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ABSTRACT

Jamestown, Virginia, the first permanent English settlement in the New World is considered by many to be the most significant historic site in the United States. Protected by a stewardship including the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities (APVA) since 1897, Jamestown became part of Colonial National Historical Park (CNHP) and the responsibility of the National Park Service (NPS) by Presidential proclamation in 1930. Archaeological investigations have taken place at Jamestown since 1897 under the APVA and later from the 1930s through 1950s on-and-off under the supervision of NPS. A succession of engineers, historians, architects, and archaeologists have contributed a number of significant publications on the seventeenth-century culture of Jamestown.

Historical archaeology can be said to have developed at Jamestown, Virginia. It is unusual that so many of the original researchers at a historic site still exist to augment the story of archaeology there but such is the case with Jamestown. Contained in this written thesis as well as in a videotaped documentary produced in conjunction with it is the oral history of archaeology at Jamestown. This audiovisual presentation is aimed at disseminating the archaeological information to a broader television audience.

Three primary influences are responsible for the approach taken to interpreting the historic site of Jamestown. First, the ethics of historic preservation and its corollary federal legislation which are accountable for protecting cultural resources. Second, the historiographical biases of the past research design which determined the archaeological objectives. Third, the evolution of anthropological theory which today, combined with the historical method, offers a new approach to interpreting the archaeological data at Jamestown. An ethnohistoric hypothesis interpreting Jamestown's seventeenth-century culture in light of Anglo-Dutch acculturation due to maritime trade influences may be taken into consideration for future excavations.
HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY AT JAMESTOWN, VIRGINIA
INTRODUCTION

I can still recall the thrill that came the day in 1936 when I picked up my first artifact from the cellar floor of the house I was excavating at Jamestown. There in my hand was not just a non-descript sherd from a pot that some unknown Indian had used but here was Captain John Smith in the flesh. Well, maybe not John Smith, but at least a person that one could possibly identify and talk about. It was this identification with personalities that impressed me most about this new kind of archaeology.

In 1977, at the urging of Stanley South, J. C. Harrington wrote a recollection of his personal experience and involvement in historical archaeology for a prospective publication. The insights this article contains go beyond those of "Jamestown Archaeology in Retrospect" (Harrington, 1984), a formal overview contributed to a new book (Orr and Crozier, 1984). The former gave a glimpse of a personality one could identify with while the latter is somewhat like an artifact description. The people that brought life to the site of Jamestown have a story to tell first hand. Their story is the topic of this thesis.

During the spring of 1982 the curator of Colonial
National Historical Park (CNHP) in Virginia suggested that I consider the development of historical archaeology at Jamestown for the topic of my master's thesis. A study of CNHP in 1982 prepared by staff members of the National Park Service's Harpers' Ferry Regional Center had recommended that:

An oral history of the Jamestown . . . excavations should be taped to record the memories of as many archaeologists . . . as can be located . . . If Mr. Harrington and Mr. Cotter discuss their methods and goals during their pioneer digs, the Park will have a much better picture of the information which the collections contain.

(Pardue, Gay, and Feller)

Several of these archaeologists are living in Virginia while others are within the mid-Atlantic region of the eastern United States.

Collecting the oral history of archaeology afforded an opportunity in which I could combine my interests in both archaeology and ethnography. However, replies to my requests for interviews (see Appendix I-1) alerted me to the potential rewards as well as drawbacks of my proposed study.

I received your kind letter . . . requesting participation in an oral history program. I must refuse because of age. I find it unreasonable for a request of that kind to ask for detailed knowledge of what happened 50 years ago at Jamestown. Mr. Zaharov, Mr. Parris, and I excavated at Jamestown several years before Mr. Cotter and Mr. Harrington entered that project. I hope you can get data from those able men.

(Forman, 1983)

As an amateur videographer I had the training that
made it possible to record the oral history interviews with state-of-the-art technology. The potential for introducing the archaeologists of Jamestown to a larger audience was not overlooked by another person who accepted my request for an interview.

After many years of advocating the conservation of living memory from those who have participated in various events of record, it is amusing, and quite gratifying to find that time has created an objective in me for just such an undertaking. . . .

My second reaction is to hope that by the oral history undertaking you are thinking in terms of videotape. I am sure you have this new medium equipment available, and I urge you to use it, rather than sound tape alone. . . . I need hardly mention that the National Park Service would be very fortunate to have this interpretive resource available in the future.

(Cotter, October 18, 1983)

The reason videotaping oral history is preferable to sound tape alone is because the image of the narrator and the setting of the interview can be communicated more effectively (Allen and Montell, 1982). Videotaping the oral history interviews also allowed the use of voice-overs with photograph stills of the narrators' visual points of reference (Jolly, 1982).

Some of the archaeological pioneers from Jamestown subsequently founded the Society for Historical Archaeology (SHA). Since the annual meetings of the SHA were held in Williamsburg, Virginia in 1984 I organized a symposium with the past researchers willing to discuss Jamestown archaeology retrospectively (see Appendix 1–3). In this way I was able to obtain interviews with Jamestown archaeologists
now living outside the immediate vicinity. The purpose of
the symposium was to generate recommendations for future
research at Jamestown from the audience as well as from
symposium participants. Through William and Mary
Television Services a permanent videotaped document of
this symposium was recorded for the archives of the SHA
(January 5, 1984).

The symposium on Jamestown archaeology emphasized
both convergence and divergence in the archaeological
ideas which contributed to the research design over time.
It was also apparent that the research design developed,
particularly during the 1950s, was accepted by the National
Park Service because of a flexible interpretation of CNHP
administrative policy. Following the symposium one of the
participants reflected:

I think it would have been marvelous if we could
have recorded the lunch periods between myself,
Jack Cotter, Ed Jelks, and Paul Hudson as we were
trying to introduce a more anthropologically
oriented archaeology. Occasionally some of the
regular Park members would come in and we'd try
to explain to them why we were doing it differently.
. . . During the several months that we were at work,
we'd visit each other's sites and we'd discuss how
this ought to be interpreted in terms of people.
The final outcome was that when we left the area
each of us went off to teach, to work other sites,
and we carried these ideas with us. Then within
5 or 7 years the Society for Historical Archaeology
was developed and most of these ideas went into it.
(Shiner, January 7, 1984)

Forman, Harrington, and Cotter have published books
and articles on the results of the excavations at Jamestown
These publications include data from the first digging done under the auspices of the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities at the end of the nineteenth century through the last excavation sponsored by the National Park Service in the 1950s (see Bibliography). Although Harrington's most recent article (1984) and Cotter's synthesis (1958) describe and interpret the archaeological findings neither projected the scope of future research in light of social history and culture process.

In 1975 Kenneth E. Lewis, Jr. incorporated these concerns in his doctoral dissertation on the "Jamestown Frontier." When I interviewed him for my study he spoke about his motivations and feasibility for his reexamination of the site's evidence.

I was looking for an area that had been investigated fairly thoroughly in order to test a model archaeologically. And I needed an area that was investigated previous to that time. I picked Jamestown because it seemed to be the best area available. It was excavated probably more completely than any other region and the reports were readily available.

(January 7, 1984)

In my research on Jamestown I used ethnohistory to supplement the twentieth-century records outlining the evolution of historical archaeology and I also used ethnohistory as a complement to the historiography of seventeenth-century Jamestown's evolving interpretation. According to Charles Hudson, "The aim of ethnohistory is to reconstruct, using all available materials, what
'really happened' in terms that agree with our sense of credibility and our sense of relevance" (1966:54). In From Memory to History (1981) Allen and Montell outline the ways to use oral sources for ethnohistory. As with Lewis' (1975) study written sources are consulted first. Written sources are compared to oral sources to test the veracity of the latter which becomes either a supplement or a complement to the former (Allen and Montell, 1981). Corroboration of both oral sources and written accounts can be seen in the associated material culture such as artifacts and visual records (Allen and Montell, 1981).

In accordance with the suggestions of Allen and Montell (1981) my ethnohistoric project had several sequential phases. First I examined both the published and unpublished reports on Jamestown archaeology in the archives of CNHP. From these records I was able to identify the underlying biases of historic preservation in the administrative policy and in the historiographical themes influencing the archaeological research design over time. The results of this phase of research are explained in chapters 1 and 2 of this thesis.

During the second phase of my research I surveyed the photographic collection documenting the Jamestown excavations in the archives of CNHP. This exercise not only expanded my understanding of the archaeological interpretation and implementation of policy directives but
also suggested ways in which Jamestown archaeology could be reinterpreted in terms of cultural continuity and change. This phase of my research was initially incorporated in an exhibit I prepared for CNHP and subsequently in the videotaped documentary I completed on historical archaeology at Jamestown. I used the information from the first and second phases of my research to compose the oral history questionnaire (see Appendix I-2) which elicited information contained in the conclusions of this thesis.

Gradually I began to develop a new model of Jamestown's seventeenth-century culture by extending the ethnohistorical method to the primary historical documents. In doing so I was able to test the inductive hypotheses I had formulated when reexamining the archaeological interpretations and the visual documentation of the excavations. From a pilot study in family reconstitution I conducted using Jester and Hiden's *Adventures of Purse and Person* (1956) I deduced the beginnings of a regional network based on maritime trade. Recent studies of Jamestown and the Chesapeake by social historians strengthened my hypotheses with their documentary analyses of settlement pattern, emigration, and cultural ecology. The influence of social history on anthropology relevant to Jamestown represents the current approach in interpretation which is explained in chapter 3 of my thesis.

The final phase in my research was to take the
evolution in historical archaeology at Jamestown towards future recommendations for a research design. Through oral history interviews with the people most well versed in the interpretation of the previous excavations I was able to get suggestions for testing my hypothesis on maritime trade, along with the ideas presented in chapter 2. Allen and Montell (1981) indicate three types of settings for oral history interviews. When all three types are used the qualitative veracity of the data can be quantified by a "common thread" running through "divergent accounts." This method not only reveals submerged truths and circumstantial data in rememberances but exposes "folklore themes" or floating narrative elements.

Since the interpretation of Jamestown was the result of an evolution in historic archaeology, oral traditions about its culture have been perpetuated. Two of these themes pertinent to my hypotheses on maritime trade are:

1) "Jamestown was never much of a port," and;

2) "Trade was carried-on directly with the James River plantations rather than at Jamestown."

The oral history of Jamestown archaeology enabled me to separate these historiographical biases of political and economic schools of thought from the constructive criticism of my theory. I used informal, formal, and informal/formal interview settings (Allen and Montell, 1981) thereby insuring a high degree of reliability in charting the
"folklore themes" inherent in the archaeological and historical interpretations of Jamestown's seventeenth-century culture.

The traditional interpretation of Jamestown's cultural history has been popularized in print by Noël Hume (1983; 1963). However, the Odyssey (1980) series demonstrated that television is a medium which conveys the significance of archaeology far more successfully to the public at large. The videotaped documentary of historical archaeology at Jamestown will benefit the needs of future research because:

Video can capture the qualities of some narrators and can document the setting and subject of some interviews that sound tape and photographs can not convey as effectively. The videotaped interview can go beyond the information relayed, offering a documentary treatment of the subject and his or her memories that can be used to arouse public interest in oral history and to stimulate the public's appreciation of the past. (Jolly, 1982:62)

Videotaped interviews with archaeologists appear to be an innovation in historical archaeology. Three projects have pursued similar areas of interest in anthropology. Each of them has contributed towards the format of the questionnaire I compiled for my own oral history research (see Appendix I-2). This questionnaire was used in the formal symposium interview setting and the informal/formal personal interview setting. The three studies after which my research was modelled also emphasized the evolution of
method and theory in some aspect of anthropology.

Zamora and Stegal (1980) analyzed responses from 22 anthropologists they interviewed to determine why and how a person becomes an anthropologist. Their research examined the educational background of the anthropologist and its relation to his interpretation of culture. At the same time they discovered that an anthropologist tends to be limited to a degree in this interpretation by the predominant trends in method and theory over time. They concluded that the practical aspect of an anthropologist's application of these methods and theories in the field affects the type and quality of data that is gathered.

Foster (1983) undertook an oral history project at Colonial Williamsburg, Virginia in order to aid cultural resource management planning. She found that Colonial Williamsburg has experienced the effects of ongoing archaeological excavations beginning in the 1920s and continuing into the present. Foster's research highlights the changing research design in historical archaeology at Colonial Williamsburg. Foster's study revealed that an exchange of archaeological personnel between Colonial Williamsburg and CNHP occurred during the Great Depression in the 1930s; undoubtedly ideas about method and theory in archaeology were exchanged too.

Willey's *Archaeological Researches in Retrospect*
(1975) is closest in scope to the goals of my thesis. He sought personal reevaluations of their past field work and interpretations of it from pioneers in the discipline of archaeology. Willey noted that their careers span the change in theoretical themes from culture history to culture process. His work provided an insider's view of how this change affected their present opinions of past methodological techniques contrasted with present approaches and interpretations. Willey also included a "junior member" whose opinions on current method and theory in archaeology provide a counterpoint to those of the senior members. Willey concluded that the pioneers in American archaeology were influenced by the traditions of their education and training in American universities.

My thesis contains unique information from interviews with the archaeologists who worked at Jamestown. I have used direct quotes from the transcripts of the oral history interviews to contrast the retrospective present opinions to their past interpretations which are drawn from publications. The intent in providing an abundance of quotes is not only to maintain objectivity (Allen and Montell, 1981) but to retain the flavor of the videotaped documentary which incorporates this material from chapter 2 and the conclusions of my thesis. Needless to say, a picture is worth a thousand words.
I sought a representative cross section of Jamestown researchers to interview. James M. Knight, a former CNHP draftsman and past supervisor of archaeological excavations at Colonial Williamsburg was the senior contributor. He supplied information on the methods of Jamestown archaeologists now deceased. J. Paul Hudson was the curator at CNHP for 25 years and provided extensive insights to past personnel and procedures involved with the artifact collections from Jamestown. He continues to interest local Williamsburg enthusiasts through teaching a class in continuing education on Virginia archaeological sites. Hudson also supplied background material on the important role of the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities at Jamestown.

Properly hailed as "the Father of Historical Archaeology" J.C. "Pinky" Harrington was recently the recipient of the first Lifetime Achievement Award from the Society for Historical Archaeology. He is credited with bringing science and anthropology to the method and theory of archaeology at Jamestown. He continues to do historical research with his wife on Jamestown culture. Virginia Sutton Harrington brought her education in history at Swarthmore and in anthropology at the University of Chicago to an innovative interpretative program at CNHP in the 1930s entitled "This Week at the Excavations." She served as the first Treasurer of Eastern National Parks and
Monuments Association. My interviews with this husband-wife team were thought provoking and served to illuminate the importance of their working relationship in building the foundation of historical archaeology at Jamestown.

Interviews with John L. Cotter set my mind and hand racing to capture the nuances of perception that 30 years of musing on the significance of Jamestown archaeology has given to him. With J.C. Harrington, Cotter founded the SHA in 1967 and was recipient of the third Lifetime Achievement Award in 1984. His publication on Jamestown (1958) can be compared to Harrington's (1984) in charting the past and the future of archaeology at Jamestown. Cotter's is the primary narrative voice in my videotaped documentary on historical archaeology at Jamestown.

Recognizing the contribution to historical archaeology from underwater investigations I sought the opinions of Joel L. Shiner, supervisor of the 1956 underwater search for the first fort at Jamestown. Shiner provided a comprehensive statement on the evolution of the discipline of archaeology in general illustrated with examples from his own experience. He now teaches at Southern Methodist University in Dallas, Texas. Shiner's future recommendations for archaeology at Jamestown compared closely with those of the "junior member" in my study. Kenneth E. Lewis, Jr., presently an associate at the Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology at the
University of South Carolina provided the "new archaeology" viewpoint on Jamestown (1975). His invaluable criticism sharpened the logic of my maritime model of Jamestown as a port by emphasizing its role in the regional system of trade and redistribution of goods from a market place.

The most important benefits from my thesis are projected to be an increase in research projects of all kinds pertaining to Jamestown as a result of generating new interest in the topic through the videotaped documentary. As Noël Hume (January 6, 1984) suggested at the meeting of the SHA in Williamsburg, "... archaeologists must be prepared to rewrite what historians have already carved in stone. In short, we should be prepared to think the unthinkable." Later, following Noël Hume's presentation, Cotter stated at Jamestown, "History is a lie agreed upon. So this is what besets the Park Service and we have a few of these lies agreed upon here. Well, anyway the archaeologist comes and intimates the truth and they tell him to mind his own business" (January 8, 1984).

The significance of historical archaeology must be championed by a constituency of enlightened citizens who in time can best be reached through the wide-angle documentary interpretation of a television camera rather than with a telescoped synopsis of subjective history bound in a master's thesis. How the concerned citizens of the past were reached through historic preservation is shown in Chapter
1. Legislation has mandated the interpretation of the cultural heritage of this country by National Park Service administration of sites such as Jamestown.
In considering the question of how and by whom the Colonial National Monument was conceived several things are worth remembering: (1) A project of this kind is the product of much cooperative effort; its process is culminative and the ultimate results are often greatly different from those forecasted in the earlier plans; (2) The progress in the development of such a project goes on informally much of the time; official files tell only part of the story; ideas, which bear the label of one man, may have emanated from another. These difficulties are mentioned because they are well illustrated in the problem at hand.

(Park Historians' Report, 1952)

The purpose of this chapter is to assess the development of cultural resource management at Jamestown. Cultural resource management at Jamestown was influenced in the past by three primary forces: (1) Sociopolitical settings in which the legislature mandating its policies was established; (2) Ethics on the federal, state, and local levels which affected its administration; and, (3) Evolving interdisciplinary approaches to conservation, preservation, and interpretation of a colonial historic site.

Jamestown as an historic site must be related to
the larger entity called Colonial National Historical Park of which it forms a part. This region known as the "Historic Triangle" (Hosmer, 1981:536) in Tidewater Virginia also included Williamsburg and Yorktown. Colonial National Monument (CNM) was created by Presidential Proclamation on December 30, 1930, confirmed by an Act of Congress on July 3 of the same year (see Appendix II-3). Colonial National Historical Park (formerly CNN) is part of the larger National Park Service (NPS). NPS is a division of the United States Department of the Interior.

The United States Department of Interior directs the NPS's policy of development and protection for the federal system of Parks and Monuments. In a March 11, 1925 letter to the first NPS Director, Steven F. Mather, Secretary of Interior Hubert Work outlined the responsibilities of NPS to the public:

The duty imposed upon the National Park Service is the organic act creating it to faithfully preserve the parks and monuments for posterity in essentially the natural state and this is paramount to every other activity . . . they are set apart for the use, education, health and pleasure of all the people . . .

(Wirth, 1981:40)

This ethos is echoed in subsequent federal legislation which set the tone for the acquisition of Jamestown Island in Virginia. The conscientious conservation of Jamestown by the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities since the late 19th century was forthwith shared.
Legislative Background

An Act to provide for the creation of the Colonial National Monument in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes, Public Law 510, was passed on July 3, 1930. This law set lands apart for a federal Park in Virginia which included areas in Yorktown and on Jamestown Island as well as a corridor between them. It stipulated that these lands were not to be acquired through condemnation and further that they would not include those areas already belonging to the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities or the city of Williamsburg. Lands could be donated within the city of Williamsburg for which the Federal government would reimburse the city at a specific rate. The United States Secretary of the Interior was instructed to view the lands before their purchase and he was responsible for their administration although the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth of Virginia within the Monument was not to be compromised.

Public Law 448 was enacted on March 29, 1956 "To authorize land exchanges for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park in the State of Virginia;" and "to authorize the transfer of certain lands of Colonial National Historical Park, in the State of Virginia, to the Commonwealth of Virginia; and for other purposes" (see Appendix II-8). This law provided for a transfer of up to fifteen acres
of Park land to the Commonwealth of Virginia without federal compensation. The Commonwealth of Virginia utilized this land transfer at Jamestown for construction of a living history exhibit recreating the setting of the first fort of 1607 and its compound. This reconstruction was based on data prepared by the NPS.

Legislation pertaining to cooperating agencies within the boundaries of CNHP was covered by Public Law 633 passed on August 7, 1946. Although the Park Service was authorized to produce publications it was prohibited by law from selling these publications. Public Law 633 (see Appendix II-7) allowed cooperating agencies within the federal Park or Monument for the purpose of vending interpretative materials. At Jamestown in CNHP, Eastern National Parks and Monuments Association (ENP&MA) is a cooperating agency which operates the reconstructed seventeenth-century Glasshouse. This was the first living history interpretative exhibit underwritten by ENP&MA (Kahler, 1977:10).

Besides laws providing for land acquisition, transfer, and use within CNHP federal legislation set aside funds for the administration and management of federal Parks and Monuments under the jurisdiction of the NPS. The Executive Reorganization Act, Public Law 212 (see Appendix II-4) placed all federally held parks and monuments under NPS administration. Before this law was enacted Colonial National Monument (later CNHP) and George Washington's
birthplace were the only historic sites over which NPS had control. Much to the dismay of NPS administrators who wanted a standardized approach to protection and use throughout the federal Park system, military parks were administered by the United States Department of War previous to the enactment of Public Law 212. The new approach was also seen as fiscally conservative.

Public Law 91-332 (see Appendix II-10) enacted July 10, 1970 elaborated additional duties of the Executive Director and personnel of NPS. Enacted to authorize "... the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the establishment of Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes" it stipulated that federal Park reports be submitted annually to Congress by the legislated National Parks Centennial Commission. This commission convened "... to prepare and execute, in cooperation with Federal, State, local, nongovernmental agencies and organizations, and appropriate international organizations, ... a prospectus for conservation and management of parks through a worldwide movement." This legislation recognized the significance of federal Parks and Monuments in setting an example for preservationists at large, Jamestown being a case in point.

While the NPS has grown since the establishment of Yellowstone National Park in 1872 from management of an increasing number of federal Parks to recommendations for
worldwide park management, the bedrock of preservationist
ideals expressed in 1924 by Work is still retained in the
most current applicable administrative legalese. Approved
on August 18, 1970, Public Law 91-383 (See Appendix II-11)
reiterates that:

Congress declares that the national park system
. . . has grown to include superlative natural,
historic, and recreation areas in every major
region of the United States, its territories and
island possessions; that these areas, though
distinct in character, are united through their
inter-related purposes and resources into one
national park system as cumulative expressions of
a single national heritage; that, individually
and collectively, these areas derive increased
national dignity and recognition of their superb
environmental quality through their inclusion
jointly with each other in one national park
system preserved and managed for the benefit and
inspiration of all the people of the United
States . . .

(United States Code, 1970:825)

Acquisition of lands as well as management of the cultural
resources situated upon them are covered in federal
legislation which is applicable to Jamestown.

The subsurface investigations undertaken to find
evidence of seventeenth-century Jamestown were planned in
concurrence with three important legislative directives.
The first of these, the Antiquities Act of 1906, Public
Law 209 was enacted on June 8, 1906 (see Appendix II-1).
This was the first time the federal government formally
recognized its responsibilities to protect cultural remains.
Permits were to be issued, subject to Smithsonian approval,
prior to excavation on federal lands. Lands with historical
significance could now be set apart for preservation. This act allowed the federal government to set up rules and regulations for excavation and reporting upon it and to penalize those who undertook unauthorized excavations.

An Act To establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes (see Appendix IX-2) explained how NPS could control any undertaking upon federal lands under its jurisdiction. It also recognized that NPS would follow any recommendations in other legislation relative to conservation and preservation interests. Therefore, in 1935, when An Act To provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes, Public Law 292 (see Appendix II-6) was enacted. NPS was prepared to instigate its instructions at CNHP and specifically at Jamestown. The Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) grew out of the Historic Sites Survey (HSS) and with the broad directives of the Antiquities Act of 1906 provided an outline for archaeological investigation and interpretation at Jamestown from the 1930s through the 1950s.

