

FOREWORD

EVERY ARCHÆOLOGICAL PROJECT is a team effort. In a profession that cannot agree on the spelling of its own name, differences in detail or overall concept should be expected whenever two senior-level researchers collaborate. Results of such collaborations will be either successful or disastrous, rarely ordinary.

You are holding such a report. The principal investigator and theoretician is a prehistorian trained in anthropology, but the fieldwork and administration was in charge of an industrial archæologist with primarily historical training. While sifting more than 4,500 cells through a quarter-inch screen, the latter published a diatribe condemning the evils of mandating the use of screens.

Theory and methodology reflected this diversity, which is why this report contains more than the usual discussion of methodology and approach. If these heavy doses of theory and discussion are a burden, we apologize, but we were constrained to consider, if not explore, every avenue that was suggested.

We feel that apparent theoretical and procedural digressions contributed to the quality of the outcome. Chapter six reflects many conversations over three years in which the authors sought to question, compromise, debate, and explore the possibilities of extracting useful data from a site that seemed to offer so little. The resulting chapter is more of a supplementary inquiry into the basis for a research design than a chronicle of laboratory procedures, which normally would be expected at this point in the report.

Narrative chapters of this report have been written to reflect our thought processes as we defined features and activity areas through the analysis process. Each discovery is reported at the stage where it occurred, which is why features 1-4 are discussed in the field narrative, but features 5-8 are first mentioned in the spatial analysis chapter. The chapter on features attempts to summarize all these discoveries.

There is no chapter named “artifacts.” Instead, a chapter on tool morphology and chronology focuses on describing the tools in their contexts through time, rather than reporting them as museum objects.

Statistical appendices were another casualty of our re-thought methodology. Relevant distribution tables and artifact counts have been incorporated into the text, where they are discussed. The original reasons for segregating such tables in appendices were largely technological, and no longer apply.

The master catalogue of this site is an excavation register, where each artifact is reported in its archæological context. This register, which ran around 500 pages, was too long to distribute. It may be consulted at the State Historic Preservation Office.