

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE 1973 SYMPOSIUM
ON
LAMAR ARCHAEOLOGY**

Edited By
MARK WILLIAMS

LAMAR Institute Publication 5
LAMAR Institute
1990

INTRODUCTION

In June of 1973 a symposium on Lamar archaeology was held at Florida State University in Tallahassee, Florida. This was put together by Dr. Donald Crusoe, then an employee of the U.S. National Park Service. This document provides a verbatim transcript of the tapes from that one day meeting. The LAMAR Institute has produced this document in the conviction that if we are to continue to advance our knowledge of the Lamar societies in the Southeast, researchers need to be explicitly aware of what research has gone on before. Further, documents of this sort provide critical bench marks for future historians of archaeology.

The background for the meeting is as follows. About one year before its June 15 date, the Southeast Archaeological Center of the National Park Service moved from Macon, Georgia onto the campus of Florida State University, partially through the close contact of Crusoe and Hale Smith, archaeologist at Florida State. All of the artifacts and records excavated in the 1930s WPA archaeology program, which had been stored at Macon for years, were also transferred to Tallahassee at that time. The Park Service began a program in cooperation with the F.S.U. Department of Anthropology to analyze the artifacts and notes from the many sites represented in the huge collection. The first site selected for analysis was the Lamar site, 9BI2 (the correct site number). Graduate students worked on the materials during the 1972-73 school year and the report entitled: *Analysis of the Lamar Site (9BI7) Materials at the Southeastern Archeological Center* was produced. Hale G. Smith was listed as the editor of the report. The announcement of the symposium was from Crusoe and was dated May 10, 1973. The complete text of that announcement is as follows:

Dr. Hale G. Smith, Coordinator
N.P.S. - F.S.U. Contractual Curatorial Program
Department of Anthropology
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

Dear Hale:

Now that the Lamar research contract with Florida State University is complete, we should plan to have the commentary symposium on this site and culture period during the middle of June. This will no doubt conflict with some of the discussants field programs, but in order to accommodate those who have classes and final exams and also to give time for copies of the manuscript to circulate through the offices involved, I have chosen June 15 and 16 for the Symposium.

I will circulate the manuscript to the discussants shortly; they should consider the manuscript as a contribution to their institution's library. If the designated discussants (listed below) cannot attend, I hope that a representative will be present, or perhaps that written comments on the manuscript or just comments in general on Lamar will be forwarded to me for inclusion in the commentary section which will become part of the report which we intend to publish.

As we previously discussed, a large conference room should be obtained at the F.S.U. Union for the days involved. Hopefully, there will be chairs for interested onlookers who wish to

observe ye old Lamar battle. Accordingly, I hope that those involved will spread the word to interested professionals and students and encourage them to attend. I am sure we can find enough floor and bed space to accommodate the non-participants.

I am tentatively planning a get-together at my apartment for the discussants on Friday, June 15. This kind of recreation should serve to stimulate further thought and argumentation which I hope will be transferred to the Saturday morning session.

I will assemble all the necessary conference materials (a list of motels, restaurants, etc.) and forward it to those who plan to attend.

I hope that those who have not already so will notify me of their intentions concerning the meeting by May 21 so that I can make reservations for them. I will also keep everyone involved up to date on occurrences, both before and after the symposium.

Sincerely,
Donald L. Crusoe

Copies of this letter were sent to the following archaeologists:

Adelaide Bullen, Florida State Museum
Ripley Bullen, Florida State Museum
Joseph R. Caldwell, University of Georgia
W. A. Cockerell, Florida Archives and History
Charles Fairbanks, University of Florida
Leland Ferguson, University of South Carolina
Frank Fryman, Florida Archives and History
Thomas Hemmings, Florida State Museum
William Hendrickson, SERO
Calvin Jones, Florida Archives and History
Arthur R. Kelly, University of Georgia
Lewis Larson, West Georgia College
Ross Morrell, Florida Archives and History
Robert S. Neitzel, Florida State University
Daniel Penton, Florida Archives and History
George Percy, Florida State University
Curtiss Peterson, Florida Archives and History
Norman Ritchie, Ocmulgee National Monument
Margaret Clayton Russell, University of Georgia
Allen Saltus, Florida Archives and History
Gordon, Willey, Harvard University

Many of the above could not attend the symposium. The actual list of the attendees from the initial list above, plus the organizers, included:

Arthur R. Kelly, University of Georgia
Margaret Clayton Russell, University of Georgia
Lewis Larson, West Georgia College
Ross Morrell, Florida Archives and History

Frank Fryman, Florida Archives and History
Calvin Jones, Florida Archives and History
Daniel Penton, Florida Archives and History
Donald Crusoe, National Park Service
Pete Faust, National Park Service
John W. Walker, National Park Service
Hale Smith, Florida State University

Additional attendees to the symposium included students from Florida State University, many of whom worked directly on the report and are featured prominently in the taped conversations included:

Stephen A. Deutschle
John Penman
Tom Padgett
David Swindell
Tom Potts

Finally, three additional members of the symposium included:

Craig Sheldon, West Georgia College
Elizabeth Sheldon, West Georgia College
Bill Browning, Florida Archives and History

Thus, the participants of the symposium included a total of 19 individuals. The event took place in the facilities of the FSU Anthropology Department in the Bellamy Building. Photographs were made of the conference by then FSU student Ben Nelson. Prints of these are in the possession of the LAMAR Institute. Tom Padgett was in charge of the audio tapes made during the session. These are also now in the possession of the LAMAR Institute.

Although it may have been the intention of the National Park Service to summarize and publish the proceedings, this was never done. A very rough and inaccurate transcription of the meeting tapes was made about 1975. Nothing more was done with the tapes and other materials until they were transferred to the LAMAR Institute in August of 1986. The Institute eventually had accurate transcriptions of the tapes made and they are presented here. I have listened carefully to all the tapes and believe the transcriptions are quite good.

A few notes of explanations are in order here. If material on the tapes was inaudible or unclear, this is transcribed either in parenthesis or as blank lines with question marks. The interjection "uh" has been removed from all speakers text and "yeah" has been changed to "yes." Other than that, no changes were made. I have broken the text into rather long paragraphs to make the text flow a bit better. Additional information added by me is placed in brackets. Speakers are identified by first and last name the first time they added a comment. After that, only last names are used to identify the speakers. The spelling of all laughter has been standardized as "hah."

It seems appropriate to place the results of this symposium in some historical theoretical context. An in-house National Park Service memo to the Director of the Southeast Region from the Chief of the Southeast Archaeological Center dated July 10, 1973, provides some interesting first insights. Two paragraphs from that document are reproduced here verbatim.

On June 15, the Center, in conjunction with Florida State University, held a symposium on the Lamar site (Ocmulgee National Monument) and the Lamar culture period. The basis for the symposium was the report on the Lamar accession analysis contract recently completed by Florida State University. Faust presented the introduction to the symposium and chaired the morning session. Dr. Hale Smith, principal investigator under the contract, chaired the afternoon session and summarized the results.

Although no startling conclusions were reached and there was general agreement among the symposium participants that still further research will be required to clearly define Lamar culture, none of the participants were critical of the report; and all seemed to agree that the analysis and symposium had made a significant contribution to knowledge of Southeastern archaeology. Results of the symposium may be added to the research report as an appendix.

The Lamar report was never published in another edition, and no other comments or results, to my knowledge, were ever prepared about the symposium. The number of copies of the Lamar report prepared is also unknown, but it was probably no more than 35 copies. These were placed in key libraries, however.

I wish to offer here a few of my own observations and of several of those of my colleagues who have read the draft transcript. The symposium as presented in the following pages shows these Lamar archaeologists to be quite theoretical. They were addressing some interesting issues of Lamar society, primarily in the afternoon session. Unfortunately, they were doing so from with very little site data to back up or test their formulations. In short, there was a great deal of speculation with too little data. The lack of data is most apparent in discussion that dealt with small Lamar sites. Some of the researchers even questioned their existence. We now know that, in some areas, they are incredibly common. The discussions, therefore, centered on the large Lamar mound sites, including, of course, the Lamar site itself. Jones does make reference to "outlying satellite sites," however. Morrell did recognize the need for broad systematic surveys in order to understand Lamar better. There was no understanding of settlement pattern archaeology as we now understand it.

There were the usual smatterings of cultural-historical jargon such as: "the blending of Fort Walton and a flavor of Lamar" or "influences coming in," but it was less than at earlier periods in region. The term chiefdom was briefly referred to by Kelly, however. It is pretty clear that none of the participants, except perhaps for Larson, seemed to understand chiefdom-level social organization, the likely form of these Lamar societies. Certainly Kelly did not.

Lewis Larson was correct when he identified a Lamar site as one that has Lamar pottery on it, much to the dismay of Kelly and several other members of the symposium. Almost all of the participants failed to understand statistics and consistently misused terms such as "significance." On a practical level, it is very important to learn from Kelly about the rain and collapsed roof flood that badly compromised the data from the Lamar site. This data should really be considered a surface collection from now on. If we are to learn anything of stratigraphic importance from

Lamar, it will have to be with new excavations. The old data is too compromised, and was excavated with too little control to begin with.

This was not a great conference. This report does document the general state of Lamar archaeology in the early 1970s well, however. Anthropology was just beginning to be interjected into Lamar Archaeology, and the old data of the past was found to fall short of the need of the new generation of Lamar archaeologists.

This version of this report was slightly edited in January 2011 by the editor.

THE SYMPOSIUM

PETE FAUST - On behalf of the National Park Service and Florida State University, welcome to the Lamar Symposium. There are some recording devices scattered around the room, prominently, an anathema of the government, so I bring it out that they are in sight. This is because we want to get a recording of this and make a transcript of the seminar, which then will be circulated to all the participants for editing and we hope eventual publication. We'd like to keep it as informal as possible, we are here for an instructive dialogue, we hope, a free dialogue on this significant cultural manifestation in the Southeast. One we have known about for a good many years. One that has been mentioned in a comparative context a great deal. As we all know, until just recently no descriptive report of the type site [9Bi2] has been available. It is the report by Florida State University of the type site that provides the impetus for this symposium. We hope that it will be the first of a long series of symposia of the archeology of the Southeast.

I had prepared some introductory remarks, trying to keep within the time limit. Being infinitely lazy, I had made them for publication so that I wouldn't have to re-write it. But, looking at them I can see the difference between written English and spoken English. I don't really want to start this thing out on a formal note, so I think I'll just extract some of the things that I wanted to say. I'm not even sure why I'm up here. I know very little about Lamar, but I, as the rest of us at the Center, have lived with this for a good many years and I thought it might be helpful if we examined some of the circumstances leading up to the writing of the report. It might aid in the understanding of some of the complexities, the limitations, and the criticisms that are embodied in the report *Analysis of the Lamar Site Materials*.

As most of you know, in 1966 the Park Service established the Southeast Archaeological Center in Macon. This was in response partly to reorganizational changes in the Service. The Center's responsibilities were, and they remain, the accomplishment of research in public works projects and research in units of the National Park System. Park System research includes, by definition, some consideration of the collections related to the uncompleted W.P.A. work, which is represented by the massive collections for which we became responsible at Macon, and of course, the corollary to that in not only the Lamar research, but all of the W.P.A. collections that we inherited. From the outset, we had two very hard questions to pose in regard to these old collections and they were the subject of quite a bit of the discussion which generated more heat than light, usually. I think the discussions still go on. I see Don [Crusoe] sitting back there smiling. We used to have five arguments a week on this. Questions, though, first, were the collections worthy of an additional investment of time and money? Second, if they were worthy of analysis and reporting, how could we best go about accomplishing the research given the constraints of our organization, our limitation of money and man power? I don't think that there is too much doubt that there is an obligation to complete the research which was started on the W.P.A., the F.E.R.A., and the other relief projects.

In 1944, two years after the close down of W.P.A. archaeology, the planning committee for the Society for American Archaeology was busy attempting to locate and to tabulate the results of the program and trying to encourage further analysis. Their report to the 1945 annual meeting of the committee had some pertinent remarks. And I'll quote "the quarterly reports are the key to a wealth of data. Which has been amassed through the expenditure of public funds. At the moment it is difficult to find out just what was accomplished by W.P.A. In order that future archeological work may be pursued rapidly, and accurately, there is an urgent need for providing

archaeologists with the means by which they can find out what has been done and what is now hidden in the records", end of quote. I had the opportunity to attend the most recent Annual Meeting of S.A.A. and sat in on a very interesting symposium on W.P.A. archaeology. One of the discussants, Stuart Struever, called for a renewed effort to research the masses of unreported data.

And equally recently, Jim Stoltman, in the edition of *The Development of North American Archaeology* [Fitting 1972:117-150], had this to say: "The final reports on a number of important sites remain to appear. Notably, Macon Plateau, Lamar, Swift Creek, Marksville, Moundville, and Spiro." It reads, in part, like an inventory of our collections. Since 1971, we have made a program commitment to study the data that is under our responsibility and to make useful data, including artifact type collections, available to the profession. All of the staff members have created and contributed a great deal to this, but I think the principal architect for research design, procedures, systems analysis, has been Doctor Crusoe. He is in charge of our collections research and the contracting program whereby we do this collection research. Now, Lamar has been the first project that we have undertaken under contract with Florida State. Now, whether we find that this project embodies problems that will be typical of all of the other collections research, of what we might call second generation salvage archaeology, remains to be seen. But there have been problems that at times have been critical, but I think that generally we can categorize these into two classes.

First there are the problems which are inherent in the original collection of the data. These relate, I think in part, to the state of the art during the 1930s and I think they relate also to the failure of the profession at that time, to organize adequate man-power and expertise for the conduct of such large scale and long term field work. Referring back to that 1945 planning committee report of S.A.A., I quote again: "These harsh words can be taken as criticism of a single aspect of the W.P.A. program, but it is obvious that there are many more. These involve the whole archeological field. One of the major difficulties with the W.P.A. program was administration. Labor problems, and general organizational programs were, for the most part, in the hands of either state or federal governments. Sometimes they were controlled by both in the most complicated manner. In general, archaeologists were not prepared for such administrative duties. Often, they were not able to adjust themselves to the situation, and have failed to obtain the scientific results because they could not handle all aspects of the job." Criticisms perhaps we could even make today.

To elaborate on that, just as one example, for one of the Macon projects, we have the following record of supervisory personnel: one scientist and technical supervisor, one supervisor of time keeping department, one relief project supervisor, one time checker, one technician, three engineers, one junior engineer, two project general foremen, one carpenter, one draftsman, one draftsman in charge of laboratory, one secretary, seven general foremen, five gang foremen, two rodmen, two catalogers, eight trowel-men--a total of thirty-nine supervisory personnel. I have no idea of how many field workers. I think on some projects, it must have run in the neighborhood of two hundred. So I think that it is quite evident that one archeologist had his hands full trying to operate a project of this magnitude.

The second type of problem has been the erosion of data because of the long interval between the field work and the analysis. Now, just when this erosion began is difficult to discover, but it is evident that not all the artifacts, the field notes, and the drawings are now available to the researcher. I imagine that, in the parlance of the day, this missing material has been ripped off over the last three decades. The 1973 report by Florida State alludes to these

problems, and I suspect that our discussions this morning may well reiterate some of them in detail. As such, these statements reflect our, perhaps, imperfect conception of reality, but they do not imply any personal criticism of scholarship of any of the archaeologists or other people that were involved in the long, long history of the Lamar Project. With this report, we find ourselves embarked on a road which we hope will lead to the fulfillment of our's and the profession's obligation to analyze this material, get it into print, get it to the profession. The success of this will be measured, in part by the quality of the report and by the results of seminars such as the one we are now having. It's time to turn to the discussion of the data.

This morning we are going to hear some basic data and I hope that we can have a dialogue on these things. I would ask that during the morning we might keep any discussion brief and to the point. There will be an opportunity this afternoon in Hale Smith's session to state other opinions, philosophical differences, and make larger presentations. Our first discussant will be Steve Deuschle. He will be talking about the Lamar site, the setting, excavation method. After that we can have a period of discussion and then Steve will continue with burials and burial furniture. I think there are two or three program changes to mention. We do want a coffee break. Last decision was that we will adjourn and go over to the Union Building. We will have about a half an hour. That should be adequate. We will start building this morning, reach a crescendo this afternoon, and then Don Crusoe has given us an opportunity to come crashing down on his place at eight o'clock tonight, so you're all invited. Steve, your hour is at hand.

STEVE DEUTSCHLE - I think essentially the first part which I have to cover, namely the general discussion of the Lamar Site and its setting, is really just straight forward, descriptive. I assume everyone has read what we have produced. I should like to comment at the outset that what we tried to do in the site and setting was simply put in one place as much of the loose bits of information as we have floating around in our files. Some of this has had to be culled out of letters. They are not even in the Lamar folder, they are under a different category. At the time this work was started there were geological studies done and botanical studies done. What has ever happened to the originals to this, I have no idea. Most of what we have on file are now just excerpts.

Initially, what we have at the Lamar site is part of the Ocmulgee National Monument. It is not, however, attached to the Monument in a physical sense. It is a little over a mile to the south and east of it. The Lamar site is approximately forty acres. At the time excavation was started, not all of this land was cleared, only about half of it and the only obvious sign that there was, in fact, a site at Lamar was the presence of two rather large mounds. This whole area has been subject to silting from the Ocmulgee River and, as such, no surface collections were evident. The area that was cleared was approximately 1200 feet east-west, about 1000 feet north and south, almost oval shaped in its outline. As it turned out, for the Lamar occupation this was approximately the area that they occupied. There have been other excavations done in different areas of the site and it seems that, at one time or another, practically all of the forty acres was occupied in prehistoric and protohistoric times. The site is located within the floodplain of the Ocmulgee. The river lies approximately, I think, 1300 feet to the west. There is an old abandoned channel of the Ocmulgee to the east and it is now referred to, at least on one map, as Black Lake.

Two mounds are present on the site. The western-most mound, A, is pyramidal in shape. It is approximately 150 feet square at the base and it is again approximately oriented toward the cardinal directions. The mound stands about 20 feet above the present land surface. Mound B is

to the east and at first appearance it was simply a truncated cone approximately, again, 150 feet across the base. Once the mound was cleared, however, it became obvious that it had one unusual feature and this is the fact that it is spiral. There is, in fact, a ramp starting at the base, circling around the mound, reaching the top. Simply to clarify one point, no one has ever excavated in Mound B. Reports have it now that the mound has been pretty heavily potted as has much of the Lamar tract.

We have one note in the files indicating that the geological formation on which Lamar sits, is in fact, an erosional remnant of Eocene deposits. The Ocmulgee River has eroded around it, but never managed to quite remove the entire thing. The silting has covered most of the site, generally to the middle of it this silting is shallow, about eight inches. As one approaches the edges of the site it gets quite deep. Now the entire area around the site is a marsh, typical of a marsh area. Indications are that the silting has been rather recent and, in fact, rather dramatically rapid. The latest thing that I could find in the folders indicated that the silting really started building up between the decade 1840-1850 which was about the time this land was first cleared for cultivation. It appears that this goes hand in hand with massive land clearing further up the Ocmulgee drainage leading to runoff and silting. That, essentially, I think, covers the site. It is mostly flat except for the two mounds. It is surrounded by marsh and swamp. Indications are that at the time of occupation it was really a swamp--much more so than today.

