chan Funk and Fort Jackson’s Environmental Division to test a number of late historic sites that were not recorded during the large scale surveys of the early 1990s. Our goals were 1) to determine site boundaries and 2) to provide a professional assessment as to their eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. Of special note is our Field Site 2, which was identified last year by South Carolina National Guard Archaeologist Dr. Jason Moser. Although the historic period occupation had been heavily impacted by installation activities, we discovered a light but expansive distribution of late Archaic and early Woodland period lithics and pottery concentrated along the edge of the flat landform that overlooks a tributary of Colonels Creek (Figures 4 and 5). All told, we excavated 264 shovel tests on a 10-meter interval to delineate the site, which measures 400 meters on its long axis. In the field it seemed that areas of higher artifact density were spaced about every 80 to 100 meters along the landform. We will try to confirm this field observation once we begin to analyze the results.

When the weather heats up, so will our lab as we process, analyze, and describe the work that kept us outdoors for the better part of four months. In closing, I must acknowledge our 2015 field crew: Jacob Borchardt (B.A., Anthropology, University of South Carolina), Andy Holloway (B.A., History, College of Charleston), Abigail Rowe (B.A., Anthropology, University of Georgia), and Joe Wilkinson (B.A., Anthropology, University of South Carolina). Their eagerness to do the job and do it well is the reason we had such a great start to 2015. Tamara and I thank you! Epilogue: Jacob and Joe are entering the Anthropology Graduate Program here at USC in the fall, and Andy is entering the Graduate Program at East Carolina University in Greenville, NC. Abi is pursuing more fieldwork opportunities in the Southeast, and, in fact, as I write this, she is laboring on New South Associates’ field crew at Fort Polk, Louisiana, an installation with its own connection to ARD through Steve Smith and Chris Clement. And so it goes….

Woodland period lithics and pottery featured prominently, and we also encountered a number of late historic artifacts, including ceramics from the late 18th and early 19th centuries. In addition, we recovered a number of pre-colonial artifacts, particularly ceramics, mixed in with the midden, and these artifacts increased in frequency with depth (Figure 3).
In May 2014, Dr. Karen Smith, head of the Applied Research Division at SCIAA, took a crew of workers and volunteers to Hobcaw Barony to participate in an event for USC’s College of Arts and Sciences Alumni and Friends weekend at the Hobcaw House (Smith and Stephenson 2014). One of the activities planned was for participants to learn about and watch archaeologists using a metal detector to survey a gridded area. Jim Michie’s work in the area in 1990-1991 had located a mid-18th century site, which was never fully explored or delineated (Michie 1991). As this site was in close walking distance to the Hobcaw House where the other activities of the event were held, it seemed an ideal site to demonstrate metal detecting. In addition, working at this site would afford us the opportunity to test survey methods and results using a metal detector. In particular, we wondered whether we could define not just site boundaries but also special activities areas (such as you would have with a detached kitchen or other dependencies) by metal detecting alone.

Unfortunately for the heritage event participants, the metal detecting demonstration, which was located in a low, heavily shaded area near the marsh, was cancelled, due to the large numbers of biting deer flies that swarmed anything that moved. Or perhaps they were the fortunate ones, as Jacob Borchardt, Peter Mayers, and I endeavored through the swarm and pain to get the grid laid out, and then I began surveying the grid (Figure 1).

Our plan was to envelop the main positive shovel test from Michie’s work that identified the site with a 51 x 51-meter grid, which we hoped would be large enough to let us identify the boundaries of the site. We knew that the site did not extend very far to the south, but it was unclear how far north it went as Michie’s survey did not extend north of the transect that located the site. The site could not expand too far to the east before the marsh was encountered, and based on the previous survey it did not extend very far to the west. The grid was divided into three-meter lanes, based on a one and a half-meter sweep of the metal detector. This allows for better control within the grid, in case we want to do full coverage or partial coverage by skipping a lane. It was a very ambitious amount of ground to cover in the limited amount of time available, but fortunately, we were not limited to working on the site for just that weekend.

I was able to spend about eight hours metal detecting the site that weekend, and barely scratched the surface of the area laid out to be detected, due to the density of artifacts being much greater than I had anticipated. The location of each find was marked with a pin flag, each of which was later shot in with a transit, which will allow us to plot distributions of artifacts across the site (Figure 2). Some of the artifacts found include hand-wrought nails of various sizes, pewter and brass buttons, cast iron kettle and pot fragments, and architectural hardware. Also representing hunting activities by the Baruchs and friends were a scattering of rifle cartridges and shotshell bases. Clearly, we were in the right place, but further investigations would have to wait.

In December 2014, Karen Smith, Tamara Wilson, and I returned to the site to do more survey. Continuing the grid...
from May, over the course of the week, approximately 35 hours of metal detecting were logged and around 380 readings were excavated. There still remains another estimated 80-100 hours of work to be done in order to finish surveying the grid. Broadening and experimenting with different methods, something we did different during this second round of work was to screen the small amount of dirt produced when excavating the metal reading. This turned out to be a great plan, as we were able to recover a lot of material that otherwise would be missed. This additional data will be of great use in plotting activity areas across the site, and should prove quite useful to future work at the site.

Artifacts recovered during the second round of work included many more hand-wrought nails, an array of buttons, parts from a trade gun, lead shot, and the like. From the screening, additional artifacts recovered include ceramics such as Delft, North Devon Gravel-Tempered, slipware, creamware, colonoware, and prehistoric sherds. Other items include bottle glass, pipe fragments, brick fragments, and gunflints (Figure 3). While there is still a lot more of the grid to cover, the artifacts recovered (and not recovered) thus far do allow for a few insights. For example, a small number of cut nails were found, suggesting a later building phase or repairs. However, pearlware ceramics, which were introduced around the same time as cut nails, have not been found. Did the residents of the site not purchase new ceramics after a certain time, or did the cut nails come from old boards dumped along the road?

Questions such as this will be addressed during our analysis and interpretation of the artifacts and the site. Artifact analysis, cataloging, and conservation of iron through electrolysis is still on-going. Additional work that is also on-going includes research into the background and history of the property and making distribution maps of all the transit shots. And of course, there is still more field work to be done in order to finish the survey grid. So stay tuned for more news from the Barony!
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After a number of years of lying dormant, the Santa Elena Lab is once again alive and bustling with activity. Thanks to recently obtained funding, Dr. Chester DePratter, Director of the Santa Elena Project, was able to hire a new crop of lab technicians, with an old familiar face to lead them. The United States Marine Corps provided $110,000 and the State Legislature provided $220,000 to finance the reprocessing and reanalysis of the collection. (See “New Life for Santa Elena” by DePratter in Legacy, Vol. 18, No. 2, December 2014 issue for more information.)

With money in hand and concerned with getting the Santa Elena collection in order, Dr. DePratter hired me in October 2014 to oversee this operation and run the day-to-day activities in the lab. I have been working for the Santa Elena project off and on since 1997, when I was hired as a student to work in the lab. That long term connection and familiarity with the collection, plus an assessment of the entire collection that I conducted in 2013 as a subcontractor for Southeastern Archaeological Research, makes me well suited for the task. Peter Mayers was brought on as a full-time lab technician, and in January 2015 four USC students were hired as part-time workers. Students were sought in an effort to provide them with “on-the-job training” while still in school. Current student workers are Lauren Hamm, Marty Izaguirre, Anita Lehew, and Lalon Swaney (Figure 1).

