The Newsletter is published four times per year by the Houston Archeological Society. Contributions of news items, short articles and information of archeological significance should be sent to the Editor - Alan R. Duke, 1706 Oaks Drive, Pasadena, Texas 77502.
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HAS Officers - 1974-75

Chairman - John Herbert, 5935 Dellfern, Houston, Texas 77035
Sec.-Treas. - Janet Alkire, 10315 Greenwillow, Houston, Texas 77035
Directors - Alexander Macnab, Shirley Thompson, Jack Klatt
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HAS Programs - 1974

October - Elton R. Prewitt, research archeologist with the Texas Archeological Survey, spoke on the Love-Fox site and central Texas archeology.

November - Brent Smith, HAS member, discussed excavations in Southwestern Louisiana.

December - Kermit Schoonover, Professor of Old Testament at Perkins School of Theology, SMU, spoke on Excavation at Ai (et-tell), an early bronze age city in Palestine.
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News From Other Societies

The Lower Plains Archeological Society and the Midland Archeological Society have developed pottery boards for members to use in comparing pottery types. The boards have rim and body sherds displayed in such a fashion that anyone wanting to "type" a sherd can do so quickly. Your Editor recently sent the two Societies some Goose Creek plain and incised rim and body sherds (San Jacinto ware sherds will be sent also in the near future) and they would welcome any other Texas Gulf Coast types. If you would care to contribute any sherds to this very worthwhile project, send two rim and two body sherds of each type to: Aaron D. Riggs, Jr., 119 N. Dewberry, Midland, Texas 79701. Be sure to sack and label the sherds by type name.

The University of Texas at San Antonio has created a Center for Archeological Research, with Dr. Thomas R. Hester serving as its Director. The major goal of the Center is to provide training for graduate students in archeology via their participation in archeological research projects in the south central and southern Texas regions. The Center also exists to aid Federal and other governmental or non-governmental agencies with needed archeological surveys. Since the Center's creation in late summer, 1974, four archeological surveys have been conducted by Center personnel in Starr County, Austin County, Bexar County, and Calhoun County.
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A Harris County Shell Site

A. R. Duke

Site 41HR71 was a site similar to sites 41HR72 and 41HR73 previously described by the author in earlier issues of the HAS Newsletter. The past tense is used since the site has been completely destroyed by recent construction work. Located on the western shore of San Jacinto Bay about 20 feet above the present normal water level (allowing for subsidence), the site consisted of a rangia shell layer about 12 inches thick and at least 100 feet long. The shell was covered by about 6 inches of top soil.

Ceramics found at the site included Goose Creek Plain and Incised and San Jacinto Plain. Several hundred sherds were found and the larger sherds displayed the typical form and curvature of Goose Creek vessels. Several perforated sherds were found also. Incising, color and tempering were quite typical.

The lithic artifacts included the following:

**Projectile Points** - 51
- Perdiz - 25; Gary - 6; Kent - 5; Wells - 1; Yarborough - 3;
- Bonham - 1; Clifton - 5; Unidentified - 5

**Perforators** - 2 (Reworked points)

**Knives** - 2 (double edged)

Deer and bird bone was plentiful. However there was not any evidence of worked or polished bone. The absence of worked bone is somewhat unusual on shell sites in this area.

When the author first visited the site, a flowing spring existed in a hollow about 100 feet inland and a number of sherds were found around the spring. "Old timers" in the area used the spring and stated that it had "always" been there. Undoubtedly it provided fresh water for the Indians.

Dating this site is difficult but we can assume by comparison with other sites in the area exhibiting the same type of dart points, pottery, etc. that the site could have been occupied as early as 600 AD and as late as 1700 AD.

41HR71 is another example of a Harris County site lost to erosion and the dragline. Lately, subsidence is taking its toll in this area. Sites visible along the shoreline 10 years ago are now completely submerged even at low tide.
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Now let's read about a Woodland site in Harris County. --
A Harris County Woodland Site

L. W. Patterson

In a previous article (Patterson 1974), I suggested that HAS members should do more publication of archeological sites, using as an example that very few of the many reported sites in Harris County have been published. Along these lines, this article will report on a small Woodland period site in inland Harris County.