The history of work at the site has spanned quite a few years. The first work done was that in 1934 by the late James Ford. This was followed, according to the records, at least, in 1936 by Doctor Kelly's work there. We have no record of any of this in the files other than one note in the key notebook which catalogs all the field notes, and there is a notebook number saying Doctor Kelly's notes, 1936.

ARTHUR KELLY - I didn't do any work.

DEUTSCHLE - Well this is what I understand and we can find no...

KELLY - Well, the next (one to go in there?) was Willey. Of course, Willey was my assistant then, working for C.C.C. But you have Ford, Willey, and then Fairbanks.

DEUTSCHLE - Well, I was simply going on what we have.

KELLY - I don't know how that happened.

DEUTSCHLE - Well there are a lot of errors in the notes.

KELLY - I don't know how the notes got in that condition. I was busy on Macon Plateau. I didn't have anything to do with it.

DEUTSCHLE - Well, this is what I was wondering about.

KELLY - Ha, Ha.

DEUTSCHLE - Well, anyway, I was simply trying to present what evidence we have been given. Then, in 1937, Gordon Willey put down twenty test pits that was part of a larger project--a stratigraphic survey of the Ocmulgee basin. Lamar was only one of many sites covered. Then, finally, from 1938 to 1941 large scale excavations were undertaken. These essentially were around the perimeter of the site and they were for the purpose of excavating the area prior to building a levee around Lamar. Various correspondence that we have on file indicate that plans were to construct a levee around the site and restore it as part of Ocmulgee National Monument. Apparently this bird never got off the ground.

KELLY - They did build on the levee.

DEUTSCHLE - They did? Because I couldn't actually find the record of that.

KELLY - Oh yeah, they built quite a levee. That was quite a project. They found the stockades right under the levee, as a matter of fact.

DEUTSCHLE - Well, this is what I was going to do next. In the process of doing the perimeter of the site they encountered what has come to be known as the Lamar Palisade and proceeded from there to excavate that. The palisade is quite a long operation, it runs over 3500 feet and they excavated the whole thing. So it was a massive excavation.

Now getting into the collections and the field notes, to lay the groundwork for what John is going to have to present on artifact analysis, I would simply like to reiterate what Pete has said and that is that collections and notes have not aged very gracefully. The stuff is in horrible shape. This is probably due to no one person's activity or lack of activity. It has just happened.

Of the various excavations, Ford is the only person who excavated in both the village and the mound. So we thought that this would be the best place to start. Work with Ford's material and get a good idea of what is going on with the mound construction as well as the village. Now to sort of backtrack on this, the Park Service just moved in at the time we were ready to start this project and we spent a good deal of time getting the maps unpacked from the way the movers had quite literally thrown them in the van and trying to get all of this straight and also organized. In the process I think we went through every map and sheet of paper in there two or three times. So we have everything for Lamar that was at Macon. Now, as it turned out, there are a lot of things that are missing. We decided to do Ford's work, as I said, because of his involvement in the village area and the mound. Willey's work would probably have been a better place to start, in retrospect, because his work was well done. One only had to read his field notes to realize that this was excellent work. We, however, lacked the key map to locate the twenty pits which he put in. And according to Fairbanks' report on the palisade, there were indications that there were other occupations besides Lamar at the site. As such, we were afraid of getting in pits that might have been in this area and hence have wasted a great deal of our time. Our main concern was with Lamar. So, given the fact that we didn't have the map and we didn't know what was going on at the site, we skipped over his material initially.

I would like to go on record as noting, however, that as soon as we got a letter off to Doctor Willey, the man was most cooperative. He not only sent us his copy of the map but he sent us all of his notes for all of the projects for the Ocmulgee basin. I think it was a question of over-reply but we now have his maps for which we are grateful. Now we did not deal with any of the material from the palisade for two reasons, primarily. One is a great deal of this was peripheral, it was known that Fairbanks encountered a number of different occupations while doing this excavation. And also, the fact that from the palisade area itself, we would assume any artifacts coming out would be in a disturbed context. So, initially, Ford seemed like the best place to start. Twenty-twenty hindsight tells us that this is a place we should have never started. I am not trying to knock Doctor Ford's work.

KELLY - He was about twenty-three years old at that time.

DEUTSCHLE - Yes, as I understand it this was his first project.

KELLY - He had done a little work in Eskimo archeology for the Smithsonian, certainly, but this was his first real...

DEUTSCHLE - I want to go on record right now. I am not trying to cut down his work. If I did that I imagine that lightning would come down. What has happened is, for the village area, we have no profiles. There are none whatsoever. We do not have anywhere a real good statement of the plan of excavation, the rationale for digging hither, thither, and yon, and why. We do know

from Ford's description that what would be considered the village area of Lamar had a number of little rises on it, approximately eighteen inches high or less.

Now, the map which is hanging back there for excavation is 1937 is the earliest one we have. Unfortunately, that map only has a two foot contour interval. So these little rises do not show up on it. We have a few aerial photographs taken in the late thirties and early 1940s. These do not help at all. They were at too high in altitude. So we really do not have any good idea of the character of these low rises. Ford suspected, however, that these were locations for house mounds and, hence, marked the sites of some sort of structure. So he proceeded to put excavations in various of these. As it turned out, only one of these definitely contained a house. This is the house which is illustrated in the notes. We reproduced a plan for this which was taken off of an incomplete sketch, done by, I believe, either (Sessums?) or Jackson at the time. The verbal description and the notes do not at all match the drawing. I simply included them in the report for clarity. Perhaps the house pattern will mean something to someone who is working in another area. At least it is out and into print and someone can see it.

The method of excavation that was used is not too clear. It appears that what both Willey and Ford did in their excavations was to call the overburden one level. This is the silted deposit which is, for the most part, sterile. And then both of them tried digging in three inch arbitrary levels below this. Willey makes a clear statement of this. His notes are good. He follows it. In Ford's case, I can understand in a site that is subject to flooding, and he had a lot of rain during his season, he had a hard time keeping in three inch levels. Some were two and a half and other were eight and a half inches deep. So it's give or take a little. Profiles for this we do not have nor do we have a good discussion of the various soil types encountered. Most of the excavations done in the village area by Ford were ten by ten [feet]. However, when he hit some of these village sites, as he called them, namely Village Site 1, 2, and I believe 16, which are all to the south of Mound A, he put in larger units. Village Site 1 was one hundred by one hundred [feet] and he removed the overburden. But, again, for so rich deposits the notes are very, very scant. We do not know if he used arbitrary levels or not. We do not know if he dug below the clay floor of the house.

KELLY - He did not.

DEUTSCHLE - He did not? Thank you, this clarifies the point, but it was never explicitly stated.

KELLY - He just exposed the floors and photographed them and recorded them horizontally and it was back-filled on top of the floor.

DEUTSCHLE - Yes, well I know one of the...

KELLY - Well, your platform is still there because you've got to remember this was a National Monument. We had to leave things as they were because there is always the theoretical expectation of someday maybe restoring the site. We want the platform so he couldn't really make a complete excavation from that point of view.

DEUTSCHLE - Well, I was wondering even about trenching, possibly below this.

KELLY - He might have trenched, cut some notches in there, he might have done that in a few places but he did leave all the house platforms on what you were calling village units because they would be reconstructed, theoretically, if not in fact.

DEUTSCHLE - Well, he hit another house which is essentially north of a point between Mounds A and B, and I think it was right about this time there is a letter in the correspondence file indicating that the Historical Society of Macon was getting a bit upset with the fact that he was uncovering so many of these houses and I think they wanted less of it excavated and then restored.

KELLY - They wanted more burials.

DEUTSCHLE - So it's damned if you do and damned if you don't and I can understand his position being in hot water he simply closed the trench down.

Another problem that we have in interpreting the village area is that that map displays a number of excavations on it. They are all numbered consecutively. We do not have records for some of these. For example, there are two trenches running east-west just below Mound B--Trenches 20 and 21. There is a one paragraph description of Trench 20 which is five by fifty. There is no discussion of Trench 21 which is the same size. There is one statement in there about part of the trench being within a few feet of Mound B so I assume that they are discussing both excavations in one paragraph. There are others for which we have simply no record.

Another problem encountered, and this is the one which was a real monkey on John's back, is that the recording of depth and level was frequently not done. I should have brought in one of our accession cards to show you how they are set up. You can give each pot sherd anything but a social security number. They want everything for it and, consequently, all these pages have typed in none, none, none, none, none--Depth, provenience, date, level, or field notebook reference. Occasionally there is reference to a profile for the village area. We do not have this. I believe what they were counting on was, rather than describe in the field notes this stratigraphy in the village site, one was supposed to go to the profiles to get this information. Well, they are no longer with us.

Just to finish out the village area, let me say that Village Site 1, which is Excavation Number 1, did prove to be a house. Most of the artifacts that were found in situ are no longer with the collections here at F.S.U. Some of these are missing. In fact, some of these are in the field notebooks listed as missing. Apparently the workers came to work weighing 150 pounds and went home weighing about 200. They were simply ripping the stuff off. And, then, a lot of it has gotten lost in the collections and, I understand, a great deal of it has been loaned out to other institutions for various reasons. Given the fact that we only had three months to work on this contract we did not even try to get some of this stuff back, it would simply take too long. There is the one photograph reproduced in your reports of the house floor. It does show some of the artifacts. I listed them according to the Find Numbers.

We have a sample of charcoal from this excavation which we submitted to the laboratory at the University of Georgia. It looked fine to us until they started tearing it down in order to run a C-14 test. I think it turned out to be more Elmer's glue than anything else. So there goes the C-14 dating for Lamar. I do not know much more that can be said about the house. It was apparently surrounded by a ditch, apparently log walls, a roof that was more than likely a sod roof, because the notes make frequent reference to briquettes having filled up the house. This sounds like and, from the few pieces I have seen in the collection, looks like sod or some sort of mud thatched roof, which has in fact been partially fired. I'm not quite sure if these are what they are calling briquettes in the field...

KELLY - The house did burn.

DEUTSCHLE - Yes, the house did burn. As a matter of fact one could almost propose, given the little hints that we have for other excavations, that in fact all of Lamar was burned at one time. One might want to say the village was sacked. I don't know. That is getting a bit theatrical. But there is evidence of burning of structures throughout Lamar.

Now the real bugaboo encountered is that of Mound A. Anyone who has read the report is probably wondering what in the world I was doing with the statements I made about Mound A.

Let me point out, number one, that we only have two profiles for the mound. You see one set hanging on the blackboard now. Ford laid this thing out on a two hundred by two hundred [foot] grid. The field notes contradict each other as far as whether the trenches were named from east or west. I know that he put in three trenches on the west side. Apparently they were contiguous. This would be one, two and three, and then, finally he went back and put one on the base line. There are no profiles from this at all. In fact, it appears all they encountered was the wash from the mound because he got into what he called village site deposits.

Apparently part of the Lamar mound was built over the Lamar village. I wish the notes had been more complete. It would have been nice to document this fact that Lamar was occupied by Lamar people and only later was the mound constructed by the same group. Unfortunately, we cannot document this. On the east side of the mound Ford started out encountering a bright green grassy area which stood out in relation to everything else on the site. The notes say that he encountered evidence of a house and proceeded to make a large excavation from the southeast corner. We have no notes for this, no profiles, and no floor plans.

Apparently at this point he trenched the northeast corner of the mound, putting in trenches 5 feet wide running north-south. We have profiles for this. The two which I described, one of which is hanging on the board showing various strata. The other, quote, "profiles" are what you see in the other one on the left. They are the silhouettes. It seems that what happened is they took the contour map of the mound where the trenches would be running, simply made an outline, and this was to be filled in with the various stratigraphic deposits as they were excavated. Ford was going for vertical faces. He was not doing much horizontal excavation with the mound.

KELLY - Well, he never got beyond, really, an incipient cut into the mound. I mean he really didn't get far enough into the mound to ever get to the stage where he would have done any horizontal work.

DEUTSCHLE - Well, he uncovered a number of...

KELLY - Inside the mound.

DEUTSCHLE - Well, the few notes that we have for the mound--I should add, too, that the total number of field notes describing anything about Mound A totals less than fifteen hundred words.

KELLY - I know that's true, but I'm simply saying that simply from the point of view of conceiving a mound excavation, he never got deep enough in the mound or exposed enough of it even if he had recorded it he would have had only piece-meal profiles and...

DEUTSCHLE - What I'm striving at is that what he did encounter--he was at least into the middle of the mound, slightly east of center...

KELLY - Well,...

DEUTSCHLE - ...he encountered a log tomb, a number of other features. They are simply mentioned as having been encountered. The impression one gets from field notes of the mound is that Ford was too busy playing chaperon to all the people digging and he only had a chance momentarily to run back and see what they were doing in the trench and he would jot this down. So each time there was sort of a discontinuity. It is sort of like the mounds being excavated under a strobe light. Every 5 feet you get a description as opposed to a running description of what is happening as they are taking the vertical faces back. So this is why we have these disjointed profiles. Stu Neitzel, who helped us a great deal on this, is the one who pointed out this fact that, nine chances out of ten, Ford was simply too busy and gave a very good justification for why things are as they are.

KELLY - He must have had at least 150 people working there trying to (look out for?).

FAUST - You've used the time allotted for the first section. You can go ahead balancing whatever time you (have remaining?).

JOHN PENMAN - You can run over into mine.

DEUTSCHLE - Thank you John. What I was trying to do there was lay the groundwork for John and I think I can close this section on the village and the mound by saying that we do have burials plotted for the mound. They were given according to stake designation on the mound but without the profiles we have no way of knowing what particular mantle or stage of construction these were associated with. This is why I did not do too much with the mound.

Now I would simply add one other fact on this. We hoped we would be able to prove temporal differences within Lamar and the mound would be an excellent place to document this. As it turned out--I didn't run a statistical analysis on it, because this is just a waste of time--but it seems that for the accession cards on file for artifacts from Mound A more material was recovered, quote, "from back-fill", end of quote, than from excavation. It rained a lot so apparently what they did was go back over their back-fill every time it rained and they found more artifacts in their back-fill than they encountered in their excavation. Hence, there was practically nothing we could do with Mound A materials.

If I'm sounding apologetic in this whole section I'm sorry, but we started out this project hoping we could do a lot of things and we simply do not have the information on hand. The data was probably recorded. It is since missing. Ford, in his field notes, keeps saying "refer to catalogers notes." We have no idea what these are. There might be another catalog or another notebook. If so it is missing. I think Jack Walker can support us on the fact that the information is very, vary scanty for most of Lamar. He has worked with the stuff for a while and, I think, finally retired to a bar and contemplated the results. It will simply drive you up a wall.

KELLY - Well, there is one thing that you probably don't have a record of. All of this material was being taken up to the old college, Wesleyan College, which has since been torn down and I think that they've built a post office or something there. This was an old building--dormitory--and we had the whole...plenty of space, but the roof was leaky and, well, the main thing is that the building was not in good repair and after we had gone and put all these things in shoe boxes and the draftsmen were working there and we were working on the profiles and there was a flash flood and it really came through that roof and just melted down some of the shoe boxes. I mean it just collapsed them and they picked them up, and they lost some maps and profiles then.

DEUTSCHLE - Oh they did?

KELLY - I know that might account for part of them. In other words, Ford did have them. We were making these drafts and profiles.

DEUTSCHLE - This is it. There are records of these things being done, but we don't have them.

KELLY - They were made, but this might explain where...this could very well explain cause this is precisely what they were doing at the time of that flood. It tore down...it didn't tear down the building, but it really almost destroyed a good portion of the laboratory...

DEUTSCHLE - Glad you pointed that out.

KELLY - ...and the work that was going on, but no notes have ever been made of that, but that could explain some of the losses right there.

DEUTSCHLE - Well, that does explain a lot especially if you say that the maps and things were lost.

KELLY - Because that was precisely the work that was being done at that time--the records you are talking about.

DEUTSCHLE - Are there any questions concerning that section? I didn't go and reiterate the whole thing outside of the setting. Most of it I think is just straight-forward descriptions. If there are any questions I would be happy to clarify anything if possible.

FAUST - Well, go right ahead with the burials and burial furniture if there is no discussion.

DEUTSCHLE - I want to apologize at the outset. I'm handling both burials and the furniture. I did not analyze the furniture. I haven't had a chance to go over too much of the material.

Essentially, what we have with burials are, for Ford's work, sixteen in the village area, twenty-one in the mound. Willey encountered an additional twelve burials in his village excavations which must have excited him tremendously because he placed his twenty pits trying to avoid any surface feature that would mess up his stratigraphy. So here he is with twelve burials out of twenty pits. There is not a whole lot that can be said.

I tried tackling all burials encountered whether they were in the excavation units which we analyzed or not simply for the sake of completeness. As it turned out we had an awful lot of incomplete stuff. The same problem pertains to burials as with our other artifacts--incomplete records. Preservation, number one, at Lamar was terrible. One need but look at a couple of the photographs, I think they are Plates 19 and 20 in the back of the book, and realize that it is mostly bone meal. What material was preserved has, I think, for the most part been dispersed to other institutions. We have a few sets of teeth in the back and a few other miscellaneous bits and pieces. None of it, however, is statistically significant. I didn't bother analyzing it.

KELLY - I think Ford, I mean Willey, after he went up to Columbia [University], wanted to do some physical anthropology. I think he tried to do something with the bones as part of a paper. I don't think he took the bones to Columbia, but I do recall he had great difficulty in getting enough bones in shape to make any sort of a satisfactory analysis in terms of physical anthropology in that respect. Of course, soon after he left Macon he went up to graduate school.

DEUTSCHLE - Well, trying it now, even thirty years after the fact, has made it that much more difficult. I had hoped to do a complete study and physical on the Lamar population. Well, I got blown off right off the bat. We don't have the bones here. The recording of the field notes is not of the type which lends itself to osteometry or anything like this. There is a chart presented on--not chart--but just a list on pages 58 and 59 of various features encountered in burials. Now I broke down the burials between village and mound. I lumped Ford and Willey's village burials and Ford's Mound A burials separately. In defined pits for the village area and the mound there are only eight each. How the rest of these interments were made I have no idea.

This next category, age--the very sophomoric entry here--adult or young. This is the best I could cull out of the notes. It simply said young individual or an old individual or something like this. So I at least tried to break it down that way. This is the reason no attempt at mean age of death or anything like this. Sex was not recorded very often. Given the poor preservation and the fact that sexing landmarks were frequently not too pronounced. The fact that sexing was not done in the field is not too unusual.

The positions--they were either flexed, or semi-flexed except for this one unusual burial which Willey encountered in the village area, reminiscent of another part of the country, namely, the "sitting" burial. Later on in here I quote Willey's field notes on that. There are no photographs, no drawings. Over the weekend it was vandalized and the skull was taken. So all we have is the fact that Willey says that the burial was made in a sitting position. I tried working something out with body orientation. This also got just about nowhere. No significant statistics showed out.