Last year marked 35 years since Stanley South first began excavations at Santa Elena, and over the years and numerous field seasons, nearly 900 cubic feet of material has been recovered. Utilizing lab space provided by USC in the Jones Physical Science Building, all of the collection housed at SCIAA, which was about two-thirds of the total, was relocated to an 18 x 30-foot area. The remainder of the collection is currently located at SCIAA’s curation facility, and is slowly being moved to the Jones lab as artifact boxes are processed and space created.

The initial phase of work has two primary areas of focus. The first is to hand-wash any artifacts that still need it, as in earlier years of the project some of the artifacts were only water screened. The second area of focus is to bring the housing of the collection up to current curation standards, which includes rebagging everything into four millimeter-thick plastic bags and reboxing the collection into acid-free, archival quality cardboard boxes (Figure 2). In the first four months of work, over 20,000 new bags were used.

In addition to this work, the collection will be resorted, as the accumulated knowledge of 35 years allows us to make better refinements in our categorizations and identification of various artifacts. Afterwards, a new, standardized and complete catalog of the collection will be made. An electrolysis system has also been set up to continue the conservation of iron artifacts. Progress in the lab has been great thus far, but there remains plenty of work to do.
How hard could it be to digitally recreate Ft. San Felipe (I), one of Santa Elena’s five forts? After all, Stanley South excavated its northwest bastion in 1982 and much of the remaining interior in 1983 and 1984. I returned with him to the site in 1997 to re-excavate part of the interior, and we excavated part of the southwest bastion in 2006. Given these extensive excavations, there should have been sufficient information to readily allow an accurate recreation of this fort, so important in Santa Elena’s history. But was there?

The Spanish town of Santa Elena was established on present-day Parris Island by Pedro Menéndez de Avilés in 1566, a year after he destroyed a large French colony and settled his large force of soldiers, sailors, and colonists at St. Augustine. At first, Santa Elena had only a small fort, San Salvador, and its military garrison, but the town was destined to be Florida’s major settlement and its capital. When reinforcements arrived in Florida in the summer of 1566, Menéndez sent Captain Juan Pardo and his 250 men to Santa Elena, where they built a new fort, San Felipe (I). Over the next several years, the population of Santa Elena grew to around 350, the town became the capital of “La Florida,” and Menéndez moved his family there.

In 1570, Ft. San Felipe (I) burned, and a new fort, also called San Felipe, was built elsewhere on the site. The death of Pedro Menéndez in 1574 ultimately led to a one year abandonment of Santa Elena in 1576-1577, and when Santa Elena was resettled, it was no longer the capital. Between 1577 and 1587, two additional forts, both named San Marcos (I and II), were built at Santa Elena. The town was abandoned in 1587, and it was not reoccupied by the Spanish.

There are no known maps of Santa Elena, and drawings of only two of its known forts have been found in Spanish archives. One of the first tasks I tackled when I joined Stanley South in Santa Elena excavations in 1991 was to figure out the locations of its five forts. When Stan South began his excavations at the site in 1979, he had in hand a report by Dr. Paul Hoffman, LSU historian, detailing what was known about Santa Elena’s forts. Dr. Hoffman proposed locations for each of the known forts based on his reading of Spanish documents.

In Stan South’s first week of excavations, he found a fort and identified it as San Felipe (II), based on the work of Paul Hoffman. Reports on his subsequent work on this fort’s northwest bastion and interior all identify this fort at Ft. San Felipe (II). In looking at the available documents and the two extant fort plans, I began to think that the fort Stan South had dug was Ft. San Felipe (I) built by Juan Pardo and not San Felipe (II) built after the 1570 fire. I am now convinced that Stan excavated Pardo’s first Fort San Felipe. This misidentification led to misinterpretation of the archaeological features excavated in the early 1980s. Inside the fort, South found remains of a large 50 x 70-foot square structure that he thought was one of two “casas fuertes” or strong houses that documents describe as being inside San Felipe (II). If the fort he dug was instead San Felipe (I), then what might that large structure be? While it could indeed still be a strong house, I have believed for several years that it was instead a church. While doing research in the past several weeks, I have found a Spanish document that says there was a church inside Ft. San Felipe (I). Juan Pardo had 250 men under his command at Santa Elena at the time this fort was built, so a sizeable church would have been needed.

So why all this renewed interest in Ft. San Felipe and what it might have looked like? Back in the fall of 2014, I received an email from Dr. Brian Crane of Versar, Inc., an engineering firm in Springfield, Virginia. Dr. Crane had in hand a Department of Defense Legacy Grant that, in part, involved recreating Ft. San Felipe (I) using digital 3D visualization technology. His email contained his preliminary reconstruction images, and these got me thinking about the details of
San Felipe’s form and construction. We arranged to have him fly to Columbia in April 2015, so that we could come up with a digital reconstruction as accurate as documentary research and archaeology would allow.

By the time Dr. Crane, Jim Legg, and I met on April 13, I had spent a great deal of time looking at Stan South’s excavations and all of the Spanish documents available to me. I had learned a lot in the several months since Brian and I first communicated, and I was excited about the prospect of creating an accurate representation of San Felipe (I).

Although it is far too complicated to describe in detail here, I spent a lot of time looking at the sequence of St. Augustine’s nine wooden forts built in the 16th and 17th centuries, as well as comparing those forts to Santa Elena forts, including San Felipe (I). In doing so, I concluded that a fort drawing believed to be a St. Augustine fort might actually depict San Felipe (I) or a St. Augustine fort identical to it. The
trapezoidal fort on this plan is identical in shape and dimensions to San Felipe (I), so I decided that it should be the model for our recreation. Once that decision was made, Brian, Jim, and I set about the task of recreating the fort over a period of three days.

While the final digital reconstruction is not yet available, I can say with certainty that the final product will be as accurate and as detailed as we can make it using presently available archaeological evidence and Spanish documentary sources. The final product will be made available to the Parris Island Museum for exhibit purposes. After working with Brian and Jim, I am ready to move on to digital recreations of Santa Elena’s other forts. Who knows what we will learn as we undertake these new projects.

All of Stanley South’s reports on his San Felipe excavations, as well as all other published SCIAA reports are available at Scholar Commons via this link: http://scholarcommons.sc.edu/archanth/
The Yamasee Indians in South Carolina

By Chester B. DePratter

If you have never been to St. Augustine, Florida, you should go there if you ever have the opportunity. It is a small, coastal city on the Matanzas River tucked away behind Anastasia Island with its beautiful beaches. Founded by Spaniard, Pedro Menéndez de Avilés, in 1565, St. Augustine has an interesting history that is closely linked to that of South Carolina. The year after Menéndez established St. Augustine, he founded the town of Santa Elena on what is today Parris Island with the intention of moving himself and his family there and making it the capital of Spanish Florida. Santa Elena prospered until Menéndez’s death in 1574, and after that the settlement struggled until it was ultimately abandoned in 1587.