Site 4J217 is located on a high sandy stream bank. A small number of artifacts have been found over an area of approximately 100-by-200 feet. Using Aten’s chronology (1971, fig. 10), this site can be possibly dated to a period of 200 to 600 AD, as there are dart points and ceramics, but no bifacial arrow points. The date range is bracketed by the start of ceramics and the start of bifacial arrow points. Story (1973) refers to this as the Woodland period, although this term does not have the same cultural meaning in Harris County as in other parts of the United States.

Even though large size fresh water shell fish are found in this immediate area, the archeological remains do not indicate that they were a major food factor. A few small shell pieces are present on this site.

Ceramics found consist of 7 body sherds smaller than 15 mm square and 6 body sherds of a larger size. No rim sherds were found. All ceramics are Goose Creek Plain, with sandy paste. A description of this pottery type has been given by Suhm and Jelks (1962:57). Colors range from brown to black, and thicknesses range from 5 to 9 mm, with a 6 mm average.

One Gary dart point made of light tan flint was found, and is shown in Figure 1. Gary points are common in this area (Duke 1971) and in east Texas in general (Suhm and Jelks 1962:197). The lithic flake collection is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smaller than 15 mm square</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 20 mm</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 25 mm</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prismatic blades</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microblade core fragment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This collection includes 2 gravers, 1 thumbnail scraper, and 3 retouched flakes, all shown in Figure 1. There were also 3 thick flint chips, including one with definite heat treating.

Lithic materials used are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>red jasper</td>
<td>\frac{15}{100}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>light tan flint</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brown flint</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dark grey flint</td>
<td>\frac{5}{100}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no major conclusions to be made from this information. This is simply one small step in filling a large gap in the lack of published information on local archeological sites.
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Activities of HAS Members

Brent Smith is currently teaching one section of an introductory anthropology course (Anthropology 2301: Introduction to Physical Anthropology and Archeology) at the Sharpstown High School campus of the Houston Community College. This is the first semester that an anthropology course has been taught by the H.C.C. Current plans for the spring semester are to offer two sections of the first introductory course (7-8:30 P.M. MW at the Sharpstown High School campus and 7-8:30 P.M. TTh at the Waltrip High School campus). A second introductory course (Anthropology 2302: Introduction to Cultural Anthropology) has been proposed for the Sharpstown High School campus (8:30-10 P.M. MW). Potential students can contact either Brent Smith (office: 638-5941, extension 66 or 69; home: 688-1906 or Dr. Sue Cox, Chairperson for the Division of Social Sciences (office: 521-9371), for further information.

Brent and another member of the HAS, Gary Wiggins, have recently been involved with test excavations at the Wiggins Site (41 NR 276), a Neo-American shell midden on the lower San Jacinto River in Highlands, Texas near Baytown. Members of Brent Smith’s Houston Community College anthropology class and several other members of the HAS have also recently participated in the work there. The primary purpose of this research is to horizontally strip a large section of the midden to possibly delineate activity areas and living floors. So far, however, these excavations have not uncovered any discernible archeological features. Material recovered in the midden has included grog-tempered plain and decorated ceramics, at least two distinct arrow point types, and deer, gar, snail, turtle, small mammal and Rangia cuneata remains. HAS members who are interested in participating in either the field work or the laboratory analysis can contact either Gary Wiggins (426-2536) or Brent Smith.

Brent recently has written the following articles for publication:

1974 A Preliminary Identification of Faunal Remains From The Claiborne Site, Mississippi Archaeology (whole volume), May.

1974 A Bibliography of Mississippi Indians, Volume 1, Prehistory, Mississippi Archaeology (in press).

1975 Prehistoric Settlement Patterns of the Young’s Bayou Drainage, Natchitoches Parish, Louisiana, Louisiana Archaeology (submitted for March publication).

1975 Archeological Site Surface Collection; What is of Value? Newsletter of the Jonesville (Louisiana) Archaeological Society (accepted for January publication).
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Site Preservation

The following published articles contributed by Lee Patterson and John Herbert, respectively, present two approaches to the vital site conservation problem - the amateur's role and a summary of new archeological legislation. The destruction of sites in the Houston area and in Texas closely parallels the experience in Oregon.
Of 45 major archaeological occupation sites known to have existed on the Oregon coast between 1900 and 1950, today only one remains intact and only twenty percent of the others survive in part. Of the forty sites known in the Portland area in 1971, ten have been vandalized or entirely destroyed, four have been covered by industrial developments, three have been flooded or badly eroded, twelve others have been ruined by the work of inexpert amateurs, six have been paved over or built upon in a similar fashion, and two are presently scheduled for excavation by amateur groups; this leaves, on balance, only three sites undisturbed. In Arkansas, (the statistics are less grim, but similar) 25 percent of that state's known sites have been destroyed in the past ten years. I am sure that analogous figures would also apply to other parts of the country.