The other feature which I found a bit unusual is that burials associated with goods are low in number. In the village area there were only seven with clear burial furniture in association. And there were only seven in the mound. I should like to point out that in the village area the number could be reduced to only four. In Village Site 1 there were three burials encountered below an enormous deposit of potsherds. In the section on burial furniture, these sherds are broken down by type. One could say this is burial furniture then again one could flip the coin and come up with the fact that it is not. The association is not clear. So the statistics might indicate that there is a slight preference for richer burials in the mound. Also, again, any discrepancies in the statistics between the total number of burials is simply the fact that a lot of this material was not recorded. Or we don't have it or the photographs are not good. One great drawback that I found in the material and should have been recorded in the notes is the evidence for disease and trauma. I think Willey makes reference to one carious tooth and this is it. Leaves one with the impression that Lamar is a great place to go and you will live in great health. I think every bit of evidence we have from any other prehistoric site is that, nine times out of ten, it was just the opposite. Caries are common. Broken bones are common. This sort of thing. So we are left with no real good picture of physical types or the health of these people for Lamar. Now, as concerns the burial furniture, I did not really have much to say about it. I think it just stands on its own. It is descriptive, this, this, and this was found with the burial.

A number of these--I did not go back and re-read the field notes when Marsha [Chance] was doing this. I was going through the notes for physical features of the individuals. A number of these deposits, I think, might be questioned. Given the fact that we have very few defined pits for the burials, the fact that one in a village midden encounters artifacts in association or nearby, might be association through accident? Not too many of the goods that are referred to as burial goods are outstanding or indicative of what one might expect with a burial. So I tend to think that perhaps we have actually fewer burial goods than are indicated.

KELLY - That's probably because you had very rich midden and there was a tendency--I'm saying it because I was there, I haven't visited the site, I still haven't. After all these years I still have a recollection to indicate what I saw. These burials were being made in and around houses and the houses were on platforms about as high as this table and there was a well defined ditch around the base of these platforms. A lot of the burials in a very poor state of preservation were in those low lying parts of the platform structure, in the ditch. You can see that that's where the drainage from the house would accumulate, midden would accumulate, and they were buried in the midden. They were just buried along the outside in the moat right off of them. You would get very poor preservation. And the bones they just dig or excavate a shallow grave in midden, plunk this individual in there, and cover it over. And you can see that could create a very ambiguous situation. What part of the artifacts were floating in the midden, and what part were definitely associated?

DEUTSCHLE - Well, this was the point I was trying to make is that the association might in fact be a fortuitous one.

KELLY - It would have been difficult even under the most persnickety and careful effort to make a determination of some kind. It would have had to have been a more or less arbitrary decision to be sure about the association on the situation down there.

DEUTSCHLE - I see Marsha [Chance] is here if she wants to say anything about burial goods. Are there any comments or questions concerning burials at Lamar? The only thing I would like to point out with this is if you start doing average depth of overburden, that is silting, and try to

reconstruct the prehistoric land surface as it was at the time of occupation and the depth of the burials, the burials turned out to be rather shallow. Using averages, the decimal point sounds out of place, but they were only about 16.5 inches below surface. So they are shallow. Now there was a case of six burials having been plowed up and Ford had encountered these out in the village area. One kind of wonders if, perhaps, since this was part of a plantation at one time, these might not be slave burials rather than prehistoric or protohistoric. They were included in the tabulation of the total number of burials from the village area. I would simply like to point out that there are six which could be questioned. Since we do not have the remains, there is no way of identifying physical type to see if they vary from those of the other inhabitants.

FAUST - We have a couple of minutes yet for any other discussion. Jack would you like to take an opportunity to make any remarks about your work or do you want to wait till this afternoon's session?

JACK WALKER - Either way Pete.

FAUST - Well, we have about two minutes, we will break this session off. I would remiss in my introduction in pointing out that we are missing a few faces of people that we hoped would be able to come and contribute. Notable, Joe Caldwell. His health, I gather, wouldn't permit him to come.

KELLY - Joe just got out of the hospital Monday. He had another slight heart attack and they kept him and took a lot of tests to see why his red corpuscle count was low and then they finally decided he had a kidney condition. So he's at home recuperating, getting ready to go up to north Georgia, try to carry on up there and though he very much regretted it, it was impossible for him to come down.

FAUST - Well, we regret that he couldn't make it down. We hope that Joe will be able to review some of this material. Chuck Fairbanks also was not able to make it. Of course, as Steve mentioned, Chuck worked at the site. I would like to point out for the students that we are very happy to have here Professor Arthur Kelly, who was the guiding genius for the work at Macon, and, Doc, we are really glad to have you. Alright, let's adjourn for coffee now, to reconvene at 10:45. There is coffee at the Union Building. For those who do not want to go that far there is a coffee machine outside the door.

[COFFEE BREAK]

FAUST - Welcome back to the symposium on Lamar. We have a goodly amount of time. We'd like to break between 11:45 and 12:00 o'clock for lunch if possible, but I'm going to leave it up to the participants as to how long the discussions go. So anytime you're ready, John.

JOHN PENMAN - I hope this is going to be more discussion than ___?___. Basically, what we tried to do was go in--we went in with the assumption that there was some length of occupation at the site as for Lamar period sites as Doctor Kelly's '38 report pointed to. And assuming this we tried to break down design motifs as much as possible in the bold incised and in the stamped ware in an attempt to see design changes through time. However, as Steve has said, we ran into several logistics problems. We've lost one whole profile book--evidently all the profile drawings that Ford had done. That would be the equivalent of about twenty-four excavation units.

We started out dealing with his material even though we didn't have the profile drawings hoping that they would turn up because of the shifting and moving process. We did manage to find a lot of the material that was recorded as being in the collections. As of the day of analysis

began we didn't have it, but it did turn up later on. However, his field notes or his profile notes never did show up. But we started out with his material rather than Willey's because we didn't have any plan of excavation for Willey. So we had a missing link in each excavation.

The village site surface material was the material we dealt with first just trying to isolate as many design motifs as we could. All those charts in the back of that second section--the part on ceramic analysis--used all of these design motifs that we pretty much arbitrarily assigned names to for the bold incised. Now, for the stamped ware we tried to follow Wauchope's north Georgia survey as closely as possible. But we didn't find nearly the number of motifs in the stamped wares that he had found. **[drawing on board]** I can give hand signals too. Well these design motifs were set up for, like I said, for Village site surface material. This was some ten thousand sherds and we managed to find fourteen Lamar Bold Incised motifs in that. And that's this stuff represented up here on the board and also throughout the paper which you have there.

As we got into the analysis further into the Mound A material, which we also dealt with as a surface collection, we decided that possibly a couple of these should be eliminated because they weren't really motifs per se but probably just elements--partial elements of other designs. The main vessel shape that we have is a cazuela shape like this vessel on display over here. Most of them are considerably smaller than that and as in the report there are a few with incising and stamping. I'd say we--just looking at numbers of accession cards dealt with and the number left to deal with and the sample that we dealt with which is approximately thirty thousand sherds--we've probably covered not more than twenty-five percent of the material that's stored in the Park Service collections. Also, just trying to justify some of the things that we did, we didn't deal with any of the ceramics within House Site 1 because we couldn't find them. Evidently they were all mostly whole vessels, probably in the house when it burned, and these were evidently reconstructed and sent to the Smithsonian Institution.

In Village Site 1, which is one hundred by one hundred square, we dealt with approximately twenty-five percent of that sample and there is some historic material showing up in that and throughout the whole site. There was some material dealt with in units that we didn't actually analyze the ceramics from so that historic section in there is kind of biased in that it's more units than we dealt with as far as ceramics go, but I think there is enough material there to indicate at least some indirect contact and therefore at the Lamar site in middle Georgia we are carrying up into early historic period. So we tried to concentrate a lot of attention to Village Site 1 because some of the material was showing up in the area of Village Site 1. However, we only got to approximately one quarter of the material within that. We dealt with seven excavation units by Ford. The main reason they were put in the report by the level in each unit was that hopefully these things will turn up somewhere. There's maybe a group of his notes stuck in a crack in a building back at Ocmulgee. I did try to present them, pretty much just the raw data there, in case this material does show up.

We did have written descriptions of all of the material--all of the excavation units that we dealt with. So we did try to (take?) what were arbitrary levels when the field notes indicated that there had been some disturbance in the area. Now in Willey's material we dealt with eight of his pits. These were ten by ten pits also, as Ford's were. The interesting situation there is that we could not show an obvious evolution of Lamar Bold Incised at the Lamar site. Now this is one thing that is referred to in the literature quite frequently is that the assumption is made that early in Lamar incising is not that prevalent and somewhere near termination it seems to gain in popularity

over complicated stamping to a point where it would be significant on a seriation chart. We didn't find this situation at Lamar.

Also on these design motifs, at this point we can't show any evolution of designs at the Lamar site specifically. And there are some that--most notably this Rectilinear-Curvilinear C which is down here at the bottom left. This appears in a great quantity in several other Lamar sites. The main ones with good statistics on them are stuff from Wauchope's north Georgia survey. These he lists as being the major motifs in bold incising in northern Georgia, most notably in White and Habersham counties. Therefore, as Doctor Kelly assumed in the '38 report, after looking at Ford's material, that Bold Incising would be represented at the Lamar site in it's peak development, that you can't see the obvious evolution.

KELLY - I based my statement in that report largely on communications from Gordon Willey who remained at Ocmulgee after I went up to Washington and who analyzed his material and Gordon told me that while he had a lot of pits, strat pits, were ambiguous. It was obvious from the chemical mixture that he felt convinced that he did have evidence, stratigraphically, that your bold incised comes to a peak in the upper limits of his arbitrary zones. He was convinced of that and it was largely on the basis on his statement that I made mine.

PENMAN - Well now we have a sampling problem too in that we only dealt with eight of his twenty pits.

KELLY - Now I have gathered from reading your report that it wasn't as clear from your analysis as it apparently had been to him.

PENMAN - No and like I say that could be due to our sampling error in that we are only dealing with approximately one third of his material. But we have got a computer program worked up for this and we just haven't run it yet. Maybe it will show up some differences, too, in seriation. But, of course, we only have eight out of the fifteen pits that we dealt with total that we could do any seriation with at all, which is a pretty small percentage in itself. This means we couldn't deal with Ford's material in trying to reconstruct this development of Bold Incising.

KELLY - Well Ford's material, most of it was coming from those...he was trying to intercept house platforms--these little knobs which may be stuck up like little hummocks for maybe a foot, foot and a half above the silted-in plain, and he was trying to intercept those and work on them and clear houses. That was his whole procedure. Gordon Willey went down there with his mobile C.C.C. unit and his survey and he put down his regular strat pits. And he wasn't trying to intercept houses. He hoped he could find a strat block that would have relatively little pitting and mixture in appearance. But, of course, just hitting it from the top, this is a chance situation and you just hope that you've got plenty of pits maybe you've got half of them that will be relatively undisturbed and that's apparently how, probably, it turned out.

But the method, you see, the whole objective, the whole approach between Ford and Willey was different. Willey was doing a real strat test. Ford was trying to intercept house patterns, house platforms. He wasn't really going around systematically doing a strat survey and of course if you do a house platform, as I pointed out, you're not going to get a strat survey because you stop with your platform and you preserve your platform because as an after-thought, well maybe we are going to reconstruct this house someday.

PENMAN - Well, now that's why we dealt with Village Site 1 as one level. There too, because it did, as near as we can tell from the field notes, that's what happened.

KELLY - Well, I'm just pointing out the difference in objective and methodology and approach between Ford and Willey. And of course that's the key consideration when you are trying to...you

can't really correlate the data from the two surveys because they are undertaken with a different goal and objective.

PENMAN - Well, on the stamped ware we found one design motif that seems to be a take off on the filfot cross which is also frequently mentioned, particularly for the Georgia coast, and that little sketching back there is kind of a schematic evolution, possibly of Savannah designs into Irene into Lamar. That's not to say that the paddles were carved at Lamar in that fashion, but possibly they were carved as filfot crosses per se, but, the intention in the ceramics is not to convey a filfot cross design. At best it is one or two arms of the cross. In most cases the ceramics were deliberately obliterated.

Now in the statistics I left the obliterated ceramics out of design motifs. Just trying to make the percentage figures significant enough for them to be understandable. I didn't go out to ten thousandths of a place. But it should be noted that, mainly, designs in the stamped ware are obliterated. It would seem to be a deliberate thing. And when they are conveyed in most cases--this what we are calling a Figure 9 design, one arm of a cross--and it's more the intention to convey just this possible half of a cross than anything else. And this would seem to be an evolution--a degenerate type of thing, if you want to call it that, out of this fine, clear, well executed stamping of the Irene, which seems to be a little bit earlier in time. I guess that we will get into that more this afternoon. At Lamar, then, the main stamp designs would be the Figure 9 and then a concentric circle similar to both Savannah and Irene then a concentric loop which could also be some kind of a take-off from this filfot cross design and then check stamping. And in these I've tried to follow, again, Wauchope's terminology.

It's pretty noteworthy here that check stamping, as far as stamping designs go, is probably fourth in popularity, whereas in some of these other Lamar period sites it seems to be a little more prevalent at them. Now, again, on this situation of other occupations at Lamar, we could discern a little bit of Ocmulgee Fields activity and some archaic fiber temper material. Stallings' Island ceramics are showing up in several areas. It is mentioned in the report how these seem to pattern within the site. The Ocmulgee Fields material is pretty scant and is the occupation that Fairbanks refers to. The Ocmulgee Fields occupation he refers to is probably taking place somewhere south of these southern-most pits that we have dealt with, somewhere in the palisade area. This material probably turned up when he was doing the palisade excavation. He also mentioned a Swift Creek occupation and this would also seem to be down in the southern end of what we are delineating as the Lamar site. We don't have any significant amount of Swift Creek to show any Swift Creek occupation north of the southern-most end of the palisade.

KELLY - The original village you still think now is about forty acres--the Lamar village. It's fairly well defined by the palisade which...

PENMAN - Well, it would have been a little smaller than that. That map back there, the squared in boundaries, the squared boundary on that is a forty-acre tract and, is that correct?

DEUTSCHLE - The whole tract is forty acres as far as the Monument but it appears the palisade outlined approximately twenty-one acres.

KELLY - Twenty-one?

DEUTSCHLE - According to the notes, yes.

PENMAN - Now, there is enough occupation in the southern end near the southern end of the palisade to indicate that there's probably Lamar village site material in good association with maybe with Ocmulgee Fields or whatever further south of the palisade. So there is some village

activity south of the palisade and outside of it, but we didn't, in this report deal with any of those excavation units. I guess that's about it. Do you have any questions?

LEWIS LARSON - Did I hear you correctly when you said the principle vessel shape was the cazuela shape? Now are you talking only about the incised?

PENMAN - Right, for the incised. For the stamped ware it would be, well, a straight sided bowl or a jar shape with an out-flaring rim. These seem to be the two principal ones for the stamped ware and for the plain ware. Oh, another thing I didn't mention in stamped and plain there seems to be an obvious evolution of rim treatments at Lamar and specifically these two excavation units that we dealt with and seriated the rim treatments for in that chart--I think it's Chart Number 11 in the publication--paper and what the rim treatments seem to be doing there is going from an appliqué pinched. Now, this is on plain and on stamped ware going from an appliqué pinched with a little bit of appliqué reed punctated in the lower levels and then appliqué reed punctated increasing and a pretty significant percentage in the upper levels. Now, we get in the Village Site 1 material which we are assuming is the latest material. It's going back to appliqué pinched again.

KELLY - It looks as if the appliqué pinched is an old style which comes into fashion again in Ocmulgee Fields, really. I mean the earlier Lamar appliqué comes back for some reason probably a couple of centuries later...150 years. I don't...

PENMAN - Well, it seems to be happening at the Lamar site in Village Site 1 which is we're assuming the latest unit that we are dealing with in this sample. It's more prominent again in the appliqué reed punctate so there's an actual fluctuation within the occupation of Lamar site. Now, I don't know whether this will hold up in other sites or not and it does seem to be significant in the Southeast, but I guess that's another thing...

KELLY - Well, later on we've seen them in probably better context but I found appliqué--what you call appliqué rim--in my earth lodge level with carbon dates going back to Macon Plateau: 1000 A.D. I wouldn't have believed it if I hadn't found them on the floor of a lodge with all the collapsed roof material over it. Because, if I'd found it on a Lamar site then that would have been perfectly good, but here's a thing, though from practically a Macon Plateau level, in perfect context.

WALKER - Well, Doc, there's some appliqué pinched on some, quote, "Late Swift Creek" that was even on Napier.

KELLY - Okay, now that particular style, that particular rim treatment can go back...

PENMAN - Caldwell notes that in the Savannah material too, at Irene. And he actually gives a schematic evolution of rim treatments at that particular site so it's happening at least in the same quantity in Late Mississippian so it's not anything that developed strictly out of this thing that we are calling protohistoric right now. But it seems to be in popularity over every other rim style that was quote typical of this earlier Lamar period.

KELLY - Well, there is one thing you've not--you haven't mentioned in here or shown--do you get loop handles for example or strap handles, what about that?

PENMAN - Very few loop handles, no strap handles that could be anything other than trade ware. There is some trade ware coming in that's Etowah II, mainly Etowah II. There is some Etowah III and Etowah Plain ware with strap handles, but it's pretty small. It's not showing up on the Lamar ceramics themselves. There's some noded plain, but the percentage is so small that it is just insignificant.

LARSON - What you mean Etowah II or III is showing up in the Lamar levels?

PENMAN - Etowah II Complicated Stamped, mainly, and some Etowah III.

LARSON - What is the data that supports the contemporaneity of Etowah III and Lamar?

PENMAN - I don't know, but it's definitely a trade ware. It's not a copy of an earlier Etowah design.

LARSON - I mean can you demonstrate that this stuff is contemporary in a deposit with Lamar material?

PENMAN - Yes, I think you could with several of the units.

LARSON - How would you -----?-----.

PENMAN - That's worried me a lot.

KELLY - That situation could be very ambiguous though because at the time early Lamar, we'll say, is being deposited there on house floors or in the, we'll call them, ditches around the platform there could have been some earlier material, Early Mississippian materials, around and there wouldn't be enough soil accumulation even within one hundred or two hundred years under the conditions that existed then to give you any discrimination in terms of arbitrary levels to even three inch levels. I mean within a 150 to 200 or 300 years I don't think you could get enough soil build-up to separate them.

PENMAN - It seems like in some of these...

KELLY - You would now--the soil conditions for the last 150 years. But not at that time. You didn't have that much storm (occurring?), that much overflow, or that much silting.

PENMAN - Well, now, in some of these pits Steve mentioned this eight inch of alluvium over the whole site and the evidence...

KELLY - Yes, but that's the last 150 years.

PENMAN - Yes, well, in the excavated units we dealt with there seems to be, in the ones where the Archaic material is showing up, there's maybe three inches at most of alluvium. So there's a, you know, maybe a five thousand year period. There's only a three inch accumulation and then eight inches in the last 150 years. There is considerable amount of disturbance, but there's so much of the Etowah II stuff showing up that it would seem to be contemporary.

LARSON - When you start talking about these Etowah sherds as trade ware I think you are implying an awful lot here that is going to require a considerable amount of support.

KELLY - Well, against this you can have the fact that you have Jackson's drawings which he made for me for example for my notes on the Macon plateau on what I called prehistoric dugouts that surround the area there. There were some Etowah sherds coming out of the fill to those dugouts and of course there Macon Plateau and Etowah are closer together in point of time and you would expect it and you do find it.