Manpower to drive the intentions of preservation and interpretation at Jamestown in CNHP was provided by the well-known "make work" program created during the Great Depression "... for the relief of unemployment through the performance of useful public work and for other purposes" (United States Code, Public Law 5, March 31, 1933:22).
A later version entitled "Mission 66," a provision of Public Law 573 was approved on June 13, 1957 to upgrade the National Park System following the neglect in maintenance attenuate to a lack of employees during wartimes, and an increase in visitation (Wirth, 1981). Both pieces of legislation keynoted conservation of all kinds including the cultural resources of primary importance to Parks with historic sites upon them, Jamestown being of particular significance. It seems as if some "grand plan" for resource management was formulated in Washington D.C. and filtered down to the various Parks and Monuments. However, upon closer examination this preservation philosophy was actually given the individual stamp of Park superintendents, many of whom were historians first and administrators second.

Comprehensive Long-range Planning

The NPS was created in 1916 but no funds were budgeted for its organization until the following year (Albright, 1971:5). The first NPS Director, Steven Mather was an avid conservationist. His interest in the environment probably contributed to concerns for a "historic setting" in those federal Parks and Monuments, such as Jamestown, where early American settlement has taken place. Along with his assistant, Horace Albright, Mather embraced the historic preservation ethics lobbied in Congress by United States Representative John Lacey of Iowa who sponsored
the Antiquities Act of 1906 (Albright 1971:5). Lacey's ideas may have given impetus to their determination that a NPS "Master Plan" for management and administration of all federal Parks and Monuments was more practical than the Department of War's original jurisdiction over military Parks.

Master planning in the National Parks and Monuments became administrative policy during the 1920s under the second NPS director, Horace Albright. Before a federal Park is approved through legislation a comprehensive master plan is prepared. In this plan the proposed Park's uses are outlined depending on such considerations as the cultural resources for which it is to be preserved, for example. Development designs are also included in the master plan so that the natural environment is not compromised while park visitors are accommodated (Everhart 1972:69). Master plans based on preservation of historic structures and sites for interpretative purposes emphasize adaptive use (King et al. 1977:21).

In the 1920s and continuing to the present day the Colonial Williamsburg Restoration, funded initially by John D. Rockefeller, Jr. epitomizes the criterion of adaptive use at a historic site. Rockefeller's interest in this project was solicited by the head of the Conservation and Development Commission of Virginia, William E. Carson. His eloquence on behalf of the "Historic Triangle" formed
by Williamsburg, Yorktown and Jamestown appealed to the patriotic preservation instincts at NPS as well.

As William E. Carson so aptly said in his memorable letter of March 26, 1929: "These three areas, which are closely adjacent, if combined in a historic national park, or state and national park, would present to the Nation and to the world many of the most salient facts associated with the birth of the Nation and the birth of the Nation's liberties . . . Thus, too, the development of educational machinery for interpreting the successive stages of American Colonial progress to the visitor as comes within the monument area gives added impetus to the essential idea of unity."

(Park Historians' Report, 1952)

Early in 1929 Albright met with Carson. Later that year in November Albright toured the "Historic Triangle" with Carson visiting sites such as the eighteenth-century mansions along the James River outside of Williamsburg. Following this tour Albright was feted at Colonial Williamsburg where he met numerous individuals influential in the Virginia Preservation Movement. Among the guests were ladies of the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, a future President of Colonial Williamsburg, Kenneth Chorley, and Rockefeller's friend Louis C. Cramton, Representative from Michigan to the United States Congress (Albright 1971:13). Albright and Cramton took the local preservationists' concerns with them when they returned to Washington D.C.

Albright initiated master planning for a colonial national monument in Tidewater Virginia. He consulted with Cramton who suggested the idea of a parkway. Albright
recalled that several months passed during the preparation of the master plan and the drafting of the legislation for it. As the CNM Act took shape it set a precedent for federal Park legislation which was to follow by including consultations with State and local people interested in the proposed park.

With the powerful aid of Congressman Louis G. Cramton, we had moved into the field of historic preservation without reference to the over-all planning of the White House, but with Secretary [of the Interior] Wilbur's full concurrence... Naturally, we in the National Park Service were carefully—and excitedly—watching progress in Williamsburg. The years 1927-29 were largely devoted to research planning the restoration, and acquisition of the properties in the old city. (Albright, 1971:13)

"After the authorization of Colonial National Monument on July 3, 1930, the NPS was in business in historic preservation on a scale of some magnitude" according to Albright (1971:16). Albright was a business executive and has been said to have put the NPS on a management basis (Cotter, January 26, 1984: Personal communication). Perhaps recognizing this aspect in Albright's personality Kenneth Chorley at Colonial Williamsburg had alluded to him that there could be greater cooperation with CNHP if the Park expanded its research and development. This may have created an awareness at NPS of some competition in the images of the two organizations (Hosmer, 1981:273). There is a basic difference in the "organic concept" of CNHP and Colonial Williamsburg; the former places emphasis on
"preservation" because of its legislative mandate while the latter stresses "restoration (Cotter, January 26, 1984: personal communication).

NPS does not restore or reconstruct buildings for several reasons. This attitude is a by product of master planning. "The policy followed is that it is better to preserve than repair, better to repair than restore, better to restore than reconstruct" (Everhart 1972:162). Both restoration and reconstruction are contingent upon adequate data on the original structure, availability of materials and skills to create an accurate replica, and the significance of the original structure.

From an interview with Elbert Cox, a former staff historian at CNHP, Hosmer wrote "... he commented that the idea of restoring Jamestown ... seemed to follow the precedent established by the Rockefeller organization at Williamsburg (1981:501). Hosmer also notes that the archaeologist-in-charge for excavations at Jamestown, employed at the same time as Cox in the early 1930s, recommended two other alternatives for foundations: (1) stabilization, and; (2) removal from the site. (Day, October 11, 1935). Only one structure at Jamestown has met the criteria of NPS for reconstruction and the "1607 Glasshouse" was initially managed privately. Today ENP&MA operates the Glasshouse, reinvesting any profits into competitive research grants at the recommendation of NPS.
Research and interpretative efforts of ENP&MA are a part of administrative master planning which is one of the major divisions of NPS operations. The method taken varies from park to park but is steered by two basic principles: (1) No effort will be made without thoroughly planning all possible contingencies, and; (2) an interdisciplinary approach is mandatory in this planning process (Everhart, 1972:68). Albright seems to have taken both precepts under consideration when the possibility of manpower to perform conservation and preservation within the NPS was suggested by the Unemployment Relief Legislation of 1933 (Public Law 5):

... There is no way of course of telling how much money will be allotted to the National Park Service. It will all depend upon the showing we make as to the need of the people in the neighborhood of the parks and the plans that we have for doing the work.

(excerpt of Memorandum from Director Albright to Senior Assistant Demaray in Wirth, 1981:73)

During the gestation days of CNHP development the second stipulation of master planning for an interdisciplinary approach touted Mather's original conservation interests. A division of landscape architects planned the environmental impact to Park areas from the development schemes of the engineers undertaken by the Works Project Administration during the 1930s. This arrangement was first implemented at CNHP and specifically at Jamestown (Everhart, 1972:85).
I realized that the time had come to employ a professional historian with experience in research, interpretation, and report writing. I found him in Dr. Verne E. Chatelain . . . Also we were fortunate in having in our bureau Charles E. Peterson, a young landscape architect who, because of his interest in archaeology and history, developed into a very able architectural historian . . . on assignment to CNM . . . He designed the Colonial Parkway . . .

(Albright, 1981:16)

This tradition of historians' perogatives in master planning at CNHP has continued through the most recent archaeological work at Jamestown under NPS Director Conrad Wirth's brainchild "Mission 66" when Charles E. Hatch, Jr. was Park Historian. Chatelain was the first Chief Historian at NPS, and with B. Floyd Flickinger, one of the first two historians assigned to CNM. Elbert Cox joined the staff of CNM as an assistant historian under Chatelain and Flickinger in 1932. In 1933 Cox left and Malcolm Gardner became the new historical assistant (Hosmer, 1981).

In 1934 Flickinger and Chatelain designed an interdisciplinary archaeological research design for Jamestown. Like all their disciplinary descendents they focused on historical events (Cotter, January 26, 1984). In 1936 Flickinger became CNHP Acting Superintendent and Edward M. Riley assumed his former position. In 1938 Cox replaced Flickinger, and shortly after the onset of World War II, the historians monopoly on administrative policy at CNHP ceased when former Jamestown archaeologist-in-charge, J.C. Harrington became
Administrative History

The foregoing sections outlined the legislative framework for an educational and interpretive program of Jamestown's history designed according to NPS policies. The 1906 Antiquities Act recognized the importance of archaeology to site interpretation but gave documentary historians, rather than archaeologists, the role of guiding the research programs under the auspices of the Smithsonian Institution (King et al., 1977). The Historic Sites Act of 1935 expanded their degree of control in determining the research objectives that were investigated, analyzed, protected and developed by engineers, architects and archaeologists (King et al., 1977). CNHP popularized the ideal of depicting American cultural progress within a circuit of some 40 miles referred to as "the Historic Triangle" (Riley, July 30, 1947). With the arrival of anthropologically trained personnel at CNHP more emphasis was put on explaining human behavior within the framework of economic and political development (Shiner, January 7, 1984).

The concept of combining the interpretation of Jamestown, Williamsburg and Yorktown reinforced the patriotism underlying traditional history. This interpretation was the dominant technique used in the 1930s and 1940s for cultural analysis. In the words of Edward M.
Riley, a former CNHP historian:

It has been said "The future of a nation may be read in the character of her memorials." CNHP is a national memorial set apart by the expressed will of the people of the United States by Act of their representatives in the Congress. At Jamestown was planted the seed of the American nation; the fruit of the victory achieved at Yorktown was the independence of this nation.  
(July 30, 1937:11-12)

Architectural historians and landscape architects gave substance to this interpretation through their research into the colonial American expression of English gentility envisioned for the historic Williamsburg restoration project. When the Williamsburg restoration project fell on hard times during the Great Depression of the 1930s, former Colonial Williamsburg architects, such as H. Chandlee Forman and John T. Zaharov, became CNHP employees working to supply information on Jamestown's foundations for HABS (Cotter, January 26, 1984).

Federal legislators had conscientiously provided for professional interdisciplinary efforts in the research activities undertaken at CNHP mandated with the creation of NPS in 1916 and CNM in 1930. Charles E. Petersen who was hired at CNM shortly after its inception was cognizant of the problems in management of historic and archaeological resources. Petersen knew that buildings would deteriorate if they weren't protected. He felt that the history, and its events, was best represented by interpretation in an appropriate setting and landscaping was preferable to
reconstruction or restoration (Cotter, January 26, 1984). According to Hosmer (1982:501) the only reconstruction at Jamestown that Petersen recommended to NPS Director Horace Albright was "... the first triangular stockade. It seemed natural to stress only the most important historical development at Jamestown—the survival of the original colony."

As one of the first two historians assigned to CNHP, Dr. Verne D. Chatelain formulated a program of research for Jamestown similar to that used at Colonial Williamsburg (Wirth, 1980). Chatelain's objectives included: (1) a search of the primary documents to provide locations of the residences of specific individuals; (2) search the documentary sources and identify colonial industries; and, (3) find and use historical data to determine the location of the original fort at Jamestown. The long-term goal of this research was interpretation of the historic site of Jamestown to Park visitors. Verification of the historical documents was to be found through archaeological investigations. The short-term goal to this end was putting the unemployed in the Historic Triangle area to work under legislated relief programs of the 1930s-1940s.

The Civilian Conservation Corps needed blue collar workers and white collar supervisors to undertake legislated directives concerned with emergency conservation and its corollary elements of preservation and development.
(Wirth, 1980). This administration influenced the practical applications of social science research techniques in NPS, and archaeology seemed a good activity for unskilled excavators in public works projects (King et al., 1977). When Chatelain's fellow CNHP assistant historian B. Walter Flickinger became acting superintendent in 1936 an aggressive program of "ground-truthing" historical facts was initiated.

Pragmatic concerns of the federal Unemployment Relief Administration placed historical researchers in the position of designating sites to be excavated. Therefore, historical research and archaeological testing took place almost simultaneously at Jamestown from 1934-1937. The HSS and HABS required that sites on federal lands be located, evaluated, and preserved. Archaeological testing of documentary data on property lines and analysis of structural foundations uncovered in this way were believed to fulfill the requirements of the legislation protecting CNHP cultural resources (CNHP Superintendents' Monthly Reports, 1934-1954).

Protection of endangered cultural resources was given priority by such engineering schemes as the sea wall and shoreline rip rap constructed at Jamestown (CNHP Superintendents' Monthly Reports, 1934-1954). Artifacts were important only in illustrating historical models for museum exhibits (CNHP Superintendent's Monthly Reports,
1934-1954). This contrasts with the present day emphasis on artifact patterning as indicative of human behavior adapting to the New World environment (Lewis, 1975). Public Works Administration reporting and curatorial guidelines were inadequate for the volume of archaeological data being unearthed (King et al., 1977). Analyses were descriptive and functional and did not interpret Jamestown in a larger cultural context.

Before 1937 the multidisciplinary approach to interpreting Jamestown's cultural resources was unable to successfully foster cooperation among the researchers' disparate objectives (Harrington, 1984).

The historians, beginning with Chatelain and on to Malcolm Gardner and Hatch were searching for historical "facts"--who did what, and when and where, and what was the result of achievement and of a body politic. Events were the key. About artifacts they couldn't care less. Structures were a nuisance to interpret, and were best covered up quickly.

(Cotter, January 29, 1984)

HABS architects' reports hint at the unique cultural identity developing from the New World experience but they don't treat architecture as an intergrated aspect of colonial culture (Forman, 1938). In light of the fact that architectural historians are very house specific in their treatment of artifactual material, it is understandable that the archaeologists employed on the Jamestown project were offended by the prohibition of their investigations no
closer to foundations than three feet (Harrington, 1984).

In 1937 after the review and recommendations of conservationists and preservationists a new approach to interpretation of colonial Jamestown and its cultural resources was instigated by a new staff under the direction of "archaeologist-in-charge" J.C. Harrington. Harrington prepared a long-range plan for the Jamestown Archaeological Project which outlined a research design within the perogatives of the federal legislation applicable to CNHP (see Appendix II-12). Although he drew upon the work of the past staff in recommending documentary research, Harrington defined "historic research" in much broader terms than those of the traditional historians. Harrington's intent was to undertake a cultural study and this required historical research in Europe as well as in North America (Harrington, February 15, 1937). Adding to the suggestions of the present staff, which included a hold-over museum technician named Worth Bailey, Harrington instituted a program for curation and analysis of the artifacts previously excavated, and for preservation of foundations uncovered. From his own personal experience he outlined a plan for intensive survey of the site of Jamestown, and with his future wife, Virginia (then a CNHP Ranger Historian) formulated programs for interpretation and education about archaeological activities to Jamestown visitors.

Harrington stressed that excavation should follow
historical research and intensive survey since these activities would suggest the areas to be investigated systematically. Harrington also pointed out the destructive aspects of excavation. He noted that artifacts out of their original context cannot afford a holistic interpretation of a cultural continuum. Furthermore, he suggested seasonal planning for excavation and, ongoing reevaluation of the research design for the efficient utilization of the available work force. Under Harrington's guidance historical archaeology was given impetus at Jamestown (Harrington, February 15, 1984).

After Harrington's work force funded by Unemployment Relief programs dried up at the start of World War II, he served as the acting superintendent of CNHP. Research in the archives of CNHP has established that Harrington's master plan for archaeology at Jamestown, which was first given voice in his February 15, 1937 "Long-Range Plan," subsequently became the unlegislated example for future ethics of historic preservation there. In the 1950s Harrington was Regional Chief of Interpretation for Region One of NPS which included CNHP. During this time he continued to provide suggestions for cultural resource management at Jamestown when NPS undertook another large development project at CNHP. This project, Mission 66, was conceived by NPS to ready the Federal Parks for increased visitation after their neglect during the World War II and
Korean War periods.

Conrad Wirth was the director of NPS during Mission 66 and said:

The big expansion in the national park system and in state parks initiated in the CCC period was further encouraged by Mission 66; this program stimulated federal legislation for the preservation of natural and historic sites and promoted the development at all levels of government of historic, recreational, and natural areas. (Wirth, 1981:166)

Wirth decided that NPS should undertake large long-term projects of construction in the National Park system. Mission 66 offered improvements in federal parks in every state if the states' Congressional representatives would agree to fund them through legislation. The project was to last 10 years and would be complete by the 50 year anniversary of the creation of NPS. Wirth believes that, "... Mission 66 . . . triggered a general reawakening of government to its responsibilities in the field of conservation . . . " (Wirth, 1981:284; see Appendix II-13).

Wirth's design for historic preservation in NPS differed from that of Albright 30 years earlier. Salvage archaeology was funded at Jamestown under Mission 66 while funds supplied by the federal Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown 350th Celebration Commission funded research archaeology (Cotter, May 9, 1956). Historical archaeology had passed from Harrington's long-range plan to the hands of John L. Cotter, "supervising archaeologist" in
connection with Mission 66. Man-hours were again budgeted for archaeology with Cotter and his interdisciplinary crew coordinating their efforts with Charles E. Hatch, Jr., then Chief Park Historian at CNHP.

Cotter provides an exemplary example of creativity in salvage archaeology research design. He presented preliminary, interim, and completion reports which impeccably describe the methodology used. His management of the business end of archaeology set a precedent for contract endeavors (see Appendix II-14). His published report on the excavations at Jamestown includes summaries of all the previous excavation reports collated to those from the 1954-57 excavations (Cotter, 1958). Underwater archaeological excavations were performed under his guidance. Cotter proposed cultural theories of change, cross-cultural comparisons, and suggested directions in which future research might proceed (Cotter, 1958). As this chapter has demonstrated future research at Jamestown will proceed not only under the directives of archaeologists but will be guided by a NPS general management plan which takes its lead from federal legislation protecting cultural resources.
CHAPTER 2

EVOLUTION IN RESEARCH DESIGN

Jamestown, site of the first permanent English settlement in the New World, furnishes an interesting example of the use of archaeological techniques to put factual meat on abstract or theoretical bones. For over half a century off-and-on a succession of historians, architects, engineers and archaeologists have sought physical evidence in the earth to identify the location of vaguely-defined landholdings and buildings, the first fort built in 1607 by the first contingent of settlers, and clues to everyday living habits as shown by utensils and implements. The immediate purpose was often salvage in advance of construction, but the final objective was interpretation of historic data.

(John L. Cotter, 1957)

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a brief overview of the evolution in research design for archaeology at Jamestown. A chronological perspective in the format of traditional history provides researchers' names and the dates and locations in which they undertook significant archaeological excavations between 1897-1957 according to published accounts on these investigations. Comments from oral history interviews with some of the past researchers of Jamestown are recounted if these comments shed new
light or add new information about the archaeological excavations on which reports, either published or unpublished, are extant. Comments from oral history interviews with past researchers at Jamestown are also included if they are in the form of future recommendations for archaeological investigations at Jamestown. It should be emphasized that an in-depth treatment of the evolution of historical archaeology at Jamestown was produced as an hour long videotape documentary in conjunction with the body of this thesis and was intended to give a succinct portrait of the legacy of historical archaeology at Jamestown in the words and visualizations of the people who worked there.

This chapter is not to be considered complete by itself but as a synopsis for the videotape documentary. The idea of presenting an audiovisual depiction of this aspect of Jamestown's interpretation is to allow other archaeologists as well as the layman an insider's view of the archaeological investigations. In this way new interpretations of the past archaeology at Jamestown will be engendered without encountering the subjective bias inherent in the written works on this topic. By actually seeing what was "in the ground" and hearing the interpretation of this evidence given by the narrator, the viewer is in a better position to identify "folk themes" of traditional history which may actually be at odds with the message conveyed by the material culture.
In conducting the research for the visual part of the videotape documentary it became readily apparent that the photographs of the excavations and specifically the building foundations may tell a different story than that of the archaeologist or architectural historian. In addition to the epistemological biases in the various social science disciplines involved over the years in the interpretation of the archaeology of Jamestown, the administrative objectives of Colonial National Historical Park (CNHP), the National Park Service (NPS), and the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities (APVA) must be borne in mind. The legislative mandates of CNHP and NPS were described in detail in relation to the archaeological work at Jamestown in Chapter 1 of this thesis. The motives of the APVA are not included in this thesis except where they are referred to by various narrators in the videotaped documentary.

In 1963 Ivor Noël Hume offered "An Archaeologist's View of Colonial Life and History" in his book *Here Lies Virginia*. This book contains an entire chapter interpreting the material culture of Jamestown excavated previously by a variety of people, some of whom were archaeologists associated with the CNHP programs. In this book Noël Hume speculates on the nature of Jamestown as a port based on documentary evidence not clearly cited. He does not back up this statement with any evidence from the artifactual material which he describes in detail to "put flesh upon
the bones of history" (Cotter, 1957). Like so many historians, architects, engineers, and historical archaeologists before him, Noël Hume's primary interest is in historical facts and events—specifically the location of the first fort of 1607.

Evidently the topic of the first fort is one which Noël Hume has pondered for over 20 years since this year he presented a paper at the 1984 meeting for the Society for Historical Archaeology on the location and configuration of said fort (January 7, 1984; see Appendix III-1). Noël Hume's future recommendations for archaeological investigations are a renewal of the quest for the first fort, a question that has cropped up over and over to the present day since who knows when—? While Noël Hume's documentary evidence for the configuration of the first fort is to be commended, he failed to note that the area on Jamestown Island that he suggested to test for the presence of the first fort has already been tested, with negative results, and reported upon by CNHP archaeologists (May, November 19, 1934; October 30, 1936; Harrington, May 15, 1941; Shiner, June 23, 1955). This oversight throws a different light on the comments made by Noël Hume in regard to Jamestown archaeology in his 1982 publication.

Martin's Hundred (Noël Hume, 1982) contains a chapter entitled "The Jamestown Perspective" (1982:22-33). His intent in this chapter at first seems to be to draw an
analogy between the two seventeenth-century settlements of Jamestown and Wolstenholme Towne at Martin's Hundred. It becomes apparent quite soon that the intent of this chapter is to comment on the evolution in interpretation of Jamestown archaeology by NPS archaeologists.

I had previously supposed that the intensive archaeological work at Jamestown that began in the 1930s and brought together a vast corpus of knowledge about the town and the lives of its people. I should have known better. Historical archaeology in the thirties was even less refined than it was in the early sixties. At Jamestown, the artifacts were there, but more often than not their message had been lost.

Because what was not found at Jamestown was to have a direct bearing on the importance of what we were yet to find at Carter's Grove, I must digress long enough to summarize the development of Jamestown and the history of its archaeology.

(Noël Hume, 1982:27)

To someone who is not familiar with the archives of CNHP this statement would appear to be valid.

Chapter 1 has shown that Noël Hume has misunderstood the basic legislative mandate for the earliest archaeological work at Jamestown when he states, "The architects and archaeologists needed each other, but in those days before the value of interdisciplinary research had been recognized, neither side would admit it" (Noël Hume, 1982:30). The research done for this chapter and documented in the videotape and oral history interviews has also proven that three other errors in interpreting the archaeological history at Jamestown were made by Noël Hume in this publication (1982:31).
Although Harrington is today recognized as the father of professional historical archaeology in America, the sad truth is that most of the digging at Jamestown was done in the two-and-a-half years before he took charge.

... Jamestown's architect excavators had been interested primarily in buildings of the kind that John Zaharov had learned to uncover in Williamsburg: solid courses of laid brick readily identifiable. By and large such substantial remains at Jamestown dated from the town's later decades. Most buildings raised in its first years had been slight structures erected on posts seated in the ground, sometimes with wooden sills between but often without... Such feeble foundations left nothing behind for a laborer-excavator to bang his shovel on, only dirty marks in the subsoil that could be scraped away unnoticed...

Knowing that the earliest settlement was surrounded by a wooden palisade and ditch, serious efforts were made to detect the latter's contours, for once these were found and recorded, the site of the original James Towne would be known—and that, above all else, was what the Park Service and Virginia wanted from the project. [Underlining by Polk]

Several object lessons are to be learned from Noël Hume's "digression" on the development of archaeology at Jamestown. First, that if emphasis is placed primarily on artifacts for an understanding of Jamestown's culture then the context from which the artifacts were recovered may be considered intact to a limited degree in the photo records of the excavations, even if the complete recorded provenience of the artifact in question is missing. Next, secondary sources for information on the excavations, such as formal publications, may not contain all the information necessary for a complete reconstruction of the former archaeological milieu which can be found in field books, drawings,
photographs, and unpublished official reports. Third, oral history can yield information which may not exist in any other source and therefore can afford a control against which to measure information contained in other sources or, it may supplement information contained in other sources. This is the best argument for audiovisual interpretation of archaeological excavations rather than subjective scrutiny by those who didn’t actually work at Jamestown.

