

This was written for a class called New World Prehistory

The Neville Site and Rescue Archaeology

© 1999 Donna M. Dube

The Neville Site

The Neville Site was located on the east bank of the Merrimack River, immediately north of Amoskeag Falls, in Manchester, New Hampshire. The site dates mainly to the archaic period but a few artifacts from earlier periods as well as later periods have been found. It is believed that these few artifacts were moved from another area to the site by later peoples (Dincauze 1976: 118).

The property, originally owned by the Stark family was later passed on to John Neville in 1925. Neville lived on the site until 1967 when the New Hampshire Department of Public Works and Highways took the land to build the new Amoskeag Bridge. The original Stark house stood on the site until it was moved in 1968 to avoid demolition (Dincauze 1976: 2).

Since construction of the bridge required the relocation of a street that would destroy part of the historic Smyth garden, the New Hampshire Archaeological Society (NHAS) planned a salvage operation in the garden. The NHAS and a crew of volunteers excavated the garden in the 1967 and 1968 field seasons. Among the volunteers was avocational archaeologist, Peter McLane. McLane expressed concern that the society was testing such a small part of the area that would be affected by the bridge construction and obtained permission to conduct excavations on the terraces below the Smyth gardens. With the help of his sons, McLane excavated 34 units on the lower terraces, two of which were in the Neville family's yard (Dincauze 1976: 4).

From the upper three feet of each pit they recovered typical New England historical trash, and a jumble of pot sherds and projectile points. Below the historical trash, they discovered artifacts of unfamiliar styles. Curious about these lower levels, McLane decided to have a charcoal sample dated. He chose a sample that was found in conjunction with a small stemmed point. The date returned was $5,385 \pm 380$ years, this was one of the oldest dates reported in New England at the time. After a series of consultations and discussions with other archaeologists, it was determined that this was a significant site (Dincauze 1976: 4).

Excavations ended in September 1968 and a second charcoal sample was sent for analysis, in the event that the first sample was contaminated. The date returned was $7,015 \pm 160$ years, "implying a major extension of New England's cultural chronology" (Dincauze 1976: 5). McLane, feeling buoyed by the date, accepted full responsibility for preparing the report on the site. Unfortunately, before the report was even beyond the outline stage, McLane became ill and was unable to continue. When he realized he would be unable to complete the work, he and his associates offered the data to Harvard University requesting that Dena F. Dincauze be the one to complete his work (Dincauze 1976: 5).

By the time Dincauze assumed responsibility for the report, the site was completely destroyed. The only information on which she had to base her report was in the materials collected and data recorded. She says she accepted the task because, "it remains to this date the thickest series of archeological deposits known in New England" (Dincauze 1976: 5).

The collection arrived at Harvard in early 1970, with most of the finds sorted and labeled with level designations, but the majority of the materials arrived uncatalogued, still in their level bags (Dincauze 1976: 5). Harvard University proceeded to catalog the artifacts and

compile an accessions catalog. The artifacts were shipped to the State University College in Buffalo, New York where studies were completed by the summer of 1973 (Dincauze 1976: 6).

In addition to the salvage of the site the excavators claim to have had three specific goals in mind. These were:

- "1. to demonstrate the validity of the stratigraphic sequence,
2. to describe and date the cultural sequence at the site, and
3. to define the patterns of the site utilization through time" (Dincauze 1976: 5).

In my opinion, I feel that the goals stated were determined after excavations had been started, perhaps even completed and that the initial reason for the excavations was purely curiosity and salvage of materials and information that would have otherwise been destroyed forever.

Dena Dincauze does an excellent job of describing the sampling plan and excavation procedures used by McLane considering the admittedly "poor job of recording and note taking [that was] done during excavations" (Dincauze 1976: 14). She includes excerpts from his preliminary report from 1969 and notations from McLane himself. She notes that "excavation records consisted mainly of notations and sketches on the faces of the paper bags which received the materials recovered from each 3-inch level" (Dincauze 1976: 13).

Dincauze admits to some loss of information such as observations on soil color and texture, but says that "after working with the data for four years, [she has] confidence in the reliability of the records as far as they go" (Dincauze 1976: 14). She feels that the excavation strategy used at the Neville Site "is not an ideal, or even recommended, strategy for learning about site specific activities" (Dincauze 1976: 136).

