

SEAC

NEWSLETTER

SOUTHEASTERN ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONFERENCE • VOLUME 19 NUMBER 2 • OCTOBER 1977

SEAC

NEWSLETTER • VOL. 19 NO. 2

• OCTOBER 1977

The SEAC *Newsletter* is published biannually in the spring and fall by the Southeastern Archaeological Conference. Subscription is by membership in the SEAC. Dues for annual membership are \$5.00 for individuals, \$7.50 for family and \$7.50 for institutions. Membership includes one (1) bulletin and two (2) newsletters. Requests for memberships and general inquiries should be addressed to the secretary; subscriptions, dues, changes of address, and orders for back issues to the treasurer; manuscripts for publication in the bulletin to the editor of the bulletin; and newsletter items to the editor of the newsletter.

OFFICERS

President: R. Berle Clay, Department of Anthropology, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506

Vice-president: Charles H. McNutt, Department of Anthropology, Memphis State University, Memphis, TN 38152

Secretary: Martha A. Rolinson, Arkansas Archeological Survey, University of Arkansas Museum, Fayetteville, AR 72701

Treasurer: Alfred K. Guthe, Frank H. McClung Museum, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37916

Sergeant at arms: Robert S. Neitzel, 110 Joffrion St., Marksville, LA 71351

Editor of the Bulletin: Drexel A. Peterson, Jr., Department of Anthropology, Memphis State University, Memphis, TN 38152

Editor of the Newsletter: David H. Dye, Department of Anthropology, Washington University, St. Louis, MO 63130

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

Current State Research

Illinois (Southern Illinois University) 2

Kentucky (Northern Kentucky University) 2

(Shellmound Archaeological Project) 4

Tennessee (Tennessee River Archaeological Project) 5

Deaths/James H. Chapman 5

1978 James Mooney Award 6

Science with a small "s"

(by Michael Trinkley) 7

New Publications 10

1977 SEAC Preliminary Program 11

SEAC Back Issues 13

Meeting Calendar 15

NEWS OF THE 34TH ANNUAL MEETING &
PRELIMINARY PROGRAM

begins on page 11

Current State Research

Illinois

Southern Illinois University

The University Museum of Southern Illinois University-Carbondale has engaged in a number of archaeological surveys this year.

James Rudolph has been directing field operations in the small valleys along the Bay Creek drainage for the Soil Conservation Service. Of twenty-one sites excavated, most reveal evidence of Late Woodland and Mississippian occupation. He is currently completing the final report on the survey in the upper Shawnee Hills highlands where little work has previously been conducted.

During reconnaissance along the Mississippi River shoreline in the Cache River Valley in Alexander County, personnel of the University Museum discovered two Middle Woodland storage pits eroding from the bank. Ceramics associated with these pits reveal rim treatment similar to Naples Stamped of the Havana Tradition, generally recovered further north. Body sherds suggest cord marking of the Crab Orchard Tradition. Subsequent testing of the Frog City and Red Light sites, under the direction of Lawrence Santeford, has yielded new data on the Middle Woodland in this part of southern Illinois. The Frog City site was covered with approximately 2.5 meters of alluvium, with layers of sand and clay lying immediately above the occupation level. Evidence suggests that the site was covered by the river almost immediately following occupation. Fisk (1944: Plate 15, Sheet 1) reveals one reconstructed meander (Stage 3) of the Mississippi River lying in this area from ca. A.D. 365-465. Despite problems with Fisk's chronology, it appears that the site was covered; the dates are close to the period of occupation. Samples from the pits have been submitted for radiocarbon dating, while the remainder of the pit fill will be floated. The latter should provide some of the first and best environmental data from southwestern Illinois for this period. The site will be covered with rock by the Corps of Engineers to prevent further erosion by the river.

Other surveys have been carried out in the Little Grassy Lake area and along Route 1 where the bridge crosses the Saline River in Gallatin County.

Personnel from the University Museum are also in the process of planning exhibits on the prehistoric aborigines of southern Illinois for the new museum facilities. A slide program, with narration, on the subject will soon be available for presentation in the museum auditorium.

Lawrence Gene Santeford
Staff Archaeologist
University Museum
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, IL 62901

Kentucky

Northern Kentucky University

The fourth annual archaeological field school for Northern Kentucky University was conducted between June 6 and July 8, 1977. Sixteen students from the northern Kentucky-southwestern Ohio region were instructed by Mr. Kenneth C. Carstens and Dr. James F. Hoppgood. Several field trips to other archaeological sites (Incinerator site, Seip Mound group, Fort Hill, Great Serpent Mound, and

the Mound City group) were taken to give students additional archaeological experience.

Both the third and fourth annual archaeological field schools were held at 15Be36, a multicomponent site in Boone County, Kentucky. The local land owner has collected chipped stone artifacts from this site. His collection spans the duration of eastern U.S. prehistory, Paleo-Indian through Fort Ancient cultures. He has also collected several early historic items as well, e.g., blue glass, hexagonal beads.

The Fort Ancient occupation of this site is located on a glacial outwash feature that overlooks a small tributary of the Ohio River, Gunpowder Creek. This creek lies to the northwest of the site and flows in a general southwesterly direction until it merges with the Ohio River two miles downstream. The site commands a 0.75 mile view in all directions as it overlooks the widest floodplain portion of Gunpowder Creek. The site is also between two geologically older, water-cut ridge systems which lie to the northwest and southeast.

The modern environment of the immediate site vicinity may be divided into five major ecological zones: (1) upland hill tops; (2) upland slopes; (3) glacial outwash features; (4) floodplain-bottomlands; and (5) water habitat. The modern flora reflects the almost two-hundred years of modern wood cutting and agricultural activity for the region; however, according to the landowner, some virgin tree stands still exist. The flora, when present, consists mainly of second growth acorn, hickory, oak, elm, and sycamore as major constituents in the forest canopy. The bottomland and glacial outwash features are still used extensively for corn and bean agriculture, whereas the adjacent hillsides are used primarily for cattle grazing and pasture. White-tail deer, raccoon, eastern cottontail, red squirrel, and box turtle are still prevalent in the area today. Gunpowder Creek supports numerous freshwater fishes (e.g., bass, drum, catfish, and gar), aquatic soft and hard shell turtles, and some migratory water fowl — Canadian goose and mallard duck. Shoals are not as prevalent as in the past due to riverine backflooding by the Ohio River lock and dam systems. In fact, the local landowner claims that since the lock system was initiated, water levels along Gunpowder Creek have risen five to ten feet above their natural embayments. Unionids may still be collected from riffles and shoals near the shallow headwaters of Gunpowder Creek. Chert may also be collected from these shallow areas. Several large chert outwash areas were located during a brief surface-resource reconnaissance along Gunpowder Creek. In conjunction with the archaeological research during the 1977 field season, a modern botanical-geological survey (transecting the site 0.75 mile to the northeast and southwest) was initiated. It is scheduled for completion during the fall of 1977.

Preliminary test excavations (550 sq. ft.) and a large surface collection supervised by Dr. Hoppgood in 1976 revealed evidence of two major Fort Ancient components: Baum (ca., A.D. 900-1000) and Madisonville (ca., A.D. 1200-1500). Plowing depth in the Spring of 1977, however, was 18 inches below the surface and is reportedly the deepest this site has ever been plowed. Unfortunately, this means that portions of the Madisonville component will be disturbed.