The Legacy of Historical Archaeology

I began from the first to study the covered ruins of the church and gradually outlined them slightly. It is well known that this foundation is that of the church built in 1639 and rebuilt after Bacon's Rebellion. In the year 1897 I dug with my own hands quite deep inside of the south wall of the church and discovered the little inner wall composed of large bricks and cobblestones. This must have been the foundations of the ... Church built in 1617 . . .

(Mary Jeffreys Galt, quoted by Hudson, January 5, 1984)

The story of historical archaeology begins with the excavations of the 1639 and 1617 Jamestown Church foundations in 1897 by Mary Jeffreys Galt of the APVA (Hudson, January 5, 1984). The APVA at that time owned 22\(\frac{1}{2}\) acres at the western end of Jamestown Island and decided to excavate church foundations known to exist adjacent to and east of the extant 1647 red brick church tower (Hudson, January 5, 1984). Later on in 1901 and 1902 John Tyler, Jr. continued excavation of the 1617 church foundations and was
assisted by Mary Jeffreys Galt, Mary W. Garrett and William Leal, a brick mason (Yonge, 1930:65-74). Tyler, Galt and Garrett supplied studious reports on these excavations to the APVA and it is these reports which have furnished subsequent researchers such as Samuel H. Yonge (1930) with their information on the church foundations. These reports may be the earliest accounts of historical archaeology undertaken in the United States on behalf of the first preservation society formed in Virginia in 1898 (Hudson, January 5, 1984).

The 1671 church foundation was built upon "cobblestones" and lay about five or six inches inside the later brick foundation of the 1639 church. The former was believed to be a frame structure while the latter was said to have been constructed of all brick (Hudson, January 5, 1984). Historical accounts state that the 1617 frame church was the meeting place for the first representative legislative assembly held in the New World (Hudson, January 5, 1984). The site of the first State House of this legislative body may have been discovered by Colonel Samuel H. Yonge. Yonge was working for the United States Army Corps of Engineers constructing a seawall, at the request of the APVA, along the shoreline of their property on the western end of Jamestown Island. Construction activities encountered a brick foundation eroding into the James River (Hudson, January 5, 1984).

Yonge believed that he had uncovered the first
State House established in 1642 (Yonge, 1930:78). He continued excavations on this complex of attached structures from 1901-1903 and reported upon his excavations to the APVA in reports which, coupled with his extensive research in historical documents both primary and secondary, resulted in a publication in 1930 entitled The Site of Old "James Towne" 1607-1698. This series of buildings measuring 240 feet by 24 feet was oriented on its long axis from east to west and exhibits four different building phases (Cotter, 1958). Consequently this feature was later identified as the so-called Ludwell Third and Fourth State House, rather than the First State House, due to its architectural configuration (Cotter, 1958).

In 1903 the last private owner of Jamestown Island, the Barney family, discovered the foundations of a second "row house" foundation of three attached rooms adjacent to the southern shoreline in the so-called "New Towne" area (Cotter, January 5, 1984). Colonel Edward Barney and his wife excavated the eastern-most of these three rooms and recovered a large amount of "domestic debris" (Noël Hume, 1963:62). In 1932 a Richmond antiquarian, George C. Gregory continued investigations of this building which measured 120 feet by 20 feet with its long axis from east to west located on property which had been acquired by the APVA by that time. In 1935 Gregory reported on his findings in a publication entitled James City and James City
Island 1607-1700: The First Fort Site and City Limits From
Time to Time in which he proclaimed the identity of this
structure to be that of the First State House. What Gregory
failed to note was that in 1667 the primary documents had
stated that the distance from the First State House to the
river was 67 feet whereas in 1935, according to Yonge, the
distance from the river to the structure deemed the "First
State House" was only 64 feet (Cotter, January 8, 1984).

Shortly after 1936 NPS took over responsibility for
the "New Towne" area of Jamestown Island, but in 1935 had
continued excavations at Gregory's "First State House"
recording the structure, designated number 17, to the re­
quirements of the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS)
(Cotter, January 8, 1984). Former Colonial Williamsburg
architects H. Chandlee Forman and John T. Zaharov, working
for the Works Project Administration under the Unemployment
Relief legislation, gathered architectural and archaeological
data respectively on Structure 17. Forman agreed with
Gregory's contentions that this was the location of the
First State House and that therefore the First Fort location
should be somewhere in the vicinity of it in consideration
of historical documentation (Forman, 1938). Zaharov, a
"White Russian" emigrant who came to the United States to
study engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of
Technology (Knight, July 6, 1983), endeavored to date this
structure by the characteristics of its brick and mortar.
He was said to have let this foundation's cellar collapse in part at this time (Knight, June 6, 1983).

Neither Forman nor Zaharov were interested in the relationship of the artifactual materials associated with Structure 17 except for architectural artifacts (Forman, 1938). However, Forman is said to have excavated in levels assigning proveniences to artifacts from within the structures he analyzed at Jamestown (Cotter, January 5, 1984). Apparently Zaharov's method was to "dig big pot holes" here and there (Knight, June 6, 1983). After Zaharov's departure as the archaeologist on the Jamestown project in 1936 W.J. Winter, Alonzo Pond, and H. Summerfield Day respectively supervised archaeological excavations at Jamestown until 1937 when only Day and Museum Technician Bailey remained. The remaining staff assisted J.C. Harrington who assumed the duties of "archaeologist-in-charge" of the Jamestown Archaeological Project. While Pond had worked as an Egyptologist in Old World archaeology, Day had come to Jamestown with an anthropological background (Knight, June 6, 1983). Day was sent by Harrington to interview Conrad B. Bentzen and Carl F. Miller, two other anthropologically oriented researchers who along with Harrington brought their experience from excavating at prehistoric sites (Cotter, January 5, 1984).

Forman had received his architectural education at Princeton and at the University of Pennsylvania and, with
his assistant Fred Parris, had worked for HABS (Cotter, January 5, 1984). Harrington had received his training in architecture at the University of Michigan (Harrington, 1977). Harrington also had an M.A. in anthropology from the University of Chicago where he had worked "... at the famous Kincaid site, a training ground for many anthropologists and archaeologists ..." (Cotter, January 5, 1984).

Frank Setzler who was at the Smithsonian National Museum in the 1930s has observed that historical archaeology was given direction by the work at Jamestown under Harrington (Hosmer, 1982). Harrington has recalled that in conversations between himself, his wife, and Setzler the scope of historical archaeology as a discipline began to take shape in the 1930s (Harrington, June 7, 1983). With Harrington, CNHP archaeology fulfilled the rigors of the federal historic preservation legislation, the scientific expectations of anthropological research, the interpretation of Jamestown's structures and artifacts for the general public's edification, and set the pace for the new archaeology of historic sites.

Harrington wrote (1977: 7):

Some archaeologists, of course, had broader objectives, although we were years away from today's questioning of whether the goal of historical archaeology is, or should be, history or anthropology. We simply assumed we were engaged in a form of historical research, using artifacts and other buried evidence to supplement the documents.

A total of 85 reports on the excavations at Jamestown
under Harrington's direction were compiled from 1937–1941 (Cotter, January 5, 1984). On August 1, 1938, Virginia H. Sutton (soon to become Mrs. Harrington) presented a "Special Report on the Educational Work at Jamestown" to the administration of CNHP (CNHP Superintendents Monthly Report). This educational work included weekly exhibits interpreting the archaeological excavations and discoveries to visitors (CNHP Photo Archives, 1938–1941). New research such as J.C. Harrington's pipestem chronology was also explained through this visual medium. Although Harrington shared Forman's interest in the Anglo-American ethnicity apparent in Jamestown's architecture (Forman, 1938), he resisted romanticizing his interpretation of the foundations of seventeenth-century furnaces and buildings which he represented accurately, according to historical documentation, in an exhibit model on the '1607 Glasshouse' (Harrington, January, 1950).

Robert L. Schuyler (1978:1) says Harrington's approach to archaeology at Jamestown represents the historicalist position epitomized by the title of his oft-quoted article "Archaeology as an Auxilliary Science to American History" (Harrington, 1955). He sees John L. Cotter, who followed Harrington as the next "supervisory archaeologist" at Jamestown a little over 10 years later, as a "transition" theorist of culture history (Schuyler, 1978:1). Cotter's approach to the interpretation of Jamestown's
culture from the archaeological evidence appears to be a precursor to the "New Archaeology" emphasizing culture process, cultural ecology, acculturation, and systems theory (Binford, 1964; South, 1977). Cotter (1958) likewise heralds the study of the folk-urban continuum, between the cultures of the Old and New World of the seventeenth-century represented at Jamestown, before these ideas were articulated by later social historians and structuralist anthropologists (Deetz, 1977; Carson et al., 1981). Cotter and his team of Edward B. Jelks, Joel L. Shiner, Louis R. Caywood, and J. Paul Hudson gave a new perspective to the old interpretations of industries, the first fort, and the different State House buildings at Jamestown. They also articulated aspects of the prehistoric aboriginal occupation, the eighteenth-century Ambler Plantation occupation, and the military aspects of the Confederate occupation in the nineteenth century without slighting the seventeenth-century aspect of Jamestown's history.

During the course of many years of fruitful archaeological investigations at Jamestown beginning in 1897 and ending in 1957 no trace of the first fort has been uncovered. There is no reliable way to calculate how much time and money has been spent on this search which the current APVA and CNHP steering committees are again advocating today for future archaeological endeavors. Harrington has said that "Every excavation at Jamestown has been a rush job"
and Cotter has said that "What lies beneath the ground at Jamestown is like an archaeological safety deposit box" (Cotter, January 8, 1984). During the meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology (SHA) in Williamsburg, Virginia held January 5 through 7, 1984 a symposium entitled "Retrospect on Jamestown Archaeology" was presented as a forum for the opinions of past researchers at this site on their work there. Future recommendations for research at Jamestown were also introduced and these recommendations are included in the videotaped record of the symposium and in part in the next section of this chapter.

Learning From the Past to Prepare For the Future

In 1980 J.C. Harrington wrote a letter on the past and possible future of Jamestown archaeology (Harrington, June 10, 1983). Within its context he quoted from his personal knowledge of the current approved plan of CNHP for management of the Jamestown area. This plan stated at that time that no areas would be developed beyond those presently maintained for visitor use. It also noted that beyond the townsite, the intention was for the "Island to be allowed to return to a 1607 climax forest, providing a setting for the historic scene" (Harrington, June 10, 1983).

However, cultural resource management in the past has been mitigated by development, and planning for the future must take into consideration any eventual change in
the research design for historical archaeology at Jamestown. In reviewing the past archaeological investigations at Jamestown it becomes readily apparent that many potentials for research still exist. The misconception that Jamestown archaeology in the past was all inclusive can be dispelled. Historical archaeology developed in response to a need for a more intensive and extensive approach to cultural process in Colonial America. To better understand the archaeological data from Jamestown, the personal perspective of its past researchers will be elucidated.

J.C. Harrington

Numerous personal communications and two extensive oral history interviews in addition to comments made at a symposium on Jamestown archaeology at the 1984 meeting of the SHA provided the gleanings of recollections and future recommendations from J.C. Harrington.

Retrospect

I believe the major contribution of the archaeological work at Jamestown during the 1930s was in establishing historical archaeology as a legitimate discipline in its own right, and in demonstrating its potential as an adjunct to the fields of anthropology, historiography, and architectural history. A secondary contribution was in developing techniques, procedures, and objectives in this new discipline. And finally, through its interpretive programs and publications, it prompted the growing public interest in, and the understanding of, the preservation of historic sites and buildings.

(June 10, 1983)
Harrington stated that he had no "conscious" research design for archaeology at Jamestown while he was working there. However, Virginia Sutton Harrington disagreed with him on this point (May 31, 1983). Neither of them recalled the memorandum that J.C. Harrington wrote on February 15, 1937 about the long-range plan for the Jamestown Archaeology Project (see Appendix II-12). Both Harringtons remembered that "we called all the post holes 'fence lines' unless there was a chimney at each end"; this was due to the fact that there were no similar sites at the time with which to make "cross-comparison" for definition of post-in-ground earth-fast structures (Harringtons, May 31, 1983).

Future Recommendations

We shouldn't go into unexplored, undisturbed areas unless we are in the position to see it through to some kind of a conclusion. There would have to be certain geographical limitations [to the investigation]. . . It's just not good to do a spot of things here and a spot of things there.

(June 9, 1983)

Harrington has recommended that the APVA conduct remote sensing surveys on its grounds to locate any subsurface indications of the first fort which may remain below the Confederate Fort (June 9, 1983). He questions the idea of "limited testing" at Jamestown, "I think you just mess things up for somebody later" (June 9, 1983). Harrington has a "pet" archaeological project planned for within the "next 25 years or so, if I live long enough"
(January 5, 1984). Harrington has estimated that at a cost of "only $50,000" he would locate one of the "little outlying farms," which the seventeenth-century land records indicate "might lie on one of the small areas of high ground" outside of the townsite, and excavate it. His advice was to "Forget the Townsite. . . . The best colonial site in America has been mutilated" (January 5, 1984).

J. Paul Hudson

Extensive correspondence, telephone conversations, an oral history interview, and comments made at the symposium on Jamestown archaeology at the 1984 SHA meeting in Williamsburg supplied the personal account of Hudson's rememberances of and future recommendations for archaeology at Jamestown.

Retrospect

When I first went to Jamestown artifacts were stored in wooden storage cabinets; as time went on these were replaced with up-to-date metal storage cabinets or metal shelving units. The more important iron objects were placed in plastic envelopes. Gloves were made available for handling the more important iron objects. . . . NPS as a whole gave little attention to archaeology at Jamestown. Few officials from Washington ever visited the storage collection rooms, and the Superintendent and Park Historian were almost total strangers. . . . (January 7, 1984)

Hudson recalled that when he first came to work at Jamestown in 1952 his responsibilities were to construct a
temporary exhibit "from any artifacts in the collection I wanted to use" (October 28, 1983). He said at that time a true catalog system for the artifacts did not exist because no museum technicians worked on the materials after Worth Bailey left (Hudson, October 28, 1983). Hudson said that he began accessioning artifacts from the excavations in the 1950s by proceeding from the numbering sequence where Bailey had left off in the 1940s (October 28, 1983). He stated that during the 1950s excavations a Chemistry professor from the College of William and Mary, Dr. Alfred Armstrong, and one of his assistants, Ed Katz, had conserved artifacts at Jamestown (Hudson, October 28, 1983).

Future Recommendations

No one mentions the Jamestown Churchyard. This is my own personal project. I'm making a list of 200 church sites that should be excavated in Virginia. . . . every Virginia church had to have a wall around the church yard. . . . But [at Jamestown] no one knows where this wall is located. You assume the church was in the center of God's acre or two acres. . . . [church] parishes were situated around markets. (October 28, 1983)

Hudson seconded Harrington's recommendations that a search for the first fort be undertaken beneath the Confederate Fort on the APVA property, and also recommended that a seventeenth-century farm site (with outbuildings adjacent to it) be excavated on Jamestown Island (October 28, 1983). Hudson stressed the richness of the Jamestown
artifactual collection and pointed out the need for artifact classes such as thimbles, lead bale seals, casting counters, and the glass recovered from the Glass house excavations to be studied and reported upon in publications; "What's the purpose of archaeology if you're not going to tell the world about what you've found?" (October 28, 1983)

**John L. Cotter**

Ongoing written correspondence, constructive criticism of all aspects of this thesis, encouragement to develop new hypotheses about the seventeenth-century culture of Jamestown, a willingness to talk just about anything related to anthropology, a personal videotaped tour of what he considered "the significant sites" at Jamestown, and comments made in the symposium on Jamestown archaeology conducted at the 1984 SIIA meetings accorded Cotter's memories and future recommendations a high degree of veracity for this ethnohistoric undertaking. His comments at the symposium goaded thoughtful responses from Harrington who preferred to attend this session as a "passive" participant. Cotter provided a 1957 recording of an interview on the eve of the 350th Anniversary Celebration of the founding of Jamestown. Any archaeologist who has prepared for meeting the public and interpreting his site can appreciate Cotter's replies after working to recover as much data as possible in three short years.
Local radio interviewer: What do you feel like? Do you feel like an actress about to go out for her first night? Or What? What's the feeling you have?

Cotter: Tired.

Interviewer: Tired?!

Cotter: Yes. Of course, everybody here has been working like mad but it's a good show and I think that it's going to be a lot of fun for visitors, particularly if you bring your imagination with you.

Retrospect

History is a lie agreed upon. So this is what besets the Park Service and we have a few of these lies agreed upon here. Well anyway, the archaeologist comes and intimates the truth and they tell him to mind his own business. But that's life and that's fate and that's fun too. I enjoy it thoroughly!

(January 8, 1984)

Cotter revealed several interesting points about the archaeological history of the APVA grounds. He stated that the markings on the ground over the Ludwell Third and Fourth State House represented the first archaeological interpretation for visitors to Jamestown (January 8, 1984). Cotter also noted that H. Chandlee Forman had planned on overseeing the restoration of this structure but was discouraged in this undertaking (January 8, 1984). Finally, he mentioned that because of their interest in genealogy and Jamestown, the APVA ladies had in the past investigated some of the graves in the churchyard, later placing markers upon them (January 8, 1984).
Future Recommendations

Here at Jamestown [the English] thought they were going to duplicate [the experience of the Spaniards who had found gold in the New World]. Well, they didn't. But just the same, the thought was there and this was heavy stuff and this was greatly inspirational for England at that time. And that's why Jamestown is to be studied in its whole context. Historical context. And nobody's really done it yet. But, by God, don't do it before I do!

(January 8, 1984)

Cotter has recommended that more research be done in the archives of France, Holland, London, and Madrid but "NOT BY HISTORIANS [sic!]. By archaeologists who know what is significant in building hints, everyday life, and material culture" (January 9, 1984). He suggests a research design which would review the entire culture "evidenced at Jamestown and its related plantation and other population centers in Tidewater Virginia and Maryland" (January 9, 1984). Cotter says that new questions should be asked of the artifactual data rather than further quantification of types by localities. He believes that the "Whole Island is the object of the quest" (January 5, 1984). While touring Jamestown Island Cotter emphasized that he does not believe that the location of the first fort is on land where Noel Hume has speculated that it is.

Joel L. Shiner

Several lengthy telephone conversations, a prolonged
oral history interview, and Shiner's comments at the symposium on Jamestown archaeology held at the 1984 SHA meeting provided his retrospective and prospective views.

Retrospect

We developed techniques and we developed rigor. We developed ways of recording material. We improved our photography. We certainly did a lot with the preservation of perishables. There was a bunch of stuff we didn't do. A very common practice in modern archaeology we didn't do was floatation or micro-seeds. And we didn't do pollen because nobody else was doing pollen in archaeology then. We didn't do food analysis. So I'd say the digging techniques, recording techniques, mostly derived from prehistoric techniques. And modified to accommodate Colonial situations. Then we went on to teach that. Now, what we were faced with for the first time in our lives—we already had on paper most of the questions we would normally ask of the site. Who lived there? When did they live here? What was their lifestyle? We had to start with all that given. And then through archaeology elaborate considerably on the lifestyle of the people and then project the lifestyle of living on coastal Virginia.

(January 7, 1984)

Shiner described this "rigor" as "Cotter's discipline" of "the smaller than method approach" where everything about the excavation and the artifacts contained within it was meticulously recorded on a daily basis (January 7, 1984). He also worked under Harrington during the same time period and so was able to contrast the two techniques, "Pinky . . . was very, very critical of drawings that were not quite precise, brick by brick. . . . And was somewhat less critical of what we saved and how we recorded
the information about pure garbage" (January 7, 1984).

During the symposium on Jamestown archaeology at the 1984 SHA meeting, Shiner reviewed the offshore and land searches for the first fort and concurred with Cotter's opinion that no trace of seventeenth-century materials was found in the location which Noël Hume believes harbors the site (January 7, 1984). An interesting point not known before about the graves discovered during the 1950s excavations at the Ludwell Third and Fourth State Houses was the fact that Shiner admitted that he had examined some of the skeletal remains to confirm that they were not native Americans (January 5, 1984).

**Future Recommendations**

Today at Jamestown we should establish a number of questions that we just can't answer before we start digging again. At least digging on any kind of a large destructive scale. The old, old idea "Leave half the site for the future" used to be "So that we will have better techniques." Well, that's no longer the main thing. "So we'll have better questions." We don't need answers for which we have no questions. Now we need more questions. (January 7, 1984)

Shiner has recommended that the aerial photographs taken by the Army Corps in the early 1900s be reexamined, in light of considerations for remote sensing on Jamestown Island, to discover traces of archaeological sites. He pointed out the limitations in the state of the art of remote sensing and recommended that this type of survey would reveal only the grossest discontinuities in the soil.
without giving an accurate diagnosis of their cultural significance (January 7, 1984). Shiner discouraged future underwater archaeological investigations at Jamestown because of the adverse diving conditions of stiff currents and tidal flow along with low visibility (January 7, 1984). Finally, he said "I know what haunts me [now] is, how different is early Jamestown from a comparable village in England of the same size? I know its got to be very, very different in every single aspect" (January 7, 1984).

Dr. Kenneth E. Lewis, the "junior member" of the Jamestown researchers at the symposium on Jamestown archaeology at the 1984 SHA meeting has addressed those very questions in his doctoral dissertation of 1975. He used the archaeological data gathered from the 1930s-1950s to come to conclusions about seventeenth-century Jamestown culture which he had hypothesized from combining the theories of "new archaeology" with the method of social history. His was essentially an ethnohistoric approach. Chapter 3 follows Lewis' lead as well as that of other researchers of culture process in seventeenth-century colonial society. Using the ethnohistoric approach to introduce a model of maritime trade at Jamestown new questions are asked of the old data from the Jamestown excavations.
The history of early America is preeminently the history of the multiple and shifting frontiers between different cultures. Colonial life was defined primarily by the contact between competing and sometimes cooperating ethnic groups—French, Dutch, English, Spanish, German, Swedish, African, and Indian. Wherever diverse cultures came together, whether for trade, war, or love, there was the frontier. Only when a group ceased to maintain control over its own destiny and definition did a particular frontier cease to exist. But by then the competing cultures had been marked indelibly by the acculturation that such contact entails. For when two peoples meet, they invariably become part of one another, and their histories—for better or worse—are henceforth intertwined.

(Axtell, 1978: 111)

This chapter will show how the approach of ethnohistory can be used to ask new questions of the archaeological data from Jamestown. The previous two chapters have demonstrated that past interpretations of Jamestown's material culture were influenced by several different factors. These determinants, the ethics of historic preservation and an evolution in research design capitalized on the public image of "Jamestown, site of the first
permanent English settlement in the New World." This image has fostered "folklore themes" about the seventeenth-century culture at Jamestown as a result of historical analysis of seventeenth-century documents.

A student leaving the library at Jamestown overheard a visitor comment, "What was it like living in colonial Jamestown?" Historians and anthropologists have offered answers to this question. The difference in their answers can be attributed to the fact that history tends to focus on a time perspective whereas anthropology focuses on a space perspective (Axtell, 1978). History has been said to focus on a change in personnel while anthropology studies change in social structure through time. History deals with what humans have written down and anthropology deals with what humans think. Ethnohistory combines the systemic approach of interpretation familiar to anthropologists with the in-depth documentary research techniques practiced by historians.

History and sociology are the parents of anthropology and all are descendents of philosophy. These disciplines define the social science emphasis on people and change through time. History has developed successive schools in the interpretation of primary source materials. When studying the first person narrative a researcher must place this literature into its temporal context. The meaning and significance of the events a person describes
are shaped not only by his own personality but by the structure of the society in which he lives, and by that society's past history.