Considering the quality of the original excavation records, I feel that the author included sufficient maps, photographs and illustrations of the stratigraphy and artifacts, although I might have included photos of the actual site during excavations and after. But, such photos may not have been available for inclusion considering the manner of record keeping.

Information about the geology and paleoecology was included in the report with the assistance of specialists in the fields. Descriptions and comparisons of the artifacts are detailed. Dincauze also includes information about the manufacturing technology believed to have been in use at the time the site was occupied as well as her hypothesis about the functions of some of the finds. Specialists in radiocarbon analysis and palenology were enlisted for the laboratory analysis in these disciplines as well.

Dincauze concludes that this site has relevance for "cultural sequence, and chronology, adaptive patterns, culture history and methodology" (Dincauze 1976: 133). However, she also states that "interpretations about adaptive patterns at this scale of generalization cannot be supported with data from only one site" (Dincauze 1976: 134). She makes these conclusions about the site based on comparisons of the Neville Site to other sites in the immediate area, in Southern New England and along the entire Atlantic seaboard. She states that "at the level of site and locale, all the conclusions presented above have relevance" (Dincauze 1976: 133). In my opinion, in looking for similarities in sites as far away as Florida (Dincauze 1976:140) or even as far south as the Doerschuk site in North Carolina (Dincauze 1976: 139) is stretching a bit in looking for like sites. Although the sites provided artifacts similar to those found at the Neville Site, I feel she has overlooked the possibility of

independent invention and is making the assumption that all sites with similar artifacts are related.

Despite this, the report is detailed and readable. The sub-headings within each chapter make it easy to find information relating to specific topics. In all, I feel that given the amount of information and the condition and quality of information, that Dena Dincauze did an excellent job in reporting on this site, considering that she did not have a hand in designing the excavation procedures, was unable to work the site herself, was not even able to see the site because by the time she was enlisted to write the report it was completely destroyed. She, in addition, faced the inadequacies in the record keeping methods of the excavators. I feel that she put a tremendous amount of work into sorting and organizing an incredible amount of data so that it means something.

Rescue Archaeology

The way I describe rescue archaeology to my acquaintances is simple. "It's quick and dirty archaeology, done one step ahead of the bulldozers. Archaeologists go in and pull as much "stuff" out of the ground that they can before the dude with the backhoe comes and plows it under and destroys it forever."

But there is much more to rescue archaeology than pulling artifacts out of the ground. It's the information gleaned from those artifacts and their context and the information from the features recorded that is preserved for future generations to study. Destruction of a site does not necessarily have to be the result of human initiated construction projects either.

"Agricultural intensification" threatens sites with "mechanized farming" (Renfrew 1996: 521), and some sites are in danger of destruction due to natural phenomena such as erosion or floods and even hurricanes.

Rescue archaeology is the preservation through excavation of sites in danger of imminent destruction.ⁱ Sometimes rescue archaeology is confused with conservation archaeology which "emphasizes the need for protection, management and frugal exploitation of our limited archaeological resources" (Lipe 1978: 122). In a sense conservation archaeology is a form of rescue archaeology in that the sites are being saved from destruction by being protected in some form or another. The Archaeological Conservancy purchases sites throughout the United States for preservation and to insure that they "will be here for future generations to study and enjoy" (Burroughs 1999: 4).

Public archaeology and Cultural Resource Management (CRM) are used synonymously by some archaeologists (Kerber 1994: 5, Mrozowski 1999). Public archaeology recognizes that archaeological resources "belong or should belong to society as a whole" and that that society should support the study and conservation or management of such resources for the benefit of the society (Lipe 1978: 122).

This "includes the preservation, use, protection, selective investigation of, or decision not to preserve, prehistoric and historic remains; specifically, includes the development of ways and means, including legislation and actions, to safeguard extant evidences or preserve records of the past." (NPS 1981: 1.7)

CRM involves much public funding, and involvement in public laws and with public agencies that help in the preservation/conservation of cultural resources that many people view public archaeology and CRM as one in the same.ⁱⁱ

Traditional archaeology or large-scale excavations are not performed as often today as they were in the past. Usually large-scale excavations are done in an academic or teaching context. Many archaeologists have opted for a minimalist approach when excavating preferring to do test pits or small excavation units that do not disturb entire sites (Mrozowski, 1999). Archaeologists have realized that in digging a site that they are destroying a non-

renewable resource and that with today's advances in science they can learn as much if not more information from a small amount of materials than was possible just a few years ago.

