

A COMPANION TO THE AMERICAN SOUTH

Edited by

John B. Boles

 **BLACKWELL**
P u b l i s h e r s

A Companion to the American South



Blackwell Companions to American History

This series provides essential and authoritative overviews of the scholarship that has shaped our present understanding of the American past. Edited by eminent historians, each volume tackles one of the major periods or themes of American history, with individual topics authored by key scholars who have spent considerable time in research on the questions and controversies that have sparked debate in their field of interest. The volumes are accessible for the non-specialist, while also engaging scholars seeking a reference to the historiography or future concerns.

Published

- 1 *A Companion to the American Revolution* edited by Jack P. Greene and J. R. Pole
- 2 *A Companion to 19th-Century America* edited by William L. Barney
- 3 *A Companion to the American South* edited by John B. Boles
- 4 *A Companion to American Indian History* edited by Philip J. Deloria and Neal Salisbury

In preparation

- A Companion to Colonial America* edited by Daniel Vickers
- A Companion to 20th-Century America* edited by Stephen J. Whitfield
- A Companion to the Vietnam War* edited by Marilyn Young and Robert Buzzanco
- A Companion to the American West* edited by William Deverell
- A Companion to Women's History* edited by Nancy Hewitt

A COMPANION TO THE AMERICAN SOUTH

Edited by

John B. Boles

 **BLACKWELL**
P u b l i s h e r s

Copyright © Blackwell Publishers Ltd 2002
Editorial introduction and organization copyright © John B. Boles 2002

First published 2002

2 4 6 8 10 9 7 5 3 1

Blackwell Publishers Inc.
350 Main Street
Malden, Massachusetts 02148
USA

Blackwell Publishers Ltd
108 Cowley Road
Oxford OX4 1JF
UK

All rights reserved. Except for the quotation of short passages for the purposes of criticism and review, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Except in the United States of America, this book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, resold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form of binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A companion to the American South / edited by John B. Boles.

p. cm. — (Blackwell companions to American history; #3)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-631-21319-8 (acid-free paper)

1. Southern States—Historiography. 2. Southern States—History. I. Boles, John B. II. Series

F208.2.C66 2002

975—dc21

2001018473

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Typeset in 10/12 pt Galliard

by Kolam Information Services Pvt Ltd, Pondicherry, India

Printed in Great Britain by TJ International, Padstow, Cornwall

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Contents

List of Contributors	viii
Preface	x
PART I THE COLONIAL SOUTH	
1 The First Southerners: Indians of the Early South <i>Amy Turner Bushnell</i>	3
2 Spanish and French Exploration and Colonization <i>Paul E. Hoffman</i>	24
3 The English Colonial South to 1750 <i>Cynthia A. Kierner</i>	38
4 The Origins of Slavery, 1619–1808 <i>Betty Wood</i>	54
5 Understanding the South in the Revolutionary Era, 1750–1789 <i>Ira D. Gruber</i>	69
PART II THE ANTEBELLUM SOUTH	
6 The South in the New Nation, 1790–1824 <i>Daniel S. Dupre</i>	85
7 The Plantation Economy <i>Mark M. Smith</i>	103
8 The Maturation of Slave Society and Culture <i>Stephanie J. Shaw</i>	118
9 Plain Folk Yeomanry in the Antebellum South <i>Samuel C. Hyde, Jr.</i>	139
10 Religion in the Pre-Civil War South <i>Randy J. Sparks</i>	156
11 Politics in the Antebellum South <i>Daniel W. Crofts</i>	176
12 Women in the Old South <i>Sally G. McMillen</i>	191