Anyone with the slightest knowledge of history or archaeology will see from such facts that a moment of crisis has been reached, and work to check the destruction of our archaeological heritage must begin now. Unlike plant and animal species threatened by extinction, archaeological sites cannot be restored to a natural balance by means of intelligent conservation measures; they are a nonrenewable resource, and once they are gone, they are gone forever.

What can be done to lessen and prohibit this increasing destruction of archaeological sites? And, further, what can we members of the general public do to ensure their preservation and help see that they are scientifically treated when excavations are undertaken? We have available to us several possible courses of action; these include litigation, education through the schools, public demonstrations and finally legislative action. Litigation is slow and expensive; besides it would not even be possible without effective laws. Education is an excellent and necessary means of making the public aware; but it too proceeds slowly and would require massive legislation to develop an ongoing program. Public demonstrations supporting archaeological preservation would, to my mind, be inappropriate and probably unproductive.

This leaves the legislative process itself as the best tool for accomplishing the task with any speed—and speed, at this point, is absolutely essential. Although there are federal laws to protect our native heritage, they cover only lands under federal control, and they deal with only limited aspects of the problem. Since local governments everywhere tend to be overburdened—and all too often ineffectual—the state governments must do the job. In fact, most states have some laws intended to protect archaeological sites and to regulate archaeological activities, but they are inadequate.

Better laws are needed, but state legislators, on the whole, know nothing, or at best very little, about archaeological matters, and there are far too few professional archaeologists to see that the statutes are properly enforced. In these circumstances, would not the amateur archaeologist be the best person to take up the cause? By "amateur" I mean not the casual pothunter but the informed nonprofessional who has at least as much interest in the preservation of sites and the collection of accurate data as he does in the recovery of objects. There are a number of vital services such a person can perform, and often he brings significant advantages to his tasks. For one thing, he is part of the general populace and as such can often communicate more easily with the public than the professional archaeologist. He can join with other amateurs in a coordinated effort—preferably, to my mind, through an organized society—to campaign for additional laws and effective regulatory agencies, for greater public education and for the funding required to support such undertakings. Indeed, if amateur archaeologists do not become involved in the effort to preserve our national heritage, they, like everyone else, are shortly going to lose this resource.

What sorts of legislation might an amateur group endorse? In the field of public education, it should press for the creation and expansion of museums, archaeological exhibits, publications and the like. Second, it should seek to establish a research program whose purpose is to gather all the information available from those sites that must, for various reasons, be destroyed. Third, all states need definite provisions for preserving and protecting sites and archaeological information, and for the regulatory mechanisms involved. The details of such a program are beyond the scope of this paper, and they will vary from state to state.
What is happening in Oregon may be of general interest. Two years ago, Charles H. McGimsey III published Public Archaeology (New York 1972), a book which several members of the Oregon Archaeological Society read. Many of us had already begun to recognize that the archaeological community within the state was not adequately organized, and McGimsey's ideas inspired us to act. It was the beginning of an effort that has had some useful results.

The Oregon Archaeological Society (OAS) was organized in 1951 with roughly thirty members; since then its total membership has grown to 650. Whereas the society started mainly as a group of interested collectors, it has evolved into a group more intent on preserving the past than on collecting artifacts. In 1950 the OAS began annual excavations, at which only inchoate attempts were made at disciplined stratigraphy. Subsequently, the society enlisted professional supervision, and it has now matured to the point where this year it assisted in the excavations of the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. As is probably the case with most such societies the OAS comprises people from all walks of life and with many different personal kinds of interest in archaeology.

Two years ago a Legislative Committee was formed, and not without opposition from some of the members. This committee consisted entirely of interested citizens, only one of whom, an attorney, had any particular knowledge of the legislative process. One of the committee's first tasks was to establish the aims of the legislative program it intended to sponsor. It drafted a statement of goals, which had five points: (1) to encourage the preservation of Oregon's archaeological sites not threatened by destruction; (2) to salvage and preserve information and material from endangered sites; (3) to increase public awareness and interest in archaeology in Oregon; (4) to cooperate with and assist professional archaeologists by offering individual expertise not otherwise available to them; and (5) to encourage amateur participation in any state program of archaeological research.

