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The Great Depression was a time of extreme poverty for many Pennsylvanians. Individuals had to cope with the economic and cultural stress associated with the worst economic depression in American history. Archaeology can contribute to the understanding of these times by highlighting parts of the Great Depression that are often overlooked by popular history. This research focuses on understanding the buying strategies of individuals enrolled in the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). To understand how consumer behavior changed in the Great Depression, and the economic influence of enlistment in the CCC, excavations were carried out at a CCC camp in the Allegheny National Forest. The results of these excavations were then synthesized with the results from excavations at two other CCC camps, two Depression-era domestic sites, and two pre-Depression era domestic sites. By comparing consumer behavior at these sites, it is possible to show the effect that the CCC provided to its enrollees compared to the general population that was not receiving federal relief. The outcome of the synthesis is an in-depth understanding of buying strategies in the 1930s and the affect that the Great Depression had on them.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Overview

This thesis examines the consumer behavior of enrollees at a Civilian Conservation Corps camp in Northwestern Pennsylvania during the Great Depression. The CCC was part of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s famous New Deal (Schlesinger 1940:9). This program was designed to employ young men, so they could support their families during the Great Depression (Hillstorm 2009:56).

This research focuses on understanding the consumer choices and specifically the buying strategies of the men who worked at ANF-1, the official name of the CCC camp located in Duhring, Pennsylvania from 1933 to 1942. The Great Depression was a crucial time in the history of the United States of America and the Civilian Conservation Corps was an important factor during this period (Badger 1989:191). It became an economic lifeline to millions of men and their families (Maher 2005:52). By understanding how these men lived and how they chose to spend their money it is possible to understand their hopes, desires, and convictions (Caratzas 2008:58). Using the archaeological and documentary records of the enrollees at ANF-1, two other CCC camps, two Depression era domestic sites, and two pre-Depression era domestic sites, it is possible to see the underlying buying strategies of these individuals, an important aspect of 20th century culture.

This synthesis of data will show what buying strategies were utilized by the men enrolled in unemployment camps and how the Great Depression influenced these buying strategies. A specific sector of consumption, discretionary spending, will be the focus of this analysis. By isolating this specific sector of consumption, it will be possible to determine if individuals sacrificed discretionary purchases in order to maintain essential purchases, or if they relied on
already established buying strategies. The different scales of comparison employed in this research all for various aspects of the decisions made by individuals during the Great Depression to be illuminated. Finally, this study seeks to understand what motivated individuals to consume discretionary goods.

**Research Objectives**

To guide this investigation a series of research objectives have been formulated. Using consumer behavior theory these research objectives attempt to understand the economic decisions made by the enrollees in the CCC (Henry 1991). These questions will be answered through an analysis of the archaeological assemblage generated by excavations at ANF-1 and then compared with data from two other CCC camps. To better understand the results, they will be compared with the other sites outlined above.

**Objective 1:** To investigate how the economic hardships of the Great Depression influenced American culture through the items that were purchased, consumed, and discarded by individuals during the Great Depression.

The Great Depression was a time of devastating poverty (Bernstein 1989:33). Mass unemployment and lack of economic opportunity affected millions of people (Garson and Kidd 1999:1). Groups such as the Communist Party and the Socialist Party of America were challenging the very fabric of American culture (Coode and Bauman 1981:63). The cultural and economic stress associated with the Great Depression influenced the many minute choices that go into an individual’s decision to buy something and in turn, the results of the consumer choices can be seen in the archaeological record. Did individuals spend what little they had on the basic necessities of life, and reduce their spending on goods that did not directly contribute to their survival? Did individuals use a “mindset of thrift” (St. Denis 2002:116)? This study attempts to answer these questions. The Great Depression was a time of change, and people had to alter their
normal habits to accommodate the economic downturn that was plaguing the nation (Himmelberg 2001:5). This condition would contrast with pre-Depression consumer decisions. The 1920s were a time of economic prosperity when the American economy was booming (Watkins 1993:24). Assemblages from pre-Depression deposits should show higher rates of consumption compared to sites from the Great Depression. This difference should be noticeable in comparisons of artifact assemblages from pre-Depression contexts and Depression contexts.

In order to address this research objective, a series of hypotheses will be tested. The answers to these smaller questions will contribute to our understanding of how the Great Depression influenced consumer choice. By identifying non-essential and essential spending, it will be possible analyze the affects of the economic and cultural stress associated with the Great Depression.

**Research Objective 2: To investigate how individuals decreased their participation in discretionary spending, due to the economic downturn associated with the Great Depression.**

This research objective differs from the first one, in that it isolates a specific sector of consumer behavior, discretionary spending. In this study discretionary spending is defined as any nonessential spending – the purchase, consumption, and deposition of goods that are not needed for survival. Based on the specific context of the goods, these items could range from porcelain dinnerware, to alcohol. Understanding the economic and social context of the goods is important in identifying them. A full description of the characteristics of discretionary goods can be found in Chapter 4. This sector of consumption will be used to compare Great Depression sites as well as sites from before the Great Depression. CCC camps represent a good laboratory to understand discretionary spending. Once an individual enlisted in the CCC, they were provided with clothing, shelter, and food so that isolating discretionary spending at CCC camps is relatively
easy since the men were supplied with all the necessities they needed (Watkins 1989:130). They were also given a monthly salary in exchange for their work (Pasquill 2005:14). By understanding how they spent their salary, it will be possible to understand their buying strategies. Once their strategies have been established, it will be possible to compare how discretionary spending varied between the different CCC camps, how it varied between CCC camps and regular residences during the Great Depression, and finally how it varied during the Great Depression and domestic residences inhabited before the Depression.

_Hypotheses._

In order to gain an understanding sought in the above research objectives, a series of specific hypotheses will be tested. In comparing ANF-1’s assemblage to two other CCC camps, the following hypothesis will be tested - _The same level of discretionary spending was taking place at ANF-1 as at the other CCC camps_. This hypothesis will be supported if the artifact assemblage from ANF-1 shows similar levels of discretionary spending when compared to the artifact assemblages from the other two CCC camps. This hypothesis will be refuted if a wide range of discretionary spending is found to have taken place at the three CCC camps. It is believed that a similar amount of discretionary spending was taking place at all the CCC camps in this study because of the similar conditions in the camps. CCC camps were run by the U. S. Army as they had experience in dealing with a large number of men, and would be able to manage the camps efficiently (Speakman 2006:23). Each enrollee at all three camps was paid the same amount of money and given the same basic necessities. It is plausible to hypothesize that discretionary spending was be similar at all three camps as well.

In the comparison of the CCC camps to the two Great Depression domestic sites, the hypothesis, _discretionary spending was higher at the CCC camps than at the domestic sites in_
the same period, will be tested. This hypothesis will be supported if the levels of discretionary spending at the CCC camps are higher than those found at the two Great Depression domestic sites. This hypothesis will be refuted if it is found that the levels of discretionary spending is equal to the CCC camps or higher at the two Great Depression domestic sites. Enrollees at the CCC camps were furnished with all the basic necessities while the individuals living at the domestic sites were forced to purchase everything they needed, and would likely have had less to spend on nonessential items.

The next relationship to be analyzed will be between the three CCC camps and the two sites that date to pre-Depression times. The hypothesis, discretionary spending was lower at the CCC Camps than at pre-Depression sites, will be tested. The hypothesis will be supported if it is found that the two pre-Depression sites have a higher percent of discretionary spending than the CCC camps. The hypothesis will be refuted if it is found that the CCC camps have a higher or equal percent of discretionary spending compared to the pre-Depression sites. This hypothesis is based on the assumption that the economic and cultural stress associated with the Great Depression reduced the levels of discretionary spending even in environments where basic needs were provided.

After this comparison is complete, the hypothesis, discretionary spending decreased in domestic contexts in the 1930s compared to sites from before the Depression, will be tested. This hypothesis will be supported if it is found that discretionary spending was higher at the pre-Depression residential sites than the Depression era residential sites. This hypothesis will be refuted if it is found that the depression era residential sites had an equal or higher percentage of discretionary spending than residential sites dating to the pre-Depression era. People in the 1930s were either unable to or did not want to participate in the levels of discretionary spending that
took place in the early 20th century. This hypothesis was tested to determine the effect of the Great Depression on individuals who were not receiving federal relief.

Finally, the amount of variance between Depression era sites (CCC and domestic), and pre-Depression era sites will be compared. Comparing how discretionary spending varied between CCC contexts and pre-Depression contexts, and between residential Depression contexts and pre-Depression contexts, will allow for general conclusions about the consumer decisions made during the Great Depression. The hypothesis, *discretionary spending decreased in the Great Depression regardless of actual economic pressure* will be tested. This hypothesis has been formulated based on the assumption that individuals in the Great Depression were either forced to or chose to take on a mindset of thrift. A mindset of thrift is a moment of reflection before deciding to purchase an item. It is a moment in which the individual may ask, “Do I really need this?” (St. Denis 2002:116). The decrease in discretionary spending in normal domestic sites may be tied to economic hardship, but a decrease in discretionary spending in government camps where necessities are provided in addition to a salary can be attributed to an adoption of this mindset of thrift. The thrift mindset would restrict the consumer in discretionary spending due to the hard economic times that were taking place in America. Even in contexts where the basic necessities of life were provided, and the individual had the ability to participate in discretionary spending, they restricted themselves due to the general economic and cultural stress of the times.

**Organization of Study**

The following chapter, Chapter 2, provides the historical framework of the CCC and the Great Depression. The era is examined with special attention focused on the CCC, and how the agency operated. Camp ANF-1 is examined; the physical layout of the camp, information
regarding the enrollees at ANF-1, and how the camp fit into the larger context of the Allegheny National Forest are discussed. The chapter will conclude with a survey of the archaeological context of Great Depression sites and CCC camps. This chapter will provide a frame of reference for the excavations at ANF-1 as well as the other Great Depression sites.

Chapter 3 discusses consumer studies and the development of consumer choice theory in Historical Archaeology. This chapter will also discuss the application of consumption theory to the data generated by this study.

Chapter 4 details the methodology used to collect and analyze the data. The excavation methods will be presented along with the sampling strategy that was used at ANF-1. A detailed discussion of data analysis is also presented. The documentary research completed to inform the archaeological record is summarized as well as the different methodologies used. Finally, the methods used to determine discretionary spending, as well as the comparison of the different sites, will be discussed in detail.

Chapter 5 presents the results of the excavation at ANF-1 and the analysis of the artifacts recovered. The documentary research will be applied to the artifact assemblage to provide a detailed view of the discretionary spending at ANF-1. Finally, the level of discretionary spending will be determined based on the artifact and documentary records from the camp.

Chapter 6 presents the two other CCC camps that will be used for comparison, the two Great Depression domestic sites, and the two pre-Depression domestic sites. The historic use of each of these sites, the excavation history, and the artifact assemblage will be summarized, as well as the discretionary spending data for each site. This data will then be used to facilitate the testing of the hypotheses in the next chapter.
Chapter 7 uses the data from Chapter 6 to test the five hypotheses outline above. The different levels of comparisons are summarized, focusing on the results and the support or negation of the hypothesis. The data is then used to answer the research questions and confirm or negate the final hypothesis.

Chapter 8 discusses the results from the testing of the five hypotheses and then interprets the data. These interpretations are then used to make conclusions about discretionary spending amongst the enrollees in the CCC. Broader trends that are visible in the data will also be discussed in detail.

Chapter 9 discusses future work regarding CCC camps, Great Depression sites, and consumer choice studies in light of this research.
CHAPTER 2: HISTORICAL CONTEXT

In order to understand the results of this study, it is important to look at the historical context of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) and the Great Depression. A substantial amount of literature discusses the political shifts and economic changes that occurred in this era (Parker 2002, Barnard 1995, Coode and Bauman 1981, Sutton 1975, Fraser and Gerstle 1989). The concerns of this study deal with the major events that took place in America before and during the Great Depression, events like the Stock Market Crash of 1929, the election of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and his New Deal. Understanding these events will be valuable in understanding the times and ultimately the decisions that are represented in the data from ANF-1 and the other sites in this study.

Roots of the Great Depression

President Calvin Coolidge, in his 1928 State of the Union address, claimed that "No Congress of the United States ever assembled, on surveying the state of the Union, has met with a more pleasing prospect than that which appears at the present time" (Galbraith 1955:6). The 1920s were a time of growth and prosperity for the United States (Watkins 1993:24). A year earlier, over five million automobiles were produced; manufacturing alone generated over sixty-eight billion dollars (Galbraith 1955:7). The middle class in America was becoming a dominant force, and many individuals from that class were rising to prominent positions in business and government (Wecter 1948:2).

In 1928, Republican Herbert Hoover successfully beat Democrat Alfred E. Smith in the campaign for the presidency of the United States (Hillstrom 2009:16-17). He ran on the platform that America was close to ending poverty, and unregulated markets and private investors would insure the success of the American way of life (Edsforth 2000:12). However, this ideal and the
American economic system came crashing down, on October 24, 1929, when the New York Stock Exchange started a five-day spiral that caused the disintegration of the American economy (Phillips 2000:31).

Black Thursday, October 24, 1929, was not a random event in the market (Ferguson 1989:3). It was the culmination of many factors, which stemmed from the boom that occurred in the 1920s. On Black Thursday these factors came together and caused the crash (Badger 1989:40-47). However, in many sectors the depression had already started. Industrial sectors such as the coalfields in Western Pennsylvania, and the textile industry in Philadelphia were already spiraling before Black Thursday. In Pennsylvania, the mining industry was already spiraling downward; the bituminous coal fields of southwestern Pennsylvania were barely surviving since the decline in the price of coal after World War I (Coode and Bauman 1988:97). The coal companies were producing over a billion tons of coal and were only selling half that amount. This overproduction left large amounts of coal sitting in piles, and at the same time workers’ hours and wages were being cut to compensate for the overabundance (Coode and Bauman 1981:24). By 1929, the conditions in the coalfields were severe with violence often erupting between coal companies and unions. The Depression had already started for many miners (Badger 1989:19).

On the other side of the state, Philadelphia's textile industry was dealing with a similar problem. Mass immigration to Philadelphia in the 1920s caused a surplus of workers (Badger 1989:25). At the same time, the improved automation of the factories increased production and efficiency (Badger 1989:19). Consequently, falling prices, a surplus of workers, and the increased output associated with modern efficiency resulted in the unemployment of thousands of workers (Coode and Bauman 1981:53).
These two Pennsylvania examples highlight a major economic problem that was taking place elsewhere in the manufacturing sector of the American economy. Investors and executives had faith in the market and in the continued prosperity of the 1920s (Hillstorm 2009:17). They increased production, maintained a large work force, and improved mechanical automation (Badger 1989:29-3). These decisions resulted in increased output. It was only a matter of time until supply outpaced demand for these goods (Watkins 1993:45).

Along with overproduction, the monopolization of industries was evident everywhere in America. One-half of the nonbanking wealth in America was owned by only 200 companies (Philips 2000:16). Instead of increasing wages or turning profit back into their businesses, these companies took this money and invested it in the stock market.

These stock market investments were in the form of speculation (Watkins 1993:39, Badger 1989:32). Speculation occurs when investors buy stocks with money they do not have. For example, the investor would buy the ¼ of the stock with his own money, and he would get the rest from his broker who borrowed it from a bank (Wecter 1948:4). If the stock increased, then everyone made money. If the stock dropped or did not increase fast enough, the interest on the loan would outweigh the profit (Galbraith 1955:24). In the last half the 1920s, this practice expanded rapidly with 8.5 billion dollars associated with loans that were based on speculation (Phillips 2000:26). On Black Thursday, the speculation boom ended. The results were a massive loss of capital and crashing stock prices (Hillstrom 2009:20). The loans, which the banks had given to the investors and the brokerage firms, evaporated. Both investors and brokerage firms were left with nothing (Watkins 1993:40). The stock market crash eliminated 32 billion dollars worth of capital and destroyed the economic system of America (Phillips 2000:32).
The Early Years of the Depression

The early years of the Great Depression were characterized by grinding poverty (Himmelberg 2001:9, McGovern 2000:5-19). Throughout the American economy, every industry was hit with the economic downturn. The response necessitated cutting wages, reducing inventories, laying off the work force, and reducing the number of hours worked (Phillips 2000:34). Unemployment affected the entire society. By 1932, one out of seven people in America was unemployed (Phillips 2000:35). The early years of the depression, between 1930 and 1932, were years of increasing poverty with a complete lack of response from the U.S. Government (Goldston 1968:53).

The federal government under the Hoover administration failed to see the extent and depth of the oncoming depression. Hoover believed that while the stock market had crashed, the fundamentals of the American economy were still in place, and that industries such as manufacturing and distribution would lift America out of the depression (Edsforth 2000:36). This was not the case. Even though the increased production and employment had made these sectors of the economy bulwarks during the 1920s, they were gutted by the mass financial crisis of 1929. Hoover, and Washington in general, believed that depressions were part of the life cycle of capitalistic economies. The federal government could help, but the American people should do all they could to find employment (Warren 1959:114). Hoover was cautious to avoid any direct federal involvement. He believed that the problem of unemployment was a local problem, and it should be taken care of at the local level. Any major federal government intrusions into this sphere of life would be a step toward socialism, and Hoover was unwilling to have his administration identified as socialists (Phillips 2000:44). He focused his resources and time on large economic structures such as the banking system and the heavy industrial sector.
(Himmelberg 2001:35). He left the unemployed masses in the hands of the cash-strapped states and local governments.

Meanwhile, conditions were starting to worsen for the common person (Ferguson 1989:3). Individuals were forced to take drastic measures to survive. Institutions like the Communist Party, The Socialist Party of America, and the American Federation of Labor started to find support in urban centers, which catered to all levels of society (Coode and Bauman 1981:63). Food started to become scarce, and fuel necessary for winter survival was a large problem (Hillstrom 2009:29). Many men were out of work and the urban centers were filled with the unemployed (Phillips 2000:35). The Depression had not reached its climax, and conditions were worsening. Something needed to be done. The turning point of this era came with the election of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1932.

Roosevelt and the New Deal

In 1932, Franklin Delano Roosevelt (FDR) beat the incumbent Herbert Hoover in a decisive victory with 57.4% of the popular vote (Watins 1993:113). FDR won major victories throughout the nation, winning every state west of the Mississippi and key states in the South and the Northeast (Edsforth 2000:71). The nation decidedly believed that FDR would do what Hoover could not accomplish, and he would get the country out of the depression.

The two men had very different views on how to lessen the depression (Goldston 1968:87, Edsforth 2000:54-58). Hoover believed that the country was on the road to recovery, and financial conservatism was the best way to ensure economic recovery. The Great Depression, according to Hoover, was a natural event associated with the rise and fall of capitalistic economies. Roosevelt, on the other hand, believed that the Great Depression was the result of specific factors, and only an intense federal government response would lessen the
Depression and lead the country back to prosperity (Ferguson 1989:3). His victory in November of 1932 showed that the American people shared his opinion.

FDR's victory gave the Democratic Party strength throughout the country. The era to follow would revitalize the Democratic Party and realign the country behind it (Coode and Bauman 1981:109). With FDR's victory, Democrats gained control of the House and the Senate as well as the presidency (Edsforth 2000:1972). The Democratic monopoly allowed FDR to push through a substantial amount of legislation that expanded the power of the federal government, created different federal agencies to deal with unemployment and social unrest, and dealt with industries such as agriculture that had been ignored by Hoover (Hillstrom 2009:45). FDR promised a "New Deal" for the country with his election, and this involved radical reorganization. While the New Deal was greatly beneficial and helped to bring America out of the Great Depression, many groups of Americans did not know what to expect. This uneasiness was evident in the financial panic that accompanied the first few months of 1933 (Warren 1959:270). On Saturday, March 4, 1933, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt was inaugurated, and his famous "Hundred Days" began.

Within hours of taking the office, FDR called a bank holiday and shut down every financial institution in the nation (Badger 1989:70). FDR also called for a special session of Congress and initiated a dozen taskforces to create a legislative package that is unparalleled to this day (Phillips 2000:106). The months leading up to FDR’s inauguration were characterized by a surge in bank failures. The bank holiday allowed FDR to create legislation that would allow the federal government to swiftly close banks that were on the brink of failure, and reopen banks after the financial holiday that were thought to be more stable (Himmelberg 2001:39). These actions created public confidence in the American banking system. Eight days after taking office,
FDR, with the help of congress, repealed prohibition (Edsforth 2000:137). On March 21, 1933, FDR asked Congress to pass a piece of legislation, Bill 598 (Speakmen 2006:1). He asked Congress to create the Civilian Conservation Corps. FDR told Congress, "It will conserve our precious natural resources... [and] make improvements in national and state domains. We can eliminate the threat that enforced idleness brings to spiritual and moral stability." (quoted in Edsforth 2000:137). Congress approved the bill 10 days later and formed the CCC.

**The Civilian Conservation Corps**

The goal of the Civilian Conservation Corps was to put young men back to work. The CCC was built around three ideals: relief, recovery, and reform (Speakmen 2006:1). These ideals guided the CCC and its work. Furthermore, between the late 19th century and the early 20th century, the American landscape had been devastated. Increased industrialization with significant resource extraction had taken place. The methods used during this period left the landscape and the environment shattered. Mass deforestation by the lumber industry had resulted in heavy soil erosion. Over a billion tons of prime soil eroded away each year. By 1934, more than a sixth of the continent was without topsoil (Salmond 1967:4). FDR saw this as an opportunity to provide relief, recovery, and reform for not only the unemployed and the economy but for the landscape as well.