13	Intellectual and Cultural History of the Old South <i>David Moltke-Hansen</i>	212
PART III CIVIL WAR AND RECONSTRUCTION		
14	Sectionalism and the Secession Crisis <i>Mary A. DeCredico</i>	235
15	The Civil War: Military and Political Aspects along with Social, Religious, Gender, and Slave Perspectives <i>George C. Rable</i>	249
16	Emancipation and Its Consequences <i>Laura F. Edwards</i>	269
17	Political Reconstruction, 1865–1877 <i>Michael W. Fitzgerald</i>	284
18	Economic Consequences of the Civil War and Reconstruction <i>Joseph P. Reidy</i>	303
PART IV THE NEW SOUTH		
19	Southern Politics in the Age of Populism and Progressivism: A Historiographical Essay <i>Samuel L. Webb</i>	321
20	The Rise of Jim Crow, 1880–1920 <i>James Beeby and Donald G. Nieman</i>	336
21	Women in the Post-Civil War South <i>Elizabeth Hayes Turner</i>	348
22	The Discovery of Appalachia: Regional Revisionism as Scholarly Renaissance <i>John C. Inscoe</i>	369
23	Religion in the American South Since the Civil War <i>Paul Harvey</i>	387
PART V THE MODERN SOUTH		
24	Southern Environmental History <i>Mart A. Stewart</i>	409
25	Labor Relations in the Industrializing South <i>Daniel Letwin</i>	424
26	The Impact of the New Deal and World War II on the South <i>Pamela Tyler</i>	444
27	The Civil Rights Movement <i>Charles W. Eagles</i>	461

28	The Rise of the Sunbelt: Urbanization and Industrialization <i>David R. Goldfield</i>	474
29	The Transformation of Southern Politics, 1954 to the Present <i>Wayne Flynt</i>	494
	Index	506

Contributors

James Beeby is a graduate student in history at Bowling Green State University.

John B. Boles is the William P. Hobby Professor of History at Rice University and Managing Editor of the *Journal of Southern History*.

Amy Turner Bushnell is an Invited Research Scholar at the John Carter Brown Library and Adjunct Associate Professor of History at Brown University.

Daniel W. Crofts is a professor of history at the University of New Jersey.

Mary A. DeCredico is a professor of history at the United States Naval Academy.

Daniel S. Dupre is an associate professor of history at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

Charles W. Eagles is a professor of history at the University of Mississippi.

Laura F. Edwards is an associate professor of history at Duke University.

Michael W. Fitzgerald is an associate professor of history at St Olaf College.

Wayne Flynt is the University Professor of History at Auburn University.

David R. Goldfield is the Bailey Professor of History at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

Ira D. Gruber is the Harris Masterson, Jr., Professor of History at Rice University.

Paul Harvey is an associate professor of history at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs.

Paul E. Hoffman is a professor of history at Louisiana State University.

Samuel C. Hyde, Jr. is an associate professor of history at Southeastern Louisiana University.

John C. Inscoc is a professor of history at the University of Georgia and Secretary-Treasurer of the Southern Historical Association.

Cynthia A. Kierner is a professor of history at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

Daniel Letwin is an associate professor of history at Penn State University.

Sally G. McMillen is a professor of history at Davidson College.

David Moltke-Hansen is President of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

Donald G. Nieman is a professor of history at Bowling Green State University.

George C. Rable occupies the Charles E. Summersell Chair of History at the University of Alabama.

Joseph P. Reidy is a professor of history at Howard University.

Stephanie J. Shaw is an associate professor of history at Ohio State University.

Mark M. Smith is an associate professor of history at the University of South Carolina.

Randy J. Sparks is an associate professor of history at Tulane University.

Mart A. Stewart is an associate professor of history at Western Washington University.

Elizabeth Hayes Turner is an associate professor of history at the University of Houston–Downtown.

Samuel L. Webb is an associate professor of history at the University of Alabama at Birmingham.

Pamela Tyler is an associate professor of history at North Carolina State University.

Betty Wood is a professor of history at Cambridge University.

Preface

The history of the American South continues to fascinate scholars and general readers alike, both in the United States and abroad. The region's long travail with slavery, and then the Civil War, Reconstruction, sharecropping, and segregation, are simply the most obvious features of its history that seem to set the South apart from the rest of the United States. American scholars study the region because of its own distinct history and for how, through contrast, it illuminates the history of the nation as a whole. For scholars around the world, however, the South's historical experience of "military defeat, occupation, and Reconstruction," while it may distinguish the region from the American North, paradoxically makes it seem a more universal history, having much in common with their own nation's historical experience (Woodward 1993: 190). The result is that southern history is studied across the breadth of the United States and throughout the English-speaking world and beyond.