The History of Rescue Archaeology

Rescue archaeology stems from the post World War II building boom of the 1940's. The United States government began planning a "national system of dams for flood control and reservoirs for water supply to many important river valleys" (NPS 1999a: 1). Archaeologists became concerned that many archaeological resources might be destroyed or lost as a result of these construction projects.

In 1945, The Committee for the Recovery of Archaeological Remains (CRAR) was established. It provided "a voice for archaeologists to express their concern that salvage archaeology is conducted to preserve archaeological remains before reservoir projects are completed" (NPS 1999a: 1).

In 1946 the National Park Service (NPS) established the Interagency Archaeological Salvage Program to be administered by the NPS and the Smithsonian Institution. Its goal was to insure that archaeological materials and information that was unearthed by modern construction would be preserved for future study (NPS 1999a: 1).

During the 1950's development of highway systems contributed to the development of rescue archaeology with the passing of the Federal Aid Highway Act. This act included specific directions for contractors to follow regarding the salvage of archaeological materials in a construction area. Also in the 1950's The Pipeline Salvage Program in the southwest allowed archaeologists to work directly with the construction firms to insure the rescue of sites in the paths of the pipelines. (NPS 1999a: 2)

During the 1960's, rescue archaeology took off. The Reservoir Salvage Act in 1960 made funds available for the rescue of sites in danger of flooding due to newly constructed dam systems. In 1966, The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) created the National Register of Historic Places and the Environmental Protection Act required environmental impact statements (EIS) for all new construction. Section 106 of the NHPA states that all Federally funded projects are required to determine the impact of those projects on "any district, site, building, structure, or object that is included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register" (NPS 1999c). Contractors now had to take into consideration the impact that their construction would have on historic and pre-historic properties as well as the environment.

In 1973, President Nixon signed Executive Order 11593. This order expanded the responsibilities of Federal agencies in relation to the Historic Preservation Act. It specified that Federal agencies were to begin to locate and record historic properties on their lands that may be eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places.

The Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974, also known as the Moss-Bennett Act, placed public archaeology under the Secretary of the Interior and authorized public funds for archaeological excavations, research and publication of project results (NPS 1999b: 2).

In 1979, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act was passed, the purpose of which is;

"to secure, for the present and future benefit of the American people, the protection of archaeological resources and sites which are on public lands and Indian lands, and to foster increased cooperation and exchange of information between governmental authorities, the professional archaeological community, and private individuals having collections of archaeological resources and data which were obtained before October 31, 1979" (NPS 1999d).

All of this legislation led to the growth of rescue archaeology in that it brought the subject of archaeological resources to the public.

Currently, local governments have the most control over archaeological preservation. Local governments issue permits and oversee projects. When a site is slated for a construction project, under certain circumstances, archaeological surveys are required. If the project will impact sensitive wetlands, or uses Federal funds for example, state and Federal laws require environmental impact surveys (Mrozowski 1999). If a survey discovers a site, then a hold is put on that construction until the site can be evaluated and if necessary protected or salvaged. If there is no way to preserve the site, then rescue archaeology will be done. Certain sites are considered so valuable that protection rather than excavation is required (Mrozowski 1999).

Benefits of Rescue Archaeology

The most important benefit of rescue archaeology is knowledge. There is a tremendous amount of information that would otherwise be lost without rescue operations. We can gain insight into the lives of people and cultures that no longer exist. Archaeology is in a sense, writing a history where no written history exists. Since most political and social decisions are based on history (Mrozowski 1999) we need to have the knowledge of that history.

Contractors also benefit from doing rescue archaeology. Since there is specific legislation that requires archaeological surveys be built into project planning, it is often much less expensive for a contractor to throw money at archaeologists and get the project done ahead of construction, than to delay construction, with red tape and mitigation, when they find a site accidentally.

Disadvantages of Rescue Archaeology

A disadvantage of rescue archaeology is the loss of the physical site for future generations to study. As science advances, future generations will have at their disposal new techniques and tests that will be able to tell more about the past from less and less material. If we dig all our sites now, the possibility of learning more later is reduced.

Another disadvantage to rescue archaeology is the rush factor. When an archaeologist has a bulldozer bearing down on them, and time constraints, the quality of work suffers. Information that would otherwise be recorded may be lost in the necessity for haste.

There is also the possibility of artifacts and features having been damaged or destroyed by the large-scale earthmovers. If a site is not located before the contractors start digging, then pieces of it may be lost.