With the 1670 founding of Charles Town (today’s Charleston) in Carolina, conflicts immediately arose with the Spanish at St. Augustine. English Carolina was an intrusion on what Spain had claimed to be part of “La Florida” since the early 16th century. In the same year that Charles Town was first settled, the Spanish began construction of the immense Castillo de San Marcos, a fort constructed of blocks of quarried shell aggregate called coquina (Figure 1). The fort was not finished until 1700, just in time to resist a 1702 invasion by Carolina Governor James Moore. There were attacks back and forth between Charles Town and St. Augustine until 1740, when General James Oglethorpe, founder of the Georgia colony, defeated a large Spanish force on St. Simons Island on the Georgia coast.

At the same time that these European colonial powers were fighting over control of the lower southeast, the Native American populations in the region were fighting for their very survival. A group called the Westo by the English and Chichimeco by the Spanish arrived in present-day Georgia from the far north in 1659. Because the Westo carried firearms, while those they attacked were armed with only bows and arrows, local
populations were quickly overrun with those taken prisoner and sold as slaves in Virginia. These Westo attacks led to forced migrations of many indigenous groups over the next couple of decades, but those who were most dramatically effected were those who came to be called the Yamasee. The Yamasee from the interior Georgia province called La Tama by the Spanish fled first to the lower South Carolina Coast and then by 1665 to the Georgia coast to take refuge on the fringes of the Spanish missions there among the Guale and Mocama Indians.

By 1683, the Westo had been driven from Carolina, but pirates attacked the Yamasee and the Spanish missions. In that year, the Yamasee fled north to the area around Port Royal Sound on the lower South Carolina coast, and they were soon joined by a large number of coastal Georgia Guale. These Yamasee/Guale refugee groups resided in South Carolina for the next 30 years (Figure 2). They became strong allies of the English at Charles Town, assisting them in their wars against the Spanish and other Indian groups, including the Tuscarora, and attacking Spanish-allied Indians all the way to the Florida Keys. Indigenous Florida Indian groups were decimated, with thousands of captives sold as slaves for Carolina plantations or transported out of the colony.

In 1715, the Yamasee and all their Indian neighbors rose up against Carolina due to abuse by traders, mounting debt owed to those same traders, and a host of other offenses against them. The Yamasee War failed as an effort to dislodge the by then numerous settlers in Carolina, and the Yamasee and their allies were forced to withdraw to the south with many of them settling around the periphery of St. Augustine. These Yamasee communities were subjected to repeated attacks by Carolina forces over the following decades. Many surviving Yamasee joined the Spaniards who relocated to Cuba when all of Spanish Florida was ceded to the British in 1763 by the Treaty of Paris, which ended the Seven Year’s War, though there are still Yamasee descendants living across the Southeast today.

I was recently in St. Augustine from April 16th through 19th for a conference titled “The Yamasee Indians: From Florida to South Carolina.” I co-organized this conference on the 300th anniversary of the
Yamasee War with Dr. Denise Bossy, a historian at the University of North Florida (Figure 3). While at another conference two years ago in Savannah, we talked about the need for a focused conference on the Yamasee, since there are many historians and archaeologists conducting research on this important group. The St. Augustine conference was the result of our efforts. The conference was held at Flagler College in the former Ponce de Leon Hotel built by industrialist Henry Flagler in 1888 (Figure 4). The opulent setting was enjoyed by the conference participants and the registered audience of more than one hundred.

The impressive group of scholars who participated in the conference came from across the entire eastern half of the United States, as can be seen from the following: Chairs and Discussants: Dr. Charles Cobb (University of Florida), Dr. Alan Gallay (Texas Christian University), Dr. Gifford Waters (University of Florida), Dr. John Worth (University of West Florida); Presenters—Historians: Dr. Denise Bossy (University of North Florida), Dr. Amy Turner Bushnell (Brown University), Dr. William Ramsey (Lander University), Dr. Jane G. Landers (Vanderbilt University), Dr. Steven C. Hahn (St. Olaf College), Dr. Susan Parker (St. Augustine Historical Society), Amanda Hall (University of North Florida); Presenters—Archaeologists: Dr. Chester B. DePratter (University of South Carolina), Dr. Keith Ashley (University of North Florida), Dr. Eric C. Poplin (Brockington and Associates), Dr. Jon Bernard Marcoux (Salve Regina University), Alex Sweeney (Brockington and Associates), Andrea Page White (University of New Orleans), Carl D. Halbirt (Archaeologist for City of St. Augustine) (Figure 5).

The three days of conference activities included four paper sessions, dinners, luncheons, receptions, and plenty of time for the participants to talk about the Yamasee from many different perspectives. In my experience, it was a rare opportunity for a group of historians and archaeologists to listen to each other’s papers and then have time to discuss common interests, newfound knowledge, and the potential for future research (Figure 6).

In the coming months, Dr. Bossy and I will be compiling the conference presentations into an edited volume that we believe will be a major contribution to our understanding of the lower southeast in the late 17th and early 18th centuries. The book will not be published until Fall 2016 or Spring 2017, but in the interim, the conference participants will be sharing knowledge and expertise as Yamasee research proceeds with renewed impetus. The website for the Yamasee Conference can be found at: http://yamaseeconference.weebly.com/.

South Carolina Archaeology Month 2015
In 2015, I will Chair the design of the South Carolina Archaeology Month poster, and the theme this year is in recognition of the 300th anniversary of the Yamasee War in South Carolina. Many of the articles on the back of the poster will be derived from papers presented at the Yamasee Conference on South Carolina Yamasee villages and archaeological sites on land and underwater. The design of the front of the poster will be published in the fall issue of Legacy 2015.
When I returned to SCIAA in 1994 to work for the Santa Elena project, I realized that there was a growing backlog of unconserved 16th century iron artifacts. These objects required conservation not only to preserve them for the future, but more immediately to make them presentable for report illustrations. One solution for the problem would have been to contract with a professional conservation service. There are certainly archaeological recoveries such as preserved organic material, or iron objects from salt water environments, where a professional, academic or commercial conservation lab is the only responsible option. Such services are remarkably expensive, however, and they are not really necessary for the majority of the metal artifacts recovered from terrestrial projects in the southeast.

The solution was to set up my own modest “lab,” and to employ my own modest knowledge of iron conservation. That knowledge was (and remains) entirely practical rather than academic, and it was (and is) poorly grounded in the basics of chemistry and physics that real conservators take for granted. A youthful fascination with 19th century artillery ammunition meant that I was already doing rudimentary iron conservation when I was in high school. I quickly figured out what seemed to work best, while remaining almost entirely innocent of why it worked. In the 1980s and early 1990s, I applied my techniques to archaeological materials from a variety of projects with which I was involved, and even set up small “labs” for a couple of employers. In retrospect, the methods I brought to bear on the first batch of Santa Elena artifacts in 1994 were not ideal, but they were a great deal better than nothing, and they have improved steadily since then.

With encouragement from Stan South and Chester DePratter, I began by conserving iron artifacts from the 1993 and 1994 Santa Elena field seasons. After that, when we returned from subsequent field seasons, I always made an effort to conserve an array of both unique, and common, representative artifacts from the new material. After several years I was caught up well enough to begin work on the large backlog of Santa Elena iron from pre-1993 seasons. Eventually, I began to work on projects other than Santa Elena, and have conserved collections of iron artifacts from a wide variety of sites ranging from the 16th to the 20th centuries. In particular, my battlefield work with Steve Smith has generated collections of iron material from military sites, including Camden (Figure 1), Blackstocks, Fort Motte, Dunham’s Bluff, Williamson’s Plantation, and Congaree.

