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MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

Moores Creek National Battlefield is a unit of the National Park Service located within the Southeast Region. As such, it is included in the Regionwide Archeological Survey Program (RASP), which is a subset of the Systemwide Archeological Inventory Program (SAIP). Under this initiative, systematic scientific research to locate, evaluate, and document archeological resources on National Park Service lands is conducted; eligible properties for the National Register of Historic Places are nominated; and strategies for resource conservation, protection, preservation in situ, management, and interpretation are recommended. One goal of RASP is to assess the adequacy of each park's Archeological Overview and Assessment (O & A). The preparation of this synthesis addresses the park's need for a current O & A.

This document summarizes current knowledge regarding the archeological content, resources, and potential of the park. As such, it is a foundation of referential data for future archeological research, development, interpretation, and preservation in the park. It also identifies specific issues the park staff needs to be aware of in order to meet managerial responsibilities for the archeological resources.

In an effort to systematically inventory and evaluate all archeologically significant resources within the park, priorities have been suggested for scheduling required work in the near future. Highest priority is given to resources that are imperiled by erosion and looting. Lowest priority is assigned to resources that are considered stable and unrelated to the primary mission of the park, which is the preservation and interpretation of the Revolutionary War battle at Moores Creek.

Priority 1: Action is recommended within the next fiscal year.
Priority 2: Action is recommended within the next two years.
Priority 3: Action is recommended within the next three years.
Priority 4: Action is recommended within four to five years.
Priority 5: Action is recommended within the next twenty years.

Based on these criteria, the following specific projects for future archeological investigations at Moores Creek National Battlefield are recommended.

SPECIFIC PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

PRIORITY 1 — NEGRO HEAD POINT ROAD

The park has recommended that the portion of the old roadbed known as the causeway should be stabilized within the next fiscal year to prevent further erosion caused by cyclic flooding of Moores Creek. The location of the historic trace road near the bridge was tentatively identified by Wright in 1992 during the placement of the reconstructed historic bridge abutments. However, to determine the eighteenth-century dimensions of the road and possibly restore it to its eighteenth-century condition will require further archeological investigations. The northern edge of the causeway has been stabilized with wooden riprap, but it might be possible to clean the southern profile of the trench, which has been cut by erosion, and determine the depth of the original roadbed exposed in the profile. In conjunction with this, it is recommended that two or more trenches be placed across the roadbed to determine the eighteenth-century width of the road.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has implemented an erosion control project to stabilize the causeway along the east side of Moores Creek Bridge. Work was completed in July 1997 (John Tucker, personal communication 1997).

PRIORITY 2 — FORWARD AND PATRIOT EARTHWORKS

Two previous excavations of the Forward Earthworks have given conflicting information regard-
ing the location and extent of the entrenchment. In 1937, King excavated Trench SP across the
earthworks, reporting their location and extent. However, in 1974, Thompson excavated Trench 15 in the vicinity of the earthworks and reported no evidence of the entrenchment (1975). As a
major component of the events related to the Battle of Moores Creek, determining the size and location of the Forward Earthworks is necessary for proper interpretation of the site. A third excavation of the Forward Earthworks is therefore recommended within the next two years. It should be positioned to cross the center of the raised area. Because the Forward Earthworks have never been restored, the area should be surveyed using ground penetrating radar and a Geonics EM 38 ground conductivity unit before any excavation is done. All levels should then be hand-excavated and screened through quarter-inch mesh hardware cloth to ensure full data recovery.

During the 1994 RASP survey of Moores Creek National Battlefield, Trench 1, located on the eastern side of the earthworks approximately five meters south of Negro Head Point Road, was excavated. Feature 1, encountered within Trench 1, was interpreted as a fire pit. Approximately half of Feature 1 was excavated in 1994. It is probable that the fire pit dates to the battle of 1776. It is therefore recommended that future consideration be given to reopening and excavating Trench 1, Feature 1, to retrieve archeological data and pit contents.

**Priority 3 — Metal Detector Survey**

A metal detector survey of 100 percent of the park’s 86.52 acres is needed within the next three years to fully document the Revolutionary War battle at Moores Creek. Previous metal detector surveys within the park have been confined to the Patriot Earthworks, the west bank, and the creek bed. The metal detector survey should conform to standard RASP field methodology (Prentice 1996), which includes running transects at close intervals and piece plotting all collected materials.

**Priority 4 — Tar Kilns Complex**

Two tar kilns have been located and both have been radiocarbon dated. Excavations conducted within Tar Kiln 2 are sufficient to interpret the location, dimensions, and construction methods used in the original building of the kiln. Additional archeological investigation is unnecessary as long as the resources are protected from erosion, future construction, and other potential threats. However, a literature review is recommended within four to five years in order to bring more information to light regarding the use of tar kilns in the area and to evaluate the resource’s eligibility for the National Register.

**Priority 5 — Prehistoric Site Excavations**

With the completion of Cornelson’s survey in 1994 (RASP Project No. MOCR-Z015), enough information has been accumulated to suggest a possible prehistoric presence within the park boundaries. The prehistoric artifacts gathered to date consist of six small ceramic sherds, one possible thinning flake, four possible waste flakes, and one honey-colored chert/flint flake, which to date has been interpreted as a byproduct from resharpening a gunflint. Land use within the park, however, is such that the prehistoric artifacts may be of secondary deposition. Within the next twenty years, two excavation units should be positioned to encompass the locations from which Cornelson recovered prehistoric ceramic sherds. These units should be large enough to ensure proper data recovery.

It should be noted that this document was prepared using data current as of November 1996. Since then, the park acquired an additional 1.23 acres, bringing the total acreage to 87.75. The additional acreage is not addressed in this document, but it should be treated, in the future, the same as all other unsurveyed portions of the park. Archeological clearance is required prior to any disruptive land use.
Moores Creek National Battlefield is located one mile southwest of Currie in Pender County, North Carolina (Figure 1). The park commemorates the February 27, 1776, Battle of Moores Creek Bridge in which nine hundred Patriots convincingly defeated a Loyalist contingent of sixteen hundred men. This victory destroyed the plans of Tory troops to rendezvous with and provision the British fleet, due to arrive on the Carolina coast. Thus, a full-scale invasion of the South was averted. Perhaps more importantly, the victory demonstrated the surprising Patriot strength in the countryside and discouraged the growth of Loyalist sentiment in the Carolinas.

Located within the park’s 86.52 acres are the remains of earthworks erected by the Patriots on a rise of ground overlooking the Widow Moore’s Bridge. The site of the Moores Creek Bridge itself and a section of the historic Fayetteville to Wilmington road are also found within the park. Annual celebrations of the anniversary of the battle began on the site in 1856. The following year, a monument was erected and dedicated to John Grady, the only Patriot to die from wounds received during the battle.

In 1898, the state of North Carolina purchased the two-acre earthworks tract and an adjacent eight-acre tract for use as a public park commemorating the battle. In 1925, North Carolina offered to donate the park lands, which then contained thirty acres, to the federal government. On June 2, 1926, Congress authorized the establishment of

![Figure 1 — Location of Moores Creek National Battlefield in Pender County (cross-hatched area).](image-url)
Moores Creek National Military Park under the War Department's administration. By Executive Order of August 10, 1933, the park was transferred to the Department of the Interior and made a unit of the National Park Service.

The following overview presents a summary of the known archeological resources within the park and offers recommendations regarding the future protection and management of these resources. These recommendations are based on the goals of the Moores Creek master plan (NPS 1968), on information from the Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan (Keel et al. 1996), and on the work of previous archeological investigators.
Chapter 2

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

LOCATION OF STUDY AREA

Moores Creek National Battlefield, located in Pender County, North Carolina, lies one mile southwest of the modern town of Currie (see Figure 1). The nearest major metropolitan area in the region is Wilmington, located about twenty miles southeast of the park near the North Carolina coast. Fayetteville, North Carolina, is situated approximately one hundred miles to the northwest.

Moores Creek is a tributary of the Cape Fear River. With its headwaters located in the North Carolina Piedmont, the Cape Fear River flows southeast across the Coastal Plain (Figure 2) through the heart of Pender County. The Black River, Northeast Cape Fear River, and a number of streams are also tributaries of the Cape Fear River (Barnhill 1991:2).

PHYSIOGRAPHY AND TOPOGRAPHY

The major land use in Pender County is woodland. About 459,089 acres (82 percent) of the county are commercial woodland (U.S. Forest Service 1983). The state of North Carolina owns about 62,748 acres, which is used for wildlife refuge. Roughly 246,850 acres are privately owned land used as commercial woodlots. The paper industries own about 149,181 acres of woodland. Ten percent of the county, about 54,200 acres, is used as cropland for corn, soybeans, tobacco, and peanuts (Barnhill 1991:1).

The topography of the coastal region is relatively flat. A small portion of the park is characteristic of the higher land of the inland Carolina Coastal Plain. This area descends abruptly to the lowlands surrounding Moores Creek, a freshwa-
Swamp—Located adjacent to the creek, this area rises to an elevation of three to four feet above sea level. Cypress, willow, and water ash predominate.

Bog—Varying from wet to damp, this area generally lies four to eight feet above sea level. Gum, bay, and ash trees and shrubbery are present.

Savannah—Largely created from a drained swamp, this area contains mostly grasses, which are mowed.

Sandhill—This area ranges in elevation from five to thirty feet. Loblolly pine, oak, hickory, bear grass, and prickly pear cactus are present (NPS 1968:7).

A set of 1985 aerial photographs show disturbances to the natural environment, including areas of farmland and replanted timbers and several buildings, trails, and monuments. From the age of the trees, it can be inferred that the area has been repeatedly deforested and replanted.

CLIMATE

Winter temperatures average 46° F, with an average daily minimum of 34° F. Frost penetration is slight, averaging from one to three inches with a maximum of five to six inches (NPS 1968:16). Summer temperatures average 78° F, and the average daily maximum is 88° F.

Average annual precipitation is around fifty-three inches. About 60 percent usually falls between April and September, which is the growing season for most crops in the region. For every ten-year period, there are two years when the rainfall between April and September measures less than twenty-six inches. Thunderstorms occur about forty-six days out of the year. The average seasonal snowfall is three inches (Barnhill 1991:2–3).

The mid-afternoon relative humidity averages about 55 percent and rises at night. At dawn, the average is about 85 percent. The sun shines 65 percent of the time possible in summer and 55 percent in winter. The prevailing wind is from the south-southwest. Average wind speed is highest in spring at eleven miles per hour. Every few years a hurricane crosses the county (Barnhill 1991:3).

The fire season usually occurs between December and June, but combustible conditions can develop at any time. Although serious fires have occurred in the Moores Creek environs, none are known to have occurred within park boundaries. An eight-foot firebreak is maintained along the boundary to keep fires on surrounding lands from encroaching onto park property.

SOILS AND GEOLOGY

Pender County has three geomorphic surfaces: Wicomico, Talbot, and Pamlico. The narrow strip of land along and near the Cape Fear and Black Rivers is dominated by the Pamlico surface. It ranges from sea level to twenty-five feet in elevation. The Pamlico surface has a mantle of accumulated organic material thick enough to obscure nearly all the topographic features of the underlying former mineral surface. The thickness of the organic material ranges from six to seventy inches. The mineral or parent material, where it can be seen in Pender County, consists of sediments containing stable mineral types, such as quartz. When deposited, these sediments contain little weatherable minerals, such as feldspar. The finest textured sediments are generally concentrated at the surface and become more coarsely textured in deeper layers (Barnhill 1991:91–92). The overlying soils series that occur in the Moores Creek National Battlefield area are shown in Figure 4 and listed in Table 1.

Ground water deposits in Pender County occur mostly within unconsolidated surficial sediments and are of good quality with infrequent high contents of iron. The sediments vary in thickness
Figure 3 — Contour map of Moores Creek National Battlefield, 1986.
Figure 4 — Soils map of Moores Creek National Battlefield and surrounding area (adapted from Barnhill 1991, sheet 11; park boundary is an approximation).

Table 1 — Area soil descriptions (from Barnhill 1991).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AnB</td>
<td>Alpine fine sand, 1 to 6% slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AuB</td>
<td>Autryville fine sand, 1 to 4% slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BaB</td>
<td>Baymeade fine sand, 1 to 4% slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fo</td>
<td>Foreston loamy fine sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoA</td>
<td>Goldsboro fine sandy loam, 0 to 2% slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KeB</td>
<td>Kenansville fine sand, 0 to 4% slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LnA</td>
<td>Leon fine sand, 0 to 2% slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McC</td>
<td>Marvyn and Craven soils, 6 to 12% slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>Muckalee loam, frequently flooded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu</td>
<td>Murville muck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoA</td>
<td>Norfolk loamy fine sand, 0 to 2% slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoB</td>
<td>Norfolk loamy fine sand, 2 to 6% slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On</td>
<td>Onslow loamy fine sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ra</td>
<td>Rains fine sandy loam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>Tortunta mucky fine sand loam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wo</td>
<td>Woodington fine sandy loam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the county, ranging from only a few inches in the Rocky Point and Maple Hill areas around the park, to about forty feet in other places. The sediments increase in thickness toward the southeast. Immediately below the unconsolidated surficial sediments in the western part of the county and below the limestone aquifer in the eastern portion is another aquifer of compacted, dark, silty and loamy material (Barnhill 1991:2).

Low-lying areas adjacent to the creek (0 to 10 feet) are subject to occasional floods due to prolonged rains. Land lying below five feet in elevation is frequently flooded, often several times a year. Flooding in these areas is usually the result of water backing up from the Black River. The water recedes very slowly and soil erosion is minimal with some areas experiencing alluvial buildup.
Those portions of the park that become flooded are unusable until the water recedes. Under normal conditions, Moores Creek experiences a two to two-and-one-half foot tidal fluctuation within the park (NPS 1968:15).

**VEGETATION**

The environment in and around Moores Creek consists of wooded swamp and bog areas, as well as upland areas to the west of the park. Trees, shrubs, and vines found in the area are listed in Tables 2 and 3, which are adapted from information compiled by the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Table 4, based on data compiled by park ranger David Elkowitz and park volunteer Mary Davidson, lists local flowers. Prevalent in the area are such trees as loblolly and longleaf pine, pond cypress, walnut, gum, bay, oak, water ash, hickory, dogwood, holly, and willow. Shrubs include wax myrtle, wild azalea, wild blueberry, and poison oak. Also present are bear grass yucca, honeysuckle, jasmine, poison ivy, prickly-pear, sundew, pitcher plant, Venus flytrap, and Spanish moss (NPS 1968:7).

While the federal government keeps a list of endangered species, by federal mandate each state must create and maintain a list of endangered species found within its own geographical boundaries. North Carolina’s state regulations are designed to minimize threats to species falling into three categories: endangered, threatened, and of special concern (North Carolina Administrative Code 1994). Certain species found at Moores Creek National Battlefield have been identified as endangered at the state level and are noted in the tables with an asterisk.

**FAUNA**

The native fauna of the North Carolina lower Coastal Plain can be characterized as abundant and diverse due to the wide ranges in habitat. The park’s general master plan (NPS 1968:7) contains a brief description of mammals found in the area. The master plan also mentions that occasionally deer, bear, fox, and “wildcats” are seen (Table 5).

Bird species common in the park (Table 6) include woodpeckers, wrens, warblers, crows, jays, hawks, owls, ducks, and herons. The creek con-

Table 2 — Trees found in the area of the park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Taxonomic Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Taxonomic Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ash, Carolina Water</td>
<td>Fraxinus caroliniana</td>
<td>Oak, Turkey</td>
<td>Quercus laevis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beech, American</td>
<td>Fagus grandifolia</td>
<td>Oak, Upland Willow</td>
<td>Quercus cinerea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch, River</td>
<td>Betula nigra</td>
<td>Oak, Water</td>
<td>Quercus nigra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottonwood, Swamp</td>
<td>Populus heterophylla</td>
<td>Oak, White</td>
<td>Quercus alba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress, Pond</td>
<td>Taxodium ascendens</td>
<td>Oak, Willow</td>
<td>Quercus phellos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogwood, Flowering</td>
<td>Cornus florida</td>
<td>Old Man’s Beard/Fringe Tree</td>
<td>Chionanthus virginicus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickory, Pale</td>
<td>Carya palida</td>
<td>Pine, Lobolly</td>
<td>Pinus taeda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly, American</td>
<td>Ilex opaca</td>
<td>Pine, Longleaf</td>
<td>Pinus australis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly, Deciduous</td>
<td>Ilex decidua</td>
<td>Poplar, Tulip</td>
<td>Liriodendron tulipifera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornbeam, Eastern</td>
<td>Ostrya virginiana</td>
<td>Redbay</td>
<td>Persea borbonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loblolly-bay</td>
<td>Gordonia lasianthus</td>
<td>Redcedar, Southern</td>
<td>Juniperus virginiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia, Southern</td>
<td>Magnolia grandiflora</td>
<td>Sparkleberry</td>
<td>Vaccinium arboreum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple, Red</td>
<td>Acer rubrum</td>
<td>Sweetbay</td>
<td>Magnolia virginiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak, Blackjack</td>
<td>Quercus marilandica</td>
<td>Sweetgum</td>
<td>Liquidambar styraciflua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak, Laurel</td>
<td>Quercus laurifolia</td>
<td>Sweetleaf, Common</td>
<td>Symlocos tinctoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak, Post</td>
<td>Quercus stellata</td>
<td>Sycamore, American</td>
<td>Platanus occidentalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak, Southern Red</td>
<td>Quercus falcata</td>
<td>Walnut</td>
<td>Juglans sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak, Swamp Chestnut/Basket</td>
<td>Quercus michauxii</td>
<td>Willow, Black</td>
<td>Salix nigra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 — Shrubs and vines found in the area of the park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Taxonomic Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Taxonomic Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Azalea, Wild*</td>
<td>Rhododendron sp.</td>
<td>Jessamine, Carolina (Yellow)</td>
<td>Gelsemium sempervirens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterflyweed</td>
<td>Asclepias tuberosa</td>
<td>Laurel, Sheep</td>
<td>Kalmania angustifolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cane, Small</td>
<td>Arundinaria tecta</td>
<td>Oak, Scrub</td>
<td>Quercus margareta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattail, Narrowleaf</td>
<td>Typha angustifolia</td>
<td>Partridge Berry</td>
<td>Mitchellia repens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chokeberry, Red</td>
<td>Pyrus arbutifolia</td>
<td>Pepperbush, Sweet</td>
<td>Clethra alnifolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creeper, Virginia</td>
<td>Parthenocissus quinquefolia</td>
<td>Poison Oak</td>
<td>Toxicodendron toxicarium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallberry, Bitter</td>
<td>Ilex glabra</td>
<td>Sassafras</td>
<td>Sassafras albidium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallberry, Large</td>
<td>Ilex coriacea</td>
<td>Staggerbush</td>
<td>Lyonia mariana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass of Parnassus</td>
<td>Parnassia asarifolia</td>
<td>Sumac, Winged</td>
<td>Rhus copallina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart Leaf</td>
<td>Hexastylis stuttlerwurtii</td>
<td>Wax Myrtle</td>
<td>Myrica cerifera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He-Huckleberry/Red Titi</td>
<td>Cyrilla racemiflora</td>
<td>Wax Myrtle, Dwarf</td>
<td>Cerothammus punctilis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honeysuckle, Scrub</td>
<td>Azalea atlantica</td>
<td>Yaupon</td>
<td>Ilex vomitoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honeysuckle, Trumpet</td>
<td>Phenianthus sempervirens</td>
<td>Yucca, Bear Grass</td>
<td>Yucca filamentosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huckleberry, Running</td>
<td>Herpothamnus crassifolius</td>
<td>*Endangered species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Endangered species

Table 4 — Wild flowers found in the area of the park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Taxonomic Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Taxonomic Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alder, Smooth</td>
<td>Alnus serrulata</td>
<td>Orchid, Yellow Fringe</td>
<td>Habenaria ciliaris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Button, Boy</td>
<td>Pilostaxis lutea</td>
<td>Pearl Twist</td>
<td>Ibidium gracile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterwort, Blue</td>
<td>Pinguicula caerulea</td>
<td>Persimmon</td>
<td>Diospyros virginiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterwort, Yellow</td>
<td>Pinguicula lutea</td>
<td>Pineweed</td>
<td>Sarothra gentianoides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colicoot (Stargrass)</td>
<td>Aletris farinosa</td>
<td>Pitcher Plant*</td>
<td>Sarracenia spp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-vine</td>
<td>Bignonia capreolata</td>
<td>Pogonia, Large Whorled</td>
<td>Isotria verticillata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dragonhead, False</td>
<td>Physostegia virginiana</td>
<td>Poison Ivy</td>
<td>Toxicodendron radicans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flytrap, Venus*</td>
<td>Dionaea muscipula</td>
<td>Prickly-pear</td>
<td>Opuntia humifusa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass, Pink</td>
<td>Calopogon tuberosus</td>
<td>Skullcap, Hyssop</td>
<td>Scutellaria integrifolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse-nettle</td>
<td>Solarium carolinense</td>
<td>St. Andrew’s Cross</td>
<td>Ascyrum hypericoides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris, Violet</td>
<td>Iris sp.</td>
<td>St. Peterswort</td>
<td>Ascyrum stans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine, Blue</td>
<td>Viorna crispa</td>
<td>Storax</td>
<td>Styrex americana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Justicia ovata</td>
<td>Sundew, Dwarf</td>
<td>Drosera brevifolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily, Spider</td>
<td>Hymenocallis occidentalis</td>
<td>Sundew, Narrow Leaf</td>
<td>Drosera intermedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludwigia</td>
<td>Ludwigia bononiensis</td>
<td>Sundew, Round Leaf*</td>
<td>Drosera rotundfolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupine, Lady</td>
<td>Lupinus villosus</td>
<td>Toadflax, Blue</td>
<td>Linaria canadensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupine, Wild</td>
<td>Lupinus perennis</td>
<td>Trumpet</td>
<td>Sarracenia flava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss, Spanish</td>
<td>Tillandsia usneoides</td>
<td>Trumpet, Creeper</td>
<td>Campsis radicans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchid, Golden Fringe</td>
<td>Platanthera cristata</td>
<td>Violet, Birdfoot</td>
<td>Viola pedata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchid, Rose-crested</td>
<td>Pogonia ophioglossoides</td>
<td>Violet, Lance-leaved</td>
<td>Viola lanceolata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Endangered species

contains bass, bream, perch, catfish, and garfish (Table 7). Poisonous rattlesnake, copperhead and cottonmouth are seen occasionally, as are a number of other reptiles and amphibians (Table 8). The black widow spider (Latrodectus mactans) becomes a hazard in the park’s storage spaces (NPS 1968:7).

Several mammal species that were common in the area before the arrival of Euro-American settlers have since been eliminated or greatly reduced in numbers due to overhunting and the elimination of natural habitats. These include beaver (Castor canadensis), wolf (Canis lupis), and
### Table 5 — Mammals found in the area of the park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Taxonomic Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bear, Black</td>
<td>Ursus americanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Castor canadensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobcat</td>
<td>Lynx rufus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer, White-tail</td>
<td>Odocoileus virginianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox, Gray</td>
<td>Urocyon cinereoargenteus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion, Mountain</td>
<td>Felis concolor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>Perognathus spp.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6 — Birds found in the area of the park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Taxonomic Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackbird, Red-winged</td>
<td>Agelaius phoeniceus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackbird, Rusty</td>
<td>Euphagus carolinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluebird, Eastern</td>
<td>Sialia sialis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobwhite</td>
<td>Colinus virginianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinal, Northern</td>
<td>Cardinalis cardinalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catbird, Gray</td>
<td>Dumetella carolinensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickadee, Carolina</td>
<td>Parus carolinensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowbird, Brown-headed</td>
<td>Molothrus ater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creeper, Brown</td>
<td>Certhia familiaris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crow, Fish</td>
<td>Corvus ossiferus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuckoo, Yellow-billed</td>
<td>Coccothraulus americanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dove, Mourning</td>
<td>Zenaida macroura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duck, American Black</td>
<td>Anas rubripes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duck, Wood</td>
<td>Aix sponsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egret, Great</td>
<td>Casmerodius albus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finch, House</td>
<td>Carpodacus mexicanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flicker, Common</td>
<td>Colaptes auratus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flycatcher, Acadian</td>
<td>Empidonax virescens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flycatcher, Great Crested</td>
<td>Myiarchus cinerinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gnatcatcher, Blue-gray</td>
<td>Polioptila caerulea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldfinch, American</td>
<td>Carduelis tristis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goose, Canada</td>
<td>Branta canadensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grosbeak, Rose-breasted</td>
<td>Pheucticus ludovicianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawk, Cooper's</td>
<td>Accipiter cooperi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawk, Marsh/Northern Harrier</td>
<td>Circus cyaneus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawk, Red-shouldered</td>
<td>Buteo lineatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawk, Red-tailed</td>
<td>Buteo jamaicensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawk, Sharp-shinned</td>
<td>Accipiter striatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heron, Great Blue</td>
<td>Ardea herodias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heron, Green-backed</td>
<td>Butorides striatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hummingbird, Ruby-throated</td>
<td>Archilochus colubris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibis, White</td>
<td>Eugoeocinus albus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay, Blue</td>
<td>Cyanocitta cristata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junco, Dark-eyed</td>
<td>Junco hyemalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingbird, Eastern</td>
<td>Tyrannus tyrannus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingfisher, Belted</td>
<td>Megaceryle alcyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinglet, Golden-crowned</td>
<td>Regulus satrapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinglet, Ruby-crowned</td>
<td>Regulus calendula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mockingbird, Northern</td>
<td>Mimus polyglottos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuthatch, Brown-headed</td>
<td>Sitta pusilla</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7 — Birds found in the area of the park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Taxonomic Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nuthatch, Red-breasted</td>
<td>Sitta carolinensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuthatch, White-breasted</td>
<td>Sitta carolinensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owl, Barred</td>
<td>Strix varia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pewee, Eastern Wood</td>
<td>Contopus virens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoebe, Eastern</td>
<td>Sayornis phoebe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redstart, American</td>
<td>Setophaga ruticilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin, American</td>
<td>Turdus migratorius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sapsucker, Yellow-bellied</td>
<td>Sphyrapicus varius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparrow, Chipping</td>
<td>Spizella passerina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparrow, Field</td>
<td>Spizella pusilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparrow, Fox</td>
<td>Passerella iliaca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparrow, Song</td>
<td>Melopsia melodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparrow, Swamp</td>
<td>Melopsia georgiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparrow, White-throated</td>
<td>Zonotrichia albicollis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starling, European</td>
<td>Sturnus vulgaris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swallow, Tree</td>
<td>Iridoprocne bicolor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swift, Chimney</td>
<td>Chaetura pelagica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanager, Summer</td>
<td>Piranga rubra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrasher, Brown</td>
<td>Toxostoma rufum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrush, Hermit</td>
<td>Catharus guttatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrush, Wood</td>
<td>Hylcocichla mustelina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titmouse, Tufted</td>
<td>Parus bicolor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towhee, Rufous-sided</td>
<td>Pipilo erythrophthalmus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veery</td>
<td>Catharus fuscivus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vireo, Red-eyed</td>
<td>Vireo olivaceus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vireo, Solitary</td>
<td>Vireo solitarius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vireo, White-eyed</td>
<td>Vireo griseus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulture, Black</td>
<td>Coragyps atratus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulture, Turkey</td>
<td>Cathares aura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warbler, Black-and-White</td>
<td>Minniotilla varia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warbler, Blackburnian</td>
<td>Dendroica fusc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warbler, Chestnut-sided</td>
<td>Dendroica pensylvanica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warbler, Hooded</td>
<td>Wilsonia citrina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warbler, Kentucky</td>
<td>Oporornis formsus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warbler, Northern Parula</td>
<td>Parula americana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warbler, Palm</td>
<td>Dendroica palmarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warbler, Pine</td>
<td>Dendroica pinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warbler, Prairie</td>
<td>Dendroica discolor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warbler, Prothonotary</td>
<td>Protonotaria citrea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warbler, Yellow</td>
<td>Dendroica petechia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mountain lion (*Felis concolor*). Migratory passenger pigeons (*Ectopistes migratorius*), once seasonally prevalent, are now extinct due to historic overhunting. Megafauna present during North America’s last glacial period became extinct by the beginning of the Holocene; these include mastodon (*Mammut americanum*), giant ground sloth (*Megalonyx jeffersoni*), giant beaver (*Castoroides ohioensis*), and giant bison (*Bison bison antiquus*) (Anderson 1984; Kurten and Anderson 1980).
DISCUSSION

As palynological studies have shown (Delcourt and Delcourt 1981; Delcourt et al. 1980), the taxonomic compositions of the vegetative communities that occur in the park today are, of course, distributed differently than they were when Euro-American settlers first arrived. The introduction of Dutch elm disease, for example, has significantly altered the occurrence of American elm \textit{(Ulmus americana)} trees in the forest habitats, and historic land clearing and timber harvesting have resulted in a local patchwork of successional forest types.

The prehistoric distribution of vegetative communities in the area is not well known, but it is thought that the correlation of vegetative communities with the major topographic zones (upland ridges, slopes, bottomlands) has been relatively stable for roughly 5,000 years. Prior to 3000 B.C., there have been major vegetational shifts as a result of major climatic changes.

The general sequence for environmental change in the North Carolina region shortly before and during the times of known human occupation is summarized in the following paragraphs.

The peak of the Late Wisconsin Continental Glaciation is dated 16,000 B.C. (Delcourt and Delcourt 1981). Shortly thereafter, with continuing climatic amelioration, the Laurentide Ice Sheet began its slow retreat to the north. During that time, North Carolina was within the southern portion of a broad zone of jack pine-spruce forest that extended northward into Pennsylvania and New Jersey (Delcourt and Delcourt 1981:146–147). A narrow belt of mixed conifer-northern hardwood forest was present just south of the state’s southern boundary.

The forest zones in North Carolina remained relatively unchanged until approximately 8000 B.C. As the continental ice continued to retreat toward the north, the mixed hardwood forests that were previously limited to the Savannah River Valley expanded to cover most of the South Coastal Plain. (Delcourt and Delcourt 1981:147, 149).

From roughly 6000 to 3000 B.C., a warming and drying trend occurred, which once more resulted in major shifts in North Carolina’s biotic regimes. This Hypsithermal climatic interval was caused by an increase in the westerly prevailing winds and resulted in the replacement of the mixed hardwood forests by a forest dominated by oak, hickory, and southern pine.

Oak-hickory-southern pine forest became established in the North Carolina Piedmont, while southern pine forest came to occupy most of North Carolina’s Coastal Plain. Large pockets of cypress-gum forest occupied the lowland coastal areas. Following the warm and dry conditions of the Hypsithermal, there was a cooling trend with increasing precipitation that continues into the present. Over this period of time, the predominant forest zones of North Carolina have apparently remained relatively stable due to the limited climatological fluctuations (Delcourt and Delcourt 1981:150–153).
Chapter 3
CULTURAL OVERVIEW

NATIVE AMERICAN CULTURES

Unfortunately, little attention has been paid to the history of Precolumbian Native American cultures in the park and in the immediate surrounding area. As a result, cultural chronologies based on archeological work conducted in adjacent areas have been extended to provide an interim framework for those past Native American cultures expected to occur within the local area. The chronological framework employed here (Table 9) has been largely adopted from information obtained from Phelps (1983), Anderson et al. (1996), and Trinkley et al. (1996).

PALEOINDIAN PERIOD (10,500 – 8000 B.C.)

The earliest known human inhabitants in the New World are referred to as the Paleoindians. They are believed to have migrated across the Bering Strait land bridge to North America during the last glacial age. Archeological evidence confirms Paleoindian occupation in the southeastern United States between 10,500 and 8000 B.C. Current interpretations of the archeological record portray Paleoindian peoples as nomadic, egalitarian bands composed of several nuclear or extended families (Anderson 1990; Morse and Morse 1983). The Paleoindian period climate and environment were in transition and considerably different than at present, with sea levels seventy or more meters lower than they are today (Anderson et al. 1996:4). The available global water was taken up by massive polar ice sheets, which exposed much of what is now the North American continental shelf in the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico. Coastal shorelines were frequented by the Paleoindians, as evidenced by submerged sites found on the continental shelf today (Dunbar and Webb 1996).

With the generally colder temperatures of the time period, the Southeast was a scene of vastly different floral and faunal communities, including such now extinct Pleistocene megafauna as mastodons and giant ground sloths.

Until relatively recently, the amount of contact between megafauna and Paleoindian hunters was hotly debated. However, the discoveries of a speared giant tortoise from Little Salt Spring (Clausen et al. 1979) and the skull of a *Bison antiquus* with a projectile point embedded in its forehead from the Wacissa River (Webb et al. 1984) provide direct association of Pleistocene fauna and Paleoindians in the lower Southeast (Anderson et al. 1996:3).

Whether Paleoindian hunters only contributed to or actually caused the extinction of North America's megafauna is still a matter of debate. Changing environmental factors also appear to have played a role in their demise. Controversy also exists concerning the role of megafauna in the subsistence strategy of Paleoindian populations. Although it is commonly assumed that Paleoindians were big-game hunting specialists, there is actually little direct evidence to support this generally accepted theory.
As the last glacial age came to a close, the Southeast experienced rapid environmental change. The sea levels rose to within a few meters of present levels, and the patchy boreal forest that covered much of the landscape was eventually transformed to mesic oak-hickory forest. “The best evidence suggests this transition was complete over much of the lower Southeast by shortly after 10,000 B.P. [8000 B.C.], and almost certainly by 9000 B.P. [7000 B.C.]” (Anderson et al. 1996:4).

The Paleoindians of the North Carolina Coastal Plain are poorly represented in the archaeological record as fewer than fifty Paleoindian sites in this area have been recorded (Phelps 1983:18). Recently, it has been suggested that few Paleoindian sites should be expected in the lower southeastern Coastal Plain (except in Florida where environmental conditions differed considerably) “since the initial founding populations were apparently not technologically and organizationally adapted to such an environment” until late in the Paleoindian period (Anderson et al. 1996:7).

The Paleoindian period has been subdivided into three sequential temporal groupings: Early, Middle, and Late Paleoindian (Anderson 1990; O’Steen et al. 1986:9). These correspond with changes in lithic technology and, presumably, changes in subsistence patterns and other lifeways.

**Early Paleoindian (10,500 - 9000 B.C.)**

Clovis projectile points (Figure 5) are temporally diagnostic artifacts from the Early Paleoindian period. Sellards (1952) and Wormington (1957) describe the points as being relatively large lanceolate forms with nearly parallel sides, ground haft margins, slightly concave bases, and single or multiple flutes that rarely extend more than a third of the way up the body (Anderson et al. 1996:9). Often points that resemble the classic Clovis are also attributed to the Early Paleoindian period. Other names sometimes used to describe these forms are Eastern Clovis and Gainey (Anderson et al. 1996:9; MacDonald 1983; Mason 1962; Shott 1986; Simons et al. 1984).

**Middle Paleoindian (9000 - 8500 B.C.)**

The Middle Paleoindian period is characterized by smaller fluted points, unfluted lanceolate points, and fluted or unfluted points with broad blades and constricted haft elements. Common Southeastern forms include Suwannee, Simpson, Clovis Variant, and Cumberland types (Anderson et al. 1996:11). The Clovis Variant (Anderson et al. 1992; Michie 1977:62-65) are smaller fluted forms, some of which appear to be extensively reshaped Clovis points. Clovis Variant points occur mostly in the South Appalachian Piedmont (Anderson et al. 1996:11). Cumberland types are the most common types recovered in the mid-South. They are characterized by Lewis (1954) as being narrow, deeply fluted, slightly waisted lanceolates with faint ears and a slightly concave base (Anderson et al. 1996:11). Beaver Lake and Quad types are sometimes assigned to the Late or transitional Middle/Late Paleoindian period (Anderson et al. 1996:12).