Like their predecessors and descendents, historians are subject to the socialization process over time. Change is the one constant through time. It is inevitable that what has happened in the past will be interpreted differently by successive generations of scholars. The historiography of cultural analyses at Jamestown serves as a case in point.

To better understand the meanings of past events, the story teller tries to relate the past to the present structure of his own society with which he is familiar. Much history of the New World was written from the Euro-American colonial perspective. It can perhaps be said that the colonial mind set was responsible for the chronological ordering of events in the Western world. The colonial chronicleers viewed their world as progressive in the political and economic sense. For the early ethnographers of Jamestown, such as Captain John Smith, cultural comparison and contrast were the literary metaphors for expressing their opinions and expectations (Morgan, 1975). Working from the descriptive analyses or diaries of past times, successive historians of the Whig school of thought revised the meaning of these primary sources to fit their perspective of historical relevance in their
own societies. The political and economic problems of the Virginia Company at Jamestown described by Captain John Smith were seen as examples of conflict in the governing of the colony by later eighteenth-century chroniclers such as Robert Beverley (Morgan, 1975). He described the process of change in the structure of his society by giving it a politically progressive image in comparison to the past. The reality of Smith's Jamestown was valid only as a justification for the development he perceived in his own society.

Keeping in mind that the narratives from the primary sources such as Smith's and Beverley's are probably subjective interpretations, it should be mentioned that some documentary sources are more appropriate for use by historians than for genealogists and likewise for ethnographers and archaeologists. First, there are the documents pertaining to the administration of the Virginia Company and subsequently to the colony of Virginia. This information should not be divorced from other data of a statistical nature to be found in the records of Jamestown's social institutions (i.e. probate, census, insurance, parish, etc.). These sources should provide a test of each other for humanists using them to discern patterns of behavior within a society. The limitations of these records lies in their disconnectedness from other colonial information found outside the United States.
The second type of information available to the researcher can be seen as the source of contention between the different types of social scientists. These works have long been regarded as primary sources in the sense of the more statistically oriented works. The assumption made with the chroniclers' accounts is that, like the Virginia Company records, these are accurate sources for research into social patterns. However, the former should be analyzed as ethnographic field reports written from a contemporary perspective. Therefore, they ought to be regarded like all other secondary sources of information.

As secondary sources, the chroniclers' narratives do provide qualitative data for the researcher concerned with behavior. These sources are actually case studies for the interaction of personality and culture in a historical context. While they are useful in providing material for hypotheses they cannot be relied upon in the same way as quantifiable primary source materials of the type defined previously. Personal accounts are biased by the egocentric and ethnocentric attitudes of their authors and the attenuate litany of both implicit and explicit ideals and norms for their respective societies.

No less subject to the socialization processes that affected the chroniclers' and Whigs' historical interpretations are the attitudes of their descendents in the succeeding works on Jamestown. By the eighteenth
century the school of Cates' concensus historians had reinterpreted Jamestown as "the birthplace of our nation and our nation's liberties" (Hudson, January 5, 1984), by identifying with the democratic political process of common interests first practiced in the seventeenth-century General Assemblies of the Virginia colony. This interpretation was a by product of the nationalistic pride which culminated in independence for the English colonies and the creation of the United States of America. By the nineteenth century historians were no longer describing the entire culture of Jamestown because the influence of the Industrial Revolution placed historical emphasis on economic progress, and a further elaboration of the concensual interpretation. With the advent of Marxist theory in economics and its reinterpretation of colonial American history, historiography began to focus more on explanations of change over time and to fall into stride more with anthropological attitudes toward culture studies (Schuyler, 1978).

The historicalist approach taken in the twentieth-century interpretation of Jamestown's culture began under the auspices of the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities (APVA). Yonge's book (1930), Gregory's article (1935), and H. Chandlee Forman's publication *Jamestown and St. Mary's: Buried Cities of Romance* (1938) all perpetuate the concensual interpretation
of the site. They were all a product of their times and following World War I, nationalism gave a stronger flavor to the Anglo-American aspects of Jamestown's political and economic development. Forman began to introduce ideas about the social structure of seventeenth-century Jamestown from his interpretation of the architectural history (1948). His 1938 work was reviewed by Colonial National Historical Park (CNHP) administration with some apprehension since it was a landmark publication interpreting the archaeological data from Jamestown but had not been federally authorized (Hosmer, 1978).

National Park Service (NPS) master planning for CNHP had placed other concensual historians such as Chatelain, Cox, Gardner, Riley, and B. Floyd Flickinger in charge of the archaeological research design which was intended to complement the documentary interpretation of Jamestown's history. While Flickinger was acting superintendent during the 1930s he hired his brother Walter as a field crew foreman. However, Walter Flickinger actually did research for exhibits that interpreted the economic, political, and military aspects of Jamestown's history to the Park visitors through the use of artifacts recovered during the archaeological excavations (CNHP Superintendents' Monthly Reports, 1938). Later on museum technician Worth Bailey's analyses of ceramic sherds along with ceramic pipe remains, and his exhibit on a Dutch oven used for
baking bread at Jamestown gave insight to the everyday life of the seventeenth-century colonist.

When J.C. Harrington was hired and put in charge of the archaeological excavations at Jamestown after 1936, an innovative program interpreting the site excavations allowed Park visitors to share in the discovery of history in the ground. He placed emphasis on historical research before excavating an area and on historical documentation of the site within the report on it. Harrington saw archaeology as the handmaiden to history (Schuyler, 1977). CNHP Chief Park Historian Charles E. Hatch, Jr. shared this viewpoint with Harrington.

Hatch did extensive documentary work on the history of Jamestown providing the historical background for some of the unpublished site reports on file with CNHP. Hatch's orientation seems to be that of a concensual historian and the background data he provided to J. Paul Hudson in the 1950s-forward for the interpretative exhibits using material culture reinforces this idea. Hatch produced an abundance of popularized accounts of Jamestown's history for NPS/CNHP and in conjunction with the 350th Anniversary Celebration of the founding of Jamestown in the 1950s (see Bibliography). Hatch seemed to be emphasizing the social history aspects of Jamestown's interpretation as well which would make him a forerunner to later historical schools of thought currently used.
The oral history of archaeology at Jamestown gives no indication to the flow of ideas between Hatch and Cotter concerning the culture history of Jamestown. It is obvious from the CNHP files that Harrington and Cotter were working together along these lines and, the oral history interviews have shown that Jelks, Shiner, and Hudson all contributed ideas about the historical interpretation of Jamestown which was presented originally in the 1950s, and pervades the interpretative exhibits at the CNHP Visitor Center even today. The influence of CNHP Superintendent Stanley Abbott is said to have been responsible for permission allowing Eastern National Parks and Monuments Association (ENPMA) to present the first living history exhibit at Jamestown on glassmaking in the seventeenth century, carrying on the original work of a private founder (Hosmer, 1973). As if oblivious to the role historians have played at CNHP since its inception, Harrington wrote in a 1955 article that historians should be asking the questions for archaeology to answer in the future. The nature of these questions by social historians can be tied to the parallel development of "new archaeology" in the period following the last excavations at Jamestown and is taken-up in the following section of this chapter.
Social History and New Archaeology

In his article entitled "The Ethnohistory of Early America: A Review Essay," James Axtell traces the rise of the social approach in history and outlines the effect it has had upon the development of the ethnohistoric analysis of colonial culture. He relates this development to anthropology:

Since change and persistence are but two sides of the same process, ethnohistory offers the best opportunity for "testing theories of pattern growth and decline, for demonstrating cultural change, and for explaining stability." Such a service is of considerable value to both history and anthropology because historians tend to assume too much change and anthropologists too little, especially in the cultural study of small societies.

(1978: 118)

He notes that ethnohistory can have different meanings depending on the historical approach advocated by the researcher whether it is concensual or progressive. The concensual school of history was discussed earlier in this chapter, and the progressive school of history was introduced in the twentieth century by Frederick Jackson Turner. Turner's historical interpretation of frontier expansion as a determinant for the structure of colonial societies draws upon anthropological theories of acculturation and systemics (Axtell, 1978: 117).

Axtell (1978) considers Turner's progressive approach as an ethnohistoric approach to frontier society.
He also places Edmund S. Morgan's classic social history of colonial Virginia, *American Slavery, American Freedom* (1975) into the category of ethnohistoric interpretation. Morgan's work is concerned with the adaptation of English colonists to the New World environment of seventeenth-century Virginia. He explains the development of society's classes based on the availability of land, the production of tobacco as a cash crop, and the control of the means of production through available emigrant and slave labor in seventeenth-century Virginia. Axtell points out the influence these two approaches have had on encouraging the use of all types of documentary materials rather than a dependence on written works alone.

Two other innovative historical approaches to interpreting Virginia's seventeenth-century culture should also be mentioned because they too reflect anthropological concerns, and along with Morgan and Turner, have had a profound influence on subsequent historical studies of Jamestown. "From Organization to Society: Virginia in the Seventeenth Century" by Sigmund Diamond (1958) proposed that the feudal system for holding land and controlling its resources and access to them was transferred from England to Jamestown by the Virginia Company of London. He suggests that the initial corporate organization of the Virginia Company control of resources and access to them was maintained by society through the behavior of deference.
towards the established "planter" families who had settled under the original organization of the Virginia Company. Rhys Issac follows Diamond's pattern of deference in society into the eighteenth century in *Transformation of Virginia* (1982) but uses other primary source materials and structuralist theory from anthropology to imply that social class was the way in which people reconciled themselves to the New World's environment.

With the ideas of "new" archaeology as anthropology (Binford, 1964) theories of society's role in adapting to the ecosystem of seventeenth-century Virginia were reintroduced. Certain studies of colonial material culture in conjunction with documentary research produced a striking similarity in approaches between the social historians discussed previously and certain anthropologists in the 1970s. James Deetz' *In Small Things Forgotten* (1977) analyses seventeenth-eighteenth-century colonial American vernacular architecture, ceramics, and gravestones to illustrate their expression of human behavior. His study of the documents from the same period of time have led him to believe, like Issac (1982) and Diamond (1958), that society in colonial America changed from a replication of English ethnic patterns of behavior (which he calls "Medieval") to a uniquely American pattern by the eighteenth century. Deetz demonstrates that the classes of colonial artifacts which he discusses show these
changes in attitudes or behavior as a result of adapting to the New World environment.

Stanley South's definition of the frontier pattern of behavior (1977) as evidenced in the material culture is somewhat at odds with Deetz' interpretation of the artifact patterning. However, it does compliment the frontier characteristics of expansion into the landscape, or settlement patterning, delineated by Turner according to Axtell's analysis of his work (1978). South equates certain artifact assemblages with specific types of site function which are expressed in the architecture and its arrangement in the landscape. His interpretation also defines social classes according to the types of artifacts he believes are accessible at different stages in the development of a specific colonial frontier. South uses documentary evidence to ascertain the status of the landowners at the sites he examined.

The foregoing anthropological studies could also be considered as ethnohistoric interpretations of colonial culture since they combine the method of history with the theory of anthropology and draw upon a wide variety of source materials from archives and archaeology. Three other historians' articles which fall into the category of ethnohistory and have relevance to seventeenth-century Jamestown may be mentioned in passing. Carson et al's (1981) work combines information from documents and architectural
evidence revealed by archaeology to define a pattern of adaptation and socioeconomic behavior seen in seventeenth-century Tidewater Virginia and Maryland. This article incorporates the ideas of Morgan (1975), Diamond (1958), and Deetz (1977) discussed earlier. The "new" idea added in this article is that a change from tobacco to grain production led to increasing permanence in settlement locality. The idea of architectural impermanence was actually proposed before by Cotter (1958).

Another idea suggested by Cotter in 1958 was the relation of sickness at seventeenth-century Jamestown to the estuarine environment. This observation is interpreted from documents in an article by Carville Earle called "Environment, Disease, and Mortality in Early Virginia" (1979). The significance of this article lies in the fact that Earle keynotes the fact that seventeenth-century Virginia governors forced emigrants in Jamestown to remain as residents for the protection their presence afforded the settlement. The drawback of this article is that he insists on perpetuating the traditional historian's view that this behavior on the part of the politicians was a desire to create English towns in the New World.

James Horn's article "Servant Emigration to the Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century" (1979) examines the reasons for the large numbers of European emigrants in the Chesapeake area based on an examination of documents in
England. The important point this article makes is that merchants and mariners arranged for the transport and indenturing of laborers in the New World. Horne's data compares favorable with Morgan's (1975) which documents the numbers of emigrants by sex, age, and date of arrival at Jamestown. Merchants and mariners in the seventeenth century essentially controlled the means of production, its distribution, and the access to many of the resources necessary to Chesapeake society in the seventeenth century due to their finesse in world communication and transportation systems (Hatch, 1957). Morgan (1975) highlights this point in the chart on the following page by listing several prominent business men of seventeenth-century Jamestown as "the winners in the servant sweepstakes" according to the 1624 muster.

Two studies which can be considered ethnohistoric in nature and which have particular relevance to the thrust of this chapter are reviewed below. These studies bear a remarkable resemblance to one another in many ways and one explanation for this may be the corollary developments between social history and new archaeology already discussed. In 1971 the topic of J. Frederick Fausz' master's thesis in history was "Settlement in the James River Basin 1607-1640." This period of time is especially important to the model of maritime trade developed in the next section of this chapter. He seems to have been influenced by the
Figure 1

Winners in the Servant Sweepstakes

February, 1625, a muster of the inhabitants' names and numbers of every man's "men," or servants, including both tenants and genuine servants.

Ralph Hamor 10
John Pott 12
Edward Bennett 12
William Epps 13
Roger Smith 14
William Barry 15
Edward Blaney 17
William Peirce 17
Francis Wyatt 17
William Tucker 17
Daniel Gookin 20
Samuel Mathews 23
George Sandys 37
George Yeardley 39
Abraham Peirsey 39

(Morgan, 1975:119)
social history interpretations of Jamestown discussed earlier, with special reference to the work of Diamond (1958). Fausz also uses the works of Yonge (1930) and Forman (1938) to reinforce his interpretation of how social classes and statuses were defined at Jamestown and manifested in the proxemics of "New Town" (see Tab 1 on page 170). He makes the point that landholding competition developed early on, and that mariners were special benefactors in the access to land through the Virginia Company headrights because of their claims on behalf of the emigrants they transported to Jamestown.

In 1975 Kenneth E. Lewis, Jr. chose as the topic of his doctoral dissertation "The Jamestown Frontier: An Archaeological Perspective on Colonization." His problem was much broader in scope than Fausz' thesis. Lewis uses anthropological theories of cultural ecology and systems analysis to test the utility of the archaeological data collected at Jamestown for proving his hypotheses about the transference of English patterns of behavior to the Chesapeake region (Lewis, January 7, 1984). His hypotheses appear in Appendix IV-1). Lewis examined the documentary records from the seventeenth century to discern sub-systems important to frontier expansion away from Jamestown, the baseline from which to measure development. He then formulated his hypotheses and tested them against the archaeological data, mostly drawn from the 1950s excavations.
at "New Towne." Lewis concluded that the data supported his hypotheses and also provided a picture of adaptation and acculturation in seventeenth-century Virginia, much as Cotter had inferred in 1958. Lewis' sub-system hypotheses which bear most on the next section of Chapter 3 are those of transportation and communication.

A Model of Anglo-Dutch Acculturation and Maritime Trade at Jamestown

The purpose of this section is to introduce a model of Anglo-Dutch acculturation at Jamestown during the period when maritime trade created a situation of culture contact there. The period of contact is purported to have occurred between 1619 when the Dutch brought the first African slaves to Jamestown up to 1660 when England passed the Navigation Acts which prohibited free trade in the colony of Virginia. It is hypothesized that the society of seventeenth-century Jamestown had become dependent on maritime trade connections in England for transportation of goods and labor and for communication with other colonies in the New World. Therefore during the period of civil strife in England when the colony of Virginia was cut off from English trade sources, trade goods and labor were acquired through the Dutch merchant marine of the seventeenth century. If this hypothesis is valid then during this period the material culture at Jamestown should reflect a greater
abundance of Dutch trade goods as well as exhibiting other features of Dutch ethnic affiliation due to culture contact. These features of acculturation will most likely be apparent in those members of Jamestown's society who had the most to gain by associating with Dutch mercantile concerns.

Fausz' study (1971) has shown that the shakers and movers of seventeenth-century Jamestown lived in a discrete neighborhood which has subsequently been referred to as "New Towne." Construction began in this area, after the threat of Indian violence was believed to have passed once and for all, by 1624. Fausz' placement of the residences in New Towne builds upon Forman's earlier work (1938; see Map 2 on page 176), whose placement of these residences was based on Yonge's plan drawn up earlier (1930; see Map 3 on page 173). Fausz illustrates the fact that two opposing factions in the ruling class of the Virginia colony lived nearly side by side in New Town, and that the cause for bad blood between them was the legislative competition which governed access to land and labor. The faction opposing the colony's governor consisted of the "ancient planters" who extended their personal land base and economic network by exploiting the kinship system of essentially a folk society similar to that found contemporaneous in England. In conjunction with this thesis research a pilot study in family reconstitution was conducted using "ancient planter" William Pierce as a representative of the faction which
opposed mariners’ headrights to land in seventeenth-century Virginia.

E.A. Wrigley’s classic work *An Introduction to English Historical Demography From the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Century* (1966) describes how to use the technique of family reconstitution to trace kin networks in pre-industrial societies. He used this technique to delineate patterns of English historical demography. In folk societies the kin network affords the means to consolidate and redistribute land, goods, and labor. The pilot study at Jamestown applied Wrigley’s method to the information from the 1624 muster compiled and edited by Annie Lash Jester and Martha Woodruff Hiden in their book *Adventures of Purse and Person: Virginia 1607–1625* (1956). The 1624 muster includes folk terms which give information on titles (status), roles (behavior), and assets (class). Therefore, patterns in the social structure at Jamestown can be drawn from it.

The kinship chart for William Pierce’s extended family compiled in the family reconstitution study from the 1624 Jamestown muster appears in Appendix IV-7 (p. 182). Fausz (1971) has asserted that the landowning faction to which Pierce belonged acquired land in areas which had already been shown to be a sound investment as far as cash-cropping in tobacco was concerned. The family reconstitution study showed that Pierce’s only daughter
Joan (Joanne) was the third and last wife of John Rolfe. Rolfe is famous for introducing tobacco seed from the (Dutch controlled) island of Trinidad to the colony of Virginia. Through his second wife, Pocahontas, daughter of the chief of the Powhatan Indian Confederacy, Rolfe had access to Virginia tobacco seed and cultivation technology which was successfully hybridized to the West Indian weed seed to produce a marketable commodity for Europe. After Rolfe's death, Joan remarried to Roger Smith who gained control over Rolfe's former properties on the south side of the James River across from the Jamestown settlement (Hatfield, 1957). After Joan's death, her father William gained control over her properties by assuming guardianship over Elizabeth, her daughter by Rolfe.

William Pierce and the other ancient planters had a jump on later settlers in the Virginia colony not only because of their access to land but through their political association and control over the means of tobacco production. It is not surprising that this seventeenth-century faction opposed the threat to their control represented by mariners who not only controlled access to European markets but, as Horn has shown (1979), their control over access to labor which provided them ongoing access to land through emigrant headrights. The colonial governor was the local administrator of the Crown's directives and foremost in his responsibilities was to keep the flow of exports' capital coming from Virginia to
England to fill the royal coffers. It was to the governor's benefit to see to it that ships visited Jamestown often and left with their holds filled with Virginia's products. Laws favoring mariners encouraged maritime trade on the James River and mariners often sold their headrights to the "governor's men" (Fausz, 1971).

An article by John R. Pagan entitled "Dutch Maritime and Commercial Activity in Mid-Seventeenth Century Virginia" (1982) gives insight to the types of mariners that the governor and his faction were favoring through colonial legislation. He breaks the historical tradition of interpreting seventeenth-century Virginia culture in terms of the Anglo-American experience alone by consulting Dutch records from this period in the archives of Rotterdam and Amsterdam. Starting with the arrival of 20 Negro slaves at Jamestown aboard a Dutch vessel in 1619, Pagan points out that the Dutch West India company may have begun to tap into the Virginia tobacco supply as early as 1607. He notes that Dutch triangular trade patterns at this time went from Holland to Brazil then into the West Indies and up to Virginia before returning to Holland. Pagan highlights the role of the Dutch maritime trade during the English civil wars of the 1640s when shipping was interrupted between London and Virginia, especially following Opechancanough's raids on white settlement where crops and homes were destroyed.

Pagan tells us that early on in Virginia
maritime trade the "Dutch found it difficult to compete effectively with Londoners because, unlike their rival they did not yet possess a well-developed network of local agents who could assemble cargoes and transact business on their behalf" (1982:486). During the 1930s tobacco market glut in England, Virginians began to trade with the Dutch to offset the lowered price for tobacco on English markets. From the Dutch historical archives of maritime trade in Virginia during the period 1630 through 1660 Pagan provides information on Dutch establishment within the social network of colonial Virginia's prominent families, several of which had residences at Jamestown in "New Towne." These people belonged to the governor's faction which opposed the ancient planters' efforts to prohibit free trade in the Virginia colony. Pagan's data was used in a second cursory family reconstitution study to demonstrate how the Dutch established themselves in the Virginia colony for maritime trade purposes.

One of the first Dutch merchant families from Amsterdam to establish themselves in Virginia were Derrick and Arent Corsen Stam. The Stams received 250 acres of land for themselves and for each of the family members they transported through the headright system. They became major tobacco exporters, according to Dutch documents, shortly after they settled. In 1638 Dutch records show that the Stams had patented land on Jamestown Island but this patent is not reflected in either Yonge's (1930), Forman's (1938), or
Fausz' (1971) maps which were based on English documents from the same period (see Maps 1, 2, and 3; appendix IV).

As William Peirce was taken as a representative of one faction of the governing upper class at Jamestown during the period of Dutch mercantile activity, Governor Francis Yeardley may be taken as the epitomy of the opposing planter network ensconsed at Jamestown. Pagan follows the activities of Simon Overzee, the son of a leading Rotterdam tobacco importer who became a prominent trader in Virginia and Maryland during the mid-1600s. From the Dutch documents, Pagan traces Overzee's movement in the Virginia gentlemen class. In 1640 Overzee married Sarah Throughgood, daughter of Adam Throughgood, a prominent politician from Lower Norfolk County. Sarah's stepfather at the time was Francis Yeardley who had married her widowed mother a few years previous. In 1650 Yeardley purchased a Dutch vessel in partnership with Overzee.

Yeardley in 1644, was also supplied with servants by another Rotterdam merchant, one Alberct Cocx according to Pagan's research in the Dutch archives. The Dutch thus controlled access to a scarce resource, labor, which was provided to Virginia's prominent colonists in return for tobacco. This fact necessitates a reevaluation of Morgan's (1977) data on the "winners in the servant sweepstakes" when one takes into consideration the role of the Dutch as labor brokers to planter families. In addition, the Dutch role in
maritime trade in mid-seventeenth century Virginia may explain why a great deal of European emigrants of all origins disembarked at Jamestown, and why the governing General Assembly may have had use for their labor there in connection with loading and provisioning merchant vessels. Therefore, the laws passed requiring people to settle and build at Jamestown in the 1620s and 1630s may be seen in a different light.

Yeardley is credited with governing the colony during the most prosperous years up to the 1620s. Other Virginia governors with residences at Jamestown during the 1630s and 1640s followed Yeardley's lead in trade with Dutch merchants. Governor John Harvey (who followed Yeardley as governor) as well as his governmental secretary, Richard Kemp (who was later acting governor), trafficked with the Dutch as early as 1638 according to Pagan's examination of the Dutch documents. William Berkeley, governor from 1641 through 1652 and from 1660-1676 traded during the 1640s with an Amsterdam merchant, Richard Glover who also interacted with Berkeley supporters Richard Lee, Richard Bennett, and Ralph Wormeley. Berkeley instigated legislature in the Virginia General Assembly during his terms as governor which protected Dutch trade, even in opposition to the English Navigation Acts of the 1650s and 1660s.