Figure 1: A conserved trade gun flintlock mechanism from the 1780 Camden Battlefield. (SCIAA photo by James Legg)

Figure 2: Artifacts recovered from the Continental 6-pounder battery erected during the Siege of Fort Motte, 1781. (SCIAA photo by James Legg)
Creek. In the last several years, I have dealt with large iron artifact assemblages from 38HA161 (a mid-18th century plantation in Hampton County), 9EF169 (Mount Pleasant Trading Post on the Savannah River), a range of 18th century Chickasaw towns in Mississippi, and our on-going work at Fort Motte (Figure 2). I have also assisted the USC Department of Anthropology with their iron material from Fort Congaree, and most recently completed a selection of artifacts from the 1979 Yaughan and Curriboo Plantations project that are curated at SCIAA (Figure 3). I am sometimes asked by colleagues or the owners of interesting artifacts to conserve something they have, and more often than not I have added their items to one of my electrolysis tanks (Figures 4 and 5). At this stage, however, I have more than enough iron material to conserve that is directly related to SCIAA projects, and my standard response has become, “I will be happy to show you how to do it yourself.”

I have almost always had some assistance with my conservation efforts, most often USC graduate or undergraduate anthropology students working at SCIAA, or regular lab employees. These people have rotated through SCIAA on a fairly regular basis, such that easily 15 individuals have learned the basics of my version of “expedient iron conservation.” Most recently, anthropology undergraduate Katherine Carter comprised the iron “lab staff” during her senior year, and current anthropology graduate student Brandy Joy (Figure 6) now devotes a portion of her assistantship time to my iron conservation. Santa Elena lab director, Heathley Johnson, has recently taken over (or rather revived) the conservation of Santa Elena iron artifacts, and has set up a new lab in the SCIAA Jones Science Building facility. At this writing, the Applied Research Division of SCIAA is setting up its own conservation capability in the SCIAA Wet Lab, including a sturdy new shelf built by Joe Wilkinson that houses their electrolysis tanks and most of mine as well (Figure 6). All along my fairly modest supply and equipment needs have been met by Chester DePratter or Steve Smith, often with out-of-pocket purchases. While acknowledging assistance, I should add that State Archaeologist Jonathan Leader has always been willing to entertain my questions regarding conservation, and he has also passed along some very useful supplies and equipment, including all of the sodium carbonate I have used for at least a decade, and most of the heavy plastic tanks that I use for electrolysis. Jon, of course, is a real conservator, and in the days when SCIAA had an actual, professional conservation facility, conservation was one of his jobs. Jon has always been kind (or at least silent) regarding my “expedient” conservation.
Method

The conservation of excavated iron (including cast iron, wrought iron, and steel) has three major goals, including cleaning the surface of iron-product encrustation (rust), removing contaminants (mainly chlorides) that reside in the porous surface of the object, and sealing the surface after cleaning to protect it from the atmosphere. Chlorides, in particular, are responsible for the rapid, destructive corrosion of iron objects that have been excavated and left unconserved. Both rust removal and the reduction of chlorides are accomplished by electrolysis, which involves the creation of an electrolytic cell in a tank or vat, with the artifact as the negative cathode and stainless steel plates serving as the positive anode. The array is submerged in a base solution (electrolyte) of water and sodium carbonate. When current is supplied by an ordinary manual battery charger and the cell functions, two important things happen. First, hydrogen bubbles evolve at the interface between the metallic iron and the iron-product encrustation (rust), and the encrustation is mechanically pushed away. Second, negatively charged ions of chlorides and other contaminants are drawn out of the surface of the iron artifact, and plate onto the stainless steel anodes.

Typically, most of the rust encrustation will detach from an artifact within the first 24 hours or so of electrolysis. This suggests that the process is nearly complete, but it is in fact only getting started. The remaining fraction of rust, usually that on interior or concave surfaces, can take days or weeks to loosen, and can require careful repeated manual cleaning with steel wire brushes, dental picks, and other implements. Any patches of rust that are not removed can harbor chlorides that will eventually result in new corrosion. While the removal of the rust encrustation releases a substantial portion of the chlorides, the porous outer zone of the metallic iron (the layer partially mineralized by corrosion) initially retains significant contamination. Continued electrolysis will usually reduce those chlorides to insignificant levels, provided that the solution in the tank is changed several times. There are also simple procedures for measuring the remaining chloride content. As a general rule, I leave an object in electrolysis until it is completely clean, and then continue the process for at least several more days in a fresh solution.

The next step after electrolysis is a final effort to remove contaminants, and to ensure that the PH of the porous zone is neutral or slightly basic rather than acid. This involves repeated boilings totaling several hours in mildly basic water solutions, alternated with rinsing in cold water. Distilled water is always preferred. The artifacts must then be thoroughly dried, which I accomplish by heating them on an electric burner on medium heat for several hours. After the artifacts are dry, most conservators apply tannic or phosphoric acid, which turns the surface of the artifact entirely black. The blackened surface is actually protective, but it has an unnatural painted appearance, and for that reason I do not use phosphoric acid. My final step after drying is the application of microcrystalline wax, which involves immersing the artifacts in very hot molten wax for several hours. The wax penetrates even microscopic pores in the iron, and creates a sealed surface that protects the objects from moisture, air, and handling. After cooling, each artifact goes into a fresh archival zip lock artifact bag, and is ready for photography, exhibit, or long-term curation with little danger of any additional deterioration. Ideally, the finished artifacts should be stored with silica gel for moisture control.

Figure 5: The cast iron pot from Snow Island with conservation complete. (SCIAA photo by James Legg)

Figure 6: USC Anthropology graduate student Brandy Joy monitoring electrolysis tanks at SCIAA. (SCIAA photo by James Legg)
Archeological Testing and Paleoenvironmental Research at White Pond, Elgin, South Carolina

By Christopher R. Moore

In March 2015, the Savannah River Archaeological Research Program (SRARP) initiated exploratory archeological investigations at White Pond, near Elgin, SC (Figure 1). This work was inspired by renewed paleoenvironmental interests in the deep pond sediments, including geologic coring by a team from the U.S. Department of the Interior, Southwest Climate Science Center, in Tucson, Arizona and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS).

Early paleoenvironmental reconstructions by Watts (1980) established White Pond as one of the oldest and most complete paleoenvironmental records in the Southeast with a basal core date of ca. 22,000 calendar years B.P. The current study by the U.S.G.S. seeks to provide a much higher resolution core chronology, along with a more detailed analysis of plant pollen and charcoal. In particular, the focus of this work is on characterizing the Late Pleistocene environment, the Pleistocene-Holocene transition (visible in the core as a change from silty sediments to organic rich peat), and to determine the timing of the mid-Holocene transition from oak to pine dominated forests reported elsewhere for the Southeast. Combined archaelogical and paleoenvironmental work at White Pond provides a unique opportunity to link prehistoric occupations to a continuous and high-resolution paleoenvironmental record preserved in the pond’s sediments.