![Figure 5 — Projectile points of the Paleoindian and Archaic periods (Anderson et al. 1996, figure 1.2).](image-url)
Late Paleoindian (8500 – 8000 B.C.)

Hardaway-Dalton projectile points are assigned to the Late Paleoindian period. Related point styles including Quad, San Patrice, and Beaver Lake types (Anderson et al. 1996:12; Coe 1964; Good-year 1974, 1982:390; Justice 1987:35–44; Morse 1971a, 1971b, 1973; Webb et al. 1971). Hardaway-Dalton points are described as having a lanceolate blade outline and a concave base that is sometimes thinned and ground on the lateral and basal margins. The edges of the blade may be incurvate, straight, or excursive and are frequently serrated (Cambron and Hulse 1975; DeJarnette et al. 1962:47, 84; Justice 1987:35–36). Beaver Lake points are characterized as small, slightly waisted lanceolates with very faint ears, a weakly concave base, and moderate basal thinning (Cambron and Hulse 1975; DeJarnette et al. 1962:47, 84; Justice 1987:35–36). Quad points are small lanceolates with distinct ears, concave bases, and pronounced basal thinning, sometimes to the point of appearing fluted (Anderson et al. 1996:12; Cambron and Hulse 1975; DeJarnette et al. 1962:47, 84; Justice 1987:35–36; Soday 1954:9).

Another sequence for the Paleoindian period of the Piedmont area (Oliver 1981a:16, 1985:199–200) recognizes four developmental phases of projectile points as follows: (1) the Hardaway Blade, considered a regional variant of the Clovis, which evolves into (2) the Hardaway-Dalton semi-lanceolate, which in turn evolves into (3) the Hardaway Side-Notched, and in turn gives rise to (4) the Palmer Corner Notched. Phelps (1983:19) acknowledges that the final phase, Palmer Corner Notched, is often defined as Early Archaic rather than Late Paleoindian period, and personally defines the type as transitional. Trinkley discusses Oliver’s typology in the following paragraph.

Oliver (1981b, 1985) has proposed to extend the Paleoindian dating in the North Carolina Piedmont to perhaps as early as 14,000 B.P. [12,000 B.C.], incorporating the Hardaway Side-Notched and Palmer Corner-Notched types, usually accepted as Early Archaic, as representatives of the terminal phase. This view, verbally suggested by Coe for a number of years, has considerable technological appeal. Oliver suggests a continuity from the Hardaway Blade through the Hardaway-Dalton to the Hardaway Side-Notched, eventually to the Palmer Side-Notched [Oliver 1985:199–200]. While convincingly argued, this approach is not universally accepted. (Trinkley et al. 1996:25)

Archaic Period (8000 – 1000 B.C.)

Archaic cultures in the Southeast are recognized as very successful adaptations to the new forest communities and related animal populations that followed the end of the last ice age. Like the preceding Paleoindian period, the Archaic period has been typically divided by Southeastern archaeologists into three subdivisions: Early, Middle, and Late Archaic.

Early Archaic (8000 – 6000 B.C.)

The temporally diagnostic artifact assemblage of Early Archaic culture on the North Carolina Coastal Plain includes the following projectile points: Palmer, a corner-notched point that is considered by some to be transitional from Late Paleoindian to Early Archaic; Kirk Corner Notched, which is generally attributed solely to the Early Archaic period; and Kirk Stemmed, which gradually replaces the Kirk Corner Notched and often exhibits a serrated blade. Toward the end of the Early Archaic, bifurcate stemmed points, such as LeCroy and Kanawha (Justice 1987:85–96) are also sporadically found. The Early Archaic tool kit also includes end- and sidescrapers, blades, and drills that exhibit manufacturing techniques similar to those used during the Paleoindian period.

Middle Archaic (6000 – 3000 B.C.)

The Middle Archaic period coincides with a period of warmer and drier climate referred to as the Hypsithermal Interval (Delcourt and Delcourt 1981:150). During this period, the oak and hickory forests that had come to dominate the Atlantic Coastal Plain following the last ice age were replaced by southern pine forest. Since the close of the Hypsithermal (3000 B.C.), southern pine has
remained the dominant forest type of the North Carolina Coastal Plain except for the cypress-gum forests inhabiting the Green Swamp just west of Cape Fear and the Dismal Swamp regions of Albemarle Sound.

Changes in the tool assemblages used by Middle Archaic peoples accompanied the changes in climate and forest communities. The new artifact assemblage included Stanly Stemmed (ca. 6000-5000 B.C.) projectile points, polished stone artifacts, and semilunar spearthrower weights. Other new point types, including Morrow Mountain (ca. 5500-3500 B.C.) and Guilford (ca. 4500-3500 B.C.), are thought to have been introduced into North Carolina from western Piedmont sources (Coe 1964:123; Phelps 1983:23).

Late Archaic (3000 – 1000 B.C.)
The Late Archaic was a period of major technological and economic change for North Carolina’s native peoples. With increasing population levels and concomitantly shrinking territories, native populations experienced reduced residential mobility, but still continued their seasonal movements in order to exploit natural resources as these became seasonally available. Perhaps as a compensation for reduced territorial size, Late Archaic peoples participated in long-distance exchange networks to obtain nonlocal resources. And, although evidence is currently lacking, it is possible that Late Archaic peoples along the North Carolina Coastal Plain were experimenting with plant husbandry—a change in subsistence practices that other Late Archaic groups in the Southeast are now known to have adopted.

Projectile point styles also continued to change, although the exact time range of certain types remains somewhat ambiguous. Large Savannah River Stemmed points, which began to appear near the close of the Middle Archaic, were probably made throughout the Late Archaic and were predominant in the Middle and South Atlantic Coastal Plain (House and Ballenger 1976:24). Other innovations of the period included the manufacture and use of steatite (soapstone) vessels for cooking and perforated soapstone disks, which were apparently used in the stone-boiling cooking method. By the end of the period (1000 B.C.), Late Archaic groups over much of the state had adopted, to some extent, the manufacture and use of pottery.

Woodland Period of the South Coastal Region (1000 B.C. – Contact)
The temporal division drawn between the Archaic period and the succeeding Woodland period on the Coastal Plain is somewhat blurred and a point of continuing discussion among members of the archaeological community. It is debated because the introduction and use of pottery, a primary trait for assigning Woodland cultural affiliation, developed rapidly in some areas of the Southeast but was slow to advance in others. Determining the temporal division is additionally complicated in the Moores Creek area because Moores Creek lies near the fluctuating boundary between two distinct cultural traditions, which later witnessed the development of relatively independent ceramic traditions (Herbert and Mathis 1996:141-142; Phelps 1983:27). It is further complicated by the lack of well-documented and well-dated ceramic assemblages (Anderson 1996).

The initial introduction of pottery is viewed by many archeologists as an inappropriate time marker for distinguishing Archaic from Woodland cultures in the Georgia-Carolina region because pottery was not widely used during the first millennium, or more, after its introduction around 2500 B.C. People living on the Georgia-Carolina coast, along with those living in the Savannah River Valley, peninsular Florida, and small portions of the mid-South, developed early pottery traditions that were not matched in surrounding and intervening areas. As Sassaman and Anderson explain:

"Pottery seems to have been grafted onto an existing Late Archaic technology with little change in settlement and subsistence.... What is more, the development of pots for use over fire was a slow and uneven process, with coastal populations quick to adopt innovations and riverine populations lagging behind"
for reasons that may have little to do with pottery function or efficiency....It was not until about 3,000 B.P. [1000 B.C.] that pottery was widely employed across the Southeast.... Given these developments, 3,000 B.P. [1000 B.C.] represents a meaningful turning point in Southeastern prehistory, and a rational place to draw the temporal line between Archaic and Woodland periods. (1995:30)

Toward the end of the Late Archaic period, approximately 2000 B.C., the region encompassing the Cape Fear River drainage saw the first introduction of pottery—the Stallings Island fiber-tempered series (Sears and Griffin 1950) (Figure 6). However, of the thirty-eight sites with Stallings Island pottery that were studied by Phelps (1983) in the North Carolina south coastal region, the only type represented in the collections is Stallings Island Plain (Sears and Griffin 1950). This implies that the full-fledged ceramic series with its decorative types did not extended into the south coastal region of North Carolina (Phelps 1983:26). Phelps described the limited distribution of fiber-tempered pottery in North Carolina at the end of the Late Archaic and the distinct ceramic traditions that evolved between the north coastal and south coastal regions of North Carolina following its introduction.

Sites with Stallings Plain sherds are concentrated from the Neuse River system southward.... It appears that the distribution of fiber-tempered pottery north of the Neuse river is rare, representing a minor influx....In succeeding centuries the boundary moved southward, but the two regions it defined within the North Carolina Coastal Plain remained distinct and by about 1000 B.C. had developed their own characteristic traits. (Phelps 1983:26-27)

Sand-tempered Thom’s Creek pottery was also added to the ceramic assemblage near the end of the Late Archaic period. In the currently accepted ceramic cultural sequence for the Cape Fear River area (Phelps 1968; Trinkley et al. 1996), Stallings Island fiber-tempered ware precedes, is later contemporaneous with, and, around 1500 B.C., is eventually replaced by Thom’s Creek sand-tempered pottery as the result of the introduction of new technological traits in ceramic production. Thom’s Creek pottery, in turn, is followed by the coarse sand-tempered New River series, which dates roughly to between 1000 and 300 B.C. (Herbert and Mathis 1996; Trinkley et al. 1996). Toward the later half of the Early Woodland period, minor numbers of Deptford series ceramics appear and signal the immanent arrival of Middle Woodland cultures in the area.

The introduction of coarse sand and grit (rock) tempered pottery types, such as New River and Deep Creek, is a defining hallmark of Early Woodland culture in the North Carolina Coastal Plain. Small, stemmed, triangular bladed projectile points,
such as the Gypsy and Roanoke points, are also typical of the Early Woodland culture in this area.

Somewhat different ceramic sequences occur within the Coastal Plain immediately to the south (Anderson et al. 1982; Ledbetter 1995; Steen and Braley 1994). The existence of this ceramic sequence is considered the result of a "ripple effect" in the area of the Pee Dee River drainage in South Carolina. This probably represents the most northerly extent of the complete Stallings Island ceramic series, with Stallings Island Plain rarely found north of the Neuse River. Thom's Creek ware appears to reach its northernmost extent at the Neuse River, and Refuge (ca. 1000–500 B.C.) and Deptford (ca. 600 B.C. – A.D. 500) types are only rarely found north of the Cape Fear River (Anderson 1996; Herbert and Mathis 1996; Lilly and Gunn 1996; South 1976; Wilde-Ramsing 1978).

**Early Woodland (1000 – 200 B.C.)**
The dominant Early Woodland pottery type for the south coastal region is a coarse sand-tempered ware that Loftfield (1976:149–154) terms New River. The attributes of New River pottery closely resemble the Deep Creek pottery types identified by Phelps (1983:29–31) for the north coastal area of North Carolina, and have been subsumed in Phelps’s (1983:31) Deep Creek typology in his attempt to standardize the Coastal Plain ceramic chronology. This unification of types has apparently not attracted much support, however, with Loftfield’s New River series still being used in the archeological literature (e.g., Herbert and Mathis 1996:145; Trinkley et al. 1996:32) when referring to the south coastal region.

Essentially identical to Deep Creek pottery, New River pottery is tempered with coarse sand. New River pottery may be “thong marked” (i.e., simple stamped), cord marked, net impressed, fabric impressed, and plain (often smoothed). Although there are few radiocarbon dated assemblages for either Deep Creek or New River (Herbert and Mathis 1996:140–145), they are assumed to be roughly contemporaneous.

Three phases have been suggested for the Deep Creek series tentatively dated from roughly 1000 to 200 B.C. Deep Creek I (ca. 1000–800 B.C.) is characterized by coarse sand-tempered wares dominated by cord marking with some simple stamping and the first evidence of net/fabric impressing. Phelps is of the opinion that “the origin of this simple stamping lies somewhere within the Stallings Island-Thom’s Creek continuum but is reinforced by the paddle-stamped type that is typical of the later Deptford phase” (1983:30–31). Deep Creek II (800–500 B.C.?) has an increased emphasis on simple stamping, net/fabric-impressed surface treatments (Herbert and Mathis 1996:144). Concomitantly, there is a decrease in the use of cord marking on vessel exteriors. The Deep Creek III phase (500–200 B.C.) is characterized by decreasing popularity in the use of simple stamping with a continuance of cord-, net-, or fabric-impressed decorative motifs.

Although New River and Deep Creek pottery decorative techniques are virtually identical, the occurrence of net- and fabric-impressed surface treatments is more prevalent in the coastal area north of the Neuse River.

The information currently available is insufficient to speak definitively about the subsistence and settlement patterns exhibited by the Early Woodland peoples in the North Carolina Coastal Plain. Settlement patterns similar to the Late Archaic have been suggested (Phelps 1976), with base campsites being located in riverine settings where major streams are accessible. However, this hypothesis is based primarily on surface collected materials (Phelps 1983:32). Sassaman and Anderson (1995:151) suggest that applying Milanich’s (1971, 1972) transhumance model of seasonal movements between the coast and the interior lower Coastal Plain produces anomalous data. Widmer’s (1976) model, on the other hand, depicts two discrete adaptive systems—one on the coast and the other in the interior. According to this model, the coastal adaptation was sedentary whereas the interior groups were semi-nomadic, moving up and down rivers in a seasonal manner (Sassaman and Anderson 1995:151).

**Middle Woodland (200 B.C. – A.D. 800)**
The Middle Woodland period, typically dated from 200 B.C. to A.D. 800, is more clearly understood
than the Early Woodland period because more information is available. Trinkley and his associates (1996) suggest that the best data currently available is represented by Phelps’s (1983) Mount Pleasant series developed for the north coastal region. However, for the south coastal region, medium-sized sand-tempered Cape Fear and grog-tempered Hanover ceramics are considered hallmarks of the Middle Woodland period (Herbert and Mathis 1996:147).

The Mount Pleasant phase ceramic complex appears to be a traditional continuity from the earlier Deep Creek ware, varying from the latter in a possibly higher frequency of net-impressed surface finish, a trend toward larger clastic temper, and the addition of incised decoration. The size of the tempering material varies widely, a fact noted by Haag (1958:71) in the analysis of his “Middle Period” grit-tempered ware (Phelps 1983:33).

South (1976:18) originally defined Middle Woodland south coastal region ceramics as the Cape Fear and Hanover series. Phelps (1983), however, subsumes the Cape Fear pottery into his north coastal Mount Pleasant series. Similarly, Loftfield (1976) has subsumed South’s Hanover series within his Carteret series. Loftfield (1976) also offers a type description for a poorly understood Onslow series—a crushed quartz-tempered ware with cord-marked and fabric-impressed surfaces—which he places between Carteret and White Oak (a Late Woodland phase).

Trinkley and his co-writers (1996) admit that very little is known about the people who produced the Cape Fear and Hanover ceramics found by South (1976) in the south coastal region, but they can describe the various attributes of these people’s pottery. Cape Fear pottery is sand-tempered, the sand particles being of medium size (0.25–0.50 mm) using the Wentworth scale (Herbert and Mathis 1996). Surface decorations include cord marked, fabric marked, net impressed, and plain. Hanover pottery is distinguished on the basis of clay- and sherd-tempering with some suggestion that the majority of the temper is composed of crushed sherds. Hanover wares surface decorations include fabric impressed, cord marked, and plain.

The presence of small, low, sand burial mounds during the Cape Fear phase is a unique trait of the Middle Woodland period in the south coastal region. The geographical boundaries of these mounds appear to be confined from the Cape Fear River drainage northward to the Neuse River. The contents of the mounds include secondary cremations and platform pipes, many of which are similar to those recovered from mounds of the Middle Woodland period from other regions of the Southeast. Phelps discusses Brose and Greber’s (1979) suggestion that the similarities in the contents of mounds and their placement away from the habitation areas may have resulted from contact with other groups participating in the Hopewell Interaction Sphere (Phelps 1983:35).

**Late Woodland (A.D. 800 – Contact)**

Archeological and related ethnohistorical research of the Carolina Coastal Plain has shown that the area was occupied by peoples of several language groups (Figure 7) during the Late Woodland period. The Carolina Algonkians occupied the coast from north of the Virginia border to roughly south of the Neuse River. Tuscarora speakers occupied the inland area to the west. Siouan language groups (including the Cape Fear and Waccamaw) inhabited the south coastal region south of the Neuse River and east of the fall line.

South (1976:5–8) has voiced the opinion that the shell-tempered Oak Island ceramic series is a Siouan cultural indicator for the Late Woodland period in the south coast region based on summarized ethnographic documents and archeological evidence. Oak Island decorative attributes include cord-marked and net- or fabric-impressed surface decorations. South’s Oak Island series is virtually the same as Loftfield’s (1976) shell-tempered White Oak series, a fact that led Phelps (1983:48) to suggest that White Oak be subsumed under Oak Island and, likewise, has led to the classification of the region’s Late Woodland shell-tempered ceramics by some archeologists as “Oak Island/White Oak” (Herbert and Mathis 1996:151).

Other artifacts typically associated with the Late Woodland period include small varieties of triangular points, shell beads, bone pins, bone fish-
hooks, small polished stone celts, copper adornments, and pipes. Perhaps the best evidence associating the Oak Island wares with a specific ethnic group is the research conducted at a New Hanover County ossuary where the skeletal population was identified as having Siouan physical traits (Coe et al. 1982).

The association of Oak Island wares with Late Woodland peoples has been muddied somewhat by the recent realization that some of the pottery previously identified as shell-tempered Oak Island is actually limestone- and marl-tempered Hamp’s Landing ware, which dates several centuries earlier to the Middle Woodland period. As a result, Herbert and Mathis (1996:154) have voiced the opinion that the term “White Oak” be used to denote the shell-tempered series.

AGRICULTURAL CHIEFDOMS OF THE SOUTH COASTAL REGION (A.D. 1000 – CONTACT)

The agricultural chiefdoms that arose during the last few centuries (A.D. 1000–1500) of southeastern North America Pre Columbian history are most commonly known by the term “Mississippian” or “Mississippian-like.” The rise of Mississippian chiefdoms is usually characterized as the period when Native American cultures reached their greatest cultural complexity (Bense 1994; Griffin 1967, 1985; Jennings 1974; Muller 1983; Peebles
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and Kus 1977; Smith 1978, 1986). This complexity is reflected in a hierarchy of site types ranging from single family habitations or “farmsteads” to multi-mound ceremonial centers, a stratified sociopolitical organization that has been broadly compared to chiefdom-level societies, endemic warfare, specialization in the production of various traded commodities (shell, copper, salt), and a heavy reliance on maize (corn) horticulture for subsistence. Earlier subsistence strategies, such as hunting, fishing, and gathering, were used to supplement the agricultural crops.

The rise of Mississippian cultures was also intimately tied to the development of chiefdoms. Chiefdoms were organized hereditarily and were highly structured, socially and economically. This permitted larger numbers of people to share the greater productive potential (and risks) of maize agriculture. The political and economic nature of chiefdoms, however, resulted in continual intra-group competition as many individuals vied for the few highest positions. To be among the ruling elite provided them with greater affluence and prestige. Continual attempts to expand the influence of the chiefdom and bring neighboring groups under economic and political control, increases in population, and a preference for farming floodplain areas, which were limited, led to regular armed conflict.

The Mississippian period (A.D. 1000-1500) is also characterized by the presence of shell-tempered ceramics, although shell was not the preferred pottery tempering agent in all areas. This is especially true on the eastern coastal plain where the absence of shell-tempered pottery and the continued use of grit- and sand-tempering has resulted in the description of chiefdom-level societies in the region as “Mississippian-like.”

While the powerful Mississippian tradition was widespread in the Southeast, measuring the Mississippian influence on North Carolina Native Americans is difficult. Some evidence of influence exists in the form of pottery types and ornaments connected with the religious and political symbolism of the Mississippian cultural traditions. However, the temple mounds so common to the tradition are absent in the Coastal Plain of North Carolina (except at Town Creek). The cultural alliances between the politically and economically powerful groups in North Carolina seem to have been based more on the spoken language than on the forms of tribute and trade networks associated with the Mississippian tradition to the extent that the Mississippian influence was overshadowed in this area (North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office 1990).

CONTACT PERIOD (A.D. 1524 – 1650)

The first recorded European contact with Native Americans in what is now North Carolina was during the Atlantic coastal voyage of Verrazzano in 1524. Spain, France, and England later sent expeditions to North Carolina to explore the area, but it was not until 1585 that the English established a colony on Roanoke Island under the sponsorship of Sir Walter Raleigh. After this venture failed, English settlers entered the Albemarle region from Virginia. By the mid-seventeenth century, they were well established in North Carolina.

The native populations of North Carolina were largely displaced from the area as the European colonists arrived. Some native groups from the coastal area and the Piedmont voluntarily relocated as the settlers advanced. Other groups were forced to relocate to a few small reservations following bitter conflicts, such as the Tuscarora (1711 and 1712) and Yamassee (1715) Wars. The Native Americans who avoided direct contact with the colonists were, nevertheless, subject to drastically altered political and economic systems. Their cultural traditions were threatened as they became involved in the fur trade. The introduction of European diseases also contributed to the devastation of their former lifeways (North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office 1990).

The largest native groups known to inhabit the region of the Cape Fear River drainage were the Pee Dee, the Cape Fear, and the Waccamaw. All were Siouan language speakers.

In 1715, the Pee Dee lived on the middle course of the Pee Dee River near the present state boundary with South Carolina. “Black River, a lower tributary of the Pee Dee from the west, was formerly called Wenee River, probably another
form of the same word, and Winyah Bay still preserves their memory” (Mooney 1970:76 [1894]).

The Cape Fear Indians lived along the river of the same name, which is the next major river north of the Pee Dee. Mooney explained:

*The proper name of the Cape Fear Indians is unknown. This local term was applied by the early colonists to the tribe formerly living about the lower part of Cape Fear river in the southeastern corner of North Carolina.... The tribe seemed to be populous, with numerous villages along the river.* (1970:66 [1894])

After the Yamasee War, the Cape Fear Indians were removed to South Carolina where they apparently settled in the vicinity of Williamsburg County (Swanton 1946:103). Some South Carolina documents, dated 1808, state that only one mixed-blood woman of the tribe remained by that year, although some of the tribe may have joined the Lumbee or the Catawba (Swanton 1946).

The ancestral Waccamaw were a relatively small tribe of Siouan speakers that lived on the river of that name and on the lower course of the Pee Dee River in close proximity to the Winyah and Pee Dee tribes when the English established themselves in South Carolina in 1670 (Swanton 1946:203). The Waccamaw are among the several modern Native American groups who are recognized today as direct descendants of their prehistoric and early historic ancestors in North Carolina. Another large North Carolinian Indian group of greatly mixed tribal ancestry and racial background are the Lumbee (Paredes 1992:2). Other Native American groups also continue to reside within the boundaries of the state, including the Eastern Cherokee, the Coharie, and the Haliwa-Saponi (Lerch 1992:45).

**THE BATTLE OF MOORES CREEK**

**BACKGROUND**

As the economic and political controversy with Great Britain progressed into open rebellion in the mid-1770s, North Carolina became sharply divided. The legislature, which was popularly elected, openly opposed the royal governor Josiah Martin. By the summer of 1775, the split into two warring groups affected the entire population, with approximately half belonging to the Patriots and the balance composed of Crown officials, wealthy merchants, planters, and other conservatives. Among these conservatives were the Highlanders, a sizable number of people who had immigrated directly from Scotland into North Carolina in the preceding decades (Hatch 1969:1–30).

When the news of the April 1775 skirmishes at Lexington and Concord reached North Carolina a month later, royal authority was further undermined. Governor Martin fled the capital of New Bern and arrived at Fort Johnson on the lower Cape Fear River in June 1775. Only six weeks later, the North Carolina militia forced Loyalists to abandon the fort and escape to the British warship Cruizer, which was waiting offshore. The furious governor laid plans for raising an army of 10,000 Loyalists. This army was to be made up of Regulators—described as “the officers of this county [who are] under a better and honester regulation than any have been for some time” (Hatch 1969:3)—and the Highlanders of North Carolina. Martin’s plans called for this makeshift army to march to the coast and rendezvous with the powerful expeditionary force under Lord Cornwallis, Sir Henry Clinton, and Sir Peter Parker. Their combined forces would, it was firmly believed, reestablish royal authority in the Carolinas (Hatch 1969:3–12).

As soon as the British Secretary of State for the Colonies, Lord Dartmouth, approved the plans, Governor Martin began recruiting his army, which was to muster under Brigadier General Donald MacDonald and Lieutenant Colonel Donald McLeod near Cross Creek (Fayetteville). From there, they would march to the coast, provision the British troops arriving by sea, and finally reconquer the colony. By February 15, 1776, approximately 1,600 men had been assembled (Hatch 1969:11–12).

The Patriots learned of the mass assembly and began gathering their own forces. The militia was
mustered under Colonel Richard Caswell and joined the 1st N.C. Continentals under the command of Colonel James Moore. When Tory General MacDonald began marching his Highlanders toward the coast, Moore blocked the movement at Rockfish Creek. MacDonald then rerouted eastward, crossed the Cape Fear River, and proceeded toward the Negro Head Point Road, also called Stage Road, where he believed he would encounter little opposition (Hatch 1969:21-24).

In a counter move, Caswell withdrew from Corbett’s Ferry on the Black River in order to “take possession of the Bridge upon Widow Moore’s Creek” (King 1937:3). Moore issued orders for Colonel Alexander Lillington to join Caswell, then fell back toward Wilmington. Moore hoped to attack the rear of MacDonald’s column while Caswell blocked MacDonald’s forward movement (Hatch: 1969:26-30).

THE BATTLE

On February 25, 1776, Lillington arrived at Moores Creek Bridge with 150 Wilmington District Minutemen. The murky, silty stream measured more than fifty feet wide. Approximately five to fifteen feet deep, it was subject to tidal fluctuations of several feet. The dark waters wound through swampy land. The creek bottom mixed heavy accumulations of mud and debris and made crossing difficult anywhere in the vicinity except over the narrow bridge. Lillington immediately built a low earthwork on the east side, on a slight rise overlooking the bridge and its approach from the west (Figure 8a). The next day, Caswell arrived with 850 men, whom he sent across the bridge to throw up entrenchments on the east side (Figure 8b) (Hatch 1969:34-35).

During the night of February 26, 1776, Lillington and his men were camped on the east side of the bridge, Caswell and his men on the west side. MacDonald and his 1,600 Loyalists were camped six miles away, west of the Patriots. MacDonald, aging and ill, advised his council of officers against attack, but the eager McLeod insisted that the reports of the Patriot camp on the near (to their position) side of the creek, or west side, made the campsite a practicable if not an easy target. The younger officers won the debate. McLeod and his Highlanders began their march at

![Figure 8 — Battle map showing troop movements (Groh after NPS 1968).]
one o’clock in the morning on February 27. They quickly became so lost in the swamps that it was close to dawn before they reached the creek in the vicinity of where Caswell had been camped (Hatch 1969:35).

While the Highlanders were lost in the swamps, Caswell and his men left their camp on the west side position and joined Lillington on the east side behind the better constructed breastworks (Figure 8c). All that McLeod’s men found at daybreak on the west side of the creek were unattended campfires and empty trenches, which led them to believe the Patriots had fled from the area. A Loyalist patrol leader, Alexander McLean, located the bridge and saw men on the opposite bank but believed they were Highlanders who had already managed to cross the creek during the night. When he loudly called out that he was a friend to the King, the figures frantically scrambled behind the breastworks. At last realizing that the Patriots had not fled the area, he ordered his men to take cover and open fire at the opposite bank (Hatch 1969:35).

When the first shots rang out, McLeod and a company commander, John Campbell, ran southward to McLean’s position just west of the bridge. They found that the bridge planking had been removed and the remaining two sleepers greased with soft soap and tallow. To make matters worse, the Patriots were well protected behind their entrenchments on the east side. McLeod and Campbell, nonetheless, led an ill-planned charge across the bridge, the men stabbing their swords into the wooden sleepers to retain their footing. The first group got within thirty paces of the Patriot Earthworks and “Old Mother Covington and Her Daughter” (Hatch 1969:40), the trusty artillery pieces of Caswell, before both leaders were hit with musket balls and mortally wounded. McLeod continued shouting encouragement to his men until the hail of bullets ended his life. This first volley by the Patriots swept the bridge clean. Many of the Highlanders, wounded, tumbled into the creek and drowned. Others, thrown into the water by the shock of the sudden volley, were pulled below the water’s surface by the weight of their heavy clothing. Those who managed to cross the bridge were shot down. John Grady, who died on March 2, several days after the battle, was the only Patriot to be mortally wounded.

The Highlanders who remained on the west side of the creek took cover, but many of the Regulators and other Loyalists fled. The Patriots replaced the bridge planks, began a pursuit, eventually rounded up suspected Loyalists, disarmed all the Highlanders and Regulators, and captured valuable spoils, including 1,500 rifles, 350 guns and shot-bags, 150 swords and dirks, and 15,000 British pounds sterling (Hatch 1969:41–45).

However, an account written in part by British General Howe and published with the British Records Colonial Office (1776 C.O. 5, Volume 93:297) describes the battle from the Regulators point of view. A transcript of this correspondence is also kept with the North Carolina Department of Archives and History. In this letter dated April 25, 1776, General Howe and Colonel McLean recount the proceedings of a “Body of Loyalists.” During these proceedings McLean gave a narrative of events from the Loyalist perspective:

Monday 26th [February] Marched Ten miles, the Army and their Baggage crossed Black River, marched forward and joined the detached parties about eight o’clock in the morning when it was unanimously agreed that Casswell should be attacked immediately the Army being in motion for that Purpose. Intelligence was brought that Casswell had Marched at 8 o’clock the Night before [from a position on the Black River] and had taken possession of the Bridge upon widow Moore’s Creek. A party went to examine his abandoned Camp [on the Black River] and found there some horses and Provisions which the Precipitancy of their March made them leave behind them. That evening Mr. Hepburn was sent to the Enemy’s Camp with offers of Reconciliation upon their returning to their duty and laying down their Arms, who upon his return to Camp informed us that Casswell had taken up his Ground 6 miles from us upon our side of the Bridge upon widow Moore’s Creek and that it was very Practicable to attack them. A Conceal of War being immedi-
ately called, it was unanimously agreed that the Enemy’s Camp should directly be attacked. The Army was immediately order’d under arms and about one o’clock Tuesday morning the 27th We march’d Six miles with 800 men. In the Front of our Encampment was a very bad Swamp, which took us a good deal of time to pass so that it was within an hour of Daylight before we could get to their Camp. Upon our entering the Ground of their Encampment, we found their fires beginning to turn weak and Concluded that the Enemy were marched. Our Army entered their Camp in three Columns but upon finding that they left their ground, orders were directly given to reduce the Columns and form the Line of Battle within the verge of the Wood (it not being yet day) and the Army should retire a little from the Rear in order to have the Wood to cover us from the sight of the Enemy, the word of Rallement being King George and Broad Swords. Upon hearing a shot on the plain in our front betwixt us and the bridge the whole Army made a Halt and soon thereafter a firing began at the end of the Bridge, it being still dark. The Signals for an Attack was given, which was Three cheers the Drum to beat, the Pipes to play. The Bridge lying above a Cannon Shot in our front upon a deep miry creek Mr. McLean with a party of about 40 men came Accidently to the Bridge, he being a Stranger and it being still dark. He was challenged by the Enemies’ Centinels they observing him sooner than he observed them. He answered that he was a friend; they asked to whom. He being a stranger he replyed to the King. Upon his making this reply they squatted down upon their faces to the Ground. Mr. McLean uncertain but they might be some of our own people that had crossed the Bridge, challenged them in Gallic to which they made to Answer. Upon which he fired his own piece and ordered his part to fire. Upon the firing turning more general in that place Capt. Donald McLeod and Capt. Jno Campbell repaired to the Bridge and endeavored to cross they were both

Killed and most of the men that followed them. (McLean’s narrative in Howe, 25 April 1776, as cited in Hatch 1969:68–70)

THE OUTCOME

The British sea-borne expedition, which finally arrived in May, was forced to move into an area adjacent to Charleston, South Carolina. In late June 1776, local Patriot troops were able to successfully repel Sir Peter Parker’s land and naval attack at Fort Moultrie, Sullivans Island.

These two encounters—the brief but violent battle at Moores Creek and the repulsion of Parker’s attack—were decisive in the final outcome of the Southern campaign of the Revolutionary War. Victory at Moores Creek prevented the Highlanders from joining forces with the British who were gathering along the coast, thus averting a full-scale invasion of the South. Perhaps more importantly, the victory at Moores Creek demonstrated the surprising Patriot strength in the countryside, discouraged the growth of Loyalist sentiment in the Carolinas, and, together with Parker’s defeat, secured the region for the American forces until the British embarked on their second campaign to conquer the South in late 1778.

CREATION OF MOORES CREEK NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD

The first public celebration of the anniversary of the battle at Moores Creek was held in 1856. Public sentiments were thus roused and, in 1857, a monument was erected and dedicated to John Grady, the Patriot who died from wounds received in the battle. In February 1876, Richard P. Paddison purchased two acres of land containing the “Battleground of Moores Creek on which stands the monument of said battle and the old entrenchments” (Maze 1976). Seventeen years later, Paddison lost the property due to delinquent tax payments. On September 4, 1893, Bruce Williams bought the Monument Grounds, which included the battleground and entrenchments, from the Sheriff of Pender County (Walker and Lee 1988).
The purchase of up to twenty acres to be set aside as a public state park in commemoration of the Battle of Moores Creek was authorized by the General Assembly of North Carolina on March 9, 1897. On June 13, 1898, North Carolina purchased the two-acre earthworks from Bruce and Flora Williams. The adjacent eight-acre tract was purchased June 25, 1898, from Peter and Valie Simpson (Walker and Lee 1988). The Moores Creek Monumental Association was incorporated by an act of the North Carolina General Assembly in 1899. Its purpose was to oversee the battlefield and the commemorative celebrations held there. In 1905, the state granted the association an appropriation of $200 to clear the grounds and erect a pavilion to protect visitors from inclement weather.

In 1907, a series of roads, circular drives, and several buildings were constructed within the area. Two of these roads cut through the remains of the Patriot Earthworks. One corner of the entrenchment was also leveled when a pavilion was constructed there. This structure was built just inside the southeastern corner of the earthworks (King 1937). In addition, a formal garden was placed in the same corner next to the pavilion. A latrine was placed several hundred feet to the rear of the pavilion, which caused a small section of the redoubt to be leveled. A path across the parapet at this point was made over time by visitors walking back and forth. Also, “two sales booths, a jail, a keeper’s house, and a stable were constructed” (Maze 1976:3).

The state of North Carolina also purchased a twenty-acre tract of land from Peter and Valie Simpson, which adjoined the Monument Grounds on the north and east (Colvin 1907).

The Moores Creek Monumental Association administered the park for the next two decades and made numerous other improvements, including clearing land, erecting new buildings, and planting shade trees, flowers, and shrubbery (Maze 1976).

Following a fire that burned the pavilion in 1919, an attempt was made to restore the area in the vicinity of the earthworks to its former appearance (King 1937). The remains of the large pavilion were removed, the circular drive was obliterated, and a footpath was constructed following the old original road (Negro Head Point Road). A new pavilion was built just outside the breastworks in the southeast corner (King 1937).