**Organization of the CCC**

Bill 598, or the bill for *The Relief of Unemployment Through the Performance of Useful Public Work and for other Purposes* detailed the structure of the Civilian Conservation Corps (Salmond 1967:13). Four federal departments; the Department of Labor, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior and the Army, were in charge of the CCC and each controlled a different part of the organization (Hillstrom 2009:54).
The Department of Labor was responsible for recruiting the young men (Merrill 1983:vii). To be enrolled in the CCC, the individual had to be between the ages of 18 and 25, single, and unemployed with neither parent employed (Speakman 2006:26). Four categories of people were hired for the CCC: Juniors, local experienced men, World War I veterans, and Native Americans (Williams 2008). The Juniors were the basic enrollees, and they ranged between the ages of 18 to 25 (Pasquill 2005:14). They were usually signed on for a six-month enlistment with the possibility for extension (Williams 2008). Local experienced men or LEMs were hired to provide leadership of the work projects. They could be of any age, and they did not have to live at the camp. They usually had a background in forestry or other outdoor work such as masonry (Pasquill 2005:14). World War I veterans were allowed to enter due to the lack of federal recognition of their benefits under the Hoover Administration (Watins 1993:130). They were given their own camps and were assigned easier workloads due to their health and age (Salmond 1967:36). Soon after the establishment of the CCC, provisions were extended to employ Native Americans. Few camps were established for Native Americans because the CCC allowed them to enlist even if they were married; therefore, they could stay at home (Salmond 1967:32). Native Americans were selected for enrollment by the Office of Indian Affairs and the local tribal council. Those who were selected were given greater freedom, as it was hoped that the experience would be a lesson in self-governance (Salmond 1967:32).

The second federal department involved with the CCC was the U.S. Army (Hillstrom 2009:54). They were given the task of providing the CCC with supplies and other logistics as well as managing the camps (Williams 2008). The army divided the country into districts (Pasquill 2005:15). Each district was assigned a chain of command with an army general at the top (Salmond 1967:84). Every camp had officers from the army who were in charge of running
the camp and making sure the men were ready to work. The camps ran like a military installations (Holland and Hill 1974:37-42). Each man was given a work and dress uniform, and military cleanliness was enforced (Speakman 2006:42). The men were not required to salute their officers, but overall the camps were run in military fashion. Early on, the enrollees were required to attend a two-week training session at a military base to become familiar with military discipline and regimented life (Pasquill 2005:14). This time was spent marching in uniform and doing light tasks around the base but due to the high volume of enrollees the training was eventually phased out (Speakman 2006:29).

The Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior were responsible for providing work for the enrollees (Merrill 1981:vii). The Department of Agriculture was responsible for the work in the national forests, state lands, and private lands. The Department of the Interior was accountable for the work that was done in the state, county, and national parks (Otis et al. 1986:16). Work projects for the CCC were divided into 10 different categories: structural improvement, transportation, erosion control, flood control, forest culture, forest protection, landscape and recreation, range, wildlife, and miscellaneous (Merrill 1981:9). Depending on the specific context of the work project, these 10 categories could take on different meanings. Hence, work done in the Northeast for forest protection would be different from the work done in the Southwest due to the difference in the environment, and the forests.

The goals of the CCC program was to put men to work and to stimulate the economy. Roosevelt realized that the economy could not rejuvenate itself without direct federal intervention (Edsforth 2000:54-58). The problem revolved around the consumer. Individuals did not have the money to buy goods, and since they could not buy goods, manufacturers had to stop producing, which led to unemployment (Speakman 2006:15). The entire system was broken.
Through the CCC and other measures Roosevelt aimed to correct this cycle by providing people with capital (Williams 2008a, Speakmen 2006:15). The basic Junior enrollee was paid a dollar a day, and from his monthly pay 22 to 25 dollars were sent home to the enrollee's family (Merrill 1983:11). This system gave the enrollee capital and allowed them and their families to consume more goods, thus alleviating the problem of under consumption amongst Americans.

On April 5, 1933, FDR signed Executive Order 6101, which established the Emergency Conservation Work Program or the CCC (Williams 2008). The first camp to be created in the nation was located in the George Washington National Forest in Virginia, and the second camp was created in the Allegheny National Forest (ANF) near Duhring, Pennsylvania (Williams 2008b, Speakman 2006:38). By midsummer of 1933, enrollment in the CCC program reached 275,000 in 50 camps across the nation (Speakman 2006:31). This was 25,000 over FDR's projected enrollment (Williams 2008).

Organization of the Camps

The first enrollees at the early camps found neat rows of canvas tents awaiting them, but this offered little protection against the environment (Salmond 1967:135). However, this housing was only temporary, as permanent structures were soon built to accommodate the men (Barnes 1991:11). The number and the size of the buildings in a camp depended on the state in which the camp was located, the type of work to be performed, and the amount of work that needed to be done. Once the location of the camp was selected, it was up to the U.S. Army to build and furnish the camp. This was accomplished through a standard building protocol based on designs created for World War I (Butler 2006:3). The Construction Division of the Quartermasters Corps redeveloped World War I barrack plans to suit the needs of the CCC (Barnes 1991:11). Camps were usually arranged in a U shape with the barracks and other buildings surrounding an open parade ground. Camps were built to house 200 enrollees and associated support staff, and they
usually included the barracks, a recreation hall, garage, equipment maintenance building, infirmary, administrative buildings, officers' quarters, a mess hall, a lavatory, a blacksmith shop, an educational building, and utility buildings such as a generator house or oil houses (Butler 2006:4). Not all of these buildings were built at each camp. In some camps, the same buildings were used for multiple purposes such as combing the officer's quarters with the administration building. The main buildings were usually 100 ft by 24 ft with board and batten walls and a single long gable roof (Merrill 1981:16). Entrances were usually located on the ends and in the middle of the buildings. Living conditions in the barracks were relatively plain with each man receiving a simple cot and some bedding and blankets as well as a storage trunk (Merrill 1981:12).

In 1935, the army started to create prefabricated buildings to be sent to the camps (Merrill 1981:16). Originally, the buildings were constructed out of whatever material was available at the site and were relatively permanent. The CCC administration, however, saw a problem with this construction, especially in the western United States. Often work projects would last for only a year or two, and then a new project would start miles away. The camp would have to be reconstructed again at the new location, and the old camp was left to decay or fall in to private hands. After 1935, the use of prefabricated buildings allowed for easier dismantling and transporting (Salmond 1967:136). For shorter projects, of a half a year or less, side camps were created to house the men close to the work site. These camps were usually made up of pyramidal tents with wood supports, and walled tents made to house the administrative duties (Butler 2006:4). The impermanence of the job mandated the type of camp built so when the job was over, the camp could be removed without any lasting trace on the landscape.
Daily Life in the CCC

The average day for the enrollees in the CCC was guided by military policy and procedure. Regardless of the work or the location of the camp, the daily work schedule remained the same. At 6 a.m., enrollees woke up and prepared for the day. They were expected to be dressed and ready for physical training and then breakfast. Enrollees were issued two sets of clothes. The first was a denim work suit, and the other was an olive drab dress uniform. FDR, unhappy with the shoddy uniforms that were left over from World War I, had new spruce green uniforms commissioned in 1938 for CCC enrollees (Salmond 1967:137). Breakfast consisted of relatively plain but nourishing food such as stewed prunes, cereal, ham, eggs, coffee, and milk (Salmond 1967:138). The enrollees had to assemble by 7:45 a.m. for roll call, and by 8 a.m., they were on their way to the work sites.

Work was based around the 10 categories of jobs listed above and varied based on location and need. Tree planting was a major activity undertaken by the CCC, as well as the construction of recreation facilities in the nation’s parks and forests (Williams 2008). The enrollees laid telephone wire, fought forest fires, built roads and trails, built erosion control check dams, planted grasses to reduce erosion, removed invasive species, and conducted forest pest control (Williams 2008b). The men would work until noon and were then served lunch at the work site (Speakman 2006:42). Lunch often consisted of sandwiches, pie, and coffee, but it could include a prepared hot meal such as stew. Lunchtime lasted an hour, and then work commenced until 4 p.m. Supper was served from 5 to 5:30 p.m., so the enrollees had free time to do as they pleased until then. After supper, the men were encouraged to take part in athletic programs or education classes (Merrill 1981:11).

The educational program was a major component for the CCC, and it was very successful (Holland and Hill 1974:164). FDR designed the CCC program so that it would provide economic
relief, as well as instruct the enrolled youth in rational conservation polices and reform the moral health of the generation (Speakman 2006:1). This was accomplished through a combination of military discipline, educational classes, and reading material. Courses were usually taught in the education building or the recreational hall and included reading, writing, math, geology, astronomy, radio operating, clerk-typing, forestry, surveying, carpentry, woodworking, masonry, welding, auto repair, cooking, baking, and shoe repair (Williams 2008). These classes were designed to provide education as well as vocational skills to the enrollees, so that once their enlistment was up, they could find work or continue with their education. Most camps also had a library. All the books in the library were chosen by the camp officials and were limited to popular fiction or books and magazines that were conservative in nature (Holland and Hill 1974:155). They were often restricted so the enrollee had to ask for the book by title or author. This program came under great criticism (Salmond 1967:140). However, many of the vocational skills gained by the men of the CCC were instrumental in World War II.

The moral reforming that the CCC intended to do was not as successful as the planners had hoped. Gambling was a major problem with some men losing all of their money before the end of the month (Speakman 2006:114). Cards and dice were usually the favorite form of vice, but promiscuity with the local girls and drinking were also present at the camps (Holland and Hills 1974:215). Venereal diseases were found to be present in 18.3% of the men (Speakman 2006:114). Regarding matters of gambling, sexual behavior, and alcohol abuse, the Council of Education surveyed 419 enrollees, and found "the majority of CCC enrollees might almost be described as immoral" (Speakman 2006:114).

At 10 p.m. taps was played, and the lights were turned off. The camp officer usually walked through the barracks at 11 p.m. to make sure every enrollee was in his bed, and then he
retired to repeat the process again the next day. Enrollees usually worked Monday through Friday unless the weather was too bad. In those cases, they would make up the time on the weekends. During the weekends, the men were not required to work and could do as they pleased. However, they were required to assemble on Saturday mornings, participate in roll call, and do general camp maintenance (Schultz 2000). The rest of the weekend was free. Sports were always popular, and the camps often competed against each other in such games as baseball, boxing, football, or basketball. The more permanent camps usually produced a camp newspaper, which included news and events as well as sports info, camp gossip, and jokes (Salmond 1967:142). The camps occasionally had dances, and an enrollee could bring a local girl for a night of dancing. These were usually much anticipated events. The men were free to attend a religious service offered by the camp chaplain on Sunday mornings or leave the camp for the weekend to return home or see sights in the local area.

African Americans and the CCC

Like most of America at this time, the CCC was segregated. African Americans and whites had different camps. Even though the legal wording of the CCC founding act claimed that "...no discrimination shall be made on account of race, color, or creed", African Americans were often treated unfairly (Salmond 1967:88). While the CCC was supposed to help the African American community, racial prejudices at the time often limited the impact of the organization (Edsforth 2000:138). Things were especially bad in the South. Selection agents refused to consider African Americans, and southern planters worried about their loss of cheap labor to the New Deal programs (Salmond 1967:880).

African American CCC camps were frequently the stage for the manifestation of the prejudices of the times. African Americans were never allowed to have a higher rank than Mess Sergeant until many years later, and even then the War Department referred to these promotions
as experimental (Schultz 2000). State and local officials often complained when an African American camp was too close to a town, but African American enrollees had little interaction with the local population (Salmond 1967:93). Conditions in the African American camps were not good, and to this day, there is little involvement in the CCC alumni program by African American enrollees (Charles Varro, past president of the CCC Alumni association – Personal Communication 2010).

Although African Americans were treated badly between 1933 and 1936, conditions improved after 1936. African American voters were instrumental in electing Democratic candidates in northern cities. Enrollment in the camps jumped from less than 6% to around 11%, and by the 1940s, camps were starting to be desegregated (Edsforth 2000:138). In total, the CCC had around 450 African American camps and employed around 300,000 African American's throughout the country.

*Growth and Success of the CCC*

The success of the Civilian Conservation Corps was evident by the large number of enrollees and the amount of relief the program provided to these men and their families. In total, the CCC cost $2.969 billion and the average enrollee earned around $3,000 (Williams 2008). The CCC enrolled 3,463,766 men from every state in America, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands (Cohen 1960). A total of 4,500 camps were created during the CCC era, which lasted from 1933 to 1942 (Otis et al. 1986:196). These camps completed a massive conservation effort that strung 89,000 miles of telephone line, built 125,000 miles of road, protected 40 million acres of farmland from erosion, protected 154 million square yards of stream and lake bank, developed 800 state parks, stocked 972 million fish, built 52,000 acres of campgrounds, restored 3,980 historic buildings, planted between 2 and 3 billion trees, spent more than 6 million man days fighting forest fires, constructed 10,231 fire lookout towers, and built 57,424 bridges (Williams
2008, Cohen 1960). It is estimated that the work the CCC accomplished would cost 26 billion dollars today (Cohen 1960).

The CCC also benefited the men who were enrolled. The average enrollee at the time of acceptance into the CCC weighed 147 lbs, and was 5 ft 8 inches tall. This was considered to be underweight and below average for height (Salmond 1967:135). Within the first three months of service, the average enrollee gained 11.5 pounds.

**End of the CCC**

In the final years of the CCC, the organization undertook a massive realignment. Instead of trying to provide relief to the environment and to the unemployed, the organization started to look toward national defense (Williams 2008). In 1939, World War II started in Europe, and war for America seemed inevitable. America did not get involved until 1941, but FDR and other leaders in Washington foresaw the upcoming conflict and started to ready the nation for war. America was starting to recover from the Great Depression; employment was rising, and the military was expanding its recruiting operations (Speakman 2006:153). The CCC faced an identity crisis (Salmond 1967:208). How should an organization whose aim was to provide economic relief during the depression deal with a rising economy?

Starting in 1936, the enrollees and administrators lobbied for the CCC to become permanent (Salmond 1967:145). All signs were favoring this move; the organization enjoyed incredible public support, and the relief it provided was credited for helping millions of people through the Great Depression (Otis et al. 1986:24). The Department of the Interior and the Department of the Agriculture predicted that the workload was large enough to justify the CCC becoming a permanent conservation agency. However, the move was blocked by the House of Representatives (Salmond 1967:160). The majority of Representatives believed that by making
the CCC permanent the government would be surrendering to unemployment and making a move toward socialism.

The period between 1937 and 1939 was one of consolidation for the CCC. The organization came under political fire, and funding was cut (Speakman 1967:154-5). Conflicts between the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Agriculture with the army led to chaos in the administrative structure of the CCC. Coupled with the expanding economy, the CCC's time was ending.

On June 5, 1942 the House of Representatives voted not to continue the CCC, but they did appropriate funds for its liquidation (Salmond 1967:216). There were many motives behind this vote. Primarily, the economic and social problems of 1933 no longer existed (Speakman 2006:153). Secondly, the CCC was an organization that was directed toward young men, and these men were needed for the war effort (Otis et al. 1985:24). The Great Depression was essentially over and America was entering a new period; a period of war and progress that was built on the foundation that FDR created through his New Deal.

The CCC was a vital part of this foundation. It employed millions and was a beacon of hope during one of the darkest times in American history. The modern environment in America is a direct result of the millions of man-hours the CCC dedicated to conservation work and stabilization. Many of the individuals who served in the CCC went on to defend the nation they worked so hard to preserve (Speakman 2006:162). In an address to the Citadel Military Academy, General Mark Clark stated that the CCC "...and the National Guard and Reserve Units became the linchpin of our frenzied mobilization. Because of them... our Government was able to bridge a time gap that otherwise could have been disastrous." (1980). General Clark was
referring to the leadership, training, and military discipline that the CCC instilled in its enrollees who would become soldiers in World War II.

**ANF-1**

The CCC camp near Duhring, Pennsylvania was an important part of the network of camps across the country. By understanding the history of the camp and the work done by the enrollees at ANF-1, it will be possible to reconstruct the experiences of the enrollees, and provide a backdrop for the consumer choice research presented below.

**History of the Site**

**Pre-CCC Site Use.** European settlers entered the region in the early 19th century. These settlers were attracted to the large, old-growth forests in the area. After initially focusing on agriculture, it was not long until the lumber industry came into the area. In 1840, with the advent of portable steam engines, sawmills started to appear in the region (Martino 2009:9). Between 1850 and 1900, technological improvements such as the band saw and the railroad allowed the timber industry to expand. Sawmills were able to process 100,000 feet of boards a day, and the vast hemlock forests were targeted by the tanning industry. The location of the forest on the Allegheny River also allowed easy transport to the markets in Pittsburgh (Martino 2009:9). However, the lumber industry was particularly wasteful during this period. For example, hemlock trees were harvested for their bark and then were left to rot on the ground and large white pines were cut down for their timber but the branches were left on the ground since only the main trunks were utilized. (Martino 2009:9). In her 2009 study, Ann Komara found evidence of a circa 1880 sawmill and a lumber camp near the Duhring site.

In 1859, Edward Drake discovered oil in nearby Venango County (Ross 1996:1). This discovery set off the world's first oil boom. In 1896, L.E. Mallory and Company drilled a well in Watsonville, north of Duhring, and struck a large pool of oil. For the next decade, the area was
intensively drilled (Ross 1996:49). As companies started to probe for the edge of the field, an oil refinery was built near ANF-1. The location was perfect as the site rests on a relatively flat area just to the north of Spring Creek. The gravity fed oil pipes from the wells on the surrounding hills flowed naturally to the refinery. The area around Duhring reached maximum output around 1910 (Komara 2009:120). In 1920, the land was purchased by the Cheesebrough Manufacturing Company (Komara 2009:120). Not much is known about this company, but it is likely that they continued to drill in the area. Sometime between 1920 and 1933, the land was sold to the Duhring Development Company, who continued to drill.

By 1923, the region had been devastated by industrial resource extraction. The hillsides had been clear-cut, and the result was massive erosion and numerous fires. The United States Forest Service, under the direction of Congress to protect the headwaters of the nation's major rivers, established the Allegheny National Forest (ANF). The land was easily purchased from the lumber companies because they had no use for the area, and by this time the major oil fields had run dry. The government was faced with a large task of rehabilitating the shattered environment of the ANF. In 1924 alone, 28,000 acres were lost to fire in the ANF, and the cost was over 1.5 million dollars. The ANF's condition is an example of the shattered landscape that led FDR to found the CCC.

*The CCC Era.* As soon as FDR signed Executive Order 6101, the Forest Service started looking for sites that would be suitable for CCC camps in the ANF. The first site chosen by the Forest Service was at Pebble Dell. The U.S. Army came in a week before the first enrollees were to arrive in the ANF and disapproved of the site. Instead, they chose the Duhring property (Martino 2009:2). The camp included three acres that were leased from the Duhring Development Company and two more acres on public land (Komara 2009: 28). This area was
graded, and the basic amenities were brought to the site. On April 26, 1933 the first enrollees arrived at Duhring. They were given pyramidal tents for sleeping and rations from World War I. Figure 1 shows the camp in the summer of 1933. By the winter of 1933, three barracks and a mess hall were constructed, and by the end of 1934, three more barracks were built as well as a camp garage. Figure 2 shows the camp in 1934. Duhring was the first camp established in Pennsylvania, and it was the second camp to be established in the nation (Schultz 1998).

Figure 1. ANF-1 in 1933, view from the Northwest (Komara 2009).
The first enrollees to ANF-1 were mainly from Pittsburgh and Philadelphia (Komara 2009:21). Out of the 250,000 enrollees that FDR set as the initial enrollment of the CCC, 19,500 men were slated for camps in Pennsylvania (Speakman 2006:31). In the early years, enrollees enlisted at local recruiting stations and were then sent to Fort Monroe for basic military induction. They spent a week at the fort and then were sent to ANF-1 (Speakman 2006:31). New enrollees often suffered from malnutrition and sickness. During the first week that ANF-1 was operational, 20 men were diagnosed with pneumonia and were hospitalized. The army did not have any funds to pay for the men to be sent to a regional hospital, so it was up to the camp doctor to treat them. Miraculously, the doctor brought all 20 patients back to good health by using only basic herbal medicine and constant care (Schultz 1998).
The CCC tried to enroll men in the camps that were located in their home state. By 1936, the majority of men were either from the area around Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, or from western North Carolina (Komara 2009:22). Due to the devastated landscape of the ANF and other parts of Pennsylvania, however, men were brought in from other states and especially the southern states, as the work was too much for CCC enrollment from Pennsylvania alone.

The men were put to work immediately. ANF-1 was primarily established to fight forest fires that had been ravaging the region since the early 1920s. Individuals at ANF-1 were trained and on constant call to dig fire lines and build lookout facilities to warn of any approaching fires. CCC enrollees were also instrumental in creating fire roads and trails to connect remote locations to the road system of the ANF (Schultz 2000). They also planted trees. By June 1933 enrollees at ANF-1 had completed the first tree plantation in the United States; 781 acres were planted (Schultz 2000, Komara 2009:23). Additionally, enrollees were put to work building the camp structures. All of the structures were from standard army designs, and they maintained a uniform look. They were simple buildings with gabled roofs and tar-papered sides (Komara 2009:43). Accounts from the early enrollees at ANF-1 described the barracks as being very cold during the winter (Schultz 1998). Enrollees also built recreational facilities at Loleta and Twin Lakes campgrounds.

In order to provide efficient management of all CCC camps, the army broke up the country into nine different regions, and each region was further divided into districts (Williams 2008). ANF-1 was part of District 2, which included all camps west of the Susquehanna River (Official Annual 1936:15). ANF-1 was the first camp built in this district, but it was soon followed by more. ANF-1 was built in April 1933. By that June, 45 camps were established in the district with 35 more camps to be established by the end of the year. In 1936, the entire CCC
organization was facing a massive reduction in federal spending. In order to cope with this cut, many camps were closed, and the number of camps in District 2 was reduced to 55 (Official Annual 1936:15, Schultz 1998). Due to the central location of ANF-1 in the district, it was chosen to be a signal outpost for the camps in the region (Speakman 2006:31). A radio was installed at the camp and was used to link ANF-1 to other camps in the district. This was done to coordinate the massive relief works among the camps, such as dealing with the flood in 1936. In the spring of that year western Pennsylvania was inundated by heavy flooding. The signal outpost at ANF-1 was instrumental in coordinating the rescue work. (Official Annual 1936:17).