Materials recovered from both the test excavation and surface collection (1976) include large quantities of faunal

remains, ground and chipped stone, and several possible architectural features. There was an absence of post molds and refuse pits. Faunal materials recovered include black bear, elk, white-tail deer, bobcat, soft-shell aquatic and box turtle, dog, wolf, raccoon, turkey, possibly Canadian goose, duck, drum fish, and unionids. Remains of deer and turkey are the most numerous. Chipped stone items include polymorphic river cores, preforms, drills, bifacial and unifacial tools, and concave, convex, and straight-based triangular projectile points. Several projectile points have finely serrated margins. Other projectile point styles include Archaic and Woodland notched and stemmed varieties. Hammerstones and grinding stones are also numerous in the surface collection. Fire-cracked rock, aberrant fired limestone spalls, and fragments of utilized and non-utilized cannel coal were recovered in the test excavations. A single adult male was removed from test unit S10E20. Associated with the burial was a highly polished bone object (awl?) which was located inside the pelvic area. Five other individuals (several were immature) were located during the surface survey. Remnants of a charred log were found in test unit S10E40. A radiocarbon sample was taken and will be submitted for analysis in the near future. The charred log may represent either a portion of a burned palisade or house/wall structure. Unfortunately, no other associated logs or postmolds were found with this feature in any of the other five excavation units. Ceramics are the most numerous artifact type recovered from the 1976 excavations and surface collection. Both strap and lug handles are found. Strap handles are the most numerous. A single ceramic deer or dog (?) effigy head was found on the surface of the site.

During the 1976 and 1977 Fall and Winter semesters, NKU anthropology majors began independent analysis of the recovered 1976 surface and subsurface materials. Their reports (surface faunal, chipped stone, and ceramic; and subsurface faunal) will be submitted during the Fall of 1977 to a regional journal for publication. Hopefully several of the students will also report their findings to the next SEAC meetings.

Excavations at 15Be36 were not conducted during the summer of 1977. However, an intensive, systematic surface collection of the 176,000 sq. ft. area was initiated. The intended goal of this type of surface collection was threefold: (1) to delineate functional and residential areas at the site; (2) to develop significant hypotheses which will update our outmoded knowledge of Fort Ancient lifeways in the Ohio Valley and specifically for the northern Kentucky region; and (3) to teach archaeological field theory and methods to students without disrupting undisturbed archaeological deposits. A second major goal of the 1977 field season was to continue the production of an archaeological field technique movie. This movie is being made by Dr. Hopgood and is planned for classroom use at Northern Kentucky University.

The 1977 systematic, intensive survey was supervised by Mr. Carstens and two field assistants and was conducted in the following manner. A grid system comprised of seventy-one, twenty foot squares was constructed. After stringing the squares, students plotted all cultural material larger than 1.5 square inches. All "diagnostic" artifacts (e.g., projectile points, rim sherds, strap handles, etc.) smaller or larger than the size specification were also plotted, and in addition to unit numbers, were also given artifact plot numbers. Differences in soil texture and coloration were also noted for each square, and when possible, were delineated

on graph paper with the diagnostic and non-diagnostic artifacts. A written summary accompanied each surface collected unit. There were no time limitations established for the completion of any unit. Some units with a lot of cultural material took as long as nine man hours to complete; some only ten minutes. Usually three individuals were assigned to a single square: one recorder, and two mappers giving artifact coordinates and verbal descriptions.

Although this is not a new methodology to archaeology, it offers some distinctiveness from earlier methods described by Redman (1973) and Redman and Watson (1970). The two most obvious drawbacks to the method used here is time and artifact size bias. The latter is strictly a logistical problem of time, money, and manpower. There is no getting around the former problem without drastically altering the purpose of this approach: the definition and delineation of functional site areas. This approach should lend itself to similar statistical tests currently applied to excavated artifact categories due to the exactness of artifact locations (cf., Roper 1976). Hopefully the quantification of the 1977 field season data will be presented in the near future.

The 1977 Northern Kentucky University archaeological field school was definitely a success. We now have a controlled surface record of artifactual materials similar to those recovered from the 1976 field season. This controlled sample will lend itself to a greater number of statistical tests and the formulation of problem-oriented archaeological research. Our systematic surface inspection totalled 28,400 square feet or about sixteen percent of the total site area. Functional areas from preliminary map inspection are present. Site 15Be36 contains an oblong central plaza. This plaza is in turn, surrounded by various functional areas, e.g., living quarters, refuse, burial, and food processing (vegetal vs. faunal) areas. How these functional activity areas relate to specific household units and how household units relate to specific mortuary areas will be several of the problems to be tested with the surface collection material. Hopefully the answers to these questions will gain further support from the 1978 field season and will allow a reassessment of the Fort Ancient culture in the northern Kentucky area.

References Cited

- Redman, Charles L.
1973 Multistage fieldwork and analytical techniques. *American Antiquity* 38:61-79.
- Redman, Charles L. and Patty Jo Watson
1970 Systematic, intensive surface collection. *American Antiquity* 35:279-291.
- Roper, Donna C.
1976 Lateral displacement of artifacts due to plowing. *American Antiquity* 41:372-375.

Kenneth C. Carstens
Department of Anthropology,
Sociology, and Social Work
Northern Kentucky University
Highland Heights, KY 41076

The Exhibition of King Tutankhamen's Treasures

On tour in the United States are fifty of the items from the Tomb of Tutankhamen. This exhibit will be at the New Orleans Museum of Art from September 18, 1977 through January 15, 1978. The entire first floor of the museum will be given over to the exhibit. A record attendance is expected with estimates of about 800 people viewing it at any one time. According to an article in the *Times-Picayune*, New Orleans, LA on May 1, 1977, a special parking area is

being planned with a shuttle bus to the museum. The regular admission fee will be charged except that there will not be any "free days." The viewing schedule for the public will be from 10:00 AM to 9:00 PM Tuesday and Wednesday; 10:00 AM to 5:00 PM Thursday, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. Prescheduled group tours will take place from 9:00 AM to 10:00 AM daily, except Monday. Guided school tours will be conducted all day on Monday. (*The Profile*, No. 16, June 1977.)

Current State Research

Kentucky

Shellmound Archaeological Project

During June and July, 1977, several members of the Shellmound Archaeological Project under the direction of geoarchaeologist Julie Stein (University of Minnesota), carried out geomorphological investigations of several Archaic shellmiddens in the Big Bend area of the Green River. Palynological reconnaissance was also initiated in this region, focussing on Taylor Lake, a cut-off meander of the Green River in the northerly portion of the Big Bend. Fieldwork at and near the shellmiddens included soil augering and pollen coring. Preliminary results were favorable for both activities, and further work is planned for the fall of 1977.