North Carolina offered to donate the thirty-acre park to the federal government in 1925. On June 2, 1926, Congress authorized the establishment of Moores Creek National Military Park (44 Stat. 684) under War Department administration (Hatch 1969). The War Department administered all Military Parks until 1933 when administrative authority was transferred to the Department of the Interior. By Executive Orders 6166 and 6228 of August 10, 1933, the park was transferred to the Department of the Interior and made a unit of the National Park System.

North Carolina conveyed an additional 12.23 acres of land for park use to the United States on November 5, 1951, but the addition was not accepted until February 20, 1953.

Moores Creek National Battlefield was nominated to the National Register of Historic Places in 1977 (NPS 1976). The archeological remains of the battle and a number of monuments that had been erected by the Moores Creek Monumental Association in the early part of the twentieth century were classified by the National Register as “Historic Structures” as defined in National Register Bulletin 16A (NPS 1991:15). The following list briefly identifies these sites.

**HS-1** Patriot Earthworks.

**HS-2** Forward Earthworks or Lillington’s Earthworks.

**HS-3** Negro Head Point Road (originally Colonial Road or Old Stage Road). This site consists of traces of a roadway that date from about 1743.

**HS-4** Patriot or Grady Monument. Erected to commemorate John Grady, the only Patriot to die of wounds received in the Battle of Moores Creek. The foundation was laid in 1857. In 1974, the entire monument was relocated outside the Patriot Earthworks.
HS-5 Heroic Women Monument, also known as the Slocumb Monument. Erected in 1907, this white marble statue of a female form honors both the heroic women of Lower Cape Fear and Mary Slocumb. In 1929, Mary (Molly or Polly as she was sometimes called) and her husband Ezekiel were exhumed and re-interred near the monument.

HS-6 Loyalist Monument. This large granite monument, commemorating the Loyalist army, was erected in 1909 and relocated some four hundred feet south in 1974.

HS-7 Stage Road Monument. Erected in 1911, this granite structure has an inscription describing the battle and a bas-relief cannon. In 1942, the monument was moved from just inside to just outside the earthworks.

HS-8 James F. Moore Monument. In honor of the first president of the Moores Creek Battleground Association, this monument was erected in 1912. It is made of dressed granite in the shape of an obelisk. Damage caused by high winds in 1944 was repaired in January 1945.

HS-9 Bridge Monument. This granite structure erected in 1931 stands beside the Colonial Road near the location of the original bridge over Moores Creek.

HS-10 The entrenchments of Caswell’s Camp.

Newly acquired lands were added to the park once more in 1986. These acquisitions included property west of Moores Creek, a strip of land north of Patriots Hall, and another strip of land east of the park. These lands increased the park property from 42.23 to 86.52 acres. The additions were nominated and accepted by amendment to the National Register of Historic Places in 1987 (NPS 1986). The small entrenchments of Caswell’s Camp on the west bank of Moores Creek (Historic Structure 10) were also accepted to the Register at this time, although no trace of the camp or the entrenchments has ever been located archeologically.

In 1996, another amendment to the National Register of Historic Places was added for Moores Creek National Battlefield. Two boundary markers erected by the Moores Creek Monumental Association between 1897 and 1910 were nominated and accepted. “The markers are two granite slabs (6" x 5" x 6" high and 6" x 5" x 1' high) with rock-faced sides and smooth-faced tops. MCMA is inscribed on the tops. The markers are located along the park’s southern boundary off a fire trail” (NPS 1996a:3).
Fourteen archeological survey, testing, and monitoring projects have been carried out at Moores Creek. They were conducted by King in 1937 and 1939, Borresen in 1938 and 1940, Griffin in 1958, Walker in 1973 and 1974, Thompson in 1974, Paglione in 1983, Fischer and Brewer in 1983, Komara in 1984, Horvath in 1988, Wright in 1992, and Cornelison in 1994. Primarily focusing on the earthworks, road, and bridge, these and a few other minor projects are summarized herein.

**CLYDE B. KING — 1937**

The first archeological investigations at Moores Creek were conducted by park superintendent Clyde B. King (1937). He identified four features associated with the battle. Two were breastworks. The Forward Earthworks were constructed near the bridge. The Patriot Earthworks were further back and formed a roughly rectangular enclosure of two acres on the east side of Moores Creek. The third feature was the bridge, which had been replaced by a replica at the same location. The fourth was Negro Head Point Road, which was a public road and the Highlanders' attack approach.

King used archival evidence, cited in his report, visual observations, and nine trench excavations as the basis for his interpretations. The archival documents, dating as early as March 2, 1776 (Cooke 1853:236), indicated that during the evening prior to the battle, the Patriots had raised a small breastwork about fifty yards southeast of the bridge and had destroyed part of the bridge by removing planks. By the time of the first celebration at the site in 1856, a new bridge had been erected on the same location, as attested by the original timbers still visible (Daily Journal, February 28, 1856).

King observed that the breastwork, although reduced in size, was "easily visible in its entire course except the short distance between the road and the corner at the angle between sections D and E [the extreme southeast point of the earthworks] and for about 20 feet at the curve between sections C and D [the eastern boundary of the earthworks]." He described the breastwork as averaging "perhaps nine inches above the surrounding surface with a depression of perhaps four inches immediately inside" (King 1937:4–5).

The reduction of the breastworks was due to the deleterious effects of land clearing, construction, periodic flooding, and throngs of visitors. Land clearing for road access and building construction began around 1899 and was mostly completed by 1907. The degradation of the eastern boundary was due to a previous park roadway, and King observed a public road running through the center of the western boundary. A pavilion had been constructed in 1899. It stood inside the extreme southeast corner of the earthworks until it burned in 1919. A second pavilion was built outside the same corner. It still existed when King examined the site in 1937. Celebrations were frequently held in the park. They attracted crowds of five to ten thousand people, who trampled the grounds indiscriminately. These celebrations were discontinued in 1933 when the National Park Service assumed administrative duties.

Further modification took place in 1933 and 1934 when swamp soil was spread over the entire breastworks area to encourage the growth of grass. King reported that "little care was taken to retain the proportion of the breastworks to the other land area" (1937:5). In 1937, King asked permission to conduct restoration work to remove the scars left by earlier construction and other activities.

The nine trenches King excavated (Figure 9) were mapped on one plan view of the site, and their cross-sections were drawn on individual profile maps, all of which were included in his report. The profile drawings for each trench delineated and
described the soil strata encountered. Based on these diagrams and the archival evidence of the activities of the Patriots prior to the battle, King hypothesized that at their eastern boundary, the earthworks averaged four feet high and six and one-half feet wide at the bottom. He reported that at their western boundary, that which is closest to Moores Creek, the earthworks were nearly ten feet wide at the bottom, over five feet high, and had a trench all along the inner and outer sides. He also indicated it was in this southwest corner that the cannon “doubtless were stationed” (King 1937:7).

King excavated a tenth trench, which he designated “special (SP).” It was positioned across the Forward Earthworks, near the bridge. Because this breastwork did not figure in the battle, a study was deemed unnecessary except to locate its position. “Its design shows it to have been about four feet in height with a total length of less than 100 feet from the creek” (King 1937:7).

THOR BORRESEN — 1938

Thor Borresen, a historian “with considerable experience in the excavation and restoration of Revolutionary War earthen fortifications” (Walker and Lee 1988), was sent to Moores Creek in 1938 to verify King’s work. Borresen excavated six trenches, five of which were placed across visible portions of the works and adjacent to or between King’s trenches (Figure 10). The sixth trench (E-F) was placed on top of the creek bluff about fifty feet to the northwest of the earthworks. While it contained no visible earthwork remains, Borresen wanted to test an area where topography suggested that erosion had occurred. In the other five trenches, Borresen reported that “a good sharp outline of the former trench and the remains of the parapet can be seen” (1938a).

The profile drawings included in Borresen’s trip report (1938a) show the existing ground surface, the remains of the parapet, and the disturbed soil indicative of the trench. Borresen later stated there were three obstructions that “interfere with the plan of restoring the old battleground to its original form” (1938b) and recommended they be moved or removed. He suggested that, first, the monument situated in the center of the road at the bridge be moved to one side to afford a clear view of the approach used by the attacking Highlanders; second, the existing pavilion be removed entirely or moved sufficiently to permit the complete restoration of the entrenchment; and, third, a stone marker for the old road be moved outside the breastworks. He also recommended that sod or heavy soil be used to protect against erosion on the breastworks (1938b).

CLYDE B. KING — 1939

On December 13, 1939, Superintendent King received permission to restore obliterated sections of the earthworks in areas where the parapet was not visible. King used the transit point from Borresen’s survey to locate trenches and to determine surface and feature elevations. Within two days King had excavated seven trenches, removed part of the fill from ninety-five feet of the entrenchment at the southeast corner of the works, and had used this fill in reconstructing the parapet in that area (King 1940). Schematic profile drawings of the upper strata showed a depression in six of the seven trenches. This depression was interpreted as the location of the original
entrenchment. Because of the accuracy of the profiles King produced in 1937, it is assumed that the 1939 strata diagrams are also fairly accurate. King also reconstructed two twenty-foot to thirty-foot sections of the parapet that had been impacted by park roads (Walker and Lee 1988:36-37).

On December 15, 1939, King received a new directive explicitly telling him not to carry through with his plans. By this time, however, he had already completed the work.

THOR BORRESEN — 1940

In 1940, Borresen was again sent to Moores Creek to “examine and report on the restoration made on the redout by Superintendent King” (Borresen 1940). The following excerpts are taken from the inspection report.

A cross section trench was excavated to determine the exact location of the ditch, its depth and width, [and then] part of the soil which had accumulated in the ditch was removed and placed in the depressions of the parapet caused by previous road construction. Then the reconstructed portions were covered by a layer of sod.

To...make certain that the work in no way disturbed the original marks in the ground, a cross trench was excavated and, from the data collected, [a profile] drawing was prepared.
It must be admitted, however, that the original remains now contain sections which have been restored, yet in no way does it retract [sic] from the general appearance of the whole redout...no damage or harm was done. (Borresen 1940:1–2)

HARRY D. GOODSON — 1953

On January 17, 1953, park superintendent Goodson sent a memorandum to the acting coordinating superintendent requesting permission to restore the earthworks by “throwing up [dirt] from the edges to the middle, and in some places where it has entirely disappeared...haul in soil for restoration, and after it has settled, reseed and fertilize to grow new sod” (1953). A comment has been handwritten on the bottom of this typed memorandum: “Advised Mr. Goodson on the site, March 9, 1953 to repair remains with light coating of topsoil, fertilizer and seed.” While the initials on the note are illegible, they appear to match those in the routing stamp at the top of the memorandum next to the title “Assistant Superintendent.” Documentation at the park indicates that the acting coordinating superintendent in 1953 was Stanley W. Abbott (Hattie Squires, personal communication 1996). “A 4 inch layer of topsoil was added, then fertilized, seeded, and rolled. In November, winter rye grass was sown on the earthworks” (Maze 1976:7).

JOHN W. GRIFFIN — 1958

Between August 18 and 20, 1958, the regional archaeologist John W. Griffin responded to a request for the recovery of Revolutionary War artifacts to be placed in a park interpretive display by conducting a survey with a Fisher model T-10 metal detector. He surveyed most of the earthworks, specifically the area inside the works, and a portion of the area between the earthworks and the bridge site. Griffin reported that the “land nearer the bridge, with the exception of the causeway, was not workable” due to thick underbrush and cypress knees (Griffin 1958:1).

Six bags of field specimens were recovered from the earthworks and sent to the museum laboratory at Harpers Ferry, Virginia, for conservation. The items recovered included a heavily patinated lead fragment, a small brass or bronze buckle, two iron fragments, a heavy iron fragment, a badly rusted chain, and a large iron fitting. None of these could be definitely attributed to the Revolutionary War period. For example, the iron fitting that Griffin collected could have belonged to a cannon carriage from the Revolutionary or the Civil Wars. The artifacts were returned to Moores Creek National Battlefield. The exact locations where artifacts were recovered were not recorded.

Griffin expressed doubts about the effectiveness of this type of survey due to the extensive site disturbance since the battle. He suggested further investigations in the form of actual excavation and screening of the causeway, where the majority of shot fell during the fighting. He also suggested dredging the creek itself, “the most likely spot to find such possible artifacts as sword hilts, etc.” (Griffin 1958:2).

JOHN W. WALKER — 1973

No further archeological work took place at the park until 1973, when John W. Walker, an NPS archaeologist, conducted a 1.15 mile long pedestrian survey following the course of the proposed southeastward relocation of N.C. Highway 210 (Figure 11). The only archeologically significant find was an old dirt road presumed to be the Old Negro Head Point Road—the Revolutionary War period road that crossed the bridge. Walker suggested the area be resurveyed once the final highway relocation route was determined and cleared of vegetation.

Walker noted evidence of extensive logging immediately surrounding but not within the park, including logging roads, “huge piles of sawdust, one excavated pit which had evidently been connected with a sawmill, and one area of tar pavement which had apparently been used in some way in the sawmill operations” (Walker 1973:1). He gave no information as to the logging site’s age.
In 1974, archeologists from the North Carolina Division of Archives and History planned a creek-bottom investigation near the bridge site. Equipment problems forced them to abandon the project before data could be recovered (Brewer 1983).

Because of increasing interest in restoration of the battlefield to its historic appearance for the approaching bicentennial, as well as questions concerning the authenticity of previous restoration efforts, the Southeast Archeological Center of the National Park Service contracted with the North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources, Division of Archives and History, Archaeology Section, in 1973 to conduct additional archeological investigations (Walker and Lee 1988). The expressed purpose of these investigations was, first, to determine the location, size, and construction of the Patriot Earthworks and the small entrenchment near the Moores Creek Bridge, and, second, to obtain as much data as possible concerning the location and construction of the colonial road that crossed the bridge. These investigations were carried out in early 1974 by Timothy A. Thompson, an archeologist with North Carolina’s Division of Archives and History. Dr. Stephen J. Gluckman served as principal investigator.

Thompson used four methods of remote sensing—multispectral aerial photography and soil resistivity, refractive seismographic, and magnetometer surveys—prior to excavating sixteen trenches (Figure 12). All four remote sensing methods proved inconclusive. Thompson reported that during excavations “soil samples were collected for pollen analysis by the National Park Service” (Thompson 1975:20–21), but no further mention of these samples nor their analysis has been found. No Revolutionary War artifacts “were expected (in fact, none were found),” however, one iron railroad spike and fifteen to twenty unidentified metal
fragments were recovered from Trench 7, and are curated with the North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources (Thompson 1975:21).

Eleven of the sixteen test trenches (numbers 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13) were placed across the earthworks, both those believed to be undisturbed and those that had been reconstructed. Two trenches, 7 and 13, cut across the intersection of the Patriot Earthworks and Negro Head Point Road, while Trenches 2, 5, 14, and 16 crossed the road itself. Trench 15 was positioned across the Forward Earthworks. Thompson explained that in Trench 10 "a contour change in the series of A12 horizons beneath the more recent A11 horizons may indicate an artificial construction previous to recent fill" (1975:80). He noted "considerable variation in stratigraphy between the excavation units" (1975:ix) and concluded that "the present earthworks appear to be almost entirely reconstructed and...little evidence for the original location can be deduced from the archeological record" (1975:31).
JOHN W. WALKER — 1974

Walker's 1974 investigations focused on the relocation of the Grady Monument and involved analyzing the contents of the monument's cornerstone. During the Battle of Moores Creek, two Patriots were wounded, one of whom died on March 2, 1776. The deceased was not identified in any contemporary documents. He was first mentioned by name in 1854 as Private John Grady of Duplin County, North Carolina (Caruthers 1854). By the time of the first commemorative celebration on February 27, 1856, it was taken as fact that this was the identity of the casualty, as attested to by the newspaper article printed the day following the celebration.

But one man fell upon the American side, Lieut. John Grady, of Duplin. Where he was buried seems to be a matter of conjecture. It is believed that he was brought to Wilmington for interment, although some suppose he was buried upon the field, and indeed, an effort was made yesterday to find the place, but without success. (Daily Journal, February 28, 1856)

The following year a cornerstone for a "suitable monument" was reportedly laid (Commercial Tri-Weekly, January 10, 1857), although it is not until 1876 that the monument can be documented as having been completed (Morning Star, March 2, 1876). During preparations for the 1907 celebration, the monument's foundations were improved (Noble 1907), although it is not known exactly what this involved. No further alterations of the monument were documented until October 7, 1974, when it was dismantled and moved to another location (Walker 1975).

The actual relocation of the monument was carried out by the crew of James A. Simon of Simon Construction, Wilmington, North Carolina (Walker 1975). The obelisk was removed first, leaving a base of approximately sixty-one inches square. This solid brick column proved resistant to efforts to lift it out of the ground and was twice broken off at the upper portion, still without revealing the cornerstone. The granite skirt was removed by crane. Almost six hours after beginning the work, a red monolithic sandstone block was located deep within the brick column. It measured 19½ inches long, 10¾ inches high, and 12½ inches wide. On one side was carved "Laid Feb. 27, 1857." The top, also made of red sandstone, was fashioned as a lid and measured 10¾ inches long by 7 inches wide (Walker 1975:4). The box was sealed with mortar. Inside the box was another container made of lead and measuring 5 inches wide, 7.95 inches long, and 4 inches high. The lid was stamped in two places with the name "L A Hart" and in a third place with the legend "FROM L A HART." The lid measured 4.8 inches wide, 7.8 inches long, and 10 inches thick (Reeves 1974, as cited in Walker 1975:7).

The cornerstone was opened on December 3, 1974, at the park with media attending as well as interested members of the public. The contents of the box included "a pulpy mass of black water soaked paper" (Walker 1975:8), which turned out to be the remains of a tightly folded newspaper, two adult human molars of which only the enamel was preserved, four fragments of immature domestic hog dentary, and one small fragment of nonhuman bone that could not be further identified. Walker reported his concern about why there was such a great difference in the deterioration of the human and hog remains, and why the hog remains were placed in the cornerstone. One theory he proposed was that a practical joker placed the remains inside during the celebrations at the original cornerstone ceremony, since these celebrations included a pig roast. The paucity and poor condition of the human remains are possibly explained by the fact that reports of the original attempt to find the place where Grady was buried were unsuccessful, and that the teeth "may have truly been all that remained of John Grady at the time the cornerstone was laid" (Walker 1975:1).

The two human molars were reinterred beside the relocated Grady Monument on February 23, 1975 (Walker 1975). The faunal fragments were sent to SEAC on March 4, 1975, with the request that they be placed in storage under SEAC Accession 209.
TERRY MAZE — 1976

In 1976, Terry Maze wrote a brief history of the earthworks, noting that disturbances to the unreconstructed earthworks included two roads, leveling for a pavilion, a visitors path, a formal garden, and a latrine. Maze noted that the earthworks were reconstructed in 1938 and 1953. They were again disturbed when two cuts were made for hard-surface trails leading to the historic bridge and from one old cut leading from the former visitors parking area to the earthworks interior, which was filled in and sodded in 1975-76 (Maze 1976:8).

SURFACE COLLECTION — 1982

Mrs. J. J. Jewett Jr. donated an unprovenienced surface collection to Superintendent John Stocked in 1982. Correspondence indicates that the artifacts were taken from a pile of dirt the park employees had been working. This collection consists of two rim sherds and two body sherds that appear to be from the same historic ceramic vessel. The ceramics are identified as finger-painted pearlware, with a dark brown glaze background and a gold annular ring near the rim. The finger painting is of earth tones with some gray-blue tones added. This type of pearlware was manufactured from 1790 to 1820 (South 1977:212), thus making it post-Revolutionary War period. The artifacts are in archival curation at SEAC under SEAC Accession 612.

TERESA L. PAGLIONE — 1983

In early April 1983, Teresa Paglione, an archeological technician at SEAC, conducted an archeological investigation along the proposed routes of waterlines from the Visitor Center to Patriots Hall and the routes for waterlines in the area of the Grady, Loyalist, and Moore Monuments. The field in the eastern addition to the park, where a portion of N.C. Highway 210 was to be rerouted, was also surveyed.

Paglione reported that eighty-four shovel tests were excavated, although more than half were abandoned when the water table was encountered at nine to seventeen inches. The average test depth was sixteen inches, with some tests in the area of the monuments descending forty to forty-two inches due to the presence of about twenty-four inches of fill.

The land in the area of the east highway reroute was visually inspected and randomly shovel tested. Noted were several recent house sites bordered by garden plots whose outlines were still visible. The plowzone in this field appeared quite distinct in the shovel tests, extending eight inches below the surface.

Nine shovel tests were also excavated in the area of the monuments. Four revealed clay and sand capping or fill over the original ground surface. The fill was associated with a parking lot known to have existed as late as 1968. Where the original ground surface was encountered in this area, tests extended to forty-two inches deep.

The shovel tests excavated in those areas affected by the proposed waterlines produced no evidence for prehistoric or historic cultural activity. Most of the area for the highway reroute had already been plowed to a depth of at least eight inches. Paglione concluded, therefore, that "because of this, the planned re-plowing to eliminate the furrows in the fields divided by the historic roadbed will have no effect on the historic resources associated with the battle at Moores Creek" (1983:5).

Although Paglione stated in the final report that eighty-four shovel tests were excavated, a close examination of the field notes indicates that apparently only eighty-one were excavated.

GEORGE R. FISCHER AND DAVID M. BREWER — 1983

Pursuant to Executive Order 11593, a comprehensive underwater survey and evaluation of Moores Creek within the park boundaries was conducted in 1983. The goals of this survey were to locate and identify any historical bridge remains, determine the artifactual data potential of the creek bot-
tom, and compile a database map of creek bottom material (Brewer 1983). George R. Fischer was the principal investigator, David M. Brewer was the field supervisor, and the team members were Richard Johnson, Ken Wild, Richard Vernon, and Ken Hoeck. All personnel were from SEAC.

The magnetometer survey consisted of two complete runs of the creek along the portion that is located within the park boundaries. Two anomalies were detected. The first was at the N.C. Highway 210 bridge that crosses Moores Creek several hundred yards north of the historic bridge site. This was attributed to intrusive material discarded from cars that have been crossing the highway bridge for a number of years. The second anomaly occurred at the second bend upstream from the historic bridge site. From this location, two pieces of an iron cooking pot and an axhead were recovered.

The metal detector survey was conducted following twelve lanes, each two meters wide, that were delineated across the creek at the reconstructed bridge site. The positions of all anomalies encountered were recorded on the first day of the metal detection survey and investigated on the following day. The members of the dive team hand-recorded each anomaly. Many items (38-40) of modern refuse were found, as well as four pieces of iron and one piece of bone. The iron items were one bolt ring, one spike, one fastener, and one bolt piece. The bone was identified as a fragment of the metapodial of a deer.

Two anomalies were not recovered. The first was in Lane E at 7.5 meters from the base line and was indicative of a fairly large presence. The divers were unable to recover the item due to the depth of the overlying sediments and obstruction by submerged bridge timbers. The second item was located in Lane K at 10.8 meters from the baseline. This item was too deep within the sediments to recover by hand.

As an adjunct to the bottom survey, a map of bridge components discovered during the process was made. These included waterlogged timbers, struts, posts, and planking strewn across the creek bottom at the bridge site. They were identified as parts of the 1931 reconstructed bridge, which was dismantled in 1945 (Brewer 1983).

The iron items recovered were believed to be from the logging industry and not the Revolutionary War (Faust 1984). The artifacts are held in curatorial stewardship at the Fort Fisher Historic Site with the Underwater Archaeology Unit of the Department of Cultural Resources at Kern Beach, North Carolina, under site number 31PD273**UW.

GREGORY L. KOMARA — 1984

From April 16 to June 18, 1984, a SEAC archaeological technician, Gregory Komara, directed investigations pursuant to the park’s planned acquisition of additional properties on the west bank of Moores Creek. These consisted of survey/mapping, posthole testing, and metal detection in two areas of the park. Komara employed metal detection from Moores Creek to the west park boundary and from N.C. Highway 210 to the path of Negro Head Point Road. The detector, a Fisher Model M-90, produced 477 targets. The majority “were believed to represent trash items associated with the Simpson occupation of the property and present use of the area by local fishermen” (Komara 1985:11). These “trash” items were disposed of after having been recorded. Sixty-four artifacts were saved for further study. Nine of these sixty-four were chosen to undergo conservation through electrolysis. None of the 477 items were considered to be from the eighteenth century.

Posthole testing took place in an area encompassing about twelve acres adjoining the western edge of Moores Creek in the vicinity of the historic bridge (Figure 13). Fourteen postholes, each twelve inches in diameter, were excavated as controls outside the area of study. The first four, labeled 1, 2, 3, and 4, were placed at forty-foot intervals in a line running east to west. They followed the shoulder of N.C. Highway 210 from Moores Creek to the park’s west boundary. Postholes 5 and 6 were aligned along the western park boundary. The remaining postholes were spaced at forty-foot intervals along the southern side of N.C. Highway 210. The maximum depth reached during the posthole testing was 190 centimeters.
Eighty-three postholes (Figure 13) were excavated in the principal study area. They were placed from the west end of the bridge northward toward the first oxbow at twenty-foot intervals aligned along the bank of Moores Creek, coincident with the “positions of reference grid stakes established here” (Komara 1985:14). Most of the postholes yielded no cultural material. Of those that did, none had evidence of artifacts or features attributable to battle-related activities or the Caswell encampment on the west bank.

One identified feature was located at a depth of eleven centimeters in the centerline of the Negro Head Point Road. Komara described it as remnants of a compacted surface, believed to be part of an earlier road surface. Recent materials were found at great depths near the creek. A fragment of a plastic container was recovered at between 100 and 110 centimeters, and two overlying oil drum lids were discovered at twenty to twenty-three centimeters. Komara reported that this confirmed the extent of recent disturbance to the region resulting from the addition and leveling of dredge materials from Moores Creek by James Simpson. Komara concluded that “substantial alteration to the original topography had resulted from the addition of dredge material” (1985:1).

Komara reported that the aboriginal materials recovered from the posthole excavations consisted of the following: a bifacially worked chopper/pounder; a possible Morrow Mountain I projectile point; a small fine-grained quartzite waste flake; a small granitic waste flake; and four small quartzite waste flakes. Recent reexamination of these items, conducted for the present assessment, leaves the cultural origin of several of these purported artifacts open to question (see Chapter 5, “SEAC Acc. 671—Komara’s 1984 Survey”). Komara believed the items were redeposited materials due to their recovery from shallow depths (ten to one hundred centimeters).

The stated aims of the Komara directed survey/mapping project were as follows:

- establishing an accurate route of Negro Head Point Road through the park;
- producing construction details of this road;
• outlining areas where modern construction occurs in relation to cultural features;
• depicting where different forms of archeological testing took place;
• determining relative positions of the Negro Head Point Road cross-sections;
• locating reference control points for mapping operations, and relating these to known benchmark elevations; and
• showing the relationship of Tar Kiln 2 to Negro Head Point Road.

Although Komara reported that "mapping formed a highly significant portion of the investigations" (1985:19), final conclusions regarding the reliability of the exact course of this road as proposed by Komara were difficult to ascertain. It was determined that two later road surfaces apparently were drained by ditches dug along both edges, and that Komara "observed varying [road ruts] representing possible sporadic periods of use" (1985:30).

The tar kiln site located near the east park boundary was investigated through the excavation of a test trench 24.5 feet in length and 3.1 feet in width (Figure 14). The initial two-inch layer was stripped from the entire trench in an effort to minimize impact from an auto repair shop, which had

Figure 14 — Komara's 1984 excavation of Tar Kiln 2 (based on uncompleted map).
previously been in operation at the site. Komara recovered 191 artifacts described as:

- 54 fragments of plate glass (blue tinted)
- 10 shattered fragments of plate glass (blue tinted)
- 10 fragments of automobile safety glass
- 81 fragments of plain bottle glass
- 9 fragments of stamped bottle glass
- 4 pieces of asphalt aggregate
- 4 tar paper fragments
- 3 stones
- 2 wire fragments
- 2 bolts
- 12 unidentified metal fragments

This site was arbitrarily divided into three sections—the mound, the ditch, and the area outside the ditch—for further excavation. The sections were taken down in six-inch levels to a maximum depth of twenty-four inches from the top of the mound section. The excavation results appeared to confirm that the site was a tar kiln, perhaps affiliated with the naval stores industry of North Carolina.

Thirty soil samples were taken and later tested for pH and soil phosphate levels. Because Komara did not compare these readings to other control readings taken outside the tar kiln area, the interpretation of the results are at best questionable.

Komara stated that the abundance of charred wood and its excellent preservation made wood identification from the kiln site advisable. The most common species of indigenous pines are longleaf pine (Pinus australis), pond pine (Pinus serotina), and Virginia pine (Pinus virginiana). Because wood anatomy analysis cannot distinguish species of the genus Pinus (Lee Newsome, personal communication 1996), the analyses were confined to a confirmation of these possibilities. Historical evidence was used to narrow the probable source as longleaf pine.

Radiocarbon assays of the charred wood resulted in two dates. The first dated to less than 85 B.P. (i.e., post-A.D. 1865) and the second dated to 420 ± 50 B.P. (A.D. 1530 ± 50), uncorrected. These assays (Beta-9846 and Beta-9847) were conducted by Beta Analytic, Inc. (Komara 1985:44).

Gas chromatography and mass spectrometry were performed on residues recovered from several surfaces in and around the kiln. The analysis revealed that the residue was from either longleaf pine or shortleaf pine. This confirmed that the residue was part of the tar kiln operation.

During Komara’s 1984 investigations at the park, he conducted a pedestrian walkover at Moores Creek Missionary Baptist Church, which is located outside the park boundaries to the northeast. He recovered fragments of marine shells, such as oysters and clams, a glass marble, brick fragments, and several small burned clay fragments. An African-American tradition of decorating the surface of gravesites with shells and items that once belonged to the deceased has a long history in North Carolina. Practitioners believe that the grave items will be reused as needed by the deceased (Puckett 1926:104-107; Vlach 1978:139-140). The cemetery items collected are curated at SEAC and designated SEAC Accession 671.

Publication of Komara’s final report was not feasible at the time due to the incompleteness of the maps and problems associated with the accuracy of specific recorded survey data. Most of these problems have been resolved in compiling the present overview.

**THOMAS H. HARGROVE — 1987**

In September 1987, Thomas H. Hargrove, an NPS historian, researched and prepared *The Moores Creek Bridge: Historic Structures Report for the Moores Creek National Battlefield, Pender County, North Carolina*. In this document he discusses the common methods used for bridge construction during the Revolutionary War period. His research was conducted in preparation for reconstructing a replica bridge at the site of the original bridge.

**ELIZABETH A. HORVATH — 1988**

During the week of June 20, 1988, Elizabeth A. Horvath, an archeologist with SEAC, directed an
investigation to assess the impact of proposed construction of a footbridge and an interpretive trail within the park. The goals of this investigation included locating that part of the Patriot Earthworks along the creek bank where the footbridge was planned. Horvath’s methodology included backhoe trenching, surface reconnaissance, metal detection, mapping, shovel testing, and hand-excavating one unit. The metal detection was conducted along the grassy area adjacent to the creek where the earthworks were suspected, and along the proposed trail on the east side of the creek. All targets were flagged for later shovel-test excavations.

Twenty-four shovel tests with an average depth of twenty-six centimeters were excavated to investigate the metal detection targets. Four of the tests were taken to depths of between fifty and ninety centimeters below ground surface. A total of 118 historic objects were recovered. Most of these items were removed from the top twenty centimeters of soil. One of the recovered artifacts was a chert flake. Horvath believed it likely originated as the result of gunflint sharpening, although she did not rule out the possibility of its being produced from aboriginal flint knapping.

Most of the historic items were recent, either building material (30 percent) or beverage containers (45 percent). A two-and-a-half-by-two-meter excavation unit was located in an area of numerous metal detector “hits.” The unit was taken down in arbitrary ten-centimeter levels. After the first ten-centimeter level, the unit was reduced to one by two meters over the metal artifacts. The final depth was thirty centimeters below ground surface. One button-like object was later shown to be a penny that had been flattened into a disk one-sixteenth of an inch larger than normal, with a residue of solder indicating possible use as a button. A two-tined fork was recovered that had been manufactured from round wire. Horvath speculated it may have been associated with the living history program that had been conducted at the park.

A brass ammunition clip, possibly dating from the first half of this century, was recovered from Shovel Test 20. Horvath described it as probably being from a .30-caliber “Springfield rifle commonly referred to as a .30-06.” She reported that it held five cartridges and “was used about the time of World War I. There are no records on file at the park indicating military personnel were ever stationed there” (Horvath 1988:5).

The three backhoe trenches were excavated within the breastworks between Negro Head Point Road and Moores Creek. They ranged in depth from seventy-five to one hundred centimeters and were taken down in six- to twelve-inch levels. Trench 1 was ten meters long, beginning at the east end of the proposed footbridge, which was set in a southeasterly direction. Two features were encountered: the first was the edge of an old access road; the second was believed to represent the entrenchment aligned along the creek bank. This feature was located from five to seven meters east in the trench. Profile drawings of both features were made. Trench 2 was excavated eight meters north of Trench 1. It was twelve meters long and one meter wide. The possible continuation of the entrenchment along the creek bank was discovered at nine and one-half to eleven meters. A charcoal radiocarbon sample (BETA-26825) taken from the feature and analyzed by Beta Analytic, Inc., provided a one sigma date range of 1610 ± 90 B.P. (A.D. 250–430). This falls well outside the Revolutionary War date range. Trench 3, which measured ten and one-half meters long, was placed twenty-five meters southwest of Trench 1. No evidence of earthworks was found.

All activities were mapped with a datum tied into the stage road monument. Excavated soil was screened through quarter-inch mesh hardware screen, and each test hole was backfilled upon completion.

The investigations resulted in the discovery of the earthworks along the creek bank. Horvath advised that since the newly discovered earthworks were integral to the site, they should not be subject to any further disturbance.

**JOHN R. WRIGHT — 1992**

Archeological monitoring was conducted pursuant to the reconstruction of the historic Widow Moore’s Creek Bridge on October 15–16, 1992.
John Wright of SEAC performed the monitoring under the guidance of the principal investigator, Elizabeth Horvath. The work involved the inspection of several trenches and holes excavated on the east and west banks of Moores Creek to accommodate the crib abutments, crib wings, and anchors for the reconstruction of the historic bridge. This reconstruction was carried out by private contractor Pete Pridgeon. Also, areas identified as developmental zones were visually inspected, and photographs and notes were taken.

The developmental zones were identified by the park’s superintendent, Dusty Shultz, as the possible expansion of the Visitor Center, the possible construction of a maintenance shed near the park staff residences, the possible extension of the existing historic trail in the west bank of Moores Creek running approximately one hundred feet to the southwest, and the construction of a boardwalk across the creek.

Wright monitored the excavation of two crib abutment trenches, one along the east bank and one along the west bank. At the north and south ends of each abutment, trenches for crib wings were excavated. These four trenches ran approximately perpendicular to the creek banks and, therefore, to the crib abutments.

The trench for the west crib abutment was excavated first. The trench for the crib wing located at its south end was excavated to a depth of two and one-half feet. At this point, operations were stopped due to problems with the backhoe. When work resumed the next day, east bank excavations (the trenches for the east bank crib abutment, both of its crib wings, and the crib anchor) were completed before excavations were continued on the west bank. When the west bank work continued, the crib wing trench, which had been halted at a depth of two and one-half feet, was excavated to a final depth of fifty-eight inches, both crib wings were excavated, and finally the hole for the crib anchor was completed.