LARSON - Well I wouldn't argue with trade ware on the Macon Plateau, no...

KELLY - Yes, it happens there at Macon. Now, if you find Etowah sherds a mile down the river the contemporaneity with Macon Plateau doesn't jar you particularly, but the suggestion of its contemporaneity with Lamar does. It jars me too. I can't accept it. I don't know how it happened at Lamar, but I don't see how the relationship should be any different in the soils at Lamar than from what they are at Macon Plateau a mile away, except that Macon Plateau is on the high east Macon bluffs and the Lamar site is in a river plain subject to a lot of mechanical reshifting and turbulence.

PENMAN - But there are very few other earlier Mississippian types showing up.

WALKER - John, I am not questioning the analysis of the material that you have done, but, as you say, this is roughly a quarter of the total sample. There is quite a bit of Macon Plateau Bibb Plain

in the collection from the Lamar site, although apparently most of these are from the palisade moat area.

KELLY - Well, I was in Washington at that time, but I did get back and I talked to Fairbanks and others and they were currently analyzing--they had a W.P.A. project to analyze all this pottery, too, around '40 to '41 when it was put back in the filing cabinet--and they were telling me that they did find Macon Plateau Bibb Plain at Lamar. The only thing that bothers me about that is can you always distinguish Bibb Plain from Lamar Plain?

WALKER - There are some vessels which are rim sherds.

KELLY - If you've got rim sherds, yes, but if you've just got body sherds.

WALKER - Alright, I'll agree there, but there are sherds with...which are rim sherds and sherds with handles which are, if the type description is at all meaningful, they are Bibb Plain sherds without question.

PENMAN - In the material that we have dealt with we don't have any Bibb Plain. I have seen it back there in the cases. We haven't tracked down some of these numbers, but it's probably mainly out of the southeast, but that still doesn't explain the Etowah II. That's showing up in significant quantities throughout all the units that we dealt with and we tried to pick them as randomly as possible.

LARSON - I'd like to make a couple of comments based on my own observation of Lamar and that is, first of all, Lamar ceramics are technically the best pottery that was ever produced in Georgia and probably the Southeast.

KELLY - Except maybe for Swift Creek.

LARSON - Well, now, I'm not talking about design element. I'm talking about the technical production. They made huge vessels, much larger than any that were produced at any time precedent to the Lamar period. It's a very hard ware. It's extremely accomplished ceramics and seems to represent a culmination of technical development. There are some things to be seen here that say something about Lamar ceramics. First of all you don't have handles which suggests that the pots are being used in other ways than pots with handles were being used. You talk about the obliteration of the stamping on the surface. I would argue that this is not deliberate, but perhaps is a consequence of a technique being used in the manufacture of the vessel. That after the stamping goes on that there is some other process which results in the obscuring of the complicated stamped design and a great deal of it is obscure. It is very difficult to isolate motifs and the fact that you have isolated that many I think you've done pretty well.

Then the fact that, by and large, the color of Lamar vessels--if you looked at ninety-nine out of one hundred sherds, it would be black--a very dark color which argues something about the way in which they are being fired. They are all being fired in, it seems to me, in a very tight kiln situation--one where there is not a lot of oxygen reaching the vessel surface. When you put all this together it contrasts with the ceramic manufacturing processes in usage that were preceding the Lamar period. At least as I look at it at the Etowah site and also on the Georgia coast.

KELLY - Now, at the climax of your Lamar, Lamar pottery is characterized by a lot of smoothing. It never quite--well in some cases it almost approximates burnishing, but there is a very definite effort to smooth out and get a nice clear, almost...

LARSON - Well, this is in certain areas of incising. In the rim area you have a high polish, but frequently the body of the vessel itself is stamped and it is obliterated.

KELLY - That obliteration isn't right. We call this roughened and the question arises is it deliberate or is it or just incidental to use or sloppiness in handling the pots before its fired?

LARSON - Well, I don't think it's either one of these things. It couldn't be incidental to use because it goes on before the pots are fired and the pot presumably is not used before it is fired. I don't think it's sloppiness because these are very well made pots. It's simply that the design element here, the stamping, was not important or at least took a low priority to some other operation in the production of the pottery vessel.

PENMAN - I guess one other point to add would be that we did not try to deal with the mound material in stratigraphic units because we had such poor information on the profiles and there seems to have been at some time an accession mix-up where a lot of the material from the mound and this could have been due to I guess to the flood you were talking about in the lab. A lot of this material from the mound has been lumped trench to trench and the only way we could pull out any information from it was by field numbers and very few of the field number indicated depth. We just put that material aside and hoped that out of the fourteen thousand that we did deal with that we would get some indication of the nature of mound construction there. About all that could be said would be that it is exclusively Lamar. There is nothing of any significance that's pre-Lamar.

KELLY - You see this stuff was put up in shoe boxes and the shoe boxes were in planked compartments. The whole darn thing literally fell down. The shoe boxes spilled out and I don't know what those W.P.A. workers did.

TOM PADGETT, ETC. - Hah, hah, hah, hah, hah, hah!

KELLY - They got there after the disaster. There wasn't a thing we could've done about it except to say well the whole damn thing is out of context and no longer means anything. But they might very well have just picked it up and put it back in any old shoe box or some new ones and stuck it back in the shelves again and that could have happened. Just on that one occasion it was a real disaster in the laboratory the whole section was wiped right out and those were the Lamar materials. That was Ford's stuff.

PENMAN - That seems to be where the main mix up was. Willey's stuff...

KELLY - This little episode I don't think was ever recorded. That wasn't mentioned after that happened. That could explain why it didn't...

PENMAN - Well, that's about it. Any more questions?

LARSON - I would like to go back and ask Mr. Deuschle a question. What is your evidence for the fact that silting doesn't begin until 1840?

DEUTSCHLE - Mainly the fact that in the notes concerning the excavations what you have Willey who did keep good stratigraphic records and profiles (that we could have pundits on Ford?), it is that there is very little evidence of silting during the time of occupation. There is never an explicit statement one way or the other and something has been read into it.

LARSON - Alright, I'll accept that, but I want to know why, why you don't date the beginning of it before 1840?

KELLY - Well, that information came largely, as I can recall, from the work that was done by Fairbanks when they were excavating for the, you know, to uncover the stockade. And they cut some trenches up from the stockade line towards the village and they made a lot of observations on the soil then and on the whole process of soil build up. That was a plantation then and they published some notes on that in American Antiquity.

WALKER - Charles Schmitt.

KELLY - Charles Schmitt, yeah. At that time they thought they had an exceptional opportunity to make some studies and observations on the erosional history of that site in the last 150 to 200

years and they felt they had some rather good observations on what had happened in the last 140 years and Schmitt...

LARSON - I haven't read Schmitt's paper.

KELLY - Well, you would be interested in seeing that.

LARSON - Well, did he take silt deposit?

WALKER - I haven't read it in years, Lewis, to tell you the truth.

DEUTSCHLE - There is one letter. I don't know if this the report to what you are referring.

There is one document in the Lamar files which is one of the workers for the palisade. Apparently he wrote a summary of his excavation, the only person to do such, and he notes that somewhere between Mound A and B they encountered an old ditch that had been silted in. They believed that this ditch dates from the time of the land clearing for the Lamar plantation which was sometime in the decade 1840-1850 and he used some rather elaborate calculations and references to other features on the site which I have not bothered to follow through since they were the palisade excavation. And he indicates that the silting did not start until about this time. And the fact that the ditch and the surrounding area had silted to about the same depth, assuming that silting on a massive scale around Lamar did not start until about the time that the land was cleared.

LARSON - Well, I think it is one thing to date the silting of the Lamar site and to attribute it to the land clearing of uplands areas. Silting is a very localized process and there could be all kinds of reasons why it begins, stops, or continues at a particular point in a river flood plain.

KELLY - This is what they were studying and they were gathering notes on and they felt they had a situation there, when they had the whole--they felt they had an erosional remnant, this Black Lake on one side, which is obviously an old channel of the river. They had the stockade and they had sort of a moat outside of it and in this moat and around the stockade they had a certain amount of fill, some of which could have been contemporary with the site, but then they had the whole alluviation subsequently up to the plantation period.

LARSON - There has been a tacit assumption that the silting in the Coastal Plain back-swamp areas did not begin until the clearing of the upland areas of the Piedmont and there is absolutely no evidence to support this and a great deal of argument can be made that this has been an ongoing affair for thousands of years.

KELLY - Yes, but this is the main controversy, for example, over at the Alcovy situation, in which Gordon [?] is making quite a point because this all had to do with the changes that had taken place and whether you are actually preserving a wilderness situation in terms of ecology. I mean this is in the last five years. It's a highly controversial point, just the thing we are talking about. Gordon [?] had one point of view and the other soil scientists, agronomists who take exactly the opposite point of view.

LARSON - This is the point I'm making.

DEUTSCHLE - I'd just like to reiterate again that in terms of the cultural deposits there is no evidence for sterile or silted layers. They might be there. If so there is simply a lack of recording data. Every indication that we have is that during the time of occupation, at least Lamar occupation, there was no real evidence of flooding having taken place. Now, I have not checked the situation in other areas where the excavations encountered, lets say, Swift Creek occupation or something like this. I do not know what separated Lamar from any other deposits. These may be sterile layers, maybe not.

LARSON - Well, I think that a great many of these sites where you have continuous occupation prior to and after flooding there is good evidence that when you get below the Fall Line and even

sites above the Fall Line that the flooding went on on the average of once every five years. You can calculate this. The constant occupation resulted in disturbance of the sub-soil, the subsurface situation, so that you wouldn't expect the evidence for silt layers to be present. You might pick it up locally in small portions of the site. But just the day to day occupation was such that the layers would be destroyed almost as fast as they were created. I know of no silt layers at the Etowah site [9Br1], yet it was being flooded constantly.

KELLY - I agree to that but Hally at Pott's Tract [9Mu103] found alluviation in silt layers and they occur on the village area there at Little Egypt [9Mu102] and...

LARSON - Where you have an interruption in the occupation. I would be willing to bet that they separate occupations.

KELLY - No, there's an alluvial plating that seems to cover it. Last summer we even found one cabin site [9Mu10?] over on the Sixtoe site that was exposed by a bulldozer that Pat Garrow was interested in because it had late eighteenth and early nineteenth century occupants. But it had that much alluviation on it over the site of the cabin.

LARSON - Over the entire site or just...

KELLY - Over the cabin site.

LARSON - Yes, but this is just a local area.

KELLY - Yes it's a local area, but I mean the local area is a whole big alluvial bottom. Cause I found the same thing over on the Bell Field site. And on the base of that mound it was covered by a depth of oh, 7 feet. The mound was much higher, considerably higher than appears now, even appeared when we first went there in the early 60s.

FAUST - I don't believe that we have finished on time! I don't think that there is much that I can say to summarize what we have covered this morning. We have talked about the problems, the limitations, the size of the sample. I find myself wondering what interpretations and what conclusions we can make. I wonder if we can, can or if we should, pose some additional questions about research at Lamar. What more should we do? What more can we do? It's a viable park area for the Park Service. It seems to me it may be a very viable research area. I don't know whether the symposium this afternoon will address itself to some of these things. Don, do you have any comments about that?

KELLY - I think that one thing, as an old Park Service hand interested in development and what you do with your areas, in terms of future interpretation. I think at Lamar you have one of the few sites in Georgia of the period that is still relatively well preserved. You have your two mounds there. You haven't touched Mound B and I think that when you get back to Mound A you're going to discover that Ford has not...that three-fourths of your mound is still there, probably more. You are going to have a much more viable situation in terms of data gathering and processing than Larson had, for example, when he went back to his Mound C that Moorehead said he had completely destroyed and yet Larson spent, what was it, about five seasons on it?

LARSON - Seven.

KELLY - Seven? Hah, hah, hah. In other words, Bartram in his *Travels*, has a little sketch there of an idealized, what he calls a Muskogean Village. You have got two mounds. You've got a court area in between. You've got your village indicated at the top side of your court and it appears to be that the Lamar type site is the best preserved example of that sort of thing that we know of in Georgia today. Now there are single mound sites, but not two, with the ceremonial area in between and with your village alignment on these platforms off to the side. All within a stockaded area. It's a type, really interesting. It's still there.

In other words, the Park Service has the best opportunity that I know of, certainly in Georgia or the immediate Southeast, to theoretically, ultimately explore the site in depth and to reconstruct it and actually have a chance perhaps to reproduce a Lamar village on justifiable scientific data. I mean this is the best site for that sort of purpose. It seems to me that might well be your goal, objective, but in order to set that up and justify it as a project, because it would be an expensive project, it would take, oh, five or six years at least to do this. You need to examine the data you have, see where you are and to see if there actually is an ongoing potentiality there that would provide feasibility for this sort of project. It seems to me that discussions here might more profitably help the Park Service if we considered this objective.

FAUST - I think the point that...

KELLY - There are other sites, that site up there near Athens [9Ge4] is a two mound site, but that's under 5 feet of alluvium and while it is in Oconee National Forest now I don't think that we would ever be able to develop it. We might, but it's been hit lots more by erosion and things than Lamar has and it's not as ideal a situation. I don't know of another site as ideally fitted for the total exploration and reproduction as a village exhibit. I don't know, except for Town Creek that Coe's been working for over twenty years. I think it's our best opportunity to do something like that in the deep Southeast.

FAUST - I think it's true. It's a manageable unit. I think you're right that it would take a good many years, funding being what it is.

KELLY - Well, maybe you need another depression! Let's don't panic.

PADGETT, ETC. - Hah, hah, hah.

FAUST - Are you ready to volunteer for another service at Ocmulgee?

KELLY - Well, if I could still move around. You give me a wheel chair I might. No, not me, I'm honest. I'm recording--I'm trying to get through with Coosawattee and finish writing it. Ya'll want me to do that. But I really think that Lamar has a terrific potential ultimately as a cultural entity in nature exhibit areas. It always depressed me and hurt me a little bit to see the site down there getting overgrown and really being neglected. In a way it's neglected. In another way the fact that it's completely covered with trees--you couldn't hardly walk through it--may even have preserved it from pot-hunters and other people who really shouldn't be in there.

FAUST - I don't think the pot hunting has been too bad. There have been several holes excavated in the tops of the mounds. It's a veritable jungle now at Lamar. The last time I was there it was difficult to find the mounds even. We are...

KELLY - You get lost going from one mound to the other, literally. If you get on top of one mound you can't find the other mound unless...

WALKER - You can be within 10 feet from it and not see it.

FAUST - I would hope that we could, through discussions like this, perhaps develop some additional areas of research. I can think of a lot now. I think Doc's right that there is tremendous potential at that site. I think we could, given the money and the opportunity, research the entire site. There are a lot of questions, it seems to me, about ceramics to be answered--a lot of questions about activities at the site that surely we have the chance of finding those answers.

KELLY - Well, you have an example there on Lamar to do a total extraction and work out as much as the so-called New Archaeology will permit. A lot of approaches, a lot of techniques. I mean all of that can be done at Lamar. You could come out, I believe, with something separately on a par with Town Creek and perhaps even better because Lamar has...well, Lamar is a little bit more

florid than Town Creek. It really is because I believe that you would be able to...that particular component of Lamar is not quite as drab as the so-called Lamaroid sites get to be if you go north.

FAUST - This symposium was in part the brainchild of Doctor Crusoe, I wonder if he has anything to say about this morning or about what we might expect this afternoon.

CRUSOE - Hopefully, this afternoon we will be able to get everybody around a couple of tables and what I was kind of hoping this afternoon would be is a bloodbath! An attempt to define Lamar in the Southeast and perhaps interrelate it. There have been so many things said about Lamar, perhaps just as much as has been said about Hopewell, and, but, maybe we can as a result of this afternoon get some sort of concluding section which could go on to this report and complement it rather well. That's what I would hope that this afternoon would be.

FAUST - The concluding section that might give us some guidance perhaps in contemplating additional work?

CRUSOE - Yes that's right.

FAUST - Okay. Well, I've been told that reservations for lunch have been made at Ravenstreet for about twenty people and that we should be adjourning there before twelve o'clock. So I think that we will call this session at a close and come back for the blood and guts session at 1:30 and we will have a sack of rocks for everybody that wants one right outside the door.

AFTERNOON SESSION:

HALE SMITH - I think this afternoon is really going to get down to the nitty-gritty and see what it's all about. I think one thing that we can talk about is the impact of Lamar as a unit or the evolution of specific groups, either affiliated with Lamar or distant from Lamar in the Southeast United States, and ask the question why. Why did all this happen? Why was Lamar, as a unit, as it seems to have been, rather unique? Because you have this particular site with these particular things and you know that Lamar influence fitted into other sites in the Southeastern United States. But, why was this? And why do we have such a complex at Lamar?

Now, you've all read or know about various data that goes with the Lamar thing and is this a particular thing which is a unique manifestation? And I think we can throw this back and forth. We really don't know, but it looks like what I've projected, I think, that we do have something unusual here. And what are the consequences of it? What caused it's development and why did it wane? Why was it more or less cut off at a particular time? And, of course, you can read into this maybe it is because of European influence. So I'm simply opening up the floor now to any discussion because I have nothing, really, as far as by-lines are concerned, to lead the discussion. But what is Lamar? And I think maybe--I hate to call him a grandfather--the father, the great-grandfather, of Southeastern archaeology might start this because you probably know more than anybody else about the whole situation in the Southeast United States.

ARTHUR KELLY - Well, I've been encountering Lamar sites ever since I came to Georgia in 1935 [sic 1933] for the Smithsonian. What I did at that time was recognize that something on these sites that I'd visited from Macon with members of the Georgia Archaeological Society, sites that they knew about, looking at the site collections. And then we were doing this intensive work on the Lamar site. The Lamar-Patterson plantation was the name for that Lamar culture. It has since stuck as we all know and persisted. All of these Lamar sites are characterized by certain common traits. They have mounds, one or more, and I think it might be interesting to note that

some of them are one mound sites. A number of them are two mound sites and there are a few which have multiple mounds. This probably means something in itself.

You go from the Lamar site at Macon south and north and west and east and up to the Carolinas all the way to the Georgia coast, in fact all the way over to Alabama, where somewhere along the Chattahoochee River there, what we might call the Lamar phenomenon seems to come almost to a screaming halt. The work has been done by Alabama archaeologists and more recently, a chronology established for that part of Alabama by David Chase, for example. The work that Margaret [Russell] has done here, a former Alabaman, who has been in Georgia in recent years, all indicates that the Chattahoochee River is in some peculiar manner a sort of cultural boundary. The companion sites are the sites that might be roughly contemporaneous in Alabama do seem as you move west on the Chattahoochee to depart from the what shall we say the norms, pottery wise and otherwise, that we ordinarily associate with what we call Lamar. In other words, you don't get true Lamar very far into Alabama.