ANF-1 was used as a CCC camp from April 26, 1933 until December 1943, which was when the official liquidation order was given for the camp (Martino 2009). This camp was home to thousands of enrollees who worked tirelessly to conserve that natural landscape of the ANF.

Post-CCC Use. After the order for liquidation was received, the camp was transferred from the CCC administration to the Forest Service Division, who leased it to the United States Army. The army used it as a prisoner of war (POW) camp for German soldiers captured during World War II. The camp was surrounded with a barbed wire fence, and machinegun emplacements were installed (Martino 2009). On September 15, 1947, after the last POWs had been repatriated, the U.S. Army to decommission the site and donated it to the Camp Committee of the Forest County Agricultural Extension Association (Martino 2009). After the donation went through, ANF-1 became the northwestern district 4-H camp. From 1947 to 1969, the camp was used by high school bands, regional 4-H clubs, boy scouts, football teams, and other organizations that needed a summer camp. In 1969, the camp was sold to Bill and Helen Summers, who used the barracks to house horses for trail rides in the surrounding ANF.
descendents, Robert and Sally Summers, still own the property and use it as a base camp for trail rides in the ANF (Martino 2009).

Buildings at ANF

A 1939 account of ANF-1 quoted in Martino 2009 recorded 39 buildings on the site. The following description of buildings’ functions, use, and amenities is derived from that account.

The administrative building was one of the first buildings built at the site. It was originally used as a barrack and later outfitted as an administrative headquarters and officers' barrack. With a rigid frame design, the building was 20’ 2” by 145’7”, with an attached 8’10” by 8’10” wing. The interior of the building was divided into 17 rooms: a one-room office, 7 rooms dedicated to dispensary and storage, 9 rooms for the officers' quarters, and 2 lavatories/baths. It was heated with natural gas and was equipped with water and sewage as well.

Directly to the north of the administrative building was the recreation hall. This building had a rigid frame, and it was built around a large stone and tile fireplace. The dimensions of the recreation hall were 27‘ 8” by 101’. The hall consisted of one large room with a stage on the southern end and five smaller rooms located on the eastern side. These rooms were used for storage, a barbershop, and the camp store. The building was heated by coal and natural gas and had no sewer or water connection. The camp store sold basic amenities such as cigarettes, soda, magazines, dime books, and other similar items.

The first mess hall was constructed in 1933 with the establishment of the camp. Its dimensions were 20’4” by 143’6”. The building was partially dismantled in 1939 to allow for the construction of a larger mess hall. The second mess hall, completed on June 28, 1939, was 20’ by 175’6”, and it had two wings. The first wing was 20’ by 20’, and the second wing was 20’ by 24’. The interior was subdivided into four rooms: a large dining room, a smaller kitchen, storage, and scullery. This building was adopted over the older mess hall because the entire company
could eat at one time. It was heated with coal and natural gas and contained water and sewage connections.

All of the barracks were identical since they were all designed with the same plan. They were 20’ by 175’ 6” and the interior was divided into two large rooms that housed the men plus a two-room shower and latrine. They were heated with coal and natural gas and had water and sewage connections. In total, the camp had five barracks, and each barrack housed forty men. The only variation was in barrack two, which was the location of the cook’s quarters. Figure 3, shows Barrack one while it was used by the CCC.

Located to the northeast of the recreation hall was the education building. This building was 19’4” by 109’4” and was divided into 11 rooms. The rooms included a woodshop, a library, a lavatory, an editor's office for the camp newspaper, a reading room, a music room, a museum, a mimeograph room, a photo room, a room dedicated to mechanical drawing, and a typing room. The building was heated with natural gas but did not have a water or sewage connection. The building directly to the east could have possibly been a greenhouse, but it is also possible that the greenhouse was attached to the education building.
The rest of the buildings at the camp were either utility buildings or storage buildings. They included a laundry/boiler/garage building, an oil storage house, a generator house with three electrical generators, a mechanic's shop, a supply house, and a tool house. Many of these buildings were constructed before the CCC, as part of the historic oil and timber camps, and then reused by the camp. The buildings were connected with brick and stone walkways that were occasionally lined with red pines (Komara 2009:52).

Two ponds are located to the north of the camp. Both are artificial. The western one was constructed before the CCC era. It was used by ANF-1 as a reservoir for the water necessary to fight forest fires (Komara 2009:55). The second pond was dug after 1969 and was used as a gravel quarry and then filled with water.

The camp had four entrances. The first entrance was a dirt and glass aggregate paved road that led over a covered bridge spanning Spring Creek, which was south of the education building. The second entrance was to the east of the camp and directly in front of the education building. The third entrance was located over a suspended bridge that was southwest of the mess hall. Finally, the fourth was located directly north of the recreation hall between the two artificial ponds.

During the nine years that the camp was in use, it grew from a few buildings and tents to an established group of buildings that supported the enrollees. Certain buildings at ANF-1 were unique such as the recreation hall with its large stone chimney, but the overall style and layout of the camp were heavily regulated by army policy.

*ANF-1 in the Context of the Allegheny National Forest*

Fourteen CCC camps were established in the ANF. Only two of these camps were used for the entire duration of the CCC era: ANF-1 at Duhring and ANF-3 at Red Bridge. ANF-3 was established in 1935 and remained open until 1942. The rest of the camps only remained open for
a few months up to four years. The individual camp’s operational time depended on the work that had to be completed in the area (Schultz 1998). Very little is known about the majority of the camps in the ANF.

ANF-2, Kelletville, was located to the west of ANF-1 on Tionesta Creek and was created in the fall of 1933. The men were originally assigned to a tent camp further north near Heart's Content. Eventually buildings were constructed at ANF-2, and it became a fully functioning camp similar to ANF-1. The camp was instrumental in road building projects in the western portion of the ANF and gravel quarrying. The camp also took part in the massive replanting of trees as well as fire suppression (Schultz 1998). In 1936, the camp was disbanded, and most of the enrollees, who were from Florida, Georgia, or Alabama, were sent to other camps in the Allegheny National Forest.

ANF-3, located at Red Bridge, is north of Kane, Pennsylvania and is in the eastern portion of the ANF. ANF-3 was an permanent camp similar to ANF-1. It was operational during the entire span of the CCC era, 1933-1942 (Schultz 1995). The camp took part in the creation of the Twin Lakes recreation center, in addition to fighting fires, stringing telephone line, creating roads, and planting trees.

ANF-4 was located in the eastern portion of the ANF and close to Kane, Pennsylvania, and housed only African American enrollees. The camp was involved with quarrying rock near Wilcox, Pennsylvania, fighting forest fires, and road construction (Schultz 1995). This camp was created in 1933 and was part of the initial creation of camps in the region. The camp remained active for two years and was then disbanded in 1935 (Schultz 1995). ANF- 5 at Sugar Run in the northern portion of the national forest and ANF-12, just north of ANF-1, were also African American CCC camps.
Little is known about the remaining camps. Two of the camps, ANF-12 at Whig Hill and ANF-8 at Kinzua, were tent camps, and they only lasted between 6 and 8 weeks (Schultz 1998). ANF-14, located near the New York border and at the very northern limit of the ANF, was a WWI veteran's camp. Of the remaining camps, only ANF-9 at Lamont and ANF-13 at Bull Hill were operational in 1938 (Schultz 2000). The rest of the camps not mentioned were only operational between two and six years, and the budgetary cuts in 1936 closed many of them.

The 14 camps that operated in the Allegheny National Forest are directly responsible for the current conditions that the forest enjoys today. Due to the tireless efforts of the CCC in the forest, forest fires have almost disappeared, the lumber industry in the region is thriving, and the biodiversity in the region has stabilized.

**Archaeological Context**

*CCC Archaeology*

There has been some archaeological research on CCC camps, partially due to their locations on public or state land. This has led many agencies such as the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management and the National Park Service to conduct archaeological inventories of these sites. The result has been increased preservation and awareness of these cultural resources.

The best-publicized study of a CCC camp was undertaken by Monica L. Smith. In 2001 she published her results in *Historical Archaeology*. She conducted historical document research as well as surface surveys of a CCC camp located at Bandelier National Monument in New Mexico. Her research demonstrated two things. First, it showed that the combination of documentary research and archaeology could provide clear conclusions about the CCC and the culture of the camps (Smith 2001:35). Secondly, it showed that an analysis of artifacts from sites that have been cleaned up or date to a time of modern trash removal can be used to support
inferences about how the site was used and who used it (Smith 2001:38). These two observations are important for CCC archaeology, and this study.

Another archaeologist who focused on CCC camps is William B. Butler, the park archaeologist for the Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado. Butler reported that four camps operated in the National Park, and all have been recorded as having some archaeological remains, although in a very limited context (Butler 2006:3). After the CCC era, the camps and dumps were removed as they were viewed as waste or trash. Besides a few references in historical documents and the lists of supplies needed by the organization in the Rocky Mountains National Park, very little is known about the layout of the camps and what took place within them (Butler 2006:22). Butler recorded that while ground disturbances were visible at all four camps, only one of the camps had any kind of material culture present. This camp was a temporary camp operated during two consecutive summers in 1933 and 1934, reoccupied in 1938, and again in 1940 when a permanent camp was built on the spot (Butler 2006:14-15).

CCC camps often have fewer surface features than other historic sites of the same period. After the first few years, the government determined that CCC camps should be impermanent. Many of the buildings were constructed so they could be easily removed. After the CCC era, many camps were either torn down or simply burned. This became so widespread that ANF-1 represents one of the last 25 CCC camps with original standing buildings. Archaeologists who attempt to investigate CCC camps must deal with the fact that the assemblage has been removed or altered through incinerators or other trash disposal techniques.

After the CCC camps within the ANF were disbanded, the military hired local workers to remove the structures, clean up the campsites, and either burn the remains of the camp or bury them off site (Chaplin personal communication 2010). The only reason ANF-1 did not suffer
from this methodical clean up was its location on private land. The remaining 13 camps in the ANF were completely torn down and removed. All that may suggest the remains of these camps are historical markers to tell the casual observer that a CCC camp once stood there and the remaining subsurface features.

Little work has been done concerning the CCC camps within the Allegheny National Forest. The forest service has located 13 of the 14 camps created by the CCC and delineated their boundaries, but it has conducted little archaeology on them. ANF-14 could not be located because the site was flooded during the construction of the Allegheny Reservoir (Schultz 1998). Isabelle Champlin, a professor of Anthropology at the University of Pittsburgh at Bradford, conducted archaeological field schools at ANF-3 near Red Bridge (2002), ANF-13 near Bull Hill (1999), and ANF-5 at Sugar Run (1992), along with limited investigations at ANF-1 and ANF-12. Champlin focused on determining site structure based on surface and subsurface features, primarily through tape and compass surveys. Any artifacts that were found were recorded, photographed, and then reburied in the same location.

Her work at ANF-1 focused on determining the pedestrian circulation system that was in place at the camp. Champlin and her students found several brick walkways installed to connect the barracks and other buildings.

Overall, there has been little archaeology done at the CCC camps. However, a great deal can be learned about the culture and lifeways of the CCC and the Great Depression from an archaeological examination as is evident from the studies cited above.
CHAPTER 3: THEORY

This study builds on previous research to understand the consumer behavior of individuals during the Great Depression. In order to understand the results of this research, it is important to comprehend the theory that this study builds on. Consumer studies represent an important theme within the discipline of Historical Archaeology. As early as 1976, researchers investigated consumption and the reason for different consumer choices (Adams 1976).

This chapter is divided into three different sections. The first two sections will detail the two earlier schools of thought regarding consumer studies. To properly discuss all the important research that has been done in the last 40 years would require more space than is available here; these sections will focus on only the work most relevant to this study. The third section will explain the consumer theory most relevant to this research. Concepts, such as discretionary spending, and thrift will be discussed as will how they are applied to the data in this study.

Consumer Research within Historical Archaeology dates back to the late 1970s (Adams 1976). Consumer Studies developed as researchers started to focus on the consumption component of capitalism, and trying to determine socioeconomic class within the archaeological record (St. Denis 2002:113). Building on the fact that socioeconomic class is often marked by unique material culture, researchers believed that by studying an individual’s or group’s consumption they could determine class (Garrow 1987:217).

Consumer studies can be divided into two periods. The first period focused on consumer choice (Cook et al. 1996:52). Researchers used consumption analysis to investigate other issues, such as socioeconomic class, or how communities were tied to the global market. This period lasted from the late 1970s to the early 1990s. The second period looked at actual consumer behavior, which focused on the point of view of the consumer (Cook et al. 1996:52). During this
period, researchers considered the act of consumption meaningful and archaeologists looked at the decisions consumers made, the products they bought, and then tried to understand the meaning behind those decisions (Henry 1991, Herman 1999, Walker 2008, Wilkie 2003).

**Consumer Choice Studies**

The first archaeologist credited with studying consumer choice was William H. Adams (1976). His study of the small, isolated, farming community located in Silcott, Washington was unique in that he traced all of the goods from deposits dating between 1900 and 1930 back to their original manufacturing site. Adams discovered that even though Silcott was a small, farming community in rural Washington, the vast majority of goods found at the sites in this community were made over 1,500 miles away (Adams 1976:100). This research indicated that by the start of the 20th century consumers were taking part in a nationwide market. The goods found in Silcott could be found all over the United States.

Building on his earlier study, Adams and Timothy B. Riordan investigated how manufactured goods reached the consumer (Riordan and Adams 1985). They tested sites based on the hypothesis that sites with the same access to a national market would be similar to each other, and sites that have different access to the national market would have different assemblages (Riordan and Adams 1985:8). Sites such as Silcott, Washington (Adams et al. 1975, Adams 1977, 1982, Riordan 1976); Staten Island, New York (Schuyler 1974, 1980); Waverly Plantation, Mississippi (Riordan and Adams 1980); and Bat Springs Mill, Mississippi (Adams et al. 1981) contained a "profile" of the national market (Riordan and Adams 1985:8). This profile was determined by how the sites were related to the American manufacturing belt through transportation networks. Their research proved that all of the investigated sites were connected to the national market by the end of the late 19th century and into the early 20th
century, and consumers were participating in the buying and consuming of goods on a national scale (Riordan and Adams 1985:17). They urged archaeologists to look at data and determine how it applied to the national market. What is unique about Riordan and Adams’ study (1985) is their use of archaeology to look at market economics on a national scale. Their study applies a model of commodity flow developed by a geographer, Alan Pred (1970), to sites in Washington, Mississippi, and New York (Riordan and Adams 1985). This model created a typology of commodity flow that was based on industry type and market access (Riordan and Adams 1985:6). The study proved that even though the sites were separated by thousands of miles, they all shared a similar profile of the national market (Riordan and Adams 1985:16).

In 1980, George L. Miller proposed the possibility of understanding socioeconomic classes based on the ceramics found at 19th century sites (Miller 1980). This was accomplished by calculating the average cost of the ceramics from a site and then using that figure to compare different sites (Miller 1980:15). Ultimately these calculations allowed for comparisons of socioeconomic classes. Sites with expensive ceramics should be of a higher socioeconomic class than those with less expensive ceramics. This research is an often-cited application of consumer choice studies, as Miller directly connected socioeconomic status with consumer choices.

In 1987, R. Lee Lyman (1987) proposed the use of faunal remains from historic sites to show socioeconomic class. After investigating four sites in Sacramento, California, he proposed that people from a higher socioeconomic class were purchasing better cuts of beef (Lyman 1987:59). The result of the study was that "meat-yield per beef cut as related to the cost per beef cut provides an accurate measure of cost-efficiency of beef purchases, and that measure is directly interpreted as reflecting income level and purchasing power" (Lyman 1987:66). This conclusion indicates that people buy only what they can afford. Clearly, this is not true. Lyman
has been heavily criticized for his study since it restricts the consumer by only one variable, and it does not take into account factors like ethnicity and individual preference (Walker 2008).

In that same year, Suzanne M. Spencer-Wood edited a volume entitled *Consumer Choice in Historical Archaeology*. The goal of the volume was to demonstrate that patterns found in archaeology could be related to social stratification (Spencer-Wood 1987:1). Spencer-Wood proposed that the relationship between an individual's socioeconomic status and their buying strategies was influenced by such variables as ethnicity and market access, and that there was a high correlation between occupational social class and types of consumer goods selected by individuals (Spencer-Wood 1987:6). She goes on to create a consumer-choice framework that explains why goods of different quality or price were bought and deposited by different cultural subgroups in a market economy (Spencer-Wood 1987:9). Spencer-Wood and the authors in the volume built their studies on the premise that clearly discernable factors, such as occupations and income levels, would dictate consumer choice. By looking at specific consumer choices, an archaeologist would be able to determine the socioeconomic status of the individual.

This volume was a benchmark in consumer choice studies (Spencer-Wood 1987). Researchers diligently tried to use consumer choice to understand socioeconomic status. They believed that items were purchased based on simple decisions such as cost. Researchers in this first period thought that patterns would be evident in the archaeological record, and that they would correspond to consumer decisions. As researchers in the next school of thought, Consumer Behavior, were quick to point out, individuals almost never make a simple decision to consume (Cook et al. 1996, Walker 2008). The decision to consume is influenced by many factors.
Consumer Behavior

The second period of consumer studies was characterized by an interest in the meaning that an object carried (Cook et al. 1996:52). Attention shifted away from the information that consumer decisions told us about market access or socioeconomic status and shifted towards data of why individuals bought certain items and what these items conveyed about the purchaser (Henry 1991:24). In 1991, the Society of Historical Archaeology devoted a complete issue of Historical Archaeology to the subject (vol 25, number 2), emphasizing the changes that were taking place in consumer studies.

In this volume, Susan L. Henry created a theoretical framework to look at consumer choice (1991). Using psychology, sociology, and other disciplines, Henry defined consumer behavior as the process in which consumers search, acquire, use, evaluate, and dispose of products, services, and ideas that they expect will satisfy their needs (Henry 1991:3). The switch from the earlier period to the new period is evident in the terminology. Archaeologists started to investigate consumer behavior instead of consumer choices (Cook et al. 1996:52). The overall behavior became important and not just the factors relating to acquiring an item (Henry 1991:24).

Another change from earlier approaches was the idea that consumer behavior was not strictly influenced by economic factors, but by social and individual factors as well (Henry 1991:3). This allowed researchers to get at a range of other topics, besides class and market access, through consumer behavior. In Henry's model (1991), individuals did not buy goods only for their functional value but for a set of want-satisfying attributes. Consumers were influenced by different trends, and ideas that were prevalent in their society or culture; this idea has been thoroughly researched by earlier archaeologists (see Deetz 1977) (Henry 1991:11). Henry
expressed that friends, neighbors, family, reference groups, class, and subcultures that an individual belonged to exerted a significant amount of influence on their consumer behavior (Henry 1991:6). By understanding these groups, it was possible to understand consumer decisions.

At the end of the article, Henry (1991) addressed the relationship between status and consumer behavior. This relationship had been a focus of consumer choice studies for a long time (Spencer-Wood 1987, Lyman 1987, Miller 1980). Henry claims that individuals validated and defined their status through the consumption of certain consumer goods (1991:8). Status was one of the many meanings that were attached to the objects.

Building on this research, Lauren J. Cook, Rebecca Yamin, and John P. McCarthy published an article in 1996 asking the discipline to look at shopping as a meaningful action (Cook et al. 1996:52). Cook et al. claimed that cultural phenomena, such as consumption, is meaning centered, thus agreeing with Henry. They went even further by saying that this meaning is centered on the individual, who is conscious of and in control of their intentions and motives (Cook et al. 1996:52). Consumer behavior must be linked to the individual, and any meanings that are encoded in the item are interpreted and expressed by individuals within the social sphere. What Cook et al. did for the study of consumer choice was to fuse it with practice theory and make understanding the agency of the individual paramount to understanding why individuals made certain purchases (Cook et al. 1996:53). This understanding would make it possible to understand the politics related to consumption and the symbolic nature of consumption (Cook et al. 1996:56). To accomplish this, it is necessary to use the documentary record, along with the archaeological record to understand the specific consumption of a type of goods by specific consumers (Cook et al. 1996:60). What Cook et al. is proposing is not to look at the artifact
assemblage of an entire site, and look to see patterns of consumption, but look at a specific good and tie it to a specific consumer (Cook et al. 1996:60).

Laurie A. Wilkie applied Cook et al.’s suggestion of investigating the consumption of a specific good by a specific consumer to an enslaved family in the Caribbean (2000). She investigated how an enslaved family used European goods and created meaning for them in the local Creole culture (Wilkie 2000:11). By looking at ethnographic literature regarding the Bakango culture of West Africa, she investigated how enslaved Africans created meaning for mass-produced European goods that was distinctly African (Wilkie 2000:23).

Overall, the growth of consumer studies has mirrored the change in the theoretical orientation of the discipline of archaeology (St. Denis 2002:114). Starting with the New Archeology that looked for testable patterns in the archaeological record, consumer choice studies tried to find clear indicators of status from what the people consumed. With the rise of Post-Processualism, and the idea of looking for the individual and for meaning in the archeological record, consumer studies started to investigate consumer behavior. This new line of research focused on why people bought what they did and what did the item mean to them.

**Application of Consumption Theory**

The intense economic downturn that took place in the 1930s changed the way individuals consumed goods, and it is the intent of this study to understand why consumption changed. Corporations in the 1930s were supplying the American public with goods on a national scale (Adams 1976). So comparisons between sites that are separated by thousands of miles are possible as individuals in New Mexico had similar access to goods as those in Pennsylvania (Riordan and Adams 1985).
This study draws on the second phase of consumer studies and investigates consumer behavior. Building on Henry (1991) and Cook et al. (1996), this study examines the buying strategies of enrollees in CCC camps across the country and ultimately the individuals who lived during the Great Depression. The 1930s were a time of economic stress. Individuals had less money so what they bought took on added importance. Considering Cook et al.’s (1996:60) advice to look at specific consumption by specific consumers, this study will investigate how individuals during the Great Depression consumed non-essential goods. I refer to the purchasing, use, and disposal of these non-essential products as discretionary spending.