Next, the committee determined its priorities. The first was to gain expertise in federal and Oregon laws pertaining to archaeological matters; the second, to draft a sound and feasible law for the state; the third, to organize a lobby that could go into operation any time an archaeological site might be threatened. The committee has achieved the first of these objectives; the second is presently being pursued, and the third has yet to be fulfilled.

Early in our endeavors, we decided that the initial legislative draft should be the work entirely of the OAS, except for the input of Charles H. Hibbs, a professional archaeologist with the National Parks Service at the Fort Vancouver site. We began with a thorough study of McGimsey's book, which became our principal guideline and which is mandatory reading for anyone interested in these matters. We also attended a workshop on environmental legislation being presented by a local law school. We became more familiar with pertinent Oregon law—of which there is very little—and the state's traditional governmental habits and procedures; we then consulted with a number of other states that have adequate laws or good drafts. After eighteen months of hard work, we succeeded in producing the initial draft we had envisioned. In the main, our proposal seeks to fill in the vacuum which exists in Oregon law; it recommends the passage of antiquities legislation such as exists in other states, the creation of the position of State Archaeologist and a regulatory body to oversee the state's archaeology, and finally the initiation of a good educational and research program.

When the initial draft was written, we began to consult members of our own society as well as professional archaeologists, museums, historians, Indian groups and other amateur archaeological groups within the state. Once these groups have gone over the draft, we plan to consult state government agencies and many of the major businesses that might be affected by the passage of such a law. We need as much constructive criticism and feedback as we can get. Our final draft will have to reflect a broad cross section of interests, for only by getting widespread backing and support can we have any reasonable hope of seeing our draft enacted as law.

There remains, in addition, the no doubt formidable proposition of persuading the state legislature that new laws are needed. If we have laid our groundwork well, we should have a chance of success.

How active are the amateur archaeological groups in other states? This I do not know; but it is my understanding that many such groups are significant local forces, and I hope that they, like the Oregon Archaeological Society, will take the lead in promoting needed legislative change. It is a job that needs to be done—and it is a job that can be done. To the amateur archaeologist it presents an especially inviting challenge, for it affords him the chance to make a genuine contribution to the welfare of the nation, to its future—and to himself.

"The past belongs to the future, but only the present can preserve it." The challenge, let it be clear, demands a vigorous response.

Archeological Conservation Bill

The Archeological Conservation Bill was signed into law by President Nixon on May 24, 1974. Dr. C. R. McGimsey III, President of the Society for American Archaeology said "this bill is the most important and far reaching conservation legislation since 1966 and the enactment of the Historic Preservation law."

The bill authorizes salvage of our nation's archeological remains that are in eminent danger of destruction by a wide variety of federal programs. It will not only vastly expand the investigation into our past - of vital interest as the Bicentennial nears - but will allow for recovery and interpretation to the public of our heritage in ways and on a scale never possible before.

Under the 1960 Reservoir Salvage Act, which this act amends, the National Park Service was authorized to salvage archeological sites that would be destroyed in the building of major dams. This new act widens this program and includes all federal agencies.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires all agencies to consider archeological resources as part of the environment and this Conservation Act authorizes federal agencies to expend funds for the study of these nonrenewable resources. Funding can be done either directly by an agency or by contracting the work to an appropriate institution. Alternately, federal agencies may transfer funds, up to 1 per cent of the project authorization, to the Secretary of the Interior for administering the work.

The Secretary may carry out such work in a wide variety of federal grant or federally assisted private or public projects which alter the terrain and result in loss of archeological resources. He is further directed to conduct such salvage work in any other circumstance where he finds archeological resources are being destroyed by a federally funded or licensed project.

Agencies may now plan for research into the nature of the resources being affected by their work, long ahead of construction. Planning for the rescue and interpretation of the information will go hand in hand with planning for the project. Not only will this be done efficiently and to the benefit of all citizens of the country, but it will require revolutionary new approaches to the study of the past.