The quality of the actual reporting varies with rescue archaeology. " We now have thousands of institutional and noninstitutional archaeological contractors. Some certainly are excellent; a few, or even perhaps many, are unqualified; some are dishonest... many are categorically unethical." (Wilson 1987: 155)

There is also the cost of not only carrying out the excavations, but in disposing of the collections rescued, for analysis, curation and conservation of the collection for the long term (Wilson 1987: 165). In Alberta Canada, for example, all archaeology is paid for by the developer. The Archaeological Survey of Alberta does not pay for any of it. "The developer is seen to be taking the cultural heritage. The province owns that heritage, so the developer has to pay for the right to destroy that heritage" (Wilson 1987: 166). In many cases, it is much less expensive to just avoid the sites altogether.

There are both advantages and disadvantages to doing rescue archaeology. In most cases, conservation and preservation is preferred over salvage. But, there are a few where rescue is necessary to preserve that little bit of history.

The Rescues and the Results

Each of the sites below was excavated as a rescue archaeology project for a different reason and with different results. These sites represent the ideal situations for rescue archaeology as with the Lodge site or the Israel River Complex and the worst case situation as with the Mansion Inn site.

The Bull Brook Site, Ipswich, Massachusetts

The Bull Brook site, located in Ipswich, Massachusetts was a site known to have produced occasional diagnostic points and pottery dating from the Archaic to Early Woodland periods (Byers 1954: 343). In 1951, upon investigating the site, William C. Eldridge and Joseph Vacaro recovered "implements of the fluted point complex" (Byers 1954: 343) approximately 18 to 20 inches below the surface.

The site, on the south side of Bull Brook is located on a terrace that juts into a salt marsh and is approximately one half mile wide. The property was being stripped of topsoils for a sand and gravel operation when the site was rediscovered under approximately 6 inches of sandy loam (Byers 1954: 343). When the bulldozers stripped off the surface layer, artifacts were exposed on the surface. From all appearances there was only one layer of occupation. It has been inferred by Eldridge and Vacaro that the;

"process of deposition is that during successive occupations the materials which were left behind came to rest on a surface of the humus... Upon being abandoned, the artifacts were covered up by the vegetation and by deposits of the very light humus which drifted about the site. Successive occupations deposited tools and chips in this humus in the same manner so that their location can give little or no clue to the stratigraphy." (Eldridge 1952: 39)

All artifacts have been found in this humus layer or in the transitional zone between it and the underlying sand (Eldridge 1952: 39).

Over 1000 artifacts have been recovered, more than 50 of which are fluted point fragments, suggesting a Paleo-Indian occupation. Some of the materials identified are exotic to the area and have been identified as coming from sources in Pennsylvania and Maine (Byers 1954: 345). Also found were graters, end and side scrapers, drills, flake knives, utilized flakes and cores. Hammerstones have been identified as well, but it is unknown as to the time period which they may represent (Byers 1954: 349).

Also found are what has been identified as *sheared* points and tools. At the time of the find, in New England there had been no occurrences of tools sharpened by a method called *shearing*. This is a technique that gives the appearance of having been finely flaked (Byers 1955: 40). It has been suggested that the lack of data in New England regarding sheared tools is due to the fact that it is difficult to identify and usually found on objects which would have been normally discarded as scrap (Byers 1955: 42).

Some small burned bone fragments, believed to have been deer, were found in conjunction with paleo artifacts but not in later periods (Byers 1955: 275). It was determined that this may have been a campsite at which people worked stone, cooked and ate, throwing their refuse into a fire (Byers 1955: 275). The presence of pottery, a glass bead and a clay pipe fragment suggests later occupation (Eldridge 1952: 42).

A possible hearth feature was located, where concentrations of charcoal had been noted in context with artifact fragments. Upon further investigation and excavation it was determined that it was the remains of burned tree roots and that the presence of worked stone was purely coincidental (Byers 1955: 274). No other possible features were located. Byers

notes; "The entire artifact-bearing zone has been unstable and subjected to disturbance over a long-continued period of time" (Byers 1955: 276). Disturbances such as frost action, wind throwing of trees, shifting sand and surfaces trampled by human action have all contributed to the destruction of this site (Byers 1955: 276).