Preliminary archaeological investigations focused on a high ridge on the south end of White Pond next to a cabin used by White Pond, Inc. members (Figure 2). In early March, SRARP and SCIAA staff and volunteers assisted in the excavation of two 2 x 2-meter units placed along the high flat portion of the ridge immediately west of the cabin (Figure 3). The location was selected based on a large amount of quartz and metavolcanic flake debris, stone tools, and pottery eroding out and exposed on the slope leading down from the ridge towards the waters edge. Although analysis of the findings has only just started, the site is multicomponent
with Woodland, Middle Archaic, and Early Archaic artifacts (Figure 4). Excavations revealed a dense Woodland occupation with a large amount of quartz flake debris and triangular arrow points. Pottery was also present but in more limited amounts. A thin lens of dense quartz flakes was found immediately below the surface indicating extensive working of stone and manufacture of triangular points at the site. Numerous and well-made metavolcanic triangular arrow points were also found indicating the use of non-local stone and/or procurement of Slate Belt material from river cobbles in the nearby Wateree River. Reduction of small quartz cobbles was also evident in the flake debris. These cobbles were likely brought in from nearby alluvial gravels in the Wateree or from Piedmont sources further west. Small amounts of what appeared to be flow-banded rhyolite and black chert (Ridge & Valley?) were also present. Beyond the intensive use of this location during the Woodland Period, evidence was found for Middle Archaic occupation in the form of two quartz Morrow Mountain points. A formal unifacial endscraper manufactured from quartz signaled the presence of an ephemeral Early Archaic occupation of the site. All occupations of the site were found within a shallow sandy matrix with most artifacts occurring in the upper 30 centimeters (Figure 5).

Based on the presence of a weathered argillic horizon with thick clayey lamellae (occurring below archaeological deposits), the landform is likely of considerable age (possibly predating White Pond). Other large dunes, including a large parabolic sand dune, occur around White Pond and are possibly related to the formation of the pond basin as an aeolian blowout or interdune region sometime during Late Pleistocene (ca. >20,000 years ago).

White Pond occupies a position on the Fall Line between the Coastal Plain and the Piedmont. This position between the two major physiographic regions of the state would have provided a unique and ecologically rich, upland setting for prehistoric hunter-gatherers, as well as a large source of freshwater and aquatic resources when away from riverine settings. The diversity of lithic raw material evident from the eroding ridge slope, as well as that found during limited test unit excavations, attest to the likely convergence of prehistoric populations at White Pond—possibly moving along overland trails and coming from regions...
both within and outside the Coastal Plain of South Carolina. Further work is needed to determine the range and intensity of prehistoric occupations at White Pond. Detailed paleoenvironmental work on the core sediments from the pond should provide a useful proxy for evaluating human response to climate shifts (particularly drought) experienced over the entirety of the region’s prehistory.

Following archaeological fieldwork, SRARP and SCIAA staff assisted Drs. Stephen Jackson (U.S. Department of the Interior, Southwest Climate Science Center) and Teresa Krause (Postdoctoral Fellow, Southwest Climate Science Center U.S. Geological Survey) in coring fieldwork at White Pond. The U.S.G.S. team utilized a floating platform to collect cores by manually pushing core barrels (i.e., modified Livingstone piston corer) into the soft sediments underneath the pond (Figures 6 and 7). Cores were collected in one meter sections to a depth of ~six meters below the bottom of the pond.

In addition to collecting cores for paleoclimate reconstruction, the U.S.G.S. team graciously provided the participants (i.e., Christopher Moore [SRARP-SCIAA]; Mark Brooks [SRARP-SCIAA--Retired]; Al Goodyear [SCIAA], and Terry Ferguson [Wofford College]) a replicate core bracketing the transition from silty to organic sediments at the Pleistocene-Holocene boundary. This core will be radiocarbon dated to determine the precise location of the Pleistocene-Holocene transition, analyzed using magnetic susceptibility (for correlation between our core and the one collected by the U.S.G.S. team), and sampled to look for the presence of geochemical signatures of the climate transition at the end of the last ice age, including an analysis to determine the presence of elevated Platinum (Pt). Platinum that has been found elsewhere at the Pleistocene-Holocene transition (Petaev et al. 2013) and may be indicative of the hypothesized Younger Dryas impact (e.g., Firestone et al. 2007; Wittke et al. 2013). Confirmation of the presence of elevated Pt and other rare-earth elements (REEs) at this boundary would provide additional support for the input of this material consistent with the impact hypothesis and would provide a precise chronostratigraphic marker for this core and others like it for the start of the Younger Dryas climate interval (ca. 12,800 calendar years B.P.). Such a temporal marker of a particular stratigraphic horizon would be incredibly useful in geoarchaeological research.

Future work at White Pond will include additional archaeological testing along the eastern and western margins of the pond to look for more deeply buried and stratified archaeological deposits. In particular, the western margin has large aeolian dunes with extremely xeric (well-drained) loose sand. This area has the potential for significant slope-wash contribution as an agent of archaeological site burial and preservation on the lower sections next to pond. Plans are also underway to conduct ground-penetrating radar (GPR) surveys of the pond fill (by boat) and surrounding dunes.
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Figure 6: Collecting a sediment core by pushing the core barrel from a floating platform on White Pond. (SCIAA photo by Christopher Moore)

Figure 7: Extracting a core section containing the Pleistocene-Holocene transition. (Note the transition between lighter colored Pleistocene-age silty sediments and darker, organic rich, Holocene-age sediments.) (SCIAA photo by Christopher Moore)
Introduction

The 12,000 Year History Park Project (12KHP), located in the City of Cayce, Lexington County, South Carolina (Figure 1) is a multiagency initiative enabled by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), signed in June 2014, between the River Alliance, The City of Cayce, and the National Park Service (NPS). The 12,000 Year History Park Working Group, which also includes Lexington County, SC Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism, and the SCANA Corporation, is a formal multi-member partnership that acts as a steering body for park programs and development. Since November 8, 2014, when the 360 acres of the park were transferred by SCANA to the City of Cayce, the park has been managed by the city with the assistance and guidance of The River Alliance. Existing facilities include a developed trail system (Figures 2 and 3) that connects to the Three Rivers Greenway (Figure 4). With well-preserved regionally and nationally significant archaeological and historic sites, the park offers unparalleled opportunities for public education, interpretation, and research of all major periods of South Carolina history and prehistory. The South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology has provided assistance and advice throughout the development of the park and continues to support this effort. This article highlights some recent progress in park development.

Park Resources

The park is a treasure of archaeological sites dating as far back as 12,000 years. Among significant sites is the 1718-1722 Fort Congaree I trading post, discovered by the late SCIAA archaeologist James Michie, and recently excavated by USC Department of Anthropology graduate student James Stewart (Anderson 1975; Michie 1989; Stewart 2013). The park is also the location of a day-long Civil War battle, when an advanced column of Major General William T. Sherman’s army converged on the Confederate earthworks at Congaree Creek. Today, the highly visible 1865 earthworks are well preserved and protected thanks to their location in the Congaree River floodplain and multiple 20th century preservation efforts. The park also includes the Old State Road, which generally follows the path of the prehistoric/historic Cherokee Trail, and numerous prehistoric Native American sites.