The field is also one of very intense cultivation, with new methodologies and approaches, new questions, and fresh viewpoints enlivening seemingly familiar topics and opening up new topics as well. Even scholars specializing in the history of the South often find that they cannot keep abreast of the torrent of scholarship, and new students and those investigating the southern aspect of some topic they have previously studied in a different geographical setting sometimes hardly know where to begin. This volume is intended for those trying to keep up with the field or simply wanting to find an entry point. Twenty-nine chapters (and of course the pie could have been cut in many other ways or sliced more narrowly or broadly) attempt to divide the region's history into manageable slices that represent how the scholarship has developed. Authors who were intimately familiar with their fields were asked to identify the major themes, interpretative schools, historiographical debates, and basic books of each topic. The authors were asked to imagine readers either new to the topic or wanting to update their understanding, then tell them about the essential scholarship, with some attention to older, classic books but emphasizing more recent scholarship of the last two decades or so. It is my hope that this volume will be an intellectual Baedeker to those setting out to study the history of the American South, a companion they will resort to frequently as they proceed on their course of reading and discovery.

The individual essays have focused on the specific topics, but there are general books and reference guides relevant to the entire field of southern history that do not appear in the separate chapters. Two older guides to the literature of southern history still repay use (Link and Patrick 1965; Boles and Nolen 1987), as do the most recent

editions of two college-level textbooks (Cooper and Terrill 1996; Boles 1999). We seem to live in an age of encyclopediazation, and four recent collaborative titles should be considered essential references both for their brief capsule accounts of innumerable topics and also for their brief bibliographies (Roller and Twyman 1979; Hill 1984; Miller and Smith 1988; and Wilson and Ferris 1989). No one should miss the southern and South-related articles and bibliographies in a recent guide to United States history in general (Parish 1997). One of the most important developments in American historical scholarship over the past half century has been the multivolume publications of carefully edited versions of the letters and papers of major (mostly political) figures such as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Henry Clay, John C. Calhoun, Jefferson Davis, and Booker T. Washington. All of these volumes contain material far broader than politics, and students of many aspects of the South's history should be alert to the riches found therein. Many scholarly periodicals contain valuable articles on practically every imaginable aspect of southern history; the best guide to this scholarly outpouring is the annual "Southern History in Periodicals: A Selected Bibliography," published in each May issue of the *Journal of Southern History*. That journal also contains reviews each year of approximately 250 books related to the field, along with fourteen to sixteen articles. The Southern Historical Association, which supports the journal, also sponsors a large academic conference each fall at which more than a hundred papers and panels are presented, and every three years the Southern Association for Women Historians sponsors a summertime conference with papers and panel discussions.

Southern history is thriving as a field of study, and there are many venues for reading it, hearing it, and publishing it. The editor and authors of this volume hope that the present book will be accepted as an introduction and an invitation to the history of the American South.

I wish to express my appreciation to the various authors whose individual chapters constitute this book, my extraordinary staff at the editorial offices of the *Journal of Southern History*, and two graduate students, Charles A. Israel at Rice University and Matthew Tyler Penney, then at Baylor University, who checked the bibliographical citations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Boles, John B. 1999: *The South Through Time*, 2nd edn, 2 vols. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Boles, John B. and Nolen, Evelyn Thomas 1987: *Interpreting Southern History: Historiographical Essays in Honor of Sanford W. Higginbotham*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Cooper, William J., Jr. and Terrill, Thomas E. 1996: *The American South: A History*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hill, Samuel S. 1984: *Encyclopedia of Religion in the South*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.
- Link, Arthur S. and Patrick, Rembert W. 1965: *Writing Southern History: Essays in Historiography in Honor of Fletcher M. Green*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Miller, Randall M. and Smith, John David 1988: *Dictionary of Afro-American Slavery*. New York and Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

- Parish, Peter J. 1997: *Reader's Guide to American History*. London and Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers.
- Roller, David C. and Twyman, Robert W. 1979: *The Encyclopedia of Southern History*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Wilson, Charles Reagan and Ferris, William 1989: *Encyclopedia of Southern Culture*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Woodward, C. Vann 1993: *The Burden of Southern History*, 3rd edn. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