Byers questioned Eldridge's and Vacaro's Paleo-Indian claims. Byers also claims to have never seen any of the paleo complex artifacts *in situ* (Byers 1954: 343), and it is unclear to him how the objects became buried at the level at which they were found. He claims that "neither slope wash, wind action, nor frost action seem to offer satisfactory media for burying the objects" (Byers 1954: 343). After investigating the site himself, he also noted that he found no fluted fragments and no proof that any materials found can be related to the fluted point complex in New England. He also comments that "lack of land surface and of association among artifacts in turn, makes it extremely difficult to place the Paleo-Indian occupation with respect to any episode in the history of the site" (Byers 1955: 276).

The great loss at this site is one of context. Without the context in which the Paleo-Indian artifacts are found it is difficult to prove one's theories. It becomes a question of credibility for the archaeologist. Because the context of Bull Brook was destroyed there is the difficulty in comparing the site to other sites of the same complex (Grimes 1984: 166). The missing data can never be recovered. There is some resemblance between the fluted points and some Clovis points, suggesting a connection, but until a Clovis site is positively identified in the north east, one cannot make cultural connections (Byers 1954: 351).

The Mansion Inn Site, Wayland, Massachusetts

The Mansion Inn site in Wayland Massachusetts was unearthed in 1959. It was located in the Sudbury River Valley equidistant from Dudley Pond and Lake Cochituate

(Mansfield 1961: 1). While moving earth for a housing complex, contractors exposed what was believed to have been a cremation cemetery.

J. Alfred Mansfield, an amateur archaeologist, knowing that the area had yielded surface artifacts in the past decided to investigate the site. Upon finding charcoal deposits, he began a salvage excavation. Local residents and their children heard of the finds and were soon swarming the site, with even the local news reported the 'collecting.' By the time the R. S. Peabody Foundation stepped in, the site had been all but destroyed. The Foundation closed the site to the public and Frederick Johnson conducted the salvage operation of the disturbed burial pits (Dincauze 1968: 12).

A cemetery was located on the site, at least 40 by 50 feet in extent with an "intensive concentration of burial pits." Separate from the pits was what is believed to have been a stone-lined crematory (Dincauze 1968: 64). Some of the artifacts that were looted were recovered through donations to the Peabody Foundation and other collections have been *loaned* for the purpose of information collection (Dincauze 1968: 12). Among the artifacts found were projectile points and knives, drills, honing stones, grooved axes, small pestles, hatchets, gouges, scrapers and a steatite bowl. In some cases artifacts were found in conjunction with red ochre and calcined bone believed to have been human (Mansfield 1961: 3).

It is unknown how much more there may have been to this site originally (Dincauze 1968: 64). No records exist of just how many burials were disturbed or how many originally existed. No intact features were located. There were no pot sherds or shell refuse. The field notes of the amateurs who originally located the site have been studied but since the site was

disturbed by the construction, prior to their arrival, even their information is sketchy (Dincauze 1968: 12).

Besides the loss of the site and information regarding it, one of the most distressing things about the whole situation was that some of the 'collectors' that participated in the looting were members of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society and should have known better. This prompted D. S. Byers to call upon state societies to "discover some way of disciplining members who do not conform to ethical standards for archaeological work" (Byers 1960: 420).

The greatest tragedy of the loss of this site is the loss of the information that might have been gathered had this site been preserved or excavated properly. We will never know the context surrounding this site and the loss of the information about the cremation burial complex in New England as well as an unknown number of artifacts will provide us little opportunity to interpret burial rites in this area (Dincauze 1968: 65). Although radiocarbon dates can be obtained from the charcoal residues, the disturbed contexts of the residues make it impossible to relate any of those dates to the tools and associated grave materials found at the site. As Byers puts it; "Quite possibly we shall never have a like opportunity again" (Byers 1960: 420).

What we have learned from this situation is that "controlled excavation of undisturbed cemeteries or burial pits is the only way to amass the necessary information" required for the interpretation of such a site (Dincauze 1968: 90). Also, in my opinion, there is a lesson to be learned in discretion; until the proper authorities are aware of the finds and such sites are protected from the unethical pot-hunters only those who need to know of the finds should be told.

The Lodge Site, Tilton, New Hampshire

The Lodge site, located on the banks of the Winnepesaukee River in Tilton, New Hampshire was actually discovered in 1952 when the New Hampshire Archaeological Society was excavating test units in the area. The site was recognized and recorded as one of seven sites in the Lochmere Archaeological District (Gengras 1998: 5). In 1983, while moving earth for house construction the site was once again unearthed. The new owner stopped construction and enthusiastically agreed to allow the site to be studied and salvaged (Gengras 1998: 1).