**WEST BANK OF CREEK**

The west crib abutment trench was excavated by backhoe to the top of the high tide waterline, approximately three feet in depth. It was accomplished in four-inch levels, with each level being trowelled and examined for artifact location and recovery. Soil horizons were noted, photographed, and a final profile of the trench was drawn. Three wood timber fragments, believed to be loblolly heart pine, were encountered. Two were between five and seven feet in length and the third was less than two feet long. Wright reported that the larger two timbers were possibly remnants of the reconstructed bridge of 1931, which was razed in 1942–1943. No other artifacts were discovered.

The crib wing on the south end of this abutment (labeled “west crib wing” in Wright’s report) was excavated to a depth of between two and two and one-half feet, at which point the backhoe became inoperative. Photographs and profile drawings were completed during repair work on the backhoe. When excavation resumed, the final depth was fifty-eight inches. No artifacts were discovered.

The crib wing on the north end of the west crib abutment (labeled “east crib wing” in Wright’s report) was excavated to a depth of approximately fifty-eight inches. One iron metal fragment was discovered at twenty-seven inches below ground surface, and one broken quartz flake was discovered in an alluvial layer at thirty-three inches below ground surface.

The hole for the crib anchor at the west end of the bridge was excavated to a depth of fifty-seven inches. No artifacts were discovered.

**EAST BANK OF CREEK**

A small trench was excavated just east of the east crib abutment, and the existing concrete bridge abutment was removed. No artifacts were found.

The crib wing at the north end of this crib abutment was labeled “east crib wing” in Wright’s report. The trench for this crib wing was excavated below creek water level to a depth of fifty-eight inches below surface. A single artifact, one blue-edged whiteware rim sherd, was recovered at approximately thirty-five inches below surface in a historic fill zone. A metal screw approximately nine inches long was recovered from the ground surface in the fill zone immediately southeast of this
crib wing trench. Similar type screws were observed in park photographs of the 1931 reconstructed bridge.

The crib wing at the south end of this crib abutment was labeled "west crib wing" in Wright's report. The trench for this crib wing was excavated to a depth of about fifty-nine inches below surface. A portion of an anomaly/feature was encountered at twenty-five inches below surface. This consisted of a reddish brown sandy clay zone, very compacted, above two other zones. The higher of these two lower zones was a black (N 2/0) fine granular, slightly loose sand; the lower zone was a very dark gray (10 YR 3/1) sand. Wright reported that the anomaly/feature appeared cultural and may have been the old road surface and bed. No artifacts were recovered from the crib wing trench.

The hole for the crib anchor at the east end of the bridge was centered about five feet southeast of the creek bank and excavated to a depth of sixty-one inches. No cultural material was recovered.

The excavation of trenches for the two crib abutments, the four crib wings, and the two anchors revealed no evidence attributable to the Revolutionary War battle. All recovered artifacts, except for one lithic waste flake, have popular use dates and manufacturing dates in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Wright reported that the anomaly/feature identified in the crib wing trench at the north end of the crib abutment on the east bank of the creek may represent a small portion of the Negro Head Point Road, however, construction of the abutments and wings will not adversely affect this resource. The crib wings will extend only five feet into the bank from the crib abutment. The anomaly/feature was identified about two feet beyond the end of the wing.

JOHN E. CORNELISON JR. — 1994

During the months of June and July 1994, SEAC staff surveyed sixty-nine of the 86.52 acres of Moores Creek National Battlefield under the direction of John Cornelison (Figure 15). The project was conducted as part of the Systemwide Archeological Inventory Program (formerly the National Archeological Survey Initiative), later identified in the Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan (Keel et al. 1996). The records and artifacts recovered from the survey are recorded under SEAC Accession 1132. The original project was designed to survey 100 percent of the park lands, however, several areas of the park were eliminated from survey due to low potential for site presence and for environmental reasons (Cornelison 1997).

The park properties were arbitrarily divided into four zones for survey purposes. The first zone encompassed the open, well-mowed areas; the second consisted of the lightly wooded area with dense undergrowth; the third was the savanna area; and the forth included the swamp and creek.

The open areas of the park were tested using a twelve-inch (30.48 centimeter) auger bit mounted on the back of a tractor. The average depth achieved by the auger was approximately seventy centimeters below surface. All soils recovered from the tests were screened through a portable shaker screen that was constructed with quarter-inch mesh hardware cloth.

In the wooded or other hard to reach areas of the park, shovels tests were used instead of the power auger, and the average depth was reduced to approximately fifty centimeters. All soils were screened as described above.

The third zone, the savannah area, was generally open and covered with tall grass. However, several endangered species of plants precluded subsurface testing except on the trails.

The swampy areas of the park were not tested and no underwater investigation was undertaken.

AUGER/SHOVEL TEST SURVEY

A twenty-meter north/south grid and vertical control was established from a permanent datum, USGS Benchmark 8.6 (BM 8.6), situated within the park. The benchmark is located directly across from the Visitor Center in the traffic island. The benchmark is listed as a vertical elevation control with the state of North Carolina, but no horizontal coordinates are on record with the state. Cornelison assigned field coordinates 10,000N, 10,000E to BM 8.6. Beginning at BM 8.6, a baseline was es-
Figure 15 — Cornelison’s auger and shovel test locations.
tablished with datum points positioned at twenty-meter intervals on a compass heading of 83°/263° (uncorrected magnetic north). Auger test lines were positioned at right angles to the baseline on a bearing of 353°/173°. The starting point of every other survey line was staggered ten meters.

The following synopsis of the survey is provided by John Comelison.

A total of 331 auger/shovel tests were dug at MOCR [Figure 15].... Of these, only sixty-one were positive, containing some type of cultural material. Of the positive tests, only seven contained historical material and three aboriginal material.... Test 2 contained both prehistoric and historic material. The remaining tests contained modern material, such as glass or nails. Two of the three tests that contained aboriginal material were located to the north side of the entrance road on the eastern end of the park. Tests 2 and 34 each contained one untyped, sand-tempered aboriginal sherd. The lack of additional aboriginal material indicates that these sherds were brought into this area, possibly from the road-grade fill or a commercial garage known to have once been located in this area. They are not the result of an aboriginal occupation.

Four quartz- and sand-tempered body sherds were recovered from Test 625 in the center of the west bank causeway of Negro Head Point Road. Two of the sherds with fabric impressing are possibly associated with the Deep Creek/Cape Fear ceramic traditions (David Anderson, personal communication 1996). These sherds were recovered from a location where it is evident that dredge fill from Moores Creek has been used to level the area. (1997:30–31).

Two of the sherds recovered by Comelison (which were originally one large sherd), exhibit fabric-impression on the exterior surface, which is typically associated with Deep Creek and Cape Fear ceramic traditions (David Anderson, personal communication 1996). This would place them within the Woodland time period.

EM 38 TESTING

A Geonics Model EM 38 Ground Conductivity Unit with a Polycorder Digital Data Recorder was used during the project as a possible means of detecting subsurface features, such as buried earthworks and roads. Four areas were selected for testing with the EM 38. These were Tar Kiln 2, the Patriot Earthworks, Caswell’s Camp, and the Slocumb Graves.

Tar Kiln 2
The first area tested using the EM 38 was Tar Kiln 2. The location was chosen for several reasons. It was in an open area; it had previously been excavated; and portions of a modern road and Negro Head Point Road would be included in a twenty-meter grid surrounding the tar kiln.

Figure 16 is a composite of a sketch map and a Surfer generated isoline map produced using EM 38 data. Analysis of the readings shows that the EM 38 did not detect the tar kiln. However, it did detect large concentrations of metal associated with
the removed auto repair garage that Komara reported in 1985. Three readings from the EM 38 detected Negro Head Point Road (lower left corner). A high reading, or spike, near the center of the paved road (upper right corner) probably reflects steel reinforcements in the road.

**Earthworks and Negro Head Point Road**

Two grid sections were staked out to test the area encompassing the Patriot Earthworks with the EM 38—one twenty-meter square and one rectangular-shaped area forty meters long by ten meters wide. The twenty-meter square was positioned to test the Patriot Earthworks, Negro Head Point Road, and a recently constructed park tourist sidewalk. The forty-by-ten-meter area was positioned to test more of Negro Head Point Road and the southeast corner of the earthworks where the pavilion once stood.

Figure 17 is a composite of a sketch map of the surface features within the twenty-by-twenty-meter square and a Surfer generated isoline map produced using EM 38 data. Analysis of the readings shows two striking facts:

*First, the front side of the earthworks is represented by closely spaced lines, while the lines on the backside have greater spacing. Second, the EM 38 did not detect Negro Head Point Road, possibly because the road in the area is very ephemeral and composed of sand.*

(Cornelison 1997:28)
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The archeological testing in the forty-by-ten-meter area failed to detect the road or the pavilion. Cornelison states that “it is unlikely that substantial remains of the pavilion still exist, as no evidence was noted during auger testing of the same area” (1997:29).

**Caswell’s Camp Area**

An analysis of the data from the EM 38 test of the twenty-by-twenty-meter grid in the Caswell’s Camp area “shows no evidence of Negro Head Point Road or any other subsurface features” (Cornelison 1997:29).

**Slocumbs’ Graves Area**

Although the EM 38 was not as effective an instrument as anticipated in detecting the archeological remains associated with the Battle of Moores Creek, the graves of Mary and Ezekiel Slocumb were easily detected. The graves are found adjacent to the Slocumb Monument in a plot of land approximately nine by seven meters in size.

Figure 18 is an isoline map of the EM 38 readings in which the individual graves are clearly seen as two parallel peaks or rises. Although the EM 38 was not used to actually discover the graves, since their positions were known, this data shows the potential utility of the EM 38 for locating buried objects and features.

**EXCAVATION UNITS**

Three test units were excavated at the park. All were dug in ten-centimeter arbitrary levels unless otherwise noted. All soils were screened through quarter-inch mesh hardware cloth.

**Trench 1**

Trench 1 was located on the eastern side of the earthworks, approximately five meters south of Negro Head Point Road (Figure 19). This area of the earthworks was selected because it was farthest from the creek and, therefore, less likely to be affected by seasonal flooding.

An excavation unit measuring four by one meters was centered across the highest portion of the long axis of the earthworks. Prior to the first reconstruction of the earthworks, King (1937)
noted that approximately four inches of the earthworks were visible. Therefore, the reconstructed portion of the works were excavated as a single level designated Level 1. Although the soil from Level 1 was not screened, visible artifacts were recovered. All subsequent levels were excavated within the western two meters of the unit.

Between forty-five and fifty centimeters below datum, a clay cap was encountered. Below this cap was a gray (N8) sand layer from which thirteen fragments of a light blue soda bottle (catalog no. MOCR 150) were recovered. Based on the machine molded seam, the bottle dates between 1881 and the present (Jones and Sullivan 1989). However, the regularity of the seams and the size and nature of the kickup places the manufacture date closer to between 1930 and the present (Cornelison 1997:35). The bottle was embossed with “Wil” and “N.C.” (presumably for Wilmington, North Carolina), which could indicate local manufacturing.

More blue glass bottle fragments, one lead shot (7.26 mm in diameter), and two wrought nails were recovered at a depth of between fifty and sixty centimeters. The wrought nails should date to the eighteenth century, since these items were quickly replaced by hand-headed machine-cut nails first manufactured sometime around 1790 (Benson 1983:136; Fontana and Greenleaf 1962:54; Walker 1971:75). Although the lead shot is not a datable artifact, it does correspond to the type of ammunition used during the Revolutionary War.

At eighty-five centimeters below datum in Trench 1, the trench excavated by King in 1937 (designated Trench B) was encountered and was clearly visible in the south profile of the unit. The soil removed from King’s backfilled trench was screened separately and was found to contain more blue glass bottle fragments.

Below the gray sand, a band of dark, densely packed sand appeared. This band did not contain any artifacts and appears to be the swamp muck laid down by King (1937) to reconstruct the earthworks and provide the base for a grassy cover.

No artifacts were recovered from the rest of the excavation. However, at 100 cmbd, two stains became apparent, one in the northeast corner (Feature 1), and the other in the southeast corner (Feature 2). (Cornelison 1997:36)

Cornelison further described the features located in Trench 1.

- Feature 1 consists of a white ashy deposit of sandy soil surrounded by dark colored, densely packed, burned soil. In profile, it was apparent that the dark soil capped the white soil. Feature 1 was interpreted as a fire pit. The fire it contained appears to have been extinguished by covering it with soil.

- Feature 2 was interpreted as a portion of the original earthworks. In profile view, the feature appeared as a saddle (rise/depression/rise) of darkly stained soil. The depression is the likely area where the soldiers stood behind the earthworks facing out (Cornelison 1997:37–38).

Trench 2

Trench 2 (see Figure 19) was located on the western side of the earthworks and positioned to encompass the intersection of the Patriot Earthworks and Negro Head Point Road. This location was selected to assess the damage caused by erosion, which undercut the causeway (the raised portion of Negro Head Point Road), and to determine if original sections of the earthworks existed near Moores Creek.

The four-by-one-meter excavation unit was again centered at the highest point across the long axis of the earthworks. The same procedures used with Trench 1 were employed with Trench 2, these consisting of removing the reconstructed earthworks as Level 1 and not screening the excavated soil. All subsequent levels were excavated from the eastern two meters of the unit.

Two things were noted in the stratigraphic profile of Trench 2. First, on the side of the unit where the earthworks were anticipated (south profile), the stratigraphy revealed no evidence of the original earthworks. “The south profile (earthworks side)
of the unit was fairly homogenous with some striations. The striations are the result of leaching and not construction episodes" (Cornelison 1997:39). Second, although narrow bands of orange clay with lighter sand in between indicated modern road repairs, no evidence was found to indicate intact portions of Negro Head Point Road.

Cornelison did encounter one artifact of particular note in the trench.

*At 84 cmbd, the edge of a thin metal box was discovered in the southwest corner of the unit. The box was cleaned in situ and photographed....Due to its fragile nature, the box was not removed.* (1997:39)

A small sample of the box was removed and taken back to SEAC for analysis.

**Trench 3**

Trench 3, positioned in Tar Kiln 1, was excavated primarily to recover material for radiocarbon dating. The unit measured one by one-half meters and was excavated to a depth of forty centimeters below datum. The contents of the unit consisted of charred wood and various sized charcoal pieces with no discernible stratigraphy. A charcoal sample (Beta-75331), sent to Beta Analytic, Inc., for radiocarbon assay, was dated to 100 ± 50 B.P. (between A.D. 1800 and 1900) at one sigma level of confidence (Cornelison 1997:41).
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ASSESSMENT OF PREVIOUS ARCHEOLOGICAL WORK

SEAC ACCESSION 486 — KINGS 1937 AND 1939 EXCAVATIONS

During his tenure as park superintendent, Clyde B. King wanted to restore the Patriot Earthworks to their original size and shape. He deemed excavations of the earthworks necessary to accomplish this. Starting in 1937, King repeatedly requested permission to conduct excavations but was denied. The NPS demanded that only qualified personnel conduct NPS archeological work. King, however, proceeded to excavate anyway, opening up ten trenches, nine of which were positioned across the Patriot Earthworks. On the basis of the excavations and archival evidence, King concluded that the center portion of the earthworks averaged four feet in height and six and one-half feet in width at the base. At the western end, the dimensions were found to be five feet high and ten feet wide.

King's tenth trench, labeled "special" or "SP," was located across the Forward Earthworks near the bridge. He subsequently reported that "its designs show it to have been about 4 feet in height with a total length of less than 100 feet from the creek" (King 1937:7).

Following these initial successes, King continued to request permission to repair the earthworks. On December 13, 1939, two years after his first excavations, King received a memorandum granting him permission to proceed with additional repairs to the earthworks. On December 15, 1939, he received another memorandum rescinding permission. However, the additional work had already been completed. During those two days, King not only excavated seven more trenches, but also removed part of the fill from ninety-five feet of the entrenchment at the southeast corner of the works and used this fill to reconstruct the parapet in that area.

It is difficult to assess King’s work from 1939. He reported finding little evidence of the original earthworks in the southeastern corner, and, indeed, this is the case today. What is less clear is whether King’s repairs damaged that portion of the works or if the damage occurred before King’s repairs when the visitors pavilion was constructed there.

King’s work was criticized by administrators prior to, during, and after the excavations. The excavations, however, have provided archeologists with valuable information regarding the Patriot Earthworks. Archeological investigations conducted at the park since King’s excavations have confirmed his interpretation regarding the dimensions and location of the earthworks and have credited King with accurately restoring the relative shape and size of the entrenchments. Nonetheless, criticism of King is not without just cause.

In a letter dated February 8, 1940, from A. R. Kelly, Chief, Archeological Sites Division, to the Regional Director, Kelly stated:

It is evident that the final phase of the work on the Moores Creek earthworks was done in a hasty and unqualified manner. A supervising archaeologist, trained to recognize soil features identifiable with historical structures located in documentary sources was needed. In filling in the obliterated sections of the earthworks, Superintendent King actually made “repaired” sections, which to all intents and purposes are “restorations.” The integration of Mr. Borresen’s work with the “repair” done in three days was not complete. Nor is there justification for the view expressed by Mr. King that the work accomplished was actually repair of an obliterated section of the earthworks. It is practically clear that this is a reconstruction of an historical structure.

The primary deficiencies concerning King’s work are the lack of vertical and horizontal control and ambiguous feature descriptions. The trench
profile drawings are to scale, but the vertical datum King used was the 1937 ground surface, which he subsequently altered during the restoration of the earthworks. The exact locations of his excavation trenches are also unknown due to the lack of horizontal control.

King’s description of the Forward Earthworks as having “a total length of less than 100 feet” can also be read two ways: that the total length of the earthworks was 100 feet or that the earthworks are located 100 feet from the creek.

SEAC ACCESSION 490 — BORRESEN’S 1938 AND 1940 EXCAVATIONS

In 1938, Borresen was requested by NPS administration to evaluate King’s excavations of the Patriot Earthworks performed the year before. In doing so, Borresen excavated six additional trenches across the Patriot Earthworks. Unfortunately, the report produced by Borresen is less detailed than King’s regarding field data. And, although the schematic drawings by Borresen and the excavation unit profiles drawn by King appear to be in close agreement regarding archeological evidence at that time, Borresen’s drawings do not delineate the soil strata present in his excavations. Therefore, no comparison to King’s earlier work (1937) or Thompson’s later work (1975) can be made.

In 1940, NPS administrators requested that Borresen return to Moores Creek National Battlefield once more to assess King’s 1939 repairs. He subsequently reported that King’s repairs had not harmed the original earthworks.

SEAC ACCESSION 488 — WALKER’S 1973 SURVEY

Walker conducted a pedestrian walk-over survey following the course of the then proposed southeastward relocation of N.C. Highway 210. Two archeologically significant finds were reported: an old dirt road, which was tentatively identified by Walker as the Negro Head Point Road, and evidence of extensive logging operations south of the park.

Walker’s survey was limited in scope. He readily acknowledged this by recommending re-survey of the area after the lands were purchased and cleared for the highway relocation.

SEAC ACCESSION 487 — GRiffin’S 1958 METAL DETECTOR SURVEY

Griffin’s metal detector survey of the Patriot Earthworks using a Fisher model T-10 was the first of this type conducted at the park. It was an attempt to recover Revolutionary War artifacts from the battle for use in the interpretive displays on site. The project produced only one possible period artifact—a small heavily patinated lead fragment. All artifacts recovered from the survey were sent to Harpers Ferry for conservation, then to SEAC for analysis, and finally to Moores Creek National Battlefield. During the process, the small heavily patinated lead fragment was lost, and no letters of transmittal, loan forms, or other documentation exist that might have proved helpful in tracking the location of the lead fragment. Hattie Squires, Administrative Officer at Moores Creek National Battlefield, conducted a visual inspection of all known artifacts housed at the park and reported that the lead fragment is not at Moores Creek (Squires, personal communication 1996).

The value of the remainder of the collection is compromised further because provenience information was not recorded for any of the artifacts recovered by Griffin. Field notes and detailed site maps are also lacking.

SEAC ACCESSION 489 — THOMPSON’S 1974 EXCAVATIONS

Thompson’s excavations at Moores Creek National Battlefield were intended to produce sufficient information regarding the dimensions and construction methods of the original earthworks and Negro Head Point Road. He used four methods of remote sensing prior to the excavations:
multispectral aerial photography and soil resistivity, refractive seismographic, and magnetometer surveys. All proved inconclusive.

Thompson then excavated sixteen trenches. Based on his findings, he reported that nothing existed that could "unequivocally be identified as a 1776 earthwork" (1975:vii). He also could not determine the exact location of the roadbed at the time of the battle.

It can be argued, however, that such a conclusion was not warranted. Five of the nine trenches cutting through sections of the earthworks, which were shown to be standing on the 1934 topographic map, produced evidence for possible eighteenth-century construction. It is also important to note that Thompson did not have access to the detailed topographic map prepared in 1934 or to the profile drawings prepared by Borresen in 1938 and 1940, any one of which would have affected his interpretation of the data (Walker and Lee 1988). Thompson’s Trench 15 was positioned to test for archeological evidence of the Forward or Lillington’s Earthworks. However, after close examination of Thompson’s field map, it is apparent that this trench was positioned diagonally at the far southeastern end of a natural rise, rather than across the earthworks. Thompson simply missed bisecting the earthworks.

Soil samples for pollen analysis were reportedly taken by the NPS at the time of Thompson’s excavation, but no further mention of these samples nor their analysis has since been found. The location of the pollen samples is unknown.

SEAC ACCESSION 209 —
WALKER’S 1974 MONITORING OF THE GRADY MONUMENT RELOCATION

At the request of park management, the monument erected to honor John Grady (the only Patriot to die from wounds received in the battle) was moved from its original location within the Patriot Earthworks to a new location outside the Patriot Earthworks. Walker was present at the opening of the Grady Monument cornerstone, which was said to contain the remains of John Grady. Human teeth, pig jaw bone fragments, and shreds of wet, deteriorated newspaper were found inside the inner metal box. The teeth were reinterred in the monument’s new location, while the faunal fragments were conserved at SEAC.

The report prepared by Walker was thorough and well documented, and he averted the potentially embarrassing situation of finding the pig remains mixed with the human remains. However, no field maps were ever produced that identify the new or old positions of the monument.

SEAC ACCESSION 637 —
PAGLIONE’S 1983 TESTING OF PROPOSED WATERLINES AND HIGHWAY 210

Eighty-one shovel tests were excavated by Teresa Paglione along the proposed waterline routes from the Visitor Center to Patriots Hall and in the areas of the Grady, Loyalist, and Moore Monuments. The eastern portion of the park, where Highway 210 was to be rerouted, was visually inspected and randomly shovel tested. Noted there were several recent house sites bordered by garden plots whose outlines were still visible. The plowzone in this field, which extended to a depth of eight inches, appeared quite distinct in the shovel tests.

In those areas affected by the proposed waterlines, the shovel tests produced no evidence for prehistoric or historic cultural activity. However, Paglione’s report contained only one hand-drawn sketch map, which lacked horizontal control. Consequently the location of the shovel tests cannot be reproduced. Additionally, the archeological remains of the recent house sites were not mapped or tested. No cultural materials were reported or recovered during the project.

SEAC ACCESSION 650 —
FISCHER AND BREWER’S 1983 UNDERWATER SURVEY

Following the suggestion made by Griffin in 1958, an underwater survey of Moores Creek was conducted by David Brewer. A metal detector and a
magnetometer survey for mapping the bridge ruins were used. Waterlogged timbers, struts, posts, and planking were observed and mapped. These were identified as parts of the 1931 reconstructed bridge that was taken apart in 1945. The team could not definitively locate the remains of the original bridge, nor did they recover cultural material associated with the 1776 battle. In a 1984 memorandum from Richard D. Faust, Chief of SEAC, to the park, he tentatively identified the artifacts as being from the logging industry and not the Revolutionary War.

The final report prepared by Brewer was thorough and contained specific details regarding the provenience of the recovered materials. Unfortunately, the concrete bridge abutment that served as the center of the east bank grid station has since been removed. Reproducing Brewer’s original grid and lane locations will therefore be difficult, although other datum points were established.

**SEAC ACCESSION 671 — KOMARA’S 1984 SURVEY**

Komara directed survey/mapping, posthole testing, and metal detection in two areas of the park: from the west side of Moores Creek to the park’s west boundary, and in the northeast corner of the park from N.C. Highway 210 to the path of Negro Head Point Road as it crosses the park’s east boundary. The majority of the 477 positive metal detector targets were identified by Komara as modern trash and discarded. Nine of the sixty-four retained artifacts were chosen to undergo preservation through electrolysis. None of the 477 items, however, were believed to be from the eighteenth century. A location map of the metal detector targets was cited by Komara in his final draft report but was never produced.

The artifacts collected by Komara are scheduled for analysis by SEAC’s curation staff as part of the backlog cataloging process. However, the prehistoric lithics mentioned in his report were looked at by Guy Prentice, a SEAC archeologist. What had originally been identified by Komara as a chopper/pounder, a Morrow Mountain I projectile point, and a waste flake were incorrectly identified and are naturally occurring mineral masses (rocks) of granitic and quartzitic composition.

Furthermore, Allen Cooper, a former archeological technician for SEAC and one of Komara’s 1984 field crew members, stated that the alleged Morrow Mountain I point misidentified by Komara was recovered from gravel fill that had been brought into the park. He also stated that the field specimen bag had been clearly labeled as a gravel sample (Cooper, personal communication 1996).

The other five lithic items recovered by Komara were reassessed. Three waste flakes were correctly identified. However, one waste flake is more correctly identified as a thinning flake. One quartzite waste flake is a possible waste flake but of granitic composition, and its cultural origin is doubtful.

Komara’s excavation of Tar Kiln 2 recovered archeological data regarding the original size and construction of the pine tar production site. Two radiocarbon samples of charred wood were assayed, giving date ranges of less than 85 years B.P. and 420 ± 50 B.P., uncorrected. Thus, the time span between the two date ranges—A.D. 1865 and A.D. 1350 ± 50—provided by the radiocarbon assays are too great to definitively state the temporal affiliation of the kiln.

Thirty soil samples were taken from the kiln and later tested for pH and soil phosphate levels, but Komara failed to gather a control sample from outside the kiln area. Therefore, the pH and soil phosphate levels reported by Komara are only relative to themselves, which leaves the results of questionable utility.

Gas chromatography and mass spectrometry were performed on residues recovered from a number of surfaces in and around the kiln. The analysis revealed that the residue was from either longleaf pine or shortleaf pine, which are commonly used in the production of pine tar.

Komara conducted a pedestrian ground surface collection at the Moores Creek Missionary Baptist Church located northeast and outside of the park. He recovered fragments of marine shells, such as oysters and clams, a glass marble, brick fragments, and several small burned clay fragments.
from the surface of graves in the cemetery of the church. It is a southern United States African-American tradition, also practiced in coastal North Carolina, to decorate the surface of graves with shells and items that belonged to the deceased. It is believed that the personal items will serve the needs of the deceased as they did before death (Puckett 1926:104–107; Vlach 1978:139–140). The artifacts are stored in archival curation at SEAC and awaiting analysis by SEAC staff as part of the backlog cataloging process.

Publication of the final report was not feasible due to the incompleteness of the maps and problems associated with the accuracy of specific recorded survey data. An incomplete draft report was prepared, however, and is on file at SEAC.

SEAC ACCESSION 796 —
HORVATH'S 1988 EXCAVATIONS

The archeological investigations conducted by Horvath examined an area of the Patriot Earthworks that had not previously been tested—the western side of the entrenchment, which parallels the east bank of Moores Creek. Horvath recovered evidence of the original earthworks in two of the three trenches positioned across this section.

Within Feature 2 of Trench 2, a small charcoal stain was observed. A radiocarbon sample taken from the stain resulted in the date range of A.D 340 ± 90, obviously outside the acceptable range for the Revolutionary War period. Horvath did not consider the possibility that the charcoal stain could be a result of previous aboriginal activities at the site and that this could account for the circa A.D. 340 radiocarbon date (Horvath, personal communication 1996). She simply considered the assay to be an errant date based on the lack of aboriginal material and the fact that the stain did not resemble a posthole or a fire pit.

Other investigative methods employed by Horvath included shovel tests, surface reconnaissance, and the use of a metal detector. Among the recovered artifacts was a brass ammunition clip. Possibly dating from the first half of this century, the clip was probably from a .30-caliber Spring-field rifle or a .30-06. Horvath’s statement that the rifle “was used about the time of World War I” (1988:5) might be misleading, since this type of ammunition clip is currently available and still used by sportsmen and hunters in the United States (Bob Wilson and John Cornelison, personal communications 1996).

SEAC ACCESSION 1059 —
WRIGHT’S 1992 MONITORING OF THE BRIDGE RECONSTRUCTION

While monitoring for the reconstruction of the Widow Moore’s bridge, Wright observed an anomaly/feature on the east bank of Moores Creek that he suggested might represent a small portion of the Negro Head Point Road. The bridge reconstruction did not disturb the feature. However, Wright failed to caution future researchers that excavations conducted in this area may have the potential to damage the original roadbed.

All documentation from Wright’s archeological monitoring project is available and complete.

SEAC ACCESSION 1132 —
CORNELISON’S 1994 SAIP/RASP SURVEY

Cornelison’s survey was originally designed for 100 percent coverage of the park (Cornelison 1994:1). Due to dense underbrush, exclusion of some areas containing threatened plant species, and low data recovery potential in some areas, the survey actually covered 69 (80 percent) of the park’s 86.52 acres. Standard NPS survey shovel testing techniques were employed. Additionally, an EM 38 was used with the expectation of detecting the subsurface remains of the earthworks and the road associated with the Battle of Moores Creek; however, the instrument did not locate either of these features.

Cornelison recommended that additional survey using a metal detector be conducted to encompass the entire park. This technique has proved successful when employed at other Revolutionary or Civil War battlefields. This is because most of
the expected artifacts are of metal composition (John Cornelison, personal communication 1996) and too widely scattered to recover using other methods. Although metal detector surveys have been previously conducted within the park, they were confined to the earthworks and portions of Negro Head Point Road.

During the 1994 SAIP/RASP survey conducted at the park by John Cornelison, two excavation trenches were positioned across the Patriot Earthworks. In the northernmost Trench 1, clear evidence of the original earthworks was present. The repairs or restorations to the earthworks from the 1930s, 1950s, and 1970s were also visible in the trench profile above the original works. Of particular note, Cornelison found Clyde King’s Trench B (excavated in 1937) clearly visible in the north profile of the unit at eighty-five centimeters below datum. Cornelison has subsequently suggested that Thompson’s 1974 excavations were not dug deep enough to encounter the original earthworks (Cornelison, personal communication 1996). The archeological remains of a fire pit were exposed within Trench 1. It probably dates to the battle of 1776.

Trench 2 failed to produce any evidence of the Patriot Earthworks. Trench 3, excavated to obtain a radiocarbon sample from Tar Kiln 1, provided a radiometric date of A.D. 1850 ± 50.

SUMMARIZING PREVIOUS ARCHEOLOGICAL FINDINGS

The cultural resources in the park can be divided into three categories: (1) resources directly associated with the Revolutionary War Battle of Moores Creek, (2) resources associated with historic activities since the war, and (3) possible resources associated with prehistoric activities.

REVOLUTIONARY WAR
BATTLE OF MOORES CREEK

The historically documented components of the Revolutionary War battlefield in the park are the Patriot Earthworks, the historic bridge site, the Negro Head Point Road, and Caswell’s Encampment. The location and extent of the Patriot Earthworks and the Negro Head Point Road have been archeologically confirmed, although some additional research is appropriate. The Forward Earthworks, the historic bridge, and Caswell’s Encampment have been tested with less satisfactory results. Two excavations of the Forward Earthworks provided conflicting results; the remains of the 1776 bridge across Moores Creek have not been recovered; and Caswell’s Encampment on the west side of the creek has not been located.

Since the artifacts associated with the Revolutionary War battles are largely of metallic composition, it is recommended that 100 percent of the park lands, all 86.52 acres, be surveyed with a metal detector. Previous metal detector surveys within the park were confined to the Patriot Earthworks, the west bank, and the creek bed. As a result of his work at the park, Cornelison offers the following commentary with regard to conducting the metal detector survey.

This project identified intact stratigraphy and subsurface archeological features associated with the Patriot Earthworks, but only a few historical artifacts that are probably associated with the Battle of Moores Creek. Recent projects have proven that a systematic metal detector survey, using modern metal detectors, is a cost-effective and practical way to locate battle evidence. Because of advances in machine technology since the mid-1970s, metal detector surveys that predate these technological changes are now substandard in that they may not have detected the majority of metal artifacts that were present.

Doug Scott’s work at Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument (Scott and Fox 1987), as well as the recent work at Stones River National Battlefield (Cornelison 1995a), Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park (Cornelison 1995b), Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park (Cornelison and Leslie 1996), Guilford Courthouse National
Military Park (Cornelison 1995c), and Cowpens National Battlefield (Cornelison and Hageseth 1995), has shown that a metal detector in the hands of trained volunteers is an effective and efficient tool for locating battle lines, troop position, and even retreat routes. The archeological investigations at Cowpens and Guilford demonstrated that the volume of artifacts on a Revolutionary War battlefield is extremely small. The material culture from the Battle of Moores Creek would probably be dozens of items rather than hundreds. (1997:42-43)

Patriot Earthworks
The archeological investigations of the Patriot Earthworks have been extensive and thorough, and further excavations are not necessary to define the area or size of the breastworks. However, during the SAIP/RASP survey conducted in 1994, one of the two excavation trenches positioned across the earthworks revealed a feature that probably dates to the battle of 1776. In Trench 1, the archeological remains of a fire pit were partially exposed.

The archeological information gained from excavating the fire pit could enhance the interpretation of battle-related events. It is therefore recommended that future consideration be given to reopening and excavating Trench 1 in order to retrieve archeological data and pit contents from the fire pit.

Forward (Lillington’s) Earthworks
The Forward Earthworks were the first entrenchments hastily built by Lillington’s men on the east side of Moores Creek, on a slight rise overlooking the bridge and its approach from the west. Quickly replaced by the more substantial Patriot Earthworks, the Forward Earthworks were not used during the battle on February 27, 1776.

In 1937, the area of the Forward Earthworks was tested by King, who confirmed their existence. However, in 1974, Thompson tested the location again, with negative results, presumably because he dug too far to the southeast.

A thorough examination of the Forward Earthworks area using remote sensing devices, such as the EM 38 or ground penetrating radar (GPR), is recommended. The construction of the earthworks was a major component in the events leading up to the battle. Determining the precise location and extent of the Forward Earthworks would enhance the park’s ability to interpret the site.

Caswell’s Encampment
The historical documents concerning the location of Caswell’s Encampment are not as specific as those describing the other elements of the battle. Loyalist MacDonald dispatched a messenger, James Hepburn, under a flag of truce to offer the King’s pardon if Caswell would lay down his arms and swear an oath of allegiance to the Crown. MacDonald’s main intent, however, was reconnaissance. In this regard, Hepburn was successful. He reported that Caswell “had taken up his Ground six miles from us upon our side of the Bridge upon Widow Moore’s Creek and that it was very Practicable to attack [him]” (Hatch 1969:36). This account supports the theory that Caswell had camped on the west side of the creek in the area of the bridge, perhaps in the backward C-shaped section of land formed by the creek north of the bridge. It was also reported that after the Loyalists had entered Caswell’s abandoned camp, they had moved to the rear, closer to the verge of the wood, to take cover from the sight of the enemy. This larger contingent of Loyalists then heard a shot coming from the plain between the bridge and the army. It was McLean’s band of men, who had approached the bridge and saw the Patriots on the east side of the creek. It is clear from the above statements that the west bank abandoned camp was not in front of the bridge, but whether it was north or south of the bridge is unknown. However, it is generally agreed that Caswell established a temporary camp on the west side of Moores Creek. It is less clear if Caswell actually dug an entrenchment or only built a campfire.