The most recent archaeological work has been conducted by Brockington and Associates Inc. (Poplin and Baluha 2013; Poplin 2015) focusing on the Civil War battle and included historical research and metal detecting. In 2014, Brockington and Associates archaeologists, assisted by SCIAA, conducted a second metal detection survey at the battlefield leading to the discovery of the location of a temporary defensive structure called a tete-de-pont. This find allows for an interpretation of the two central phases

Figure 1: Google map showing location of the 12,000 Year History Park on the western side of the Congaree River floodplain. (Map courtesy from Poplin 2015, Figure 4.3).
of the battle from the night of February 14, 1865 through the night of February 15, 1865 (Figure 5).

Park Concept and Planning

The idea of a 12,000 Year History Park was the brain-child of Oz Nagler, civil engineer, and Mike Dawson, Chief Executive Officer at The River Alliance, in the mid 1990s. For over a decade, The River Alliance, Inc., a non-profit (501c3) public advocacy consortium, has led local efforts to create the park. The idea was to develop a publicly-owned park that would enable the public to benefit from the park’s rich cultural heritage assets; primarily preserved archaeological remains. With the National Park Service as a founding partner, the park offers an interpretation and management scheme that emulates the standards of the National Park Service (NPS).

Planning for the park gained momentum during the first decade of the 21st century. In 2000, the River Alliance approached the NPS Southeast Archeological Center in Tallahassee, FL, known for its expertise and leadership in archaeological heritage interpretation, to oversee a study of existing and potential archaeological resources within the park. This work included the production of four interpretive oil paintings depicting historic activities at the park (Kane and Keeton 2007). In December 2010, The River Alliance hosted an archaeological resources interpretation workshop with NPS personnel that produced recommendations for an interpretive strategy for the park.

Local public involvement is critical in the park’s development, and the River Alliance and the 12KHP Working Group have organized and hosted numerous stakeholder meetings. For instance, in August 2013, as input for the preparation by NPS of a Long Range Interpretive Plan (LRIP), a stakeholder meeting was attended by over 50 individuals and special interest groups. Additional meetings followed this initial planning meeting, which including a live video Skype session with Don Wollenhaupt, Chief of Education and Interpretation at the NPS Atlanta Office.

A 2012 AGO (Americas Great Outdoor Initiative) report recommended a multi-party governmental/non-profit partnership to administer the park spearheaded by The River Alliance, with the eventual formation of a stand-alone non-profit to administer and manage the park. The envisioned partnership would include The River Alliance, the University of South Carolina (Department of Anthropology and SCIAA), the National Park Service, the SC Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism, Lexington County, and the City of Cayce. Based on an analysis of similar publicly administered sites in the area, the report suggested a median expectation of about 130,000 visitors per year for the 12,000 Year History Park. Pearlman (2000), in an earlier development feasibility study, placed the estimated visitation at just under 180,000.

Application of the Operational Partnership Model

As noted, the 12,000 Year History Park is a part of, and connected to, the Three Rivers Greenway project (Figure 2). The River Alliance has established a park trail system that connects to the greater Cayce Riverwalk Trail System. In 2011, the Three Rivers Greenway was selected by the AGO as one of the country’s most promising ways to reconnect Americans to their natural and cultural heritage. This designation led to the NPS Office of the Comptroller-Business Management Groups selection of the Three Rivers Greenway as one of seven projects for its Business Plan Internship Program (BPI). Each summer the BPI program selects graduate students to work as summer
consultants in a NPS unit. In 2012, the park became the first ever non-NPS unit to be included in the program. The summer consultants were tasked with the following objectives: (1) conduct research on similar park operating models and funding sources; (2) develop an operational and organizational model for the proposed visitor center; and (3) analyze financial self-sustainability of the proposed model based on predicted visitation.

**City of Cayce Archaeological Ordinance**

On June 3, 2014, in accordance with the MOU, a substantial Archaeological Ordinance was approved by the Cayce City Council to protect the resources in the park:

“It shall be unlawful for any person to damage or disturb, or cause to be damaged or disturbed, any area, structure, artifact, fossil or fossil material, archaeological feature or archeological element on an archaeological/historical site owned, leased, operated or maintained by the city without prior written permission from the city manager or her/his designee, or on any other archaeological/historical site located within the city limits without prior written permission from the property owner. Each such act of damage or disturbance shall constitute a separate offense.” (City of Cayce 2014).

The City of Cayce has also committed significant resources to public safety (law enforcement and trail lighting) and operational trail maintenance for the park.

**Volunteer Program**

Between November 2014 and January 2015, the River Alliance coordinated the recruitment and training of volunteer guides to lead tours of the Battle of Congaree Creek, in conjunction with Burning of Columbia, Civil War 150th Sesquicentennial Commemorations. This work and the development of the Battle of Congaree Creek Interpretive Module was carried out by myself representing the River Alliance as Staff Secretary of the Working Group, with substantial assistance by Douglas Patterson, Volunteer Coordinator. The volunteers received eight hours of interpretation techniques training led by the staff at Congaree National Park. The program was an outstanding success. A total of 28 volunteer-led tours of the battlefield and entrenchments were carried out between January and March 2015. Tour attendees represented 38 zip codes, mostly from South Carolina but also from four other states in the east and Midwest. Building on our past work in collaboration with partner organizations and individuals, our recent work has established a platform to move forward in planning for the park, including a strategy for marketing, managing projects and events, and expanded roles for volunteers (Figures 6 and 7).

**Proposed Work in 2015 and Beyond**

Developing the park is a long term effort and many new projects are being planned. For instance, starting in June 2015, The River Alliance will host volunteer information meetings to be scheduled for every 3rd Saturdays and Wednesdays at 9:00 AM at the River Alliance offices, 400 Rivermont Drive,
2nd floor. We are planning to begin new volunteer-led tours, utilizing the Civil War Human Interest Interpretive Module, in September 2015.

Two workshops are planned in 2015. To assist our efforts in information gathering ahead of preparing the story narratives and supporting graphics, we plan to organize an all-day workshop on this topic on Saturday, July 25. As part of our partnership with higher education, we are planning a “Higher Education Day” event at the park on September 18, 2015. USC departments and other local colleges and universities faculty, staff, SCIAA’s Archaeological Research Trust Board, and graduate students will be invited to attend this event as an orientation/introduction to park resources and research opportunities.

Summary
The 12,000 Year History Park Project involves the collaboration and cooperation of local organizations and agencies. Existing facilities include an extensive trail system connecting to the Three Rivers Greenway. The River Alliance has led local efforts to apply high standards of resource protection and education. With well-preserved regionally and nationally significant archaeological and historic sites, the park offers unparalleled opportunities for public education, interpretation, and research of all major periods of South Carolina history and prehistory.
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Arkhaios Cultural Heritage and Archaeology Film Festival
Held in Hilton Head Island, SC, October 23-25, 2014
By Joanna Casey, Professor in Department of Anthropology, USC

Arkhaios is the creation of avocational archaeologist Jean Guilleux, who noted that while there are over a dozen archaeology film festivals in his native Europe, North America has only one: The Archaeology Channel International Film and Video Festival in Eugene Oregon (TAC). Guilleux’s five-year plan is to see if he can generate enough interest and support for an on-going annual archaeology film festival in the eastern U.S. For the first Arkhaios in 2013, Guilleux rented a slate of winning films from the TAC film festival and solicited films specifically about South Carolina heritage and archaeology, but this year’s Arkhaios was a juried competition. Guilleux’s criteria for films are that they must be of high intellectual merit, well produced, and of interest to both general and academic audiences. He also tries to balance the program so that excellent smaller films are not overshadowed by big budget ones, and he reserves three hours (one hour per day) of the festival for films about South Carolina. Entries were solicited in February and a screening committee made up of film makers, historians, ethnographers, archaeologists and writers/journalists selected 17 films from the 40 that were submitted for consideration. A separate jury of similar composition voted on the winners in four categories. There was also a Founder’s Award for Public Archaeology, and audience members voted for their favorites each day. The winners in all categories were announced at the end of the festival.