The site was investigated by the State Cooperative Regional Archaeology Plan (SCRAP), now known as the State Conservation and Rescue Archaeology Program, during the spring and summer of 1984 (Gengras 1998: 1). The site is a multi-component site situated on a 1.7 acre lot that crosses one terrace and extends onto a slightly higher second one (Gengras 1998: 3). The SCRAP team began work under the direction of Principal Investigator, Victoria Bunker with assistance from Alan Strauss, with preliminary surface collecting to deter vandalism. They proceeded with controlled surface collecting, shovel test units, one-meter excavation units and shovel skimming to reveal soil deposits and features (Gengras 1998: 6-7).

The quantity of stone artifacts is the most impressive aspect of this site. There were 161 formal stone tools, tool fragments and cores found. Diagnostic artifacts recovered from the surface as well as in the excavation units allow dating of the site to the Middle Archaic through Late Woodland periods (8000-400 B.P.) (Gengras 1998: 11). Projectile points identified included Neville points, Brewerton Ear Notched, Squibnocket, Jack's Reef points, Levanna points and some that were untyped (Gengras 1998: 12). Other worked stone tools

included perforators, blades, scrapers, utilized flakes, gravers, cores and a fragment of an atlatl weight.

Also found was an uneven distribution of pottery across the site. Some 145 pottery sherds were recovered, 85% of them were from disturbed contexts (Gengras 1998: 21). The types and styles of pottery suggest that the site was inhabited during the Middle and Late Woodland periods (2000-400 B.P.)(Gengras 1998: 26). Much of the pottery was found in the northern part of the site, suggesting a "localized Woodland occupancy" as well (Gengras 1998: 29).

One feature, circular in nature, is believed to have been a hearth. It consists of charcoal stained soils and 182 fire-altered rocks. The feature was dated to the terminal archaic period, 3840 ± 70 years B.P. (Gengras 1998: 27). There were no charcoal filled pits located, but it is obvious though that such features had once existed at the site due to high concentrations of fire-altered stone. No post molds were located. It is suspected that many features were destroyed by the bulldozing before the site was actually recognized (Gengras 1998: 29). A few historical artifacts were recovered, none in concentration, thus they are believed to be simply "historic trash scatter" (Gengras 1998: 28).

It's obvious from the quantity and quality of the information gathered at the Lodge site that this was a situation where rescue archaeology was successful. Although some information was lost, a tremendous amount was saved. Through the artifacts and data recorded, archaeologists have been able to determine that it was a multi-component site and that it resembles other sites in the same area. They have also determined that it was not a single activity site, but rather one of diverse activities that may have included hunting, fishing, food processing and tool manufacture and maintenance, and that one activity did not dominate

in any particular time period (Gengras 1998: 30). What was lost in the disturbed strata of this site are answers to questions such as subsistence, and seasonality. Questions on chronology may never be answered.

Currently analysis of floral and faunal materials is still underway, as is intensive analysis as to the origin of the stone materials found in the tool assemblages. Perhaps this analysis can provide insights into the "nature and extent of cultural interactions" outside the Winnepesaukee area during the occupation periods (Gengras 1998: 31).

The Israel River Complex, Jefferson New Hampshire

The Israel River Complex is located in Jefferson New Hampshire and consists of three sites. The sites were investigated by the volunteers of the State Conservation and Rescue Archaeology Program (SCRAP) (Boisvert 1998: 97). Individually these sites are significant, together, even more so. Information about the paleo complex in New England is almost non-existent (Boisvert 1998: 101). The Israel River Complex has provided new preliminary data about the Paleo-Indian occupation in the north east region (Boisvert 1998: 104).

Jefferson I was identified in 1995 by Paul Bock and Edward Bouras. The site is located on a terrace, below which a small stream drains into the Israel River. Non-diagnostic debitage was recovered during a walkover survey of a cleared field and was brought to the attention of the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources (NHDHR) (Boisvert 1998: 97).