If Caswell built an entrenchment it may be possible to detect the earthworks by using remote sensing methods (GPR or a magnetometer). However, before the park acquired the west bank property, Moores Creek was dredged and the spoil was placed on the creek bank north of the bridge. This presumably would have seriously altered the natu-
eral electromagnetic fields in that area. It may be necessary, therefore, to conduct large-scale excavations to locate possible cultural features or artifacts left by Caswell’s camp fires since the previous posthole surveys of west bank property have failed to detect these features.

Although the general location of Caswell’s camp is “known” from the historic documents relating to the events of the battle, the site has not been archeologically located. Therefore, Caswell’s camp has not been assigned a listing with the Cultural Sites Inventory-Archeology (CSI-A) database (1994a) or the Archeological Sites Management Information System (ASMIS) database (1996b), or issued a subsite number from the state of North Carolina.

**Negro Head Point Road**

Park staff have recommended stabilizing the portion of the old roadbed known as the causeway to prevent further erosion caused by cyclic flooding of Moores Creek (NPS 1994b:19). The location of the road near the bridge was tentatively identified by Wright in 1992 during the placement of the reconstructed historic bridge abutments. However, to determine the eighteenth-century dimensions of the road and ensure its preservation, further archeological investigations are necessary. The northern edge of the causeway has been stabilized with wooden riprap; however, it might be possible to clean the southern profile of the causeway exposed by erosion to establish the depth of the original roadbed. In conjunction with this, it is recommended that excavation trenches be placed across the original roadbed in order to determine the eighteenth-century road dimensions.

**Moores Creek**

In the *Moores Creek Statement for Management* (NPS 1994b), an archeological survey is recommended for the stream bank of Moores Creek. The goal would be to identify cultural resources and evaluate the impact of bank erosion on them. It is probable that portions of the original roadbed and the support members of the original bridge may be impacted by erosion. SEAC concurs with the park regarding the need for this type of survey.

### POSSIBLE POST-REVOLUTIONARY WAR SITES

**Tar Kilns**

Cultural resources consisting of two tar kilns, possibly associated with the naval stores industry of North Carolina, have been identified at Moores Creek National Battlefield. The tar kilns may date to the Revolutionary War era, but probably postdate the battle and therefore do not fall under the “Revolutionary War Battles Fought in the South” theme of the park. Regarding the National Register status of the site, the tar kilns are not currently listed as a contributing resource. Komara’s excavation of Tar Kiln 2 was sufficient to determine its location and dimensions, as well as to interpret the original methods of construction. Additionally, radiocarbon dates have been obtained from both kilns, which indicate probable nineteenth-century use.

The Tar Kiln Complex has been listed in the SEAC Cultural Sites Inventory: Archeology (CSI-A) computerized database and has been subsumed into the Archeological Sites Management Information System (ASMIS) database under MOCR-2.00 with each kiln assigned a subsite number: Tar Kiln 1 under MOCR-2.01 and Tar Kiln 2 under MOCR-2.02. North Carolina has issued subsite numbers as follows: Tar Kiln 1 under 31PD273**06 and Tar Kiln 2 under 31PD273**07. The Tar Kiln Complex has not been evaluated for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places.

Standard Section 106 procedures dictate that mitigation be conducted prior to proposed restoration or reconstruction activities regarding the kilns.

### POSSIBLE PREHISTORIC SITES

The artifactual information that has been recovered from the various archeological projects conducted in the park indicates a potential prehistoric presence within the park boundaries. The artifacts gathered from the park to date consist of six small ceramic sherds, one possible thinning flake, four possible waste flakes, and one honey-colored chert/flint flake that has tentatively been interpreted as a byproduct from resharpening a gunflint.

Before Moores Creek National Battlefield acquired the west bank property, portions of the creek
bed were dredged and the spoil placed on the west bank. The prehistoric artifacts recovered from the dredged soils included all the lithic materials except the honey-colored chert/flint flake and four of the six aboriginal ceramic sherds. It is entirely possible that all prehistoric materials recovered are from secondary contexts, most likely the creek bottom sediments.

In 1984, Komara recovered prehistoric lithic material from the west bank property and stated that “the generally shallow depth of the lithics and the association of one of them (from MD-350) with historic materials suggests that they have been re-deposited from their original contexts” (1985:18).

The single honey-colored chert/flint flake recovered by Horvath is the only possible prehistoric artifact found in the area of the Patriot Earthworks. The flake was recovered from Excavation Unit 1, Level 1. Horvath speculated that the flake was the result of resharpening a gunflint (catalog number MOCR 91). The color and superior quality of the material suggests that it was not acquired from local sources. The chert is very similar to the French flints, which were honey- or taffy-colored. There were no centers for the production of gunflints in the United States during the Revolutionary War period (Woodward 1960:37), and most gunflints used during the war, even in British camps, were French in origin (Hamilton 1960:74). “On the other hand, the flake could be the remnant of aboriginal stone tool production. Thus, indicating ephemeral utilization of the area by the Indians” (Horvath 1988:6).

John R. Wright, while archeologically monitoring the reconstruction of the historic Widow Moore’s Creek Bridge, recovered one broken quartz thinning flake from an alluvial layer of the west bank property.

During the SAIP/RASP survey conducted at the park in 1994, John Cornelison and his field crew recovered six prehistoric ceramic sherds. The sherds are in poor condition but are the only aboriginal ceramic material recovered so far. Two badly eroded sand-tempered sherds were recovered from two auger tests excavated near the current entrance road into the park. Cornelison stated that “the lack of additional aboriginal material indicates that these sherds were brought into this area, possibly from the road-grade fill or a commercial garage known to have once been located in this area. They are not the result of an aboriginal occupation” (1997:30).

Although the ceramics recovered in the vicinity of the former garage may represent re-deposited artifacts, the question remains whether or not they originated from within the park. Given the past history of dredging the nearby creek for fill dirt, it is possible that the ceramics recovered in this instance are associated with a prehistoric site located closer to the creek.

The third test in which pottery was recovered was excavated in the center of Negro Head Point Road in the raised portion known as the causeway on the west bank of Moores Creek approximately twenty meters west of the bridge. Four quartz- and sand-tempered body sherds were recovered from the test. Two of the sherds were originally one larger fabric-impressed sherd that was possibly associated with the Deep Creek or Cape Fear ceramic traditions (David Anderson, personal communication 1996). These sherds were recovered from an area where fill has obviously been used to level the ground and where dredging spoil from Moores Creek has been deposited.

It is recommended that all park subsurface activities be monitored for additional information regarding prehistoric presence. Although current information is still inconclusive, it is possible that one or more prehistoric Native American sites may be present in the park.
INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of this chapter is to identify the current locations of artifacts and documentation originating from archaeological investigations conducted within Moores Creek National Battlefield and to describe the nature of these collections. At present, there are five institutional repositories providing curatorial housing and stewardship of Moores Creek National Battlefield cultural materials. They are: (1) Moores Creek National Battlefield in Currie, North Carolina, (2) Charles Pinckney National Historic Site, (3) North Carolina’s Department of Cultural Resources in Raleigh, (4) the North Carolina Underwater Archaeology Preservation Laboratory at Fort Fisher Historic Site, and (5) the Southeast Archeological Center in Tallahassee, Florida. Information regarding the collections—including the name of the principal investigator, the date of recovery, the provenience, and item counts—are provided when possible.

MOORES CREEK NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD

The only artifacts currently housed at Moores Creek National Battlefield are those on display (see Appendix 5, Table 16). The rest of the artifact collection was moved in 1997 to the Charles Pinckney National Historic Site curatorial facility.

CHARLES PINCKNEY NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

All artifacts previously housed at Moores Creek National Battlefield that are not currently on display at the park have been moved to the new curatorial storage facility at Charles Pinckney National Historic Site. The collection is largely archaeological in nature, consisting of about forty items (see Appendix 5, Table 17).

The artifact salvage conducted by Griffin in 1958 recovered six items from the Patriot Earthworks using a metal detector. The items—one eighteenth-century buckle, one iron wall bracket, one section of chain, one metal ring, and two iron fragments—have also been moved to Charles Pinckney National Historical Site. Griffin’s original manuscript is housed at Moores Creek National Battlefield.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CULTURAL RESOURCES

The North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources is providing curatorial housing—under state site number 31PD273**—for the artifacts collected by Timothy Thompson in 1974 while under contract with the NPS. The items are one iron spike and fifteen to twenty unidentified metal fragments recovered from Excavation Trench 7.

The Underwater Archaeology Preservation Laboratory at Fort Fisher Historic Site, North Carolina, has conserved and is providing housing for the artifacts recovered during the 1983 underwater survey conducted by Fischer and Brewer (SEAC Accession 650) (Lawrence 1996). The artifacts are curated at the Fort Fisher Historic site facility under state site number 31PD293**UW. Table 10 lists all known reference numbers concerning the artifacts.

SOUTHEAST ARCHEOLOGICAL CENTER

The documents and artifacts associated with thirteen SEAC accessions are currently curated at the Southeast Archeological Center in Tallahassee. The artifacts have been cataloged according to the
Cataloging Manual for Archeological Objects (NPS 1990). They are presented in numerical order according to the SEAC accession number. The Moores Creek accession number follows.

Table 10 — Reference numbers for artifacts recovered during 1983 underwater survey at 31PD293**UW.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Record #</th>
<th>Field ID. #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 iron/steel axe head</td>
<td>2BKR1</td>
<td>Lot OB1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 iron ring bolt</td>
<td>2BKR2</td>
<td>Lot G - 9.0-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 iron fastener</td>
<td>2BKR3</td>
<td>Lot 1 - 7.0-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 iron spike</td>
<td>2BKR4</td>
<td>Lot L - 10.8-N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 iron cooking pot frag.</td>
<td>2BKR5 (A)(B)</td>
<td>Lot OB2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEAC Acc. 209; MOCR Acc. 21
This accession consists of documents and artifacts recovered by John W. Walker from the cornerstone of the Grady Monument in 1974. The contents were originally thought to be the human remains of John Grady, the only Patriot soldier to have died from wounds received during the battle. However, pig remains were also recovered. The human remains (two teeth fragments) were reinterred in the cornerstone after the monument, dedicated to Grady, was set at its new location. The faunal remains are curated at SEAC. Catalog numbers will be assigned following future analysis as part of SEAC’s backlog cataloging process.

SEAC Acc. 486; MOCR Acc. 22
Comprising this accession are documents associated with the excavations of the Patriot Earthworks conducted by Clyde B. King in 1937 and his 1939 earthworks restoration activities. No artifacts were recovered during King’s projects.

SEAC Acc. 487; MOCR Acc. 23
The documents regarding the metal detector survey of the earthworks and bridge, conducted by John W. Griffin, August 18–20, 1958, make up this accession. The six artifacts recovered by Griffin are housed at Moores Creek National Battlefield under MOCR Acc. 23.

SEAC Acc. 488; MOCR Acc. 24
This accession contains all of the documents (catalog number MOCR 84) from John Walker’s 1973 archeological survey for the relocation of Highway 210 at Moores Creek National Battlefield. No artifacts were recovered.

SEAC Acc. 489; MOCR Acc. 25
Under NPS contract number CX500040454, investigations of the earthworks and the Revolutionary War road were undertaken between January 9 and May 9, 1974. Timothy A. Thompson from the Division of Archives and History, North Carolina State Department of Cultural Resources, was field supervisor; Stephen J. Gluckman acted as principal investigator. The subsequent documents comprise this accession under catalog number MOCR 185.

The artifacts recovered by Thompson (one iron railroad spike and fifteen to twenty unidentified metal fragments) are curated at the North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources, Raleigh, under state site number 31PD273**.

SEAC Acc. 490; MOCR Acc. 26
In 1938, Thor Borresen was sent to Moores Creek National Battlefield to assess King’s 1937 excavated portions of the Patriot Earthworks. In 1940, Borresen was again sent to excavate the earthworks following the restoration activities conducted by King in 1939. No artifacts were collected by Borresen.

SEAC Acc. 612; MOCR Acc. 27
This accession includes four historic sherds collected from the park grounds in 1982 by Mrs. J. J. Jewett Jr. and correspondence indicating the sherds were taken from a pile of dirt that the park employees had been working on. Catalog numbers will be assigned following future analysis as part of SEAC’s backlog cataloging process.

SEAC Acc. 637; MOCR Acc. 28
Documents regarding the waterline survey for Moores Creek National Battlefield, conducted by SEAC’s Teresa Paglione between March 31 and April 2, 1983, are curated under this accession.
The scope of work included archeological investigation of a proposed waterline system, which would link the Visitor Center and Patriot Hall, and consisted primarily of eighty-one shovel tests. These revealed no prehistoric or historic cultural activity. No artifacts were recovered.

SEAC Acc. 650; MOCR Acc. 29; 
State Site Number 31PD273**UW
This accession includes documents regarding the August 1983 underwater survey of Moores Creek conducted by David Brewer, SEAC, under the direction of George Fischer, principal investigator. The scope of work included a systematic underwater metal detector and magnetometer survey and mapping of the 1931 bridge ruins.

The recovered artifacts are housed with the Underwater Archaeology Unit of the North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources under state site number 31PD273**UW. They include five iron artifacts dating to the post-Revolutionary War period.

SEAC Acc. 671; MOCR Acc. 30
This accession contains the documents and artifacts generated from Gregory L. Komara's field investigation conducted at Moores Creek National Battlefield from April 16 to June 18, 1984. Investigations consisted of survey, mapping, posthole testing, and metal detector survey of two areas: (1) the west bank area in the vicinity of the historic Moores Creek Bridge site; and (2) newly acquired property to serve as the Highway 210 relocation area. Work also concentrated on mapping the route of the historic Negro Head Point Road. A suspected tar kiln site was also partially excavated. Special project analysis consisted of soil testing, wood identification, radiocarbon dating, chemical analysis of the tar kiln deposits, and electrolysis. Catalog numbers will be assigned following future analysis as part of SEAC's backlog cataloging process.

Artifacts were recovered from the 95 posthole tests and 477 positive metal detector readings; however, no artifacts associated with the Revolutionary War era were found. The materials are awaiting analysis at SEAC.

SEAC Acc. 796; MOCR Acc. 31
The materials associated with this accession are the result of archeological investigations conducted by Elizabeth A. Horvath during the week of June 20, 1988, prior to the construction of a footbridge and trail within Moores Creek National Battlefield. Subsurface testing was conducted by means of backhoe trenching, shovel testing, and hand excavating one unit. Visual surface reconnaissance was assisted by a metal detector survey of the proposed impact area. The testing located segments of the Patriots' breastworks. Horvath recommended that no further disturbance of the resource be allowed.

The documents regarding the excavation are assigned catalog number MOCR 110. The documents concerning the radiocarbon samples taken are curated at SEAC under MOCR 103.

The artifacts recovered from the investigations are currently housed at SEAC under catalog numbers MOCR 51 through MOCR 109. (See Appendix 5, Table 18, for the inventory list of artifacts recovered under SEAC Accession 796.) The collection consists largely of modern artifacts; however, one small lithic flake that was recovered may have been struck off a gunflint. The superior quality and color of the chert flake offer strong evidence that the material was not locally derived.

SEAC Acc. 1059; MOCR Acc. 32
The collection (see Appendix 5, Table 19) associated with the archeological monitoring conducted in October 1992 in preparation for the reconstruction of the historic bridge at Moores Creek National Battlefield includes documents (catalog number MOCR 42) and artifacts (catalog number MOCR 44 through MOCR 46). The work was carried out by John Wright, SEAC, under the guidance of Elizabeth Horvath, principal investigator. Trenches were excavated by backhoe for the bridge abutments and then were troweled. Old timbers from the 1931 bridge were exposed, photographed, and mapped. Some modern artifacts were recovered and are housed at SEAC under accession 1059, but no cultural materials relating to the Revolutionary War battle at Moores Creek were recovered or observed.
SEAC Acc. 1132; MOCR Acc. 34
This accession includes the documents and artifacts (catalog number MOCR 112 through MOCR 182) recovered during the SAIP/RASP survey of Moores Creek National Battlefield conducted by John Cornelison in 1994. Approximately two-thirds of the park was investigated using an EM 38 magnetometer, posthole tests, auger tests, and excavation units.

Housed at SEAC under this same accession are the artifacts recovered from Cornelison’s survey. These include prehistoric lithics and ceramics, possible Revolutionary War period items (two wrought nails, one lead shot), and various historic materials.

Catalog numbers for the artifacts have been assigned (Cornelison 1997, Appendix 1). While the archeological investigations conducted at Moores Creek National Battlefield have been extensive (80 percent or 69 of the park’s 86.52 acres have been surveyed), there is insufficient information regarding some park resources. Further studies should be undertaken to provide specific information and documentation for site interpretation, cultural resource management, and site protection programs. Research should include, but not be limited to, a metal detector survey of the park, documentary research on the tar kilns, and exploring the possibility of prehistoric resources in the park.
This section identifies and makes recommendations for correcting deficiencies concerning documentation, treatment, and monitoring issues for Moores Creek National Battlefield's cultural resources. The following recommendations are based on Department of Interior guidelines as presented in the National Park Service's *Cultural Resource Management Guideline: NPS-28*. First published in 1985, *NPS-28* was updated in 1994 (NPS 1994c).

**DOCUMENTATION ISSUES**

Each park is expected to maintain certain basic cultural resource documents to aid in managing its cultural resources. These identify, document, and evaluate the known information about a unit's cultural resources and should be prepared or updated prior to preparation of the General Management Plan (NPS 1989).

**ARCHEOLOGICAL OVERVIEW AND ASSESSMENT**

As a result of this report, the Archeological Overview and Assessment for Moores Creek National Battlefield has been completed. This document describes and assesses the known and potential archeological resources in the park and adds any cultural resources not previously listed on the Cultural Sites Inventory-Archeology (CSI-A), which is now subsumed by the Archeological Sites Management Information System (ASMIS).

**ARCHEOLOGICAL IDENTIFICATION STUDIES**

The purpose of these studies is to identify the locations of historic structures and/or archeological sites in the park. To the extent currently possible, this Overview and Assessment, in summarizing past archeological projects, preparing an archeological base map, and generating ASMIS forms, has accomplished the goals of such studies.

Although the general location of Caswell's camp is understood from the historic documents relating to the events of the battle, the resource has not been archeologically located. Therefore, Caswell's camp has not been assigned a listing with ASMIS or issued a North Carolina subsite number. These documents should be prepared if and when Caswell's camp is located.

**ARCHEOLOGICAL EVALUATION STUDIES**

These studies are conducted to evaluate the integrity (i.e., condition) of archeological resources and provide the basis for determining National Register eligibility of sites and other archeological resources. Enough work has been conducted in the park to evaluate some properties but not others.

The entire park and four of the five known resources associated with the Revolutionary War Battle of Moores Creek have been listed on the National Register of Historic Places. They include the Patriot Earthworks, the Forward or Lillington's Earthworks, the Negro Head Point Road, and the Caswell's Camp area. The Moores Creek historic bridge is well known in the historic documentation of the period but has not been identified archeologically. Additionally, eight monuments erected by the Moores Creek Monumental Association have been placed on the National Register under historic structure numbers HS-4 through HS-9, HS-11, and HS-12.

Two other cultural resources consisting of tar kilns have been identified within the park. The kilns are associated with North Carolina's naval stores industry. The radiocarbon dates provided from wood samples taken from the kilns indicate that they probably postdate the Revolutionary War period. The Tar Kiln Complex has been listed on the CSI-A database and has been subsumed into...
the ASMIS database under MOCR-2.00 with each kiln assigned a subsite number: Tar Kiln 1 under MOCR-2.01 and Tar Kiln 2 under MOCR-2.02. North Carolina has issued subsite numbers as follows: Tar Kiln 1 under 31PD273**06 and Tar Kiln 2 under 31PD273**07.

Eligibility for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places has not been determined for the Tar Kiln Complex. A historic resource study should be conducted to address the development of the naval stores industry in North Carolina and, more specifically, the production of pine tar, and to evaluate the kilns for possible nomination to the National Register.

**ETHNOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW AND ASSESSMENT**

The Moores Creek Statement for Management, prepared by the park in 1994, discusses some inadequacies regarding historical data.

*Although the park has been under federal administration since 1926, major gaps still exist in the battle story and related topics. This often handicaps park management in its efforts to restore and maintain a historically accurate scene as well as fully educate park visitors. Major history topics requiring research include: evaluation of all related pension claims, social history of the region, naval stores and Black River commerce, Widow Moore, John Grady, contemporary land ownership, and a study of all 1776 newspaper coverage of battle related material. (NPS 1994b)*

No current research is being conducted in these areas as part of the current Archeological Overview and Assessment, but these topics could be addressed in an Ethnographic Overview and Assessment, which is recommended.

**ETHNOGRAPHIC ORAL AND LIFE HISTORIES**

The park has no current documents regarding oral and life histories. Future consideration should be given to the possible benefits of conducting such studies.

**HISTORICAL STUDIES**

Two histories of the Battle of Moores Creek have been prepared: one by Hatch (1969), another by Rankin (1986). However, both studies are related exclusively to events of the battle. Any discussions on the social, political, economic, and ethnic composition of the battle participants are brief and generalized. Therefore, further in-depth research concerning the individual soldiers of the battle and their lifeways prior to and after the Revolutionary War would aid park staff in compiling a more accurate and complete interpretation of the park’s resources.

**HISTORICAL BASE MAP(S)**

The National Park Service’s Cultural Resource Management Guideline: NPS-28 (1985) states that:

*Base maps are to be prepared to show the location of all known archeological sites and all areas within a park that have been surveyed for archeological sites with annotation on the survey methods used, all historic resources, including the location of elements that have disappeared, and known ethnographic resources and sites, including those with subsistence and sacred value to Native Americans. Additionally, troop movements maps are included, if applicable.*

Two historical base map and grounds studies have been previously conducted at the park. In 1974, John Albright prepared a historical base map and historic ground study document that also included a history of the Widow Moore’s Creek Bridge. In 1988, SEAC archeologists Walker and Lee prepared a map study of the excavations conducted within the Patriot Earthworks. Archeological investigations conducted outside the Patriot Earthworks were not included in their study.

As part of the present overview and assessment of Moores Creek National Battlefield, AutoCAD maps were prepared that include the locations of all known archeological sites and historic resources and troop movements. No known ethnographic re-
source or site having subsistence or sacred value to Native Americans exists in the park.

**HISTORIC RESOURCES STUDIES**

The primary purpose of a Historic Resources Study (HRS) is to identify and evaluate historic resources within the park as potential National Register eligible properties. Moores Creek National Battlefield has two identified historic sites—Moores Creek Battlefield and the Tar Kiln Complex—with each having associated subsites. The subsites associated with the battlefield are the Patriot Earthworks, Forward or Lillington’s Earthworks, Moores Creek Historic Bridge, Negro Head Point Road, and Caswell’s Encampment. The subsites associated with the Tar Kiln Complex are Tar Kiln 1 and Tar Kiln 2.

In 1976, Moores Creek National Battlefield was nominated to the National Register of Historic Places and the following components of the battle were placed on the register as historic structures: Patriot Earthworks, Forward or Lillington’s Earthworks, and Negro Head Point Road. The term “structure” is used to distinguish them as constructions whose functions were usually for purposes other than creating human shelter (NPS 1991:15). An amendment to the register was added in 1987 that designated the historically documented area of Caswell’s camp as a historic structure. However, the location of Caswell’s camp is unknown, therefore, it has not been assigned a CSI-A/ASMIS or state site number. The remains of the original bridge, although historically documented, likewise have not been located archeologically.

The Tar Kiln Complex and the associated components have not been evaluated in terms of their National Register eligibility. An HRS is therefore recommended to assess this possibility.

No other standing structures, besides monuments erected by the Moores Creek Monumental Association, exist at Moores Creek National Battlefield.

**PARK ADMINISTRATIVE HISTORY**

A Park Administrative History summarizes the history of the park entity. Two sections in the present Overview and Assessment—“Creation of Moores Creek National Battlefield” in Chapter 3 and “Appendix 1, Enabling Legislation”—have been compiled to incorporate some of this information.

**SCOPE OF COLLECTIONS STATEMENT**

Chapter 6 of this report clearly describes the status and location of the archeological collections and associated documents from Moores Creek National Battlefield. This, however, does not fulfill all the requirements of a Scope of Collections Statement, which is recommended once the backlog cataloging of artifacts is completed by SEAC’s curatorial staff.

**TREATMENT ISSUES**

According to the Secretary’s Standards as defined in NPS-28 (NPS 1985), archeological resources are to be left undisturbed unless intervention can be justified based on compelling research, interpretation, site protection, or park development needs. All resources are to be protected against natural and human agents of destruction and deterioration whenever practicable. Preservation is to include techniques of arresting or retarding deterioration through a program of ongoing maintenance. Deteriorated areas (e.g., depressions created through erosion, slumping, subsidence, and other natural causes) will be backfilled or otherwise stabilized. Excavation and other destructive techniques will be employed only when necessary to provide sufficient information for research, interpretation, and management needs. Excavated areas are to be backfilled or otherwise stabilized. Stabilization of a resource to arrest and inhibit deterioration will be done in such a way as to detract as little as possible from its appearance and significance and not adversely affect its research potential unless adequate data recovery has occurred. Stabilization by vegetation, installation of riprap or landscape netting, burial, or other alterations will be undertaken only after sufficient research or experimentation to determine the probable efficacy of the action and only after existing
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conditions are fully documented. A complete record of stabilization work will be kept. Archeological sites and structures will not be rehabilitated, restored, or reconstructed.

One of the primary components of the Battle of Moores Creek is the Patriot Earthworks. Since 1937, five major excavations have identified and located the entrenchment. The data recovered to date provide a sound base for interpreting the site, and, therefore, further exploratory archeological investigations of the earthworks should be avoided. However, in 1994, SEAC’s RASP survey identified a fire pit in one of two trenches excavated across the Patriot Earthworks. As previously mentioned, it is recommended that future consideration be given to the potential benefit of reopening the trench and excavating this feature.

The elevated portion of the Negro Head Point Road on the east bank of Moores Creek, known as the causeway, has suffered repeated erosional damage caused by water draining from the east side of the park to Moores Creek as well as by seasonal flooding of the creek.

The north side of the causeway has been stabilized with riprap but continues to erode. NPS-28 states that “the only prehistoric sites or historic structures [cultural resources] which should undergo stabilization are those which are in imminent danger of structural collapse or are otherwise deteriorating to a serious degree and which are at the same time considered vitally important to the program of cultural interpretation and/or to scientific research needs. Stabilization of eroding footpaths may be necessary to ensure visitor safety” (NPS 1985, ch. 3, p. 7). Under these directives, a study is recommended to determine a solution to the erosion threatening the causeway and those portions of the original Moores Creek Bridge that may still remain.

**MONITORING ISSUES**

Archeological resources are to be protected from vandalism and looting. Patrols, fencing, warning signs, and remote-sensing alarms are to be used as appropriate. Stewardship is to be promoted through public educational programs.

Since federal enactment of the Archeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) in 1979, no ARPA violations have been recorded at the park. The park grounds, however, are continuously threatened by visitor traffic and seasonal flooding of Moores Creek. A vigorous program of monitoring the condition of resources would help park personnel identify threats and establish priorities. The park should consider employing volunteers from the public sector to aid in this process.

Although the Tar Kiln Complex does not fall under the general park theme for which it was established, it is nevertheless a potentially significant cultural resource in the park. Currently, the Tar Kiln Complex has neither been developed nor interpreted. Furthermore, no ongoing maintenance or monitoring program exists for the protection of the complex. It is recommended that preservation of the resource be considered in any protection and maintenance schedule that is established.
Appendix 1
ENABLING LEGISLATION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
69th Congress
1st Session
Report No. 1090

TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL MILITARY PARK AT THE
BATTLE FIELD OF MOORES CREEK, N.C.

May 6, 1926—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state
of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. WURZBACH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submitted
the following

REPORT

{To accompany H. R. 3796}

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3796) to establish a
national military park at the battle field of Moores Creek, Pender County, N.C., reported favorably
thereon, and recommended that the bill be passed
with the following amendment: Strike out section 3.

On the 27th day of February, 1776, the first
American victory was gained by the American
arms in the War of the Revolution at Moores Creek,
Pender County, N.C. The National Society of the
Daughters of the American Revolution in a recent
session in the city of Washington unanimously
passed the following resolution:

Whereas on February 27, 1776, 150 years ago,
was won at Moores Creek, in Pender County, N.C., the first decisive victory of the American Army in
the War of the Revolution, when 1,000 patriots
under Col. Alexander Lillington put to flight 1,600
Tories under General McLeod, and thereby saved
North Carolina to the cause of American indepen-
dence.

Whereas the victory was one of the chief fac-
tors leading to the ultimate decision of the colony
to pass the Halifax resolutions of independence and
freedom from English rule, so powerful in effect
on the subsequent Federal Declaration of Indepen-
dence.

Whereas Fiske, in his history of the American
Revolution, states, "The effect of the victory was
as contagious as that of Lexington in New En-
gland." Within 10 days 10,000 militia were ready
to withstand the enemy, so that Clinton on his ar-
rial decided not to land. A provincial congress
was forthwith assembled and instructions were sent
to the North Carolina delegates in the Continental
Congress empowering them to concur in declar-
ing independence. Wherefore be it

Resolved, That the National Society of the
Daughters of the American Revolution in Congress
assembled indorse the resolution passed by the
North Carolina State Conference to request the
Senate and the House of Representatives of the
United States to pass a bill providing for sufficient appropriations to create and maintain a national park at Moores Creek battle ground, Pender County, N.C.

The national officers of the Daughters of the American Revolution filed with the Military Affairs Committee a statement as follows:

It is a pleasure to comply with the request of Congressman Charles L. Abernethy and Senator Lee S. Overman to indorse the resolution passed by the State conference of North Carolina, Daughters of the American Revolution, and unanimously indorsed by the national board of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Saturday, April 27, 1926, to request the House of Representatives and the Senate to pass a bill to establish and maintain a national park at Moores Creek battle ground in Pender County, N.C.

Mrs. Anthony Wayne Cook  
President General, N.S.D.A.R

Mrs. George De Bolt  
Historian General, N.S.D.A.R.

Mrs. John Trigg Moss,  
Chairman Resolutions Committee  
Congress, 1926, N.S.D.A.R.

A simple brownstone monument stands as a memorial to the first victory gained by the American Army in the War of the Revolution. North Carolina throughout the War of Independence devoted her energy to the cause of freedom, and this was brought about largely on the strategy and zeal of Colonels Moore, Caswell, and Lillington, who, with their 1,100 men, stopped 1,600 of the enemy.

The hope of General McDonald, commander of the Tories and hero of Bunker Hill, was to reach Wilmington, where he expected to find Sir Henry Clinton and Lord William Campbell with a considerable land and naval force, and to be able in a short time to make an aggressive and successful advance into the interior. He organized his army of Tories and broke camp on the 23d of February, 1776, crossed the Cape Fear River, and pushed on at a rapid pace pursued by Colonel Moore and his band of patriots; crossed the South River from Bladen and New Hanover, and on approaching Moores Creek he came upon the camps of Colonels Caswell and Lillington.

The following morning the loyalists rushed forward under Captain McLeod, and the patriots, who had waited behind the breastworks constructed during the night until the Tories were within 30 paces, then arose from their concealment and bravely confronted the foe. Captain McLeod and the second leader, John Campbell, were killed; the Tories were dispersed and 900 made prisoners, including McDonald himself. Rifles and ammunition were taken in great quantities and stores amounting to the value of $100,000.

The amount of spoils taken and the number of prisoners captured does not show the benefits of this victory. The victory was the destruction of the great scheme which had been formed for the subjugation of North Carolina. The breaking up of the combination of the enemies of the colonists at home secured the State of North Carolina for the cause of independence. It showed that North Carolina was able to hold in check the Tories within her borders, and it won over to the cause of freedom many who had hitherto held back for fear of English power. A warm zeal invaded all ranks of the people in every part of the colony, and in less than two weeks approximately 10,000 men had risen against the enemy. The coming of Clinton inspired no terror, and almost every man was ready to turn out at a moment’s notice.

About the time of this battle, Sir Henry Clinton and Lord William Campbell were entering the Cape Fear with a considerable force; Sir Henry Parker, with 10 or 12 ships, and Lord Cornwallis, with seven regiments, were expected every hour. Bitter was their disappointment when on reaching Fort Johnson a few days later to learn when on the very eve of attaining the object of their expedition the loyalists of the State had been repulsed and driven back and all who survived the fatal day were captured or scattered, and their hopes were completely blasted.

This battle is of great national import, as is evidenced by the action of that patriotic body, the
National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution. The historical references to it are many.

Dawson, in Battles of the United States, volume 1, says:

“This battle was of eminent service to the American cause of independence in America. It broke the spirit of a great body of men, who would have constituted a very formidable reenforcement to an invading army. Had General McDonald effected a union with Sir Henry Clinton, the whole of the colony would have been placed at their mercy.

Frothingham, in The Rise of the Republic of the United States, says:

“This was the Concord and Lexington of that region. The newspapers circulated the details of this brilliant result. The spirits of the Whigs ran high. “You never,” one writes, “knew the like in your life for true patriotism.”

Caruthers, in Revolutionary Incidents, says:

The Battle of Moores Creek was to the South pretty much what the Battle of Lexington was to the North. In the former case the victory was more complete, but we speak of it as a test of courage, and its effects upon the community in preparing them for the approaching contest with the gigantic power of Great Britain.

John Fiske, in his American Revolution, volume 1, page 177, says:

The effect of the victory was as contagious as that of Lexington had been in New England. Within 10 days 10,000 militia were ready to withstand the enemy, so that Clinton on his arrival decided not to land, and stayed cruising about Albemarle Sound, waiting for the fleet under Parker, which did not appear on the scene until May. A provincial congress

was forthwith assembled, and instructions were sent to the North Carolina delegates in the Continental Congress empowering them to concur with the delegates in the other colonies in declaring independency and forming foreign alliances, reserving to the colony the sole and exclusive right of forming a constitution and laws for it.

In the correspondence of George III, i, 276; quoted in Frothingham. The Rise of the Republic of the United States, Boston, 1872: page 502:

Governor Martin was endeavoring to save the State for the Crown and expected to accomplish his aim by brilliant activities on the part of the Tory highlanders whom he hoped to have reenforced by Sir Henry Clinton's expedition from England, sent by George III, because, as he said, “I am clear the first attempt should be made on North Carolina, as the highland settlers are said to be well inclined”

** **“Thousands of Scots assembled: but only sixteen hundred remained when it was found that no royal troops had arrived. Under McDonald, the faithful started on their march to Wilmington. They were met at Moores Creek Bridge, 18 miles above Wilmington, by the radicals on February 27, 1776, and were killed, captured, or dispersed to a man.”

See also Channing, Edward: A History of the United States, 1912, Volume 3; The American Revolution, page 178, 179.

Henry Cabot Lodge says that—
Governor Martin stirred up one part of the community against the other, set a civil war on foot in the colony, betook himself to a man of war, and cried out for help from England. The usual result followed. The loyalists attacked the Minute Men under Caswell, who had posted themselves at a bridge from which they had taken the planks. The highlanders gallantly attempted to cross on the beams but were beaten back, for the claymore was no match for the rifle.
In this way the colony was alienated from the Crown, fighting was started, the party of the revolution and resistance was left with a clear field and a free hand as the only positive force, to set up an independent government and seize all authority. Lodge, Henry Cabot: The Story of the Revolution. New York, 1903, page 123.

R. D. W. Connor, in his History of North Carolina, volume 1, The Colonial and Revolutionary Periods, page 388, says:

High ran the enthusiasm of the Whigs, and high their confidence. Ten thousand men sprang to arms and hurried to Wilmington. "Since I was born," wrote an eyewitness, "I never heard of so universal an ardor for fighting and so perfect a union among all degrees of men."