Several new radiocarbon dates for two of the shellmound sites were released in June, 1977, by the UCLA Laboratory of Geophysics and Planetary Physics:

Carlston Annis Site (Bt-5)

UCLA -2117B, charcoal from Trench C3, level 5:
3380±80 years (1380 B.C.±80)

-2117I, charcoal from Trench C13, level 12:
4500±60 years (2550 B.C.±60)

-2117D, charcoal from Trench C13, level 15:
2515±80 years (565 B.C.±80)

Bowles site-(Oh-13)

UCLA -2117E, charcoal from Trench A2, level 2:
1820±300 years (A.D. 130±300)

-2117F, charcoal from Trench A3, level 7:
2420±200 years (470 B.C.±200)

-2117G, charcoal from Trench A3, level 11:
3440±80 years (1490 B.C.±80)

(All the above dates are given in terms of the Libby half-life with 1950 base-date and all are uncalibrated.)

Clearly there is something wrong with the determination for Trench C13, level 15 at Bt-5 (UCLA-2117D), and the date for level 2 of A2 at Oh-13 also seems too young. The other four dates fit reasonably well with our earlier suggestion (Marquardt and Watson 1976) that Bt-5 and Oh-13 are primarily Late Archaic in time.

The Shellmound Archaeological Project is partly supported by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities (RO-26228-77-371); funds for the 6 radiocarbon determinations were provided by a Washington University Faculty Research grant.

William H. Marquardt
Department of Anthropology
210 Switzler Hall
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65201

Patty Jo Watson
Department of Anthropology
Washington University
St. Louis, MO 63130

Reference Cited

- Marquardt, William H. and Patty Jo Watson
1976 Excavation and Recovery of Biological Remains from Two Archaic Shell Middens in Western Kentucky. A paper presented November 5, 1976, in the symposium, "The Research Potential of Shell Middens: Methodological and Analytical Considerations," organized by Thomas M. Ryan for the Southeastern Archaeological Conference, November 4-6, 1977, in Tuscaloosa, Alabama. The paper will appear in the *Bulletin* of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Fall, 1977.

SOPA

New officers and board of directors for the Society of Professional Archeologists for 1977 are:

PRESIDENT

Charles E. Cleland
Department of Anthropology
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan
48824 517-353-7861

VICE PRESIDENT

Carl H. Chapman
Department of Anthropology
210 Switzler Hall
University of Missouri
65201 314-882-4731

SECRETARY/TREASURER

Stanley South
Institute of Archeology
and Anthropology
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina
29208 803-777-8170

ASSISTANT SECRETARY/TREASURER

J. Ned Woodall
Box 7805 Reynolda Station
Wake Forest University
Winston-Salem, North Carolina
27109 919-761-5000

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Don D. Fowler (ASCA)
John L. Cotter (AIA)
Bert Salwen (AFA)
Hester Davis (SAA)
Kathleen K. Gilmore (SHA)

Those interested in filing application for membership in SOPA should write to the secretary for application forms.

CCONAS

The presidents and chief executive officers of the six major national archaeological societies met in New Orleans on April 27, and formed an informal organization known as the Coordinating Council of National Archeological Societies (CCONAS). They agreed to coordinate their efforts in regard to governmental actions which would effect the welfare of archaeological endeavors in the United States. The president of SOPA was designated as the secretary of CCONAS.

SOPA

The board of directors of SOPA has appointed Ed Jelks as Interim Grievance Coordinator to investigate various allegations made in a series of articles in the *Kansas City Times* regarding the conduct of archaeological contracts in the state of Missouri.

1978 James Mooney Award

The Southern Anthropological Society offers an award of \$1,000 for the booklength manuscript that best describes and interprets the people or culture of a New World population, which may be prehistoric, historic, or contemporary. The purpose of the award is to encourage distinguished writing in anthropology, and any student of the cultures and societies of the New World is eligible to submit a manuscript in the competition. The judges will welcome works in ethnography, linguistics, archaeology, physical anthropology, history, folklore, sociology, and other disciplines, and especially scholarship that crosses the traditional lines separating these areas.

December 31, 1977, is the final date that manuscripts may be submitted for the 1976 award. The Awards Committee of the Southern Anthropological Society will complete preliminary judging within six weeks of that deadline, returning those manuscripts not chosen for the final round of competition. A majority vote of the Committee will determine the prizeworthy manuscripts in the final round

of judging. The award manuscript and those runners-up deemed prizeworthy will be accepted for publication by the University of Tennessee Press. No award will be given in years when submissions fail to meet the standards of the Awards Committee.

The 1977 award was won by James M. Crawford (Georgia) for his manuscript on the Mobilian trade language in the southeast. The trade language was a *lingua franca* spoken by several Indian groups in the lower Mississippi Valley during the French colonial period. The last known speakers of Mobilian died during the course of Crawford's research. His work will probably become the definitive account of this language.

Manuscripts are to be sent to the Chairman of the Awards Committee, from whom additional information may be obtained: Miles Richardson, Department of Geography and Anthropology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803.

SCIENCE WITH A SMALL S

by Michael Trinkley
Research Laboratories of Anthropology
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

[Editor's Note: The acceptance of the following lengthy article is not in general accordance with the editorial policy of the SEAC Newsletter. However, due to its theoretical and controversial nature, and because of the limited amount of current research for this issue, it was accepted immediately prior to publication. It is hoped that others will exchange ideas by writing to the Editor.]

Four years ago Kent Flannery (1973) discussed the so-called "New Archaeology" in a paper entitled "Archaeology with a Capital S." There was reaction from those archaeologists Flannery placed in the "Law and Order" camp, and discussion from those in the "Serutan" theoretical camp. But very little was heard from those who disagree with this "New Archaeology" — the "Young (and Old) Fogeys." Only in retrospect does this make sense — the "Young Fogeys" have careers to prepare for, and surely it is better to be a "closet traditionalist" than an unemployed, self-proclaimed "Young Fogey." The "Old Fogeys" chuckle, perhaps even now, as they have made their contributions, they have seen the pendulum swing, and on infrequent occasions they have even attacked what they see as the lunacy of the "New Archaeology."

It is not my intention to discuss theories, paradigms, hypotheses, or hypothetico-deductive models. But, I would like you to examine critically examples of recent "New Archaeology" and decide for yourself if it deserves a capital "S" for science. It is not my purpose to criticize individuals, but rather common methods and attitudes. To that end I have refrained from using citations, believing that in anonymity we can learn more from the various examples I will use. Lest I be misunderstood, I reject the "show and tell" of the "Old Archaeology" as well as the "let's pretend" of the "New Archaeology." Nor am I suggesting that lunacy is a recent addition to the ranks of archaeology, propagated by the "New Archaeologists." You may recall a 1950 article by Fredrick Barth. In this amazing display of the Ecological Approach, Barth explains the influx of population into the Eastern Woodlands during the Archaic as a result of population pressure during the Paleo-Indian period. Shellfish gathering was the chosen alternative because it is the simplest adaption to a new ecological niche. Barth's obviously incorrect analysis is the result of the "theory without supportive facts" flaw, or the "let's pretend" phenomenon. This should make it obvious that there is nothing new about bad archaeology, there is just more of it today.