The films featured nine countries and covered a variety of archaeological and heritage topics. Many of the films were introduced by their directors or other people involved in them. Admission was free, so the audience was an eclectic mix of people with varied interests in archaeology and history, some of whom stayed for the whole festival, while others came to see specific films.

The jury’s Grand Prize winner for 2014 was The Lady of Cao, directed by Jose Manuel Novoa, about a spectacular Moche elite burial from Peru, and an honorable mention went to Ramesses II: The Great Journey, directed by Valerie Girie and Guillaume Hecht. Both of these are big, slick films with reenactments and computer generated imagery, the type of films that are likely to be shown on PBS. For my taste, they were among the least interesting of the festival’s offerings. Tellingly, Cao was only second runner up...
in the audience favorites on the day it was shown, while *Ramesses II* did not figure in audience favorites at all. The award for the best Cultural Heritage Film went to the superb *Agave is Life*, directed by Meredith Dreiss and David Brown, a film about the many uses of the agave plant and its place in Mexican heritage. An honorable mention went to *The Fuertiduena Apse: Journey from Castile to New York*, directed by Christopher Noey, a fascinating film that chronicled the emplacement of the Spanish Medieval apse at the Cloisters Museum in New York in 1957.

The award for the best archaeology film went to *Dance of the Maize God*, directed by David Lebrun, which looked at how painted Mayan vases have been giving insight into Mayan court life and cosmology. The film also gives even-handed documentation of how the vases figure in the lives of the looters, dealers, academics, and many others through whose hands they pass.

*Finding Clovis*, directed by Steve Folks, won both an Honorable Mention for the best Archaeology Film and the Arkhaios Founder Award for Public Archaeology. This film is about the Topper Site in South Carolina where Albert Goodyear’s on-going work has recovered Clovis and earlier artifacts, as well as evidence supporting the theory that a comet wiped out the Clovis culture.

The award for the Best South Carolina Heritage Film went to *Discovering Dave: Spirit Captured in Clay*, directed by George Wingard and Mark Albertin, which is about an enslaved potter who worked in Edgefield, South Carolina in the 1800s where he signed his name to his pots and sometimes inscribed them with poetry. Two films directed by Jamie and Christie Koelker, *Pottersville: Home of Alkaline Glazed Stoneware* and *Horse Creek Valley: A Tale Worth Telling* were also situated in the Edgefield region and provided excellent context for the film. *Pottersville* was one of the little gems of the festival. It follows archaeologist George Calfas as he directs the excavation of a groundhog kiln and truly captures the decision making process in archaeology. The honorable mention in this category went to the audience favorite, *Hilton Head Island Back in the Day*, directed by Butch Hirsch. This film tells the story of the African American community on Hilton Head Island through the reminiscences of its elders. This was the last film shown at the festival, and the house lights come up on an audience filled with people who had been featured in it. The short film, *Finding Freedom’s Home*, directed by Carol Poplin provided background to Mitchellville, the freedman’s community that figured prominently in *Hilton Head Island Back in the Day*.

One of the audience favorites that did not get picked by the jury was *The Renaissance of Mata Ortiz*, a beautiful film about how a friendship between self-taught potter Juan Quezada and anthropologist Spencer MacCallum revived the art of pottery making and saved a dying Mexican town. Although Quezada’s original pots were close copies of Casas Grandes ceramics, his work and that of the many other villagers who were inspired by him have evolved into their own spectacular art forms.

I sincerely hope that Jean Guilleux has found his audience and that we can look forward to many more years of Arkhaios. The venue was the charming Coligny Theater, a single screen movie house located in a pleasant beachside shopping center. Screenings took place from 1:00 – 6:30 pm giving festival goers plenty of time to enjoy the many amenities Hilton Head has to offer on a warm, fall weekend.

*A sherd from the 1862 Dave pot found in situ at excavations on the Savannah River Site that prompted the making of the documentary film, *Discovering Dave: Spirit Captured in Clay*. (Photo courtesy of George Wingard)*

*Scene from the film, *Agave is Life*. (Photo courtesy of Jean Guilleux)*
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ITW Foundation
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William A. Behan
Ann and Richard Christie
BOB-BQ Inc.
David G. and Jackie B. Davies
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Harold Curry
Sarah C. Gillespie
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David and Sue Hodges
Randy C. and Julie A. Ivey
Thor Eric and Grace Larsen
Joseph Mix
Lawrence C. Parham
Susan B. Smith
Robert E. and Carol Ann Tyler
Richard E. Watkins
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Mark Garrett Cooper
Walter Patrick and Jane Ballenger Dorn
George Fields
Clare and Hubert Fincher
Jane Fox
Cary Hall
Michael Harmon
Joseph and Mary Hardy
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Howard W. Holschuh
Jeffrey and Toni Goodman Hubbell
William D. Moxley, Jr.
Barbara Key Powell
Julie H. Strahle
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Randy and Mary Alice Akers
David G. Anderson
Elisabeth E. Arndt
William H. Baab, Jr.
Richard B. and Mollie Baker
Benny and Jackie Bartley
Thomas J. Blumer
Bill Bridges
Jeff and Angela Broome
Merle Gwen Brown

John Causey
Edward S. Cummings, III
Jerry Dacus
Michael J. and Lorraine Dewey
David Donmoyer
Alma Harriett Fore
E. Cantey Haile, Jr. and Patricia Smith Haile
Grace E. Harvey
Ian Hill
P. Kenneth Huggins, Jr.
Joan and Glen Inabinet
Institute of Physical Therapy
Joan Lowery
Gretchen H. Munroe
Cal Overbeek
Conrad and Betty Pearson
Kevin and Mary Prince
Byron C. Rodgers, Jr.
Robert L. Schuyler
Fred Henry and Carol Shute
Robert Patrick Smith
John J. and Pamela B. Stuart
Henry S. and Leslie Ann Sully
Lee Thomas
Jan Steensen Urban
Robert L. and Janice Van Buren
Richard G. Wall

Legacy
Randy and Mary Alice Akers
Frank and Elizabeth Allan
William H. Baab, Jr.
Richard B. and Mollie Baker
Lezlie Mills Barker
Benny and Jackie Bartley
Paul H. and Judith Davis Benson
Thomas J. Blumer
Sherrell Goodyear Boette
Jeff and Angela Broome
Merle Gwen Brown
Bobby E. Butler
John G. Causey
Janet Ceigler
Ann and Richard Christie
William C. and Robert B. Coleman
John S. Connors
Edward S. Cummings, III
Harold and Cynthia Curry
Jerry Dacus
Michael and Lorraine Dewey
David L. Donmoyer
Walter Patrick and Jane Ballenger Dorn
George Fields