The Committee on the Public Understanding of Archeology Society for American Archaeology
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Items of Interest

Dr. John Keller of the Texas Highway Department Archeological staff will speak at the HAS monthly meeting in January, 1975, on "Subsistence Potentials at the Davis Site and Their Possible Application to Caddoan Area Studies".

HAS member Jack Klatt has been elected a regional vice president of the Texas Archeological Society. Charles Chandler was re-elected to the Board of Directors.
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Status of Work at 41GV66

Barbara Burger

The investigation of Mitchell Ridge, 41GV66, is progressing well. This fall we have worked at the site nine consecutive weekends. A total of twenty-five Rice students and twenty-eight HAS members have participated in the digging. We have generally had fair weather and favorable digging conditions. Mitchell Energy and Development, owners of the land, have provided us with all the equipment and services that we have needed. In addition, they hosted a barbecue last month which was attended by members of the HAS and the Galveston Historical Foundation. Members of the Foundation have offered to assist in the study of the historical importance of the site.

Last spring fairly extensive testing of the site was done by HAS members under the direction of Lou Fullen. Several test pits placed on the highest part of the ridge at the bayou's edge revealed a shell layer and a trash pit at fifteen to twenty centimeters below the surface. To explore the possibility that the shell layer might have been part of a shell floor we began excavations in this area this fall. We now have twenty-nine squares exposed to the top of the first shell layer. From the distribution of the shells and artifacts it would appear that this was an area where oyster, deer, alligator and fowl were prepared and eaten. These remains may be in association with a house floor to the east of the original excavations. Squares opened in that area revealed an edge of shell which we are currently following. We plan to continue exposing a large horizontal area by levels to determine how this portion of the site was used.

The second major area to be excavated is in the corral at the western edge of the property. Digging was conducted there with the object of locating a cemetery, since we know that skeletal remains were accidentally uncovered when a power pole was placed there some fifteen years ago. In the vicinity of this power pole we now have excavated sixteen pits. Although we did not accomplish our first objective and find any burials, we did determine that the closer to the power pole we dug, the darker the soil became, and the more plentiful the artifacts. Artifacts were relatively scarce here, as would be expected near a cemetery area, but several recovered were particularly interesting. We excavated an unusual bone tool and some punctate decorated pottery that is not common to the Gulf Coast. More work is planned for the area near the power pole. We intend to dig farther south and west to determine if the cemetery area may lie in one of those directions.

This past week we have directed our attention to the south side of the ridge near the campfire center. Probing in this area seemed to indicate that this portion of the southern slope of the old beach ridge is steeper than any other part of the ridge. It would therefore be a particularly good location to take shelter from the "northerns", and we would expect to find evidence of Indian habitation here. By digging a trench twenty-eight meters by one half meter, from the crest of the ridge to the foot, we exposed the stratigraphy of the slope, as well as one of the richest midden areas yet uncovered. The trench also cut through the edge of a pit which extends into the old beach shell. Whether this pit is the result of geological or cultural activity we will attempt to determine this week.

In the future we intend to continue work in the three areas already opened as well as explore other areas of the site which were tested last spring. The different proportions of artifacts appearing in these other
locations would seem to indicate that several activity areas exist in the site and should be investigated.

A cataloguing center has been set up at the Rice archeology lab and the processing of the artifacts is keeping pace with the excavation. Anyone interested in participating in the cataloguing of artifacts, or the investigation of the site, is welcomed.
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HAS Dues Increase

Houston Archeological Society dues have been increased as follows:

Junior Membership, (12-14 years of age) ......................... $ 2.00
Student Membership .................................................. 2.00
Active Membership .................................................... 9.00
Family Membership with address of active member .......... 1.00
Institutional Membership (receives newsletter only) ...... 2.00
Sustaining Membership .............................................. 15.00
Contributing Membership .......................................... 30.00
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A Clay Pipe from Peggy Lake (Harris Co., Texas)

A. R. Duke

The clay pipe shown below was found on a desolate stretch of peninsula between Peggy and Crystal Lakes - west of Baytown. The pipe is made of molded light brownish-gray clay and is of the type that must be fitted with a hollow stem. The bowl is oval shaped - 1 inch across at its wider dimension and 1-1/2" deep. It has a raised rim around the circumference of the bowl about 1/8" below the top. The stem opening is 5/16" in diameter.

The pipe resembles a trade pipe and also the pipes used by some Europeans in the early 1800's. It has never been smoked. Original mold marks are sharp.