Now, Margaret has been doing some work along these lines recently. She gave us a very nice, very fine report, I thought, at the meeting we had at the Georgia Academy in trying to pull together the various site implications which would tend to tie the Lamar phenomenon up with one particular linguistic or culture group--the so called Creeks or Muskogean. It does appear from some of these sites, Lamar sites, very definitely come up to the historic horizon. There is no question about that. They come up to the eighteenth century. And others are protohistoric or prehistoric. Without having any precise chronological indicators, simply from the span of time it seemed indicated to me for the development of the recognized discreet cultures in middle Georgia when we started out in '35 to '40, I thought that then, at least in middle Georgia, that you would have to have Lamar going back at least to pre-De Soto times and that probably the Lamar type site, the peoples responsible for Lamar were the people that De Soto was encountering when he left Florida and went up through the barren lands, the so-called pine barrens of Georgia and finally crossed to Cofachiqui and went through the Carolinas. He would have been encountering Lamar peoples.

This is the middle Georgia picture and I still think it's true that and indicated in 1938, that I thought Lamar just simply to allow for the subsequent changes and modifications would have to go back before this to the seventeenth century and perhaps even the sixteenth for its beginning. Then as you know we did a series of surveys with the Smithsonian starting all the way from Hartwell and Clark Hill through Buford Basin and Allatoona. We're talking about a 200, 250 mile sweep through northeast and north Georgia. On all those basin surveys we encountered a lot of Lamar sites. And there does seem to be some sort of density or concentration of Lamar sites in north and northeast Georgia extending up into the Carolinas and into the immediate South Carolina region. And as you know, we all know that there's Town Creek, Pee Dee. I think we have to recognize it has a Mississippian focus which has some sort of morphological relationship to what we recognize as Lamar. As you probably all know, Joffre Coe, and Reed and others of his students seem to feel that some of our sites that we definitely call Lamar, and Irene is one of them, has some relationship to the Pee Dee.

Joe Caldwell was to have talked to you if he had been able to come about some of the ideas he is currently entertaining about the in-depth picture of developmental Lamar. Formative theory in what you might call early Lamar through middle Lamar and then a late phase. This depth picture would recognize a time span of several hundred years and he has about four different archaeological theories to cover that and I think he would talk to you about it. I would imagine he

will probably get out a paper out pretty soon. As I say Lamar is characterized...they are large sites, most of them, and they are vested with mound sites. You get an idea that there was a substantial village, a substantial community there. You get a definite idea of arrangement of mounds and buildings and open areas which suggest stabilized communities with rather advanced type of ceremonials.

And when I say stabilized communities, I mean of course, that they had an economic subsistence basis which was adequate to maintain these populations in these situations. This is a continuation, of course, of a way of life and a basis of life which had already been established in the earlier Mississippian at sites like, I would say, Macon Plateau. But in Lamar times, when you look at the truly monumental, the aspect of it in terms of mounds and structures and building arrangements, the whole layout of the village, you get a picture of a full rounded, matured type of social organization, and secure economic grasp on the local facilities which they were exploiting, whatever it is. You might call this maturity. This although the term has been employed with reference to the big mound sites like Macon Plateau, Cahokia and a whole raft of others.

Then I could mention the fact that we did these north and northeast Georgia River Basin surveys on a lot of Lamar sites and you will be glad to know that we are going to have some of this old data accumulating out of those River Basin surveys made available. Joe Caldwell has asked and received from the Smithsonian his Allatoona report which has some vital data and the Tugalo report which he's reworking now. And we just submitted a manuscript to South Carolina on the Wateree Camden site which is a Pee Dee type site with definite Lamaroid attributes. A number of mounds, this was a multiple mound group. And the Wateree River was some sort of ethnographic boundary of the Cherokees. That's just about where they figured their territory went in that particular direction. This may be a happenstance. I'm simply mentioning that McDougal mound [sic McDowell] which is one of the older mound groups to start with, is recognized even by the Squire and Davis report, and have the early survey made in the early nineteenth century. That site is going to appear and I think South Carolina intends to publish it and I think that George Stuart and some others intend to go back there and do some additional work.

Bull Creek at Columbus, we have done extensive work there off and on with different people and all of that data is being pulled together and Frank Schnell at the Columbus Museum says that publication is just about ready to appear. And with the work at the type site coming out here, at long last we are beginning to get more and more Lamar materials available. Currently, we have been doing a survey at the West Point dam and reservoir. There are two mounds there: the Avery mound [9Tp64] and the Parks mound [9Tp41]. And Margaret Russell here is looking over the pottery from both of these sites. They are both stratified mound sites. At least as I understand it at least five occupations, aren't there Margaret, in Parks mound? Well-defined, hard-baked, fired mound summits which had buildings on them and so we are going to get a stratified picture there and we will get another one at the Avery mound a few miles away.

Currently, well, let me say for the last eight or nine years, I have been pursuing a situation at Carter's dam in north Georgia where there were evidently no less than ten occupations, probably five of which were truncated in modern cultivation, but I have the down slope fill at the site. Then I've got what I call the core mounds which are still intact, and there are three of those. And those core mound situations are...turn out to be mound summits on which there were four buildings, two buildings in the lowest part now I can see. Now these are all part of a continuum architecturally of earth lodge constructions. And these earth lodge constructions are strikingly similar, parallel to the picture which was unfolded recently in North Carolina with the so-called Pisgah culture that

Roy Dickens has found and Coe and that, eventually, in a protohistoric and historic type Lamar late culture which they call Qualla. In South Carolina we know that and in Tennessee the picture is instead of getting what you might call Qualla you get Dallas and a late Dallas. And the late Dallas finally becomes increasingly mixed with increments of definite Lamar pottery.

I call this increasingly mixed Dallas and Lamar in north Georgia Dallamar was the coinage. I think of Hally must have called it the Barnett Phase or something else but its alright. We both agree that what happened in his village site Little Egypt and what I'm getting over in the mound is that demonstrably your pottery series taken from these successive mound occupation contexts show quite clearly that from somewhere around 1300 and something or there about on up to the around the time of De Soto you've got Dallas. And..but Dallas with some grit tempered, sand tempered stuff that still carries a roughened stamp and it could be considered some sort of early Lamar that's mixed in even then. But then Dallas is successively preempted and taken over and swamped by the true north Georgia Lamar. It's largely dominated with the linear, rectilinear stamps. Then, that eventually, up in the eighteenth century that is what was probably the site of Coosawatee Old town.

Margaret and Carole Hill had written a very nice ethnohistorical summary on Coosawatee Old Town. I know you've seen that. I think the paper was read before a meeting of the Southern Anthropological meetings over in...I think somewhere it probably has gotten out. But here we seem to have then, at Carter's, one site in which we have depth. The lowest carbon dates on those north Georgia earth lodges is around 1060, somewhere around 1000 A.D. And I've got one of them, the early earth lodges, has got two dates of 1060.

In the next phase of the earth lodges instead of having your posts coming in as leaner post at about a 45 to 50 degree angle and a rectangle with rounded corners and simple hearth you suddenly get an elongated structure. It's dirt covered, but your posts here are a buttress against heavy gumbo and this is the type of earth lodge that you've got in Macon for example, and it's the type of earth lodge that Joe Caldwell found at Tugalo, Georgia, [9St1] and it's the type of earth lodge that Frank Schnell is finding at the Singer mounds [9Sw?], and it's the type of earth lodge which you find in the...and with the... You don't get a central hearth in this phase, you've got a series of maybe five or six little hearths strung out along these stringers of anchor posts of which there might be three lines to support a rather large structure. They are large in Pisgah and they are pretty large in north Georgia.

Currently we are able to demonstrate a complete architectural development from two models of earth lodge construction into an eventual typical wattle and daub which you find of course in Dallas for example. And which you find in Lamar, along with...we have there, what you might call a pre-Dallas or a Hiwassee Island type situation, in those earth lodges, but you still have in the earth lodges, you are still getting some definite quantum of shell tempered plain and cord mark pottery. On the floor last summer of one of these collapsed earth lodges we picked up no less than five big rim sherds and body sherds.

Three of these had these flat flange-like protuberances, number of protuberances. There are three different variances of that. One of them had the appliqué rim which was notched. Not an appliqué rim strip, it's put on at the top and this looks almost...it could be confused with what I call a folded rim, but it really is an early appliqué. But what is really interesting is one big rim sherd of plain, shell tempered ware which has a large strap handle. Now, mark you, the dates for this are going to be around 1000 A.D. and we've got several of them. Now, this means that those earth lodges there in north Georgia are possibly coeval or contemporaneous with the ones at

Macon. And as you all know, the, in terms of morphology, and the Macon Mississippian sequence you tend to get the loop handles with a lot of nodal variations on the loops.

But I'm just simply saying that it sort of shocked me to find this strap handle, and it definitely couldn't be intrusive because it was on the floor of the earth lodge and the bark and the cane and the yellow daub clay which they put over the roof was in place over it. So this I thought was a contextual situation which indicates that certain morphologic gimmicks which we normally would assume came later can come in an earlier context.

SMITH - Well, do you think Lamar, as we are talking about Lamar, whatever that is...

KELLY - Now, I'm not saying, I don't want to even say that this is Lamar.

SMITH - No, I'm saying...in your whole frame of reference that you have been talking, do you think that this is an intrusive thing in the Southeast or sort of an indigenous evolution?

KELLY - No, I don't think it's intrusive! I think it's a distinctive Southeastern evolutionary phenomenon. To me, Lamar...well even in '38...my views haven't changed too much on that. In '38 my view of Lamar was, it was a sort of a last, last expression, representation of the Southern Appalachian stamped. There was no...Lamar was the final morphological and stylistic expression of that. That doesn't mean that everywhere you get what we Ocmulgee Fields, but you might get the equivalent Ocmulgee Fields. At least you tend to get plain wares or painted wares or roughened or cord marked, not cord marked, but various other expressions after which are not completely out of line with all this long tradition of stamped pottery.

And as I said, to me Lamar, in so far as you can categorize the stamps and recognize them, and a lot of it is as you've all remarked--you have problems with the fact that it is roughened and it's over-stamped and it takes trying all sorts of tricks to try and lift it off and see if you can look and see what sort of stamp you have there. And we know that there are some of them that are definitely rectilinear and linear and some of them are definitely curvilinear. I have a hunch that this division between rectilinear and curvilinear is a persistent custom through time which probably reflects mythic and stylistic differences on earlier levels. In other words, I think that the...I strongly suspect that if eventually we got enough site data and we could make maps out of it you are going to find an interesting configuration of sites that stand to show curvilinear elements as over against those that show rectilinear.

I think already, of the sites that I have seen, just a macroscopic impression that your rectilinear and linear elements tend to be much more characteristic in north and northeast Georgia through North Carolina. But, the curvilinear elements seem to be stronger in middle Georgia and...Savannah, for example, which they gave to the first recognized down on the Georgia Coast. Savannah is geographically misplaced. It doesn't belong to the coast. That's just the place where it came in. The true focus or center of Savannah is going to be somewhere up in north Georgia or up toward the Carolinas.

SMITH - You know, one thing that has been worrying me about this whole thing, here you have Lamar sitting down in the swamp. Is this a breakdown of political organization because if you go up there, you know, to the park area, you have a nice well drained area and so on. Were they forced into the swamp?

KELLY - No, I don't think they were forced into the swamp. I think they went there because...these people have a developed agriculture. They really are getting to be good horticulturalists and they rely somewhat less on the mixed economy in which they are hunting and fishing than the other peoples did before them. And there was certainly quite a contrast with Swift Creek and some of what we call the Woodland cultures. I think there must have been some

sort of socio-political development which has come to a crux ___?___?___, generally in this part of the Southeast. It may represent a development of populations--more people--which gives them more strength and better to group together and maintain permanent villages and that these situations tend to express themselves around some sort of large center.

For example, I think Macon might have been an example. And at this center, must have been some sort of strong political domination with satellites--communities around it. The idea of a paramount chief in service with others that we've been talking about--a definite political aggregation which you not only have here at one site, your mound site--but if you look around and get additional, adequate survey data, you would find other Lamar sites, not so large, and not necessarily with a big mound and the evidences of a political and...

LEWIS LARSON - How many other Lamar sites are there in the area?

KELLY - Hum?

LARSON - How many other Lamar sites are there?

KELLY - Which area?

LARSON - Well, in the area of the Lamar site.

KELLY - How many Lamar sites? You find more Lamar sites than anything else in the area of it's, well, it's in your map up there.

LARSON - I'm not talking about the area in the map, I'm talking about the Ocmulgee Valley.

KELLY - Well, Gordon Willey, I don't remember just how many Lamar sites, he had about eighty sites in all and certainly most of them were Lamar type sites.

JOHN WALKER - I did notice one thing, Doc, in plotting some of those. The concentration is definitely flood plain with...

LARSON - Well, how many, how many are there?

KELLY - Well, the ones that we recognized.

LARSON - Well, we recognize...we've talked about one. We're talking about the Lamar site.

KELLY - Well, we're talking about one. But I think that...but then if you go up to Commissioners Creek up the Ocmulgee there and add that to his survey you'll have between, I'd say easily 25 to 30 Lamar sites.

LARSON - Now, we are north of the plateau now...

WALKER - South of the plateau.

KELLY - I'd saying that you have that many sites along the Ocmulgee River and I would...

LARSON - Well, between what length of the Ocmulgee River?

KELLY - Well, I'd say as far down as, he surveyed down to as far as Dublin.

LARSON - Alright, how many are there between Macon and Dublin [Dublin is on the Oconee]?

KELLY - Well, he had about eighty sites and I would say two-thirds of them were Lamar.

LARSON - I would be willing to bet there isn't another one.

KELLY - Another Lamar site?

LARSON - No, between Macon and Dublin.

KELLY - You mean not another site the size of Macon, that's what you? of Lamar...

LARSON - In the Ocmulgee flood plain.

KELLY - Oh, yes.

WALKER - There are no...I don't know of other Lamar...

KELLY - What about Cowart's Landing for example?

WALKER - I am...let me back up here and say I am talking about sites with large quantities of Lamar pottery. There are quite a number including one that's immediately across the river from

the Lamar site, I believe it's Horse Shoe Bend site. The best preserved site I've seen in the Southeast, the Royston Creek site is a Lamar site [9Tw1].

LARSON - How far south is it?

WALKER - It's in the next county south, Twiggs County. It's just north of Bullard's Landing, I guess Lewis it's 12 miles or so down-stream.

KELLY - And you've got a big Lamar site at Bullard's Landing too [also 9Tw1].

WALKER - And there are a number of others right in there that are quite near the river. Cowart's Landing...

LARSON - Are they on the flood plain?

WALKER - Yes, Yes. They are on the flood plain. In mapping a number of those sites I noted that the majority of them are flood plain sites.

JOHN PENMAN - How do they compare ceramically to Lamar?

WALKER - ahhh...

KELLY - Well, they are middle Georgia Lamar.

PENMAN - Pretty close? I mean good Lamar sites?

KELLY - Very close, yes.

WALKER - Well, I might say this with these other sites, with rare exception I've seen no Macon Plateau material, but as far as the Lamar ceramics themselves they seem quite similar.

PENMAN - This is all within an area of, say, 20 miles radius of the Fall Line.

WALKER - The ones that I'm familiar with myself, yes. I'm not...I'm just saying the ones I'm familiar with. I wouldn't give a distribution. In fact there is a tremendous area in there that no one has been...

KELLY - There are a lot of Lamar sites on the Oconee.

WALKER - Oh, yes!

KELLY - And there are lot of Lamar sites on, as we know already, as indicated in the north-northeast Georgia River Basin surveys.

WALKER - And there are a lot further up the Ocmulgee that show up in the Wauchope's survey.

KELLY - That's right Wauchope's survey.

SMITH - Let's clear up a little thing. What is a Lamar site? Is it a stratum six inches deep?

KELLY - No, that has nothing to do with that. Mostly Lamar sites are...

SMITH - I'd just like to know what a Lamar site is, you know?

KELLY - They are complicated, many of them. They are multiple site occupations. The same conditions which led those Lamar people to set up a substantial settlement there, and a rather permanent one, also attracted other peoples. You'll find in the great majority of cases, you'll find some Swift Creek or some of what Joe Caldwell called Cartersville on the same site. I think you've indicated that we even find some Archaic on most every site. But you're getting good, deep strat pits and you're covering your areas pretty generously, you'll find, you'll find this situation duplicated over and over again.

LARSON - Yes, but what's a Lamar site?

KELLY - Well, I've been trying to indicate a Lamar site is indicated by a certain type of configurations of mounds, village layout, your ceremonial or recreational area, your court area. This maintains the older Mississippian pattern but, your getting a tendency, for example, there at Macon. You have this rotunda, circular mound, and you have another mound of totally different shape and structure and presumably, probably, these two mounds had buildings on them which served different purposes.

LARSON - Isn't a Lamar site a site that has Lamar pottery on it?

KELLY - No, I think that is too simplistic.

LARSON - Yes, but I don't see how else we can define them. We certainly can't define them as a site with mounds on it.

WALKER - Well, quite a number of these sites do not have mounds.

B. CALVIN JONES - Well, that's the question I was going to ask. What do we know about Lamar sites other than just the mound sites? Do we have remnants of all satellite sites? Doctor Kelly is suggesting...

KELLY - I'm suggesting that Lamar represents a special kind of socio-political development. It's a sort of a, there's a formative Lamar, and there's a formative Mississippian. I don't know whether you're going ascribe it to more effective farming, more effective subsistence, an ability to maintain larger populations and with larger populations should develop a more diversified and variegated type of community life, social life.

LARSON - What you are talking about, though, is what is usually given as the definition for Mississippian.

KELLY - I know, but then I think that in Lamar you get something, you get...for example Macon Plateau, as far as we know except for that site out there 9 miles away at Brown's Mount [9Bi?] we don't know of another Macon Plateau manifestation in Georgia.

WALKER - Doc, in going through the collections I did find that there was nine sites on which there were Macon Plateau pottery.

KELLY - Yes, but there are not, as far as we know, Macon Plateau sites, they may have some Macon...now the Singer Mounds [9Sw?] for example and Roods [9Sw1] maybe.

WALKER - No, I was meaning in the Ocmulgee River area in the general Macon area.

KELLY - Well, but then they are presumably contemporary with Macon and they may represent little satellite settlements.

WALKER - Yes, this is what I think they were, yes. But perhaps even hunting...

KELLY - But, I mean it has taken us thirty years of survey and sifting through notes to find that. You don't, even within a sea of surveys, find Lamar cropping up all over the place. And it's taken a long time to find any new appearances of Macon Plateau. And Etowah, for example, this is something that Lewis has been studying. Etowah has a somewhat broader satellite expression. You definitely get the idea that there were Etowah communities all around up there which was some way or another are (temporarily?) tied in and probably auxiliary to the main establishment.

But, I don't know of any Mississippian situations of the Early Mississippian, these large impressive sites, in which you get additional site data of related sites which are conglomerated and seem to have some sort of geographical logistical relationship to a large central site. You don't get into the same extent. It isn't as characteristic of the Mississippian site as it is of Lamar. Macon Plateau, another thing, is a heavily fortified site. And most of the sites around there you get the impression they were not Macon Plateau peoples. They were probably peoples who were already there. I, all the time I've been in Georgia, having previously been in Illinois at Cahokia, and Joe Caldwell had the same experience--we see Macon Plateau as some sort of outlier to the something like Cahokia in the same sense that Aztalan is to the north. And now that you are getting earth lodges at Macon Plateau and in north Georgia...

WALKER - And in Illinois.

