

This brief notice is not only to correct an unintentional mistake, but to point to the necessity for careful examination of animal bones in archaeological deposits.

EDGAR B. HOWARD
University Museum,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

SURVEY METHODS

Apropos of Mr. Robbins' letter on survey methods, the Van Epps-Hartley Chapter has used an exactly similar method of designating sites, in its survey of this area. Our method was upset recently by the adoption by the New York State Planning Board of an official number system for New York State topographic quadrangles, differing from that which we had been using, and which was the seemingly more logical system used by Mr. Robbins, by the Gila Pueblo, and by a number of other surveys. Since it *is* an official system, we will use it, but it might be well for others who are contemplating such work to check with their state boards before making an extensive survey according to some system of their own, no matter how good it may be. For the benefit of outsiders who will later refer to their data, it is advantageous to reduce the number of different systems to a minimum. On the other hand, where there are no official state systems, it is of distinct advantage to make use of a system which has been generally adopted by workers in other states and which might eventually be made uniform for nation-wide site surveys under the aegis of some such group as the *Society for American Archeology*. The system which Mr. Robbins describes, which we formerly used, and which is on the whole the most logical simple system which is generally applicable, meets these conditions admirably. The Society could well advocate the general use of this scheme, or some modification of it, in reducing survey data throughout the country to a common basis.

P. SCHUYLER MILLER
Secretary-Treasurer
Van Epps-Hartley Chapter
N.Y.S. Archeological Association

SHOULD WE DAMN THE PRESS?

There are those who would abbreviate this title.

Some years ago a companion and I drove to Florida to investigate a report which had reached us concerning a burial mound the contents of which had been exposed by a Gulf storm. Our automobile had been left for safe keeping at the police station in Pensacola and our belated return had caused some anxiety on the part of the chief; in fact, newspaper headlines had already proclaimed, "Scientists Feared Missing." The news of our return soon reached the press

office. Fatigued from a rough journey over water, we were somewhat indisposed when the reporter arrived. A great scoop on the front page met our withering gaze the following morning. The most lurid press account of King Tut's tomb was like the description of a grave in the potter's field in comparison to that of our discoveries! Fearing that foul play might befall us and our treasures, consisting of a few skeletons, pots and potsherds, we pulled down our hats and sped out of town.

The reader will doubtless recall one of the most flagrant examples of press sensationalism which occurred a few years ago when the unwary owner of an excavated prehistoric village gave free rein to several reporters whose reputations for bombast are second to none. The press throughout the country fairly shrieked with archaeological absurdities. Prehistorians took up arms and so did the scientific periodicals. Being well acquainted with this man, I discussed the situation with him. The admission was made that he did desire publicity, but it was plain to see that the whole thing had gotten beyond his control and that a mole hill had turned into a mountain. At the peak of the conflagration, an eastern newspaper syndicate made him a \$10,000 offer for his cooperation in dragging the controversy into the limelight. Fortunately he avoided the snare. His enterprize prospers today and archaeology escaped a stinging stench which would have touched the heavens.

Mindful of such considerations, many investigators feel that a let-alone policy toward the press is highly advisable. Then, too, there are those who seek an audience only from the direction of their colleagues. Perhaps the practicability of this policy ought to be questioned on the basis that public money supports their researches, and builds and maintains the museums and other institutions which employ them. It might also be asked whether there exists a director or curator of a museum these days who is not gravely concerned over the lack of interest in archaeological exhibits which is being shown by the average museum visitor. Perhaps the lack of this interest may be due to the prehistorian's failure to awaken the consciousness of the public through the medium of the press to the significance of his findings which are so painstakingly arranged in museum cases.

Let us examine a few more of these sanguine abortions of the press before we take up the matter of therapeutics. During an extensive investigation in Tennessee in 1934, with which I was connected, an Associated Press reporter came to me for information. Having been cautioned by my chief to ignore all reporters, I referred the man to him. Apparently, however, the reporter had been instructed to complete his assignment that day and so proceeded to make his own observations. The article which appeared the following day consisted largely of quoted statements for which, it was alleged, I was responsible. If the article contained a true statement at all, it was a mere coincidence. My chief contacted me over the long distance telephone to inform me that he had just read the article and sincerely regretted my being a party to such atrocious statements. Several days later the same sheet carried another article in which my

chief was erroneously awarded the responsibility for statements, compared to which those cited in the previous article were empty nonentities. My exoneration was quite complete.

When a reporter receives an assignment and fails, he faces the danger of losing his job. We are not concerned with that contingency, but we ought to be concerned with what might result from the pressure of circumstances. Either a flat refusal to release any information whatsoever or failure to supply adequate information nearly always results in the type of article which leaves the public in considerable doubt as to any justification for archaeological research. Controlled popularization can produce highly desirable results. It offers an avenue through which the pot-hunter and the public in general may acquire a greater appreciation of prehistory; it can encourage school children to search for village sites and gather surface collections; it can cause numerous individuals to submit reports concerning archaeological evidence encountered to the institution sponsoring the articles and, finally, much can undoubtedly be accomplished by way of arousing a greater appreciation for the meaningless objects displayed in museum cases.

There is much advantage to be gained by calling the same reporter whenever a release is to be made. In his eagerness to obtain further releases, he will hold his imagination under control. There should always be a definite agreement that the final article be submitted for the informant's approval before it goes to press. Obviously, any information or photographs which are apt to incite the looting of graves by curious individuals should not be included.

T. M. N. LEWIS
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

FORMER INDIAN SITES IN MARYLAND, AS LOCATED BY EARLY COLONIAL RECORDS

Dr. D. S. Davidson's interesting article in *AMERICAN ANTIQUITY*, Volume I, No. 2, has encouraged me to submit certain references pertaining to the Indians of Maryland which have come to my attention. Concerning the Conoy Indians (Piscattaways) Mr. Davidson says (p. 85): "For the Conoy of Maryland . . . there seem to be no direct accounts of treatment of the dead."

Searching for evidence on this subject is indeed like looking for the proverbial needle in a haystack. A solitary record is the reward of long research. In the month of August, 1678, Nicotagsen, then Emperor of Piscattaway, together with the "speaker" of that people and other Indian notables, presented himself to Lord Baltimore's Council, then in session, on a matter of business. When questioned as to why some of their chiefs absented themselves from this meeting, the Piscattaways offered the following excuse: "Most of their great men