Pagan's data allows for more theories of covert Dutch activities on Jamestown Island during the period.
1640-1660 to be drawn. Men dealing with Dutch traders owned much of Jamestown Island at this time and the residents of the two opposing governmental factions seated in New Towne held patents on most of the land with access to riverine sub-systems for frontier communication and transportation to the outlying James River settlements in which they held an interest (Lewis, 1975). There are indications in English documents that all English trade came into Jamestown and was redistributed to the plantations from here, although mariners did trade directly to the plantations as well (Hatch, 1957). Pagan (1982) found that the Dutch documents referred to trade with specific individuals before 1640 and that after this date references to trade rendezvous on the small creeks and streams feeding into the James River are made. After the enactment of the Navigation Acts, according to the Dutch documents, their illicit trade continued in Virginia. It does not seem improbable that Dutch goods smuggled into the plantations found their way back to the residences of prominent planter families at Jamestown where they were exchanged for legal English goods redistributed only through this marketplace and port. Furthermore, it is not impossible that the Dutch maintained trading outlets in Jamestown prior to 1640 under the guise of land patented to their colonial kith and kin based on the evidence of the pilot study in family reconstitution. Finally, Virginia exports that could not reach England or English colonies in
the West Indies during the English civil war could have been transported for redistribution to the West Indies by Dutch vessels during the period 1620-1660.

If the hypotheses extrapolated from the documentary findings in the Dutch documents of the seventeenth century (Pagan, 1982) and reinforced by the family reconstitution data are valid, the archaeological evidence found in the association of artifacts and architecture of the presumed residences of New Towne's prominent citizens in governmental positions dating to the period 1620 through 1660 should show a preponderance of Dutch cultural characteristics over those of English ethnic affiliation. Furthermore, there should also be archaeological evidence to support an increase in export of Jamestown's products such as lumber, iron architectural components, bricks and tiles, and glass as ballast for tobacco and sassafras rerouted through the West Indies where construction materials were needed as the entrepots serving European markets developed. Therefore, Dutch West Indies adaptive characteristics may be assumed to have been translated to the material culture of Jamestown in the architecture during the period of mercantile trade if it was also adaptive to the Tidewater environment. Finally, Dutch trade goods associated with subsistence such as gin bottles, hollow wares for grain storage and conveyance, wine bottles for storage of a wide range of liquid commodities, flatware, and clothing artifacts representative of provisioning
indentured servants, destitute slaves, and mariners who travelled light should also be indicative of the Dutch maritime trade influence of Jamestown during its role as a seventeenth-century port.

Since the beginning of historical archaeological investigations at Jamestown researchers have been trying to follow historian formulated research designs for locating the significant events and the people involved with them in relation to an Anglo-American interpretation of history. According to Cotter (1957:4-5):

At first it was hoped that existing seventeenth century survey records and descriptions of land tracts and buildings would supply a frame of reference into which archaeological findings would fit without undue complications. It has since been realized, however, that so tenuous is the written data that only one building has been identified with reasonable certainty, the Ludwell Third and Fourth State House. . . . Tract descriptions when plotted out on a modern map have little to tie on to except marshes, the river, and each other.

Nonetheless, historians such as Fausz (1971) perpetuate past attempts to do this by engineers and architects who worked on the Jamestown archeological excavations prior to 1936 (Yonge, 1930; Forman, 1938). To further confuse the issue Fausz uses Yonge's and Forman's interpretations of the architectural materials to substantiate his assertion that persons of high status lived in the New Towne area.

Yonge (1930) and Forman (1938) placed much emphasis on the primary accounts written by upper class residents
such as Ralph Hamor and John Rolfe at Jamestown in the 1620 through 1640 period (Hatch, 1957). From the discussion earlier of Fausz' (1971) data on Rolfe's role in the opposing class factions it should be apparent that his account was not unbiased. Furthermore, Yonge (1930) and Forman (1938) both identified the "row house" group of foundations on the APVA property as the Ludwell Third and Fourth State House without any reference to the terminus post quem or terminus anti quem expressed in the associated artifacts which are unprovenienced stratigraphically. Referring to primary sources which infer that residences were modelled after that of "Secretary Kemp's fine brick house," both Yonge and Forman assumed that brick houses represented the homes or tavern/ordinaries of upper class residents of Jamestown who only used these buildings when they were in town for political or business reasons. Forman (1938) takes the idea of class and architecture one step further in showing that the tavern/ordinary foundations of the "Ludwell" and "the First State House" were the correct dimensions for English contemporary correlates in the tenement row house.

Primary source materials written by seventeenth-century authors have been repeatedly cited for an interpretation of Jamestown architecture from the perspective of economic and political progress. Even Carson et al.'s (1981) thoughtful analysis of impermanent architecture in
Tidewater Virginia assumes that farmhouses were frame structures which were later replaced by more "substantial" brick buildings. This type of analysis again draws upon primary source materials written by upper class residents or upon chronicleers' accounts describing early Jamestown habitations. The problem with most interpretations of the structures at Jamestown is threefold: (1) these historical interpretations do not describe the changes in function of a building over time; (2) these interpretations do not analyze buildings (other than during the early period) in terms of multiple use, and (3) these interpretations do not take into consideration missing artifactual data which has been historically documented for reuse, such as building materials, in particular.

Noël Hume's books (1982; 1963) place emphasis on those architectural and artifactual elements of Jamestown material culture which support his view of early English adaptation to the New World environment. The key idea here, as in most analyses of Jamestown, is English. In his 1963 work he reviewed the historical documentation in the primary sources which is pertinent to the traditional interpretation of the Ludwell Third and Fourth State House and to the purported "First State House" (Structure 17 in Cotter, 1958). A review of architectural descriptions in the primary source materials of private accounts cited by Noël Hume's 1963 publication is useful within the context of the
hypotheses of maritime trade at Jamestown which my thesis has proposed.

In 1608 Jamestown settlement was described as having a palisade surrounding three rows of houses (row houses?), a storehouse, Corps du Guard, and a chapel. In 1612 it is described as consisting of frame houses, three large storehouses joined together for a total length of 120 feet, inside of an impaled wall (Kingsbury, 1906-1935). In 1639 Jamestown consisted of 12 houses and stores (one and the same?) with Secretary Kemp's house noted as being of brick and frame. In 1661 three attached tenement houses measuring 120 feet by 40 feet are described in a plat which noted that the middle house had belonged to Governor Harvey and had been the first State House. The Town Act of 1662 stipulated that at Jamestown 32 brick houses were to be built, each house to have the dimensions of 40 feet by 20 feet, and a roof covered in slate or tile (McIlwaine, 1905-1915). The Act further specified that those who built brick houses would be allowed land on which to construct a storehouse (warehouse?). Six attached houses 40 feet by 20 feet back to back give the dimensions of one section of the Ludwell Third and Fourth State House which halved give the dimensions of a row house (Structures 17 and 125 in Cotter, 1958).

Nott Hume (1963) draws comparisons between the configurations and dimensions of the Ludwell Third and Fourth State House and the "First State House"
(See Figures 3, 4, and 5). He noted that both had cellars in the eastern-most sections which were bricked completely with yellow Dutch bricks and in a manner which was standard for seventeenth-century Dutch New World floors expected to withstand heavy traffic. In addition both buildings were aligned with their long axes east-west and their gabled ends on the south riverfront. This may explain why the eastern-most cellars in relation to the water table at these locations were of non-porous yellow Dutch brick. This type of brick was also used for building cisterns in seventeenth-century Dutch New World settlements, and the Ludwell House also has a recessed rectangular feature identified by Jamestown archaeologists as a "wine cooling" well (Cotter, 1958). In 1982 Noël Hume reflected that what wasn't found at Jamestown sheds light on what was found at Martin's Hundred, a seventeenth-century plantation abandoned in 1622 and rediscovered through his archaeological excavations. Maybe everything found at Jamestown has not yet been reported upon either, so Noël Hume's findings may shed new light on Jamestown.

At Martin's Hundred, Noël Hume (1982) discovered what he interpreted as high status artifacts or basically, quite a few goods of non-English European origin. Among the assemblage were lead bale seals, golden threads for clothing, German and (perhaps) Dutch ceramics, fine English flatwares, and numerous other artifact classes (some were locally made).
Figure 5—Plan of Ludwell-Statehouse Group

(Cotter, 1958:26)

The Country-Ludwell-State House Block of Five Houses at Jamestown

(Porman, 1938:114)
The State House of Virginia Governors at Jamestown

(Forman, 1938:104)

Comparative Plans

of the cellar remains of the First State House, Jamestown (left), as measured and drawn by the writer in 1935, and of the First or "Ground" Floor of typical London row houses of the seventeenth century (right), redrawn from a "Plat" in Moxon's Mechanic Exercises. By changing a few of its dimensions, the London plan would fit very well over the State House cellar. a is an oven addition, b an unidentified brick addition, c are fireplaces, d brick walls two and a half bricks thick, e two bricks thick, f one and a half bricks thick, and g one brick thick.

(Forman, 1938:107)
all dating to the seventeenth century. Although Noël Hume made a good case for the earliest settlement, Wolstenholme Towne, resembling an Irish bawn or folk structure which was fortified by a palisade and incorporated a row of buildings including residences and attached outbuildings. He does note that this type of layout was also common in Germany during the early seventeenth century as well. Cotter had suggested in 1958 that the original site of Jamestown probably resembled an Irish bawn. Noël Hume recognized that trade goods are present at Martin's Hundred but it was Hatch in 1957 who pointed out that the residents of Martin's Hundred had complained of the abuse they suffered at the hands of mariners, a plight apparently common to all outlying settlements (Hatch, 1957).

Noël Hume's work on Martin's Hundred makes use of seventeenth-century Dutch paintings of folk life to illustrate the uses to which certain artifacts were put. At one point he goes so far as to compare a sherd of sgraffito ware found at Martin's Hundred to several he collected from the West Indies' island of St. Eustatius, settled by the Dutch in the second quarter of the seventeenth century. Having drawn this analogy it seems surprising that he did not also notice the resemblance in the seventeenth-century material culture at Jamestown to that at St. Eustatius. In the course of reviewing the photographs from the archaeological excavations at Jamestown in
preparation for the videotaped documentary on the legacy of historical archaeology there, I made notations from the jackets of the photographs on each building foundation or feature which seemed to me to be an indication of Dutch acculturation.

Cotter's synthesis (1958) of the archaeological data recovered from the past excavations was used to follow up the information on building foundations I thought looked "Dutch" (see Appendix IV-2). During the 1950s excavations a third row house almost analogous to the Ludwell row house earlier described was found. I began to see a pattern in this type of feature which I felt was an indication of maritime trade beyond that of the buildings' associated artifact assemblage (See Appendices in Cotter, 1958). Noël Hume (1963) has noted that the dimensions of these buildings are correct for a seventeenth-century residential or commercial building. With the exception of one building foundation tentatively identified as a "warehouse" none had been discovered at Jamestown. In light of changing functions, multiple use, and reuse of buildings I decided that continuing the traditional proxemics of an earth-fast bawn layout, a later structure built upon the same site might have become a tenement row house then a warehouse, then a tavern/ordinary and finally was either abandoned entirely or components of its structure were reused to build elsewhere. Research into seventeenth-century Dutch architecture may reveal that three attached rooms in
buildings of more than one story is indicative of a warehouse on the lower floors and a residence above ground level.

Without falling into the past epistemological trap of trying to identify who lived in which row house and when it was used for different functions, I can only return to the indications from family reconstitution at Jamestown. Kemp, Yeardley, Harvey, and Berkeley were all trading with the Dutch during the mid-seventeenth century. The dates of the row houses compare favorably with this time period, and the historical documents indicate that Secretary Kemp's brick house at Jamestown was emulated by other residences built after 1638. Given their connections with the Dutch and their access to trade goods it can be seen that these types of goods dominate the assemblage of these structures (see Cotter, 1958). Furthermore, indications in the building construction hint at a Dutch ethnic adaptation, especially if the transference of ideas about prevention of hurricane damage to a building can be inferred from the roofing materials, as Noel Hume suggests (1963). Finally, the "wine cooling" features may actually be merely the footing for cisterns whose bricks were carried off and used elsewhere, as seems to be the case with the buildings' chimneys. The HABS drawing of Structure 125 identifies the "wine cooling well" as a cistern (see Figure 6).

Wine cooling wells are common to several of the brick
Figure 3

Plan of excavated foundation, sections, and detail, Illinois Masonic Building, Survey drawing.

(Cotter, 1958:143)
foundations with brick-lined wells found at Jamestown (see Appendix IV-2). One cellar actually has a vaulted ceiling, and taken along with the evidence for vaulted above the ground tombs seen at the later Travis burial ground, may strengthen the analogy to Dutch New World adaptations seen on St. Eustatius. Although it has not been documented in the English records it does not seem too out-of-line to suppose that the settlement at Jamestown could have incorporated the Dutch idea of cisterns to catch rainwater. With an abundance of emigrants passing through Jamestown (Morgan, 1977; Hotten, 1874) and the provisioning of ships with fresh water a requirement of port activities, it's not possible that the twenty-four features identified as wells found to date on the Island could have served these purposes alone for almost a century. Even if more seventeenth-century wells are located, cistern features which are generally above ground and made of multi-purpose yellow Dutch bricks, were very likely dissembled for use elsewhere. Finally, since no privies were found during the excavations at Jamestown it may be in the best interests of the present thesis to reconsider the interpretation of the wood-lined well features and well features with barrels at the bottom found in conjunction with brick-lined wells (Cotter, 1958).

Lewis' dissertation emphasized that settlement types such as the "frontier town" he identified at Jamestown fall into a series according to their role within the
sub-systems he outlined (see Appendix IV-1). These phases of settlement are not necessarily contiguous and may be repeated at different times or eliminated all together at a particular site. It seems that Jamestown has manifested all of the settlement types from the seventeenth century forward including "dispersed settlement," "semi-nucleated settlement," "nucleated settlement," "frontier town," and "entrepot" (Lewis, 1975: 22-24). Although the historical interpretation stipulates that "Jamestown was never much of a port" and "all the trade went directly to the plantations" (Cotter, January 5, 1984; Shiner, January 7, 1984; Harrington, May 31, 1983), the intent of this section of my thesis has been to show that the period of Dutch mercantile and maritime activity in seventeenth-century Virginia was a catalyst to development and adaptation in Jamestown. It is no mere coincidence that the demand for Jamestown's industrial products and its decline very nearly parallels its hypothesized role as an entrepot due to maritime trade with the Dutch. During the period of 1640 through 1660 when Dutch ethnic influences on American culture may have been dominant at Jamestown English documents cannot be depended upon exclusively. Reanalysis of existing archaeological data and future excavations will provide definite answers to this assertion.
CONCLUSIONS

Although the governor and his government moved away, Jamestown did not entirely disappear; it continued to exist as a port through most of the eighteenth century, and eventually became part of the Ambler plantation, whose colonial brick mansion burned for the third and last time in 1898. During the Revolution, Jamestown was a center of both naval and military activity, and in the Civil War a Confederate earthwork was thrown up within yards of its historic brick church. In short, Jamestown was no Pompeii cut off in its prime, no site left sleeping through the centuries waiting only to be awakened by the archaeologist's magic spade. Instead, it was like most of the world's urban sites, its face ever changing, leaving a cat's cradle of archaeological evidence calling for endless time and superlative field techniques if its overlapping and interlocking strands were to be sucessfully untangled.

In 1982 Ivor Noël Hume suggested an interpretation of Jamestown's culture which incorporates both the approaches of social history and "new" archaeology (Noël Hume, 1982: 27-28). Although he does not suggest a research design for gathering the evidence to support the historical model of Jamestown he proposes, he does offer the example of his own analysis of another James River seventeenth-century site at Martin's Hundred (Noël Hume, 1982). Noël Hume's findings at
Martin's Hundred are especially significant in relation to the model of maritime trade at Jamestown proposed in my thesis research. Noël Hume draws comparisons between the early Jamestown settlement pattern, artifactual evidence, and architectural references in historical documents to support his reconstruction of Wolstenholme Town at Martin's Hundred to the time of its demise following an Indian massacre in 1622 (Noël Hume, 1982). Noël Hume offers a convincing argument for the historically documented status of certain Martin's Hundred residents based upon remains of specific European trade goods. However, he does not fully elaborate the fact that these goods could also represent the impact of maritime trade patterns on the James River, and specifically, the redistribution of goods by ferry from the port of Jamestown.

I will now recapitulate the indications from my own research on the archaeology which are pertinent to a maritime model of Jamestown as a port. The introduction to this thesis pointed out that there has been an evolution in historical archaeology at Jamestown. My thesis has taken the ethnohistoric approach to the documentary sources on the interpretation of Jamestown's culture. The ethnohistoric approach seemed to be the most holistic way to integrate information from a wide variety of applicable sources including primary and secondary historical accounts, oral history interviews, archaeological reports and publications, architectural drawings and interpretations,
photographic records of the archaeological excavations, and related research from contemporaneous contexts both regionally and globally. My research was not intended to be all inclusive but to indicate several areas in which more research should be done to place Jamestown into a continuum in terms of synchronic and diachronic cultural process. An overview of the evolution of historical archaeology at Jamestown is provided by the one hour videotaped documentary I produced in an effort to convey the significance of this topic to a wider audience.

Each chapter of my thesis highlighted key aspects of the varied influences on the interpretation of Jamestown archaeology over time. The first chapter sketched the legislative mandates which allowed for the preservation and development of Jamestown's cultural resources. Chapter 1 also showed how the historical preservation movement in the Tidewater Virginia area stimulated the federal government to fund archaeological and interpretative work at Jamestown on-and-off between 1934-1957. This motivation fit well with the larger NPS master plan for management of historic sites, monuments, and buildings. Chapter 1 also demonstrated that the actual administration of the NPS master plan for CNHP in general and Jamestown specifically was a flexible approach guided by historical aims and instigated by a multidisciplinary team who directed unskilled laborers.

While Chapter 1 focused on administrative influences
on the interpretation of Jamestown, the aim of Chapter 2 was to compare the changing intent in research designs during the archaeological investigations there. This chapter pointed out Ivor Noël Hume's perspective of the past archaeological work at Jamestown and supplemented this viewpoint with data gathered for my thesis from the publications and unpublished reports of the Jamestown researchers. While the published works present a polished picture of the archaeological findings, the unpublished reports and photographic records in the archives of CNHP come closer to the complete portrait explicit in the culminating conclusions. My research sought the "emic" or insiders' perspective on the historical archaeology at Jamestown through oral history interviews with some of the past researchers. In the course of a symposium on Jamestown archaeology held at the 1984 meeting of the SHA in Williamsburg, Virginia, both previously unknown data on the past excavations and future recommendations for Jamestown's research design were revealed. These views are included in part within this chapter as a contrast to both Noël Hume's opinions and the Jamestown researchers' own past opinions. Chapter 2 illustrated the influence of anthropological theories on the interpretation of Jamestown's culture.

Although Chapter 1 touched upon the influence of the concensual school of history on military and economic interpretation of Jamestown's culture, the evolution in historical
thought is not the topic of my thesis. Nonetheless, this interest was seen to have affected the approach of the archaeological research design as evidenced in the analyses of Harrington and Cotter touched upon in Chapter 2 and explored in the videotape documentary. Harrington firmly subscribed to the culture history approach at Jamestown and consequently influenced Cotter's work there. Cotter himself and his team of Shiner, Jelks, and Hudson began to allude to theories of culture change due to acculturation and adaptation in the New World.

With the advent of social history and the "new archaeology" in the 1960s which placed emphasis on culture process, researchers began to reexamine the documentary and archaeological evidence at Jamestown. The relevance of these recent approaches as an expression of ethnohistory and their contributions towards my theory on culture process at Jamestown are delineated in Chapter 3. My pilot study on family reconstitution in seventeenth-century Jamestown during the critical period of Dutch maritime trade in Virginia suggested a mercantile kin network through which trade goods and labor might have been redistributed upon the James River to outlying settlements. My hypotheses is a logical evolution from Lewis' theory of early Jamestown as a frontier outpost and offers an explanation of Jamestown's gradual decline through the remainder of the seventeenth century after Dutch trade was prohibited due to the Navigation Acts.
The ideas of social history will probably influence the shape of master planning for future archaeological excavations at Jamestown as the tradition of having a NPS historian develop the research design at CNHP has been maintained to the present day. Since Harrington and Noël Hume both continue to offer suggestions for excavations on the property at Jamestown belonging to the APVA, questions concerned with culture history will hold sway here. The symposium on Jamestown archaeology at the 1984 meeting of the SHA made public some of the research questions about other aspects of Jamestown's history and interpretation: (1) what relation did European settlement have to earlier aboriginal settlement; (2) how did the Jamestown culture influence European culture; (3) are underwater investigations a viable avenue for research; (4) how have past analyses been biased by not considering artifacts that were missing from the assemblage due to differential preservation? Ironically, the research questions proposed for future interpretation are still dominated by the original quest to define the seventeenth-century shoreline and the location of the first fort, according to the latest management plan.

Cotter has recommended that reevaluation of past archaeological reports, reanalysis of artifactual data, and reinterpretation of the archaeological evidence of Jamestown be undertaken. Lewis' doctoral dissertation did just such a study and found that each of his hypotheses treating
Jamestown as a baseline by which to measure frontier expansion in Tidewater Virginia was borne out. Two classes of artifactual material at Jamestown which were not fully examined but which should prove invaluable in explicating frontier lifestyles at Jamestown are the soil samples and faunal remains recovered during the archaeological excavations from the 1930s through 1950s, according to Harrington and Jelks. Analyses of these materials would help to explain the relationship of other classes of artifacts, such as ceramics, found in association with them.

Shiner has suggested the value of archaeological excavations adjacent to the eighteenth-century Ambler ruins for studying evolution in eighteenth-century ceramics. This type of study should be done on any such artifacts presently included in the Jamestown collection as well. Regretfully, Forman's classic work on the architecture of Jamestown should not continue to be viewed as all encompassing. My research in the photo archives at CNHP has revealed that a reanalysis of this data can and should be done by a qualified architectural historian. Future researchers undoubtedly will find answers to different questions than those asked in the past but, as my thesis research has shown, each researcher will be biased in his analysis by his own training, his subjective viewpoint, and the legacy of historical archaeology at Jamestown.

My hypothesis about maritime trade's role at
Jamestown in the seventeenth century is not an exception to the rule. As an example of the ethnohistoric approach my analysis is intended to serve as both a complement and a supplement to the documentary interpretation of Jamestown culture in the seventeenth century. Ivor Noël Hume was the first to emphasize the significance of Jamestown as a port (1982; 1963). However, he did not develop his theory fully in these works. My thesis does not fully develop the idea of Jamestown as a port either but does suggest some ways in which the past archaeological evidence may be reevaluated in light of the adoption of ideas along with material goods traded into Jamestown. During the period prior to the Navigation Acts when the Dutch were supplying labor and commodities to the Chesapeake area (Pagan, 1982), Dutch material culture and architectural adaptations to the New World should overshadow those of English ethnic affiliation. This idea should be pursued in a future study.

My research into the past archaeological analyses has identified "folklore themes" inherent in historical interpretations of Jamestown's seventeenth-century culture. The overriding consideration leading to a perpetuation of certain ideas about Jamestown's culture is based in a bias on the part of most researchers towards identification of English ethnicity and continuity in the culture at Jamestown in the seventeenth century. Given this focus it is apparent that the chronicleers' accounts upon which most
interpretations are based were considered by some as a truthful and accurate picture of early Jamestown settlement rather than as an idealized and subjective viewpoint given by members of the upper classes. Furthermore, these types of interpretations leave no room for people and events that contributed to the flavor of Jamestown's early culture through illicit and unrecorded trade activities although these very acts may be documented in other European sources. Finally, these interpretations tell us nothing at all of the important personal and family histories of those persons who were illiterate, whether they are aboriginal Indians, African slaves, or non-Anglo indentured servants in contact with the culture of Jamestown in the seventeenth century.