Michael T. Finch
Hubert and Clare Finch
Joel and Lorene Fisher
Alma Harriett Fore
Jane Fox
Joan Gero
Albert C. Goodyear, III
E. Cantey Haile, Jr.
Patricia Smith Haile
Joyce Hallenbeck
Joseph and Mary Hardy
Michael Harmon
Antony C. Harper
Harper Family Foundation
Norman A. Hastings
Ian D. Hill
David and Sue Hodges
Curtis and Agnus Janet Holladay
John and Kay Hollis
Howard W. Holschuh
Jeffrey and Toni Goodwin Hubbell
Glen and Joan Inabinet
Institute of Physical Therapy
Randy and Julie Ivey
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Ted M. and Barbara B. Johnson
Daniel R. Jones
Judy S. Kendall
Thor Eric and Grace Larsen
Stephen G. Loring
Joan G. Lowery
Sam and Gina McCuen
Jerrell D. Melear
Jacqueline M. Miller
Joseph A. and Delinda A. Mix
Gretchen H. Munroe
Francis and Mary Neuffer
Cal Overbeek
Robert W. Owen, Jr.
Patricia Richards Parker
Conrad and Betty Pearson
Mike N. Peters
Barbara Key Powell
Byron C. and Benona Rodgers, Jr.
Roschen Foundation
Mary Julia Royal
William C. Schmidt, Jr.
Robert L. Schuyler
Fred Henry and Carol B. Shute
Leroy Hampton Simkins, Jr.
Robert Patrick Smith
Tim and Alice Barron Pearce Stewart
Julie H. Strahle

In May 2015, Albert Goodyear led ART Board members and guests to the recent excavations at the Topper site. (L to R: Bob Mimms, James Borton, Elliott Levy, Al Goodyear, Steve Smith, Bill Schmidt; not all participants shown) (Photo courtesy of Nena Powell Rice)
ART Board Members and Guests at the Topper site excavations led by Dr. David Anderson, kneeling front and center. (L to R: Sam McCuen, Bob Mimms, Jo Baker, Nena Powell Rice, James Borton, Bill Schmidt, Chair Bill Bridges, Chris Gilliam, and Steve Smith) (Photo courtesy of Nena Powell Rice)

Robert N. Strickland
John J. and Pamela B. Stuart
Henry S. and Leslie Ann Sully
James W. Taylor
Lee Thomas
Randall W. Turner
Robert and Carol Tyler
Jan Steensel Urban
Robert L. and Janice Van Buren
Richard G. Suzanne B. Wall
Constance A. White
David Jack and Jeanie Gail Youngblood
Rebecca F. Zinco

Allendale Archaeology Research Fund
Glenn and Sherry Bower
Joanne Cross
Randolph B. Dunlap
Linda Fallon
Edmund Heyward Hardy
Rhett McLeod Hardy
Anthony C. Harper
Harper Family Foundation
Neal A. and Catherine W. Konstantin
Mary W. Koob
Patricia Linsteadt McGinnis
Ruth Ann Ott
F. J. Stilp
Robert N. Strickland
Trust for G. A. and Kathryn M. K. Kil gore
Robert and Elmina Westen
White Pond, Inc.
Constance White

Civil War Prisons Research Fund
Daniel L. and Uta P. Anderson, Sr.
Eric J. Boothroyd
John Bratton
Daniel Chaplin Camp No. 3
City of Columbia
Terry Robert and Elizabeth Hatch Dimmery
James Russell Fennel
Joyce Martin Hill
Hughes Development Corporation
Jasper County Historical Society
Edward and Dorothy Kendall Foundation
Daniel Mickel Foundation
Lindsay Burnside Pressley
Kem Rankin Smith
Robert N. Strickland
Cable and Jodi A. Willenborg

Contact Period Fund
Southeastern Natural Sciences

Maritime Archaeology Research Fund
Anonymous
Lawrence and Nancy M. Babits

Palo Materials Lab Fund
Frank and Elizabeth Allan
Anonymous
Charles Robert and Joyce W. Baugh
Frederick and Sherril Goodyear Boette
William A. Childress
Colonial Packaging, Inc.
Hal and Cynthia Curry
David W. Dunlap
Dennis T. Fenwick
Albert C. Goodyear, III
Donald and April Gordon
Anthony C. Harper
Eleanor M. Hynes
Bill Kanef
D. L. Kendall
Judy S. Kendall
Neal A. and Catherine W. Konstantin
Mary W. Koob
Martha J. Lewis
David A. and Alice Noble
Richard W. and Melodie S. Ohaus
Ruth Ann Ott
Thomas and Betsy Perttierra
Eliza Lucas Pinckney Chapter of DAR
Ernie and Joan Plummer
Carol Reed
Harry Everett and Margaret Grubbs Shealy
John and Alison Simpson
Arthur P. Wallace
Karim and Myron Yanoff
Rebecca F. Zinco
Paula Zitzelberger

Savannah River Archaeological Research Program
Charles Horace Gray, Jr.

SCIAA ArchSite Fund
Banks Construction

Snow Island/Fort Motte Fund
Richard E. Watkins

SCIAA Family Fund (ART/Outreach)
Elizabeth A. Allen
F. Jo Baker
William Benton and Jane Gunnell
Sherrell Goodyear Boette
Bill Bridges
Howard W. Holschuh
Ted and Barbara Johnson
Sam and Gina McCuen
Jay and Jennifer Mills
Robert Mimms
Nena Powell Rice
Heyward Robinson
William C. Schmidt, Jr.
Morgan Stanley Fund

Robert L. Stephenson Library Fund
Archaeological Research Trust Board
Edward and Dorothy Kendall
Jay and Jennifer Mills
Faith Stephenson
Andrew R. and Karen Walsh Thomas
USC Thomas Cooper Library

John Winthrop Archaeological Research Endowment Fund
Archroma, Inc.
John Winthrop
The John Winthrop Archaeological Research Endowment Fund

By Albert C. Goodyear

In 2014, Mr. John Winthrop of Charleston, South Carolina created an endowed fund with the USC Education Foundation, which will provide in perpetuity, funds to support archaeological research in the Allendale County region, particularly the Topper site. Mr. Winthrop has had a long record of supporting archaeology in this region, specifically with exhibits and grants to the University of South Carolina Salkehatchie campus. He donated artifact cases that now exhibit his personal collection from nearby Ivanhoe Plantation, the Allendale chert quarry findings, and the Groton Plantation artifacts from the Harvard Expedition of several years ago. In 2010, he provided a grant to help install the current Topper site exhibit in the University of South Carolina Salkehatchie Library.

The John Winthrop Archaeological Research Endowment Fund was created to give more meaning to the John Winthrop collection currently on display, to continue to conduct research on the Topper site and the broader Allendale County region, and to provide a stipend for a student to allow them to become involved in various aspects of archaeology, including field work, laboratory analysis, exhibit preparation, and the study of private collections from the region. Mr. Winthrop is to be commended for his long time support of the archaeology of the Allendale County region at the University of South Carolina Salkehatchie campus, and now with this gift, he has created a lasting means to continue support to these important studies.

SAVE THE DATE!

ARKHAIOS CULTURAL HERITAGE AND ARCHAEOLOGY FILM FESTIVAL

OCTOBER 21-23, 2015

COLIGNY THEATER, HILTON HEAD ISLAND

http://www.arkhaiosfilmfestival.org