Discretionary spending is one component of an individual’s buying strategy. Items that were not necessary for daily life or represented spending for enjoyment or amusement, such as alcohol, candy, cigarettes, magazines, cologne, or soda, fall into this category. A major tenet of this study is that items were bought, consumed, and then deposited not only for their functional value but also for their social meaning (Cook et al. 1996:54). Discretionary spending presents an opportunity to isolate this meaning even further because the functional value of the goods would be low. Understanding how individuals chose to spend their money can lead to broader conclusions about the culture that these individuals participated in and the factors that influenced their decisions.

This study provides a synthesis of previous consumption research. Individuals such as Miller (1980) and Lyman (1987) who looked at the relationship between purchases and status were unknowingly investigating discretionary spending. A basic tenet of both their studies was that individuals would purchase non-essential items, high quality whiteware and better cuts of meat, to demonstrate socioeconomic class. Both these studies show that a better understanding of discretionary spending is a way to understand consumer choice. This study builds on the research
done in the 1990s (Henry 1991, Cook et al. 1996) and beyond (St. Dennis 2002, Wilkie 2000, Walker 2008) as it does not directly attempt to determine class, but looks at consumption as meaningful, and influenced by factors beyond functional use and economic value.

In this study, a comparison is made between CCC camps, residential sites of the Great Depression, and the sites dating to before the Great Depression. The comparison illuminates the factors that influenced the discretionary spending of the times. By understanding these influences, it will be possible to direct attention towards larger trends occurring during the Great Depression. One of these influencing factors was the concept of thrift.

Thrift, or consciously limiting one’s economic expenditures because of the tough economic situation in the Great Depression, should be seen by a decrease in non-essential or discretionary spending. I hypothesize that individuals would have to carefully consider each purchase, as wealth was rare during the 1930s. When individuals choose to make a non-essential purchase during the Great Depression, a moment of reflection might have occurred. Individuals would ask themselves “do I really need this?” (St. Denis 2002:116). It is the intent of this study to determine if individuals were adopting a mindset of thrift during the Great Depression irrespective of economic or employment status. Based on the research questions presented in Chapter 1, this mindset of thrift should be visible in sites from the Great Depression, but not from sites dating to pre-Depression times. The buying strategies of individuals who inhabited sites from the 1920s would not be influenced by thrift, as economic times were good, unemployment was low, and wealth was readily available.

The buying habits of CCC enrollees have never been investigated archaeologically. However, CCC camps provide a unique opportunity to understand discretionary spending as the U.S. Federal government provided enrollees in the Civilian Conservation Corps the basic
necessities: food, shelter, and clothing. Hence, the majority of the expenditures made by the enrollees represented discretionary spending. If it is found that the discretionary spending at the CCC camps was still below pre-Depression levels, then it can be assumed that the mindset of thrift was widespread during the Great Depression. If it is found that the CCC enrollees were not practicing this mindset, then it can be assumed that the concept of thrift was only adopted by the exceptionally poor during that time.

Consumer studies have gone through many changes since archaeologists started to try to explain how people lived and consumed in the past. This study represents a new application of consumption theory to a new data set. The result will be a better understanding of individual buying strategies in the Great Depression and ultimately a better understanding of consumer behavior in archaeology.
CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

This chapter will explain the methodology used in collecting the data that will be analyzed in Chapter 5. The chapter is broken into two main sections: excavation methods and comparative methods. The excavation methods section will discuss the methodology used in the excavation at ANF-1, the laboratory methods, and how the artifacts from the excavations were converted into the data that was used for the analysis in Chapter 5. The second section will discuss how the comparative data was analyzed. The chapter will conclude with a discussion of how the data from ANF-1 and from the comparative sites were synthesized.

Excavation Methods

Excavations were carried out at ANF-1 between May 28 and June 2, and June 11 and June 14, 2010. In total, thirty-two shovel test pits (STP) and three 1-meter by 1-meter test units were excavated. All STPs were 57-centimeter diameter circular pits and were dug until 10 centimeters of sterile subsoil were encountered. The one-meter-by-one-meter test units (TU) were excavated in 10-centimeter arbitrary levels within the natural stratigraphy. All soils excavated from STPs and TUs were dry screened through ¼-inch mesh, and all cultural material was bagged with location and basic counts written on the bag.

These excavations produced 646 artifacts and encountered four subsurface cultural deposits (see Appendix A for artifact catalog). The depth of the cultural deposits ranged from 4 centimeters to 56 centimeters below ground surface, and ranged in thickness from 12 centimeters to 43 centimeters (see Appendix B for summary of subsurface deposits).

The first step in conducting the excavation was a walkover of the site. Any artifacts eroding out of the bank of Spring Creek or in the small perennial stream located to the west of the camp were collected and cataloged as a surface collection. Excavation was constrained to the
margins of the camp, as the landowner, Robert Summers, did not want any ground disturbance on the main portion of the camp because it would interfere with the current use of the camp as a horse stable. In consideration of this restriction, the site was divided into six test areas based on landforms, see Figure 4. Detailed views of the test areas and the excavation units will be provided in Chapter 5.

Figure 4. Overview of ANF-1 showing test areas.
**Test Area 1**

Test Area 1 was located on a terrace above Spring Creek, Figure 5 Stretching from the officers’ barracks, west to the bend in Spring Creek, Test Area 1 extended north to the point where the dirt road runs along the edge of a small slope. The area was made up of manicured grass close Creek. The remains of a suspension bridge are located on the western portion of this test area as well as a small foundation that currently houses a large oil tank. The oil tank dates to the 1920s when the site was used as a focal point for the surrounding Duhring Oil Field (Komara

![Image of Test Area 1 showing excavations.](image-url)

**Figure 5. Overview of Test Area 1 showing excavations.**
The suspension bridge was originally constructed to provide oil and gas workers access to the processing station located on the eastern edge of the camp, but it was also used by the CCC enrollees as an access point to the camp (Komara 2010:14). Along the western edge of the site semi-buried oil pipes can be found running north from the oil tank. Sixteen STPs and one 1-meter-by-1-meter test unit were dug in this test area. Thirteen STPs were placed at 15-meter intervals starting to the east, by the officers’ barracks and then extending to the bend in Spring Creek, see Figure 5. At the bend, STPs were dug northwest until the landform terminated with a small slope into Test Area 2. Three more STPS were dug in this test area to delineate a cultural deposit.

**Test Area 2**

Test Area 2, Figure 6, was a small bench located west of the camp and northwest of Test Area 2. Figure 6. Overview of Test Area 2 showing excavations.
Area 1. Three STPs were dug ten meters apart from each other, with the first STP located at the base of the small slope that separates Test Area 1 and Test Area 2. One STP was placed to the northwest of the first STP, and one STP was placed to the west. No above ground cultural resources were located in this test area. Based on the STP excavation, a cultural deposit was located, and two one-meter-by-one-meter test units were excavated to sample this deposit.

Test Area 3

Test Area 3, Figure 7, was composed of a perennial creek bed and the surrounding banks. The test area was chosen because of the large amount ironstone probably associated with toiletry, and

Figure 7. Overview of Test Area 3 showing excavations.
miscellaneous glass objects that were found eroding out of the banks of the stream

A cement bridge runs through the center of the test area connecting the camp to the areas to the west. The southern edge of the test area was Spring Creek, and the northern limits of the test area were defined by the edge of the manmade pond and the narrowing of the perennial stream. Four STPS were dug in this test area.

Test Area 4

Test Area 4, Figure 8, was located on the manmade wall of a small pond. The pond was constructed before the site was used as a CCC camp. Pictures of the camp from 1933 show the pond. Test Area 4 was located on the western retaining wall of the pond. A single STP was excavated to test the retaining wall and determine if it contained historic fill from the CCC camp or earlier.

4.1.5 Test Area 5

Figure 8. Overview of Test Area 4 showing excavations.
**Test Area 5**

Figure 9, extended from the officers’ barracks east to the covered bridge. The area was selected for testing, as it was adjacent to the officers’ barracks and behind the camp latrine. Six STPs, running approximately east to west, were dug at 15-meter intervals. The southern edge of this test area was bound by Spring Creek. Located on the northern edge of the test area was a line of CCC-planted red pine trees and the foundation of what appears to be the camp latrines.

![Figure 9. Overview of Test Area 5 showing excavations.](image)

**Test Area 6**

Test Area 6, Figure 10, was located to the northeast of the camp. The test area was chosen because of the location of a cement pad that could have housed an outbuilding for the camp. Two STPS were dug around the cement pad to sample the cultural material and try to place the building in relationship to the rest of the camp. The test area was bounded on the south and the east by gravel roads that lead to the main road to the town of Duhring, the CCC camp and small hunting camps that were located in the near vicinity of ANF-1.
Laboratory Methods

Once the artifacts were excavated, they were transported to Indiana University of Pennsylvania, where they were cleaned. Glass, plastic, and ceramics were submerged in hot water and then cleaned with a toothbrush. Metal objects were dry brushed and then briefly submerged in hot water to remove any remaining sediment. Cloth was dry brushed, and faunal artifacts were cleaned gently with a wet toothbrush. Overall, the goal of the cleaning was to remove any sediment from the artifacts that would hinder the identification of diagnostic marks. Maintaining the overall integrity of the artifact was a high priority.

Once all the artifacts were cleaned, they were sorted based on material, while maintaining the location of where the artifacts were excavated. The artifacts were then bagged in curation standard, 4-millimeter polyethylene bags with zip-lock closures, according to type and location.

Cataloging Methods

After the artifacts were cleaned and bagged, they were cataloged. While doing this, each group of artifacts were assigned specimen numbers. For example, if STP 4 produced 6 nails, 1 ceramic, and 1 glass the specimen number would be 4.1 for the nails, 4.2 for the ceramic, and 4.3
for the glass. If different types of artifacts were found, like a single redware sherd and five ironstone sherds, the redware would receive its own specimen number, and the ironstone would receive another specimen number. Artifacts were divided into categories that isolated the general traits. An ironstone sherd with transfer print was bagged separately and assigned a different specimen number than an undecorated ironstone sherd. Assigning specimen numbers was done to provide an easy way to look at the catalog and find a specific artifact. After all of the artifacts were assigned specimen numbers and bagged, the artifact inventory was put into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. The spreadsheet included columns for provenience, test area, specimen number, quantity, material, and descriptive comments that could be useful for analysis. After initial cataloging was completed, the artifacts were organized into Stanley South’s Functional Groups (1977). These categories organize artifacts into groups based on their purpose and function. South’s Functional Groups allowed me to break the assemblage into percentages and provided a useful way to compare the assemblage from ANF-1 to other assemblages. South created this system to look at colonial sites in the Eastern United States. To compensate for the temporal and spatial differences of this research when compared to South’s research, the modifications to South’s functional groups proposed by the Sonoma State University Anthropological Studies Center (2008) were used. These groups are a modified version of South’s to account for artifact variability in the late 19th and early 20th century sites (Anthropological Studies Center 2008:2). Once the artifacts were categorized according to the Sonoma groupings, the artifact catalogue was organized into three categories: 1) artifacts that could be dated to the CCC era (1933-1942), 2) artifacts that could be dated to after the CCC era (1943 – to modern times), and 3) artifacts that could not be confidently dated to either period. By organizing the catalogue in this way, it was possible to understand the temporal sequence of the
cultural deposits as well as guide the analysis. This was important as the site was occupied before and after the CCC era. A major step in the cataloguing process was isolating the CCC era cultural material from previous and subsequent occupations.

*Discretionary Spending*

After the catalogue was completed, the artifacts were further broken into three categories. The first category was discretionary items. These items are defined as non-essential to life or wellbeing and show evidence of discretionary spending. Items such as alcohol, cologne, tobacco, or soda fall into this category. This category is mainly composed of South’s personal items group as well as portions of the kitchen or domestic group. The next category, non-discretionary, was composed of items that did not represent discretionary purchases. The majority of items in this group were made up of artifacts that fall into South’s domestic category or the activities category. The last group represents items that fall into South’s structural group. Items in this group include window glass, nails, bricks, and other artifacts relating to buildings. These items were eliminated from the categories of discretionary spending as they represent a single large investment and have little effect on the daily, personal economies of individuals in the CCC or at other sites used in these comparisons. Artifacts that could not be identified were left out of the discretionary spending categories as well. For example, bottle fragments whose contents could not be determined were intentionally excluded. Since the contents could not be determined, it is possible that they represented discretionary spending, but equally possible that they did not. By not including unidentifiable objects, the data was clarified and the results could be counted on to accurately show discretionary spending.

It must be noted that in assigning discretionary and non-discretionary categories, the context of the artifact must be known and taken into account. The context is important, as an
artifact at one site could be considered discretionary while at another site it could take on a very different meaning. Take for example, fishhooks. Fishhooks at a CCC camp would be classified as a discretionary item since the fishhook would have been used for leisure. At a Great Depression domestic site a fishhook would take on additional meaning as individuals would often have to fish for food to eat. This context dependent nature of the discretionary categories makes it difficult to form general rules about their application. As a very broad rule of thumb, items in South’s personal group usually fall into the discretionary category. There are exceptions to this rule such as the fishhook example discussed earlier.

Once the CCC-era artifacts were placed into one of the two categories and the structural and unidentified artifacts were removed, the two categories were grouped together and then divided by the total number of artifacts to calculate a percentage of discretionary to non-discretionary spending. The main goal of this action was two provide a way to compare sites with different assemblage sizes. By reducing the assemblages into percents, it became possible to compare the different assemblages and understand the different discretionary spending that was prevalent at each of the sites.

**Comparative Methods**

In order to answer the research questions outlined in Chapter 1, a comparison was undertaken between ANF-1, a CCC camp at Bandelier National Monument New Mexico (Smith 2001), a CCC camp at Zigzag Oregon (Tuck 2008), a Depression era domestic site in northwestern Arkansas (Gilliland et al. 2007), a Depression era domestic site in southwestern Virginia (Higgins et al. 2003) and two pre-Depression domestic sites in Braddock, Pennsylvania (Diamanti et al. 2009). These sites are described in Chapter 6. In order to compare these sites, the first step necessitated the organization of the artifact catalogue from each of the sites to be
similar to the organization of ANF-1’s assemblage. By organizing the artifacts from the sites listed above into discretionary, non-discretionary categories, and removing the structural and unidentified artifacts, it was possible to measure the level of discretionary spending that was taking place at each of the sites. Once this was done, the data was standardized by finding the percentage of discretionary and non-discretionary artifacts at each site. Standardizing the data allowed me to compare sites with vastly different assemblage sizes.

After all of the data was standardized, I organized it to test the four hypotheses outlined in Chapter 1. The first hypothesis, *the same level of discretionary spending was taking place at ANF-1 as the other CCC camps*, was tested by comparing the levels of discretionary and non-discretionary at spending at ANF-1 to those of the CCC camps at Bandelier, and Zigzag. A chi-square test was used to determine if the results were statistically significant or simply the result of a random distribution. The use of the chi-square is outlined below in section 4.3.1 Statistics. The second hypothesis, *Discretionary spending was higher at the CCC camps than at the domestic sites during the Great Depression*, was tested by finding the average level of discretionary spending at the CCC camps, and the average level of discretionary spending at the Depression era domestic sites, and comparing them to each other. Another chi-square test was conducted to verify the results. The third hypothesis, *Discretionary spending was less between CCC camps and Pre-Depression sites*, was tested by finding the average of discretionary spending at the three CCC camps and then comparing them to the average discretionary spending at the two pre-Depression domestic sites from Braddock, Pennsylvania. A chi-square test was conducted on these results as well. Finally, the fourth hypothesis, *Discretionary spending decreased in domestic contexts in the 1930s compared to sites from before the Depression*, was investigated by finding the average levels of discretionary spending at the two Depression era
domestic sites and comparing them to the average of the two pre-Depression domestic sites. Once again, a Chi-Square test was performed on the results to determine statistical significance.

Based on the results of the four hypotheses, the final hypothesis was tested. The hypothesis, *Discretionary spending decreased in the Great Depression regardless of actual economic pressure*, would be supported if the CCC camps showed similar levels of discretionary spending, the camps had higher level of spending than the Depression era domestic sites, and both the Depression era domestic sites and the CCC camp had a lower level of discretionary spending than the pre-Depression sites. The results of these comparisons will be presented in Chapter 7.

*Statistics*

To verify the results of this research, it was important to determine if the differences found in the comparisons of assemblages were statistically significant. To do this, I employed a chi-square test to each of the four hypotheses. Archaeologists have used the chi-square test to compare the results of their analysis for a long time. The most famous application of the chi-square test was by A.C. Spaulding (1953) to test the distribution of prehistoric pottery characteristics such as, tempering, surface decoration, and shoulder decoration. The chi-square test has since become widespread in archaeology (Shenen 1997:104-115). Using the equation:

\[ \chi^2 = \sum \frac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i} \]

I tested the relationship between the observed percentages of discretionary spending and the expected percentages (Ritchey 2000:432). The chi-square value \((\chi^2)\) is the sum of all the observed \((O)\) values minus the expected \((E)\) values, squared, and then divided by the expected \((E)\) values. The results of this test determined the nature of the relationship between the
assemblages being compared. In testing my first hypothesis, I calculated the percents of discretionary spending and non-discretionary at each of the three CCC camps. Then, I calculated the expected values by finding the mean of each of the discretionary and non-discretionary columns. These would be my (E) values. Using the observed percentages from the archaeological data as my (O) value, I determined the chi-square value ($\chi^2$) for each of the observed values by using the equation shown above. Once this was done, I added up all the chi-square values ($\chi^2$) and compared the sum against a chi-square table (Ritchey 2000:578), using 2 degrees of freedom. The result indicated how likely it was that the archaeologically generated means were the result of random variation. This procedure was conducted for all four hypotheses to determine if the assemblages were significantly similar or if they were a result of random variation.

In summary, the results from the excavation at ANF-1 were organized into the categories of discretionary spending, and non-discretionary spending. These same categories were applied to the six other sites in the synthesis. Once this was completed, it was possible to compare the different sites based on their levels of discretionary spending. The hypotheses were then tested using the chi-square test.

The following chapter discusses the results of the excavations at ANF-1 and places the artifacts within the two categories of discretionary spending outlined above. Chapter 6 outlines the six sites that will be compared to ANF-1, and the level of discretionary spending found at the sites. Then, in Chapter 7, the results will be synthesized and interpreted, and the research hypotheses outlined in Chapter 1 will be tested.
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS OF EXCAVATIONS AT ANF-1

Excavations were conducted at ANF-1 between May 28 and June 1, and then again between June 11 and June 14, 2010. The results of the excavations are presented below. For a complete list of the artifacts recovered, refer to Appendix A: Artifact Inventory. For detailed descriptions of the subsurface testing, refer to Appendix B: Results of Subsurface Testing. For graphical representations of the profiles found in Test Units 1, 2, and 3, see Appendix C.

**Surface Collection**

A surface collection was conducted along the northern bank of Spring Creek and along the perennial stream located to the west of the camp. Artifacts could be seen eroding out of the ground. Figure 11 shows a piece of ironstone eroding out of the north bank of Spring Creek.

All collected artifacts were bagged and labeled as surface collections, and their locations were noted. Artifacts were only collected if they showed diagnostic traits. A total of seven artifacts were collected during the surface collection. The full results of this collection can be seen in Appendix A: Artifact Inventory.

Figure 11. Artifact eroding out of bank, picture taken by author.
Preliminary Testing

The preliminary testing of ANF-1 entailed placing 32 standard test pits (STP) 57 cm in diameter across the test areas to locate cultural deposits. Appendix B itemizes the results of the STPs. The preliminary testing excavated 330 artifacts and identified four cultural deposits. The cultural deposits were located in Test Areas 1 and 2. I define a cultural deposit as a depositional layer that does not occur naturally.

Cultural Deposit 1

The first cultural deposit was identified in two STPs. This cultural deposit, located in Test Area 1, was first noted in STP 2, and it continued on through STP 3. STP 3 had the highest concentration and density of artifacts with 38 artifacts recovered. To further delineate the deposit, three radials placed 5 meters off of STP 3 in the cardinal directions, were dug. The goal of these STPs was to determine if the deposit found in the original two STPs was one single deposit. The radials determined that the deposit was between both STPs, and that it extended to Spring Creek.

The deposit was classified as a sheet midden with seemingly random concentrations of artifacts. The midden ranged from 13 to 20 centimeters thick, and was comprised of a 7.5 YR 3/2, dark brown, silty loam. A large amount of coal was found in the cultural layer as well. The largest concentration of artifacts was unearthed from STP 3 with a total of 16 artifacts found in the cultural deposit.

Cultural Deposit 2

This deposit was located in Test Area 1 and identified through STP 6. The deposit was 16 centimeters below the ground surface and went to a depth of 34 centimeters with the highest density of artifacts at the top of the deposit and diffusing towards the lower boundary. Seventy-
four window fragments, twelve bottle glass fragments, one miscellaneous metal fragment, and a piece of a burlap bag were found. Some of the artifacts showed signs of burning. The deposit seemed to have been confined to the area around STP 6.

**Cultural Deposit 3**

Cultural Deposit 3 was found in Test Area 1 around STP 10. The cultural deposit could not be dated and did not produce any diagnostic artifacts except for a modern metal bottle opener. The deposit had a high concentration of artifacts, but was only 6 centimeters thick. The modern artifact seems to point to the feature as being deposited post CCC.