Work was carried out at this site because the landowner wanted to salvage the felled timber (Boisvert 1998: 98). Shovel test pits and one meter excavation units yielded fragments of exotic raw materials, paleo fluted fragments, channel flakes, scrapers, retouched flakes, and biface fragments (Boisvert 1998: 97). No features were identified but data suggests two

activity areas at the site. Dense underbrush and fallen trees hampered the investigation of the site but it is believed that more activity areas may be present (Boisvert n.d: 9). It was determined that the principal activities at the site were manufacture of chipped stone tools and possibly hunting (Boisvert n.d: 9).

Shortly after preliminary testing was done, the owner of the site indicated that there would be no further threat from human alteration of the site. Therefore research was postponed and is still incomplete (Boisvert n.d: 9).

The second site, designated Jefferson II was located in the fall of 1995 after violent windstorms uprooted stands of pines trees nearby. Inspection of the exposed root balls yielded a portion of a fluted point (Boisvert n.d: 9). This encouraged inspection of other upturned trees and a third site, Jefferson III was located.

Jefferson II is located on a terrace overlooking the Israel River, approximately 600 meters from Jefferson I (Boisvert 1998: 99). Shortly after the identification of the site, the landowner put the site on the market for sale. With the possibility of the site being purchased and developed, the site was given priority over the other two (Boisvert n.d: 9).

The property was mostly an open pasture area used mainly as a log yard. The disturbance by timber moving equipment is minimal but some areas had been exposed and had started to erode. Artifacts were exposed as a result (Boisvert 1998: 99). Again, through surface survey and shovel test units, artifacts of paleo nature were recovered including a channel flake midsection and biface fragments. A single root ball yielded 850 lithic specimens, some of them well-defined flakes of the local rhyolite (Boisvert 1998: 99). There is an obvious paleo component at Jefferson II.

A fragment of charcoal from 46 cm. below the surface, found in a context with several small flakes yielded a radiocarbon date of 9600 Y.A. The date is more than 1000 years too young to be related to the fluted point complex. This implies that either the site is multi-component or the charcoal sample is unrelated to the fragments. Since no diagnostic materials from other time periods have been recovered, the latter explanation has been accepted (Boisvert n.d: 11).

Since this site was up for sale, thus in imminent danger, the Archaeological Conservancy has stepped in and purchased the site for conservation. The Conservancy is in the process of developing a 100-year management plan for the property. The site is now protected and no further salvage work will be done (Downing: 10).

Jefferson III is approximately one kilometer from the Jefferson I site. It is known that the site was used as a pasture during the early part of the 20th century. The site is now mostly bare of trees due to the high winds of 1995. Again, inspection of an uprooted tree yielded a biface fragment, a channel flake and debitage. It was determined upon closer inspection that the biface fragment may actually be a fluted point preform, broken in manufacture (Boisvert 1998: 100). A road was built onto the site to aid in the removal of fallen timber, which caused some erosion and revealed more debitage approximately 80 meters from the initial finds. Additional investigation yielded a significant amount of exotic raw materials, as well as an additional channel flake (Boisvert 1998: 100). The presence of channel flakes infers fluted points thus a paleo occupation (Boisvert 1998: 101). Cutting and scraping tools were more abundant at this site than at the other two, but this may be a result of a sampling bias due to an inadequate sample size (Boisvert n.d: 12).

Currently the only danger to this site is one of natural phenomena, such as erosion and wind damage. Major excavations have been completed, though small scale testing may still be done (Boisvert 1999).

Since no organic remains have been excavated, it makes it difficult to date these sites accurately. Fluted points and fragments suggest a Paleo-Indian occupation. Although a lot of information has been gathered there are some questions that may never be answered about this complex. Without organic materials, we may never be able to determine substance patterns or group dynamics (Boisvert n.d: 15). We may never be able to determine what was hunted or when exactly (Boisvert n.d: 15). However, the fact that much exotic raw material was recovered may provide insight into external contacts (Boisvert 1998: 104) or trade alliances or even migration patterns (Boisvert 1999). At this time archaeological information is still incomplete and research is continuing (Boisvert n.d: 1).

The five sites discussed in this paper are varying examples of rescue archaeology. Some of the sites no longer exist, which is why they were being rescued in the first place; others have been rescued through conservation. They range from an ideal situation with an enthusiastic landowner to a situation where there was, in a sense, chaos. Over the years archaeologists have learned how to control that chaos, through selective silence and controlled excavations. Because of that learned control we have been able to save more information about lost cultures than in the past. Through state and Federal legislation archaeologists have more power to protect and conserve sites for the future. Through the advances in science we have also been able to learn more about the past from less material culture than ever before.