KELLY - And you have them in Illinois and the dates as far as we are getting carbons lie somewhere between 800 and 1200. The dates between 800 and 1200, so Bob Stephenson and

others tell me who have worked with the early cultures up there in the plains. That's about the period of maximum development expression of the earth lodge cultures in the plains. Isn't it interesting it's at the same time they are appearing in Georgia and the Southeast. These plains people have been looking for years for something they can get some influence outside of their own area to explain their development of earth lodges. They've even tried to tie them up with the pit houses in the Southwest. They've tried to see if it is possible to get some sort of relationship even going out to the northwest coast where you tend to have this type, sort of thing. And they have played with the idea of the Southeast, but we've never been able to give them any data along this line.

It's just now beginning to come out! In other words, I think Macon Plateau, reconsidered in this case, I think it represents a definite movement of peoples and they are coming from north, (they hop down?) through Illinois, through Tennessee, and into Georgia and that this movement must have taken place about 1000, 1100 years ago and it's also bringing cord marked pottery which you find in these other sites in the plains. And the architecture is strikingly similar. Stephenson looked at my earth lodge last summer and he sat down and made me a model with matches. He said the damn thing looked exactly like a good Plains Indian model. (Evidently these things do tend???) in Carolina.

And you not only have similarities in architectural models, you have precisely the same sort of architectural changes taking place. You start with a rectangular structure which is about thirty by thirty. It's relatively small, 900 to 1000 feet [square feet] and with a central hearth and with anchor posts around the central hearth and connected by passage-ways to another structure. Then you, in, right on top of that, squashed out it you get an earth lodge which is longitudinally a little longer than the ones I mentioned, but now you do not have central hearths. You've got stringers of support posts, anchor posts all the way down the long axis. And the way your roofing is arranged everything's more like a long house and yet this thing...and now your posts are vertical. These are vertical posts to the side instead of being leaners and all of this gumbo fill comes up to the shoulder and then from there on they are using the black plastic clay over the bark or cane. The same thing happens...Roy Dickens working. I haven't been in contact with him or him with me. (They) came out with precisely the same models, the same architectural succession, and between North Carolina and Georgia. And it's really a hairy thing to see how close it is.

Now, or course, there are between these points, these subregions, you get a little bit different pottery picture. They are still getting stamped pottery. They are getting different makes. Some of them are roughened. They have both rectilinear and curvilinear series like you have here. And in the bottom of Pisgah they even got some late Etowah. And I'm getting some Etowah on my second earth lodge stage. I thought maybe they brought it in with the sand, you know. They bring in to sand the floors. But no, I don't think so now. The carbon dates--it's okay. It could be an Etowah.

SMITH - You're saying basically that these influence that go into Lamar are coming out of the plains area through Cahokia and so on down? And it got here...

KELLY - I think that's one contributing element, but I think that when they got here they found the Southern Appalachian stamp going its own internal evolution and we call it Savannah complicated stamp in north Georgia for example.

SMITH - So they more or less took over in building temple mounds and so on what was already indigenous in this area and what they are bringing in was mainly house types and pottery tradition?

KELLY - Yes, maybe some...for example, we get very little midden, very little pottery off these floors.

SMITH - In other words religion...they accepted a religious complex, possibly out of the Southeast and bringing in these other influences.

KELLY - I think they did. I think that they probably had some sort of religious complex which seemed to be acceptable to the people who were already here. So to me Lamar is something...it picks up threads from several different sources. I've mentioned one of them possibly through the earth lodges coming out of the plains. And being something like a Cahokia influenced style. I refer to early Mississippian. But this is engrafted on these old conservative southern complicated stamped tradition that Holmes first envisioned this, which have at least a two thousand year old history behind them if you go back to it.

SMITH - Of course, if we look at the historic period at Cahokia which is around 1500 to 1600, then there would be a hundred years hiatus between Cahokia and what happened down at Lamar.

KELLY - Well, I don't know what their Cahokia dates are now.

SMITH - Well, I should know, I wrote an article on it. Anyway, it was around...no it's contemporary, could be contemporary. Cause the Franciscans got up there in 1725, something like that. No, I'm just trying to put it in my mind in juxtaposition because you've opened up a new theory of thought as far as I'm concerned in getting these influences coming down at a rather late period into the Southeast.

KELLY - Well, I think these, this Mississippian is developing the large mounds in what we would call...Lewis spent a lot of time developing his ideas on what this Mississippian was in terms of community patterns and architectural arrangements and the whole business. But, I think that takes place around 900 to 1000 A.D. and it resulted in things like Macon Plateau and a number of these larger Mississippian sites as you go out here in Tennessee and Alabama.

WALKER - There is one thing that bothers me here and I may be wrong. My memory may be faulty, but unless I'm mistaken the plains earth lodges would really not be early enough to predate, for example, the Ocmulgee earth lodge.

KELLY - Well, they are about the same date. The earliest...I don't know...Stephenson tells me that the earth lodge are continuous in terms of plains archaeology which would be about a four hundred year period, about 800 to 1200. And that's just about...that happens to overlap precisely what we are getting in north Georgia with our carbon dates. The earliest earth lodges--I have two dates of 1060 and one of 860. The next phase I have a date of 1220. And another two of 1280. Well, you see that's getting right around in there between 800 and 1200. And while some of those dates are discrepant--they're have the troubles with carbon that they usually have--there is one thing they tend to be consistent in that all of the basal, sub-mound or early mound situation all have early carbon dates.

Now, there may be two hundred years between what seems like one level to the next and I know that darn good and well that earth lodges don't last two hundred years in north Georgia. There's something wrong there but whatever is wrong--the point I'm making--it tends to be consistently wrong. Up in the Geochron laboratory at Macon they think the answer may be that, well...I think I have evidence the way I interpret it that throughout this period...see what we are driving at here if I'm correct and the carbon dates are reliable on that one site you have a continuum of between seven or eight hundred at least six hundred years of continuous history coming up to the early eighteenth century. And it's unbroken. There is no evidence of any new people or any hiatus in there.

SMITH - Well, speaking of pit houses, I think Calvin Jones can help us out on that, or Ross Morrell, because we do get 'em down here in Florida in the historic period that runs into the seventeenth and eighteenth century.

JONES - Well, I wasn't going to say to much about that because its...

SMITH - Well, we don't seem to have then in Lamar. That's what worrying me right now...

JONES - Well, we're rethinking that now. In other words, what site excavations on the realm in '69 were referred to as the Velda mound site contains one apparent temple mound and that's all and sites in the village. But, it's not real clear yet as to whether that village is Lamar or some sort of Fort Walton.

SMITH - Where's this?

JONES - Northeast of Tallahassee about 5 miles we're just not sure yet...Lamar or Fort Walton.

SMITH - I just live here.

DON CRUSOE, ETC. - hah, hah, hah.

JONES - We don't know where the mound, in other words, whether it was constructed by these people that were bringing in the Lamar-like pottery or people who were making the Lake Jackson variety of Fort Walton. We hadn't found it there. As far as the pit house situation, we had pit house at a mission site that dates in the 1600s. That's the only one. We've got two houses. We don't have anything earlier than this. So there's quite a time difference here between what you've got and what we're finding here. We don't have anything that's in a comparable period that's a pit house. So that's why we're limited about pit houses.

KELLY - Now, you see the picture of Lamar that I'm trying to draw here is that...you've got something like a chiefdom in which there is a strong socio-political bond, in which some central organization is able to maintain some sort of solidarity linking with outside communities. And that some of these people who are providing these new bonds of political solidarity through a chiefdom are probably bringing peoples of diverse cultural backgrounds who are already there. This happened in Mexico and other places, you know. So that they, linguistically, they might have been different. They probably made different pottery. I think we have got evidence, for example, on the Coosawattee that at one time they were making Etowah pottery on the Sixtoe Field [9Mu100] at the same time I got a pre-Dallas Savannah like field with the early Dallas or the Hiwassee series on the other side of Coosawattee and the carbon dates would imply that there probably was an Etowah like village on one side of the river this totally different thing on the other. The carbon dates imply that they were there about the same time.

SMITH - Well, Lew, do you find this whole thing uncomfortable?

KELLY - Now, see, if I could find this sort of situation this explains why you get the little increments of different style and stamping and what not in all of our collections. We can't just strictly ascribe this to the village idiot who just went off trying something new. These styles are being produced by women potters in a traditional manner. This implies that if you do have little increments, little tribal increments living close together maintained by some sort of common government or socio-political control. If we can sort of move the picture we know that had developed in parts of Mexico, for example, here in the Southeast, I think that will explain the type of different types of stuff that you see combined in say, that will come up in one of these multiple sites.

CRUSOE - This is interesting, Doc. I was just about to ask Ross over there if this same sort of picture occurs in Florida. What Doc has been thinking about Lamar?

ROSS MORRELL - Well, I'd rather not answer that. What I...I was thinking that perhaps the conversation was maybe going in the wrong way at this point and what maybe we should do is just back completely up and try to wipe everything clean and consider for the moment Lamar as only being the site under discussion. Decide what it is we're talking about, what estimated range in time it's occurring and then, and only then, go on to see what is this we're calling Lamar in other places. And I think Lew was eluding to this and, you know, we're talking about a ceramic.

I don't think we're talking about a grouping of traits and then after we maybe get this developed then start looking in terms of geographical distribution and whether we're including mounds or not including mounds, are we in riverine situations or are we in piedmont situations. You know...this is kind of the way I'd like to see the discussion go for it seems to me like we'd better to this particular site

KELLY - In (order to translate, though?) Ross, (you've got to define?) for years. Some of us have said that, some of us who have been here longer, have kicked around these different site manifestations, we say that we think we see at least maybe six different kinds of Lamar. And they're all, they all possess certain morphological traits in common, particularly certain gimmicks of treating rims, for example. Lamar rim treatment does tend to be rather distinctive. These Lamar (rim types?) seem to be fairly consistent over a large area.

The kind of designs that they put on their pottery may vary...uh, up there in north Georgia, in Tennessee, and extending on into Georgia you do have this apparently a contemporary Lamar that they call Dallas. And Dallas extends all through South Carolina and it's the Dallas that enters the picture instead of the Qualla in which Pisgah ends up, for example, and instead of Lamar in which our Dallas phase ends up in north Georgia. And I brought in the picture of possible movement of people out of the plains to the earth lodges to simply represent the idea of actual movements of substantial populations with different potteries and different religious ideas, probably. They were able to move down more or less en masse and in sufficient numbers to maintain themselves in large fortified villages such as Macon Plateau (lodge?).

CRUSOE - Well, Doc, we can compare your Bell Field site with the Lamar site and there are a lot of distinctions between the two. For instance, apparently when they excavated the mound there, they didn't find any earth lodges, to my knowledge, at the Lamar site, whereas you are finding them at your Bell Field site and supposedly, as you say, there are (pot?) bearing houses in the village, but you just found the village at Bell Field so we don't really know if they are platform houses there, so again, it was, just as Ross was saying that what we are playing with is just a pottery type or a design.

STEVE DEUTSCHLE - I think we might have two things involved Don.

KELLY - Well, I'm trying to draw the picture to envision certain political, social conglomerations and the way your site is laid out, the arrangement of mounds, as I say to the large part...

LARSON - What is different between the way in which the Lamar site is laid out and any other Mississippian site? There is no difference, you've got two mounds, you've got a plaza between the pair, you've got a palisaded delimitation of the boundaries of the site. Now, to the extent that you've got about 38 more mounds at Moundville, there's not too much difference.

KELLY - You've got more mounds at Macon Plateau too.

LARSON - Sure, and there's not too much difference there either. Now, if you're going to...I want to know what the internal arrangement is that sets the Lamar site apart from the other Mississippian sites. Because I'm trying to arrive at a definition of Lamar. Now, so far the only thing ...

KELLY - Well, I'm trying to broaden it beyond the...

LARSON - Now, so far...

KELLY - ???

LARSON - Now, wait a second, the only thing, wait, yeah, well, alright I want to know, I want to know, broaden it beyond that too.

KELLY - I know, we all do.

LARSON - To date I don't see any difference between or...I mean I don't see any definition that's going to permit us to define Lamar other than pottery. Because we don't know anything about Lamar. You can't...I...you can't tell me what's different about the Lamar site, as such, and other Mississippian sites. I don't think we've got enough data to permit...we can distinguish the Lamar pottery from...

PENMAN - Can I argue the case of pottery then for a minute? It seems to me just in, well, looking at what literature is in print, and comparing it to Lamar, that the decorations compare most closely to Chauga, Peachtree, and Estatoe, which are documented Cherokee sites and also, rim treatment corresponds closest to these. I think another thing that we probably have been discounting is the possibility of simultaneous occupation at Lamar and at Macon Plateau specifically around the Trading Post area. Because this is supposedly documented historic Creek on the Plateau and there seem to be some of these design motifs and shapes coming out of Lamar Bold Incised. As a matter of fact there is almost a one-to-one correlation on some of the stuff that we have looked at.

KELLY - Now, that needs to be reexamined by Margaret [Russell], I'd like to hear her express herself on that subject - she has been trying to work out this relationship the same, in Lamar sites, which are almost purely complicated stamped and those in which you get broad lined incised, and I thought some of the data that she gave us at the Georgia Academy meeting was rather interesting. Couldn't you sort of summarize that for us? I mean in connection with the points you were raising, she has some interesting data.

MARGARET RUSSELL - Now, what was the question?

KELLY - The situation in which the sites which seem to have increasing amounts of incised pottery occur on sites in middle Georgia and on the Georgia coast and late sites in northeast Georgia in which she thinks the Muskogean or Creek peoples came in protohistoric times. The early occupation was dominated more by a type of Lamar in which you had complicated stamped. She made a rather wide site analysis and, as I say, the Chattahoochee River seems to be some sort of a significant boundary. The Muskogean, in other words, she thinks were the ancestors of the Creek phenomenon. She thinks was concentrated in Alabama, that right?

MORRELL - Excuse me, did I misunderstand you or did you say that you think that you are postulating a possible contemporaneity between Lamar and the Trading Post site?

PENMAN - Yes, I think we can do that. Now, there is a considerable pre-Post [!] occupation on the Plateau. There is some historic material coming in, but then again not in the great quantity that there is at Lamar. It seems though, that from the amount of material that's at Lamar that the occupation was terminated there some time before the Trading Post was built which was around 1690, roughly. So you have got a termination of somewhere around 1690. Now, granted some of these historic artifacts could be intrusive from an Ocmulgee Fields occupation at the Lamar site too, but I don't think all of them are.

MORRELL - Well, the best publicized historic materials from the Trading Post site are in, my opinion, relatively early trading materials, buck-eyed hoes, and things like this. Trading material from the Lamar site is, my opinion is, right up almost on 1800, looking at the whole collection.

PENMAN - Well, now the way Tesar's clustered that stuff there, it would be 17, right around 1700, 1750 and he says probably a tighter range of 1700-1730 and there is some earlier material appearing than that, too. Not enough material to make you think that there is good contact, but enough to make you think that there is some indirect contact with the whites.

KELLY - You'd think that Trading Post at Macon must have been established soon after the establishment of Charleston as a base for supplies and the trading route to Macon--the trade path we followed all the way across Macon Plateau, it leads right up to the entrance of the trading post and you have to remember that there was this map in General Harris' office, an early Macon map, which shows around the 1830s and it shows across the Ocmulgee there, from the Ocmulgee site, a notation on the Map says Moore's Trail and all the ethnohistorical background was the basis of the Park Service and the museum preparation there and making this beautiful diorama which most of you have probably seen if you've been in Macon at the Ocmulgee Museum. It shows Moore with his fifty Carolinians coming to this trading post and picking up a thousand Creek Indians and going down here to wallop the Spaniards, that was about 1706.

WALKER - 1703, December 1703.

PADGETT - Hah, hah, hah, hah.

PENMAN - Well, that would fit in with the dates that Jack has for the trading post, then, of 1690-1715.

KELLY - But remember, you've also got Spanish stuff there which might reflect some Indians coming up from the Bainbridge--Georgia equivalent of the Appalachian country here. The Spaniards are trading with these people from here before the 1700s.

PENMAN - We also have some French material too. Well, Mason says in her dissertation on the Trading Post that there is significant European contact before the actual establishment of the Trading Post. And it would seem to me from just a scan of the material that we have, that what is happening is that there is a termination of the Lamar occupation some time around say 1690 then, with not too many goods showing up. Then again, too, we are only talking about, in terms of material excavated from the site, maybe not a ten percent sample.

KELLY - Well, the picture that Margaret was painting for us implies that, this stuff fits in with what you are saying I think too, that what we are calling a Lamar concept, pottery-wise, which is largely dominated by what I call by the terminal Southeast Southern Appalachian Stamped, it suddenly becomes more variegated change through the introduction of incised pottery and certain pottery painting and other things which come in from the west and which might be a reflection of the movements which seem to have indicated in Chiquilli's legend, for example.

LARSON - There is painted pottery in the area before Lamar.

KELLY - Yes, that's true.

PENMAN - Yes, I think that's Mississippian in your Macon Plateau it's what we are dealing with now.

LARSON - All these traits are present.

PENMAN - But...

LARSON - Incising is present.

KELLY - Yes, its present somewhere, it's not particularly prevalent. You don't get much incising in Macon Plateau, for example.

LARSON - You have Etowah Incised which is certainly sufficiently like Lamar Incised to have served as an antecedent technique and even design element model for much of Lamar Incised.

KELLY - Well, alright, what I am trying to say, trying to develop here is the idea that Lamar is a, an idea that I've been trying to express for a number of years, is Lamar is a sort of a residual. All of these residues in terms of pottery traditions and styles are preserved and you even get different kinds, you even get Lamar, I even find Lamar vessels which have a simple stamp on them and Lamar rims.

LARSON - You can find Lamar vessels that have a very poorly defined stamp, but I don't know that you could refer to it as simple stamped.

KELLY - It looks like the same simple stamped.

DAN PENTON - In the Qualla area of North Carolina you get what is in effect an executed simple stamp, but it is a paddle. It has parallel grooves, so it's in a sense a complicated stamp which is expressed as a simple stamp.

PENMAN - A good guess would be that it is a take-off on this thing we're calling Figure 9 which is just a cut down version of a filfot cross. A lot of this material that is coming out of the Lamar site would look like that too.

PENTON - We also get that here in the Leon-Jefferson, if I'm not mistaken.

MORRELL - What's that Dan?

PENTON - This paddle simple stamped, whatever you want to call it. It's not applied the same way as...

SMITH - Well, to follow what Art said, if you've got a residue here of all the different types, doesn't that look like a breakdown in a political organization where another group or a group within a group, like Watergate, pulled all these things together and you had women from all different areas coming in and still making their own traditional pottery under a different political organization. I keep getting back to political organization.

PENMAN - Possibly that's it, but by the time we are talking about the specific occupation of Lamar...

SMITH - I'll be talking about what he said.

PENMAN - I'm just trying to put it in the perspective of Lamar to try to compare it to the Plateau, is that what Lamar represents is an extremely late phenomenon within this whole period of time? The incising is well developed, fully developed, and that the stamping is in the state of the art that it happens to be in and that the two are contemporary. This Macon Plateau occupation is contemporary to the Lamar occupation.