I recall a highway survey done in the Piedmont of a southeastern state, which covered a fifty mile long right-of-way. As a result of a 20% probabilistic sampling scheme, 22 sites were located, while 37 sites were found by an inductive reconnaissance, primarily of stream margins. Of the 22 sites discovered by probabilistic sampling 3 were post-1800 house sites, 4 were finds of an isolated artifact or flake, and the remaining 15 sites had collections ranging in size from 2 to 198 specimens. Concerning the probability of finding

sites in areas of overgrowth or pasture, using one meter test pits, the authors state, "the probability . . . is primarily a function of the density of the sites." This is a low-order undeniable truth at best, but a simplistic, naive, and damning half-truth at worst. The probability of finding a site depends on a number of uncontrollable variables, including site density, site configuration, placement and number of sampling units, size of the sampling unit, and probably the interest of the archaeologist in doing the survey.

Five sites were deemed by the investigators to be worthy of mitigation: a quarry area, a hill top Archaic scatter, a Mississippian site already disturbed by land clearing, and 2 ridge top lithic scatters. The paucity of the sites and their seeming insignificance aside, it is perhaps significant that 4 of the 5 sites defined by the authors as worthy of mitigation were found by traditional, inductive survey. The fifth site is represented by 2 flakes recovered from a one meter test pit in a sampling unit.

I am not raging against "probablistic sampling" as such, because the technique may indeed be a good *starting* point if the investigator is ignorant of what to expect in a given area. But obviously it is not the most productive technique otherwise. In much of "New Archaeology" there is a failure to draw upon previous knowledge, and the failure to utilize one's entire store of resources smacks of arrogance, or at least short sightedness.

In an attempt to bring science into the survey, several hypotheses were tested. One, that there "was no exploitation of the inter-riverine Piedmont" was "disconfirmed." The investigators also tested the hypothesis that prehistoric sites tend to be located along streams. Nowhere is it indicated how close a stream must be to a site to fulfill their requirements, but it should be noted that streams and creeks in the Piedmont form a dendritic pattern, and it is harder to get away from a creek than it is to find one. The result of the work was that sites were not strongly associated with streams, but questions of flooding and site function preclude any strong conclusion.

The results of the survey, the hypotheses tested, and the recommendations for impact mitigation leave more questions unanswered than the authors probably intended. Is this type of survey more economical and/or effective than a "traditional" survey, do such surveys fulfill the usual contractual obligations, do the results justify the expense, can the hypotheses put forth actually be tested by such a survey, and if they can are they worthy of testing?

The original survey cost approximately \$13,000; the "low figure" being the result of highway construction already having started and the survey, in response, being a "rush job." The cost of a more leisurely project covering about 20 miles less, in the same area of the Piedmont, is now exceeding \$40,000, not counting possible mitigation costs. This is in excess of \$2,000 per mile, more than the cost of all other environmental studies combined. As a result of the first project, the impact on a ridge top lithic scatter was mitigated for \$20,000.

Another survey of a highway right-of-way utilized both an extensive or traditional survey as well as an intensive technique modeled after Binford's "dog leash" method. Stakes were driven, knots were tied, and the investigators began walking — but only for 20 minutes, after which they stopped. No allowances or controls were made for ground cover, bias introduced by amateur collectors, plowing differences, soil conditions, or collector differences. Further, by limiting the amount of time spent in each intensive

sampling unit, the original purpose of obtaining a complete sample from a statistically defined portion of the site is negated (cf. Binford 1964).

As to the effectiveness of this method, the investigator is reluctant to commit himself. Although the intensive samples provided larger samples of cracked rock and flakes, the extensive samples provided a more complete inventory of a site's contents, while both samples provided equal data on the ceramics. One additional advantage of the statistical method was that "variations in artifact frequencies from samples collected within a site tended to confirm intuitive observations about the nature of the components . . . or the density of the artifacts in particular areas." This exemplifies an attitude of "New Archaeologists" that only what can be shown deductively is reliable, and that what is known inductively or intuitively must somehow be proven deductively to become viable data. Another example from the same report concerns the bias introduced into the archaeologist's study by the prior collection of a site by relic hunters. The investigator states that intensive collections would have to be made before and after local collectors scoured the site to "indicate the degree and orientation of such relic collecting activity." There are few archaeologists so unfamiliar with the local collectors and sites that they would be unable, with a high degree of confidence, to "indicate the degree and orientation of relic collectors." Further, such unrealistic and impossible qualifying statements are excellent examples of the "let's pretend" phenomenon.

The author mentions, as do most archaeologists justifying their idiosyncratic "statistical" methods, that the intensive sample "indicated what the artifact scatter . . . was like." But nowhere in the report is this observation passed on to the reader — thus, it is not possible to be sure that there was, in fact, any real difference in the two collection techniques.

A basic flaw of the survey methodology is the assumption that "the factors causing artifacts to appear on the surface, are the same throughout." Those factors include depth of plowing, depth of the midden, and erosion factors. Again we see the "let's pretend" method of science. In this case, "let's pretend that the factors causing artifacts to appear on the surface, are the same." However, there is no way to determine the similarity of midden depth except by large scale excavation. Erosion is not a sole function of land form as the author implies, but rather of soil type, slope length and gradient, but most importantly of crop management and erosion control practices. In essence, there is no way to control for the multitude of variables which lurk to trap the unwary archaeologist.

There seems to be a failure to realize why highway right-of-ways are surveyed. Yes, certainly to obtain heuristic data capable of generating cultural laws, but primarily to insure that significant sites are not destroyed without at least a token effort at salvage or preservation. As the investigator states, "the explicit purpose of this survey was to locate . . . sites that might be endangered by the construction." Whatever method may be used to determine significance, it is first important to realize how a site fits into the culture history of the region, and as the author of this particular survey admits, only the traditional techniques provide data "useful in placing sites within a chronological or cultural perspective." Anything beyond a listing of sites and the associated recommendations is not within the scope of the initial survey.

The researcher pleads that "better data" are needed, and that the traditional survey is inadequate and defective. But yet, when "better data" are collected, such as fire-cracked rock, what does it mean? The author admits that "there are no necessary relationships between surface artifacts and sub-surface artifacts or feature distribution." If such is the case, noting the presence or absence of data not directly related to the primary goal of the survey seems to be the sanest alternative to elaborate collection techniques of limited usefulness. There is today confusion between "more data" and "better data" — more not necessarily being better.

Turning to a third example of Environmental Impact (EIS) archaeology, this time in North Carolina, we see an example of a \$17,500 project. Although this site held the promise of providing data concerning the development of Cherokee culture in western North Carolina, the excavation and subsequent analysis demonstrated only the inexperience of the personnel. Of the 22 references in the bibliography, only five are directly related to Southeastern prehistory, while the remainder cover such diverse subjects as computers and dictionaries. No mention is made of basic sources, suggesting that the project's foundation was weak from the beginning. Over half of the 96 pages in this report are appendices. Included are 9 pages of ceramic counts, a listing of the post hole dimensions, a level form, 14 pages of catalog listings, 13 pages of lithic counts, *ad nauseum*. In the case of the glossary of lithic terms, the appendices only serve to indicate the inexperience of the investigator, who evidently does not distinguish between a prismatic blade and a thinning flake.

Five inhumations were found at the site, and were dated by the investigator to the Middle Woodland, using the occurrence of Early and Middle Woodland projectile points in the burial fill. A little additional thought would indicate to anyone appreciating archaeological methodology that these points only indicate the burials date no *earlier* than the Middle Woodland, but they may date any time afterwards. Nowhere are these burials discussed, or metric and nonmetric data given. The reader of the report has no way of judging their probable cultural association.