**Cultural Deposit 4**

Cultural Deposit 4 was identified in the northwestern corner of Test Area 1, through STP 13 and then on into Test Area 2 in STP 1. The deposit was made up of two distinct features. The top feature was 14 centimeters thick and composed of 7.5 YR 2.5/2 dark brown soil mottled with a 5 YR 3/2 dark red brown soil. The soil was silty loam with coarse sand inclusions. A large amount of coal and cinders was found in this stratum as well as artifacts that had been burnt at high temperatures. The second feature, being separated by a thin lens of what appeared to be subsoil, was a Gley 1 2.5/1 reddish black, coarse sand with inclusions. A large amount of cinders, slag, and coal was found in this feature.

Cultural Deposit 4 appeared to have been the refuse of an incinerator. While there was no mention of an incinerator in the historical documents or the camp newspapers, it is clear that the level of burning associated with the artifacts from these two features was the result of some sort of thermal waste disposal.
Further Testing

In order to better understand these features and the material culture of ANF-1, it was determined that three test units would be dug to test two of the four cultural deposits. The first cultural deposit tested was Cultural Deposit 1. This was chosen due to its proximity to the CCC era barracks, and the nature of the assemblage indicated that it was deposited during the 1930s. A single test unit (TU 1) was dug to the south of STP 3. Cultural Deposit 4 was also tested since it contained a high density of artifacts as well as diagnostic artifacts that related to the CCC era. In order to test Cultural Deposit 4, two test units were excavated (TU 2 and TU 3).

Test Unit 1

Test Unit 1 was dug to further test Cultural Deposit 1. The test unit was placed 2.5 m south of STP 3 in Test Area 1. The cultural deposit was located approximately 15 centimeters below ground surface, and it was on an average of 10 centimeters thick. The highest concentration of artifacts was found in the northern portion of the test unit. TU 1 produced 64 artifacts with the majority coming from the cultural deposit, but some were excavated in the A Horizon. The test unit was excavated to a depth of 22 centimeters, and then sterile sub soil was encountered. An auger was used to determine if there were any buried cultural deposits. The subsoil remained uniform to a depth of 1 meter.

Test Unit 2

Test Unit 2 was dug to test Cultural Deposit 4. Based on the CCC era diagnostic artifacts found in STP 13 in Test Area 1 and STP 1 in Test Area 2, it was believed that the test unit would produce a large sample of CCC related material culture. TU 2 was dug directly to the north of STP 1 in Test Area 2. The soils identified in STP 1 were found seven centimeters below ground surface. The deposit was 10 centimeters thick, but did not produce any artifacts. An auger was
used to determine if there were any buried cultural deposits. The subsoil remained uniform to a depth of 1 meter.

*Test Unit 3*

Due to the failure of Test Unit 2 to produce any cultural material, a second test unit was excavated to further test Cultural Deposit 4. Test Unit 2 was excavated directly to the southeast of STP 1 in Test Area 2. Both features identified in STP 13 were found with this test unit. Feature 1 was encountered 20 centimeters below ground surface and was completely surrounded by Feature 2. Feature 1 extended 15 centimeters at its thickest point and was composed of a 7.5 YR 2.5/2 very dark brown coarse sand with inclusions mottled with a 5YR 3/2 dark red brown coarse sand. Feature 2 was found directly below and was 21 centimeters at its thickest point. It extended to a maximum depth of 42 centimeters below ground surface. Feature 2 was composed of a Glay 1 2.5/N Coarse Sand with inclusions and a large amount of burnt artifacts.

The test unit produced 253 artifacts with 51 originating in the A Horizon above the features and the rest from the two features. A large amount of coal, cinders, and slag was found. The artifacts ranged from heavily thermally altered to no signs of burning. Based on the excavation of TU 2, and TU 3, Cultural Deposit 4 was clearly the trash dump for the camp. It seems that the deposit was formed by a combination of incinerator dump as well as a sheet midden. This would explain the wide disparity in burning among the artifacts, and the seemingly random artifact concentrations.

**Site Formation Process**

Based on the excavation and the assemblage, it must be noted that the archaeological record at ANF-1 was disturbed. The depositional practices at ANF-1 were hard to determine due to the continued use of the site from the 1880s to modern times. It is believed that the western
portion of the camp was used as a dump since the 1930s. The presence of the incinerator fill points to modern waste removal practices taking place at the site during the CCC era. There was also a mention of the camp replacing old trashcans in the barracks with new ones in the camp newspaper (Spring Creek Murmurs April 1939). It is also possible that the garbage was disposed offsite. This location has not been identified in this study. The removal of waste from the camp greatly hindered the recovery of artifacts that would be a full representation of the sites material culture.

After the start of World War II, and the disbanding of the CCC, other CCC camps in the Allegheny National Forest were removed by the army. This did not take place at ANF-1 because the camp was used as a POW camp throughout the WW II era. It is logical though to assume that the army did some form of clean up at ANF-1 before it was changed into a POW camp.

While these factors might limit some studies, Monica Smith, in her 2001 article entitled “The Archaeology of a “Destroyed” Site: Surface Survey and Historical Documents at the Civilian Conservation Corps Camp, Bandelier National Monument, New Mexico”, showed that
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Figure 12. Full identifiable assemblage from ANF-1.
archaeological analyses of CCC camps was valid. She proves that even though the U.S. Government attempted to remove the impact of the CCC from the landscape, a faint archaeological signature remained (Smith 2001:38).

**The Assemblage**

As outlined in Chapter 4, the assemblage was catalogued using Stanley South’s artifact categories (1977) and the modifications proposed through the Anthropological Studies Center (2008). The breakdown of the full assemblage can be seen in Figure 12. The structural category dominates the assemblage, making up 49% of the total. The next two highest categories were the
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domestic category constituting 9%, and the indefinite category constituting 39%.

A problem with ANF-1’s assemblage is the lack of diagnostic CCC-era artifacts. Out of 647 artifacts, only 102 dated to the CCC period. This determination was based on the maker’s marks on the bases of the bottles and ceramics and contextual association with CCC era diagnostic artifacts. Out of the remaining 545, 42 were clearly the result of an occupation after the CCC era. This determination was based on the form or diagnostic marks on artifacts recovered within the same context. The majority of the artifacts recovered could not be confidently dated. Some probably dated to the CCC era, while others probably dated to the P.O.W. camp or later times. For a detailed catalog of the assemblage and the dating of the artifacts, refer to Appendix A. For the purpose of this research, only the artifacts that date to the CCC era were analyzed and then compared in the larger synthesis.

Once the artifacts that could not be dated to the CCC era were removed, the domestic group made up 46% of the assemblage, and the structural group made up 44%. The groups from the CCC-era assemblage are illustrated in Figure 13.

**Discretionary Categories**

Using the discretionary categories outlined in Chapter 4, the structural group and the indefinite groups were removed, thus reducing the number of artifacts to 50. Out of the 50 artifacts, 24% were discretionary items and 76% were non-discretionary items (Figure 14). The discretionary items at ANF-1 were mainly composed of artifacts that would fall into South’s
domestic group (75%, n=9). The majority of the domestic items represented soda bottles. The other 25% of the discretionary category was composed of personal items. The non-discretionary category was composed completely of the domestic group (100%, n=38). This category was made up mainly of milk bottles and utilitarian ironstone ceramics. These results will be compared with the rest of the sites in the synthesis in Chapter 7.

Figure 14. Discretionary Spending at ANF-1.
CHAPTER 6: COMPARATIVE SITES

In this chapter, the sites that are compared to ANF-1 will be discussed. Each description will entail a site history outlining its historic use and its inhabitants. This description will be followed by a discussion of the archaeology performed at the site and the assemblage that the excavations produced. The application of the discretionary spending categories will then be discussed, and the results of that application will be shown. The first two sites that will be introduced are the comparative CCC camps. Two Great Depression domestic sites will then be discussed, and the chapter concludes with comparisons of pre-Depression residential sites.

The CCC Camp at Bandelier National Monument, New Mexico

In order to fully understand the discretionary spending at ANF-1, it is important to compare the results with other CCC camps across the nation. The comparison will allow a detailed view of the CCC enrollees’ buying strategies and show how they negotiated the economic and cultural stress associated with the Great Depression. The CCC camp at Bandelier National Monument was constructed for the purpose of providing support to the National Park Service and constructing recreational and administrative facilities within the park. The camp was occupied from 1933 to 1939, and it was home to approximately 200 enrollees who lived and worked at the permanent camp (Smith 2001).

Site History

Bandelier National Monument was established in 1916 under the jurisdiction of the United States Forest Service (USFS). In 1932, the 26,000-acre preserve was transferred to the National Park Service (NPS) (Smith 2001:32). The change in management changed the way the monument was run. The United States Forest Service managed the site to preserve the ruins. The NPS determined the ruins should be accessible for public use, and services should be constructed
at the monument to allow the public to enjoy the park (Smith 2001:32). The construction of these facilities fell largely upon the CCC.

CCC enrollees arrived at Bandelier National Monument in 1933, and the men spent the first part of the year living in tents similar to the enrollees at ANF-1 (Smith 2001:32). The NPS selected the floor of Frijoles Canyon as the location for the permanent camp. Soon after their arrival, the enrollees constructed a single large U-shaped barracks capable of holding one hundred men, two smaller barracks which housed 50 men, a mess hall, an infirmary, officer quarters, storage shed, a large recreational building, and a three-pit latrine (Smith 2001:36). Between 1933 and 1939 enrollees at the camp constructed visitor facilities, administrative offices, a new lodge, employee residences, picnic and campgrounds, a maintenance area, utility systems, an oil house, underground gasoline and oil storage tanks, modern electrical and sewage systems, a power house, a refuse burner, septic tanks, and 30,000 gallons of water storage (Smith 2001:32).

In 1939, the camp was deemed to have completed its mission at Bandelier National Monument. The enrollees dismantled the camp, and the foundations of the buildings were bulldozed (Smith 2001:32).

Archaeology of the CCC Camp at Bandelier National Monument

The site was recorded and excavated in 1990 and 1991 as part of a five year NPS inventory survey of cultural resources at Bandelier National Monument (Smith 2001:32). While the main goal of the survey was to inventory and assess the integrity of the Ancestral Pueblo sites within the park, historic sites were also recorded. The CCC camp was recorded as 31LA77728 due to the large amount of construction and structural debris as well the presence of surface artifacts relating to the 1930s (Smith 2001:33). Monica L. Smith conducted the survey.
that recoded the site, and she noted that the site had a large amount of artifacts that were consistent with a CCC camp, such as structural and domestic refuse (Smith 2001:33). Dates were given to the site based on diagnostic artifacts. Glass artifacts found at the site ranged from 1880 to the present, and metal cans dated from 1925 to 1955 (Smith 2001:34). These dates placed the site in the CCC era, and after additional historical research was undertaken, it was determined that the site was a CCC camp, which was used from 1933 to 1939.

Figure 15 shows the categories of the assemblage found at Bandelier. Similar to ANF-1, the assemblage was dominated by the structural category with 71% of the total assemblage falling within this category. The indefinite category was also prominent and contained 14% of the total assemblage. Both ANF-1 and Bandelier have relatively small assemblages, and this will decrease even further once the discretionary categories are applied.
Discretionary Categories at the CCC camp at Bandelier National Monument

The discretionary categories outlined in Chapter 4 were applied to the assemblage from the CCC camp at Bandelier National Monument, and the results are illustrated in Figure 16. The majority of the discretionary spending category was composed of artifacts that would fall into South’s personal group (69%, n=11). These items include alcohol bottles, cologne bottles and a tobacco tin. The remaining 31% was from the domestic group (n=3). Like ANF-1 these were mainly soda bottles. The non-discretionary category was predominately South’s domestic group (77% n=12) and the activities group (18%, n=4). Like ANF-1, the domestic group was mainly composed of ceramics while the activities group, which was not found at ANF-1, was composed of objects relating to automobile maintenance. The discretionary spending was 42% at Bandelier as compared to the 24% found at ANF-1. Both assemblages were very small, and it must be acknowledged that this could be biasing the results of the discretionary spending categories.

Figure 16. Discretionary spending at Bandelier.
The CCC camp at Zigzag, Oregon

In order to make further comparisons of the results from ANF-1 and the CCC camp at Bandelier National Monument, information from a CCC camp located in Zigzag, Oregon was added to the synthesis. Adding the CCC camp in Oregon to the synthesis will provide a detailed picture of what discretionary spending was like in CCC camps across the United States during the New Deal era. The camp at Zigzag was inhabited from 1933 to 1942 for public works and conservation projects in nearby Mt. Hood National Forest (Tuck 2008). The site was excavated by Janna Tuck to complete her Master’s Thesis at Portland State University. She has agreed to allow her data to be used in this synthesis (Tuck - Personal Communication 2011).

Site History

On May 14, 1933 under the direction of the Emergency Conservation Work Act, Company 928 was formed in Vancouver, Washington and was directed to construct a permanent camp at the western entrance to Mt. Hood National Forest (Tuck 2008:27). Similar to ANF-1 and the Camp at Bandelier, enrollees at Zigzag, Oregon spent the first part of 1933 living in tents while they constructed permanent camp buildings. In 1937, Camp Zigzag boasted four bunkhouses capable of holding 50 men each, an educational building, a recreation hall, a kitchen and mess hall, officer’s quarters, an infirmary, a shop building, and a truck shed. According to the camp newspaper, a fifth bunkhouse was constructed in 1939 (Tuck 2008:27). The camp was typical of all CCC camps, and it offered a robust educational program, extracurricular activities, and the military organization typical of the CCC. Camp Zigzag was unique because all of the enrollees were from Oregon, and most of them had completed high school (Tuck 2008:28). This higher level of education was relatively rare amongst CCC enrollees, as a high school education was not considered necessary in the early 20th century to get gainful employment. The camp
was used during the entire New Deal period, and it was the last camp to be closed in Oregon (Tuck 2008:28). After the camp was closed, the buildings were considered a fire hazard so the structures were burnt to the ground, and the site was bulldozed (Tuck 2008:31). Through preliminary testing, Tuck determined that the site had subsurface deposits relating to the CCC era and warranted listing on the National Register under Criterion D (Tuck 2008:34).

Archaeology of the CCC Camp at Zigzag

The camp was first recorded in 2007 and registered with the State of Oregon Historic Preservation Office as a 4 acre site located in the town of Zigzag, Oregon (Tuck 2011:17). In order to identify archaeological deposits at the site, Tuck in conjunction with the United States Forest Service archaeologists conducted a metal detector and a Geometrics G-858 cesium magnetometer survey of the site (Tuck 2011:17). She identified deposits but noticed that the majority of the site was located under a large gravel parking lot used by the United States Forest Service (USFS) (Tuck 2011:18). After processing the results from the metal detector and geophysical survey, Tuck combined the information from the survey with historical maps of the camp. She then placed 12 one-meter-by-one-meter test units, and 2 fifty-centimeter-by-fifty-centimeter units (Tuck 2011:35). Tuck produced 8,217 artifacts from her excavations. She then transported the artifacts back to her home and conducted an analysis similar to that done for ANF-1. She organized her results according to Stanley South’s artifact categories in order to understand how the objects were related to specific tasks (Tuck 2011:21).
She found that over 60% of the assemblage was composed of artifacts relating to South’s structural category, while the domestic, activities, and personal categories added up to a total of 10%. She also found that 24% of the assemblage excavated from Zigzag could not be identified and fell within the Indefinite category. Her results are illustrated in Figure 17. In comparison with the assemblages from ANF-1 and Bandelier, it appears that, while the
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**Figure 17. Artifact assemblage from Zigzag OR.**

*Discretionary Spending Categories at the CCC Camp at Zigzag*

Once the structural and indefinite categories were removed from the assemblage, the number of artifacts analyzed dropped to 654. Figure 18 illustrates the discretionary categories found at Zigzag. The discretionary category is made primarily of artifacts relating to the personal group (56%, n=61), followed by domestic (33%, n=36) and activity groups (10%, n=11). Similar to ANF-1 and Bandelier, Zigzag’s personal group was mainly composed of alcohol bottles, and tobacco tins as well as cockatoo figurine, and several fragments from pocket watches. The domestic group was again made up of mainly soda bottles and the activities group was composed of miscellaneous items like fragments from a fishing rod, and pieces of a harmonica. The large
sample produced by Tuck allowed for a wider range of discretionary items to be analyzed, but the same predominance of the personal group, followed by the domestic and the activities group was found. The non-discretionary category from Zigzag was mainly composed of artifacts from the domestic group (66%, n=351). A large amount of utilitarian clothing related items were found, along with ironstone ceramic sherds. The next highest group was the personal group (18%, n=97), which encompassed a large amount of artifacts relating to basic hygiene. Finally, the activities group made up the remaining 16% (n=86). Artifacts in this group were mainly related to office work, like lead pencils and paper clips. The discretionary spending is similar to ANF-1, which had a value of 24%, but it is notably different from the discretionary spending found at Bandelier, which was 42%.

![Figure 18. Discretionary spending at Zigzag.](image)

**3CW974: The Smith Farmstead**

To further compare the results found at ANF-1 and the other two CCC camps, two non-CCC sites from the Great Depression were analyzed. These sites will provide a baseline, showing what life was like for those not receiving financial relief from the government. The first
site, 3CW974 or the Smith Farmstead, provided an excellent comparison with the CCC camps already investigated. Inhabited from 1935 to 1945 by the Smith family, the site demonstrates the consumer choices average Americans were making during the Great Depression. In addition, 3CW974 provided an excellent comparison because one of the residents of the site joined the CCC in 1936 (Gilliland et al. 2007:40). This link provided a direct comparison of what life was like for enrollees before the CCC as well as what life was like for the family with a son enrolled in the CCC. Due to the short nature of the occupation of the site, it is impossible to differentiate between the pre-CCC years and the time that the son was enrolled in the CCC.

The Smith Farmstead represents the remains of a Great Depression era farmstead in northwestern Arkansas. The site was the location of a small farm owned by the Smith family for a decade and then abandoned (Gilliland et al. 2007:40). The site was comprised of a two-story house, a smokehouse, a canning cellar, a barn, a chicken coop, a shed, a privy, and an additional building whose function remains unknown (Gilliland et al. 2007:99).

Site History

Fred Smith was born February 9, 1889 in Grand River, Kentucky (Gilliland et al. 2007:40). In 1911 he married his wife, Vienna, and from 1912 to 1919 she had three daughters and one son. In the early 1920s, the family moved to Locke, Arkansas where Smith worked as a telegraph operator for the railroads. The Smith family resided in Locke for the early part of the 1920s until they moved to Mountainburg, Arkansas. They rented a house there until the early 1930s. During the time the Smith family was living in Mountainburg, Fred bought land outside of town and built a house (Gilliland et al. 2007:40). The family moved into this house sometime between 1930 and 1935. Historic photos show the Smith family clearing the land and building a two-story house with a stone and mortar foundation (Gilliland et al. 2007:97). Fred Smith and his
family were subsistence farmers. While they did sell calves, eggs, and butter to nearby towns such as Chester or Mountainburg, the main source of income for the Smith family appears to be Fred Smith’s job with the railroad.

In 1936, Fred and Vienna’s only son, Max, left the farmstead and joined the CCC (Gilliland et al. 2007:40). It is unknown if Max worked in a local CCC camp or was stationed elsewhere in the country. The rest of the family inhabited the site until 1941. Fred then retired from the railroad, moved the family to the town of Mountainburg, and let the farmstead fall into disrepair (Gilliland et al. 2007:40). Max briefly returned in 1941. He lived at the site until he was drafted in 1945. Max was the last inhabitant of the Smith Farmstead, and the site was abandoned until 1955 when the City of Fort Smith bought the land (Gilliland et al. 2007:40).

The Archaeology of the Smith Farmstead

The Smith Farmstead was the focus of a Phase III data recovery conducted by Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc., for the City of Fort Smith’s water supply project. The site was initially recorded in 2000 with a standard test pit survey, and a brief description of the above ground foundations (Gilliland et al. 2007:47). A Phase II investigation was then conducted that consisted of 17 STPs and two test units (Gilliland et al. 2007:48). The Phase II determined that the site was eligible for the National Register, and it was recommended that the client, the City of Fort Smith, undertake the necessary mitigation if the site was going to be impacted. It was determined that the site was going to be destroyed with the construction of the new reservoir, and a Phase III excavation was undertaken.

The Phase III data recovery was conducted during June and July of 2002 (Gilliland et al. 2007:11). A total of 95 STPs were dug. In addition to the STPs 13.5 square meters were hand excavated, resulting in a total of 2,475 artifacts. Excavation focused on the foundation of the
house and the surrounding grounds since Phase I and Phase II investigations had showed this to be the location of dense cultural deposits (Gilliland et al. 2007:12). Glass accounted for 50.8% of the assemblage, which contained a large amount of canning jars (Gilliland et al. 2007:83). This was not surprising as, as the historical record indicates that the Smith family was primarily eating only what they could grow on the farm and canning would have been necessary to preserve food throughout the winter (Gilliland et al. 2007:94).

Organizing the assemblage found at the Smith Farmstead revealed that 51% of it fell within South’s structural Category, and the next three highest categories were indefinite, domestic and personal (figure 19).

**Discretionary Categories at the Smith Farmstead**

The levels of discretionary spending at the Smith Farmstead are illustrated in figure 20. It was found that 40% of the 955 artifacts were related to discretionary spending while 60% were considered to be non-discretionary. The non-discretionary category was dominated by artifacts from the domestic Group (93%, n=246), and this can be partially explained by the heavy reliance
of the Smith family on canning food in Mason Jars. The discretionary category was also dominated by the domestic Group, with 74% (n=134) of the discretionary category being from the domestic Group with a high amount of decorative ceramics, such as porcelain, and alcohol bottles being recovered. The personal group, which dominated the CCC assemblages, was not as high (25%, n=44). This could be accounted for by Smith family being able to choose to eat off fine tableware as opposed to the CCC enrollee who did not have that choice.

![Discretionary spending at 3CW974](image)

Figure 20. Discretionary spending at 3CW974.