In the future historical archaeology at Jamestown may take new directions in interpreting the material culture that documents a history that will never be found in written sources whether they be in England, Holland, Spain, or someplace that is not even dreamed of yet. My thesis research has shown that, contrary to popular belief, archaeological data collected and photographically documented by CNHP researchers during the excavations between 1935 through 1957 can be reanalyzed in light of current methods and theories and most likely will be again in the future from that perspective as well. The oral history interviews with past Jamestown researchers has revealed unique evidence on the historical archaeology conducted
there, and memories are a resource that must continue to be tapped since they fade with time. In addition, the past Jamestown researchers have shown both their willingness and skill in aiding new researchers with their reanalyses of past archaeological data relative to new interpretations of Jamestown's culture.

Finally, it is now time that a larger constituency of United States citizens have a choice about master plans for future archaeological research at Jamestown. Through the popular medium of television my videotaped documentary will give the "folks at home" a chance to decide the fate of historical archaeology based on its past achievements.

Professionals are going to be aware of the fact that they have to take the general public, including the amateur preservers, seriously. And perhaps that leads to one further point: the new generation of scholars takes itself too seriously. Historians, planners, architects, archaeologists, and curators need a little more humor; they are too concerned with what is "right" and what is "wrong," and they see these matters as moral causes. Their arguments create a wall between them and the public.

If the future of the historic preservation field can be gauged from its past, then the next quarter century may witness a revolution in widely held attitudes . . .

(Hosmer, 1975:139)
APPENDICES
Dear Participant:

I am writing to request your participation in a videotaped oral history project about the excavations at Jamestown. Dr. Norman Barka has suggested that a symposium at the January 1984 meetings of the Society for Historical Archaeology in Williamsburg would afford a public forum for this topic. The title of this symposium would be "Retrospect on Jamestown," a theme sure to attract a wide range of interested persons.

Oral history showcases individual memories of specific events. It serves as a window to understanding the past and provides impetus of predictive models of the future. Theory in the practice of historical archaeology at Jamestown has evolved through formulation of research designs influenced significantly by architectural considerations. Prospective plans for cultural resource management can be based in both past experience and present recommendations.

The importance of this type of project was cited in a study entitled The Collection Preservation Guide — Colonial National Historical Park 1982, co-authored by Pardue, Gay, and Feller. The authors suggested that:

An oral history of the Jamestown...excavations should be taped to record the memories of as many archaeologists and crew members as can be located...If Mr. Harrington and Mr. Cotter discuss ...their methods and goals during their pioneer digs, the Park will have a much better picture of the information which the collections contain.

Each researcher brings to a site his own bias according to his individual education and training. Interaction between several professionals working together synthesizes aspects of their various backgrounds. The resulting research design is then modified by the directives of the sponsoring agency and by environmental circumstances. The proposed symposium would provide an opportunity to disseminate unique data on Jamestown to a large audience of professional
colleagues. Data to which only the archaeologists and architectural historians of Jamestown can ascribe intimate meaning.

The oral history symposium will provide the focus for my Master's thesis in anthropology at the College of William and Mary. The enclosed questionnaire was compiled from a review of related research and grounded in your published works on Jamestown. I would like to conduct a personal interview on your background at Jamestown prior to the symposium. Only those questions which you agreed to discuss beforehand will be asked of you.

I would appreciate it if you'd please complete the enclosed questionnaire and mail it to me as soon as possible since arrangements must be made for the symposium by November 1, 1983. I will be contacting you shortly after you receive this letter to answer any questions you might have.

Sincerely,

Roni Hinote Polk

CC: Louis R. Caywood
    John L. Cotter
    J. C. Harrington
    Virginia Harrington
    J. Paul Hudson
    Edward Jelks
    Kenneth E. Lewis, Jr.
    Malcolm Watkins
APPENDIX I-2

ORAL HISTORY QUESTIONNAIRE
FOR JAMESTOWN ARCHAEOLOGISTS

I. PERSONAL BACKGROUND

1. Why did you decide to become an archaeologist?

2. When did you decide to become an archaeologist?

3. Why did you become interested in doing historical archaeology (or architectural history) at Jamestown?

4. When did you become interested in doing historical archaeology (or architectural history) at Jamestown?

5. What anthropologist/archaeologist/architectural historian were you most impressed with as a student?

6. Why and when were you most impressed by the person you indicated in the previous question?

7. What anthropologist/archaeologist/architectural historian are you most impressed with today?

8. What impresses you the most about the person you have named in the previous question?

9. Do you consider yourself to be a(n): (Please choose from the following or add your own description if it seems more appropriate to you.)

   a. Historical archaeologist? Why?
   b. Anthropologist? Why?
   c. Architectural historian? Why?
   d. Other? Why?

10. Do you think that your work at Jamestown significantly influenced your decision to become the type of professional which you indicated in the previous question.

11. How did your work at Jamestown influence the decision indicated in the previous question?
II. RETROSPECT ON JAMESTOWN

1. Why did you accept a job at Jamestown?

2. When did you accept a job at Jamestown?

3. How long did you work at Jamestown?

4. When you were employed at Jamestown, what role did the National Park Service policy play in the excavations at Jamestown?

5. How did the role of the National Park Service policy at Jamestown change while you were employed there?

6. Describe your objectives for Jamestown archaeological investigations at the time you conducted them.

7. What part did the philosophy of cultural resource management play in the excavations at Jamestown?

8. Why did you decide upon the type of methodology used when you conducted excavations at Jamestown?

9. How did salvage archaeology decisions affect your work at Jamestown?

10. Describe the basis of your historical research on Jamestown prior to excavation.

11. How did your historical research influence the approach you took in conducting test excavations at Jamestown?

12. In what manner did your previous training affect your approach to excavation and data analyses at Jamestown?

13. What do you feel was the major contribution your work made to an understanding of Jamestown?

14. Why do you feel that your major contribution was that indicated in the previous question?

15. What do you think is the most important aspect of the archaeological work conducted previously at Jamestown?

16. To what extent do you feel that a previous investigator's approach influenced your own approach to excavations at Jamestown?
III. FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Keeping in mind the knowledge you have obtained since your excavations at Jamestown, what would you change in your approach to archaeological excavations? (Please consider the following as a guideline)
   a. Historic research  
   b. Research design  
   c. Methodology  
   d. Analysis techniques  
   e. Cost  
   f. Personnel

2. Explain how you think your findings at Jamestown are similar to or different from those found at the following Tidewater sites:
   a. Clowerdew Hundred  
   b. Green Springs  
   c. Governor's Land (Drummond site)  
   d. Martin's Hundred  
   e. St. Mary's City  
   f. Williamsburg

3. Do you think that salvage archaeology is a valid approach to excavations at Jamestown today?

4. Under what circumstances is salvage archaeology a valid approach to excavations at a historic site, in your opinion?

5. Would you now recommend future excavations at Jamestown?

6. What questions would you now seek to answer through excavations at Jamestown?

7. Where would you now seek to excavate at Jamestown?

8. Why would you choose the above indicated location(s)?

9. To what extent do you believe that historical archaeology was "given birth" at Jamestown?

10. If you had the time and were so inclined, what would your most important revisions be to your published work on Jamestown?

11. What recommendations would you now make for cultural resource management at Jamestown?
Jamestown, Virginia as the first permanent English settlement in North America is a historic site of unquestionable significance. With its inclusion in the National Park System in 1934 it became the prototype for developing ethics of historic preservation. Guided by the precepts of history and architecture, the discipline of historical archaeology was given birth at Jamestown. The archaeological investigations at this site are research designs evolving in response to changing objectives of interpretation and protection. This symposium, an oral history of historical archaeology at Jamestown, will enhance our understanding of the written records. A discussion between these pioneers in our field and their colleagues can generate a prospectus for research at Jamestown in light of the current state of the art.
APPENDIX I-4

ORAL HISTORY AND PERFORMANCE RELEASE

In view of the historical and scholarly value of the information contained in the interview dated _______ with Roni Hinote Polk, I knowingly and voluntarily permit the College of William and Mary full use of this information. In addition I hereby authorize Roni Hinote Polk and the College of William and Mary, without restriction of any kind, to use my name, photographic likeness, and voice, singly or in combination in a video tape recording or any reproduction thereof to be produced, distributed, and exhibited by Roni Hinote Polk, the College of William and Mary, and the Society for Historical Archaeology.

I understand that all materials being used are for educational purposes only. Therefore, I hereby grant and assign to Roni Hinote Polk and to the College of William and Mary full literary, property, and whatever other rights I may have to the interview, its recordings and resulting transcripts.

The taped recordings and resulting transcripts will become a part of the Archives of the Society for Historical Archaeology and stored at the Department of Anthropology at the College of William and Mary, where access to them for scholarly and educational use by qualified individuals will be administered by the Chairman of the Anthropology Department.

Date of agreement __________________________ Signature of Narrator __________________________

Narrator's Name __________________________

Narrator's Address __________________________

Interviewer's signature __________________________
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Public Law 210

July 8, 1906
CHAP. 3060.—An Act For the preservation of American antiquities.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any person who shall appropriate, excavate, injure, or destroy any historic or prehistoric ruin or monument, or any object of antiquity, situated on lands owned or controlled by the Government of the United States, without the permission of the Secretary of the Department of the Government having jurisdiction over the lands on which said antiquities are situated, shall, upon conviction, be fined in a sum of not more than five hundred dollars or be imprisoned for a period of not more than ninety days, or shall suffer both fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.

Sec. 2. That the President of the United States is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to declare by public proclamation historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest that are situated upon the lands owned or controlled by the Government of the United States to be national monuments, and may reserve as a part thereof parcels of land, the limits of which in all cases shall be confined to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected: Provided, That when such objects are situated upon a tract covered by a bona fide unperfected claim or held in private ownership, the tract, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the proper care and management of the object, may be relinquished to the Government, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to accept the relinquishment of such tracts in behalf of the Government of the United States.

Sec. 3. That permits for the examination of ruins, the excavation of archaeologic sites, and the gathering of objects of antiquity upon the lands under their respective jurisdictions may be granted by the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, and War to institutions which they may deem properly qualified to conduct such examination, excavation, or gathering, subject to such rules and regulations as they may prescribe: Provided, That the examinations, excavations, and gatherings are undertaken for the benefit of reputable museums, universities, colleges, or other recognized scientific or educational institutions, with a view to increasing the knowledge of such objects, and that the gatherings shall be made for permanent preservation in public museums.

Sec. 4. That the Secretaries of the Departments aforesaid shall make and publish from time to time uniform rules and regulations for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Approved, June 8, 1906.

CHAP. 3061.—An Act To appropriate the sum of forty thousand dollars as a part contribution toward the erection of a monument at Provincetown, Massachusetts, in commemoration of the landing of the Pilgrims and the signing of the Mayflower compact.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of forty thousand dollars, to aid in erecting a monument at Provincetown, Massachusetts, in commemoration of the first landing of the Pilgrims on Cape Cod and the signing of the compact in the cabin of the Mayflower in the harbor of said Provincetown: Provided, That the said sum of forty thousand dollars shall not be payable until there shall have been raised and made available for the erection of said monument an additional sum of at least forty thousand dollars: Provided further, That the design of said monument shall be approved of the Secretary of War, the governor of the Commonwealth of Mas-
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Public Law 235

August 23, 1916
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby created in the Department of the Interior a service to be called the National Park Service, which shall be under the charge of a director, who shall be appointed by the Secretary and who shall receive a salary of $4,500 per annum. There shall also be appointed by the Secretary the following assistants and other employees at the salaries designated: One assistant director, at $2,500 per annum; one chief clerk, at $2,000 per annum; one draftsman, at $1,500 per annum; one messenger, at $600 per annum; and, in addition thereto, such other employees as the Secretary of the Interior shall deem necessary: Provided, That not more than $8,100 annually shall be expended for salaries of experts, assistants, and employees within the District of Columbia not herein specifically enumerated unless previously authorized by law. The service thus established shall promote and regulate the use of the Federal areas known as national parks, monuments, and reservations hereinafter specified by such means and measures as conform to the fundamental purpose of the said parks, monuments, and reservations, which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

Sec. 2. That the director shall, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, have the supervision, management, and control of the several national parks and national monuments which are now under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, and of the Hot Springs Reservation in the State of Arkansas, and of such other national parks and reservations of like character as may be hereafter created by Congress: Provided, That in the supervision, management, and control of national monuments contiguous to national forests the Secretary of Agriculture may cooperate with said National Park Service to such extent as may be requested by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 3. That the Secretary of the Interior shall make and publish such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or proper for the use and management of the parks, monuments, and reservations under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, and any violations of any of the rules and regulations authorized by this Act shall be punished as provided for in section fifty of the Act entitled "An Act to codify and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March fourth, nineteen hundred and nine, as amended by section six of the Act of June twenty-fifth, nineteen hundred and ten (Thirty-sixth United States Statutes at Large, page eight hundred and fifty-seven). He may also, upon terms and conditions to be fixed by him, sell or dispose of timber in those cases where in his judgment the cutting of such timber is required in order to control the attacks of insects or diseases or otherwise conserve the scenery or the natural or historic objects in any such park, monument, or reservation. He may also provide in his discretion for the destruction of such animals and of such plant life as may be detrimental to the use of any of said parks, monuments, or reservations. He may also grant leases, and permits for the use of land for the accommodation of visitors in the various parks, monuments, or other reservations herein provided for, but for periods not exceeding twenty years; and no natural curiosities, wonders, or objects of interest shall be leased, rented, or granted to anyone on such terms as to interfere with free access to the same by the public: Provided, however, That the Secretary of the Interior may, under such rules and regulations and on such terms as he may prescribe, grant the privilege to graze live stock within any
national park, monument, or reservation herein referred to when in his judgment such use is not detrimental to the primary purpose for which such park, monument, or reservation was created, except that this provision shall not apply to the Yellowstone National Park.

Sec. 4. That nothing in this Act contained shall affect or modify the provisions of the Act approved February fifteenth, nineteen hundred and one, entitled "An Act relating to rights of way through certain parks, reservations, and other public lands."


CHAP. 409.—An Act Granting the consent of Congress to the board of county commissioners of the county of Hampden, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to construct a bridge across the Connecticut River between Springfield and West Springfield, in said county and Commonwealth.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the board of county commissioners of the county of Hampden, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the city of Springfield, in said county, and their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Connecticut River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation between the city of Springfield and the town of West Springfield, in the county of Hampden, in the State of Massachusetts, in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March twenty-third, nineteen hundred and six.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.


CHAP. 412.—An Act To amend an Act relating to the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, approved March fourth, nineteen hundred and thirteen.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section eight, paragraph one, of an Act entitled "An Act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and fourteen, and for other purposes," approved March fourth, nineteen hundred and thirteen, relating to the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia (Thirty-seventh Statutes at Large, page nine hundred and seventy-five), as amended by an Act approved February twenty-fifth, nineteen hundred and sixteen, be amended by adding to the names of the companies excluded from the operation of said section, after the words, "and the Washington and Old Dominion Railway, excepting as to the regulation of its operation inside of the District of Columbia," in the third subdivision of said paragraph, on page nine hundred and seventy-five, the following: "And the Washington-Virginia Railway Company, excepting as to the regulation of its operation inside of the District of Columbia."

Approved, August 26, 1916.

August 28, 1916.

CHAP. 414.—An Act To authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized to establish, provide, or improve the
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Public Law 510

July 3, 1930
visions of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this Act, and subject to the approval of the proper authorities in Canada.

Sec. 2. There is hereby conferred upon Robertson and Janin Company, its successors and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property in the State of Minnesota needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State of Minnesota upon making just compensation therefor to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

Sec. 3. The said Robertson and Janin Company, its successors and assigns, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge in accordance with any laws of Minnesota applicable thereto, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the Act of March 23, 1906.

Sec. 4. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this Act is hereby granted to Robertson and Janin Company, its successors and assigns, and any corporation to which or any persons to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation or person.

Sec. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

Approved, July 3, 1930.

CHAP. 837.—An Act To provide for the creation of the Colonial National Monument in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That upon proclamation of the President, as herein provided, sufficient of the areas hereinafter specified for the purposes of this Act shall be established and set apart as the Colonial National Monument for the preservation of the historical structures and remains thereon and for the benefit and enjoyment of the people.

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to make an examination of Jamestown Island, parts of the city of Williamsburg, and the Yorktown battle field, all in the State of Virginia, and areas for highways to connect said island, city, and battle field with a view to determining the area or areas thereof desirable for inclusion in the so-called Colonial National Monument, not to exceed two thousand five hundred acres of the said battle field or five hundred feet in width as to such connecting areas, and upon completion thereof he shall make appropriate recommendations to the President, who shall establish the boundaries of said national monument by proclamation: Provided, That the Boundaries so established may be enlarged or diminished by subsequent proclamation or proclamations of the President upon the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior, any such enlargement only to include lands donated to the United States or purchased by the United States without resort to condemnation.
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Sec. 3. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to accept donations of land, interest in land, buildings, structures, and other property within the boundaries of said monument as determined and fixed hereunder and donations of funds for the purchase and/or maintenance thereof, the evidence of title to such lands to be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior: Provided, That he may acquire on behalf of the United States by purchase when purchasable at prices deemed by him reasonable, otherwise by condemnation under the provisions of the Act of August 1, 1888 (U. S. C., title 40, secs. 257, 258; 25 Stat. 357), such tracts of land within the said monument as may be necessary for the completion thereof: Provided further, That condemnation proceedings herein provided for shall not be had, exercised, or resorted to as to lands belonging to the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, a corporation chartered under the laws of Virginia, or to the city of Williamsburg, Virginia, or to any other lands in said city except such lands as may be required for a right of way not exceeding two hundred feet in width through the city of Williamsburg to connect with highways or parkways leading from Williamsburg to Jamestown and to Yorktown.

Sec. 4. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums not exceeding $500,000 as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, to be available for all expenses incidental to the examination and establishment of the said Colonial National Monument and the protection and maintenance of lands and of buildings as acquired and/or constructed, as well as for the acquisition of lands needed for the completion of the monument, including the securing of options and other incidental expenses.

Sec. 5. That the administration, protection, and development of the aforesaid national monument shall be exercised under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior by the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916, entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service (U. S. C., title 16, secs. 1-4; 39 Stat. 535), and for other purposes," as amended.

Sec. 6. That nothing in this Act shall be held to deprive the State of Virginia, or any political subdivision thereof, of its civil and criminal jurisdiction in and over the areas included in said national monument, nor shall this Act in any way impair or affect the rights of citizenship of any resident therein; and save and except as the consent of the State of Virginia may be hereafter given, the legislative authority of said State in and over all areas included within said national monument shall not be diminished or affected by the creation of said national monument, nor by the terms and provisions of this Act: Provided, That any rules and regulations authorized in section 5, and in the Act therein referred to, shall not apply to any property of a public nature in the city of Williamsburg, other than property of the United States.

Sec. 7. In the event that lands and/or buildings, structures, and so forth, within the city of Williamsburg are donated to the United States and are thereafter revenue producing, the United States shall pay in the treasury of the city of Williamsburg 25 per centum of any rentals included in said revenues, and 25 per centum of the net proceeds of any commercial enterprise there conducted by the United States, such payment into the treasury of the city of Williamsburg not to exceed $20,000 in any year.

Approved, July 3, 1930.
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Public Law 212

June 30, 1932
SEC. 323. During the fiscal year 1932—
(a) the per diem fee authorized to be paid to jurors under section 2 of the Act of April 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 323), shall be $3 instead of $4;
(b) the per diem fee authorized to be paid to witnesses under section 3 of the Act of April 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 323), shall be $1.50 instead of $2, and the proviso of said section 3, relative to per diem for expenses of subsistence, shall be suspended.

TITLE IV—REORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 401. In order to further reduce expenditures and increase efficiency in government it is declared to be the policy of Congress—
(a) To group, coordinate, and consolidate executive and administrative agencies of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purpose;
(b) To reduce the number of such agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head;
(c) To eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort; and
(d) To segregate regulatory agencies and functions from those of an administrative and executive character.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 402. When used in this title—
(1) The term "executive agency" means any commission, board, bureau, division, service, or office in the executive branch of the Government, but does not include the executive departments mentioned in title 5, section 1, United States Code.
(2) The term "independent executive agency" means any executive agency not under the jurisdiction or control of any executive department.

POWER OF PRESIDENT

SEC. 403. For the purpose of carrying out the policy of Congress as declared in section 401 of this title, the President is authorized by Executive order—
(1) To transfer the whole or any part of any independent executive agency, and/or the functions thereof, to the jurisdiction and control of an executive department or another independent executive agency;
(2) To transfer the whole or any part of any executive agency, and/or the functions thereof, from the jurisdiction and control of the executive department to the jurisdiction and control of another executive department; or
(3) To consolidate or redistribute the functions vested in any executive department or in the executive agencies included in any executive department; and
(4) To designate and fix the name and functions of any consolidated activity or executive agency and the title, powers and duties of its executive head.

SEC. 404. The President's order directing any transfer or consolidation under the provisions of this title shall also designate the records, property (including office equipment), personnel, and unexpended balances of appropriations to be transferred.
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Public Law 5

March 31, 1933
To provide for the acceptance of sums donated for the construction of a swimming exercise tank for the use of the President.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital is authorized, on behalf of the United States, to accept the fund raised by donations or contributions to cover the cost of constructing, in the West Terrace of the White House, a swimming exercise tank for the use of the President.

Sec. 2. The amount so received shall be disbursed by the Director for the construction and equipment of such swimming exercise tank and shall be expended in the same manner as appropriations for the maintenance and care of the White House. The amount of the fund in excess of the amount required for the construction and equipment of the swimming exercise tank shall be returned to the donors.

Sec. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the Director is authorized to request the cooperation and assistance of the architectural, engineering, construction, or other forces of any department or agency of the Government.

Approved, March 30, 1933.

For the relief of unemployment through the performance of useful public work, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purpose of relieving the acute condition of widespread distress and unemployment now existing in the United States, and in order to provide for the restoration of the country's depleted natural resources and the advancement of an orderly program of useful public works, the President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe and by utilizing such existing departments or agencies as he may designate, to provide for employing citizens of the United States who are unemployed, in the construction, maintenance and carrying on of works of a public nature in connection with the forestation of lands belonging to the United States or to the several States which are suitable for timber production, the prevention of forest fires, floods and soil erosion, plant pest and disease control, the construction, maintenance or repair of paths, trails and fire-lanes in the national parks and national forests, and such other work on the public domain, national and State, and Government reservations incidental to or necessary in connection with any projects of the character enumerated, as the President may determine to be desirable: Provided, That the President may in his discretion extend the provisions of this Act to lands owned by counties and municipalities and lands in private ownership, but only for the purpose of doing thereon such kinds of cooperative work as are now provided for by Acts of Congress in preventing and controlling forest fires and the attacks of forest tree pests and diseases and such work as is necessary in the public interest to control floods. The President is further authorized, by regulation, to provide for housing the persons so employed and for furnishing them with such subsistence, clothing, medical attendance and hospitalization, and
cash allowance, as may be necessary, during the period they are so employed, and, in his discretion, to provide for the transportation of such persons to and from the places of employment. That in employing citizens for the purposes of this Act no discrimination shall be made on account of race, color, or creed; and no person under conviction for crime and serving sentence therefor shall be employed under the provisions of this Act. The President is further authorized to allocate funds available for the purposes of this Act, for forest research, including forest products investigations, by the Forest Products Laboratory.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, the President is authorized to enter into such contracts or agreements with States as may be necessary, including provisions for utilization of existing State administrative agencies, and the President, or the head of any department or agency authorized by him to construct any project or to carry on any such public works, shall be authorized to acquire real property by purchase, donation, condemnation, or otherwise, but the provisions of section 355 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any property so acquired.

Sec. 3. Insofar as applicable, the benefits of the Act entitled "An Act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes", approved September 7, 1916, as amended, shall extend to persons given employment under the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 4. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be expended, under the direction of the President, out of any unobligated moneys heretofore appropriated for public works (except for projects on which actual construction has commenced or may be commenced within ninety days, and except maintenance funds for river and harbor improvements already allocated), such sums as may be necessary; and an amount equal to the amount so expended is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the same purposes for which such moneys were originally appropriated.

Sec. 5. That the unexpended and unallotted balance of the sum of $300,000,000 made available under the terms and conditions of the Act approved July 21, 1932, entitled "An Act to relieve destitution", and so forth, may be made available, or any portion thereof, to any State or Territory or States or Territories without regard to the limitation of 15 per centum or other limitations as to per centum.