A basic understanding of the concept of typology has eluded many archaeologists, including the author of this EIS mitigation. Distrusting what Anna Shepard calls "pottery sense," the investigator attempts to analyze types objectively by using a chi-square statistic, while ignoring the more powerful and perhaps more useful statistics. The feeble attempts must have been to no avail, as the results of the tests are never discussed, nor are new typologies offered. How the author can determine the site was occupied during the Pigeon-Connestee-Pisgah phases, after those existing types have been discarded, and new types have failed to be generated, is never explained.

A great deal of data has been lost by the investigator's failure or refusal to note past work. This attitude that "nothing had ever been done before I came along" is curious and is in contradiction to a precept of science — that knowledge gradually accumulates, building on itself.

Recently the Archaeology Branch of a southeastern state began the planning of a statewide archaeological survey program, designed to 1) upgrade the effectiveness of the A-95 review, i.e. develop a predictive model for site location, 2) promote public interest in archaeology, 3) delimit the legal aspects of EIS archaeology, and 4) promote interaction and co-operation among the professional

archaeologists in the state.

The implementation of this plan involves two separate activities: a probabilistic survey of the state-owned property, and the survey of three highway projects totalling 25 miles. A rationale for selecting state-owned lands is explained as 1) to fulfill an Executive Order requiring an inventory of cultural resources on state properties, 2) to develop "predictive models of site location," and 3) to include archaeological planning in the "Master Plans" of various land holding agencies in state government. The first and third reasons are realistic and deserve our attention; however, the usefulness of surveying state-owned lands to develop a predictive model of site location is questionable.

Ideally, every competent archaeologist develops such an intuitive model (based on experience and common sense) after doing fieldwork in an area for a short while. But, increasingly "New Archaeologists" are failing to develop this ability, and, as a result, are turning to ill-considered schemes. There are numerous problems with this design, the most fundamental being that state-owned lands are not, of necessity, indicative of the state as a whole. State lands are frequently areas where private development could not succeed, for example a swampy area which proved useless for farming. The federal government took control in the early 1930's, later giving it to the state. Much of the state-owned land is actually under water, making it inaccessible to archaeological survey. Of the 125,274 acres held in state parks, 42,083 acres (or about a third) are under water. Much of the good bottomlands are impounded, while there is little state land in the mountains.

The use of state-owned lands will bias the survey and make it useless for any sort of model building. If statistics are to be used, at least be careful in the choice of sampling universe. Either the Archaeology Branch should give up the goal of model building, or it should seek out another survey area which is free of obvious bias and reflects all of the state.

Of late there has been considerable concern over the determination of site significance, and the "New Archaeology" answer to this question is to establish goals and then collect data to those ends. The Archaeology Branch states, "an archaeologist cannot evaluate the significance of a site within a research vacuum, since information has no meaning without a problem to address." This leads to the conclusion that the archaeologists of this Archaeology Branch could not determine that a temple mound, such as Peachtree or Town Creek (both in North Carolina), was significant without a research design. Obviously information has no meaning only when you fail to understand it, not when you fail to have a research design.

The theory behind the survey of the highway projects is as weak as that of the state-owned land survey. The goals are to 1) test a computer-oriented site form, 2) elicit "substantive information relevant to questions of archaeological sampling", and 3) to identify "appropriate surveying techniques under differing field conditions." Thus, a part of the Southeast has just stumbled on the "New Archaeology" that has been done since the early 1970's, but apparently without also stumbling on the associated problems.

Deming (1950:2) states, "sampling is not mere substitution of a partial coverage for total coverage. Sampling is the science and art of controlling and measuring the reliability of useful statistical information through the theory of probability." There are two types of samples that can be collected. One is the probability sample, for which the sampling

errors and biases are either eliminated or contained within *known* limits (i.e. the biases are quantified). The other is the judgment sample, for which the sampling errors and biases can not be calculated or can only be qualified. Deming (1950:10) states that the judgment sample is not amenable to statistical analysis; it appears that the existence of a "pure probability sample" in an archaeological context is an ideal condition which rarely, if ever, is achieved.

Even if a statistical method were "discovered that would give a probability sample in archaeology, a second problem would be faced. A statistical sample assures the researcher of obtaining information on the statistically significant, it does not assure any information on the statistically insignificant (albeit culturally significant) aspects of the survey area. In other words, a statistically valid sample does not insure culturally valid information.

Archaeological sites are not homogeneously scattered across a county or a highway right-of-way; and in the case of salvage archaeology (or EIS archaeology) the purpose is *not* to arrive at a statistical sample of the sites, but to provide an environmental assessment of the archaeological resources, all of them that the investigator can locate. The only way to fulfill such contractual obligations is to completely survey the endangered area, not a portion of it.

These should be enough examples to demonstrate that something very serious is wrong with archaeology, at least in the Southeast. We are faced with poor scholarship being done under the banner of "New Archaeology" and "Science". Good fieldwork has been replaced by a variety of statistics, manipulated by individuals poorly trained in archaeology, and not even adequately trained in statistical manipulation. The caution of Albert Spaulding that "... statistics are never a substitute for thinking ..." has been largely ignored, and as a consequence reality is being mangled in the name of science.

There is a growing tendency toward intolerance among the "New Archaeologists" who accept only deductive logic in doing archaeology. We are told that, "by making goals and strategies explicit there is an integration of theory, method and data," but we are never told why explicitness encourages integration, or how this integration is to take place. We also hear that "without the *required* theoretical and methodological base of science, such [particularistic] work is only implicitly scientific." These "New Archaeologists" would have us believe that there is something vaguely dirty about implicit science.

We seem to be on a treadmill, attempting to explain every detail of the past in some explicitly scientific terms. Because much of the data is incomplete and vague, there is much we will never be able to explain, much less understand, either explicitly or implicitly. No amount of science will change reality.

Dumond (1977:347) has stated "it is the endeavor that characterizes science, and it is pursued by whatever logic is at hand. Whether this is primarily induction or deduction seems a philosopher's, not a scientist's question." Urging that common sense should prevail, Dumond contends that the "acceptance of research results" is "a burden of far greater import than the procedure by which hypotheses or their specific test implications are initially derived, for it is by this that supposition becomes fact, that daydreams become — dare we say it? — laws."

The point is clear — before archaeology, at least in the Southeast, deserves a capital "S" it must be conducted in a manner inspiring confidence and must be able and willing

to undergo strenuous peer review. While the "New Archaeology" may have caused archaeologists to think more frequently about method and theory, it certainly has not caused many to think any more clearly. As a result, there has been blind acceptance without the required caution and critical evaluation that usually precedes the acceptance (or demise) of any "scientific revolution." As Schindler (1976:509) has stated, "if we are to protect both our resources and scientific integrity, environmental scientists must seek to put their studies on a scientifically credible basis."

SOURCES

Barth, Fredrick

1950 Ecological adaptation and cultural change in archaeology. *American Antiquity* 15:338-339.

Binford, Lewis R.

1964 A consideration of archaeological research design. *American Antiquity* 29:425-441.

Deming, William E.

1950 *Some theory of sampling*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York.

Dumond, Don E.

1977 Science in archaeology: the saints go marching in. *American Antiquity* 42:330-349.

Flannery, Kent V.