**44PY181**

The next Great Depression era site examined was 44PY181, a domestic site located in Danville, Virginia, which was the home of many mill workers. This site enhances the comparison because it provides a view of discretionary spending by a common family during the Great Depression. This particular site was chosen as a counterpoint to the rural the Smith Farmstead because 44PY181 was located in an urban context. The combination of the two sites provides a representative sample of American culture during the Great Depression, both rural and urban.
Site History

The local economy of Danville, Virginia was centered on the production of cotton textiles, and it had one of the largest textile mills in the south, the Riverside Cotton Mill (Higgens et al. 2003:15). The mill dominated the life of its employees. It owned all the stores, the hospitals, the schools, and even the homes of the mill workers (Higgens et al. 2003:15).

The site, 44PY181, consisted of the backyards of two houses. The land, where the site was located, was purchased by T.B. Fitzgerald and later conveyed to the Riverside Cotton Mills, Inc. in 1880 (Higgens et al. 2003:28). Around 1909 the Riverside Cotton Mill merged with another mill in Danville to form the Riverside and Dan River Cotton Mills, and the ownership of the property stayed within the new corporation’s ownership (Higgens et al. 2003:31). The mill retained ownership until the 1950s (Higgens et al. 2003:31).

Throughout the period of 1880 to 1950, the mill built two modest houses on the site to house employees and their families. It was common for men, women, and sometimes children to be

Figure 21. House plan from Danville Va. (Higgens et al 2003).
employed by the mill, and this seems to be the case of the families that occupied 44PY181 (Higgens et al. 2003:15).

The mill kept their employees in a constant state of debt and controlled every aspect of their lives (Higgens et al. 2003:15). The houses that were related to the deposits of 44PY181 were relatively utilitarian houses, containing a fireplace and wood stoves for heat, a tin roof, and plaster walls. Figure 21 shows the plan and elevations of a typical Danville Mill house (Higgens et al. 2003:18). Not much is known about the actual inhabitants, and the length of occupation of 44PY181 as the company destroyed most of the records regarding the property (Higgenes et al. 2003:31). It is believed that they were typical mill workers who earned their wages at Mill 6 since it was the closest mill and was within walking distance of their homes (Higgens et al. 2003:35).

The Archaeology of 44PY181

![Artifact assemblage from 44PY181](image-url)

*Figure 22. Artifact assemblage from 44PY181.*
The William and Mary Center of Archaeological Research conducted a Phase III data recovery at 44PY181 between May 21 and June 8 and between June 18 and June 29, 2001 (Higges et al. 2003:9-10). The data recovery consisted of two stages. The first stage was the mechanical stripping of the site in order to expose features. The second stage focused on the excavation of major features found during the mechanical stripping process (Higgens et al. 2003:35). Forty-nine features were identified at 44PY181 (Higgens et al. 2003:50-51). From the 49 features, only 17 features were excavated. Based on the artifacts, the mean date of all the features was 1929 (Higgens et al. 2003:50). Many of the features were privies or slop holes that dated to the Great Depression.

The total assemblage is depicted in Figure 22. The domestic category encompassed a little over half of the total assemblage (51%), and it was followed by structural, indefinite, and personal categories. In order to provide an accurate picture of life in Danville during the Great Depression, artifacts dating prior to 1929 were eliminated from the analysis as well as artifacts that were clearly dated after the 1940s. This artifact assemblage was very different from the one excavated at 3CW974. The difference can be partially explained because the archaeology at
44PY181 only focused on the back lots of the houses, thus reducing the amount of structural elements that would be found as opposed to 3CW974, which focused on the total property. By excluding the structural group, the sample is normalized.

Discretionary Categories at 44PY181

The discretionary categories are illustrated in Figure 23. Based on the initial comparison of the two sites it appeared that there is a large discrepancy between the 40% found at 3CW974 and the 19% found at 44PY181. This could be related to the differences between the urban and rural contexts of the sites. This theme will be explored in Chapter 7. Similar to the Smith Farmstead, 80% of the discretionary category was made up of artifacts from the domestic group. Once again, both the Smith Farmstead and the Millworker’s house have a higher percent of luxury tableware when compared with the CCC camps. The non-discretionary category was almost completely composed of artifacts from the domestic Group, with 93% of the non-discretionary assemblage falling in the group. This can be explained by the presence of utilitarian domestic goods like, basic tableware, and jars.

36AL569

In order to understand if the mindset of thrift outlined in Chapter 3 was adopted regardless of the economic conditions of the Great Depression, it was important to compare the Great Depression sites against the pre-Depression sites. Due to the good economic conditions across the country before the Great Depression, the mindset of thrift would not have been required. The first pre-Depression site examined was 36AL569, which is located in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania.
Site History

With in Allegheny County, 36AL569 is located in the town of Braddock and was considered to be an urban domestic site. The site has had a long, complicated, and largely unknown history of owners since it was first settled. The first owner of the site in 1864 was James H. Oliver, who laid out the Maple Subdivision Plan of Braddocksfield (Diamanti et al. 2009:21-1). At this time, the site was part of a much larger parcel of land, and that parcel was sold to Patrick S. and Margaret Slattery (Diamanti et al. 2009:21-2). Federal census records from 1870, 1880, and 1900 show the site was being used by the Philadelphia Fuel Company as a small office building and storage facility (Diamanti et al. 2009:21-2). It is assumed that the Philadelphia Fuel Company rented the land because in 1902 the land was sold by the Slatterys to Thomas Walker and his firm, McVey & Walker (Diamanti et al. 2009:21-2). Walker then demolished the office building and constructed a three story building on the property.

Due to the poor records regarding the property, the U.S. census data was the only source of information regarding the actual inhabitants of the property. Walker and his family owned a large amount of property in Braddock, but lived elsewhere (Diamanti et al. 2009:21-2). The 1910 Federal census records indicate that between 16 and 18 African Americans single men were living in the building and the first floor was used as a grocery store (Diamanti et al. 2009:21-3). Records indicate that all of the boarders were wagon drivers, and some may have been associated with the first floor grocer.

The 1920s census records state that the building was home to 18 African Americans, 16 men employed as laborers in the steel mills, and two women (Diamanti et al. 2009:21-3). By 1930, the building was used by only six individuals: all African American and employed in various blue-color jobs (Diamanti et al. 2009:21-3). This site provided an excellent comparison
to the CCC camps discussed earlier since it was inhabited by mostly single males, the comparison does fall short, due to the different racial backgrounds of 36AL569 and the three CCC camps.

The Archaeology of 36AL569

Archaeology was conducted at 36AL569 by Archaeological and Historical Consultants, Inc. between 2006 and 2007. Fifty-one shovel tests and seven test units were dug totaling 19.75 square meters (Diamanti et al. 2009:21-13). Three middens were found as well as a variety of fill soils composed of domestic refuse and a deep trench that had been historically filled. The ceramic assemblage generated from the excavations was dominated by ironstone, and overall the “assemblage was typical of an early twentieth century domestic context” (Diamanti et al. 2009:21-14).

Artifact Assemblage at 36AL569
<n=11,267>

Figure 24. Artifact assemblage from 36AL569.

The total assemblage is illustrated in Figure 24. The indefinite category dominates the assemblage with almost 60% of the total falling within this category. This was caused by the large amount of indeterminate container glass; 2,973 pieces had no discernable function. The structural category is also relatively low, with only 23% of the assemblage falling in this
category. This low number in comparison to the other sites was probably caused by the excavation strategy that only focused on the yard and not the foundations. If the foundations had been excavated it can be assumed that the structural category would have increase dramatically.

*Discretionary Categories at 36AL569*

Discretionary spending, illustrated in Figure 25, at 36AL569 consisted of 17% of the artifacts, while non-discretionary spending was 83%. Due to the large sample size, and the nature of the deposits, it appears that the assemblage is an accurate picture of life during the early 20th century in Braddock, Pennsylvania. The low discretionary spending figure could reflect the inhabitants of the site being African American. Considering the racial prejudices of the early 20th century, it is possible that these inhabitants were discriminated against and not able to obtain well-paying jobs. In breaking the discretionary categories down farther, it appears that they follow the same basic pattern as 44PY181. The domestic group is the majority of both the discretionary and non-discretionary categories. The main difference between this site and the two Great Depression sites is the high presence of artifacts from the personal group, 36% of the
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Figure 25. Discretionary spending at 36AL569.
discretionary category (n=124). This could represent the increased buying power of individuals before the Great Depression.

36AL575

The second pre-Depression site to be analyzed for discretionary spending was also located in Braddock, Pennsylvania. It serves as a counterpoint to the Braddock site analyzed above.

Site History

Like 36AL569, 36AL575’s historic ownership is murky. The first individual to build a house and live on the site was Harmann Konig. Konig purchased the land from Margaret Shaw and Mary E. Wood, two sisters whose father was a prominent coal merchant and landowner in Braddock during the last portion of the 19th century (Diamanti et al. 2009:24-2). Konig, a Hungarian immigrant and tailor, built a residence on the property in 1895, but he sold the property and the house in 1902 to Charles W. and Mary Braznell. The Braznell’s did not live on the property but rented it out to Michael DiGenova, an Italian barber (Diamanti et al. 2009:24-2).

The U.S. census, which only provides a snapshot of the individuals who lived there every ten years, showed that Konig lived in the house with his wife Laura, his niece, brother-in-law, and a female servant (Diamanti et al. 2009:24-2). After Konig sold the property to the Braznell’s, the DiGenova’s lived on the property. The DiGenova’s family consisted of Michael DiGenova, his wife Molly, and their four children as well as an Armenian boarder who was from Turkey (Diamanti et al. 2009:24-3).
The Archaeology of 36AL575

The archaeology at 36AL575 was done by Archaeological and Historical Consultants, Inc. in 2006. In total, twelve shovel tests and six test units were dug on the property (Diamanti et al. 2009:24-4 24-5). Excavations produced 2,969 artifacts and identified multiple features as well as a brick lined privy shown in figure 26 (Diamanti et al. 2009). The privy produced 45% of the artifacts in the assemblage. The drainpipe, shown in figure 26, was installed to channel waste into the vault once indoor plumbing had been installed yet before the connection with the municipal sewer system (Diamanti et al. 2009:24-10). The artifacts from the privy and the rest of the assemblage were typical of early 20th century sites with a large amount of undecorated ironstone and bottle glass (Diamanti et al. 2009:24-9).

The assemblage is presented in Figure 27. Similar to 36AL569, the assemblage was dominated by the indefinite category. This is due to the large amount of container glass that could not be given a function. Structural and domestic categories were the next largest groups in the assemblage.

Figure 26. Privy from 36AL575 (Diamanti et al. 2009).
Figure 28. Artifact assemblage from 36AL575.

Figure 27. Discretionary spending at 36AL575.
Discretionary Spending at 36AL575

Discretionary spending at 36AL575 is illustrated in Figure 28. The 27% found at the site is 10% larger than the level of discretionary spending found at 36AL569. This ten percent increase could be the result of the inhabitants being able to gain better employment since they were white instead of the African Americans that inhabited 36AL569. Still a ten percent increase in discretionary spending is not that much of a difference compared to the 21% found between the Great Depression domestic sites. That 10% increase could be attributed to the high percent of artifacts related to the personal Group, 58% of the total discretionary category. It seems that both pre-Depression sites have a large percent of personal items when compared to the Depression era sites. While the non-discretionary category at site 36AL575 is similar to the other domestic sites with 93% of its assemblage being generated by the domestic group.

Conclusion

The data that has been presented in the chapter will be used to test the hypotheses outlined in Chapter 1. A chi-square test will be applied to the comparisons, and the results will suggest if a mindset of thrift was adopted in the Great Depression, regardless of the economic situation. The results of this test will be outlined in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 7: INTERPRETATION

The data that was presented in Chapter 6 will be tested against the hypotheses formulated in Chapter 1. Each hypothesis will be tested, and then it will be determined whether it is statistically valid through the application of a chi-square test. Finally, the results will be explained and interpreted. The chapter will conclude with a summary of all of the hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis to be tested will determine if the same level of discretionary spending that was taking place at ANF-1 was also taking place at the CCC camp at Bandelier National Monument, New Mexico and the camp at Zigzag, Oregon. This hypothesis was formulated based on the assumption that since conditions were similar in regards to housing, organization, pay, enrollees’ ages, gender, and marital status, therefore, discretionary spending would be similar.

The discretionary levels for all three camps are illustrated in Figure 29. The levels of discretionary spending at the camps ranged from 17% at Zigzag to 42% at Bandelier. The chi-
square test produced a P-value of .0002. The statistics show that the differences between the assemblages are highly significant.

Based on the distribution of the three assemblages, the hypothesis that a similar level of discretionary spending was taking place at all three CCC camps was refuted. The chi-square test confirmed this fact. A possible reason for the dissimilarity could be the small sample sizes from ANF-1 (n=50) and Bandelier (n=38). The sample size could be biasing the results, and the artifacts found by Smith (2001), and myself do not accurately depict what life was like at these camps. While this is a possibility, Smith demonstrated that her results were valid, and they portrayed an accurate picture of what life was like at Bandelier based on the documentary record (2001). As outlined in Chapter 5 (Section 5.4, Site Formation Processes) an analysis of destroyed CCC camps produces valid results.

If the results do portray a valid picture of camp life, then the variation could be explained by different populations making different choices. All three camps were located in different ecological zones. This may have some affect on the discretionary spending of the enrollees. Individuals who were living and working in the New Mexico desert would have different needs and wants than the individuals working in northwestern Pennsylvania, or western Oregon.

Another factor that could influence discretionary spending was the location of where the enrollees were raised. The length of time each enrollee spent at the camp differed, but generally ranged from six months to a year and a half (Williams 2008). Therefore, the time that the enrollees spent at the camp was relatively brief in comparison to the time they spent growing up. Discretionary spending strategies could have been formed at an earlier age, and once the enrollee arrived at a CCC camp, these strategies would have continued to be employed.
Based on the similar percentages found at ANF-1 (24%) and Zigzag (17%), a separate chi-square test was conducted using only these two assemblages. The results were a P-value of .2201. As a result, there was no significant difference between ANF-1 and Zigzag. This limits the conclusions that can be drawn. Clearly, this similarity eliminates the conclusion that different ecological zones would require different discretionary needs since the two camps’ discretionary levels do not vary significantly. Building from the conclusion that the enrollees’ buying strategies were developed earlier in life and that they were used throughout the enrollees’ time at the camps, perhaps there is some similarity between the local contexts from where the enrollees originated and the discretionary spending at ANF-1 and Zigzag. The enrollees from Zigzag came from all over Oregon, but Tuck noted that the enrollees originated in cities such as Gresham, Portland, and Oregon City (2008:28). Ann Komara, did extensive research regarding the origins of the enrollees at ANF-1, and she concluded that the enrollees “were predominately from cities” (Komara 2009:21). Thus, the majority if enrollees at both Zigzag and ANF-1 originated from urban contexts.

When ANF-1 was compared to Bandelier, a chi-square test produced a P-value of .0068, indicating that discretionary spending levels at the two camps were not similar. Smith did not state where the enrollees originated from so further testing of the conclusion that enrollees buying strategies are dependent on their original homes could not be tested further with the Bandelier data.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 seeks to understand the relationship between discretionary spending and the Great Depression. The hypothesis, discretionary spending was higher at the CCC camps than at the domestic sites inhabited during the Great Depression, was based on the assumption that
economic conditions were better in the CCC camps because the enrollees were given food, shelter, and clothing as well as a monthly paycheck. Conversely, the Great Depression domestic sites should possess lower levels of discretionary spending because these families were not provided with necessary items. However, the differences between the CCC camps and the Great Depression domestic sites should be comparable if the individuals adopted the mindset of thrift. If individuals were adopting this mindset regardless of economic pressure, then the discretionary spending levels in this comparison should be similar.
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This hypothesis was tested by finding the average level of discretionary spending of the three CCC camps and comparing it to the average of the Great Depression domestic sites (Figure 30). The chi-square test produced a P-value of .3046, suggesting that the results of discretionary spending at the CCC camps and the Great Depression domestic sites were similar, and the hypothesis was refuted. Furthermore, it was refuted because the CCC had a lower discretionary spending level (28%) than the Depression era domestic sites (30%).
While the difference between the CCC camps and Great Depression domestic sites was only 2%, it is possible that a larger sample would change the results. The inhabitants of both Great Depression domestic sites were employed throughout the 1930s, and they might not have felt the burden of the economic downturn as badly as individuals who were unemployed.

Another reason why Hypothesis 2 was refuted could be the lack of uniformity between the two Great Depression era sites. The Smith Farmstead had a discretionary level of 40% while the site in Millworker’s home in Danville VA had a discretionary level of 19%. This wide discrepancy in discretionary spending levels is further verified by a chi-square test that compared the two sites and produced a P-value of .0011. Building on the conclusion that CCC enrollees developed their discretionary spending strategies before enrollment in the CCC, a comparison between 3CW974 and the CCC camps in which the majority of enrollees were from urban contexts was undertaken. By comparing ANF-1 and Zigzag to 3CW974, a marked difference appears with 3CW974 having a discretionary level of 40% while ANF-1 and Zigzag have an average discretionary level of 20.5%. This difference is confirmed with a chi-square test that produced a P-value of .0002. When the two camps were compared with the urban site of 44PY181, the P-value rises to 0.7119, indicating that the averages are very similar. Thus, there is a relationship between the three assemblages. In comparing urban contexts and the CCC camps where the inhabitants are from cities, similar buying strategies are found. This adds validity to suggestion that discretionary buying strategies were established before the individual entered the CCC.

**Hypothesis 3**

Hypothesis 3 tests discretionary spending between the CCC camps and the pre-Depression sites. The hypothesis, *discretionary spending was lower at CCC camps than sites*
from the pre-Depression era, was based on the assumption that economic conditions were good throughout the 1920s, and the mindset of thrift would not have been manifested. Throughout the 1920s, the economy was booming, and industry and manufacturing companies were employing a large percentage of the population (Galbraith 1955:7). This changed once the Great Depression started. Individuals had to restrict their discretionary spending. If individuals adopted a mindset of thrift regardless of economic conditions there should be a higher level of discretionary spending among the pre-Depression sites than at the CCC camps. Enrollees in the CCC were supplied with all the necessities, food, clothing and shelter. If they adopted the mindset of thrift it was not because of economic necessity. Comparing the CCC to pre-Depression sites provides a baseline in the comparison.

Hypothesis 3 was tested by finding the average discretionary spending of all the CCC camps (28%) and then comparing it to the average of the two pre-Depression sites (20%) (Figure 31). The chi-square test produced a P-value of .5839 for this comparison. This shows that there
was not a significant difference between the sites, and the fact that CCC era discretionary spending was higher than pre-Depression discretionary spending further refutes the hypothesis.
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Figure 32. Discretionary spending at sites with urban populations.

In comparing the three CCC sites, the discretionary spending data from the camp at Bandelier appears to be an outlier. Once Bandelier is removed from the comparison, the P-value rises to .858, which shows that the average of ANF-1 and Zigzag was very similar to the pre-Depression sites. Figure 32 shows the percentages for ANF-1 and Zigzag as compared to the pre-Depression sites.

It is possible that the two sites from Braddock are not accurate representations of what life was like during pre-Depression times. Site 36AL569 was inhabited by African-Americans who were discriminated against economically in the early 20th century, and all of the CCC camps in this synthesis were composed of white men. Diamanti et al. (2009) claimed that the inhabitants at 36AL575, and 36AL569 were middle to upper, lower class workers, which is roughly the same for the rest of the sites in this synthesis including the CCC camps.
A better explanation of the results lies in the similarities between the CCC camps, where the individuals originated from urban contexts, and the two pre-Depression sites used in this synthesis, which were also urban sites.

**Hypothesis 4**

Hypothesis 4 tests the relationship between the Great Depression domestic sites and the pre-Depression sites. The assumption was that Great Depression domestic sites would have a lower level of discretionary spending because of the economic downturn. Pre-Depression sites would have a higher level of discretionary spending because they would not be influenced by the lack of discretionary income or the mindset of thrift, and they would have spent freely.
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**Figure 33. Great Depression sites compared to pre-Depression sites.**
The two pre-Depression era domestic sites were averaged together and then compared to the average of the two Great Depression era domestic sites. The percentages for each are shown in Figure 33. The chi-square tests of the two sets of sites produced a P-value of 0.211, and the Depression sites show a much higher percentage of discretionary spending than the average of the pre-Depression sites, thus refuting the hypothesis.

To further understand why Hypothesis 4 was refuted, I dissected the averages, compared 3CW974 to the pre-Depression sites, and compared 44PY181 to the pre-Depression sites. I then conducted chi-square tests on each of the comparisons.

In comparing the 3CW974 to the two pre-Depression sites, the P-value was 0.002, indicating that there was significant difference between the sites. In comparing 44PY181 to the pre-Depression sites, 36AL575, and 36AL569, the P-value was .858, indicating that there was a high probability that there was no significant difference between the sites. 44PY181 and both pre-Depression sites were both from urban contexts, but 3CW974 was rural. By breaking down the comparison, it becomes clear that the differences between rural and urban sites are much more significant than the comparison between Great Depression and pre-Depression sites.

This observation reveals that the context is more important than the temporal affiliation, and possibly economic climate, in regards to discretionary spending. Sites that share a similar spatial context, such as urban, also have very similar discretionary spending levels. Sites that share similar time periods, such as during the Great Depression seem to demonstrate more variability with their discretionary spending levels.

**Hypothesis 5**

Hypothesis 5 was to determine if the mindset of thrift was adopted during the Great Depression. It analyzed this concept by looking at the results of the previous four hypotheses. If
the mindset of thrift was adopted during the Great Depression, discretionary spending would be lower in the Great Depression contexts as compared to pre-Depression contexts.