Sec. 6. The authority of the President under this Act shall continue for the period of two years next after the date of the passage hereof and no longer.

Approved, March 31, 1933.

[CHAPTER 18.]

AN ACT

Relating to the prescribing of medicinal liquors.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the third sentence of section 7 of title II of the National Prohibition Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "no more liquor shall be prescribed to any person than is necessary to supply his medical needs, and no prescription shall be refilled. No person shall by any statement or representation that he knows is false, or could by
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August 21, 1935
To provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes,

(I. 593.)

An Act

To provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is hereby declared that it is a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings and objects of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary), through the National Park Service, for the purpose of effectuating the policy expressed in section 1 hereof, shall have the following powers and perform the following duties and functions:

(a) Secure, collate, and preserve drawings, plans, photographs, and other data of historic and archaeological sites, buildings, and objects.

(b) Make a survey of historic and archaeological sites, buildings, and objects for the purpose of determining which possess exceptional value as commemorating or illustrating the history of the United States.

(c) Make necessary investigations and researches in the United States relating to particular sites, buildings, or objects to obtain true and accurate historical and archaeological facts and information concerning the same.

(d) For the purpose of this Act, acquire in the name of the United States by gift, purchase, or otherwise any property, personal or real, or any interest in estate therein, title to any real property to be satisfactory to the Secretary; Provided, That no such property which is owned by any religious or educational institution, or which is owned or administered for the benefit of the public shall be so acquired without the consent of the owner: Provided further, That no such property shall be acquired or contract or agreement for the acquisition thereof made which will obligate the general fund of the Treasury for the payment of such property, unless or until Congress has appropriated money which is available for that purpose.
(e) Contract and make cooperative agreements with States, municipal subdivisions, corporations, associations, or individuals, with property used in connection therewith for public use, regardless as to whether the title thereto is in the United States: Provided, That no contract or cooperative agreement shall be made or entered into which will obligate the general fund of the Treasury unless or until Congress has appropriated money for such purpose.

(f) Restore, reconstruct, rehabilitate, preserve, and maintain historic or prehistoric sites, buildings, objects, and properties of national historical or archaeological significance and where deemed desirable establish and maintain museums in connection therewith.

(g) Erect and maintain tablets to mark or commemorate historic or prehistoric places and events of national historical or archaeological significance.

(h) Operate and manage historic and archaeological sites, buildings, and properties acquired under the provisions of this Act together with lands and subordinate buildings for the benefit of the public, such authority to include the power to charge reasonable visitation fees and grants, leases, or permits for the use of land, building space, roads, or trails when necessary or desirable either to accommodate the public or to facilitate administration: Provided, That such concessions, leases, or permits, shall be let at competitive bidding, to the person making the highest and best bid.

(i) When the Secretary determines that it would be administratively burdensome to restore, reconstruct, operate, or maintain any particular historic or archaeological building, site, or property donated to the United States through the National Park Service, he may cause the same to be done by organizing a corporation for that purpose under the laws of the District of Columbia or any State.

(j) Develop an educational program and service for the purpose of making available to the public facts and information pertaining to American historic and archaeological sites, buildings, and properties of national significance. Reasonable charges may be made for the dissemination of any such facts or information.

(k) Perform any and all acts, and make such rules and regulations not inconsistent with this Act as may be necessary to carry out the provisions thereof. Any person violating any of the rules and regulations authorized by this Act shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500 and be adjudged to pay all cost of the proceedings.

Sec. 3. A general advisory board to be known as the "Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments" is hereby established, to be composed of not to exceed eleven persons, citizens of the United States, to include representatives competent in the fields of history, archaeology, architecture, and human geography, who shall be appointed by the Secretary and serve at his pleasure. The members of such board shall receive no salary but may be paid expenses incidental to travel when engaged in discharging their duties as such members.

It shall be the duty of such board to advise on any matters pertaining to national parks and to the administration of this Act submitted to it for consideration by the Secretary. It may also recommend policies to the Secretary from time to time pertaining to national parks and to the restoration, reconstruction, conservation, and general administration of historic and archaeological sites, buildings, and properties.
Sect. 4. The Secretary, in administering this Act, is authorized to cooperate with and may seek and accept the assistance of any Federal, State, or municipal department or agency, or any educational or scientific institution, or any patriotic association, or any individual.

(b) When deemed necessary, technical advisory committees may be established to act in an advisory capacity in connection with the restoration or reconstruction of any historic or prehistoric building or structure.

(c) Such professional and technical assistance may be employed without regard to the civil-service laws, and such service may be established as may be required to accomplish the purposes of this Act and for which money may be appropriated by Congress or made available by gifts for such purpose.

Sect. 5. Nothing in this Act shall be held to deprive any State, or political subdivision thereof, of its civil and criminal jurisdiction in and over lands acquired by the United States under this Act.

Sect. 6. There is authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the purposes of this Act such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine.

Sect. 7. The provisions of this Act shall control if any of them are in conflict with any other Act or Acts relating to the same subject matter.

Approved, August 21, 1935.

[CHAPTER 594.]

AN ACT

To extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Chesapeake Bay between Baltimore and Kent Counties, Maryland.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Chesapeake Bay between Baltimore and Kent Counties, Maryland, authorized to be built by the Chesapeake Bay Bridge Company by section 11 of the Act of Congress approved March 4, 1933, and extended by Act of Congress approved June 12, 1934, are hereby further extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

Sect. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressed reserved.

Approved, August 21, 1935.

[CHAPTER 595.]

AN ACT

To amend and supplement the steering rules respecting orders to helmsmen on all vessels navigating waters of the United States, and on all vessels of the United States navigating any waters or seas, in section 1 of the Act of August 19, 1890, section 1 of the Act of June 7, 1897, section 1 of the Act of February 18, 1895, and section 1 of the Act of February 19, 1895.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Act of August 19, 1890 (ch. 502. 26 Stat. 520; U. S. C., title 33, secs. 61 to 141, arts. 1 to 31), is amended and supplemented by adding at the end thereof as section 1:2: title 33, of the United States Code the following:

"(a) All orders to helmsmen shall be given as follows:

"'Right Rudder' to mean 'Direct the vessel's head to starboard.'

"'Left Rudder' to mean 'Direct the vessel's head to port.'
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Public Law 633

August 7, 1946
[CHAPTER 788]

AN ACT

To provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the National Park Service.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That appropriations for the National Park Service are authorized for—

(a) Necessary protection of the area of federally owned land in the custody of the National Park Service known as the Ocean Strip and Quetts Corridor, adjacent to Olympic National Park, Washington; necessary repairs to the roads from Glacier Park Station through the Blackfeet Indian Reservation to the various points in the boundary line of Glacier National Park, Montana, and the international boundary; repair and maintenance of approximately two and seventy-seven one-hundredths miles of road leading from United States Highway 187 to the north entrance of Grand Teton National Park, Wyoming; maintenance of approach roads through the Lassen National Forest leading to Lassen Volcanic National Park, California; maintenance and repair of the Generals Highway between the boundaries of Sequoia National Park, California, and the Grant Grove section of Kings Canyon National Park, California; maintenance of approximately two and one-fourth miles of roads comprising those portions of the Fresno-Kings Canyon approach road. Park Ridge Lookout Road, and Ash Mountain-Advance truck trail, necessary to the administration and protection of the Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks; maintenance of the roads in the national forests leading out of Yellowstone National Park, Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana; maintenance of the road in the Stanislaus National Forest connecting the Tioga Road with the Hetch Hetchy Road near Mather Station, Yosemite National Park, California; and maintenance and repair of the approach road to the Custer Battlefield National Monument and the road connecting the said monument with the Reno Monument site, Montana.

(b) Administration, protection, improvement, and maintenance of areas, under the jurisdiction of other agencies of the Government, devoted to recreational use pursuant to cooperative agreements.

(c) Necessary local transportation and subsistence in kind of persons selected for employment or as cooperators, serving without other compensation, while attending fire-protection training camps.

(d) Administration, protection, maintenance, and improvement of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal.

(e) Educational lectures in or in the vicinity of and with respect to the national parks, national monuments, and other reservations under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service; and services of field employees in cooperation with such nonprofit scientific and historical societies engaged in educational work in the various parks and monuments as the Secretary of the Interior may designate.

(f) Travel expenses of employees attending Government camps for training in forest-fire prevention and suppression and the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Police Academy, and attending Federal, State, or municipal schools for training in building fire prevention and suppression.

(g) Investigation and establishment of water rights in accordance with local custom, laws, and decisions of courts, including the acquisition of water rights or of lands or interests in lands or rights-of-way for use and protection of water rights necessary or beneficial in the administration and public use of the national parks and monuments.

August 7, 1916

[Public Law 624]
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(h) Acquisition of rights-of-way and construction and maintenance of a water supply line partly outside the boundaries of Mesa Verde National Park.

(i) Official telephone service in the field in the case of official telephones installed in private houses when authorized under regulations established by the Secretary.

Approved August 7, 1946.

[CHAPTER 789]

AN ACT

For the relief of certain postmasters.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit for payments of per diem made by postmasters acting under direction of the First Assistant Postmaster General to postal employees detailed to postal units at camps, posts, or stations to handle military mail or at civilian plants devoted to war production at rates not to exceed that provided and authorized by the Act of December 7, 1945, Public Law 249, the credit to be allowed notwithstanding that the payments were made on orders issued retroactively by the Postmaster General.

Approved August 7, 1946.

[CHAPTER 790]

AN ACT

To clarify the rights of former owners of real property to reacquire such property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 23 (a) (1) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The term ‘real property’ means property consisting of land, together with any fixtures and improvements thereon (including hotels, apartment houses, hospitals, office buildings, stores, and other commercial structures) located outside the District of Columbia, but does not include (A) commercial structures constructed by, at the direction of, or on behalf of any Government agency, (B) commercial structures which the Administrator determines have been made an integral part of a functional or economic unit which should be disposed of as a whole, and (C) war housing, industrial plants, factories, airports, airport facilities, or similar structures and facilities, or the sites thereof, or land which the Administrator determines essential to the use of any of the foregoing; and"

Sec. 2. Section 23 (c) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The classification of property by the Administrator (including the determination of whether property is ‘real property’ as defined in this section) shall be based on the highest and best use of the property at the time it is reported as surplus property regardless of its former character or use.”

Sec. 3. The Secretary of War and the War Assets Administration are authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary (A) to reinstate the leasehold covering the Chamberlin Hotel, Fort Monroe, Old Point Comfort, Virginia, and its appurtenant land, buildings, utilities, and facilities, which leasehold, with all the furnishings and equipment used in connection therewith, was acquired
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Public Law 448

March 29, 1936
shall be established by concurrent resolution of the Congress or by
determination of the President.

Sec. 3. That the third sentence of the first section of said Act is
hereby amended by deleting therefrom the words "The amount allowed
on account of personal injury or death shall be limited to reasonableness
medical, hospital, and burial expenses actually incurred, except that",
and by capitalizing the following word "no".

Sec. 4. That the amendment made by the third section of this Act
shall be effective only with respect to claims accruing after the date of
its enactment.

Approved March 29, 1956.

Public Law 447
AN ACT
To abolish the Castle Pinckney National Monument, in the State of South
Carolina, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the
United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Castle
Pinckney National Monument, South Carolina, is hereby abolished
and the property contained therein is hereby authorized to be disposed
of in accordance with the laws relating to the disposition of surplus
Federal property.

Approved March 29, 1956.

Public Law 448
AN ACT
To authorize land exchanges for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park,
in the State of Virginia; to authorize the transfer of certain lands of Colonial
National Historical Park, in the State of Virginia, to the Commonwealth of
Virginia; and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the
United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purpose
of preserving more effectively for the public benefit the historic prop-
erties within Colonial National Historical Park, Virginia, the Secre-
tary of the Interior is authorized to consummate desirable land
exchanges, as hereafter prescribed, and thereby to reduce and adjust
the boundaries of the park. Any lands eliminated from the park here-
under shall not subsequently be added to the park except by Act of
Congress.

In furtherance of these purposes, the Secretary is authorized on
behalf of the United States to accept from grantors title to non-
Federal land and interests in land, together with the improvements
thereon, situated within the authorized park boundaries, and in
exchange therefor, to convey by deed on behalf of the United States
to the aforesaid grantors land or interests therein, together with the
improvements thereof, situated within Colonial National Historical Park
that may be used advantageously for exchange purposes. The
aforesaid exchanges are authorized to be made without additional
compensation by either party to the exchange when the properties to
be exchanged are of approximately equal value. When, however, the
properties are not of approximately equal value, as may be determined
by the Secretary, an additional payment of funds shall be required by
the Secretary or by the grantor of non-Federal properties, as the case
may be, in order to make an equal exchange. The Secretary is authorized to use any land acquisition funds relating to the National Park System for such purposes. The Secretary may consummate land exchanges herein authorized upon such terms, conditions, and procedures as he may find to be necessary or desirable in carrying out the purposes of this Act: and in evaluating non-Federal properties to be acquired hereunder, he is authorized to make such allowance as he may find to be equitable for the value of any residential properties that may be situated upon land to be acquired pursuant to this Act. If expedient and in the public interest to do so, he may assist in the removal of structures from property to be acquired hereunder through the exchange procedure, and he may cooperate with public or private agencies and persons in the securing of housing for the aforesaid grantors who may require new housing accommodations or facilities as a result of the land exchanges herein authorized.

Sec. 2. The Secretary is further authorized to transfer without compensation up to fifteen acres of the Colonial National Historical Park, Virginia, to the Commonwealth of Virginia for use by agencies of the Commonwealth in the establishment of a State Park in furtherance of the purposes of the Colonial National Historical Park.

Approved March 29, 1956.

Public Law 449

AN ACT

Affirming that title to a certain tract of land in California vested in the State of California on January 21, 1897.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to tract 39, township 4 north, range 18 east, Mount Diablo meridian, California, as identified on the plat of survey approved August 5, 1931, by the United States Supervisor of Surveys and accepted on March 2, 1932, by the Assistant Commissioner of the General Land Office of the Department of the Interior, vested in the State of California on January 21, 1897, the date on which the original plat of survey of such lands was accepted by the Commissioner of the General Land Office of such Department under the school land grant made to such State by the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the Survey of the Public Lands in California, the granting of Preemption Rights therein, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1853 (10 Stat. 244), and that the United States has not held any interest in such lands since the date on which title to it so vested in the State of California.

Approved March 29, 1956.

Public Law 450

AN ACT

To authorize the execution of mortgages and deeds of trust on individual Indian trust or restricted land.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the individual Indian owners of any land which either is held by the United States in trust for them or is subject to a restriction against alienation imposed by the United States are authorized, subject to approval by the
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Public Law 573

June 13, 1956
isolated areas for employees, student dependents of employees, and other pupils, and such activities may be financed under cooperative arrangements; purchase and bestowal of certificates and trophies in connection with mine rescue and first-aid work: Provided, That the Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private: Provided further, That the sums made available for the current fiscal year to the Department of the Army, Navy, and Air Force for the acquisition of helium from the Bureau of Mines shall be transferred to the Bureau of Mines, and said sums, together with all other payments to the Bureau of Mines for helium, shall be credited to the special helium production fund, established pursuant to the Act of March 3, 1925, as amended (50 U. S. C. 164 (c)): Provided further, That the Bureau of Mines is authorized, during the current fiscal year, to sell directly or through any Government agency, including corporations, any metal or mineral product that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated by the Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

For expenses necessary for the management and protection of the areas and facilities administered by the National Park Service, including protection of lands in process of condemnation; and for plans, investigations, and studies of the recreational resources (exclusive of preparation of detail plans and working drawings) and archaeological values in river basins of the United States (except the Missouri River Basin); $11,562,000.

MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of roads (including furnishing special road maintenance service to defense trucking permittees on a reimbursable basis), trails, buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities essential to the operation of areas administered pursuant to law by the National Park Service, $10,158,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and improvement, without regard to the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U. S. C. 451), of buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities; and the acquisition of lands, interests therein, improvements, and water rights; to remain available until expended, $15,250,000, of which not to exceed $250,000 shall be available for the construction of additional school facilities at Grand Canyon National Park, Arizona.

CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in section 6 of the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 73), including acquisition of right-of-way for the eastern entrance road, Rocky Mountain National Park, Colorado, $29,800,963, to remain available until expended.
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Public Law 91-332

July 10, 1970
Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is directed to request the President to issue a proclamation designating the year 1972 as "National Parks Centennial Year", in recognition of the establishment on March 1, 1872, of the world's first national park, Yellowstone, which advanced a new concept of land use in setting aside an outstanding natural area in perpetuity for the benefit and enjoyment of the people.

Sec. 2. (a) There is hereby established a National Parks Centennial Commission (hereinafter referred to as "the Commission") to be composed of the following members:

1. four Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate;
2. four Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;
3. the Secretary of the Interior or his representative; and
4. six persons to be appointed by the President from among persons not officers or employees of the Federal Government and who, in the judgment of the President, have outstanding knowledge and experience in the fields of natural and historical resource preservation and public recreation.

(b) The President shall designate one of the members appointed by him as Chairman of the Commission.

(c) The members of the Commission shall receive no compensation for their services as such, but members from the legislative branch shall be allowed necessary travel expenses as authorized by law for official travel, members of the executive branch shall be allowed necessary travel expenses in accordance with section 5702 of title 5, United States Code, and members appointed by the President shall be allowed necessary travel expenses as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 5703). Staff of the Commission shall be allowed necessary travel expenses in accordance with section 5702 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers or functions, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

Sec. 3. The functions of the Commission shall be (1) to prepare, and execute, in cooperation with Federal, State, local, nongovernmental agencies and organizations, and appropriate international organizations, a suitable plan for commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the beginning of the worldwide national park movement by the establishment of Yellowstone National Park in 1872; (2) to coordinate the activities of such agencies and organizations undertaken pursuant to such plan; and (3) to provide, in cooperation with such agencies and organizations, host services for a world conference.
on National Parks in 1972, and to assist in representing the United States in the activities of such conference.

Sec. 4. The Commission may employ such personnel as may be necessary to carry out its functions, with or without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, in its discretion.

Sec. 5. (a) The Commission is authorized to accept donations of money, property, or personal services; to cooperate with public and private associations, and educational institutions; and to request advice and assistance from appropriate Federal departments or agencies in carrying out its functions. Such Federal departments and agencies are authorized to furnish the Commission such advice and assistance with or without reimbursement. To the extent it finds necessary, the Commission may, without regard to the laws and procedures applicable to Federal departments and agencies, make contracts, procure supplies, property, and services (including printing and publishing), and may exercise the powers needed to carry out its functions efficiently and in the public interest.

(b) The Director of the National Park Service or his designee shall be the Executive Director of the Commission. Financial and administrative services (including those related to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) shall be provided the Commission by the Department of the Interior, for which payment shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement, from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the Commission and the Secretary of the Interior: Provided, That the regulations of the Department of the Interior for the collection of indebtedness of personnel resulting from erroneous payments (5 U.S.C. 5514) shall apply to the collection of erroneous payments made to or on behalf of a Commission employee, and regulations of said Secretary for the administrative control of funds (31 U.S.C. 665(g)) shall apply to appropriations of the Commission.

(c) Beginning with the end of the calendar year in which the Commission is first established, the Commission shall submit annual reports of its activities and plans to the Congress. The Commission shall submit a final report of its activities, including an accounting of funds received and expended, to the Congress, not later than December 31, 1973, and shall cease to exist upon submission of said report.

(d) Upon termination of the Commission and after consultation with the Archivist of the United States and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, the Secretary of the Interior may deposit all books, manuscripts, miscellaneous printed matter, memorabilia, relics, and other similar materials of the Commission relating to the National Parks Centennial in Federal, State, or local libraries or museums or make other disposition of such materials. Other property acquired by the Commission remaining upon its termination may be used by the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of the national park system or may be disposed of as excess or surplus property. The net revenues, after payment of Commission expenses, derived from Commission activities shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

Sec. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than $250,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act: Provided, That no part of such appropriations shall be available for obligation by the Commission until and unless at least $300,000 in donations have been actually collected by the Commission from non-Federal sources.

Approved July 10, 1970.
Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1136(9), 1136(11) and 1157(a), respectively); and under regulations prescribed by the Controller General of the United States, rental of living quarters in foreign countries and travel benefits comparable with those which are now or hereafter may be granted single employees of the Agency for International Development, including single Foreign Service personnel assigned to AID projects, by the Administrator of the Agency for International Development—his designee—under the authority of Section 636(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-195, 22 U.S.C. 2396(b)), $74,020,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 102. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for the maintenance or care of private vehicles.

Sec. 103. Whenever any office or position not specifically established by the Legislative Pay Act of 1929 is appropriated for herein or whenever the rate of compensation or designation of any position appropriated for herein is different from that specifically established for such position by such Act, the rate of compensation and the designation of the position, or either, appropriated for or provided herein, shall be the permanent law with respect thereto: Provided, That the provisions herein for the various items of official expenses of Members, officers, and committees of the Senate and House, and clerk hire for Senators and Members shall be the permanent law with respect thereto: Provided further, That the provisions relating to positions and salaries thereof carried in House Resolutions 644 and 865, Ninety-first Congress, shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

Sec. 104. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

This Act may be cited as the "Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1971".

Approved August 18, 1970.

Public Law 91-383

AN ACT

To improve the administration of the national park system by the Secretary of the Interior, and to clarify the authorities applicable to the system, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress declares that the national park system, which began with establishment of Yellowstone National Park in 1872, has since grown to include superlative natural, historic, and recreation areas in every major region of the United States, its territories and island possessions; that these areas, though distinct in character, are united through their inter-related purposes and resources into one national park system as cumulative expressions of a single national heritage; that, individually and collectively, these areas derive increased national dignity and recognition of their superb environmental quality through their inclusion jointly with each other in one national park system preserved and managed for the benefit and inspiration of all the people of the United States; and that it is the purpose of this Act to include all such areas in the System and to clarify the authorities applicable to the system.

August 18, 1970 [H. R. 14114]
Sec. 2. (a) Section 1 of the Act of August 8, 1953 (67 Stat. 496; 16 U.S.C. 1b), is amended by deleting "and miscellaneous areas administered in connection therewith" and "and miscellaneous areas" wherever they appear.
(b) Section 2 of the Act of August 8, 1953 (67 Stat. 496; 16 U.S.C. 1c), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. (a) The 'national park system' shall include any area of land and water now or hereafter administered by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service for park, monument, historic, parkway, recreational, or other purposes.

(b) Each area within the national park system shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of any statute made specifically applicable to that area. In addition, the provisions of this Act, and the various authorities relating to the administration and protection of areas under the administration of the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service, including but not limited to the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended (16 U.S.C. 1, 2-4), the Act of March 4, 1911 (38 Stat. 1253), as amended (16 U.S.C. 5) relating to rights-of-way, the Act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 917), as amended (16 U.S.C. 6), relating to donation of land and money, sections 1, 4, 5, and 6 of the Act of April 9, 1924 (43 Stat. 90), as amended (16 U.S.C. 8 and 8a-8f), relating to roads and trails, the Act of March 4, 1931 (45 Stat. 1570; 16 U.S.C. 8d) relating to approach roads to national monuments, the Act of June 3, 1934 (62 Stat. 334), as amended (16 U.S.C. 8e-8f), relating to conveyance of roads to States, the Act of August 8, 1953 (67 Stat. 490), as amended (16 U.S.C. 12), relating to aid to visitors in emergencies, the Act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 873; 16 U.S.C. 10), relating to arrests, sections 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the Act of May 26, 1930 (46 Stat. 581), as amended (16 U.S.C. 17b, 17c, 17d, and 17e), relating to services or other accommodations for the public, emergency supplies and services to concessioners, acceptability of travelers checks, care and removal of indigents, the Act of October 3, 1915 (39 Stat. 696; 16 U.S.C. 20-20g), relating to concessions, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, and the Act of July 13, 1968 (82 Stat. 355), shall, to the extent such provisions are not in conflict with any such specific provision, be applicable to all areas within the national park system and any reference in such Act to national parks, monuments, recreation areas, historic monuments, or parkways shall hereinafter not be construed as limiting such Acts to those areas."