John Clark Ridpath, in The New Complete History of the United State of America, Cincinnati, 1905, Volume V, 2490, says of this battle:

All patriotic North Carolina sprang to arms, 10,000 being in camp in a few days.

Caruthers, in speaking of this battle, further states:

The effect was to arouse their ambition, to fire them with resentment, to increase their confidence in themselves, and give them a better appreciation of their rights.


The joy of this conquest diffused among the North Carolinians is inconceivable, the importance of it being heightened by General Clinton and Lord William Campbell being then at Cape Fear in sanguine expectation of being joined by the vanquished.

Caruthers, Joseph S., supra cit., 94–95, further states:

By their conduct at the bridge and by the victory achieved, they gained some military experience and a more intelligent confidence in themselves, which was of more advantage to them and to the country than all the spoils taken from the enemy.

Bancroft, George: History of the United States of America, New York, 1892, Volume LV, page 390, 391, says:

North Carolina, proud of its victory over domestic enemies and roused to defiance by the arrival of Clinton in their great river, met in Congress at Halifax on the 4th of April; on the 8th appointed a select committee, of which Harnett was the head, to consider the usurpations and violations of the British Parliament and King; and on the 12th after listening to its report, unanimously "empowered their delegates in the Continental Congress to concur with the delegates of the other colonies in declaring independency and forming foreign alliances." At the same time they reserved to their colony the sole right of forming its own constitution and laws. The people of North Carolina were the first in America to vote an explicit sanction to independence.

R. D. W. Conner, supra cit., Volume L, 389:

North Carolina was the Rubicon over which the Colonies passed to independence and constitutional self-government. Before that event the Whig leaders had rather dreaded than sought independence. They met with indignant denial the assertions of their enemies that they had aimed at it from the beginning of their dispute with the mother country. *** At any rate, they approached independence slowly, through a long process of development, and finally adopted it, as emancipation was afterwards adopted, as a war measure. Officially
North Carolina led the way with the first resolution adopted by any of the colonies authorizing their delegates in the Continental Congress to vote for independence.

Channing, Edward: A History of the United States, New York, 1912, says:

This complete crushing of the southern loyalists brought to the fore the question of the thirteen colonies.

At its session of the legislature in 1925 the State of North Carolina passed the following resolution:

Whereas on February 27, 1776, at Moores Creek Bridge in North Carolina 1,000 patriots, under the command of Col. Alexander Lillington, put to flight 1,600 Tories, under the command of Col. Donald McLeod and thereby saved North Carolina to the cause of American Independence; showed that North Carolina was able to hold in check the Tories within her borders; won over to the cause of freedom many who heretofore held back for fear of England’s power; and so thoroughly broke the spirit of the Highlanders that they never again rallied in North Carolina to the support of the royal cause; and

Whereas the troops engaged in this battle under the patriot supreme commander, Col. James Moore, and the royal supreme commander, Gen. Donal McDonald, were engaged in the first set of military campaigns of the War of the Revolution and the patriots here won the first pitched battle fought against royal troops in this war: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring): 1. That Moores Creek battle ground, in Pender County, N.C., ought to be erected into a national park and so maintained by the Federal Government.

2. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives in Congress from this State, with the request that they seek by appropriate legislation to erect and maintain Moores Creek battle ground as a national park. In the general assembly, read three times, and ratified this 27th day of February, 1925.

The legislature also passed a resolution authorizing the Governor of North Carolina to turn over to the Federal Government without cost this battle field, the title to which is in the State of North Carolina, together with all the building thereon. There are several buildings on the grounds—a large auditorium; a splendid artesian well; the grounds are suitably fenced. This battle field was recognized by Congress at a previous session when a modest monument was erected to Mary Slocumb, who made the memorable ride of 60 miles because she had a dream that her husband was wounded. A very beautiful account of this ride is given in Wheeler’s North Carolina History, page 457. Mary Slocumb’s maiden name was Mary Hooks. She was a sister of Hon. Charles Hooks, who was a Member of Congress from the Wilmington, N.C., district from 1816 to 1825, and who removed from North Carolina to Alabama. This account of Mary Slocumb’s ride is taken from Mrs. Elizabeth Ellet’s The Women of the Revolution.

Our committee feels that this important battle should be appropriately recognized by being converted into a military park.
Appendix 2
DESCRIPTION OF ARCHEOLOGICAL SITES

This section provides a compendium of information available as of 1994 concerning the archeological resources within the present boundaries of Moores Creek National Battlefield. As such, it summarizes the existing site information, corrects errors in fact and typography that appear in previous reports, and clarifies any confusion regarding the number of sites and their delineation. Some basic information regarding the sites is outlined in Table 11.

In order to avoid misrepresentations regarding what prior investigators meant while reporting their findings, the reports and field notes of Clyde B. King, Thor Borresen, John W. Griffin, John W. Walker, Timothy A. Thompson, Teresa L. Paglione, George R. Fischer, Gregory L. Komara, Elizabeth A. Horvath, John R. Wright, John E. Cornelson Jr., and others have been extensively quoted herein. This method provides a handy, single source of information for all the sites that have been archeologically investigated in the park.

All known archeological and architectural remains at Moores Creek National Battlefield are currently listed in the Archeological Sites Management Information System (ASMIS) maintained at SEAC. Although the park’s cultural resources can technically be classified as historic structures, they have been listed as archeological resources since their primary surviving integrity is beneath the surface. The list was established to provide a cultural resources tracking method and a resource protection and management tool.

MOCR-1.00 (31PD273**) MOORES CREEK BATTLEFIELD

The site designation MOCR-1.00 has been assigned to those areas in the park that relate to the Revolutionary War Battle of Moores Creek. The state of North Carolina has assigned site number 31PD273** as an umbrella number to encompass the entire park (86.52 acres). This designation includes archeological resources not affiliated with the Revolutionary War.

Moores Creek National Battlefield is located in Pender County, North Carolina, one mile west of Currie. The park was established to commemorate the Revolutionary War battle fought on February 27, 1776, between the English Loyalists and the Patriots of North Carolina. Colonel Lillington and his Patriot forces arrived at the east bank of “The Widow Moore’s Creek Bridge” on February 25, 1776, two days before the battle. They “initially threw up positions near the bridge but later left these for a more strategic location slightly to the rear” (Hatch 1969:35). Colonel Caswell and 800 Patriot soldiers arrived the evening of February 26. “Perhaps initially with the thought of deception, Caswell sent his men across to the west side of the bridge to throw up embankments there” (Hatch 1969:35).

Although the location of the battle was known to local residents and historians, the battlefield was not established as a park until 1898 when North Carolina purchased the first ten acres (two acres that included the major battlefield area and eight more acres of adjoining land for public commemoration of the battle). Later, in 1925, North Carolina offered to donate the property, then totaling thirty acres, to the federal government. On June 2, 1926, Congress authorized the establishment of the park. The War Department was the controlling authority for Moores Creek National Military Park, as it was then named, until August 10, 1933, when the park was transferred to the Department of the Interior and became a unit of the National Park System.

The park’s primary Revolutionary War archeological resources, with their CSI-A/ASMIS subsite numbers, are as follows:
Table 11 — Summary of Moores Creek archeological site data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASMIS #</th>
<th>State Site #</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Excavation Designations</th>
<th>Field Director</th>
<th>SEAC Acc. #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOCR-1.00</td>
<td>31PD273**</td>
<td></td>
<td>MOORES CREEK BATTLEFIELD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR-1.01</td>
<td>31PD273**01</td>
<td>Patriot Earthworks</td>
<td>Trenches A–I and Areas A–C</td>
<td>Clyde B. King</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trenches AB, CD, GH, HI, KL: one trench without field designation</td>
<td>Thor Borresen</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Metal detector survey of Patriot Earthworks</td>
<td>John W. Griffin</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trenches 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13</td>
<td>Timothy A. Thompson</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trenches 1, 2, 3</td>
<td>Elizabeth A. Horvath</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area 3, Trenches 1, 2</td>
<td>John E. Cornelison Jr.</td>
<td>1132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR-1.02</td>
<td>31PD273**02</td>
<td>Forward Earthworks</td>
<td>Trench SP</td>
<td>Clyde B. King</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trench 15</td>
<td>Elizabeth A. Horvath</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR-1.04</td>
<td>31PD273**04</td>
<td>Negro Head Point Road</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>John W. Walker</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trenches 2, 5, 7, 13, 14, 16</td>
<td>Timothy A. Thompson</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trenches A-A', B-B', C-C', D-D', E-E', CC-C2C1</td>
<td>Gregory L. Komara</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge monitoring project</td>
<td>John R. Wright</td>
<td>1059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Areas 1, 2, 4</td>
<td>John E. Cornelison Jr.</td>
<td>1132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR-1.05</td>
<td>31PD273**05</td>
<td>Historic Bridge</td>
<td>Lanes A–L</td>
<td>David Brewer</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge monitoring project</td>
<td>John R. Wright</td>
<td>1059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR-2.00</td>
<td>31PD273**03</td>
<td>TAR KILN COMPLEX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR-2.01</td>
<td>31PD273**06</td>
<td>Tar Kiln 1</td>
<td>Trench 3</td>
<td>John E. Cornelison Jr.</td>
<td>1132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR-2.02</td>
<td>31PD273**07</td>
<td>Tar Kiln 2</td>
<td>Trench T–V'</td>
<td>Gregory L. Komara</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- MOCR-1.01 the remnants of the Patriot Earthworks
- MOCR-1.02 the remnants of the Forward or Lillington’s Earthworks
- MOCR-1.04 the trace of the Negro Head Point Road or Colonial Road
- MOCR-1.05 the site of the original, historic Moores Creek Bridge

Also present in the park are the graves of Mary (sometimes called Polly or Molly) and Ezekiel Slocumb, which are located adjacent to the Mary Slocumb Monument (Historic Structure 5), and the Patriot or Grady Monument (Historic Structure 4) commemorating John Grady, the only Patriot fatality of the battle.

The remnants of tar kilns are present within the park but are not associated with the Revolutionary War, and have therefore been subsumed by the designation MOCR-2.00.

- MOCR-1.01 (31PD273**01) PATRIOT EARTHWORKS

The Patriot Earthworks, those located slightly to the rear of the first entrenchments (Lillington’s...
Earthworks), were initiated by Lillington and completed with the help of Caswell’s men. They were built to offer protection from Loyalist gunfire during the impending battle. “The earthworks used during the battle...form a roughly rectangular enclosure of about two acres,” which surround a portion of the old road and overlook the east end of the Moores Creek Bridge site (King 1937:1). The Patriot Earthworks were placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1977 and listed as Historic Structure 1 (HS-1) within Moores Creek National Battlefield.

In 1934, park superintendent Clyde B. King was given authorization to repair the Patriot Earthworks by adding a layer of soil. Years of pedestrian traffic had caused erosion to the earthworks, compromising their integrity. A layer of black muck approximately three inches thick was applied over the surface of the visible remains. This was the first documented effort to stabilize the earthworks at the park.

Archeological investigations began at Moores Creek in 1937 when Superintendent King requested permission from the National Park Service's Regional Office to reconstruct the earthworks. They continued to be damaged by pedestrian traffic and erosion due to the inherent nature of the sandy soil as well as the periodic flooding from Moores Creek (King 1937:5). Also, two roads had been cut through the entrenchment and a portion of the southeast corner had been leveled prior to the construction of the visitors’ pavilion. King’s report, dated November 22, 1937, stated that he machine excavated ten trenches. (The type of machine used for the trenching was not defined.) Nine trenches (field designations A through I) were positioned to cross-section the Patriot Earthworks, and one trench (designated SP or special) was positioned to cross-section the Forward Earthworks.

King’s excavations of the Patriot Earthworks began with Trench A, which was located in the northern section of the earthworks near Moores Creek. The remaining trenches (B–I) were labeled sequentially moving to the east, then south, and ending with Trench I in the southwestern portion of the earthworks on the south side of Negro Head Point Road (see Figure 9). The breastworks were described in King’s 1937 report as follows:

The breastwork today is easily visible in its entire course except the short distance between the road [Negro Head Point Road] and the corner at the angle between sections D & E and for about 20 feet at the curve between sections C & D. It averages perhaps 9 inches above the surrounding surface with a depression of perhaps 4 inches immediately inside. So far as is known, only a section of about 20 feet on the main front, where it crossed the old road, has been repaired, that to prevent the erosion common to a steep slope in sand.

Both by width and deduction it is fair to assume a breastwork of about 4 feet in all points except the main face and of 5 feet in that, with a trench on the inner side, sloped in both directions, through the entire course and on the outside at the face directly toward the bridge.

The following three paragraphs paraphrase the rest of King’s observations.

From 1899 to 1919, a pavilion stood in the approximate square formed between Trench E and the road at the corner between Trenches D and H. In 1937, a pavilion stood just outside that corner and adjacent to the road. The section of the earthworks where the road joins the enclosure was cleared of forest shortly after 1899 with constant enlargement of the clearing in following years. The area around Trenches D and C was perhaps the last to be cleared. This clearing was virtually complete by 1907. In 1933 and 1934, a coating of swamp soil was spread over the entire breastworks area to encourage the growth of grass. In working it down, little care was taken to retain the proportion of the breastworks to the other land area.

Cross-sections of the earthworks in Trenches A through F are comparable in form and height. Since these trenches are all ostensibly placed in the auxiliary earthwork, probably thrown up during the night of February 26, after the arrival of Caswell, they are considered here collectively. All indicate that with an exterior repose of 45 degrees
on the earthworks (which is a conservative estimate), they reached a height of about four feet. The basal width of the breastwork approximates six and a half feet. These approximated measurements are most clearly illustrated in cross-sections C and D, which appear to be in the most favorable location for study. The present ground contours show indisputably that the earth thrown up to make the breastworks came from a trench that was dug on the inside of the enclosure. This supports the interpretation of an armed camp encircled by a single breastwork rather than two lines of entrenchments.

Cross-sections G, H, and I are located at positions along the earthworks immediately facing the bridge. Excavations revealed that this section was most carefully worked on by the Patriots and was, therefore, probably the point of attack. All three sections show a probable basal width of nearly ten feet with a corresponding height of over five feet. The exact dimensions here are more difficult to determine because of subsequent erosion. The protective ground cover was cleared early, probably first in 1856 and 1857, again in 1876, and finally in 1899. At cross-section I the ground has been trampled badly. Trench G, placed at an oblique angle rather than a right angle to the breastworks, presents a longer cross-section, which was made here because the area seems to have been the least disturbed. A trench located on the outside of the earthworks in the area of Trenches G and H, as well as the absence of any distinctive trench inside, must account for the height of the breastworks in this area. Additional dirt, more than the former trench would have likely yielded, was doubtlessly taken from the face side and from the ground to the rear. The cannon(s) were stationed at the angles nearest G and H, their situation suggesting the range of sweep necessary for cannon in a fortification. The five-foot high earthworks would provide protection both to men and equipment and yet not hinder in firing the small caliber used in this conflict.

King supplied scaled, hand-sketched drawings of the trench profiles. The approximate measurements noted in the following table are derived from these drawings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Measurements (length by depth)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>17 feet 4 inches by 2 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>23 feet 4 inches by 2 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>20 feet 8 inches by 2 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>17 feet 4 inches by 3 feet 4 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>20 feet 8 inches by 2 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>20 feet 8 inches by 2 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>22 feet 8 inches by 2 feet 8 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>24 feet 0 inches by 4 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>25 feet 4 inches by 2 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No cultural materials were collected during King’s excavations.

The site was revisited between February 13 and 15, 1938, by Thor Borresen, a junior research assistant for the NPS. The purpose of the visit was to verify the location and size of the entrenchments prior to reconstructing the Patriot Earthworks (notes on file, SEAC Accession 490).

During the day several trenches were excavated across the trench and parapet. A good sharp outline of the former trench and the remains of the parapet can be seen, which give the exact width of the original trench and parapet.

The soil in Moores Creek is about 65 to 70 percent sand, and subject to considerable erosion. (Borresen 1938b:1)

Six trenches designated A-B, C-D, E-F, G-H, I-J, and K-L were machine excavated across the Patriot Earthworks. (The type of machine used to cut the trenches was not defined.) Trench A-B was located near the midpoint of the east side of the entrenchment. Trench C-D was positioned at the northern end of the earthworks near the east bank of Moores Creek. The next trench, E-F, was placed near the east bank of Moores Creek and was expected to confirm the presence of the entrenchment on its western side, thus verifying the shape of the earthworks as rectangular. Trench G-H was also on the western side of the earthworks but located south of the Negro Head Point Road, while
Trench I-J was located even farther south. The last trench, K-L, was located on the southern edge of the entrenchment (see Figure 10). In a report that accompanied his map of excavations, Borresen (1938b:1–2) wrote the following:

After carefully checking the outline of the trench and parapet the excavating of several cross trenches commenced. The disturbed soil is easily recognizable, due to its discoloration.

The profiles...A-B, C-D, L-K, and G-H, are practically the same; only a slight variation in depth and width of the trench is noticeable. The over-all widths are, surprisingly, the same—26 feet.

Cross section I-J shows an entirely different construction; the width of the trench is 12 feet, sloping gradually toward the front of the parapet. There is a ditch in front of the parapet; this ditch was excavated mainly to get earth for the parapet.

As this part of the breast works faces the bridge, this is most likely where the two-pounder cannon was mounted.

The width of trench—12 feet—fits with the platform for the smaller caliber guns. The dimensions of the platforms are 9 x 12', with a pitch of from 4" to 6" towards the front. The cross section below shows the proposed restoration, the gun firing in barbette.

Profile E-F shows no fortification having been constructed. The width of the swamp and the dense growth must have been considered ample protection.

No cultural materials were collected during Borresen's excavations.

On December 13 and 14, 1939, King restored the earthworks. New field designations were assigned to the restoration areas as follows: Area A was a wedge-shaped section located near the pavilion; Area B was north of Area A on the east side of the earthworks; and Area C was on the southernmost portion of the earthworks. Within Area A, seven machine-dug trenches numbered 1 through 7 were cut from north to south.

There had been considerable controversy between Regional Director Tillotson, Coordinating Superintendent Cox, and Superintendent King regarding rebuilding the earthworks. King had requested permission to rebuild on numerous occasions prior to December 1939. His requests were repeatedly denied due to the unavailability of technical assistance. On December 8, 1939, Cox authorized King to proceed with the repairs. With this end in view plans were made whereby all necessary fills and sod for stabilization would be provided. So, when in the Memorandum of Coordinating Superintendent Cox of December 8, 1939, authority was granted for said repair, work was started on December 13, the day after the memorandum was received, and by noon of the 14th all exploratory trenches were made, pictures taken, except for final, surveys made, and the work of repairing both trench and breastwork at points A & B was completed except for sodding. Unfortunately, the Memorandum of Superintendent Cox of December 12 was not received until the morning of the 15th. Inasmuch as the technical part of the work had been completed, the work of sodding was carried out so as to stabilize the work done.

In understanding the nature of the work done, it must be noted that at B & C the line of trench and breastwork was carried across the roadway to conform to the profile adjacent thereto. In neither case was any exploratory excavation done, and in neither case was subsoil disturbed. The excavations photographed on the attached plates were all taken in section A of plate III. At A a road had been cut across the breastwork, some topsoil had been removed sand-clay substituted; and a pavilion and flower bed provided. The latter work entailed the leveling of the breastwork for the pavilion and extra topsoil for the flower bed.
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The trenches dug were neither to establish the nature nor site of the originals but to provide that all excavation be within the limits of the topsoil, so that no subsoil be disturbed. In this way any future studies of the site will be unaltered by the work done.

In the work done at A the topsoil was removed to about half its depth within the trench. Work was begun at #3 and continued in both directions, following the natural earth profile as to level. The Superintendent himself did all the work on grade establishment to insure that no subsoil be removed, except such as was disturbed by the trenches. Between trenches 5 and 7 practically no dirt was moved and the breastwork was not made as high as elsewhere in order that the probable effect of time might be kept. The dirt was thrown up to a height and width to conform to the existing remains and covered with sod. The absence of any trench at #6 is noticed. At that point the breastwork was lower than at any place from 1 to 5. Too, this was the point of greatest public use due to the crossing of trails made from the pavilion. Here crossed the trails from the northeast of the pavilion to the men’s toilet and from the southwest to the bridge. The wearing down of the breastwork by human feet permitted a certain amount of weathering from rain, which completely eliminated remains. The present level is the same as prior to the beginning of work.

The work done at C consisted of filling a slight trench across the breastwork near the oak and on the opposite side of the road, of cutting out traces of the road fill in the trench, and of removing the road fill on the outside of the breastwork to make the remains stand out.

At B the work consisted of filling the breastwork by continuing the present adjacent trench across the road and by adding such dirt as was necessary to make the fill conform to that adjacent. (King 1940:1–2)

The following estimated dimensions of the seven trenches within Area A are derived from scaled drawing provided by King.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Measurements (length by depth)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 feet 6 inches by 18½ inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 feet 8 inches by 15 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 feet 0 inches by 12½ inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 feet 4 inches by 16 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 feet 7 inches by 10½ inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 feet 0 inches by 3 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6 feet 0 inches by 3 inches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No cultural materials were collected during King’s restoration activities.

On March 26, 1940, Borresen revisited Moores Creek National Battlefield “to examine and make a report on restoration made on the redoubt by Superintendent King” (notes on file, SEAC Acc. 490). The following excerpts are from his draft report:

Recently an attempt was made to restore the area in the vicinity of the redoubt to its former appearance. The large pavilion has been removed; the circular drive has also been obliterated and a footpath constructed following the old original road. However, the marks left by the former abortive construction remained. It was to do away with these scars that a slight restoration was suggested.

The restoration made by Superintendent King was done by the following method:

A cross section trench was excavated to determine the exact location of the ditch, its depth and width, part of the soil which had accumulated in the ditch was removed and placed in the depressions of the parapet caused by previous road construction. Then the reconstructed portions were covered by a layer of sod.

None of the new restoration rises higher than any other section of the present remains. The whole of the parapet now has a more uniform appearance.
To complete the inspection and to make certain that the work in no way disturbed the original marks in the ground, a cross trench was excavated...[by Borresen, however, no field designation was assigned to this trench and its location was not documented].

[King's]...work was not carried out haphazardly but in a careful manner, proving that much thought and careful judgment were used. (Borresen 1940)

On January 17, 1953, Superintendent Harry D. Goodson requested authorization from the acting coordinating superintendent to restore the earthworks once more by “throwing up from the edges to the middle, and in some places where it has entirely disappeared we should haul in soil for restoration, and after it has settled, reseed and fertilize to grow new sod.” A handwritten note at the bottom of Goodson’s request stated “Advised Mr. Goodson on the site, March 9, 1953 to repair remains with light coating of topsoil, fertilizer and seed.” This note is initialed with illegible letters, which appear to match those in the routing stamp at the top of the request next to the title of Assistant Superintendent. Documentation at the park indicates that in 1953 the acting coordinating superintendent was Stanley W. Abbott (Hattie Squires, personal communication 1996). While Goodson’s restoration activities reported here are not archeological in nature, the disturbance they caused to the stratigraphy of the earthworks should be apparent during future excavations.

John Griffin, the regional archeologist for the National Park Service, conducted an artifact salvage project at the request of Regional Chief of Interpretation Harrington between August 18 and 20, 1958. The project was designed to locate artifacts relating to the Revolutionary War Battle of Moores Creek for use in the park’s museum exhibits. Three areas of the park were planned for survey: Patriot Earthworks (MOCR-1.01), Forward Earthworks (MOCR-1.02), and Negro Head Point Road (MOCR-1.04) (notes on file, SEAC Accession 487). Griffin’s work in 1958 was erroneously assigned two different SEAC accession numbers, 487 and 621. Since then Accession 621 has been deleted.

Griffin used a Fisher model J-10 metal detector that “proved extremely sensitive in locating even quite small objects at a shallow depth” (Griffin 1958:1). The depth to which the instrument could locate artifacts was questioned. Its effectiveness in the deeper soils that had accumulated near the Negro Head Point Road was of concern.

Within the earthworks, there has been little soil accumulation, and it seems unlikely that any great amount of material was below the sounding of level of the instrument.

Land nearer the bridge, with the exception of the causeway, was not workable. Thick underbrush and cypress knees made use of the instrument impossible. The causeway has undoubtedly been built up, and any artifacts here must be below the level at which this instrument will work. (Griffin 1958:1)

Griffin listed the artifacts recovered as follows:

Six bags of specimens have been forwarded to the Museum Laboratory. All of them come from within the Patriot earthworks, and are as follows:

1. Lead fragment, heavily patinated, could date from revolution
2. Small brass or bronze buckle
3. Two iron fragments
4. Heavy iron fragment
5. Badly rusted chain
6. Large iron fitting, from cannon carriage??
   (Must bear in mind there were once Civil War pieces here. This doesn’t look old enough to me.)

These were the only specimens which appeared to have any likelihood of being old. We found, of course, many recent objects including Coca Cola caps and cartridges and clips from the sham battle held here some 20 years ago. (Griffin 1958:2)
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Sometime prior to 1978, the artifacts were sent from Moores Creek National Battlefield to Harpers Ferry for conservation. In 1978, the material was transferred to SEAC where it was analyzed and cataloged as follows:

1. Buckle 18th century; catalog number 2; accession number 2; Jan. 22, 1959

2. Iron wall bracket; catalog number 32; accession number 4065-1; June 13, 1978

3. Section of chain; catalog number 33; accession number 4065-2; June 13, 1978

4. Metal ring; catalog number 34; accession number 4065-3; June 13, 1978

5. Iron fragment; catalog number 35; accession number 4065-4; June 13, 1978

6. Iron fragment; catalog number 35; accession number 4065-5; June 13, 1978

Note that the above SEAC numbers are now obsolete and do not accurately reflect current SEAC accession numbering.

The artifacts were then sent back to Moores Creek National Battlefield where they are currently cataloged under Moores Creek Accession 23.

The lead fragment—item 1 in Griffin’s 1958 report—is not on the list of artifacts that SEAC cataloged in 1978. It may have been misidentified in the field prior to conservation and is now listed as another item; or the lead fragment may never have been sent to Harpers Ferry for conservation. Unfortunately, Griffin’s report and the Harpers Ferry loan form do not contain any other documentation that would assist in cross-referencing the artifacts before and after conservation. Currently, the reported lead fragment is unaccounted for in the curated collections. On May 15, 1996, Hattie Squires of Moores Creek National Battlefield conducted a visual inspection and inventory of the artifacts held at the park under park accession 23. The artifacts present at the park consist only of those items identified on the 1978 SEAC list.

Investigations of the Patriot Earthworks were conducted again from January 9, 1974, through May 9, 1974, under National Park Service contract number CX500040454. Timothy A. Thompson of the Division of Archives and History, North Carolina State Department of Cultural Resources, Raleigh, North Carolina, was field supervisor, and Dr. Stephen J. Gluckman served as principal investigator (notes on file, SEAC Accession 489).

The purpose of the project was to investigate the reconstructed earthworks and existing road using remote sensing and excavation techniques to determine if their present locations were the same as those from nearly two hundred years earlier. The secondary purpose of the project was to recover construction information to enable accurate reconstruction and restoration of the earthworks and road. In addition, a search for evidence of an earthwork adjacent to the location of the present bridge was planned, and the collection of samples for pollen analysis was to be carried out. Pollen samples were to be collected as indicators of past environmental conditions.

Multispectral aerial photography, resistivity, refractive seismographic and magnetometer surveys were conducted in addition to the traditional excavation methods.

The result of all the remote sensing surveys were worse than disappointing. No data were returned which bore any relationship to the features under investigation.

The site was also photographed from the air using standard color slide materials. A hand held Nikon 35mm camera was used. Twenty-eight mm, 50mm, 55mm, and 200mm lenses were utilized.

Instrumentation for the electrical resistivity survey consisted of a Soiltest Earth Resistivity Meter model ER-2, and copper-clad steel energizing and measuring electrodes. The sandy soil proved to have such low conductivity that no measurable current flow could be detected. The instrument was used on
Trench 13, between Trench 5 and 6, and adjacent to Trench 1 and on the causeway leading to the bridge.

A Soiletst Terra Scout Model R-150 shallow refraction seismograph was set up on Trench 13. The timer on this instrument required matching the trace of signals displayed momentarily on a cathode ray tube. The signal quality proved to be so poor that it was impossible to obtain reliable and repeatable data. The signal generator was a specially designed hammer with a large impact surface to strike the ground. The sandy, porous soil at Moore’s Creek apparently dampened the induced shock wave to the extent that detector readings were erratic and unreliable.

A check with a McPhar M700 Vertical Field flux gate magnetometer revealed no anomalous magnetic conditions associated with the suspected earthwork or road.

Initially, a base line was established along the east side of the reconstructed earthworks with transit and tape, and excavation units in the area of the earthwork were put in either perpendicular or parallel to the base line. Other excavation units were established with reference to measured angles and distances from the base line grid system.

The base line ran at an angle north 33° 30’ east of magnetic north on January 9, 1974. The grid origin, designation 0 north, 0 east, was 144.9 feet southwest of the inside edge of the curbing at the northwest corner of the parking lot adjacent to the reconstruction on a bearing taken from the grid origin of N 24° 49’ E from the grid line. The same point lies 27.8 feet northwest of the southwest corner of the parking lot on a bearing of N 140° 31’ E from the grid base line. All elevation measurements were taken from a datum plane defined by a point on the southeast corner of the cut stone base of the Grady monument which stood within the earthworks. [Unfortunately, this monument has since been moved.] (Thompson 1975:18–21)

Sixteen trenches (1–16), located on the east side of Moores Creek, were excavated, mapped, and photographed by Thompson’s crew from January to May 1974. Trenches 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 were positioned to cross-section the Patriot Earthworks. Trenches 2, 5, 14, and 16 were located to examine Negro Head Point Road; while Trenches 7 and 13 tested both the old roadbed and earthworks. Trench 15 was placed to investigate the remains of the Forward Earthworks (see Figure 12). The first two trenches were excavated by hand to obtain representative profiles and to determine the feasibility of machine trenching. Fourteen units were put in with a backhoe (Thompson 1975:21).

In his report, Thompson described the trenches that cut through the Patriot Earthworks. Only one side of each profile was mapped and photographed “since no great discrepancy was found between the sides, a representative profile was selected from each trench” (Thompson 1975:21).

The profile drawn from Trench One shows nothing that could be associated with 18th century construction activities.

Profile Three shows rather clearly the extent and nature of reconstruction activities...but nothing that could be identified as the result of 18th century construction.

...Profile Four [exhibits]...contour changes that might be associated with an 18th century ground surface, indicating a trench and mound but they are rather slight, and in the absence of corroborative evidence from adjacent trenches this interpretation must remain problematical. This interpretation would generate a conflict with King’s analysis, which locates the ditch on the inside, or to the west of the mound, because the contour dip indicated here is on the east of the rise.

In Profile Six the natural soil horizons are broken by what is evidently recent fill, so if
there were any other evidence for the original earthwork at this point, it would have been disturbed by reconstruction activities.

Nothing in the portion of Profile Seven in the area of the reconstructed mound would indicate 18th century activities, but this is not surprising since the trench cuts through the mound at the point where the path (and apparently the old road) also cut through the original mound, if indeed it was located at this point.

...Profile Eight...appears to rise slightly in contour. This may represent the feature interpreted as the remains of the earthwork before reconstruction activities were undertaken.

In Profile Nine...the lowest unit of recent fill lies directly on top of the leaching horizon....[This] indicates that earlier humus lines, which might have given a clue to the configuration of earlier ground surface contour, have been removed in the process of reconstruction.

Profile Ten displays a complex series of humic-stained deposits beneath 2 recent fill units. These humic-stained deposits probably reflect conditions at the edge of the stream terrace where the trench was cut. Flood deposits at high water and subsequent erosion would account for this complexity and would also likely have obliterated evidence of 18th century construction. (Thompson 1975:25–30)

Thompson’s later description of Profile Ten seems to contradict the earlier statement.

A dip and rise in the contours of the natural soil horizons below the recent fill in Profile Eleven [indicate] some remains of 18th century earthwork construction; though here, as in Profile Four, the dip suggesting a borrow ditch is to the east or outside of the earthwork. [In a handwritten comment dated 4/28/88, research archeologist John W. Walker indicates that Thompson had erroneously used the south profile as the north profile, thus switching the direction of the ditch in relation to the mound.]

Similar contour changes occur in Profile Twelve, though here the lowest point in the A12 Horizon lies to the east, or in this case, the inside of the earthwork. This is consistent with King’s interpretation. However, Trenches Twelve and Thirteen cut through the west side of the earthwork on the edge of the stream terrace, where King reports previous (presumably late 19th or early 20th century) reconstruction. This may account for the contour changes in Profile Twelve and similar changes in Profile Thirteen with respect to the earthworks. (Thompson 1975:22–27)

Although the results of this excavation were generally inconclusive, the exercise was valuable in that it indicated some of the basic limitations of an archeological investigation into problems of this nature....Some kinds of evidence will not survive 200 years and no application of method, however undertaken, can reveal that which is not there. (Thompson 1975:x)

The excavation unit dimensions have been estimated from Thompson’s scaled maps as follows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Measurements (length by depth)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16 feet by 2 to 4 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>27½ feet by 1½ to 5 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30 feet by 2 to 4 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20½ feet by 2½ to 4 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>24½ feet by 2 to 3½ feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20½ feet by 1½ to 2½ feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The artifacts recovered from the 1974 investigations are housed with and under the stewardship of the North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources, Raleigh, North Carolina. Thompson stated that “The original occupation of the site was limited both in time and space; hence, few associated artifacts were expected (in fact, none were found)” (1975:21). A few artifacts not associated with the Battle of Moores Creek were recovered. Upon request, the North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources provided an artifact inventory of their holdings, which are one railroad spike and between fifteen and twenty unidentified metal fragments (not conserved).

These artifacts were recovered from Trench Seven, which cross-sectioned the Patriot Earthworks and the old roadbed.

On October 7, 1974, John W. Walker, a research archeologist with SEAC, was sent to Moores Creek National Battlefield to open the Patriot, or Grady, Monument (HS-4) cornerstone in preparation of moving the monument (notes on file, SEAC Accession 209). John Grady was the only Patriot soldier mortally wounded during the Battle of Moores Creek. “Contemporary accounts of the battle do not identify this soldier, and the earliest known reference to him as John Grady of Duplin County, North Carolina, dates from 1854, however, this identification seems to have been generally accepted” (Walker 1975:1). Local residents interested in commemorating the Patriots’ victory over the Loyalists erected a monument on February 27, 1857, in honor of John Grady. The monument was placed on the battlefield near the east bank of Moores Creek and north of Negro Head Point Road. The reported remains of John Grady were placed in the cornerstone of the monument.

The following description of the monument was included in the 1976 nomination to the National Register of Historic Places.

At the southern end of the earthworks stands the Patriot or Grady Monument. Resting on a concrete base, the brown sandstone structure is 18 feet in height and 52" square. The monument is an obelisk on a stepped base consisting of six graduating squares of varying dimensions with an ornate dentil course bordering the inscription. Each of the four sides bears a different inscription dealing with the Battle of Moores Creek and those [who] fought there....On February 27, 1857, a brown sandstone cornerstone was laid in a sizable brick foundation. A box was sealed in the cornerstone containing publications of the day and the remains of Private John Grady. The monument itself was probably erected on the brick foundation in the same year. Additions and alterations have been made to the monument over the years, such as the adding of two granite base blocks; an ornamental iron fence on granite slabs that surrounded the monument; the removal of the iron fence, the moving of the cornerstone to the lower edge and beside the foundation; and finally as part of the grounds project in 1974, the moving of the entire monument approximately 250 feet to a position of the foot trail outside the earthworks. (NPS 1976)

Walker reported on the events of moving the monument and opening the cornerstone in his 1974 report as follows.