1973 Archaeology with a capital "s": In *Research and theory in current archaeology*, edited by Charles L. Redman. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York.

Schindler, D. W.

1976 The impact statement boondoggle. *Science* 192:509.

New Publications

Listed below are some of the publications that have been issued since the last SEAC *Newsletter*.

Binford, Lewis R., ed. *For Theory Building in Archaeology: Essays on Faunal Remains, Aquatic Resources, Spatial Analysis, and Systemic Modeling*. New York: Academic Press, 1977. \$24.50.

Earle, Timothy K. and Jonathon E. Ericson, eds. *Exchange Systems in Prehistory*. New York: Academic Press, 1977. \$20.00.

Johnson, Alfred E., ed. *Hopewellian Archaeology in the Lower Missouri Valley. Publications in Anthropology* 8. Lawrence: University of Kansas, 1976. \$7.00.

Lewis, Kenneth E. Camden: A Frontier Town. *Anthropological Studies* 2. Columbia: Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, 1976. \$7.95.

Schock, Jack M., William Howell, Mary L. Bowman, Richard Alvey, Dana Beasley, and Joel Stoner. A Report on the Excavations of Two Archaic Sites (CH302 and CH 307) in Christian County, Kentucky. *Bulletins* 6 and 7. Bowling Green: Kentucky Archaeological Association, Inc., 1977. \$4.00.

South, Stanley, ed. The Conference on Historic Site Archaeology Papers 1975. *Volume* 10. Columbia: The Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, 1977. \$8.00.

South, Stanley, ed. The Conference on Historic Site Archaeology Papers 1976. *Volume* 11. Columbia: The Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, 1977. \$8.00.

South, Stanley. *Method and Theory in Historical Archaeology*. New York: Academic Press, 1976. \$16.50.

South, Stanley, ed. *Research Strategies in Historical Archaeology*. New York: Academic Press, 1977. \$19.50.

Wood, W. Raymond and R. Bruce McMillan eds. *Prehistoric Man and His Environments: A Case Study in the Ozark Highland*. New York: Academic Press, 1976. \$19.50.

Yellen, John E. *Archaeological Approaches to the Present: Models for Reconstructing the Past*. New York: Academic Press, 1977. \$24.00.

Noteworthy Publications

Lithic Technology

S.R. Katz, Editor

The Center for Archaeological Research

University of Texas at San Antonio

San Antonio, TX 78285

Lithic Technology is published three times a year. Subscription is \$2.00.

American Society for Conservation Archaeology

Alexander J. Lindsay, Jr., Treasurer

Museum of Northern Arizona

Route 4, Box 720

Flagstaff, AZ 86001

The *Newsletter* is published bi-monthly. Annual membership dues are \$10.00.

Newsletter of Computer Archaeology

Sylvia W. Gaines, Editor

Department of Anthropology

Arizona State University

Tempe, AZ 85281

Newsletter for Computer Archaeology is published quarterly. Original papers, comments, and suggestions are solicited dealing with any aspect of computer applications in archaeology and related disciplines. All correspondence should be addressed to the Editor. Back issues and additional copies will be supplied at cost. Membership is \$3.00.

MASCA Newsletter

Kathleen M.B. Ryan, Editor

Applied Science Center for Archaeology

The University Museum

University of Pennsylvania

33rd and Spruce Streets, F1

Philadelphia, PA 19104

MASCA Newsletter is published twice a year. All those engaged in work concerning new techniques applicable to archaeology are urged to send notes, reports, and articles to the Editor. There is no charge for subscription.

GENERAL INFORMATION

The Conference for Historic Site Archaeology and the South-eastern Archaeological Conference will be held October 26-29, 1977, at the College Inn on the campus of the University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette, LA. The CHSA program will be held on Oct. 26, and all inquiries should be addressed to the Program Chairperson: Stanley South, Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208. Correspondence regarding the SEAC program and all local arrangements should be sent to the Program Chairperson: Jon L. Gibson, Box 4-0198, USL Station, Lafayette, LA 70504.

REGISTRATION Registration fees will be \$8.00 (regular) and \$6.50 (full-time students). All advance registration should be mailed to USL Conference Center, PO Box 3372, USL Station, Lafayette, LA 70504. This fee will help cover costs of the meeting rooms, audio-visual equipment, name tags, registration packets, coffee, parking, center personnel, "free" beer party, and the dance, featuring a well-known progressive "Cajun" band.

EXHIBITS Persons and universities wishing to display and sell publications should send a fee of \$15.00 for this service because of necessary security arrangements. Make checks payable to: "USL Conference Center," and send to PO Box 3372, Lafayette, LA 70504.

MOTEL ACCOMMODATIONS Requests for housing should be mailed to: Reservationist, College Inn, No. 2 Rex St., Lafayette, LA 70504. Accommodations will be made for the SEAC membership at the College Inn (until filled) and at various area motels. Since prices and types of accommodations vary, please specify your needs on the housing form. Confirmation of reservations will be made by motels. There are 87 rooms available at the College Inn, the site of the conference. These are singles with one double bed and share a bath with the adjoining room. Prices are \$14.00 per night per person. A block of 320 rooms has been reserved at various area motels. These include: RAMADA INN, 1810 Highway 167N, 233-5610 (50 rooms); ROEWAY INN, I-10, 800-228-2000 (75 rooms); HOLIDAY INN NORTH, NI-10, 233-0003 (125 rooms); TRAVEL LODGE - OIL CENTER, 1101 Pinhook, 234-7402 (15 rooms); and SHERATON TOWN HOUSE, 1020 Pinhook, 234-7471 (50 rooms). Prices range from \$15-24 for singles and from \$24-32 for doubles. Reservations should be made by October 12, 1977, or rooms cannot be guaranteed. from \$24-32 for doubles. Reservations should be made by October 12, 1977, or rooms cannot be guaranteed.

LOCAL ARRANGEMENTS The USL Conference Center, housed in the College Inn, is a modern facility designed exclusively for hosting conferences. Housing, eating, swimming, and lounging (including a cash bar) accommodations are self-contained. The College Inn is located on the USL campus, a state university with a student population of nearly 15,000. Lafayette, a rapidly growing city of 90,000, is the capital of "Acadiana," the Cajun country of south Louisiana, and the hub of the Gulf Coastal oil industry. It is especially noted for its restaurants, featuring "seafood" (that "slept in the Gulf last night") and its night life (which generally begins at noon and features a variety of music from disco to progressive country to country and western Cajun to Zydeco). Access to Lafayette is convenient by auto, rail, and plane. Located at the intersection of I-10 and US 167 about 140 miles west of New Orleans, Lafayette is served by AMTRACK and its modern airport is served by Texas International. Details on area attractions will be included in the registration packet. Lafayette is extremely wet; liquor may be purchased everywhere for very minimum prices. Expect to "lassizer le bon ton rouler" when you come to Lafayette.

WEATHER Lafayette's climate is semitropical. In late October the daily high is usually in the mid 70's, while the low's are generally in the upper 50's to lower 60's. Normal precipitation in Lafayette for October is 6 inches.