Sec. 3. In order to facilitate the administration of the national park system, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, under such terms and conditions as he may deem advisable, to carry out the following activities:

(a) provide transportation of employees located at isolated areas of the national park system and to members of their families, where (1) such areas are not adequately served by commercial transportation, and (2) such transportation is incidental to official transportation services;
(b) provide recreation facilities, equipment, and services for use by employees and their families located at isolated areas of the national park system;
(c) appoint and establish such advisory committees in regard to the functions of the National Park Service as he may deem advisable, members of which shall receive no compensation for their services as such but who shall be allowed necessary travel expenses as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 5703);
(d) purchase field and special purpose equipment required by employees for the performance of assigned functions which shall be regarded and listed as park equipment;

(e) enter into contracts which provide for the sale or lease to persons, States, or their political subdivisions, of services, resources, or water available within an area of the national park system, if such person, State, or its political subdivision—

(1) provides public accommodations or services within the immediate vicinity of an area of the national park system to persons visiting the area; and

(2) has demonstrated to the Secretary that there are no reasonable alternatives by which to acquire or perform the necessary services, resources, or water;

(f) acquire, and have installed, air-conditioning units for any Government-owned passenger motor vehicles used by the National Park Service, where assigned duties necessitate long periods in automobiles or in regions of the United States where high temperatures and humidity are common and prolonged;

(g) sell at fair market value without regard to the requirements of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, products and services produced in the conduct of living exhibits and interpretive demonstrations in areas of the national park system, to enter into contracts including cooperative arrangements with respect to such living exhibits and interpretive demonstrations and park programs, and to credit the proceeds therefrom to the appropriation bearing the cost of such exhibits and demonstrations.

Sec. 4. The Act of March 17, 1948 (62 Stat. 81), is amended by deleting from section 1 thereof the words “over which the United States has, or hereafter acquires, exclusive or concurrent criminal jurisdiction,” and changing section 3 to read as follows:

“Sec. 3. For the purposes of this Act, the environs of the District of Columbia are hereby defined as embracing Arlington, Fairfax, Loudoun, Prince William, and Stafford Counties and the city of Alexandria in Virginia, and Prince Georges, Charles, Anne Arundel, and Montgomery Counties in Maryland.”

Approved August 18, 1970.

Public Law 91-384

AN ACT

To amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to authorize marketing agreements providing for the advertising of papayas.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. The proviso at the end of section 8c(6)(I) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (as recodified by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and as subsequently amended (7 U.S.C. 608c (6)(I)), is amended by inserting “papayas,” immediately after “applicable to cherries.”

Approved August 18, 1970.
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JAMESTOWN ARCHAEOLOGICAL PROJECT

Policies and Objectives
General Long-Range Program Recommendations

Objectives:

By far the most important factor to be considered in planning a research program is the ultimate aim of the project—the objectives. For the Jamestown Project those can be stated as follows:

I. To secure and preserve all possible data on Jamestown history ("history" here used in its broadest sense). This data to be so recorded that it may be readily used by ourselves or by any student at any future time.

II. To assemble and study all such data so that we may eventually present a complete story of the 17th Century of Colonial History as exemplified at Jamestown.

A. In publications, reports, traveling exhibits, lectures, or whatever other educational device may be suitable for the material or in keeping with the educational policies of the Park Service.

B. In museum exhibits and other educational devices for the visitors who come to Colonial National Historical Park.

Our task is much more than simply the accumulation of data and materials which might some day be put to practical use in a museum or a publication. If such were the case we might far better leave the ground undisturbed, for there is not the slightest doubt that future generations could carry on the excavating much more efficiently than we can at this time. The public interest in Jamestown lies largely in its human history, which makes our task one of presenting this history to the people—not a mere handful who might chance upon a technical report or a folio of drawings in the Library of Congress, but the hundreds of
thousands who will visit the Park...

General Considerations: Factors Affecting our Program:

First of all this is a unit of the National Park Service, which means that our objectives and policies must be in accord with those of the parent organization, whether explicitly stated or implied. Most important of all, this relationship implies an obligation to the Public of a very definite nature which materially affects, and largely controls, our objectives...

It is important to keep in mind that this is an archaeological project. By that we do not mean that it is "pre-history" vs. "history;" Indian vs. White; or excavation vs. documentary research, but that we are attempting to gain a well-rounded picture of social and technological growth over the period during which Jamestown was inhabited. Further, it means that every possible source of data must be exhausted—written records, contemporary remains in other localities, and the evidence furnished by the study and interpretation of the materials and data from excavations.

We must once, and forever, forget that this Project is for the purpose of preserving a record which is in imminent danger of becoming lost. That very motive has led to the destruction of quantities of data which can never be replaced. The measured drawings of a building foundation, collected at the expense of other evidence in the ground which would provide some interpretation of the building and enable us to fit it into an historical framework, might far better never be acquired.

This suggests a most important precaution, and one which must be constantly borne in mind in working out our programs. That is, the unforgivable "sin" of proceeding too rapidly in excavating. It will require not less than five years to develop sufficient background and knowledge of the problems here to carry on excavating from which a reasonable proportion of the evidence will be obtained. This is not serious in the case of historical research, except from an economical standpoint, for student after student, or the same student a dozen times over, can examine, say, a bundle of letters in the Library of Congress. The pitiful part of archeology is that we must destroy while we are learning how not to destroy. There is no "royal road" to success in archeological research—no book of technical instructions which, if followed, would assure us of obtaining all possible data—and the best results
come from the combination of common sense, experience, a clear understanding of objectives, a frequent restatement of problems, and the necessary adjustment of our working program and techniques for carrying on the work.

(Paraphrased from Harrington, February 18, 1937:2-4)
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MISSION 66 GUIDELINES

1. Preservation of park resources is a basic requirement underlying all park management.

2. Substantial and appropriate use of the National Park System is the best means by which its basic purpose is realized and is the best guarantee of perpetuating the System.

3. Adequate and appropriate developments are required for public use and appreciation of an area, and for prevention of overuse. Visitor experiences which derive from the significant features of the parks without impairing them determine the nature and scope of developments.

4. An adequate information and interpretive service is essential to proper park experience. The principal purpose of such a program is to help the park visitor enjoy the area, and to appreciate and understand it, which leads directly to improved protection through visitor cooperation in caring for the park resources.

5. Concession-type services should be provided only in those areas where required for proper, appropriate park experience, and where these services cannot be furnished satisfactorily in neighboring communities. Exclusive franchises for concessionaires' services within a park, should be granted only where necessary to insure provision for dependable public service.

6. Large wilderness areas should be preserved undeveloped except for a simple facilities required for access, back-country use and protection, and in keeping with the wilderness atmosphere.

7. All persons desiring to enter a park area may do so; however it may be necessary to place a limit on the number of visitors who may enter certain prehistoric and historic ruins and structures because of limitations of space or because only a restricted number may safely pass over or through them at one time. Lodging, dining, and camping facilities cannot be guaranteed every visitor.
8. Operating and public-use facilities of both government and concessioners which encroach upon the important park features should be eliminated or relocated at sites of lesser importance, either within or outside the parks.

9. Where airports are needed they should be located outside the park boundaries; and use of aircraft within the areas of the System should be restricted to investigations, protection, rescue, and supply services.

10. Camping is an appropriate and important park visitor use in many parks, and every effort should be made to provide adequate facilities for this use.

11. Picnic grounds should be provided in areas where picnicking is an important element in the visitor day-use pattern.

12. A nation-wide plan for parks and recreation areas as envisioned in the Park, Parkway, and Recreational Area Study Act of 1936 should be completed and implemented as promptly as possible so that each level of government--local, State, and Federal--may bear its share of responsibility in the provision of recreation areas and services.

13. Adequate and modern living quarters for National Park Service employees should be provided when required for effective protection and management. Living quarters for government and concessioner employees, when located within the park, should be concentrated in a planned residential community out of public view.

14. The use of a park for organized events, organized competitive sports, or spectator events which attract abnormal concentrations of visitors and which require facilities, services, and manpower above those needed for normal operation should not be permitted except in the National Capital Parks.

(Wirth, 1980: 259-260)
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STATEMENT OF MAN-HOURS AND EXPENDITURES, BY N. P. S.
Projects 194, 102, 103, 104, Jamestown
November 21, 1954 to May 11, 1956

The following summary is based on actual man-hours worked by the field crew and the exact rates they represent. Because of the press of fiscal work in the office of Colonial National Historical Park at this time, it has not been possible to obtain exact figures on the expenditures for services and equipment; therefore, these will be estimated. The figures do not include the salaries of Messrs. Cotter, Hudson and Jelks. Projects 105, the Third-Fourth Statehouse Graveyard Search and Projects 100, 232 and 235, all devoted to the search for the First Fort, are mentioned in this and the final reports, but are not included in this summary of expenditures, since they were funded by the Virginia 350th Anniversary Commission, in the amount of $10,000.

Total Man-hours - 20,983
Total labor cost . . . . . . . . . . $27,035.36
Total equipment and services (est) . . 2,500.00

$29,535.63

(Cotter, 1957: 12)
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(Daily Press,
January 10, 1984:10)
The evidence also shows the fort probably was built by the same time that the fort was on the site of that El Marquis de la Corrodera's house. The excavation of the site of the fort was conducted to determine the exact position of the fort. The excavation resulted in a series of 1769 and 1772 almanacs. The site of the fort was eventually used for construction of the Puebla fort, which was constructed with an old mansion.

Archaeological work in 2001 at Jamestown Settlement by the Jamestown Rediscovery Project revealed the foundations of the fort. The discovered structures include the fort's exterior walls, a garrison house, and several buildings associated with the fort, including a church and a hospital. The site of the fort was located about a half mile to the east of Jamestown.

James City — James City, Indiana.

For more information, visit the Jamestown Rediscovery Project website.
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Map 1

(Samuel H. Yonge, 1930: 18-20)
The U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey of that year.

The 1609 map is a portion of Tillotson's map, greatly enlarged from the original, and the 1852 map is from the 1852 map, which is the point of land below Ochendeal Run. The line of the map is the line of the Jumonville Land, measured from the eastern part of the eastern end of the location corresponding with the location of the first settlement, but the 1869 map is two-thirds of the distance down the length of the map.

Two Jumonville Maps
Historians can be 'eyewitnesses' to history.

At a town meeting, a farmer stands up to speak. "I saw it happen," he says. "I was there." The town hall is crowded, people lean in to hear his story. It's important to remember that history isn't just about dates and events. It's about the people who lived through them. And sometimes, those people can be historians themselves.

This book is a collection of essays and interviews with historians who have witnessed history in action. From the Civil Rights Movement to the fall of the Berlin Wall, these stories offer a unique perspective on the events that have shaped our world.

"History is not just a collection of facts," one historian says. "It's about the people who lived through it, and the decisions they made."

By Avi Harwood

Jamesstown Quadratcennial

Historian eyes research project
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THE JAMESTOWN FRONTIER:
SUB-SYSTEM HYPOTHESES

1. The adoption of native subsistence items and techniques occurred quite early on the Jamestown frontier.

2. The same adverse conditions that favored the adoption of native domesticated products in Virginia were also in part responsible for a general broadening of the subsistence base of the English settlers.

3. Readjustment of the English colonists to the Virginia environment seems to have entailed the breakdown of specialized farming systems characteristic of the Old World.

4. Within the area of colonization, the concentration of subsistence activities was, of necessity, situated outside of the frontier town.

5. With the expansion of the area of colonization and the creation of new frontier towns closer to the edge of the frontier or more centrally located within the newly-settled areas, the role played by subsistence activities within the affected communities was subject to marked change.

6. The number of subsistence products upon which the colony eventually became dependent were much fewer than those in use in the metropolitan area.

7. Contact between the English colonist and the aboriginal inhabitants of Virginia was neither constant nor prolonged except during the first few years.

8. Because the necessity of adapting to a completely new environment far from the metropolitan area removed the Jamestown colony from normal networks of exchange and redistribution, it was necessary that many products usually obtained through channels be manufactured entirely or in part within the area of colonization.
9. Closely tied to the production of commodities for export to the manufacturing centers in England was the presence of certain types of part industries representing early phases of complex manufacturing processes.

10. The industrial activities which were successful within the area of colonization should be associated with its most densely-settled area, the frontier town.

11. With the replacement of Jamestown by Williamsburg as the frontier town of the Virginia peninsula, the focus of industrial activity shifted from the former to the latter and, to a lesser extent, to its principal port of Yorktown on the York River.

12. When compared with the social structure of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England, that of colonial Virginia immediately appears to have been abbreviated.

13. The settlement types characteristic of seventeenth-century England were not replaced in the Virginia colony.

14. A crucial part of the central role of the frontier town was its function as the sociopolitical center of the area of colonization.

15. The sociopolitical unity of the area of colonization has been the determinant to development of the colony of Virginia.

16. As the frontier expanded, the sociopolitical center of the Virginia colony shifted inland from the site of Jamestown to a position more ideally situated to the center of the area of colonization.

17. Trade with the Indians in the area of colonization should have constituted only a small part of the colonial economy except perhaps during the period of initial contact.

18. The frontier town plays a unique role in the trade and communication subsystem of the frontier area.

19. As in the case of the other three subsystems, the shift of the location of the frontier town through time entails a change in the focus of trade and communication within the area of colonization.

(Lewis, 1975: 348-429)
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Architectural Evidence of
Anglo-Dutch Acculturation and
Maritime Trade Influences
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<th>Earliest Date</th>
<th>Archaeological CNHP</th>
<th>Photographed</th>
<th>Architectural Features</th>
<th>Possible Evidence of Port Activities</th>
<th>Possible Dutch Port Evidence</th>
<th>Accepted to 1507</th>
<th>Accepted to 1527</th>
</tr>
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Map 1

(Samuel H. Yonge, 1930: 18-20)
THE SITE OF OLD "JAMES TOWNE."  19

18.—Tract of John Howard, 1674.
19.—Tract of Nathaniel Bacon, Sr., 1674. Contains foundation of chimney.
20.—Confederate fort constructed in 1681.
21.—Ancient tower ruin, included part of old graveyard, and foundation of third, fourth and fifth churches.
22.—Probable site of triangular fort constructed in 1697, designated in 16th century MS, "Fort Hill."
23.—Probable site of "bridge" (wharf), constructed by Dare in 1611.
24.—Probable landing place of first settlers, May 14, 1677, indicated by red flags.
25.—Approximate site of blockhouse, built by Captain Richard Stephens in 1624, and probably site of Berkeley's trench.
26.—Confederate redoubt commanding Back River, constructed in 1661.
27.—Modern ditch draining "Fitch and Tarr Swamp."
28.—Boundary lines of tracts belonging to the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities.
29.—"The old state house" (approximate), used from about 1650 to 1666, on one-acre tract, of which part was sold to Loudell and Stegg in 1657. Most probably contained Gov. Harvey's residence prior to 1641, Gov. Berkeley's residence prior to 1656 and subsequently Gov. Bennett's residence.
30.—Ruins of building on site of Amherst-Jagolinicz message.
31.—Tract of John Chew, 1674.
32.—Tract of Captain Richard Stephens, 1623.
33.—Tract of Captain Ralph Hamor, 1621, Secretary of State and chronicler.
34.—Site of the turf fort, erected probably about 1663.
35.—Cross streets connecting "the way along the Maine River" and the Back Street.
36.—Tract of George Memely, 1631, member of the Council of State.
37.—Tract of the "way along the Great river," or "Maine river."
38.—Tract of the "leading to Island House," in 1633.
39.—One-acre tract bought by William Sherwood in 1641, "on which formerly stood the brick house formerly called the Country House, and later, probably Sherwood's residence.
40.—Jamestown Island wharf.
41.—Probable site of tract of Richard Clarke, 1614.
42.—The "main cart path."
43.—The "old Great Road," in 1604.
44.—Ancient graveyard.
45.—Probable site of Richard Lawrence's dwelling about 1656.
N. B. Broken lines on map indicate approximate boundaries, etc.
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Map 2

(H. Chandlee Forman, 1938:63-64)
JAMESTOWN ISLAND ABOUT 1624

Key to Map of James Island about 1624

Approximate Locations as Described in Old Records:

New Town Patents:
1. The Governor's House, 1614.
2. Jackson, John, 1621.
4. Chet, John, 1625.
5. Harrow, Ralph, 1624.
7. Harvey, John, 1623.
8. Pott, John, 1623.
11. Smith, Roger, 1624.
12. Sally, Th., 1624.
13. Tott, John, 1628.
15. Perri, Isabella, 1627.
17. Wright, Edw., 1627.
18. Spencer, Wm., 1624.
19. Lightfoot, John, 1624.
23. Bowers, 1623;
28. Bailey, Mary, 1619;
29. Evans, Robt., 1619.
30. Fairfax, Wm., 1619;
33. Blin, 1624.
34. Smith, 1627.
35. Jones, 1627.
36. Henry, 1621.
38. Lacy, Daniel, 1625.
39. Old Landmarks:
A. Site of Original Jamestown, 1607.
B. The Public Garden.
C. Marsh between Old Town and New Town.
D. Osceola Run.
E. Highway along River Bank.
F. The Back Street.
G. Gallows Swamp.
H. Pitch and Tar Swamp.
I. Brick Bridge.
J. Present Ambler House.
K. The Park.
L. Present Church.
M. Present Shore Line of Island.
N. Old Great Road to Mainland.

Properties

Houses and Properties

P. Site of Blockhouse of 1609.
Q. Glass House Point.
R. Site of Block House, c. 1621.
S. Carr Path and Blockhouse Field.
T. Kingsmill's Creek.
U. Back Point.
V. Pocomo's Creek.
W. Goose Hill.
X. Marshale of Goose Hill.
Y. Tucker's Hole.
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Map 3

(J. Frederick Fausz, 1971: 24-25)
FIGURE 2: JAMESTOWN ISLAND, 1607-1640.

Legend

Capital “A” represents Forman’s and Gregory’s placement of the original James Fort.

Numbers in red (circles indicate that a structure occupied the site):

1. “Sir George’s House,” 1611-1614
2. Sir Thomas Dale, 1611-1616
3. Joakim Andrews and John Crabb, bef. 1619
4. Mary Ealey and Robert Evans, bef. 1619
5. William Fairfax, 1619; Rev. Richard Buck, 1620
6. Lt. Batters, 1623; David Ellis, John Radische, and George Yeardley, 1624
7. William Pinke, bef. 1624; Mary Holland, 1624
8. Percival Wood, bef. 1624; George Yeardley, 1624
9. William Spencer, 1624
10. John Johnson, 1624
11. John Lightfoot, 1624
12. Richard Kinzmill, the “Island House,” 1624
13. William Spence, 1624
14. Thomas Passmore, 1624
15. Richard Tree, 1624
16. John Hall, 1624; Thomas Passmore, 1623
17. Daniel Layne, 1624
18. Henry Southey, 1626
19. John Southerne, 1627
20. John Southerne, 1627
21. Edward Grindon (or Trindall), 1627
22. Robert Wright, 1627
23. Thomas Delamajor, 1628
24. Robert Marshall, 1628

“New Towne” Patents (black lower-case letters):

b. Richard Stephens, 1623
1. John Jackson (Juxon), 1624
1. Robert Smith, 1624
d. John Chew, 1624
1. Thomas Sully; George
m. Dr. John Pott, 1625
1. Ralph Hemor, 1624
f. George Menezie, 1624
n. George Graves and Isa-
h. Dr. John Patt, 1624
1. Gov. Francis Wyatt, 1630
i. Edward Blaney, 1624
p. George Menezie, 1630
j. William Peirse, 1624
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Base Map Showing Structures 17 and 115

(Cotter, 1958)


Bagby, Mrs. Parke C. Reports of the Excavations Made at the Church at Jamestown. Richmond: Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, November 5, 1902

Barka, Norman E. Comments made during a symposium videotaped at the annual meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology. Williamsburg, VA, January 5, 1984.


183


Colonial National Historical Park


Comments made during a symposium videotaped at the annual meetings of the Society for Historical Archaeology, Williamsburg: January 6, 1984.


Personal communication. Philadelphia: October 18, 1983.


"Archaeological Progress at James City on Jamestown Island," Yorktown: Colonial National Historical Park Archives, August 1, 1956.


Gregory, George C. James City and James City Island 1607-1700: The First Fort Site and City Limits From Time to Time. Richmond: Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, 1935.


Hanna, Susan D. Comments made in a symposium on Jamestown Archaeology at the annual meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology, Williamsburg, VA: January 5, 1984.


Comments made in a symposium on Jamestown Archaeology at the annual meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology, Williamsburg, VA: January 6, 1984.
Harrington, J. C. Personal communication. Richmond, VA: June 10, 1983.

Interview at Williamsburg, VA, June 9, 1983.

Interview in Richmond, VA, May 31, 1983.

Personal communication. Richmond, VA: March 26, 1983.


Harrington, Virginia. Interview in Williamsburg, VA: June 9, 1983.

Interview in Richmond, VA: May 31, 1983.


"References to Support the Sketch Plan of the First Fort Built by the English at Jamestown." Yorktown: Colonial National Historical Park Archives, May 15, 1951.


"A Preliminary Historical Study of the Wyatt Tract of 1641 on Jamestown Island in Colonial National Historical Park." Yorktown: Colonial National Historical Park Archives, June 7, 1940.


Comments made in a symposium on Jamestown Archaeology at the annual meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology, Williamsburg, VA: January 5, 1984.


Interview in Williamsburg, VA: October 28, 1983.

Personal communication. Williamsburg, VA: October 23, 1983.


"Jamestown: Birthplace of Historical Archaeology in the United States." A slide presentation at the annual meeting of the Archaeological Society of Virginia, Norfolk, VA: October 20, 1979.


Knight, James M. Interview in Williamsburg, VA: June 6, 1984.


Comments made in a symposium on Jamestown Archaeology at the annual meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology, Williamsburg, VA: January 5, 1984.

The Jamestown Frontier: An Archaeological Perspective on Colonization. (Unpub, PhD Dissertation) Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms, 1975.


Polk, Roni Hinote. Comments made in a symposium on Jamestown Archaeology at the annual meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology, Williamsburg, VA: January 5, 1984.

Exhibit on Jamestown Archaeology displayed at the meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology, Williamsburg, VA: January 5-7, 1984.

Quinn, David. Comments made in a symposium on Jamestown Archaeology at the annual meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology, Williamsburg, VA: January 5, 1984.


Comments made in a symposium on Jamestown Archaeology at the annual meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology, Williamsburg, VA: January 5, 1984.


True, Ransom. Comments made during a symposium on Jamestown Archaeology at the annual meeting of the Society for Historical Archaeology, Williamsburg, VA: January 5, 1984.


United States Congress, House, An Act To improve the administration of the national park system by the Secretary of the Interior, and to clarify the authorities applicable to the system and for other purposes. Pub. L. 91-383, 91st Congress, 2nd session, H. R. 14114.

United States Congress, House, Joint Resolution Authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the establishment of Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes. Pub. L. 91-332, 91st Congress, 2nd session, H. J. Res. 546.


United States Congress, House, An Act to authorize land exchanges for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park in the State of Virginia; to authorize the transfer of certain lands of Colonial National Historical Park, in the State of Virginia, to the Commonwealth of Virginia; and for other purposes. Pub. L. 447 84th Congress, 2nd session, H. R. 5280.

United States Congress, Senate, An Act To provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes. Pub L. 292, 74th Congress, 1st Session, S. 598.

United States Congress, Senate, An Act For the relief of Unemployment through the performance of useful public work, and for other purposes. Pub. L. 5, 72nd Congress, 1st session, S. 598.


VITA

Roni Hinote Polk

Born in Kansas City, Missouri, March 9, 1950.

Graduated from Grandview High School in Grandview, Missouri, June 1968. Received B.A. in Anthropology graduating magna cum laude from Arizona State University in Tempe, Arizona, August, 1979.

She has worked professionally in prehistoric, historic, and underwater archaeology. "Historical Archaeology at Jamestown - a Legacy" is her second videotaped production to date; the first was co-produced with her husband, Harding Polk II.