The last several years have been prosperous for archaeologists doing rescue work. With the economy booming, the field of rescue archaeology has been growing, more and

more real estate has been changing hands and more construction has been taking place. Thus more and more archaeological sites are being unearthed and are in need of salvage.

This paper shows how rescue archaeology has changed tremendously through the years, partly due to new laws and regulations and partly to an increasing awareness by the general public. More and more emphasis is being put on our history and our heritage, as people want to know where they came from and when. Through the field of rescue archaeology, we may soon be able to tell them.

© 1999 Donna M. Dube. All rights reserved. No portion of this paper may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage retrieval system, without written permission of the author.

References

Boisvert, Richard A.

- 1998 The Israel River Complex: A PaleoIndian Manifestation in Jefferson, New Hampshire. *Archaeology of Eastern North America*, 26: 97-106.
- 1999 New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources, SCRAP field school, Personal communication, July 1999.
- n.d. PaleoIndian Occupation of the White Mountains. Unpublished draft recieved from Dr. Boisvert, summer 1999.

Burroughs, James, Editor

- 1999 Mission statement of the Archaeological Conservancy. *American Archaeology*, 3(3): 4 (Fall 1999)

Byers, D. S.

- 1954 Bull Brook - A Fluted Point Site in Ipswich, Massachusetts. *American Antiquity*, 19: 343-351.
- 1955 Additional Information on the Bull Brook Site, Massachusetts. *American Antiquity*, 20: 274-276.
- 1960 The Rape of Wayland. *American Antiquity*, 25: 420.

Dincauze, Dena Ferran

- 1968 *Cremation Cemeteries in Eastern Massachusetts*. Peabody Museum: Cambridge.
- 1976 *The Neville Site, 8000 Years at Amoskeag, Manchester New Hampshire*. Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge.

Downing, Judy

- 1999 Jefferson Dig Made Preserve. *The Courier*, Littleton New Hampshire, July 21, 1999, pp. 1 and 10.

Eldridge, William and Joseph Vacaro

- 1952 "The Bull Brook" Site, Ipswich, Mass. *Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society*, 13(4): 39-43.

Gengras, Justine B. and Victoria Bunker

- 1998 Rescue Archaeology at the Lodge Site, NH31-6-6. *The New Hampshire Archaeologist*, 38(1): 1-33.

- Grimes, John R. et. al.
 1984 Bull Brook II. *Archaeology of Eastern North America*, 12: 159-174.
- Kerber, Jordan E. Ed.
 1994 *Cultural Resource Management*, Bergin & Garvey, Westport CT.
- Lipe, William D.
 1978 Contracts Bureaucrats and Research: Some emerging problems of conservation archaeology in the United States. pp. 121-147, *Archaeological Essays in Honor of Irving B. Rouse*. edited by Robert C. Dunnell and Edwin S. Hall Jr. Mouton, The Hague.
- Mansfield, J. Alfred
 1961 The Mansion Inn Site - Wayland. *Bulletin of the Massachusetts Archaeological Society, Inc.* 23(1): 1-5.
- Mrozowski, Stephen
 1999 University of Massachusetts at Boston, Public Archaeology Class, Personal communication, Fall Semester 1999.
- National Park Service (NPS)
 1981 *Cultural Resource Management Guidelines, NPS-28*. Release no. 2. Cultural Resources Division, National Park Service, Washington, D.C.
- 1999a Salvaging Endangered Archaeological Information: 1945-1970. Internet: <http://www.cr.nps.gov/aad/timeline/time4.htm>
- 1999b Managing Cultural Resources: 1970-1990. Internet: <http://www.cr.nps.gov/aad/timeline/time5.htm>
- 1999c National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended through 1992. Public Law 102-575. Internet: <http://www.cr.nps.gov/local-law/nhpa1966.htm>
- 1999d Archaeological Resource Protection Act (A.R.P.A.) of 1979. Internet: <http://www.nps.gov/vick/laws/arpa.htm>
- Renfrew, Colin and Paul Bahn
 1996 *Archaeology, Theory Methods and Practice*, 2nd Ed. Thames and Hudson, New York.
- Wilson, Rex L., ed.
 1987 *Rescue Archaeology, Proceedings of the Second New World Conference on Rescue Archaeology*. Southern Methodist University Press, Dallas.

i No reference, my personal definition.

ⁱⁱ My opinion, from readings and discussions.