KELLY - No, I couldn't possibly accept, in the sense that, the point that Lewis has been raising--that the thing that I would ascribe to Lamar politically, socially, he points out well--what the hell, this is as far we can determine happened earlier and its what we called the large Mississippian mound deal?. I'm trying to point out that between 1000 A.D. when this early Mississippian climax occurs, here in the Southeast and if we are going to give a say a three to four hundred year formative period, developmental period for Lamar, this occurs about two to three hundred years later.

To me it's due to some sort of syncretism or different cultural elements recombining into some sort of new emphasis given to it. But whether it's from developed agriculture or increasing populations or ideas coming in from different areas and combining you get a new cultural blossoming, which true was using much that was already there. The early Mississippian had contributed. But now you are getting it under powerful chiefdoms with a larger number of

tributary villages and communities more effectively combined. And they are able to maintain themselves militarily, defensively. And you get deeper middens and more pottery and we find these on Lamar sites.

PENMAN - Yes, but what I'm saying is that you don't get this sequence of events at the Lamar site specifically, it's happening at Irene and at Chauga and...

KELLY - Oh, I know it's not unique at Lamar.

PENMAN - No, I'm saying that the occurrence at Lamar--the Lamar site is late within the Lamar period and that using Mason's data about there being a good pre-Trading Post, which would be pre-1690 occupation for the plateau...

KELLY - That would be terminal Lamar to me, though.

PENMAN - It would be what?

KELLY - Terminal Lamar.

PENMAN - Well, that's what I'm saying is, that the termination of the Lamar site itself happened some time before 1690, before there is this great influx of trade goods and that by this time that the people on the Plateau have adapted or have adopted these incised designs from the Lamar Bold Incised. There is a one to one correlation on some of these designs. The execution is totally different. The pinched is different, but as far as...

KELLY - I think that I said that we have about nine or ten carbon dates in the mound which has ten different levels. And we start somewhere around 900 to 1000 A.D., about the same time as Macon Plateau and which is still going strong in the eighteenth century in what we think was probably Coosawatee Old Town. And from about say 1000 to oh, 1700 there are seven centuries and there's no break in there that we can detect. And this is the critical period that we are talking about. This is certainly sometime in this seven hundred years, your Lamar phenomenologically is going to appear. We all agree on that. It is just a question of how early you think it appears or when you want to fix a point at which Lamar ceases to be Lamar and becomes something else--Ocmulgee Old Fields.

I think that what we might eventually, if we get enough site data recognized, and if we want to say well, we can go on and we can recognize it right now ceramically. That may be true, but I suspect the reason this is true is because we don't have enough site data from critical key sites, and that, I think, is one of the significances of the Lamar sites you have. In addition you could eventually get a beautiful developed Town Creek sort of reproduction, there, but you could also, with the New Archaeology, and its potential, get the full quantum of data or information that could be gathered in doing your interpretation. And I think that there are other sites which if they hadn't been destroyed, and weren't going to be destroyed, we might be able to do the same thing with them.

One of them is up there within 30 miles of Athens. It is a beautiful two mound site [9Ge4], covered under about 5 feet of alluvium. But, I think Georgia Power's Dam is going to probably, if not cover it, at least it is going to be water soaked. And that's one thing that's incidentally, that Joe Caldwell has been trying to argue with them is, well, that you don't have to cover a site with water to destroy it archaeologically as far as preserving it and having as a reservoir of knowledge. If you change the water table, you can rot all the bones and a good part of your vegetal matter and other stuff we get by modern extraction methods and that so that simply by that method if you really destroy the site, you're responsible for doing something about it.

SMITH - Well, I got interrupted a few minutes ago, but I want to ask Lew what's happened on the coast these days as far as Lamar is concerned? Maybe you covered that while I was gone, but it seems to me that this is very pragmatic in the whole picture.

LARSON - Well, I'm not sure what you mean because...

SMITH - Well, you've got Lamar on the coast?

LARSON - Well, we may have.

SMITH - Well, what we think of as Lamar do you have?

LARSON - Well, there is the Irene site which I've heard described as Lamar. I would say that it is certainly contemporary with the Lamar site in so far as it represents an occupation that probably began sometime after 1500 and probably terminated sometime before 1600. The Irene site is certainly is not the sort of site that you've got there at Lamar. First of all, there wasn't anyone living there and to this extent it's very much like Town Creek. Town Creek was not a residential area, at least as far as populations were concerned.

Now, the residential areas on the coast seem to be seasonal. They are shifting around. The people that are making this incised pottery and the stamped pottery are not staying put twelve months of the year. I don't know whether they were at the Lamar site either, but at least on the coast they weren't. The only place where you have these defined towns such as Irene...well, I won't say the only place definitely--you do have defined towns where you seem to have seats of political authority and out of which operate seasonal populations.

KELLY - Cofitachequi seems to have been such, doesn't it?

LARSON - No!

KELLY - Well I meant a settlement, a defined town, a large community...

LARSON - It's not on the coast.

KELLY - Well, it's not a hell of a long ways off.

LARSON - Well, it's on the Fall Line, my god. It's 100 miles inland.

KELLY - Hah, hah, hah, hah, hah.

LARSON - No, it's not the kind of thing we are talking about. The coastal situation at this time is quite different. There are centers where mortuary practices are going on and were apparently seats of political authority. This is what the Irene site was. It's a big mound surrounded by a palisade associated with a mortuary temple and a council house. It seems to have been a situation to which the population came periodically. We take the Jesuit fathers at their word on the occasion of redistributive feasts. Otherwise the population was scattered out. Now, was the population scattered out at Lamar? I would guess that is was. There certainly is not a great deal of agricultural land in this...

KELLY - Well, I think that you said that Willey did find, you asked the question--he did find eleven large communities around the center over a thirty mile sweep.

LARSON - We don't know whether they were seasonally occupied.

KELLY - No, we don't know that, we just don't know that much about it. Macon Plateau is the only one that we have gotten any explorations...

LARSON - Well, can I speak about--you asked me specifically about the coast. But, I spent about seven years excavating the Lamar village area at the Etowah site, which is considerable. It's something probably approaching a quarter of the total acreage of the site. This would make it somewhere around fifteen acres. And there are no mounds associated with the Lamar occupation at the Etowah site. The Lamar occupation follows the mound construction phase which

terminated in the Wilbanks period. I haven't seen any plaza, but this doesn't mean that there isn't one, because we haven't excavated the entire Lamar area.

The houses, in contrast to those which preceded, are post hole construction. They are large houses. They stand in marked contrast to the houses that were being constructed in the Etowah III period. The Etowah III period you have houses that were something between 10 and 8 feet on a side. In the Lamar period you've got houses which are up to 40 feet on a side. Now, this says something about the social organization, I think. You are probably dealing with an extended family in a house that's this large. There are internal structures, benches, partitions perhaps, but it looks more like benches or sleeping platforms, something such. You have got very carefully defined hearth areas, but only a single hearth per house. Which again, I think, is significant with respect to the social organization. The walls were wattle and daub and I think this is the briquettes that somebody was talking about from the Lamar site. It doesn't imply a sod roof.

The roofs of the Lamar houses at Etowah were of organic material, apparently thatch but quite possibly cane mats and incidentally, they had very well defined smoke holes. They took the tops of large jars and plastered them very carefully so that you had a chimney effect on the roof of the house. There were defined areas within the houses given over to specific kinds of activities. We defined flint napping activities as well as food production in the areas of these houses. And I would argue that the houses themselves were under the control of women. All of the houses that we have excavated had been burned, not as a consequence of any sacking of the town or as a consequence of being careless with matches or something of that sort.

KELLY - That's something you get in north Georgia, the idea of ritual destruction of...

LARSON - All right now, let me finish. The houses were burned seemingly consequent to burials, because all the fire places were clean. The house had no fire in it at the time it went up in smoke. And invariably, all of these houses have been associated with cemeteries and cemetery areas right outside in family areas. And again this would...I interpret this as the destruction of the houses consequent to the death of the owner. These have been determined to be females in the few instances that we have had the situation examined by physical anthropologists. Lamar at the Etowah site I see as a direct outgrowth of the Wilbanks period. I find it extremely difficult to distinguish between Wilbanks Complicated Stamped and Lamar Complicated Stamped. There certainly are some major shifts between the vessel forms we characterize as Wilbanks and the vessel forms that characterize Lamar. So there is something different going on. But I don't see a big pause in the occupation.

Certainly the Lamar people come in without any respect for the architecturally defined areas of the Etowah site and set up their village. So you've got people living on what would have previously been a plaza area. But they were avoiding the mounds. You don't get any Lamar pottery associated with the mounds. The subsistence patterns in this vicinity?? a break in the subsistence pattern.

SMITH - Well, really what I was trying here was a preconceived hypothesis. I thought maybe as you go coastal, you would find that it's sort of like the pioneer situation in the United States where everybody took off from St. Louis and as you get out to the Plains, but it isn't that way at all.

LARSON - No, I think it's, you've got an entirely different kind of adaptation you can't carry on agriculture very successfully on the coast--at least in the same way you could...

SMITH - That's true.

LARSON - In these alluvial valleys in the Piedmont area north of the Fall Line. You get an entirely different adaptation and you wouldn't expect the same thing in coastal as you get in the interior.

KELLY - You've got the Maritime resources, obviously.

SMITH - But, of course, I was thinking of the influence coming in out of the Macon Plateau to the coast, down the coast coming on down to St. Augustine. That's what I was looking at and I was just wondering...

LARSON - Well, I would certainly not argue that your ceramic styles are coming down the Savannah River or down the Altamaha Valley ___?___.

SMITH - Let's get off the ceramic styles, I'm sick of them.

LARSON - I don't see anything else that would even vaguely be reminiscent of Lamar on the coast other than the ceramics.

PENMAN - Well, another thing on the ceramics on the coast, in this area below the Fall Line and north of Irene, all the rim treatment is different than what you get inland. It's a reed punctate rim or bossed rim or reed punctate or rosettes or something like this. But it is not these appliqué reed punctate or appliqué pinched as is occurring at the Chauga, Nacoochee, Lamar area in there.

KELLY - The Rembert mounds, of course, is another one. This is Pee Dee.

LARSON - I don't know, but I would question that we have to assign these ceramic differences to either a consequence of temporal differences or vast spatial differences. They may be a consequence of nothing more than simply lineage differences within a relatively short amount of space and time and distance.

CRUSOE - Well, this is certainly true of earlier periods where you have subdistricts, if you want to call it that, on the Georgia Coast where groups of islands are associated with various lineage patterns and the stylistic differences are unique within each one of these subdistricts or whatever you want to call them.

LARSON - They vary from house to house on something like the Lamar site.

MORRELL - Now, for the Big Bend of Florida, and what I, in my own mind call Lamar, is a whole lot more than a pottery type. That's the way I recognize it, but something really drastic happened.

LARSON - Yes, I do this at Etowah, too.

KELLY - Well, for me there's more to it than pottery in these north and northeast Georgia situations too. Lewis has, I mean when you question it as Lewis has, it is hard to put your finger on particular items--things which you can justifiably call Lamar other than the Lamar pottery morphology and style.

LARSON - We're using pottery to mark a temporal difference and then talking about the Lamar period is what you are talking about. We are not talking about culture. And in the Big Bend area of Florida you are talking about a particular cultural configuration that occurs in the Lamar period and you have a concept, I suspect, of what that culture is.

JONES? - It doesn't look anything at all like what's going on...

MORRELL - Really, and it's so much more than just a ceramic paste. There is an actual, in my mind at least, there is a displacement of Fort Walton peoples to coastal areas and there is a certain amount of blending with Fort Walton, but to my knowledge, you don't find Fort Walton with any historic materials and then early historic materials except in a coastal situation. You never find on the inland sites.

KELLY - Well, you've got some Fort Walton coming all the way up to Columbus and Bull Creek [9Me1].

MORRELL - Right, but I'm talking about Lake Jackson, Velda, Yon, all these big Fort Walton sites here in the area. There is no historic material there. And they are overlain with a blending of Fort Walton and a flavor of Lamar. Not this type of Lamar, but its...

LARSON - Well, there certainly are stylistic resemblances between Fort Walton and Lamar in the ceramics and, but that absence of historic material would not necessarily mean that it was very early.

MORRELL - Not in itself, I don't think so, no.

LARSON - You get some historic material in the Lamar at Etowah. Iron celts, which I think are rather interesting. They are not iron axes, they are iron celts. And a bead now and then and also what I like to think of as chain mail and a very curious stone quern?. I don't know what it is, but it came off the floor of two different houses. Both pieces fit together, too. And again its historic.

SMITH - Coffee break. Three-thirty, right back here, and actually the last part of this is, I think an important part is future excavations at Lamar and what we are going to do with the analysis of the collections. And I think this is important because various students around the Southeast have access to the materials here and we ought to talk about that and how they could project what has been done and to work it out.

COFFEE BREAK

SMITH - We're real interested in here at FSU at what suggestions you have to give us on future excavations at Lamar site and also what we should do with the rest of the collection in the analysis.

SHORT GAP IN RECORDING

KELLY - You are going to find eventually that Lamar meant more than pottery. Pottery is just sort of a fossil index.

LARSON - I agree with you, but at the level at which we are talking now, this is all that we...

KELLY - Okay, but that's what we are talking about. We are going to have to try and broaden our concept of Lamar to comprehend more than pottery. And the way to do that is to excavate on key sites where you might reasonably anticipate to get certain types of key information. But all of this information is to be keyed into an overall conception of Lamar with its variations. Because you are going to tell, at Lamar, eventually, when you get your village and you get your Lamar museum. You are not only going to tell the story of what happened on the Lamar site, but you have to explicate the idea of Lamar phenomenologically in a larger area of sense. So that not only research at Lamar, but research at Lamar related sites is all grist for your mill.

JONES - I'd like to add here...in other words Doctor Kelly, you are talking about going ahead in and actually having an areal grasp of what is in the area, in other words. In other words when I say this I don't know whether or not adequate studies have been in the area to determine whether there are these outlying satellite sites or not, and if so, as Mr. Walker pointed out, whether or not many of them do not have mound sites. He indicated to me that there were some that didn't.

KELLY - That's right, and I hadn't thought about that.

JONES - Yes, in other words, to get an areal grasp of where Lamar fits in.

KELLY - They don't have mounds there other than the Lamar site. That one area up there that doesn't have them.

JONES - You have to know the area.

KELLY - That's the one area that ought to have then that doesn't have them. I hadn't thought of that.

SMITH - Get one of them Doc, go now!

[LAUGHTER]

POTTS - Take a crew out and grow one!

JONES - I know this thing can grow and grow and grow like Topsy, but at any rate you know where it fits into the area, that is what I would suggest. My question here under B, under this suggested future excavation of collections, of what the value is in analyzing the remaining seventy-five percent of the sherds. In lieu of what Doctor Kelly said about the shoe box business, about them all falling down.

KELLY - You know, I frankly think, for a variety of reasons, and that's one of them, another thing every time you move collections, we have found, and you put them in new cases or you put them in a new building, that park? portion of the building, every time you do this, you lose something...

SMITH - Right! Right!

KELLY - ...in spite of every damn thing you can do you are going to lose things. The University of Georgia, they lose them because they turn all the stuff over to the maintenance department and they lose things as they move them from Candler Hall, for example, over from Peabody and from Peabody over to Baldwin. We've moved about four times and we have lost something every damn time. I don't know how in the world you can prevent it. You can get all your graduate students and have them go along with the maintenance men, I think, and ride in the same trays with them and handle it and you are still going to lose stuff.

SMITH (Whispered) - That's the worst thing you can do--get Graduate Students involved with it...

JONES - Right. Of course I was in no way saying (? ? ? ?) ...problem that results in the loss of critical data. That happens with all of us...

KELLY - Now I do think you've lost so much that you are going to get very limited results from the material that you have. You need new material gathered under...well, quite frankly...

CRUSOE - Are you condemning the collections?

KELLY - In terms of the type of collections you have now and the type of collections you would hope to have if you did New Archaeology, yes!

CRUSOE - So, what you are saying back there in essence is that all those pot sherds are really worthless.

KELLY - I won't say that they are worthless, I simply said that they have limited value. And I think that you have just about extracted the value that they have.

CRUSOE - You are talking about the Lamar?

KELLY - Yes.

CRUSOE - Well, I'm talking about the whole thing.

KELLY - Oh, that's something else.

CRUSOE - See, this is something that we fight about every day is whether these things were worthwhile or not and you are basically telling me that they are not.

KELLY - If you have still got those Macon Plateau collections which we laboriously collected and put in shoe boxes and which are tied down to the nearest station with all sorts of profiles and taken out with three to six inch levels, if they are still now, like they were, they certainly have value.

CRUSOE - Unfortunately, I believe that the Plateau is about as bad off as Lamar.

KELLY - Well, it may be.

CRUSOE - Everything is about the same.

JONES - I would like to add here, to follow on to what Doctor Kelly said, I would recommend that we be sure that we have a very adequate sampling, ever how much that is, five percent sample or what-not, of every area that has been previously tested so that you will be sure and have some idea in terms of looking at this stuff as a whole from each area of what might be there in terms of how it might affect your research plan in terms of whether or not Swift Creek occurs at this end of the site and Ocmulgee Fields at that end of the site or what-not.

Be sure that this material to that extent remains here to be sure what might be in that area to the end that you might want to approach the site in terms of the additional research and so that while the collections I don't think can be analyzed to any depths, I think that the individual collections...there are individuals who definitely should be quite aware what might appear to be in each area that's already been tested. A single area may or may not have been done to your satisfaction.

CRUSOE - What specific problems should we address ourselves to if we decide to go back to Lamar and excavate further?

FRANK FRYMAN - The village. We don't know where the village is. We don't know anything about it. The burials. We talked about the burials this morning, and are they, is it a cemetery? Are they scattered? Are they family plots? We don't know very much about that yet, either. We need to learn a little more about the intra-site settlement data. There is a lot that could be done there that's not available in the present collections.

DEUTSCHLE - I think something that could be done along the lines of the village site excavations would be, number one, house patterns. Ford only uncovered, in its entirety, one. I think what we should get is a site-wide idea of patterns, that is, patterns of individual houses and then how these are related overall for the site. In the process of doing this, defining what could be, let's say, a plaza area between the two mounds, also the limits of the Lamar occupation.

WALKER - Not only the Lamar occupation.

DEUTSCHLE - Well, others as well, but right now we are addressing ourselves to Lamar, as such. Certainly in the process of trying to find the limits of Lamar you are going to encounter the others as well. Trying to work this sort of thing up, burial practices would be involved in this, because all indications are that burials were within houses, around houses, in the midden, and in the mound, i.e., any place you can find a hole, you put it in it and fill it up.

KELLY - Your burials would be house related because you seem to have situations there that Larson was describing for his large Lamar village. In other words, the burials would--that Ford was finding--were in and around these houses.

DEUTSCHLE - Well, he only had two things he could identify as houses. One was Village Site 1, which is readily accepted as a house--burials in association. Both inside and in this moat-like area around the house. There was one other possible excavation that he thinks was a house floor. For all the rest of his excavations, he does not indicate that he encountered quote, a house. In fact, Village Sites 2 and 16 did not produce houses, but he got like twelve burials out of one, so they are not all strictly closely identified with houses.