PRELIMINARY PROGRAM

**1977 Annual Meeting
October 26-29, 1977**

The 18th Annual Conference on Historic
Site Archaeology
The 34th Annual Southeastern
Archaeological Conference

Hosted by
The Center for Archaeological Studies
University of Southwestern Louisiana
Lafayette, LA 70504

College Inn
Lafayette, LA

Program Chairperson: Jon L. Gibson

WEDNESDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 26

CONFERENCE ON HISTORIC SITE ARCHAEOLOGY

8:00- 9:00 **REGISTRATION** College Inn Lobby

9:00-12:00 **CHSA PROGRAM**

WEDNESDAY AFTERNDON, OCTOBER 26

1:30-5:00 **CHSA PROGRAM**

2:00-5:00 **INFORMAL DISCUSSION** FHWA Survey Policy

3:00-5:00 **SEAC REGISTRATION**

THURSDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 27

SOUTHEASTERN ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONFERENCE

8:00-12:00 **REGISTRATION** College Inn Lobby

8:00-12:00 **ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING LITHIC ARTIFACTS.**

Chairpersons: R. M. Thorne and J. K. Johnson; Participants: Thorne, Johnson, Huckabay, Anderson, Raab, Cande, Futato, Jafferries, Prescott, Purdy

THURSDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 27

1:30-5:00 **PROBLEMS IN DEVELOPING A CULTURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM FOR PREHISTORIC OCCUPATIONS AT FORT POLK**

Chairperson: A. F. Servello; Participants: Servello, Morgan, Bianchi, Fredlund, Guderjan, Morehead, Phillips, DuCote

1:30-5:00 **REGISTRATION**

THURSDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 27

5:00-8:00 **CASH BAR**

8:00-'till **FREE DANCE, "RED BEANS AND RICE REVUE"**

FRIDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 28

8:00- 9:00 REGISTRATION

9:00-12:00 COASTAL SETTLEMENT SYSTEMS

Chairperson: Richard Beavers

10:00-12:00 PERSPECTIVES ON CONTRACT ARCHAEOLOGY

Informal Discussion

Chairpersons: Dottie Gibbens and Kent Schneider

FRIDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 28

1:30-5:00 BIOTIC REMAINS: ANALYSES AND INTERPRETATIONS

Chairperson: Kathleen Byrd; Participants: Vidrine, Fradkin, Chapman

FRIDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 28

5:00-9:00 CASH BAR

7:00-9:00 FREE BEER PARTY

SATURDAY MORNING, OCTOBER 29

8:00- 9:00 REGISTRATION

9:00-12:00 MAN AND LAND: GEOLOGY, GEOMORPHOLOGY, AND SOILS

Chairperson: Sherwood Gagliano; Participants: Jackson, Spencer, Lenzer, Weinstein, Brooks, Burden, Gagliano

9:00-12:00 METHOD AND THEORY IN SOUTHEASTERN ARCHAEOLOGY

Participants: Bowen, Dye, Moore, Williams, Ferguson, Rice, Kohler, Trinkley, Wright, Keel

SATURDAY AFTERNOON, OCTOBER 29

1:30-5:00 CONTRIBUTIONS TO SOUTHEASTERN CULTURE HISTORY

Participants: Brown, Rogers, Stoutamier, Neuman, Lafferty, Walt-hall, Lee, Bense, Williams

ESAF Membership

You can now obtain an individual membership in the Eastern States Archeological Federation. This membership entitles you to receive an issue of the annual bulletin (contains membership society reports and abstracts of papers presented at the annual meeting), a newsletter (published quarterly), membership card and a volume of the monograph series — Archaeology of Eastern North America. You will also receive notices of other E.S.A.F. occasional publications that will be available from time to time.

The annual membership is \$10.00. Address all inquiries to E.S.A.F. Business Office, c/o Island Field Museum, R.D. No. 2, Box 126, Milford, Delaware 19963. E.S.A.F. is a non-profit organization.

The Eastern States Archeological Federation is an organization representing over 12,000 professional and avocational archaeologists from 25 States, Provinces and Territories of the eastern part of the United States and Canada. During its 45 years of existence, it has fostered the advancement of both prehistoric and historic archaeology throughout the eastern North America. E.S.A.F. holds its annual meetings in which the most recent archaeological discoveries are discussed and illustrated by professional and amateur archaeologists. The annual meetings are rotated throughout the area of its membership and are open to the general public. We invite you to join and participate in E.S.A.F. activities.

Wm. Jack Hranicky
Publicity Chairman
E.S.A.F.

Popular Archaeology Announces New Series

Popular Archaeology is happy to announce its new series, "Readings in American Archaeology, Memorial Editions," which will be published beginning in the Spring of 1977. This series is designed to give additional respect and honor to those amateur/professional archaeologists who have made major contributions to our national heritage and culture. In addition to each edition's containing papers by the memorial archaeologist, there will be papers by nationally known archaeologists on subjects of national interest and concern. The first edition, dedicated to Ripley P. Bullen of Florida, will be printed in an 8½ x 11 format with a plastic binding, be numbered in numerical sequence and contain approximately 50 pages. We welcome nominations for memorial archaeologists as well as for papers that you think would be of national interest. While this series is essentially a reprint publication of papers from all over the United States, we felt that you probably will not have seen all of them, and thus be able to add them to your library. We hope this will also be true when we reprint articles from out-of-print journals. This series will be issued at a zero profit level and is not part of a subscription to Popular Archaeology. Additionally, all state archaeological societies may request one free copy for their library. Cost of each edition is: \$2.75 before publication and \$3.75 afterwards, \$2.50 for libraries (this discount is extended to interested groups ordering ten or more copies).

Address all orders to:

Popular Archaeology Memorial Series
Editor/Publisher: Wm. Jack Hranicky
P.O. Box 4190
Arlington, Virginia 22204 U.S.A.

THE Southeastern Archaeological Conference

The Southeastern Archaeological Conference publishes the **Bulletin** (once a year) which includes the papers from the Southeastern Archaeological Conferences held each October or November. The **Newsletter** is published twice each year, April and October, and is devoted to the dissemination of current information about regional archaeology and archaeological research. **Special Publications** are irregularly published.

MEMBERSHIP

Membership is divided into several classes to satisfy the needs of various members. All classes of membership receive all publications of the Conference.

Membership applications, payment of annual dues, or change of address can be reported on this page. Please be sure that your name and address are CLEARLY entered and that the checkmarks are in the applicable blanks. Make checks payable to Southeastern Archaeological Conference.