Based on the four hypotheses discussed earlier, it is clear that a mindset of thrift was not adopted regardless of economic pressure. It is debatable whether a mindset of thrift was ever adopted at any of the sites in this comparison. 3CW974, the Smith Farmstead, had the highest level of discretionary spending of all of the sites, and it was a Great Depression era site. 44PY181, the mill workers house in Danville Virginia, had a much lower discretionary spending level, but when it was compared to the pre-Depression sites, it correlated with sites in an urban context. It must be stated that the inhabitants of 44PY181 could have been taking part in a different economic model based around the use of company script, but Higgsens et al. gave no mention of this economic practice.

This research points to pre-established buying strategies being maintained instead of altered by the economic downturn of the Great Depression. Although no sites were investigated that had unemployed inhabitants during the Great Depression, the synthesis of data does represent a wide range of sites.

In regards to the CCC camps, it appears that there was no general pattern of discretionary spending adopted by the enrollees. Discretionary spending was dictated by factors other than enrollment in the CCC. One of these factors appears to be the origin of the enrollee. Based on comparing sites in similar contexts, the discretionary spending was comparable. The discretionary levels found at Zigzag and ANF-1 are roughly the same as those found at 44PY181 and the two pre-Depression sites. All of these sites are from an urban context, and the two CCC camps were home to individuals who were originally from urban contexts.
The origin of the enrollees from the CCC camp at Bandelier National Monument is unknown. It must be stated that the 40% level of discretionary spending at Bandelier is very similar to the 42% found at 3CW974. Therefore, if discretionary spending strategies were established before enrollment in the CCC, the enrollees from Bandelier may have been from rural areas.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the results of this research show that a mindset of thrift was not adopted at any of the Great Depression sites investigated in this research. All five hypotheses were refuted. While this research did not show the adoption of the mindset of thrift regardless of economic pressure, it did identify some patterns in regards to discretionary spending strategies in the early 20th century. These patterns will be discussed in Chapter 8.
CHAPTER 8: DISCUSSION

This chapter summarizes the conclusions established by testing the hypotheses. The results presented in the previous chapter will be discussed, and general patterns will be identified. The chapter will conclude with the insights from this research about what life was like during the Great Depression and the role the CCC played in the lives of millions of Americans who were enrolled in it and many more who benefited from the relief that this organization provided.

Basic Conclusion

This research resulted in two basic conclusions. First, a mindset of thrift was not universally adopted during the Great Depression. Secondly, discretionary spending among the CCC was influenced by the origin of the enrollee.

The Mindset of Thrift

The goal of this research was to understand discretionary spending during the Great Depression. The first research objective of this study was to investigate how the economic hardships of the Great Depression influenced what items were purchased, consumed, and discarded. Based on the comparisons between CCC camps, Great Depression domestic sites, and pre-Depression domestic sites, buying strategies of the employed were not altered much by the Great Depression. It seems that if an individual could maintain an already established buying strategy, they did. Therefore, this research shows the stability or conservatism of an individual’s buying strategy. Urban sites in this synthesis (44PY181, 36AL569, 36AL575) show a relatively stable level of discretionary spending in comparison to pre-Depression times and the Great Depression era (Figure 34).
The second objective was to determine if individuals decreased their discretionary spending in response to the economic downturn associated with the Great Depression. Based on the analysis and then the synthesis of the seven sites in this study, it is clear that they did not. Discretionary spending remained relatively stable at all the sites dating from the Great Depression in comparison to the sites from the 1920s. In fact, the site with the highest level of discretionary spending was a Great Depression era domestic site (3CW974). It became apparent that other factors were influencing discretionary spending besides economic pressure.

Finally, this study attempted to understand whether the mindset of thrift was something adopted because of necessity, or if it was an overall trend during the Great Depression. This mindset would have been identified by comparing Great Depression sites to pre-Depression sites. Based on the comparisons presented in Chapter 7, a mindset of thrift was not adopted by many members of American society; individuals maintained their buying strategies. Based on what is presented here, the mindset of Thrift was only adopted out of economic necessity.
Influence of the Enrollee’s Origin

This research found that there was considerable variability among discretionary spending at the CCC camps. The three camps that were investigated in this study had differing levels of discretionary spending. While the CCC camp at Zigzag and ANF-1 were similar, the camp at Bandelier was a major outlier. It is possible that individuals at Bandelier took part in a much higher level of discretionary spending in comparison to other camps. While this is a possibility, the data indicated a strong correlation between ANF-1 and Zigzag, and the other urban sites in this study. All the urban sites, ANF-1, and Zigzag are clustered around 20% of their assemblages being the result of discretionary spending (Figure 35).
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This finding demonstrates that buying strategies that were established before a man’s enrollment into the CCC were continued throughout their enrollment at the camp. This further demonstrates that individuals who could maintain their already established discretionary spending strategies did so. Individuals from urban contexts continued their established discretionary buying strategies no matter what the economic conditions were.
Discretionary Categories

By breaking down the different discretionary categories into South’s functional groups, some clear patterns emerge. All of the individuals in this analysis seem to be spending a fair portion of their available income on items that would fall into South’s domestic group. On the non-CCC sites, the presence of high quality tableware seems to be the favored item of discretionary spending in the domestic group. On the CCC sites, the discretionary domestic group was dominated by soda bottles as the favored item.

The artifacts relating to the personal group were predominately found in the discretionary category, but some did fall into the non-discretionary category. It is interesting to note that on the two pre-Depression sites (36AL575, and 36AL569) the personal group made up a larger portion of the discretionary category than any of the other sites in the comparison. This could be evidence of the thrift mindset since individuals would have been more likely to spend money on items that were strictly for personal amusement as opposed to items that were discretionary in nature, but the entire family or inhabitants of the site benefited from them. The analysis of more sites would be needed to confirm this.

Finally, the non-discretionary items were dominated by utilitarian objects, like clothing related objects or simple ironstone ceramics. These artifacts would have been necessary for everyday life. They would have consumed a large portion of the individual’s economy as they were essential to life in the early twentieth century.

Life During the Great Depression

This research showed that individuals dealt with the economic and cultural stress associated with the Great Depression differently. The two Great Depression era sites in this synthesis had normal to high levels of discretionary spending as compared to the rest of the sites.
in the synthesis. Individuals and groups did not react in a single way. If they were able to, they continued on living as they had in pre-Depression times. For many individuals, the time of the Great Depression was one of extreme economic and cultural hardship. For those who were able to retain their jobs, however, it appears that their fundamental buying strategies were little affected. The Smith Farmstead is an example of a family maintaining a stable economic situation or even prospering. This situation could be a reflection of the strategies that were employed by the inhabitants of the site. Their reliance on homegrown food is evident in the documentary record, and the large number of glass cannning jars, 40.2% of the glass assemblage (Gilliland et al. 2007:47). This strategy may have allowed them to participate in a much higher level of discretionary spending. This example demonstrates how individuals were forced to change their daily patterns to accommodate the rigors of the Great Depression. The research shows that if individuals could maintain their discretionary buying strategies they did. The stability of discretionary spending was possibly bolstered by larger fundamental changes in an individuals’ daily life. Some of these changes may be invisible to the archaeological record, such as trying to find more work or selling basic goods like apples to gain a little extra income. In these cases, the documentary record becomes essential in informing the research on how people negotiated the Great Depression.
CHAPTER 9: FUTURE RESEARCH AND CONCLUSION
As usual with any type of historical inquiry, more questions were raised than answered.

This chapter will outline some avenues for possible future research, which would build on the data and the interpretations presented in this study.

**Expanding the Database**

Applying the discretionary categories to additional sites would further strengthen the results found in this study. Future researchers should try to find sites other than 3CW974, or 44PY181 where the inhabitants were more affected by the Great Depression. Incorporating these sites into the overall synthesis would provide a definitive picture of whether or not the mindset of thrift was adopted out of necessity.

To further investigate discretionary spending at the CCC camps, more CCC camps should be added to the database. For the purposes of this study, three camps were used to test the hypothesis, but by adding additional camps, the results of whether individuals maintained their discretionary spending strategies could be further supported or refuted. Future research should also try to find pre-Depression data that is similar to the CCC camps as this would provide a stronger comparison. Sites such as early 20\textsuperscript{th} century work camps (Psota 2002) would be ideal for this comparison.

To further test the rigidity of individuals’ discretionary buying strategies, sites dating after the Great Depression should be investigated. These data would reveal if discretionary spending changed after economic conditions returned to normal. It is reasonable to assume that if economic times were good, individuals would increase their discretionary buying, but as this study has shown, consumer behavior is not always logical. Currently it is difficult to find archaeologically excavated sites that date to after 1942. In the future, more archaeological work will be done on these sites as they become older.
**CCC Archaeology**

As is evident by the excavations at ANF-1, Bandelier, and the CCC camp at Zigzag, archaeological deposits at CCC camps are primarily disturbed. This fact should not deter archaeologists from investigating CCC camps. In fact, archaeologists should consider a wider focus on these sites. Jenna Tuck (2009) demonstrated that after locating the off-site dump for the CCC camp at Zigzag, the amount of identifiable cultural material was greatly increased. Archaeologists should strive to find these off-site deposits and convincingly associate them with CCC-era occupants. Secondly, archaeologists should investigate the differences between the enrollees within the camps. For example, officers were given separate quarters, better pay, and more privileges. Archaeologically, this should be visible in the material culture around the different barracks. Even if the majority of artifacts are coming from the camp dump, each barrack would leave an archaeological signature. Future studies should focus on the officer’s barracks as compared to the regular enlisted men, as this could provide information regarding class and wealth in the Great Depression.

**African American CCC Camps**

Archaeologists interested in the CCC should pay special attention to African American camps. These camps could provide an in-depth view of what life was like for African-Americans during the Great Depression. African Americans had a very different experience in the CCC than white enrollees. Like the rest of American society at the time there was heavy discrimination against African American enrollees, and the conditions at these camps were often very unfavorable (Salmond 1967:88). A comparison between African-American CCC camps and white CCC camps could highlight this discrimination and tell the story of the men who were enrolled in a segregated CCC camp.
**Future Research at ANF-1**

Future excavations should focus on the dump or Cultural Deposit 4. Excavations in this portion of the camp recovered a large number of artifacts from an identifiable context. Excavations should attempt to find the extent of the deposit because it is possible that the entire western portion of Test Area 1 is composed of refuse from the CCC camp. The results of excavations in this portion of the camp would greatly increase the understanding of what the conditions were like at ANF-1. In trying to find the off-site dump, archaeologists should focus on regions directly to the east and west of the camp along Spring Creek. However, it is also possible that the dump was located to the north of the camp. Extensive surveys would be needed to locate this dump, but the result could be extremely beneficial to the understanding of life at ANF-1.

If researchers could obtain permission from the Summers, the owners of ANF-1, excavation should focus on areas closer to the barracks and the recreation hall. While there is a potential that these areas would have been kept clean by the enrollees, any material culture found could be directly related to the building and thus facilitating intra-site comparisons. The northwestern pond would also be an excellent source of artifacts, as it seems natural for enrollees to dispose of unwanted goods, especially illicit items, in the pond and have them quickly concealed.

Overall, further research should also focus on other CCC camps in the Allegheny National Forest. Some of these camps were only used for a short duration, and others were used for similar time periods as ANF-1. The camps that were used for a short duration could provide the best assemblages because they would not have been as intensively cleaned as camps that were more established and would not have artifacts from subsequent occupations. A comparison between the camps within the Allegheny National Forest could supply excellent information regarding life during the Great Depression in northwestern Pennsylvania.
Another line of research would be the investigation of the small town of Duhring. Due to the close proximity between Duhring and ANF-1, there was probably interaction between the enrollees and the inhabitants of the town. This is confirmed from a brief study of the camp newspaper, *The Spring Creek Murmurs* (October 1938 Vol. 3, Issue 3). An examination of Great Depression deposits in Duhring could reveal a great deal about the economic impact of the CCC on rural economies. Komara (2009) noted that the old Post Office and General Store in Duhring had excellent records, and a detailed study of these records may provide an excellent source of information about the buying habits of the enrollees of ANF-1. At the present time the store was not accessible per the owners, but this could change in the future.

**Future Research Regarding Discretionary Spending**

The results of this research show a picture of individuals maintaining their discretionary spending strategies throughout the Great Depression. This result should be further tested in order to lead to a better understanding of individuals’ consumer behavior. If discretionary spending strategies are as conservative as this study suggests, then researchers should try to understand where the variability in consumer behavior originates.

Future researchers should also attempt to see if individuals maintained their buying strategies through other periods of cultural and economic stress, such as the Civil War. Understanding how individuals’ buying strategies were affected by periods of cultural, and economic stress will lead to more detailed conclusions about the nature of discretionary spending with in a capitalistic society.

*The Transformation from Worker to Consumer*  
Historian Rita Barnard emphasizes that however devastating the Great Depression was economically, it did not dampen consumer aspirations or appetite to the extent that one might think; in fact, modern consumerism first appeared during this period (1995:16). There was a shift
in the culture; the strategic element was no longer the production but the consumption of goods (Baudrillard 1975:144). It was during this time that many facets of our own culture came into being, such as the motion picture, the radio, the five-day workweek, and suburban living (Wightman Fox 1983:103). Social theorist Jean Baudrillard points to the Great Depression as a time when consumption and not production became the strategic element in the economy (Baudrillard 1975). Business leaders during the 1930s agreed with this statement, Sidney Hillman of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers’ Union is quoted as saying, “unless a great majority of people have the money to buy, nothing significant can be accomplished in the way of recovery” (Renshaw 1985:230).

Even the Untied States Government seemed to be in agreement with the transformation of the American from worker to consumer. This is evident in numerous budget studies. Some examples of these budget studies are the Family expenditures in selected cities between 1935 and 1936 by the Bureau of Labor, the Civil Works Administration’s National survey of potential product capacity, and the Works Progress Administrations 1935 inquiry to determine an adequate income for workers (Horowitz 1992:153-58). These studies found that the mere maintenance of the worker was not enough to support the worker and the family, there needed to be an increased wage scale so the worker would have enough purchasing power to ensure the nation’s economic success.

This transformation would be the most visible in studies of discretionary spending. Changing from worker to consumer could have facilitated conservative discretionary buying strategies that this study has suggested. A consumer would attempt to maintain their buying strategies, as the key element in their personal economy is the consumption of goods, not the accumulation of wealth. I acknowledge this is a top down view, as individuals would react to
hard economic conditions differently. If this change, from worker to consumer, was taking place then the maintenance and expansion of individuals’ buying strategies would have been very important. As the worker would be more likely to take into account general economic conditions, while the consumer would be focused on their specific consumption strategies. More research needs to be conducted to determine if this was actually taking place, but archaeology in this area will play a very important role in understanding this shift.

**The Use and Analysis of Grey Literature**

A major problem in archaeology today is the massive amount of “grey literature” or Cultural Resource Management (CRM) reports that are very technical and often purely descriptive. These reports provide data, but do not enhance the discipline theoretically. This is starting to be a concern amongst archaeologists (Bergman and Doershuk 2003), as a large amount of data is being generated, but there has been a lack of large syntheses, or interpretations about past behavior. This study has strove to use these reports and the data generated by them. More research needs to focus on the data generated by these reports. Researchers should mine these reports for data, and then conduct large-scale analysis. With the majority of archaeology that is done in the United States being CRM projects, researchers should look to this data to understand past behavior and culture. They are a valuable resource that has be often overlooked.

**Conclusion**

To conclude, this research investigated seven sites, over 30,000 artifacts and produced a broad synthesis of buying strategies throughout the early 20th century and the Great Depression. A main focus of this research was how enrollment in the CCC effected an individual’s buying strategy. The results indicate that instead of altering their already established discretionary spending, enrollees’ chose to maintain discretionary spending strategies. These strategies were constructed before the enrollees entered the CCC.
The modern environment in America is a direct result of the sweat and work of the men of the CCC. In 1942, the United States Government disbanded the Civilian Conservation Corp and refocused all available manpower into the war effort. These individuals were taken from the task of rebuilding our economically depressed nation to defending it on foreign shores. This study is not just an investigation into the lives of individual’s who lived in the 1930s, but an investigation into the lives of men who shaped the world that we live in today.
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Appendices
Appendix A: Artifact Catalogue
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat #</th>
<th>SP #</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>T.A.</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Strat</th>
<th>Lvl</th>
<th>Material 1</th>
<th>Material 2</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>intact bottle, hobble-skirt shape, embossed label and maker’s mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>broken, hobble-skirt shape embossed label, missing neck and nase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>intact bottle, smooth sides, embossed label and maker’s mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>Social Drugs - Alcohol</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>base of bottle, clear with bubbles, embossed maker’s mark and pat # visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>base of bottle, aqua, could be part of 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle/jar</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
<td>unidentified bottle glass, clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
<td>Unidentified bottle glass, pink coloring-possible related to burning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>Food Prep/Consumption</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Floral transfer print pink/green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Aqua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Ferrous metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Misc. Metal</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Ferrous Metal, possible nail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Slate</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
<td>Unidentifide bottle/jar, clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
<td>Unidentifide bottle/jar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Ferrous metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat #</td>
<td>SP #</td>
<td>QTY</td>
<td>T.A.</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Strat Lvl</td>
<td>Material 1</td>
<td>Material 2</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>Lithic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-diagnostic shatter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>Social Drugs - Alcohol</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Amber, unidentifide bottle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Green, possible coke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Clear, embossed, possible milk container</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Clear, milk jug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Clear, milk jug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Clear, milk jug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Ferrious metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Misc. Metal</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Ferrious metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Misc. Metal</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Ferrious metal, part of a metal lid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Metal Pipe</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Ferrious metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Ferrious metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Bottle Cap</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Ferrious metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Burlap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
<td>Clear, pink - possible buring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat #</td>
<td>SP #</td>
<td>QTY</td>
<td>T.A.</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Material 1</td>
<td>Material 2</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-6</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-6</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-6</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-6</td>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-6</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Misc. Metal</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Ferrious metal, possible bottle cap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-9</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Pocket Knife</td>
<td>Accoutrements</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Boy Scouts Swiss Army Knife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-9</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Ferrious metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-10</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Lime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-10</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Clear &quot;Half Pint Liquid/CROPP Dairy/ Tionesta Pa/84 R5&quot; embossed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-10</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>clear, possible assoc. with 9.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-10</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>clear, possible assoc. with 9.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-10</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-10</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Ferrious metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-10</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Wire</td>
<td>hardware</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Ferrious metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-10</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Bottle Opener</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ferrious metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-10</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible Ping-Pong ball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-10</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown function/form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat #</td>
<td>SP #</td>
<td>QTY</td>
<td>T.A.</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Strat</td>
<td>Lvl</td>
<td>Material 1</td>
<td>Material 2</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Aqua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Social Drugs - Alcohol</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Amber, possible beer bottle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Dark Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
<td>Green/White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>Food Prep/Consumption</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>No Decoration, plate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Aqua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Misc. Metal</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Ferrious metal, possible can base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Clear, embossed, &quot;UMPAN&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Clear embossed design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Ferrious metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Misc. Metal</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Ferrious metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>STP-B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Ferrious metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>STP-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Square Bottle</td>
<td>Grooming / Health</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Amber, cork Lid, suction scar, Illinois Glass Factory maker's mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>STP-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat #</td>
<td>SP #</td>
<td>QTY</td>
<td>T.A.</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Strat</td>
<td>Lvl</td>
<td>Material 1</td>
<td>Material 2</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>STP-1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>STP-1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Grommet</td>
<td>Misc. Fasteners</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
<td>Ferrous metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>STP-1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Plumbing Fixture</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>STP-2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Social Drugs - Alcohol</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>STP-2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Decorative Brick</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Dark Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>STP-2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Decorative Brick</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Dark green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>STP-2</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>1 side decorated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>STP-3</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Social Drugs - Alcohol</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>STP-3</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
<td>Polished groves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>STP-1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>STP-1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Glass</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Dark green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>STP-1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Nail</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Ferrous metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>STP-1</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>Food Prep/Consumption</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T.U. 1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Social Drugs - Alcohol</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Amber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T.U. 1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T.U. 1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
<td>Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T.U. 1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Ferrous metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat #</td>
<td>SP #</td>
<td>QTY</td>
<td>T.A.</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Strat</td>
<td>Lvl</td>
<td>Material 1</td>
<td>Material 2</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Washers</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Ferrous metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Tack</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Ferrous metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Aqua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Social Drugs - Alcohol</td>
<td>Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Wire</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Misc. Metal</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Decorative Brick</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Social Drugs - Alcohol</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Amber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Social Drugs - Alcohol</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Amber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Food Prep/Consumption</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Clear, possible from a glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Food Prep/Consumption</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Clear, embossed diamonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat #</td>
<td>SP #</td>
<td>QTY</td>
<td>T.A.</td>
<td>Material 1</td>
<td>Material 2</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Milk Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>Food Prep/Consumption</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Thick, no decoration, bowl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>Food Prep/Consumption</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Thick, no decoration, plate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Earthenware</td>
<td>Food Prep/Consumption</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Red/Grey, function unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Aqua, thick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Spike</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Ferrous metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul Dep</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Social Drugs - Alcohol</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul Dep</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Social Drugs - Alcohol</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Amber, striations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul Dep</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Social Drugs - Alcohol</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Amber, striations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul Dep</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Lime green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul Dep</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul Dep</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul Dep</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
<td>Clear, embossed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat #</td>
<td>SP #</td>
<td>QTY</td>
<td>T.A.</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Strat Lvl</td>
<td>Material 1</td>
<td>Material 2</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul Dep</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul Dep</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Clear with small grooves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul Dep</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Clear with small grooves (Same as 19.24) and embossed diamond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul Dep</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Clear same design as 19.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul Dep</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
<td>Clear, similar to 19.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul Dep</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul Dep</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
<td>Clear, unknown embossing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul Dep</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>Food Prep/Consumption</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>White bowl fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul Dep</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>Food Prep/Consumption</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>White, plate fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul Dep</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>Food Prep/Consumption</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>White unknown function</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul Dep</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>Food Prep/Consumption</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul Dep</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>Food Prep/Consumption</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul Dep</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Ironstone</td>
<td>Food Prep/Consumption</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul Dep</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Light Fixture</td>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>White with metal screws, Pat #2281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul Dep</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Wire Insulator</td>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat #</td>
<td>SP #</td>
<td>QTY</td>
<td>T.A.</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Strat</td>
<td>Lvl</td>
<td>Material 1</td>
<td>Material 2</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bottle Cap</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Ferrous metal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Bottle Cap</td>
<td>Plastic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Faunal</td>
<td>Unknown Bone</td>
<td>Calcine bone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Misc. metal</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Copper Nozzle</td>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Hose attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Social Drugs - Alcohol</td>
<td>Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U. 2</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Social Drugs - Alcohol</td>
<td>Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat #</td>
<td>SP #</td>
<td>QTY</td>
<td>T.A.</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Strat</td>
<td>Lvl</td>
<td>Material 1</td>
<td>Material 2</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Social Drugs - Alcohol</td>
<td>Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Misc. Container</td>
<td>Ind. Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Bottle Glass</td>
<td>Social Drugs - Alcohol</td>
<td>Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Whiteware</td>
<td>Food Prep/Consumption</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Iron Stone</td>
<td>Food Prep/Consumption</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>Iron Stone</td>
<td>Food Prep/Consumption</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Light Bulb</td>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Window Glass</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T.U.</td>
<td>Cul</td>
<td>Dep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Nails</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Results of Subsurface Testing
Test Area 1

- **STP 1**
  - Eastern Most STP
  - 5 meters North of Spring Creek
  - 4 meters West of Camp Headquarters
  - STP 1 had two buried A horizons, with most of the artifacts coming out between them. The first stratum was between 0-15 cm, and was the modern A/Ao Horizon, composed of a dark brown silt loam (10YR 3/3), with some bioturbation but lack of rocks. The first buried A was found between 15 and 27 cm. The stratum was 12 centimeters thick. The stratum was composed of a dark gray silt sand (10YR 4/1). There were organics mixed in with the buried A. The B Horizon was between 27 and 41 cm. The majority of artifacts came from this stratum. It was composed of yellowish brown silt sand (10 YR 5/8), with small clay inclusions. Underneath this stratum another buried A was found. The stratum ranged from 42 to 48 cm, and had very similar features to the previously mention buried A, dark gray silt sand (10YR 4/1). The last stratum found ranged from 48 to 72 cm below ground surface. A Silt Sand, the soils were light yellowish brown (10 YR 6/4). Moisture increased with depth. Some organics was present in the subsoil, but this was probably caused by a large decaying tree root. The subsoil was clearly different than the previous two buried A horizons. Excavation was stopped because of depth and moisture.