LARSON - That could be a cemetery.

DEUTSCHLE - Right.

KELLY - The point that I want to make is that these houses, at your site, tend to have hard compact floors. They have a lot of clay in them and they are covered, plated with alluvium, sand. I believe it would be possible to locate most of those houses, since they are only under 2 feet or less of alluvium, by modern methods of resistivity. I believe you could go over it and you could pretty

well spot where those houses are without doing a hell of a lot of digging. I think our modern methods will do this for us. And I agree that it would probably give you the maximum information, utility, and interpretative value.

The first thing would be to define your village, within the stockade. You have got a lot of things spotted for you there to start with. In spite of the fact that your data and your records are not in satisfactory condition to get access to them and to work them up. But after all, what was done there? Ford didn't work there very long. They were pretty soon said one of us would have to go. Ford went off to the coast, if you remember, and got all wound up in this terrible dispute about the missions. That pretty well started a civil war down there. So, I was left alone there until Gordon Willey came along. So we didn't really...I don't think we made a dent in Lamar. I'd say ninety-five percent of the qualified work that needs to be done there still remains to be done so I wouldn't feel too unhappy about the inadequacy of what you have since it's got to be done anyway.

DEUTSCHLE - Well, no, I was in no way trying to knock what has been done, I was simply trying to take what has been done and project questions that should be addressed to the site.

KELLY - Well, I understand that, but I'm sure if Ford were here he'd agree with me.

DEUTSCHLE - Something else in relation to this, would be to finish up in terms of superficial analysis, would be to establish the time periods in which Mounds A and B were constructed. I believe Mr. Larson has raised this question, are they in fact Lamar sites...mounds? One tends to wonder about one fact, and that is on the western edge of the site, about 20 feet in width, the trench was put through, and they encountered village site material under it. Apparently this was Lamar material.

I think it would be interesting to try and documenting, Number one, if Mound A is Lamar and, Number two, when it was constructed. Was there an accumulation of Lamar materials beneath the mound which would indicate a rather late time period to start construction for a mound 150 by 150 by 20 feet high? And then we always have the unanswered question of what is Mound B? I think these are two things that should be tackled. Now, Doctor Kelly has brought up the fact that a great deal of Mound A remains untouched. You were talking about a quarter, I tried to roughly figure it out and I don't think Ford got into more than about one sixth of the mound.

KELLY - I would agree to that, that's my impression. I don't think he did a quarter.

DEUTSCHLE - He encountered extremely rich deposits, apparently very good stratigraphy, of course we don't have a record of it but there are a number of stages of construction.

KELLY - Well, look at that profile over yonder, I think you can see in that profile that there are at least three occupations in that mound.

DEUTSCHLE - A minimum.

LARSON - Occupations or strata?

KELLY - Strata--mound building levels.

DEUTSCHLE - Stages or whatever you want to call them.

KELLY - Stages in the growth and occupation of the mound.

MORRELL - Don, if you talk about the value of going back to the Lamar site, if we talk about problems that we are trying to solve at this instance in time, aren't we being a little short-sighted in talking about a site that has had some research, no matter what the condition of the collection of your data right now? We are talking about something that has been done on a site that is now in public ownership. Okay, now I have got to disqualify myself a little bit because I feel pretty strongly about expending research funds about sites that are in public ownership. There is a great

need for really broad systematic survey of the broad area so that you see if there are indeed satellite villages, farmsteads, whatever the hell, now, while they are still there. Things that aren't in public ownership expend this money there so that at a future date it is going to help you interpret the Lamar site.

CRUSOE - This is a good point, Ross, but the problem there is that as Park Service archaeologists we can not conduct...

MORRELL - I do understand the politics of it but, none the less, I can't see coming back into the Lamar site and to do what Lew is talking about in terms of a broad interdisciplinary approach to the village area, you are talking about a half a million dollars at best and I don't think you've got that. Now, you can come back in and do some more sampling. You can come back in to the talus of the mound. You can come back in to the village area and do a little bit of this and a little bit of that.

LARSON - If you don't mind, I'd like to comment on this public ownership. The research problems should never be dictated by who owns the situation that you want to research. I think that this is the least of the considerations. Now, if you are trying to preserve the site this is another question. If your argument is that excavation should not go on because it should be preserved, this is something else. But, certainly the expenditure of research funds should not be dictated by who owns the property that is involved in your proposal?.

MORRELL - I think that it certainly should. If there is a potential of getting the same results from either one...

LARSON - Well, how can you determine this?

MORRELL - Well, can you? I'm not sure you can but, you can come close. I mean surely we have got more archaeology under our belt than that.

LARSON - We certainly haven't got the archaeology that would allow us to make this determination about the Lamar site I don't think. If we want to find out something about the Lamar site, we are going to have to excavate at the Lamar site.

MORRELL - Well, no question there, I'm just saying are you going to do it tomorrow or are you going to do it fifty years from now?

LARSON - Well, Hale was concerned with tomorrow, I thought.

DEUTSCHLE - I think Ross has a good lead on this. And Fairbanks had the idea when he wrote up his palisade report that appeared in the Regional Review and also another version in Proceedings of the Society for Georgia Archaeology. He poses that the Lamar site is in fact a center with the fields and garden plants lying out somewhere in that god-forsaken swamp. Now, the problem now is to find someone crazy enough to go out and stomp the sticks to find them. These should be located.

I think this ties in with the point you were trying to make although you weren't speaking just of the farming plots you were speaking of other sites per se. But, I think we do have to account for the fact that we have apparently a rather large population at the Lamar site. There is not that much available land for agriculture, especially if we go back to the idea that this was really swampy. These people had to make a living somehow.

LARSON - Well, I misinterpreted. I thought he was going to spend the research funds on salvage sites that weren't endangered.

KELLY - He can't. Park Service can't use their own funds on salvage.

LARSON - I know that, but...

MORRELL - But, surely a palisade town like we are talking about, there had to be farmsteads outlying. And I'm just saying that the funds being expended, if you are going to expend any...

LARSON - Ross, I'm not sure that this is a correct assumption, because I have heard this repeated again and again as far as Mississippian sites are concerned. And yet, I know of no other site than the Etowah and the Wilbanks sites that were contemporary with the climactic period at the Etowah site. There are apparently no outlying farming communities in the Etowah Valley between Rome and Ball Ground, a distance of about, what, 60 miles, that are contemporary with these two sites. And the Wilbanks site is a small site in the Piedmont whereas the Etowah site lies immediately over the boundary. There doesn't seem to be anything else that was occupied during that time. So that maybe this assumption that there were outlying sites...

MORRELL - ...maybe they are interrelated villages or what, I don't know what's there.

DEUTSCHLE - How are we defining the site? I think we all have the idea of other communities just about the same size or a little smaller than Lamar. A site is any place that has been occupied and identified.

LARSON - That's what I'm talking about.

DEUTSCHLE - What we would probably find in the area of Lamar are little homesteads.

LARSON - I would define these as sites too.

DEUTSCHLE - When we are talking about sites, let's get this clear, we are not trying to find another community comparable to Lamar that is coeval with it.

LARSON - No, this is not what I had reference to. I am talking about any place where Lamar pottery occurs. Now, Jack says there are a number of sites down the river so that this would argue that certainly Ross's suggestion or proposal would work in this area. I am talking about generally assuming that there are outlying communities of whatever size whether it is of the magnitude of a single house or something on the order of Cahokia. I think it's an incorrect assumption for the Mississippian period and I would include Lamar in this period.

WALKER - Well, one thing, Ross, in connection with what you have been saying, there is quite a bit of material in the collections from some of these other sites. Agreed, the data may be in roughly the same shape as this data is in, but there are already a number of sites that have some surface collections, some excavations, so on, that are in the general area.

KELLY - It seems to me that one project that obviously ought to be carried through--someone should be encouraged to write up Willey's C.C.C. Mobile Survey. His eighty sites. Willey has long since said, as far as he is concerned, he is ready to turn them over to anyone, he will never come back to them, he's involved in another world. So there is an eighty site situation which would make a nice doctorate dissertation.

TOM PADGETT - Well, Doctor Willey sent us, as Steve mentioned this morning, all his notes from the survey, but some of the sites in there would take you two years to go through one of them.

KELLY - Yes, it may be that you can--that Willey's survey could best be farmed out to a number of master's students. But get it done, I mean, get it analyzed. You have got a survey there--it is not a complete survey, I am sure that there are other sites that he didn't get. He just went down the river with his truck and his twelve C.C.C. boys and he went to sites that local farmers told him about. And they didn't do a lot of surveying, there are undoubtedly many more sites.

From the knowledge we have gained in doing just a river basin, you should find at least two hundred sites in any river basin survey that is at all complete and this gives you some sort of measurement of what you might reasonably expect in completing the Ocmulgee survey and I think that survey needs to be completed. What Willey did should be broadened. Get more sites in it because they are unquestionably there. But, to start with, you first need to get his survey analyzed and get that data available because eighty sites is enough to give you a pretty fair idea of what a

larger survey would be. But you need all that information. All of this, it seems to me is key data which you need to know what kind of sites, what kind of adaptations were made in the...not only in Ocmulgee, but within an area, oh, 60 miles from there.

And this is entirely in accord, for example, with what has been projected for archaeological survey under the concepts of the so-called New Archaeology. You need not only know what is happening on the site, but you need to know what is happening in, for example, in Illinois where Struever is working, you need to know what is happening in the Illinois Valley at a certain time. You can never get a complete adequate knowledge of what's happening just from intensive knowledge of one site. You need both intensive and extensive coverage to get the data that you are going to need for ultimate interpretation.

CRUSOE - So what you have said in essence is that no future work should be done at Lamar until all of this other stuff is known from around Lamar.

KELLY - I think probably that's true. Because you need that knowledge. You need that information as feasibility data to really set up your Lamar project in terms of its objectives and its methods and its procedures and to really hope to sell it and get enough money to do it proper. You need that much supporting data.

SMITH - You have been working on this a long time. What is your opinion?

WALKER - Well, I was just sitting here wondering. You can argue this thing from so many different angles. I might preface this thing by saying that for a period of almost six months, shortly after Pete and I set up the center in Macon doing our own typing and everything else that was to be done, in the time that I had free I was trying to approach this Lamar material with the idea of working up some sort of a report. And I was already, to some extent, familiar with the collections. I helped move some of the collections from shoe boxes to the metal cases when I first went with the Park Service and then later I looked over some of the material and I had some idea as to the different types of material on the site.

The fact that there, well, in the literature, in many places you see references to Lamar site as the type site and this being the only thing represented on the site. Well, I knew that there was quite a bit Macon Plateau, I knew that there was quite a bit of Ocmulgee Fields as well as Lamar. And I was looking for something that would try to tie this material together so you could get a chronological and evolutionary development, if possible. And I thought Willey's strat test would be the place to do this. Unfortunately, though, when I started going through Willey's strat test, I found that there was practically no Macon Plateau Material, if any, in those tests. So apparently, the site has various areas that were occupied at various times. Perhaps some of these extend beyond the boundaries of the stockade. I really don't know.

Now, the difficulty that the people here have encountered in working with this material is something I have total sympathy with and understanding of. Frankly, I think they have done a beautiful job with this report and I think they have accomplished quite a bit. Now, the question is, is it worthwhile to go through the rest of the material to try to at least get a cursory idea of what is represented on this site, more or less what areas this occurs in, and from this to help develop your ideas of where and what you want to investigate. I'm really not sure. Perhaps just going in and sampling trash and various areas might actually be a better idea.

SMITH - Being a teacher, I can react to this somewhat and that is with these New Archaeologists. They haven't got their feet on the ground, they're all in theory. And you have got to know a pot sherd before you can go on to theory, and I think, I'm just speaking one point of view from the student, that's good thesis material to just go over this because, the students I have known, in other

universities beside this one, they just don't know the basics of pot sherd analysis. I hate getting down to pot sherds, but you have to know this. Well, anyway, I think that's one value of it. Whether it is a term paper, it could be a term paper, it could be a thesis, but anyway, does Mr. McGruder or Mr. Mitchell have anything else? [Reference to Watergate!]

KELLY - Well, I don't want to give the impression that I think that the material we have, for example, we are talking about at least 80 sites of Willey's, but I do think that you have an obligation to extract everything you can out of it and I really think that you are going to get some useful information. I'm simply saying that it's going to be probably to some extent, a frustrating experience and you are going to feel a little bit let down, you'll feel like you have exerted a lot of effort and done a hell of a lot of work for the quantum of knowledge you get out of it, but I still think this is a necessary thing to do. Right now you need to go through those collections. As time goes by they get into even worse condition so you better get at it!

MORRELL - Isn't there a good chance if you don't look at the remainder of the material before you go back, if you go back, that when you do go back, you might never look at that material again? It seems like it's from just the physical aspects of it, it looks like it's a hell of a lot of work for what little you can extract from it. It seems like this is a better investment to initially look at the remainder of it.

DEUTSCHLE - From the Lamar site? Folks, can I point out a few things. I'm not trying to argue a point particularly one way or the other. I have tried to express, as Pete did too in the opening statements, some of the problems we have encountered with the materials. Here is an example of the condition of some of our negatives. Kodak has even said that the best thing to do is just burn them, except they get you for air pollution. The maps are in a horrible state. For example, that is the only thing we have to cover Ford's work. That map was made in '37. Ford was working in '34. God knows what happened in the meantime. Where this material came from. There was one pit plotted on there that I had to move over 400 feet one way and 410 feet the other way. This is the final map. They are in this bad of shape.

These are some of the accession cards they used for whole collections of sherds. A great deal of information can be put of this. level: none; field specimen number: none; depth: none; field note books: none; catalog notes: none; object of collections: sherds; this collection comes from trimming of profile. This is indicative of the whole thing. Now, here is another surface collection, parentheses, back fill. There is a long trench, you can barely see it on there, it runs off of Village Site 1 to the east for a distance of 200 feet. The provenience for all sherds coming from that site--none. This is just typical. If you look at the stuff, you see umpteen field note books, all kinds of profile reports, you glance over it and you think this is great. But once you try correlating some of this stuff--now we have accession cards here that the numbers on all the sherds have been changed. This may be due to that rain storm they had that they had that Doctor Kelly was talking about, some of the numbers may have been eradicated.

I don't want to get real fatalistic about this, but I would say the condition of the Lamar collections are such that it is probably a great waste of time. Because even when you read our report there is an extensive section in there on pottery analysis. When you consider the percentage of sherds that had to be condemned to surface collection and treated as such, this is a symptom of something being wrong. And I think about the only other thing you could do would be to take the site generally, condemn everything to surface, and treat it that way. And then what does this tell you?

PENMAN - Well, there would be, I think, another alternative if we are just talking economics: information gained for dollars expended, probably the only thing that we could do there would be to take those remaining pits that Willey put in--now one of the things that we talked about this morning, we were saying that he saw the sequence of the evolution of incised ware in this units. Probably what that was...

KELLY - Willey thought he did, and I'm sure that he probably did but he evidently had more complete statistics. Now he said he has turned everything over to you, but...

PENMAN - Well, he had four trenches that we don't have plotted -the only thing we have is profiles of them and that might be what he formulated it on.

KELLY - I don't know, but he did tell me quite definitely that he thought he had evidence, stratigraphic evidence, of the gradual late appearance and preponderating influence of the incised. Which is a very critical point, of course.

PENMAN - But now, from what we have left in the collections here, all we have is say, fourteen of his units, or twelve I guess it is, of his units that haven't been analyzed yet and that is part of that stratigraphic survey.

KELLY - Well, he was talking about his strat survey.

PENMAN - Yes, well, then there are like I say four trenches too that we don't have.

JONES - I'd like to indicate something here. As I said earlier what I'm suggesting is sort of a compromise here to some extent in terms of trying to get at how much data you can get from the information per dollar spent. I mean (practical relief individual???) is where I came up with that idea. In all seriousness, what I suggested earlier is that I think that the remaining materials should be looked at only from the point, and I said earlier to the extent that it can give you the data that you need to help answer or raise questions that you might want to answer to go back and do future research and that can be even only five percent of the seventy-five percent. I think that adequate samples of each unit of excavation has not yet been sampled.

Even if you do consider it a surface collection from that area, that's what you'd really be doing, cause you would have doubts as to the stratigraphic depths of the materials--where it came from. It should be looked at with small quantities, but quantities large enough to be somewhat meaningful to you in terms of a surface analysis, if that's the way you are handling it. From each area that has not been looked at needs to be looked at, this somewhat goes back to what Ross [Morrell] says that you need to know as much as you can about an area. Well, I'm saying that based upon my assumption of the condition that the data is in, as related to me by you people, that this would be adequate at this point. Be sure that you have an adequate understanding of what might be in these other areas, if you have already got the data at hand its merely a matter of looking at it.

Basically, I think you need to go back and look at adequate samples from each area that has been excavated knowing full well that they are probably no more than surface collections unto your analysis because, as you indicated to me--we talked some about this--that if you've got a big Swift Creek component at one end of the site that you don't portray on the board, for example, you know, you need to really get some feel for what's down there, in other words, by looking at the material. Somebody needs to go the point of putting it in some sort of form which goes back to what Ross says so that you'll know what the problems really are. To this extent, I think your getting a dollar return, being practical about the whole thing and not so idealistic, but also I think this ties into with the ideals that we are trying to achieve here, get as much information out of the

site whether it's been dug in the past, a feature or what not. Does everybody follow me at this point

DEUTSCHLE - I think, perhaps, the best thing to do Calvin [Jones], would be to just to modify your idea a bit and follow up on John [Penman]. Having looked through [Gordon] Willey's stuff, given its age around 1937 it is in fantastically good shape. You could probably do some of the quote, New Archaeology from this and this was something he spent I think, less than a week at the Lamar site and put down twenty pits, has profiles for everything, his camera was never in focus, but his notes are quite good. His material is excellent and, as far as we know, it is all intact because where the Park Service files may have gotten screwed up over thirty years, Willey pulled his out of the attic and shot them straight to us. They should be intact, complete. Best thing to do would be sample the rest of his material, plot it on this map, and where there are areas that perhaps he did not touch, then try to tie in with some of the old W.P.A. stuff. Willey will give you your surface collection plus your vertical control.

JONES - Yes, that's would what you need.

DEUTSCHLE - This would probably be the best thing.

PENMAN - That would be twelve pits, roughly that you could get some kind of stratigraphy from, hopefully, and then another twelve that you could condemn to surface and in combination with the twelve with control you could look for inter-site relationships. But, as far as the dollar for dollar return, the best bet would look to be retaining these twelve of the stratigraphic survey just for future analysis. In other words, roughly one half of the excavated material from the village site which is probably one third of what's left back there. Because you have got a still, a pretty good sample of material from the mound that can be nothing else but a surface collection.

JONES - Sounds reasonable.

PENMAN - That would be really just intensive analysis of one-third of what's still back there.

CRUSOE - It's getting rather late, but before we go away I wanted to make this one sort of passing remark, and that is that the collections that you see on the table before you--we have about 150. God knows how many, Louis Tesar got carried away when he... What we will be doing eventually, sometime in the near future, is to disperse these to various institutions and if your institution would like to have one of these, if you would write us, we could provide that for you.

SMITH - I move we adjourn.