New Membership
 Payment of Annual Dues (Year _____)
 Last year Dues Paid (_____)
 Change of Address _____ effective date

NAME _____ DATE _____

MAILING ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

<input type="checkbox"/> Annual	\$5.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Family	\$7.50
<input type="checkbox"/> Institutional	\$7.50

BACK ISSUES

NEWSLETTERS

<input type="checkbox"/> Vol. 2, No. 4 (1941)	\$.70	<input type="checkbox"/> No. 9	Proceedings of the 25th Conference (1969)	2.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Vol. 10, No. 2 (1961)	1.00	<input type="checkbox"/> No. 10	Pottery Type Descriptions from Alabama and Kentucky; Petroglyphs from Kentucky (1969)	2.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Vol. 12, No. 1 (1968)	.50	<input type="checkbox"/> No. 11	Proceedings of the 26th Conference (1969)	2.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Vol. 14 (1970)	1.00	<input type="checkbox"/> No. 14	Stone Site, Kentucky (1971)	3.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Vol. 15, No. 1 (1971)	1.00	<input type="checkbox"/> No. 18	Proceedings of the 31st Conference (1975)	5.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Vol. 16, No. 1 (1972)	.50	<input type="checkbox"/> No. 19	Proceedings of the 32nd Conference (1976)	5.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Vol. 16, No. 2 (1972)	1.00			
<input type="checkbox"/> Vol. 17 (1973)	.75			
<input type="checkbox"/> Vol. 18 (1976)	1.00			
<input type="checkbox"/> Vol. 19, No. 1 (1977)	1.25			
<input type="checkbox"/> Vol. 19, No. 2 (1977)	1.25			

BULLETINS

<input type="checkbox"/> No. 3	Proceedings of the 21st Conference (1965)	2.00
<input type="checkbox"/> No. 4	Bibliography of Pottery Type Descriptions (1967)	2.00
<input type="checkbox"/> No. 6	Proceedings of the 23rd Conference (1967)	1.00

SPECIAL PUBLICATIONS:

<input type="checkbox"/> No. 1	Includes pottery type descriptions from Newsletter Vol. 1, Nos. 1,2,3,4,5 and 6; Vol. 2, No. 2. These issues will NOT be reprinted separately. (\$1.00)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conference on Southern Prehistory (1932) (\$2.50)

ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO: Southeastern Archaeological Conference, Frank H. McClung Museum, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37916.

Information For Contributors

The SEAC *Newsletter* is published biannually (October and April) by the Southeastern Archaeological Conference. Original short articles, book reviews, announcements, notes, current research and comments on the archaeology of the southeastern United States should be submitted to the Editor.

All manuscript material must be typed double-spaced on one side of an 8½ by 11 inch white bond sheet leaving at least a 1 inch margin on all sides. Contributors are referred to *American Antiquity* and the *Chicago Manual of Style* for matters of style and reference. Footnotes are not permitted. Text citations are set in parentheses, e.g., (author 1975: 100). References are listed alphabetically by author and chronologically by year. Style must follow format of this *Newsletter*. Tables should be typed on separate sheets with proper titles and numbered consecutively. A note should be made in the manuscript margin indicating where tables should appear. All illustrations must be submitted as black on white drawings or glossy prints and must not exceed 9 x 12 inches in size. All illustrations are numbered consecutively in a series and are labeled "Figure"; whereas all tabular material is numbered in a separate series labeled "Table." Each article must be accompanied by a short abstract.

DEADLINE: 1st OF MONTH PRECEDING MONTH OF PUBLICATION.

Current Research — Write in narrative form a summary of your field work or any other project or research which you might normally report upon at a Current Research session. Photographs and line drawings will be accepted. Make your report a concise summary, following the format below (if at all possible). Please include the nature of the project (field school, grant sponsored research, etc.), dates of work, sponsoring institution, person in charge, current status of work, results.

Type of Research
(Federal, State Agency, University, Private, Other)
Agency (if federal) or
State — Agency, or
State — University, or
State — Private Agency, or
individual, or other

Fieldwork

Laboratory

Publications:

New Personnel

Other categories (i.e., other research)
Categories not applicable may be omitted from body of text. These headings are only for purpose of organization.

**Composition and Printing by
Focus/Typographers**

MEETING CALENDAR

Oct 13-16 NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION 31st Annual Meeting, Mobile, AL. For information, write The National Trust for Historic Preservation, 740-748 Jackson Place, NW, Washington, D.C. 20006.

Oct 15 SOCIETY FOR GEORGIA ARCHAEOLOGY Annual Meeting at South Georgia College, Douglas, GA. Most of this meeting will be devoted to research on south Georgia prehistory.

Oct 15 MISSISSIPPI ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION Annual Meeting at Mississippi State University, University, MS. Prog Chpn: Richard Marshall, Director of North American Archaeology, Cobb Institute, Mississippi State University, University, MS 39762.

Oct 26 CONFERENCE ON HISTORIC SITE ARCHAEOLOGY 18th Annual Meeting, College Inn, University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette, LA. Prog Chpn: Stanley South, The Conference on Historic Site Archaeology, Institute of Archeology and Anthropology, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208.

Oct 26-29 SOUTHEASTERN ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONFERENCE 34th Annual Meeting, College Inn, University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette, LA. Prog Chpn: Jon L. Gibson, SEAC Prog Chpn, Box 4-0198, USL Station, Lafayette, LA 70504.

Nov 3-6 EASTERN STATES ARCHAEOLOGICAL FEDERATION Annual Meeting at Hartford Hilton Hotel, Hartford, CT. Prog Chpn: David Thompson, 444 Sperry Rd., Bethany, CT 06525. Local Arrangements: Robert W Moeler, American Indian Arch Inst, Box B5, Washington, CT 06793.

Nov 12 ARKANSAS ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY Fall Meeting at University of Arkansas at Little Rock.

Nov 29-Dec 4 AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION 76th Annual Meeting, Hyatt Regency, Houston, TX.

Dec 28-30 ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF AMERICA Annual Meeting in Atlanta, GA. For information write AIA, 260 West Broadway, New York, NY 10013.

Continued on Page 5

Program Participants Please Note

Withdrawal from Program Anyone scheduled to read a paper or chair a session who will not be able to participate should contact the Program Chairperson immediately.

Participation in Program At the 33rd Annual Meeting (1976) of the Southeastern Archaeological Conference a motion was adopted that individuals be limited to one volunteered presentation per person with no limit on participation in symposia or coauthorship. In addition, a motion was carried that in order to give a paper at the SEAC, membership in the SEAC is required, except for professionals in other disciplines. These motions were reported in Vol. 19, No. 1 (April 1977) of the *SEAC Newsletter*.

SEAC Bulletin 20 (1976 SEAC) The Proceedings of the 1976 SEAC Annual Meeting (*Bulletin 20*) will not be available for distribution at the 34th Annual Meeting in Lafayette, LA. The *Bulletin* will be available shortly.

DETERMINATION OF PREHISTORIC HEAT TREATMENT OF CHERT ARTIFACTS BY THERMOLUMINESCENCE

Recent research has shown that thermoluminescence measurements can provide a reliable determination of heat treatment of chert artifacts by prehistoric people (C. L. Melcher and D. W. Zimmerman, *Science* 197, September 30, 1977, 1359-1362). The Center for Archaeometry, Washington University, is now offering a heat treatment determination service. To be suitable for testing, chert samples should be at least 5mm thick and should not have been exposed to x-rays or other sources of ionizing radiation or to temperatures of more than 100° C since being excavated. For the test a slice must be cut from the artifact about 3 mm thick and 5 mm long; the rest of the artifact can be returned if desired.

For ten samples or less, the cost per sample is \$20; prices for more than ten samples are available upon request. If you are interested in having cherts analysed, please contact Dr. David W. Zimmerman, Center for Archaeometry, Box 1105, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri 63130, to obtain submission forms and an estimate of the turnaround time.

October 1977

Vol. 19, No. 2

SEAC Newsletter
Department of Anthropology
Washington University
St. Louis, Mo. 63130