- **STP 2**
  - 10 meters north of Spring Creek
  - 5 meters south of the Barrack 2
  - A gradual slope from the North to the South, continuing all the way to the bank of Spring Creek
    - Small Drainage/Wash out, was located 2 meters to the south of STP
    - This fed out into a sandy beach
  - STP 2, was dug to a depth of 53 centimeters. The top stratum was found between 0 and 14 centimeters, composed of a dark brown silt loam (10YR 3/3). The stratum was considered an A/Ao as there were heavy roots from a near by Red Pine Tree. Small Pebbles made up approximately 25% of the fill of this stratum. The next stratum, had evidence of burning with reddened soil, as well as the presence of charcoal and coal. Slag was also found in the fill of this stratum. A high density of artifacts were located in the top of the stratum, but decreased with depth. Beneath this stratum, subsoil was encountered. The subsoil was a light yellowish brown (10 YR 6/4), and ranged from 27 to 53 centimeters. The stratum lacked rocks and artifacts. Excavation ended once this stratum did not show signs of a buried A or artifacts.

- **STP 3**
  - 10 Meters North of Spring Creek
  - 5 meters south of Row of Red Pines
  - Located on a secondary terrace above Spring Creek
The A/Ao horizon was encountered between 0-17 cm. It was composed of a dark brown silt loam (10YR 3/3). A large amount of slag was found in this layer. At the very base of this stratum, a small lens was found. The lens was three centimeters thick, and was composed of subsoil. The third stratum, referred to as Cultural Deposit 1, a dark brown silty loam (.5 YR 3/2). Found between 20 and 42 centimeters below surface, this stratum had a very high artifact concentration with large chunks of coal as well as slag. Subsoil was encountered between 27 and 53 cm. The stratum was composed of a light yellowish brown (10 YR 6/4) silt sand, and ranged from 27 to 53 centimeters. The stratum lacked rocks and artifacts. Excavation ended once this stratum did not show signs of a buried A or artifacts.

- **STP 4**
  - 10 meters north of Spring Creek
  - 5 m south of Red Pine Stand
  - On 2nd Terrace above Spring Creek
  - The STP was composed of two strata, A/Ao, and B. The A/AO was found between 0 and 17 cm, and was composed of a dark brown silt loam (10YR 3/3). Three artifacts came from this stratum, and charcoal was noted, in small quantities (less than 5% of the total stratum). The change from A to B was diffused, making a clear boundary hard to determine. The sub soil was typical for the Test Area. Excavation was halted at 46 cm, due to the uniform nature of the subsoil. The absence of rocks was noted through both strata.

- **STP 5**
  - 15 m north of Spring Creek
  - 30 m south of Mess Hall
  - 30 m east of North South bend of Spring Creek
  - This STP was composed of two strata, an A/Ao and a B. The A/Ao was a dark brown silt loam (10YR 3/3), with some charcoal flecking and flat angular rocks present. The boundary between the strata was diffused boundary. The A/Ao was between 0 and 13 cm. The B was found between 13 and 36 cm. The stratum was typical for the area, a light yellowish brown (10 YR 6/4), silt sand. The soil in the stratum had heavy iron staining and some flat angular rocks present. Some FCR was found but not collected in the A/Ao. This could be the result of a modern camp fire, located within the vicinity.

- **STP 6**
  - 5 m south of Modern Fire Pit
  - 8-10 m north of Spring Creek
  - 20m E of Spring Creek
  - Three strata were found in STP 6. The first, an A/Ao was typical for the test area. It was found between 0 and 16 cm. The next stratum, Cultural Deposit 4 (16 to 34 cm below ground surface), was composed of some charcoal, a high density of artifacts, with some brick flecking. The stratum was composed of a dark gray silt loam, (10 YR 4/1). Artifacts were encountered at high density at the top of the
deposit and then decreased with depth. The last stratum found was the typical subsoil for the test area. The subsoil was found at 34 cm below ground surface and extended to 53 cm.

- **STP 7**
  - Western Most STP in TA 1
  - 2 m east of Spring Creek (n-s)
  - 5 m north of Spring Creek (e-w)
  - 40 m south of Mess Hall
  - Close to bend in Spring Creek
  - No artifacts were found
  - Two strata were encountered, an A/Ao and a B. The A/Ao went from 0 to 19 cm, with the B going from 19 to 41. The strata were typical for the test area.

- **STP 8**
  - 5 m east of Spring Creek
  - 10 m north of STP 7
  - In slight depression
  - 45 m southwest of Mess Hall
  - No artifacts were found
  - In STP 8, five strata were recorded. The first, was the typical Ao, and ranged from 0 to 6 cm below ground surface. The second was a burnt lens, 4 cm thick, composed mostly of charcoal, with no artifacts. The third stratum was a buried A Horizon and was located between 10 and 28 cm below ground surface. The stratum was a light brown gray (10 YR 6/2) silt loam, with heavy manganese and iron staining. This stratum could have been deposited in a flood event. The fourth stratum was composed of course black cinder and was found between 28 and 36 cm below ground surface. The last stratum was they typical B for the area, and was penetrated 15 cm, to a depth of 51 cm, before excavation was halted.

- **STP 9**
  - 5 m east of spring creek
  - 30 m south west of Mess Hall
  - Located in overgrown area, next to pipe bridge,
    - Oil or Gas piping in close proximity
  - The STP was composed of 2 strata, an A/Ao, 0-41 cm below surface and a B, 41 to 56 cm below surface. The soil was typical for the area.
STP 10
- 3 m east of Spring Creek
- 30 m west of Mess Hall
- 15 m south of OGM tank
- The STP was composed of three strata; an Ao (0-6), a cultural deposit, possible Cultural Deposit 4 (6-12), and a B (12-26). The midden layer, a 7.5 YR 2.5/2 dark brown soil mottled with a 5 YR 3/2 dark red brown soil, had a high concentration of artifacts. The soil had a small amount of charcoal, but no coal/slag/cinders were found. Directly beneath this layer, in the B stratum, a solid metal bar was found running through the STP. The bar was 3 cm in diameter. The B was typical for the area. Rocks were found through the strata, and some appeared to have been smoothed by prolonged exposure to moving water.

STP 11
- 3 m east of Spring Creek
- 30 m west of Mess Hall
- 5 m south west of old OGM tank
- No artifacts were found
- STP had typical stratigraphy for the area. An Ao/A going from 0 to 12 cm below ground surface with lots of organics, and a B ranging from 12 to 42 cm below ground surface.

STP 12
- 5 m east of spring Creek
- 15 m north west of OGM tank
- Coal visible on the ground surface
- Directly below the sod cap, a Cultural Deposit 4 was found. The Deposit was found between 2 and 12 cm. The deposit had a high concentration of artifacts. The subsoil was typical for the test area and was excavated to a depth of 41 cm.

STP 13
- 5 m east of spring creek
- 5 m south west of Barracks
- 40 m south of “Cement Road”
- Presumably the location of the incinerator dump
- The STP had many cultural layers, and was composed of a very complex stratigraphy. Fill 1 was located between 0 and 9 cm and composed of Coal, cinders, and burnt glass. Below this layer was a small lens of what appeared to be sub soil, Yellow brown but with low clay content. Between 12 and 28 cm Fill 2 was found. Composed of Red Grainy sand, the majority of Fill 2 was composed of cinders (80 to 90%). Underneath Fill 2, Fill 3 was found. Fill 3 was made up of bands of Dark Black silt loam, with coarse sand bands beneath them, presumably from decayed cinders. An OGM pipe was located running at the base of this stratum. Fill 3 was 28 to 51 centimeters below ground surface. Beneath Fill 3, a typical B soil was found and was excavated to 61 cm below ground surface before excavation was halted.
• STP 14
  o 5 meters south of STP 3
  o 5 meters north of Spring Creek
  o STP was placed 5 meters to the south of STP 3 to delineate the Cultural Deposit found in STP 3
  o No artifacts were found
  o The upper stratum of the STP are composed of an Ao/A typical for the test area, Dark Brown, Silt loam. This stratum went from zero to 16 centimeters below ground surface. Beneath this stratum, the Cultural Deposit that was identified in STP 3 was found. It was composed of a dark brown to black silt loam, (10 YR 3/2, very dark Gray Brown). No artifacts were found, due to the presence of a large cement slab tilting to the south. The slab was first encountered at the start of the stratum at 16 Centimeters and then sloped downward to 22 centimeters. The STP was expanded, but the edges of the slab could not be determined.

• STP 15
  o 5 meters east of STP 3
  o 10 meters west of STP 2
  o 10 meters north of Spring Creek
  o STP was placed 5 meters east of STP 3 to delineate the cultural deposit found in STP 3
  o The top layer was composed of an Ao Horizon (<5 cm). Beneath this stratum was the cultural deposit that was identified in STP 3, a very dark Gray Brown (10 YR 3/2), Silt loam with a large amount of coal. This stratum ranged from 5-28 centimeters. Underneath this stratum was a typical B for the test area.

• STP 16
  o 5 meters west of STP 3
  o 10 meters east of STP 4
  o 10 meters north of Spring Creek
  o STP was placed 5 meters west of STP 3 to delineate the cultural deposit found in STP 3
  o The top stratum of the STP was an Ao horizon and ranged from zero to 16 centimeters below ground surface. Underneath this horizon, Cultural Deposit 1 was found. The deposit was 10 centimeters thick (16 to 26). It lacked the usual high artifact density found in the other STPS. Between 26 and 30 cm, a small lens of what appeared to be an A horizon was discovered. The A was a Brown (10YR4/3) Sand Silt loam similar to other A horizons found in this test area. Below that horizon was the typical B horizon, or sub soil. This horizon extended from 30 to 52 centimeters.
Test Area 2

- STP 1
  - 10 m Northeast of Spring Creek
  - 50 m north west of Mess Hall
  - 4 m west of bank separating TA 1 from TA 2
  - The STP was composed of three strata. The first an Ao/A was from 0 to 10 cm below ground surface. The second, Cultural Deposit 4, was a Gray Silt Clay Loam with a high density of artifacts. The intact bottle was found in the wall of the STP, coming from this stratum. A high density of artifacts was noted here. This stratum ranged from 10 to 19 cm with a typical B subsoil located beneath this. The B stratum did not contain any rocks.

- STP 2
  - 50 m west of Barracks
  - 10 m East of Spring Creek
  - No artifacts recovered
  - This STP had the same soil package as STP 1 in this test area, but no artifacts were found. The Ao/A ranged from 0 to 6 cm, Cultural Deposit 4 ranged from 6 to 14 cm, with a large amount of coal/charcoal in the stratum. The B was found between 14 and 39 cm. The B was the typical subsoil for the area, but had a high sand content that increased with depth.

- STP 3
  - 5 m east of Spring Creek
  - 5 m southeast of dry creek bed
  - Located on the lower terrace
    - Right above Spring Creek
  - No artifacts recovered
  - The STP was dug to 75 cm, and showed evidence of flood events. The A/Ao was between 0 and 20 cm. A possible B was found composed of brown silt sand between 20 and 53 cm. A buried A was then found between 53 and 75 cm when excavation was halted. The buried A was gray silt with a large amount of decayed organics.
Test Area 3

- **STP 1**
  - Southern most STP in Test Area
  - 5 m northwest of TA 2
  - 20 m north of Spring Creek
  - 75 m north by northwest of mess hall
  - On slight rise above Spring Creek
  - No artifacts were recovered
  - Composed of two, possible three strata, the STP was excavated until water was hit at 53 cm. The first stratum was an Ao with a large amount of roots. Ranging between 0 and 14 cm, the stratum was a dark brown silt loam (10YR 3/3). The next stratum, 14 to 53 cm was a dark yellowish brown silt loam (10 YR 4/6), and presumed to be an A Horizon. The last stratum was only partially uncovered do to water seeping into the hole. The stratum could not be investigated, due to the large amount of water.

- **STP 2**
  - 10 m north of STP 1
  - 10 m south of Cement Road
  - No artifacts were recovered
  - An Ao was found between 0 and 16 cm. Beneath that was a layer composed of 75% rock and a yellow brown silt loam. This was found 16 to 42 cm below ground surface. Beneath this was a lens, 2 cm thick, that looked to be composed of decaying Iron, but no cultural material could be found. Underneath this was a buried A, gray silt loam with heavy organic staining. Excavation was halted due to water seepage.

- **STP 3**
  - 3 m south of Cement Road
  - On rise in the Stream Bed
  - No artifacts were recovered
  - The STP was dug to 35 cm, and excavation was halted, as rocks, 5-35 cm in diameter made up 95 to 100% of the fill.

- **STP 4**
  - 5 m north of cement road
  - On small rise in creek bed
  - No artifacts were recovered
  - Composed of two stratum, excavation was halted due to water seepage. The first stratum, was an A, 0-40 cm below ground surface. A Dark Brown (10 YR 3/3) silt loam. Underneath that, from 40 to 45 cm below ground, a buried A was found that was Gray (10 YR 5/1) with heavy organic staining. A lack of rocks was noted
Test Area 4

- STP 1
  - Artifacts
    - Sterile
  - 50 centimeters of yellow brown (10 YR 6/4) silt clay was found. The soil looked to be identical to the Subsoil of the area.
Test Area 5

- **STP 1**
  - 15 meters east of Officer’s Barracks
  - 10 meters north of Spring Creek
  - No artifacts were recovered
  - The first stratum, 0-10 cm, was composed of a 10YR ¾ Dark Yellow brown silt loam. The stratum was considered an O horizon. From 10 to 21 cm, the A Horizon was made up of silt that was dark brown, 10 YR 3/3. Beneath the A Horizon, the B horizon extended from 21 cm to 56 centimeters and was typical for the area, a Yellow Brown (10YR 5/6), silt clay loam. The entire STP was composed of less than 1% rock.

- **STP 2**
  - 30 meters east of Officer’s Barracks
  - 10 meters north of Spring Creek
  - 4 meters south of the Privy Vault
  - Artifacts
    - 21 Glass
    - 1 Brick
  - The O horizon went from 0 to 8 cm, and was composed of a Dark Yellow Brown (10YR ¾) Silt Loam. Beneath the O Horizon was the A Horizon. Identical to the A Horizon encountered in STP 1 in this test area, this horizon contained all the artifacts found in this STP. Some charcoal flecking was found in this Stratum. The A Horizon extended from 8 to 17 cm. Underneath the A Horizon was the B Horizon. This horizon extended from 17 to 56 cm, and was considered sub-soil, and was typical for the area, a Yellow Brown (10YR 5/6), silt clay loam.

- **STP 3**
  - 5 meters north of Spring Creek
  - 2 meters southeast of Culvert/possible drain pipe
  - Artifacts
    - 2 Glass
  - The same soils found in STP 1 and STP 2 were found in this STP. With the O Horizon extending from 0 to 5 centimeters, the A extending from 5 to 14 centimeters and the B extending from 14 to 40 centimeters. The two glass artifacts were found in the O and A Horizons. Some charcoal flecking was found in the A Horizon, but no substantial enough to be a midden or a cultural deposit.

- **STP 4**
  - 5 meters north of Spring Creek
  - On a slightly lower portion of the Test Area than STP 1 through 3
  - Artifacts
    - Sterile
  - A similar O Horizon was found in STP 4 as the rest of the test area. It went from 0 to 6 cm. Beneath the O Horizon was an A Horizon, a dark brown (10YR3/3), silty sand loam. Some charcoal flecking was found in this horizon. The B Horizon was
beneath the A, stretching from 20 to 38 centimeters, the horizon was a 10 YR 5/6 silty sand loam. From 38 to 70 cm, a buried A was found underneath the B horizon. The buried A was a 2.5 Y 6/2, light brownish grey, with heavy organic staining. Excavation was halted at 70 cm as the STP started to fill with water.

- **STP 5**
  - 5 meters north of Spring Creek
  - **Artifacts**
    - Sterile
  - A small organic layer was found below the ground surface (<3 cm). Underneath this stratum, an A horizon extended to 25 cm. The A was typical of the test area, except that there were small pockets of 10YR5/6 Yellow Brown Sand Silt loam or subsoil throughout the bottom portion of this stratum (beneath 20 cm). The boundary between the A stratum and the B stratum seemed to be diffused, but the B horizon soils made up the majority of the matrix after 25 centimeters. This stratum extended to 48 centimeters when it was determined that it was the subsoil.

- **STP 6**
  - 4 meters north of Spring Creek
  - 20 meters west of covered bridge
  - **Artifacts**
    - Sterile
  - The soils in this STP were identical to those already encountered in the Test Area. The O extended to 6 cm, and was on top of a homogenous A Horizon, which extended to 26 cm. Beneath this was a B Horizon that extended to 52 centimeters. Excavation was halted as the horizon was considered subsoil.
Test Area 6

- **STP 1**
  - 6 meters north of the split in the road
  - 3 meters south of cement pad
  - Artifacts
    - 2 Glass
    - 1 Nail
    - 2 ceramics
  - The STP was composed of 2 strata beneath the sod cap. The first being the A Horizon, a Brown (10 YR 4/3) Silt loam, and the second being a B Horizon. The A Horizon extended from 0 to 19 cm below the ground surface, and the B Horizon, a 10 YR 5/6 Yellowish brown silt loam, extended from 19 to 36 cm.

- **STP 2**
  - 3 meters west of Cement Pad
  - 10 meters north of STP 1
  - Artifacts
    - Sterile
  - The STP was very similar to STP 1, with two strata, identical to the horizons found in STP 1. The A horizon extended from 0 to 22 cm and the B horizon extended from 22 to 40 cm. A small modern plastic toy was found in the A horizon, it was not kept.
Appendix C: Stratigraphy of Test Units
Artifacts

A Horizon
- 10 Bottle Glass
- 8 Nails
- 2 Misc. Fasteners

Cultural Deposit 1
- 22 Bottle Glass
- 7 Nails
- 3 wire
- 5 Misc. Metal
- 2 Brick

A Horizon: 10 YR ¾ Dark Yellow Brown, Silt Loam
Cultural Deposit 1: 7.5 YR 3/2 Dark Brown, Silt Loam with Charcoal flecking
Buried A Horizon: 10 YR 3/4 Dark Yellow Brown, Silt Loam
B Horizon: 10 YR 4/4 Dark Yellow Brown, Sand Silt Loam

1 All depths are below an arbitrary datum
Artifacts
No artifacts were recovered from Test Unit

---

A Horizon: 10 YR 3/3 Dark Brown, Silt Loam
Cultural Deposit 4: 10 YR 2/1 Black mottled with 10 YR 4/1 Dark Grey, Sand Loam
B Horizon: 10YR 5/6 Yellow Brown, Silt Sand Loam

---

2 All depths are below an arbitrary datum
Artifacts

**A Horizon**
- 10 Bottle Glass
- 3 Ceramic
- 19 Misc. Glass
- 1 Spike
- 14 Window Glass
- 1 Milk Glass

**Cultural Deposit 4**
- 2 Bottle Cap
- 92 Bottle Glass
- 16 Misc. Glass
- 4 Brick
- 1 Copper Nozzle
- 17 Ceramic
- 1 Light Blub <broken>
- 1 Light Fixture
- 39 Misc. Metal
- 5 Nails
- 14 Window Glass
- 1 Ceramic Wire Insulator

---

3 All depths are below an arbitrary datum