Shortly after 9:30 a.m., October 7, 1974, the attempt to move the Grady Monument began....After the obelisk was moved away the base was revealed to be a [square] brick column [measuring] roughly 61" by 61"...In the center was a hole roughly 18" square. At first it was thought that the hole might contain the cornerstone, but...[it contained only] loose sand...[which overlaid] solid brick. The...soil contained by the skirt [surrounding the monument base] was dug away....
The crane operator made several attempts to lift the monument off the base, however, the monument fractured. Eventually, the upper portions of the monument were broken off and removed. The granite-skirt was then removed by the crane, and... a trench [was dug] around the column... [Following more excavation] the bottom of the column appeared to have been reached. Several attempts to lift this last section failed. Further digging was necessary to place the cables under the corners. After several more attempts had been made, the column stub was brought out of the hole....

Work commenced to break that last section apart. At 3:14 p.m., Robert Marshall knocked off a section [of brick], and a sandstone surface was revealed.

Further work cleared the bricks away... [exposing] a red sandstone block, 19 3/4" long, 10 3/4" high, and 12 3/4" wide... On one side was carved, "Laid Feb. 27, 1857." In the top was a plug [or lid] made of the same material [measuring] 10 3/4" long by 7" wide.

No attempt was made to open the cornerstone at that time. [Because of]... the possibility of [it containing] human remains... it was placed in the custody of the funeral director Robert Holly of Quinn-McGowan Funeral Home in Burgaw, who... placed it in the funeral home. (Walker 1975:3–4)

Arrangements were made for Walker to return on December 3, 1974, and examine the contents.

Within a few minutes almost all of the mortar surrounding the lid had been removed. Walker then began prying at the lid in order to loosen it from the mortar which lay beneath it and attached it to the ledge. The seal was easily broken, and once it was, the lid was removed. Inside the cornerstone was a small lead box, which was later determined to measure 3.00 inches in width, 7.95 inches in length, and 4.00 inches in height.

In removing the box from the cornerstone, it was observed that the box was not sealed and that the lid which measured 4.80 inches in width, 7.80 inches in length, and .10 inches in thickness was stamped in two places with the name “L A Hart” and in a third place with the legend “FROM L A HART” [who] was subsequently identified as “...a partner in the now-defunct firm of Hart and Bailey Machine Works, forerunner of the current Wilmington Iron Works (Reeves 1974).”

It was found to contain a small lead box inside of which were the water soaked remains of a newspaper, two adult human molars, four fragments of immature pig jaw and one small fragment of non-human bone which cannot be otherwise identified. (Walker 1975:1)

On Sunday, February 23, 1975, the two human molars were reinterred beside the relocated Grady Monument.

The fragments of pig bone were sent to the Southeast Archeological Center on March 4, 1975, with the request that they be placed in storage so that they would be available should there be any questions regarding them at some time in the future. (Walker 1975:13)

As part of the bicentennial anniversary of America’s independence, a history trail was constructed in 1975 and 1976. The earthworks were affected as follows:

Two new cuts [through the earthworks] were made for the hard-surfaced history trail. One...[of these cuts went] through the front earthworks to the causeway [leading to the bridge], and the other [went] through the south side [in] returning to the visitor center. One old cut, from the visitor parking area to the earthwork interior, was filled in and sodded. (Maze 1976:8)

On April 1 and 2, 1983, SEAC sent archeological technician Teresa L. Paglione to Moores...
Moores Creek National Battlefield to archeologically investigate areas within the park where new waterlines were to be installed. The new waterline would replace the existing waterline for most of its length (1,085 feet), except for two sections measuring twenty-five feet and eighty-eight feet where additional water services were needed. Additionally, newly acquired lands on the east side of the park were surveyed for the proposed relocation of N.C. Highway 210. At the time of the survey, Moores Creek was at flood stage and portions of the park were covered by a foot or more of water. Nearly half of the shovel tests excavated had to be abandoned because the water table was encountered at nine to seventeen inches below surface.

Paglione divided the scheduled work into three areas. Area 1 consisted of three parts: Section 1, Visitor Center to path (maintenance); Section 2, path to first marker by road; and Section 3, old water break to end point where it crosses road to Patriots Hall. Area 2 was subdivided into six sections incorporating the “newly acquired lands to the east of the Visitor Center, [which were] to be graded/flattened” (Paglione 1983:3). The area contained deposits from recently “demolished” tenant houses. The open ground near the houses was visually inspected and randomly shovel tested. In Area 3, located near the monuments, Paglione archeologically retraced the existing waterlines in preparation for the new waterline installation.

Paglione reported excavating eighty-four shovel tests. However, close examination of the field notes revealed only eighty-one, which were recorded as follows: Area 1, twenty-two shovel tests; Area 2, thirty-six shovel tests; and Area 3, nine shovel tests. Fourteen shovel tests were excavated in locations outside field designations, including two dug at the maintenance road line, three excavated from the counter to the gate, and seven placed in the traffic island east of the Visitor Center.

Paglione assigned field designation Area 3 to the nine shovel tests excavated in the Patriot Earthworks section of the park that followed the existing waterline to the Loyalist Monument. The tests retraced the existing waterline to the north and south of the interpretive trail. (Test 3 was mislabeled on the drawing provided by Paglione as #1 next to the artesian well) (notes on file, SEAC Accession 637).

Area 1 – Along the route of the proposed waterline and in the re-route area shovel tests were excavated to an average of 16 inches, with some tests extending to 36 inches. In the area of the monuments, however, tests were excavated to depths of 40 to 42 inches since the area was covered with approximately 2 feet of fill. Soil stratigraphy in each test was measured and recorded.

Nine shovel tests were excavated in the area of the monuments. Four of the tests revealed a clay and sand capping or fill over the original ground surface. This fill is believed to be associated with the parking lot that was in existence as late as 1968, but is no longer present. Shovel tests in this area were excavated to a depth of up to 42 inches because of the depth of the original ground surface. (Paglione 1983:5)

Although modern artifacts were encountered, no cultural materials were collected during Paglione’s investigations.

In 1984, Moores Creek National Battlefield was revisited by Gregory L. Komara, an archeological technician with SEAC. Between April 16 and June 18, Komara surveyed two areas of the park. The first area of investigation was the newly acquired property (approximately twelve acres) on the west bank of Moores Creek. The second area was confined to the east side of the park, which serves as a visual and noise barrier between the battlefield and the proposed relocation of N.C. Highway 210. The purpose of the investigation was to identify and locate the course of Negro Head Point Road through the park (details of this portion of the survey are located under MOCR-1.04 of this document), and to locate Caswell’s camp on the west bank of Moores Creek.

The location of Caswell’s camp is historically documented as being near the bridge on the west bank of Moores Creek. It was only used the eve-
ning prior to the battle. “Perhaps initially with the thought of deception, Caswell sent his men across to the west side of the bridge to throw up embankments there” (Hatch 1969:35).

The field techniques employed by Komara included conducting a survey with a Fisher model M-90 metal detector, posthole testing, and excavating trenches with a backhoe (notes on file, SEAC Accession 671).

Komara first surveyed the west bank area using the metal detector as follows:

The initial survey area comprised the region extending from marker L851 on the western edge of Moores Creek; westward along an alignment with a NPS concrete marker at the water's edge at the west park boundary; to a point where that alignment crosscut the 100-west projected limit of the established reference grid; then along that 100-foot west grid line to the area encompassing the former Simpson hunting camp and pumphouse. From here the metal detector survey may be more or less defined by the western edge of the former entrance drive to the Simpson camp on the west, N.C. Highway 210 on the north, and the edge of Moores Creek on the east. Additional surveys were also made along the path of the Negro Head Point Road to the west park boundary and along a second more recent roadway also extending to the western boundary line.

The metal detector survey produced a total of 477 identifiable targets....The vast majority of these objects were believed to represent trash items associated with the Simpson occupation of the property and present use of the area by local fishermen. Hence, such items were taken to a trash disposal site after they had been recorded. Sixty-four of the objects, however, were collected for further study. Nine of these sixty-four were chosen to undergo conservation through electrolysis. None of these items are currently thought to be attributable to the eighteenth century.

The second phase of the excavations consisted of an effort to locate Caswell’s camp. Komara excavated ninety-five posthole tests on the west bank property. Eighty-one were confined to an established grid and fourteen others (PH 1–14) were arbitrarily placed “to serve as controls; describing the stratigraphy” (Komara 1985:20).

Attention was directed at producing a reference grid baseline paralleling as much as possible the current course of Moores Creek in the vicinity of the historic Moores Creek Bridge....The alignment...[was] 12.75 east of north...stakes [were set] at 20 foot intervals north 2000 [typographical error, should read 200] feet and south 60 feet from the datum.

A rectangularly outlined grid was established, with stakes at each 20 foot interval, extending to a point 140 feet north on the baseline and 60 feet south from the control datum and for a distance 100 feet west of the baseline. Further extensions beyond the limits of this gridded area occurred at several points. As previously indicated, the baseline was itself taken to a point 200 feet north of the control datum (0,0). The 140 foot north line of the grid was extended to a point 40 feet east of the baseline. Each of the 120 foot north, 100 foot north, and 80 foot north lines of the grid were expanded to points 60 feet east of the baseline. And the 60 foot north line was lengthened to a point 40 feet east of the baseline....[The] testing expanded into the non-inundated portion of an eastern sweep of an oxbow bend in Moores Creek just north of the historic Moores Creek bridge site. (Komara 1985:21)

Most of the postholes were totally devoid of cultural material. No definite evidence of artifacts or features relating to the Caswell encampment was found in those posthole tests that did contain material. Charcoal was present in minor amounts in several of the tests. However, in no instance was a deposit encountered suggestive of the campfires that Caswell was said to have left burning at his encampment (Rankin 1986:33).
Several instances of possible aboriginal material were encountered through this and other testing. "The generally shallow depth of many of these lithics and the association of one of them (MD-350) with historic materials tends to suggest that they have been redeposited from their original contexts" (Komara 1985:18). They consist of:

1) a bifacially worked chopper/pounder implement...found at posthole 100n 60w just below the surface.

2) a possible Morrow Mountain I projectile point...[located] at metal detector target #350 at a depth of 10 centimeters below the surface.

3) a small fine-grained quartzite waste flake...found at posthole 140n 40e in the 60-70 centimeter below surface level.

4) three small quartzite waste flakes...from the 20-30 centimeter below surface level of posthole 80n 80w. [While reexamining the artifacts, the provenience on the field bag was found to read 60n 80w.]

5) a small quartzite waste flake occurring at posthole #2 between 90-100 centimeters below the surface.

6) a small granitic waste flake in posthole 80n 80w in the 10-20 centimeter level. (Komara 1985:16-18)

Although the artifacts collected by Komara have not undergone formal analysis by SEAC's curation staff, they will be analyzed in the future as part of SEAC's backlog cataloging program. Recently, the artifacts were looked at by SEAC archeologist Guy Prentice with the following results. Items 1 (chopper/pounder), 2 (Morrow Mountain I projectile point), and 6 (waste flake) were incorrectly identified and are all naturally occurring mineral masses (rocks) of granite or quartzite composition. Item 3 (waste flake) is more correctly a thinning flake. Item 4 (three waste flakes) was correctly identified. Item 5 (quartzite waste flake) is a possible but unlikely waste flake, however, it is of granitic not quartzite composition.

Furthermore, Allen Cooper, one of the field crew members who accompanied Komara, stated that the Morrow Mountain I projectile point, later identified by Komara, was recovered along with gravel fill that had been brought into the park. He also said that the field specimen bag it had been placed in had been clearly labeled "gravel specimen" (Cooper, personal communication 1996). These items are currently housed in curation at SEAC under SEAC Accession 671.

On June 20, 1988, Elizabeth Horvath, an archeological technician from SEAC, was sent to Moores Creek National Battlefield to archeologically test areas within the park in preparation for construction of a footbridge and associated trail to facilitate visitor traffic (notes on file, SEAC Accession 796). Several excavation techniques were employed, including surface reconnaissance, a metal detector survey, subsurface testing in the form of shovel tests, backhoe trenching, and hand-digging one excavation unit (Horvath 1988:1).

The metal detector survey was conducted along the east bank of Moores Creek. The anomalies were recorded and then shovel tested. Most of the artifacts recovered with this method were from the top twenty centimeters of soil. In addition to the shovel tests, one large excavation unit (two and a half by two meters) was excavated. The unit was placed over an area where two metal artifacts—a two-tined twisted wire fork and a possible button—had been recovered. The soil was removed in arbitrary ten-centimeter levels and screened using quarter-inch mesh hardware cloth. Other artifacts from the unit date from the early part of the century and include fragments of a Coke bottle, several crown bottle caps, and a brass ammunition clip fragment (Horvath 1988:4-6).

The primary focus of these investigations at Moores Creek was to determine the presence/absence of the Patriot breastworks running along the [east] creek bank. [Previous work in this section of Patriot Earthworks had been inconclusive regarding the existence and loca-
tion of the entrenchments.] The proposed trail and boardwalk would impact the breastwork if it was in the project area. In order to investigate the locale for the breastworks, a series of three backhoe trenches were excavated. Two were located in the vicinity of the proposed footbridge/trail and the third one was located further southwest.

Trench 1 was excavated from the eastern end of the proposed footbridge heading in a south-easterly direction. The soil was removed in 6-12 inch levels until the basal depth of approximately one meter was reached. The total length of the trench was approximately 10 meters. Two features were encountered in this trench. (Horvath 1988:6)

Feature 1 in Trench 1 was located at the edge of what appears to have been an old access road. Slight tire ruts were noted near the surface. The feature contained two depressed areas. “It is speculated that these two depressional areas are natural representations of tree falls or erosion episodes caused by flooding” (Horvath 1988:6).

Feature 2, located in Trench 1, is believed to represent the creek line fortifications. While no topographic indications of the parapet were visible, the entrenchment is visible in the trench profile.

The feature, located 5.0–7.0 meters east, is evidenced by an increase in thickness in the uppermost soil strata. The dimensions of 2 meters long by 0.35 meters deep for the possible earthwork feature corresponds fairly well with those recorded by King [in] 1940. (Horvath 1988:7)

Trench 2 was located approximately eight meters north of Trench 1. Its total length was twelve meters. “It was excavated in the same fashion as Trench 1” (Horvath 1988:7). Two features were encountered in Trench 2.

Feature 1 in Trench 2 was similar to Feature 1 in Trench 1. “It is speculated that this may have been a tree fall or separate erosional remnant” (Horvath 1988:7).

Feature 2 in Trench 2 was identified as the possible Revolutionary War entrenchment. A radiocarbon sample taken from the charcoal feature was assayed by Beta Analytic, Inc., as follows: sample number Beta-26825; SEAC Accession 796; Moores Creek Accession 32; 1610 ± 90 B.P., which translates to a date range of A.D. 340 ± 90. These dates are obviously outside the acceptable range for the Revolutionary War period.

The early date exhibited by the radiocarbon assay could indicate a prehistoric presence. Horvath, however, stated that the charcoal stain did not resemble a post or fire pit that might be associated with aboriginal use of the area and that the total absence of associated aboriginal artifacts from the trench provided little support of prehistoric presence. She did suggest that the early date might simply result from a mature tree burning from natural causes or possible cultural intervention by Native Americans or Revolutionary War activities (Horvath, personal communication 1996).

Trench 3 was located twenty-five meters southwest of Trench 1. The trench produced “no evidence for the existence of the Revolutionary War earthwork” (Horvath 1988:7).

Approximately 30 percent of the materials recovered was associated with construction activities and included common wire and machine cut nails, roofing tacks, wire, mortar, a lock washer, and a wood screw. Most of the nails were modern wire nails which date from the 1850s through the present. The modern machine cut nail has been used from the late 1830s ([Nelson] 1963). In addition, quite a bit of mortar, cement, and concrete block fragments were noted in the shovel tests and excavation unit located towards the southwestern portion of the interior breastworks area. The building materials recovered were probably associated with the pavilion, gazebos, or monuments which at one time had been located within the breastworks. The pavilion was removed in October 1938.

The artifacts recovered which generated the most interest were a button and a two-tined
twisted wire fork. Upon cleaning the button, it was determined to be a penny which has been pounded thinner such that its diameter is 1/16 inches larger than a normal penny. The letters "ONE" and "CA" can be discerned along the perimeter of the button. A portion of the Lincoln Memorial can also be seen. There are no discernible numbers or letters on the obverse side although portions of the raised rim are still visible.

The fork was manufactured from a round wire. It was twisted such that an eyelet exists at the end opposite the two tines. It is 14.2 cm long and the tines are spaced 1.3 cm apart. The fork is rusted although it's in excellent condition. During the Revolutionary War, soldiers commonly used two-tined twisted iron forks. However, these were more substantial than the fork found on site. They tended to be made out of square twisted metal which was significantly thicker than this fork. Unfortunately, nothing attributable to the Revolutionary War period was recovered.

In addition to the miscellaneous historic material recovered, one chert flake was also collected. The flake is approximately 1 cm across, .75 cm in length and very thin. The flake was struck off an almost yellow and transparent chert object. The flake was removed using hard hammer percussion techniques; this tends to leave the area where it was hit somewhat crushed. It is speculated that this flake may have resulted from the resharpening of a gun flint. The chert is very similar to the French flints which were honey or taffy colored. Woodward (1960:37) noted that at the time of the Revolutionary War, there were no centers in the United States for the manufacture of gun flints. It is reported that over 95 percent of the gun flints found in American Revolutionary War camps, including British camps, were French in origin (Hamilton 1960:74).

Without chemical analysis of the residue trapped in the crevices of the flake, its actual use cannot be determined. Should it be that it is not a gun flint flake, then aboriginal utilization of the area would be indicated. (Horvath 1988:6–8)

During June and July 1994, John Cornelison, an archeologist from SEAC, surveyed sixty-nine of the 86.52 acres of the park property as part of the Systemwide Archeological Inventory Program (formerly the National Archeological Survey Initiative) as identified in the Regionwide Archeological Survey Plan (RASP). He designated the property encompassing the Patriot Earthworks as Area 3. Various techniques were used to assess the condition and location of the original earthworks. The first method employed an EM 38 ground conductivity instrument to test the soil's electromagnetic susceptibility to a depth of 1.5 meters in vertical and 0.75 meters in horizontal dipole modes. The second method used a mechanical auger or shovel testing following the established twenty-meter grid. Cornelison also placed two, one-by-two-meter excavation units across the earthworks. He designated the units as Trench 1 and Trench 2.

All of these units were dug in ten-centimeter arbitrary levels unless otherwise noted. All soils were screened through quarter-inch mesh hardware cloth. (Cornelison 1997:31)

Trench 1 was located on the eastern side of the earthworks, approximately five meters south of Negro Head Point Road. This area of the earthworks was selected because it was farthest from the creek and would be the least affected by seasonal flooding.

A second excavation unit (four by one meters) was centered across the highest portion of the long axis of the earthworks. The portion of the works reconstructed by King was excavated and designated Level 1. While the soil from Level 1 was not screened, visible artifacts were recovered. All subsequent levels were excavated from the western two meters of the unit.

Between forty-five and fifty centimeters below datum, a clay cap was encountered. Below this cap
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was a gray (N8) sand layer from which thirteen fragments of a light blue soda bottle were recovered (catalog number MOCR 150). Based on the machine molded seam, the possible manufacturing dates of the bottle are from A.D. 1881 to present (Jones and Sullivan 1989). However, the regularity of the seams and the style of the kickup places the dates closer to between A.D. 1930 and the present. The bottle was embossed with “Wil” and “N.C.” (presumably for Wilmington, North Carolina), which could indicate local manufacturing.

More blue glass bottle fragments, one lead shot (7.26 mm in diameter), and two wrought nails were recovered between fifty and sixty centimeters below datum. Wrought nails were the only available type of nail prior to 1790 when the cut nail was introduced (Noël Hume 1969:253). Although the lead shot is not a datable artifact, it does correspond to the type of armament used during the Revolutionary War.

At eighty-five centimeters below datum, Trench B excavated by Clyde King in 1937 was clearly visible in the south profile of the unit. The soil removed from King’s backfilled trench was screened separately and was found to contain more blue glass bottle fragments.

Below the gray sand, a band of dark, densely packed sand appeared. This band did not contain any artifacts and appears to be the swamp muck laid down by King...to reconstruct the earthworks....

No artifacts were recovered from the rest of the excavation. However, at 100 cmbd, two stains became apparent, one in the northeast corner (Feature 1) and the other in the southeast corner (Feature 2). (Cornelison 1997:36)

Feature 1 consists of a white ashy deposit of sandy soil surrounded by dark colored, densely packed, burned soil when viewed from above. In profile, it was apparent that the dark soil capped the white soil. Feature 1 was interpreted as a fire pit. The fire it contained appears to have been extinguished by covering it with soil.

Feature 2 was interpreted as a portion of the original earthworks. In profile view, the feature appeared as a saddle (rise/depression/rise) of darkly stained soil. The depression is the likely area behind the embankment where the soldiers stood facing out (Cornelison 1997:36–38).

Trench 2 was located on the western side of the earthworks and placed to encompass the intersection of the Patriot Earthworks and Negro Head Point Road. This location was selected to assess the damage caused by erosional undercutting of the causeway or the raised portion of Negro Head Point Road and to determine if original sections of the earthworks existed near Moores Creek.

The excavation unit (four by one meters) was again centered at the highest point across the long axis of the earthworks. The same procedures used with Trench 1 were employed with Trench 2, consisting of removing the reconstructed earthworks as Level 1 and not screening the excavated soil. All subsequent levels were excavated from the eastern two meters of the unit.

Two things were noted in the stratigraphic profile of Trench 2. First, on the side of the unit where the earthworks were anticipated (south profile), the stratigraphy revealed no evidence of the original earthworks. The soil exposed in the south profile was fairly homogenous with some striations. The striations were interpreted as the result of leaching and not construction episodes. Second, although there was evidence of many modern road repairs, no evidence was observed indicating that intact portions of Negro Head Point Road remained. The modern road repairs consisted of narrow bands of orange clay with lighter sand in between.

At 84 cmbd, the edge of a thin metal box was discovered in the southwest corner of the unit. The box was cleaned in situ and photographed....Due to its fragile nature, the box was not removed. (Cornelison 1997:39)

To summarize, Cornelison reports that the sporadic earthworks restorations were clearly visible in the profiles of both trenches. While evidence of the original 1776 earthworks was found in Trench 1, no clear evidence of the original earthworks or
Negro Head Point Road was found in Trench 2. It did produce a metal box identified at eighty-four centimeters below surface. Based on its construction, the box clearly was not associated with the Revolutionary War battle at Moores Creek. It is possible, however, that it was brought in with an early load of road fill, or it could have been buried as a time capsule—a common practice when setting memorials or monuments.

MOCR-1.02 (31PD273**02) — FORWARD (LILLINGTON’S) EARTHWORKS

The Forward Earthworks or Lillington’s Earthworks are those constructed by Lillington’s men near the east side of the bridge. They began work on the entrenchments on February 25, 1776, two days before the actual battle. A statement made to the court of North Carolina on October 31, 1832, by James DeVane, a Patriot soldier of the battle, refers to the construction of Lillington’s earthworks. DeVane stated that “...he [DeVane] commenced making entrenchments [then all Lillington’s soldiers were ordered to Corbetts Ferry but before they reached their destination were ordered back to Moores Creek]...and commenced making entrenchments a little farther off than the first they had made” (State Records of North Carolina, S.R. XV:784–785, 1832). The construction of the Forward Earthworks was not resumed, but the combined troops of Lillington and Caswell moved farther back from the bridge to higher ground and built the Patriot Earthworks. The morning of the battle, Loyalist “Col. McLeod advanced as far as the first place of entrenchment that had been made before he was killed” (State Records of North Carolina, S.R. XV:784–785, 1832). The phrase “east and south of the road” was added to the description in 1977 when the Forward Earthworks were nominated for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

The site was first recorded by Clyde B. King under the field designation “Special Trench” (SP) during trenching excavations conducted in 1937. While the main thrust of King’s work focused on the Patriot Earthworks, he nevertheless excavated one trench (SP) across the Forward Earthworks (notes on file, SEAC Accession 486).

The breastwork near the bridge did not figure in the battle and so no study except that of locating its position was deemed necessary. Its design shows it to have been about 4 feet in height with a total length of less than 100 feet from the creek. (King 1937:7)

The dimensions of excavation trench SP were twelve feet long and two feet deep. These approximate measurements were derived from a scaled profile map drawn by King. No cultural materials were collected during King’s investigations.

In 1958, the Forward Earthworks near the bridge of the east bank of Moores Creek had been a target area for Griffin’s artifacts salvage in which a Fisher model J-10 metal detector was used. However, Griffin explains:

Land nearer the bridge, with the exception of the causeway, was not workable. Thick underbrush and cypress knees made use of the instrument [metal detector] impossible. (1958:1)

Archeological investigations of the Forward Earthworks were again conducted between January 9 and May 9, 1974, by Timothy Thompson under contract with the National Park Service through the Division of Archives and History, North Carolina. Dr. Stephen Gluckman served as Principal Investigator. During Thompson’s excavations at Moores Creek National Battlefield, he placed Trench 15 across the expected location of the Forward Earthworks near the east bank of Moores Creek (notes on file, SEAC Accession 489).

Trench Fifteen was cut into the natural levee south of the road to detect any evidence of the “Lillington” fortification supposedly erected at that point. No evidence for any construction was found there and the presence of large
hardwood and pine trees on this levee would indicate that any such evidence would have been marred or obliterated by root action. (Thompson 1975:27)

The dimensions of Trench 15 have been estimated from the scaled map provided by Thompson as twelve feet long with depth ranging from one and a quarter to two feet below surface.

No evidence for any fortification adjacent to the bridge was revealed by the excavation unit there, so little advice can be offered regarding activities in that area....The profile shows an uninterrupted natural horizon sequence.... There is no evidence of any construction activities in this location....It should be noted that there is at least a possibility that the meander which borders the 'natural causeway' from the bridge may have moved downstream slightly since 1776. (Thompson 1975:31, 95)

No artifacts were recovered by Thompson from the Forward Earthworks excavation.

In 1994, Cornelison reported a small rise in the area of the park previously designated as the Forward or Lillington’s Earthworks (MOCR-1.02), however, due to wet conditions this area was not tested.

**MOCR-1.03 — COLONIAL ROAD/OLD STAGE ROAD**

This site number has been dropped from the ASMIS database because it has been subsumed under another site designation (MOCR-1.04). To avoid confusion in the future, the number will not be reassigned.

**MOCR-1.04 (31PD273**04) — NEGRO HEAD POINT ROAD/ COLONIAL ROAD/OLD STAGE ROAD

When the park was first established in 1898, Negro Head Point Road was referred to as Colonial/Stage Road or Old Stage Road (Komara 1985:64–65). Descriptions based on later archaeological investigations of these two roads make it apparent that they are actually one and the same.

The Negro Head Point Road played an important part in the Battle of Moores Creek because the Loyalists were to travel the road en route to their rendezvous with the British expeditionary forces on the coast. A portion (0.6 miles) of the historic Negro Head Point Road, which was named for its place of origin Negro Head Point, runs in a generally east-west direction through the park and over Moores Creek Bridge. The road is documented as early as 1743 as a principal route of travel. “When the Wilmington Board of Commissioners examined this bridge in 1743, it was stated that it had been built ‘to serve a road’...” (Cross 1971). Most of North Carolina’s cargoes were transported by water well into the nineteenth century, therefore roads carried foot, horse, and, to a lesser degree, wagon traffic (Albright 1974:41).

“Roads existed but they were for travel more than transport” (Lee 1965:171). In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the road provided access to the plantations in the area and served as a way home for those who floated naval stores and lumber down the Black River to Wilmington (NPS 1976, item 7:1).

The location of the trace within the park has been documented by early investigators. King, in referencing the Patriot Earthworks, wrote “only a section of about 20 feet on the main front, where it crossed the old road, has been repaired” thereby indicating the location where Negro Head Point Road crossed the Patriot Earthworks (King 1935:5).

On October 19, 1973, John W. Walker, a research archeologist for the National Park Service, conducted a pedestrian walkover survey of the area where the state of North Carolina proposed to relocate Highway 210 (notes on file, SEAC Accession 488). Walker arbitrarily divided the linear corridor into three sections. Section 1, the Southwestern Terminus to Moores Creek, extended “from the southwestern terminus of the proposed road relocation to Moores Creek.” Section 2, the Southern Boundary to Moores Creek, extended...
“from the southern boundary of the proposed park land acquisition to Moores Creek.” Section 3, the Northeastern Terminus to Southern Boundary, extended “from the northeastern terminus of the proposed road relocation to the southern boundary of the proposed park land acquisition” (Walker 1973:1). Only Section 3 is today on park property. Walker reported his finds as follows:

This section of the proposed route varied considerably from the other two in that roughly 90% of it had been cleared and in that roughly half of it lies in an open field. However, as the field had not been cultivated in some two or three years and had subsequently grown up in weeds and grass, less than 20% of the ground surface was visible.

Although a careful survey was made of all open areas along the route, of the dirt roads crossing the field and running just outside of the eastern boundary of the park, of garden patches near the route, and of open areas just inside the present eastern park boundary, no archeological evidence was found with the exception of the dirt road which is believed to have possibly been a portion of the Revolutionary War period road that crossed Moores Creek Bridge. This road, which is marked in blue on the map runs north-west-southeast across the field and the proposed highway relocation route. (1973:2)

No cultural materials were collected during Walker’s investigation.

Between January 9 and May 9, 1974, the first archeological investigations of Negro Head Point Road were conducted by Timothy Thompson under contract with the National Park Service through the North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources, with Dr. Stephen Gluckman serving as principal investigator. Six backhoe trenches (2, 5, 7, 13, 14, and 16) were positioned to cross-section the visible portions of the trace. The purpose of the excavation was to locate and determine the method of construction of the old roadbed as it appeared in 1776 during the time of the battle (notes on file, SEAC Accession 489). Detailed in Thompson’s report are the following descriptions of the trenches.

The location of the road seems to be more certain [than that of the Patriot Earthworks] since excavation revealed a pattern of moderate use below the recent surfaces. Profile Two shows no natural soil horizon development. This is apparently due to the absence of vegetative cover. Two distinct disturbed horizons indicate road use in this profile, and a third horizon indicates recent use, probably as a foot path. A clay path and a sand cover above these represent park maintenance.

In Profile Five only 1 zone of older road disturbance appears. This is overlain by 2 horizons of more recent fill and a clay path, again representing park maintenance.

The oldest road surface indicated in Profile Seven is represented by a varved horizon. The formation of these successive layers of organic and inorganic material indicates little or no use of the surface during their formation by successive rainfalls or floods. Above this lies 2 layers of fill and a layer of recent disturbance as well as a humus line capped with a covering of sand and organic litter probably placed during the maintenance process.

In Profile Thirteen there is an extensive zone of road disturbance. This would be consistent with the fact that at this location the road descends from the stream terrace toward the creek and erosion would add to disturbance by use. This zone is overlain with an A11 horizon which in turn is covered with several fill units and clay surfaces.

Trench Fourteen was cut through the road as it approaches the bridge along the “natural causeway” formed by the edge of a stream meander. At the bottom of the profile an A12 horizon lies on a depression in the subsoil and probably represents an old road surface.
Above this is a zone of road disturbance covered by an A11 horizon. Above this is a series of recent fills including 2 rows of concrete blocks with clay in between. This fill unit is similar in appearance to a 1943 drawing attached to a proposed improvement plan for this section of the path. Of interest here is the presence of 1 hewn log resting in the subsoil below the lowest humus line. This may be the remains of some early road improvement in the form of a corduroy surface. However, if an item of this magnitude remained, other portions of such improvement should also have been located. Excavation revealed no explanation for the absence of further elements of such an improvement.

In an attempt to locate further evidence of the road, Trench Sixteen was cut through the park path which runs parallel to the paved county road from the stream terrace east to higher ground. In addition to the natural soil horizons, 3 horizontally separated varved horizons appear in Profile Sixteen. The formation and preservation of the varved pattern indicates that the road surfaces were not subject to disturbance from intensive use. However, occasional use would have kept the ground surface free from vegetation which would have interrupted the sheet flow of water down the surface. Two features that might be interpreted as ditches also appear here.

In summary, the location of the road seems to be more certain since excavation revealed a pattern of moderate use below the recent surfaces. However, minor shifting in the position of the road was indicated, particularly in Profile Sixteen. (Thompson 1975:29–30)

The estimated dimensions of the trenches are derived from Thompson’s scaled drawings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Measurements (length by depth)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16 feet by 1½ feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>29 feet by 2 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only artifacts collected during Thompson’s investigations were recovered from Trench Seven, which cross-sectioned the Patriot Earthworks and the old roadbed. They included one railroad spike and approximately fifteen to twenty unidentified metal fragments (not conserved). The artifacts are housed with the North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources in Raleigh.

Excavations of Negro Head Point Road were conducted again in 1984 under the direction of Gregory L. Komara, an archeological technician with SEAC (notes on file, SEAC Accession 671). Six backhoe trenches were placed across the width of the road. The northern endpoints of trenches were assigned a letter designation, while the southern endpoints received “subscript letter designations.” Only one trench designated trench CC-C2C1 was excavated on the east side of Moores Creek (Komara 1985:21, 29). The other five trenches (A-A’, B-B’, C-C’, D-D’, and E-E’) were located in the newly acquired property on the west side of Moores Creek (Komara 1985:21).

Komara reported that the dimensions of trench CC-C2C1, located on the east side of the park, were thirty-two feet long and eighteen inches wide.

Excavations were continued along the length of this trench until it was believed that a sterile subsoil had been contacted....During the course of the excavation no cultural material, other than apparent twentieth century trash items, was discovered which might definitely be attributable to the earlier construction and use of the Negro Head Point Road. A possible exception to this may be that of a small corroded flake of metal which was found at the base of one of a series of apparent vehicle ruts present upon a series recorded previous road surfaces. (Komara 1985:29).
The five trenches (A-A', B-B', C-C', D-D', and E-E') excavated across Negro Head Point Road were located as follows:

A-A' "near the crest of the sand hill within the west park boundary"

B-B' at "the base of this sandhill"

C-C' at "the relatively level savanna area where the Simpson cabin and pump-house had been constructed"

D-D' "near the west end of the causeway leading to the site of Moores Creek Bridge"

E-E' "near the east end of the causeway" on the west bank.

During the posthole testing (20S/60W), which Komara conducted on the west bank property, Negro Head Point Road was recognized from "remnants of a compacted surface at a depth of 11 centimeters below surface" (Komara 1985:16).

Although "no cultural material...was discovered which might definitely be attributable to the earlier construction and use of the Negro Head Point Road," Komara did note several areas of Negro Head Point Road where significant details of the original roadbed were discernible (Komara 1985:22–23, 29).

Traces of several pre-existing road surfaces were discernible through differences in the compaction of deposits and/or the presence of a humic surface layer at contact with the road surface.

Two of the more recent road surfaces appear to have been drained by having ditches dug along their edges. These ditches were then later refilled through natural accretion and their use as modern trash disposal sites.

[The] presence of a series of apparent rut impressions each containing a number of varied layers, [intruded] into several of the early road surfaces. The observed varving representing possible sporadic periods of use.

Presence of three apparent post-holes along the length of the profile...represent posts for a fence line which was said to have been temporarily erected across the path of the Old Neighborhood (Negro Head Point) road by a recent property owner (Evangeline Savage, personal communication, June 1984).

Distinctive, highly compacted...sandy deposit, between 3.6 and 8.6 inches below surface. The layer averages about 8 inches in thickness, being thickest at the edges and tapering somewhat toward the center....This may represent part of the earliest roadways....

The occurrence in the uppermost levels of the accumulated road surfaces of a series of gray-colored separations of soil resulting from relatively recent road use layers. (Komara 1985:29–30)

On October 14, 1992, during the monitoring activities conducted at the park for the historic bridge reconstruction, John R. Wright (under the direction of Elizabeth Horvath) encountered an "anomaly/feature...in the west crib wing trench on the east bank of the creek, [which] may well represent a small portion of the Negro Head Road" (Wright 1992:9). No artifacts were recovered that could be attributed to the road. Wright states that the bridge abutment and wings "will not adversely affect this resource" (Wright 1992:9).

Portions of the Negro Head Point Road were tested as part of the SAIP/RASP survey conducted in 1994 by John Cornelison, an archeologist with SEAC. No artifacts were recovered during auger testing conducted along the road trace through the park. Cornelison suggested that the deposits associated with the original roadbed in the area known as the causeway on the east bank of Moores Creek are deeper than one meter. He based this on the lack of stratigraphic evidence found in the one-meter-deep auger tests he conducted in the area (Cornelison, personal communication 1997).
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Cornelison’s Trench 2 was positioned to encompass the intersection of the Patriot Earthworks and Negro Head Point Road. Dug to a depth of approximately 120 centimeters below ground surface, no evidence of the original roadbed was encountered within the test unit. There is clear evidence, however, of many modern road repairs. These repairs are evidenced by narrow bands of orange clay with lighter sand in between.

MOCR-1.05 (31PD273**05) —
HISTORIC BRIDGE

The historic bridge played a significant role in the Battle of Moores Creek. The evening prior to the battle, Colonel Caswell removed the wooden planking from the bridge and greased the remaining girders to impede the Loyalists’ attack. On attempting to cross the girders, the Loyalists were shot by the Patriot forces. The wooden bridge was rebuilt numerous times between 1776 and 1904, perhaps as many as seven. In 1904, the bridge was relocated upstream from its 1776 position on the banks of Widow Moore’s Creek. In 1931, another bridge was reconstructed at the original location. This structure survived until 1945 when it was taken down due to disrepair (Hargrove 1987:4). In 1977, when Moores Creek National Battlefield was nominated to the National Register of Historic Places, a monument (erected in 1931) commemorating the bridge site was designated Historic Structure-9 (HS-9).

Borresen noted in his report that Superintendent King requested “a study of early English type bridge construction” (1938a:2). King was concerned about the historic accuracy of the bridge reconstructed in 1931. He felt a study would be useful for future reconstructions.

In August 1958, John W. Griffin conducted a metal detector survey of the east bank causeway near the bridge foundation. He wrote the “causeway has undoubtedly been built up, and any artifacts here must be below the level at which this instrument (a Fisher model J-10) will work” (Griffin 1958:1). Griffin recommended further dredging of the creek bed for possibly locating Revolutionary War artifacts, such as sword hilts (Griffin 1958:1).

The North Carolina Division of Archives and History attempted an underwater survey of the creek bed and bridge structure in 1974, however, equipment problems prevented implementation (Brewer 1983:4).

From August 30 to September 2, 1983, the first underwater archeological survey and testing of the Moores Creek bed was conducted by SEAC under the direction of David M. Brewer, with George Fischer serving as principal investigator (notes on file, SEAC Accession 650). The area surveyed was confined to the creek bed within the park. “Since the bridge site was the focal point of the battle of February 27, 1776, this was also the central area of concern during the investigation. Because the remaining creek run was peripheral to the battle itself, it was investigated through magnetometric remote-sensing with each anomaly individually verified” (Brewer 1983:4).

Two magnetometer anomalies were recorded in the creek bed. One was located several hundred yards north of the historic bridge site and another at the second bend upstream from the historic bridge site. The first was attributed to intrusive automobile debris as a result of the many cars that have crossed the highway bridge (Highway 210) for a number of years. The second was located nearer the Old Stage Road Trace (Negro Head Point Road) and, therefore, investigated more thoroughly. Two pieces of iron cooking pot and an axe-head were recovered.

At the historic bridge site, a linear grid system composed of twelve, two-meter-wide lanes (designated A–L from north to south) across the width of the creek was established for the survey. An arbitrary point (A), located on the west bank of Moores Creek, was chosen as the primary datum point. It was positioned 14°53’ north of survey marker L851. A base line was then established on the east bank, and a stake designated Grid Center East (GCE) was placed at the center of the remains from the concrete bridge abutment. Stakes were then placed at two-meter intervals to the north and south of the GCE, covering a total distance of twenty-four meters.
The close-in metal detector survey was thorough and intensive, and yielded a great deal (38-40 pieces) of modern refuse, including beer cans, soda bottles, sheet metal, an oil filter, etc. Four items were recovered, however, that may have some relevant historical significance. These were: (1) an iron spike [Lane L], (2) an iron fastener [Lane I], (3) an iron ring bolt [Lane G], and (4) an iron bolt piece [Lane D]. Also recovered was a piece of bone that has been identified as part of the metapodial...of a deer leg [Lane G].

Two other items were located with the metal detector, yet were unrecoverable. One was in Lane E at 7.5 meters from the base line, on the southern side of the lane. The magnetic reading indicted a fairly large presence; the inability of the divers to recover was due to the depth of the overlying sediments and obstruction by submerged bridge timbers.

The other item was located in Lane K at 10.8 meters from the base line, in the center of the lane. This anomaly was simply too deep to recover by hand.

The bridge components which were mapped on the creek bottom have been tentatively identified (on the basis of photographs supplied by the park) as parts of the 1931 reconstructed bridge, which was taken apart in 1945. In a memo, dated June 21, 1945, to the coordinating Superintendent, the park Custodian stated that, in tearing apart of the old bridge, “This work has been done without respect to the tide, and applies to the above-water section of the structure.” Undoubtedly, what remains on the bottom today are the below-water sections. (Brewer 1983:5-12)

The recovered artifacts were sent to North Carolina’s Department of Cultural Resources in Raleigh for conservation. They are currently housed in archival curation with their Underwater Archaeology Unit under state site number 31PD273**UW.

A map of the bridge components, waterlogged timbers, struts, posts, and planking strewn across the creek bottom at the bridge site was prepared (Brewer 1983:7).

On October 15, 1992, John R. Wright, an archaeological technician under the direction of Elizabeth Horvath, principal investigator, was sent by SEAC to Moores Creek National Battlefield to monitor the placement of bridge abutments for the construction of a 1776 replica bridge (notes on file, SEAC Accession 1059). The areas on the east and west banks of the creek were excavated with a backhoe to the depth of about six feet. The soil was removed in ten-centimeter levels and then troweled through to recover artifacts. The trench profiles were mapped and photographed.

During the excavation of the crib abutment, three wood timber fragments were unearthed on the west bank. Each appeared to be the heart of loblolly pine. Two of these timbers were between five and seven feet in length. The third was a fragment measuring only one and a half to two feet long. The outer two timbers may be remnants of the reconstructed bridge of 1931, which was razed in 1942 and 1943. During low tide, the creek bank revealed several more timbers and the concrete bridge abutment, which had fallen into the creek some time in the past (Wright 1992:5).

The recovered artifacts (other than remnants of the 1931 bridge) included a metal screw, which Wright noted was similar to those photographed in the reconstructed 1931 bridge, and one historic blue-edged whiteware rim sherd, both from the east bank. Artifacts from the west bank included an iron fragment too rusted to identify and one broken quartz thinning flake. “All recovered artifacts [except the thinning flake] have popular use dates and manufacturing dates in the 19th and 20th centuries” (Wright 1992:9). The artifacts and records from the excavation are curated at SEAC.

MOCR-2.00 (31PD273**03) — TAR KILN COMPLEX

This listing represents the entire area within Moores Creek National Battlefield that relates to
the production of pine tar. The naval stores industry was one of the principal sources of commerce in colonial North Carolina.

*John Pory, an early traveler to the Region, was among the first in 1622 to note the excellent promise here [Cape Fear Valley area] for obtaining abundant supplies of wood for timber and ship’s masts as well as for pitch, potash, and tar.* (Komara 1985:66)

This commerce was of such importance to the British Empire that early Revolutionary War military actions were centered in the area to ensure a continual flow of goods.

Komara identified a number of archeological features relating to the production of pine tar that would likely be found at a tar kiln. These included “the presence of a ditch around the perimeter of the mound; a pit or cavity largely composed of charcoal, possible remnants of resinous material; a possible fired clay lining; firing of the deposits at the base of the mound; and traces of the drain hole and conduit for the flow of tar” (Komara 1985:33).

In 1984, park personal informed Komara of the presence of two potential tar kilns used in the production of pine tar. Located in the northeastern portion of the park, they have been assigned subsite numbers MOCR-2.01 (Tar Kiln 1) and MOCR-2.02 (Tar Kiln 2) within the Tar Kiln Complex.

**MOCR-2.01 (31PD273**06) — TAR KILN 1**

In 1984, Komara visually confirmed the location of Tar Kiln 1. However, no excavations were undertaken at this time (Komara 1985:32).

In 1994, Cornelison excavated a one-by-fifty-centimeter test unit (Trench 3) at Tar Kiln 1 to obtain a radiocarbon sample (taken from Level 4). The sample (Beta-75331) was assayed by Beta Analytic, Inc., with a resulting \(^{14}\text{C} \) date of 100 ± 50 B.P. (Cornelison 1994:11). At one sigma level of confidence, this correlates to a date range of between A.D. 1800 and 1900.

**MOCR-2.02 (31PD273**07) — TAR KILN 2**

SEAC began the excavation of Tar Kiln 2 in 1984 under the direction of Gregory L. Komara. The potentially adverse impact to Tar Kiln 2 by the construction of a new park entrance prompted the archeological investigation. “One trench [T'-V'] was excavated across the mound that measured 24.5 feet in length and 3.1 feet in width” (Komara 1985:33)(see Figure 14). The mound's surface was scattered with modern artifacts relating to the Marshall automobile repair garage, which is located adjacent to the tar kiln. Komara removed the first two inches of soil from the excavation trench in order to remove artifacts associated with the garage.

The trench was then subdivided into three sections: (1) the mound where the majority of construction details occurred; (2) the ditch that provided information on the perimeter configuration of the mound; and (3) the area outside the ditch that exposed the original condition of the construction site and the extent of refilling evident from erosion runoff (Komara 1985:33–34). Arbitrary six-inch levels were excavated within the trench. The artifacts recovered from the excavations are housed at SEAC under SEAC Accession 671. They were listed by Komara as follows:

- **Mound**
  - 0–6 inches: 3 clear bottle glass fragments, 3 safety glass fragments, 1 unidentified fragment
  - 6–12 inches: charred wood fragments, possible pine tar residue
  - 12–18 inches: charred wood fragments, possible pine tar residue

- **Ditch**
  - 0–6 inches: no artifacts recovered
  - 6–12 inches: 5 flat glass fragments, 1 rock, 1 triangle-shaped flat metal object

—

105
12–18 inches 1 (1970) penny
1 brick fragment
? tarpaper fragments
? corroded flat metal object
? glass fragments

18–24 inches ? metal fragment

**Area Outside Ditch**

0–6 inches no soil exists in this area at this level

6–12 inches ? wire staple
? flat glass
? charcoal

12–18 inches no artifacts recovered

The radiocarbon samples collected by Komara in 1984 produced inconclusive results. The assays were performed by Beta Analytic, Inc. of Coral Gables, Florida. Assay one (Beta-9846) of Tar Kiln 2 was taken between six and twelve inches below surface. It produced a \(^{14}\text{C}\) date of less than 85 years B.P. Assay two (Beta-9847) of Tar Kiln 2 was taken between twelve and eighteen inches below surface. This sample produced a date of 430 ± 50 B.P. (A.D. 1520 ± 50).

As part of the 1994 SAIP/RASP survey, Cornelison conducted extensive EM 38 testing in the area of Tar Kiln 2. He states that Komara's 1985 excavation trench (T''-V'') was clearly delineated.

Aboriginal pottery was recovered from Shovel Test 2 (FS 11.2, catalog number MOCR 121) and Shovel Test 34 (FS 15.2, catalog number MOCR 126) excavated in the tar kiln vicinity, or Area 1. In his 1997 final report, Cornelison concludes that the lack of additional aboriginal material indicates that these sherds are not the result of an aboriginal occupation. Rather, they were brought into this area, possibly with fill associated with the commercial garage that once operated here.
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RECOMMENDED PROJECTS

PRIORITIES

To systematically inventory and evaluate all archeologically significant resources in the park, priorities have been suggested for scheduling needed work. Highest priority is given to resources imperiled by erosion and looting. Lowest priority is assigned to resources that are considered stable and unrelated to the primary mission of the park—the preservation and interpretation of the Revolutionary War Battle of Moores Creek.

Priority 1: Action is recommended within the next fiscal year.

Priority 2: Action is recommended within the next two years.

Priority 3: Action is recommended within the next three years.

Priority 4: Action is recommended within four to five years.

Priority 5: Action is recommended within the next twenty years.

Using the above criteria, future archeological investigations of known sites at Moores Creek National Battlefield are recommended as follows:

Priority 1: Negro Head Point Road

Priority 2: Forward Earthworks and Patriot Earthworks

Priority 3: Metal detector survey of entire park

Priority 4: Tar Kilns Complex

Priority 5: Prehistoric site excavations

SPECIFIC PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

PRIORITY 1

The park has recommended stabilizing the portion of the old roadbed known as the causeway to prevent further erosion caused by cyclic flooding of Moores Creek. The location of the historic trace road near the bridge was tentatively identified by Wright in 1992 during the placement of the reconstructed historic bridge abutments. However, to determine the eighteenth-century dimensions of the road and possibly restore it to its eighteenth-century condition will require further archeological investigations. The northern edge of the causeway has been stabilized with wooden riprap, but it might be possible to clean the southern profile of the trench that has been cut by erosion and determine the depth of the original roadbed exposed in the profile. In conjunction with this, it is recommended that two or more trenches be placed across the roadbed to determine the eighteenth-century width of the road.

When this report was written in 1997, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers was implementing an erosion control project to stabilize the causeway along the east side of Moores Creek Bridge (Tucker 1997).

PRIORITY 2

Two previous excavations of the Forward Earthworks have resulted in conflicting information regarding the location and extent of the entrenchment. In 1937, King excavated Trench SP across the works, reporting their location and extent. However, in 1974, Thompson excavated Trench 15 in the vicinity of the earthworks and reported no evidence of the entrenchment. As a major component of the events related to the Battle of Moores Creek, determining the size and location of the
Forward Earthworks is necessary for proper interpretation of the site. A third excavation of the Forward Earthworks is therefore recommended within the next two years. It should be positioned to cross the center of the raised area. Because the Forward Earthworks have never been restored, the area should be surveyed using ground penetrating radar and a Geonics EM 38 ground conductivity unit before any excavation is done. All levels should subsequently be hand-excavated and screened through quarter-inch mesh hardware cloth to ensure full data recovery.

During the 1994 RASP survey of Moores Creek National Battlefield, a trench was excavated on the eastern side of the earthworks, approximately five meters south of Negro Head Point Road. Designated Trench 1, it measured four by one meters and was centered across the highest portion of the long axis of the earthworks. At one hundred centimeters below datum within Trench 1, a white ashy deposit of sandy soil surrounded by dark colored, densely packed, burned soil was encountered and designated Feature 1. When Feature 1 was viewed in profile, it was apparent that the dark soil capped the white soil. Feature 1 was interpreted as a fire pit. The fire it contained appears to have been extinguished by covering it with soil. Approximately half of Feature 1 was excavated in 1994. It is extremely probable that the fire pit dates to the battle of 1776. It is therefore recommended that further consideration be given to reopening and excavating Trench 1, Feature 1, to retrieve archeological data and pit contents.

**Priority 3**

A metal detector survey of 100 percent of the park lands, 86.52 acres, is needed to fully document the Revolutionary War battle at Moores Creek. Previous metal detector surveys in the park have been confined to the Patriot Earthworks, the west bank, and the creek bed. The metal detector survey should conform to standard RASP field methodology (Prentice 1996), which includes running transects at close intervals and piece plotting all collected materials.

**Priority 4**

Excavations conducted within Tar Kiln 2 are sufficient to interpret the location, dimensions, and construction methods used in the original building of the kiln. Radiocarbon dates have been obtained from both kilns. Additional archeological investigation is unnecessary as long as the resources are protected from erosion, construction, and other potentially detrimental activities. A literature review is recommended to bring more information to light regarding the use of tar kilns in the area and evaluate the resource's eligibility for the National Register.

**Priority 5**

With the completion of Cornelison's 1994 survey (RASP Project MOCR-Z015), enough information has been gathered to suggest a possible prehistoric presence within the park boundaries. The prehistoric artifacts gathered to date consist of six small ceramic sherds, one possible thinning flake, four possible waste flakes, and one honey colored chert/flint flake that to date has been interpreted as a byproduct from resharpening a gunflint.

Before Moores Creek National Battlefield acquired the west bank property, Mr. Simpson, the property owner, dredged portions of the creek bed and placed the dredged materials on the west bank. He used the dredged materials as landfill prior to building a fishing camp and associated structures on the property. It is from the dredged fill context that the majority of the prehistoric artifacts apparently were recovered, but this presumed origin is unsure. It is therefore recommended that test units be placed in the area where these artifacts were recovered (on the west bank of Moores Creek) to determine if the deposits are primary or secondary in origin. Archeological excavations are also recommended for the area north of the new park entrance. These units should be positioned to encompass the locations of the prehistoric ceramic sherds recovered by Cornelison and ascribed by him to the fill deposits associated with the automotive repair shop located nearby.
Appendix 4

THEMATIC FRAMEWORK

Development of the thematic framework for the National Park System and National Historic Landmarks Program began as early as 1929. The framework represents a thematic classification system for historic and prehistoric resources of the United States. It is used to demonstrate the extent to which units and cultural resources of the National Park System, affiliated areas, and National Historic Landmarks reflect the nation’s past. The framework's purpose is to cover all areas of United States history without excessive detail.

As explained in the introduction of the 1996 version (NPS 1996c), the first thematic framework was officially adopted by the NPS in 1936. It followed the stages of American progress and celebrated the achievements of the founding fathers and the inevitable march of democracy. Four revisions (1970, 1982, 1987, and 1996) have since been implemented. The first three substantially changed the framework’s format and organization but not its basic chronological conceptualization of the past. The current framework (NPS 1996c) is a clear break from earlier conceptualizations as it focuses on cultural processes that transcend specific temporal boundaries. It guides the NPS, working independently and with its partners in the private and public sectors, in the following:

- evaluating the significance of resources for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, for designation as National Historic Landmarks, or for potential addition to the National Park System;
- assessing how well the themes are currently represented in existing units of the National Park System and in other protected areas; and
- expanding and enhancing the interpretive programs at existing units of the National Park Service to provide fuller understanding of our nation’s past.

Adopting the new revisions is a relatively slow process. Thus, for clarity, both the well-established 1987 framework, History and Prehistory in the National Park System and the National Historic Landmarks Program, and the new 1996 Revision of the National Park Service’s Thematic Framework will be referenced in discussing the thematic framework of Moores Creek National Battlefield.

IDENTIFIED THEMES

HISTORIC THEMES

The park was established to commemorate the Revolutionary War battle fought on February 27, 1776, at Moores Creek, North Carolina, which curtailed the British governing presence in the Carolinas. As such, one major theme from the 1987 framework—The American Revolution—has been identified at the park, site, and subsite levels (Table 12) as recognized on the National Register property and resource type classifications listed in the National Register Bulletin 16A (NPS 1991:15, 20–23). No other themes related to the history of European settlement and the development of the United States are currently recognized in the National Register property listings for the park.

Applying the new 1996 framework to the listed National Register properties is relatively straightforward. Three major themes encompassing six subthemes (Table 13) are clearly applicable.

PREHISTORIC THEMES

No Native American sites of Precolumbian age have been shown conclusively to exist within the park. It appears highly likely, however, that such sites might exist. Should this be shown to be true in the future, then this aspect of the park’s thematic composition would need to be revisited.
Table 12 — Themes associated with sites and structures based on the 1987 thematic framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type/Function</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moores Creek</td>
<td>IV. The American Revolution; D. War in the South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Battlefield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriot Earthworks</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward Earthworks</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro Head Point</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moores Creek Historic Bridge</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 — Themes based on the 1996 revised thematic framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type/Function</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moores Creek</td>
<td>I. Peopling Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Battlefield</td>
<td>6. encounters, conflicts, and colonization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Shaping the Political Landscape</td>
<td>1. parties, protests, and movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. governmental institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. military institutions and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. political ideas, cultures, and theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Changing Role of the United States in the World Community</td>
<td>1. international relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriot Earthworks</td>
<td>I. Peopling Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. encounters, conflicts, and colonization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Shaping the Political Landscape</td>
<td>1. parties, protests, and movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. governmental institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. military institutions and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. political ideas, cultures, and theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Changing Role of the United States in the World Community</td>
<td>1. international relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward Earthworks</td>
<td>I. Peopling Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. encounters, conflicts, and colonization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 (cont.) — Themes based on the 1996 revised thematic framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type/Function</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV. Shaping the Political Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. parties, protests, and movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. governmental institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. military institutions and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. political ideas, cultures, and theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII. Changing Role of the United States in the World Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. international relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure: Negro Head Point Road</td>
<td>I. Peopling Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. encounters, conflicts, and colonization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Moores Creek Historic Bridge</td>
<td>I. Peopling Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. encounters, conflicts, and colonization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV. Shaping the Political Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. parties, protests, and movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. governmental institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. military institutions and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. political ideas, cultures, and theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII. Changing Role of the United States in the World Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. international relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDED ADDITIONAL THEMES**

Tables 14 and 15 present suggestions for possible additional themes represented by cultural resources in Moores Creek National Battlefield. These themes were developed from research conducted for the production of this overview and assessment.

Information was based on local and regional history, as well as the research potential for the park. Note that the new themes listed in this report, which are based on the 1996 thematic framework, are only suggestions. The park superintendent must evaluate the park’s cultural resources to establish new official park themes.
Table 14 — Recommended themes based on the 1987 thematic framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type/Function</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site: Caswell’s Camp</td>
<td>IV. The American Revolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. War in the South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Tar Kiln Complex</td>
<td>XII. Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Extractive or Mining Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Timber and Lumber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Manufacturing Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Chemicals and Allied Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure: Tar Kiln 1</td>
<td>XII. Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Extractive or Mining Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Timber and Lumber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Manufacturing Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Chemicals and Allied Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure: Tar Kiln 2</td>
<td>XII. Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Extractive or Mining Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Timber and Lumber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Manufacturing Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Chemicals and Allied Products</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 — Recommended themes based on the 1996 revised thematic framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type/Function</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site: Caswell’s Camp</td>
<td>I. Peopling Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. encounters, conflicts, and colonization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV. Shaping the Political Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. parties, protests, and movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. governmental institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. military institutions and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. political ideas, cultures, and theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII. Changing Role of the United States in the World Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. international relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site: Tar Kiln Complex</td>
<td>V. Developing the American Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. extraction and production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. distribution and consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. exchange and trade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15 (cont.) — Recommended themes based on the 1996 revised thematic framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type/Function</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| VI. Expanding Science and Technology | 1. experimentation and invention  
2. technological applications  
4. effects on lifestyle and health |
| VII. Transforming the Environment | 1. manipulating the environment and its resources |
| VIII. Changing Role of the United States in the World Community | 2. commerce |

Structure: Tar Kiln 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type/Function</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| V. Developing the American Economy | 1. extraction and production  
2. distribution and consumption  
6. exchange and trade |
| VI. Expanding Science and Technology | 1. experimentation and invention  
2. technological applications  
4. effects on lifestyle and health |
| VII. Transforming the Environment | 1. manipulating the environment and its resources |
| VIII. Changing Role of the United States in the World Community | 2. commerce |

Structure: Tar Kiln 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type/Function</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| V. Developing the American Economy | 1. extraction and production  
2. distribution and consumption  
6. exchange and trade |
| VI. Expanding Science and Technology | 1. experimentation and invention  
2. technological applications  
4. effects on lifestyle and health |
| VII. Transforming the Environment | 1. manipulating the environment and its resources |
| VIII. Changing Role of the United States in the World Community | 2. commerce |
## Appendix 5

**ARTIFACT LISTINGS**

Table 16 — Artifacts on display at Moores Creek National Battlefield.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Received From</th>
<th>How Acquired</th>
<th>Catalog #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 10, 1933</td>
<td>1 bronze swivel gun; 1 iron two-pounder gun</td>
<td>War Department</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>5*, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9, 1959</td>
<td>Powder horn</td>
<td>Robert Abela</td>
<td>Purchase museum branch</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9, 1959</td>
<td>English bayonet</td>
<td>Robert Abela</td>
<td>Purchase museum branch</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9, 1959</td>
<td>Pistol</td>
<td>Penny’s Treasure Chest</td>
<td>Purchase museum branch</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9, 1959</td>
<td>Fowling piece</td>
<td>Penny’s Treasure Chest</td>
<td>Purchase museum branch</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9, 1959</td>
<td>Musket</td>
<td>Penny’s Treasure Chest</td>
<td>Purchase museum branch</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9, 1959</td>
<td>Scottish broadsword</td>
<td>James C. Risk</td>
<td>Purchase museum branch</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 4, 1975</td>
<td>Galloper carriage</td>
<td>John Braxton</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 22, 1992</td>
<td>Iron dutch 2# cannon tube, reproduction</td>
<td>South Bend Replicas, Inc.</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 13, 1994</td>
<td>“New Kirk Sword,” American copy of British model 1768 horseman’s saber</td>
<td>Dr. and Mrs. William B. Herring</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9, 1995</td>
<td>Original bayonet from a tower musket</td>
<td>Harry Green</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Catalog No. 5 stolen in 1963.
## Table 17 — Moores Creek National Battlefield artifactual holdings, now curated at Charles Pinckney National Historic Site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Received From</th>
<th>How Acquired</th>
<th>Catalog #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 21, 1958</td>
<td>Oval copper and iron buckle</td>
<td>John W. Griffin</td>
<td>Field</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None recorded</td>
<td>Spice grinder</td>
<td>Herman Williams, Director</td>
<td>Purchase museum branch</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9, 1959</td>
<td>Meissen plate</td>
<td>William Borland</td>
<td>Purchase museum branch</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9, 1959</td>
<td>1 gold guinea</td>
<td>James Kelly</td>
<td>Purchase museum branch</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9, 1959</td>
<td>1 gold rose guinea</td>
<td>North Carolina Department of Archives and History</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9, 1959</td>
<td>Candlestick</td>
<td>Arpad and Henry, Inc., Silversmith</td>
<td>Purchase museum branch</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1959</td>
<td>2 photocopies; documents;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emancipation birth record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 30, 1965</td>
<td>Metal shot ball, two pieces</td>
<td>Fred Boege</td>
<td>Donation</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 3, 1976</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>NPS (Grady Monument ca. 1857)</td>
<td>Property NPS</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 3, 1976</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>NPS (Grady Monument ca. 1857)</td>
<td>Property NPS</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 3, 1976</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>NPS (Grady Monument ca. 1857)</td>
<td>Property NPS</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 3, 1976</td>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>NPS (Grady Monument ca. 1857)</td>
<td>Property NPS</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 3, 1976</td>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>NPS (Grady Monument ca. 1857)</td>
<td>Property NPS</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 3, 1976</td>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>NPS (Grady Monument ca. 1857)</td>
<td>Property NPS</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 3, 1976</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>NPS (Grady Monument ca. 1857)</td>
<td>Property NPS</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 3, 1976</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>NPS (Grady Monument ca. 1857)</td>
<td>Property NPS</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 3, 1976</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>NPS (Grady Monument ca. 1857)</td>
<td>Property NPS</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1976</td>
<td>Bracket</td>
<td>Div. of Museum Services, Harpers Ferry</td>
<td>Field collection, former acc. 4065</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1976</td>
<td>Chain</td>
<td>Div. of Museum Services, Harpers Ferry</td>
<td>Field collection, former acc. 4065</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1976</td>
<td>Ring</td>
<td>Div. of Museum Services, Harpers Ferry</td>
<td>Field collection, former acc. 4065</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1976</td>
<td>Unidentified iron fragment</td>
<td>Div. of Museum Services, Harpers Ferry</td>
<td>Field collection, former acc. 4065</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1976</td>
<td>Unidentified iron fragment</td>
<td>Div. of Museum Services, Harpers Ferry</td>
<td>Field collection, former acc. 4065</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1977</td>
<td>Sketch in India ink</td>
<td>Div. Of Museum Services, Harpers Ferry</td>
<td>Transfer, former acc. 2883</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 7, 1984</td>
<td>Sword</td>
<td>Origins unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 7, 1984</td>
<td>Sword</td>
<td>Origins unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 7, 1984</td>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td>Origins unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 7, 1984</td>
<td>Arrowhead</td>
<td>Origins unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Artillery shell fragment</td>
<td>Origins unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Uncataloged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18 — Artifact summary for Horvath's investigations (SEAC-796, MOCR-31).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalog #</th>
<th>Provenience</th>
<th>Object Name</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Description Category</th>
<th>Qty.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 51</td>
<td>ST01</td>
<td>Bottle, soft drink</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Light green container glass, machine molded</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 52</td>
<td>ST01</td>
<td>Button</td>
<td>Copper/lead</td>
<td>Hammered</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 53</td>
<td>ST02</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machine wire nail, machine headed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 54</td>
<td>ST02</td>
<td>Screw</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machine wire nail, machine headed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 55</td>
<td>ST02</td>
<td>Tack</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machine wire nail, machine headed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 56</td>
<td>ST03</td>
<td>Metal fragment</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Indet. manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 57</td>
<td>ST04</td>
<td>Metal fragment</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Indet. manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 58</td>
<td>5M W S W, ST02</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machine wire nail, machine headed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 59</td>
<td>5M W S W, ST02</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machine wire nail, machine headed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 60</td>
<td>5M W S W, ST02</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machine wire nail, machine headed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 61</td>
<td>5M W S W, ST02</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machine wire nail, machine headed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 62</td>
<td>5M W S W, ST02</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machine wire nail, machine headed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 63</td>
<td>ST06</td>
<td>Metal fragment</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Indet. manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 64</td>
<td>ST07</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machine cut nail</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 65</td>
<td>ST07</td>
<td>Vessel fragment</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Indef. glass (insufficient portion), indet. manufacturing, colorless</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 66</td>
<td>ST08</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Indet. manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 67</td>
<td>ST09</td>
<td>Washer</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machined</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 68</td>
<td>ST10</td>
<td>Metal fragment</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Indet. manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 69</td>
<td>ST11</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machine cut nail</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 70</td>
<td>ST12</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machine cut nail</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 71</td>
<td>ST13</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machine wire nail, machine headed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 72</td>
<td>ST14</td>
<td>Metal fragment</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Indet. manufacturing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 73</td>
<td>ST14</td>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machined</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 74</td>
<td>ST15</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machine wire nail, machine headed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 75</td>
<td>ST16</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machine wire nail, machine headed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 76</td>
<td>ST17</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machine cut nail</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 77</td>
<td>ST17</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machine wire nail</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 78</td>
<td>ST18</td>
<td>Metal fragment</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Indet. manufacturing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 79</td>
<td>ST18</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machined</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 80</td>
<td>ST19</td>
<td>Metal fragment</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Indet. manufacturing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 81</td>
<td>ST20</td>
<td>Clip, cartridge</td>
<td>Brass</td>
<td>Machined</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 82</td>
<td>ST21</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machined</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 83</td>
<td>ST22</td>
<td>Tack</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machined</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 84</td>
<td>ST23</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machine wire nail</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 85</td>
<td>ST24</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machined</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18 (cont.) — Artifact summary for Horvath's investigations (SEAC-796, MOCR-31).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalog #</th>
<th>Provenience</th>
<th>Object Name</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Description Category</th>
<th>Qty.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 86</td>
<td>MDET, N of foot bridge</td>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machined, perforated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 87</td>
<td>MDET, S of foot bridge</td>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machined, perforated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 88</td>
<td>TR3</td>
<td>Vessel</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Machine molded container glass, commercial mark, colorless</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 89</td>
<td>Area ST01</td>
<td>Fork</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machined</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 90</td>
<td>TR3</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Carbonized remains</td>
<td>Sample $^14$C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 91</td>
<td>EU1, LV1</td>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>Chert</td>
<td>Chipped stone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 92</td>
<td>EU1, LV1</td>
<td>Cap, bottle</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Stamped, machine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 93</td>
<td>EU1, LV1</td>
<td>Bottle, soft drink</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Machine molded container glass, commercial mark, light green</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 94</td>
<td>EU1, LV1</td>
<td>Glass fragment</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Indef. glass (insufficient portion), dark green, indet. manufacturing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 95</td>
<td>EU1, LV1</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machine wire nail, machine headed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 96</td>
<td>EU1, LV1</td>
<td>Cap, bottle</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Stamped, machine</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 97</td>
<td>EU1, LV1</td>
<td>Cap, bottle</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Stamped, machine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 98</td>
<td>EU1, LV1</td>
<td>Glass fragment</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Indef. glass (insufficient portion), light green, indet. manufacturing</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 99</td>
<td>EU1, LV1</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Machine molded container glass, light green</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 100</td>
<td>EU1, LV1</td>
<td>Sinker</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Cast</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 101</td>
<td>EU1, LV1</td>
<td>Vessel fragment</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Indef. glass (insufficient portion), molded, light green</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 102</td>
<td>EU1, LV1</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Carbonized remains</td>
<td>Sample $^14$C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 103</td>
<td>TR2, Feat 2</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Flora remains, wood</td>
<td>Sample $^14$C, Plantae, charcoal, A.D. 340 ± 90</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 104</td>
<td>EU1, LV3</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Carbonized remains</td>
<td>Sample $^14$C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 105</td>
<td>TR3, 75 CM BGS</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 106</td>
<td>EU1, LV2</td>
<td>Metal fragment</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Indet. manufacturing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 107</td>
<td>EU1, LV2</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Quartz</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 108</td>
<td>EU1, LV2</td>
<td>Glass fragment</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Indef. glass (insufficient portion), indet. manufacturing, no decoration, green</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 109</td>
<td>EU1, LV2</td>
<td>Glass fragment</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Indef. glass (insufficient portion), indet. manufacturing, amber</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19 — Artifact summary for Wright's investigations (SEAC-1059, MOCR-32).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalog #</th>
<th>Provenience</th>
<th>Object Name</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Description Category</th>
<th>Qty.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 42</td>
<td>BKD, W Bank Area, E Wing Crib Tr</td>
<td>Metal fragment</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machined</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 44</td>
<td>BKD, W Bank Area, E Wing Crib Tr</td>
<td>Debitage</td>
<td>Quartz</td>
<td>Chipped stone, noncortical</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 45</td>
<td>BKD, E Bank Area, E Wing Crib Tr</td>
<td>Bolt</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machined</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 46</td>
<td>BKD, E Bank Area, E Wing Crib Tr</td>
<td>Vessel fragment</td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Earthenware, refined, whiteware, blue shell edged whiteware, fired, molded, glazed, A.D. 1830–1860</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 47</td>
<td>BKD, E Bank Area</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Hand-wrought nail, hand headed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 48</td>
<td>BKD, E Bank Area</td>
<td>Concrete fragment</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 49</td>
<td>BKD, E Bank Area</td>
<td>Metal fragment</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Indet. manufacturing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCR 50</td>
<td>BKD, E Bank Area</td>
<td>Spike</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Machine cut nail</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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