PART I

The Colonial South

CHAPTER ONE

The First Southerners: Indians of the Early South

AMY TURNER BUSHNELL

HISTORIANS whose early modern America falls between the Chesapeake and Massachusetts have been wont to characterize American Indians as hunters, essentially different from the English who came to settle the land and improve it, farmers replacing forest dwellers in a kind of species shifting. But historical knows change. A larger early modern America has room for Europeans who range and Indians who inhabit, and nowhere is this clearer than in the early South. Earth, water, and sky permitting, the Indians of the South were town oriented and agricultural. Proud heirs of the Mississippian tradition, they did not fade away into the forest at the European approach. Instead, powerful chiefdoms and confederacies emerged to control the eastern woodlands south of the Ohio and Potomac Rivers and east of the Great Plains. As late as 1760, the South outside of Virginia and the Carolinas held twice as many Indians as it did blacks and whites combined (Wood 1989: 90).

Too often, this long period of Indian strength is dismissed as prefatory. The South that emerged in the 1820s presents so strong a unity of interests, expressed in the spread of commercial agriculture and black slavery, that as a historical period it has come to stand without qualification, leaving the preceding three centuries to take such names as the Early South, Colonial South, Colonial Southeast, or, in one book title, “The Forgotten Centuries” of “the American South” (Hudson and Tesser 1994). This is a South without a synthesis, for other than Timothy Silver’s study of South Atlantic forests (1990) and James Axtell’s Fleming Lectures on the Indians’ New South (1997), no early modern historian has yet stepped outside a Spanish, English, or French specialty to consider it as a whole. Moreover, until recently most studies of southern Indians focused on the dramatic early nineteenth century, for the emerging southern identity carried a sense of entitlement to nonwhite lands as well as nonwhite labor; the Louisiana Purchase of 1803 made the relocation of eastern Indians feasible; and the Removal Act of 1830 gave notice that the federal government would not protect Indian persons or properties from the jealousy of the states. Southern history begins with an act of ethnic cleansing.

Once the Indians of the eastern woodlands had lost their power to threaten and been declared surplus, their history became a magnet for myths. Non-Indian Americans constructed a pre-Columbian past of sustainable environments, primitive harmony, and mysterious mound-builders, a colonial past of pristine forests and moccasined deerhunters retreating before the advance of fences and farmers, and an early national past of warriors and purifying violence. In some quarters the feeling

persists that Indian history is a special genre, closed to outsiders and exempt from rules of evidence.

In 1954 ethnologists and historians open to nondocumentary sources launched a society and journal of ethnohistory, which came to mean the history of Indian–white relations over the course of conquest, conceived as a linear process marked by the erosion of aboriginal cultures. While the historical profession as a whole accepted the new interdisciplinary social history, early American historians did not integrate Indians, as they did Africans and women, into the main narrative. Ethnohistorians of the colonial period spoke mainly to each other, and their field began to look old-fashioned before they had finished wrestling with their sources.

Historians now speak of “a new Indian history.” No longer following what Daniel H. Usner Jr. calls “anthropology’s ethnographic preoccupation with single tribal groups, reconstructing precontact societies and then tracing predictably deleterious effects of European colonialism and American expansion upon them” (Usner 1998: 16, 56–72), the new Indian history is more conscious of relationships among Indian nations and of intercultural spaces, conceptualizing them in phrases like Richard White’s “middle ground” (1991), James Merrell’s “New World” for Indians (1989), and Usner’s own “frontier exchange economy” (1992). Combining the sense of Indian agency found in biography and tribal history, the larger landscape of institutional and policy history, and the theories and models of social science, it puts Native Americans center stage in a drama reaching back to when the South was theirs.

The new Indian history was borne into the mainstream of colonial and early national studies by the tides of history at large. Postmodernism made historians better readers of texts, more aware of silences and the unintended sense. A turn away from victor history opened the door to polycolonial histories of early modern America, subaltern histories of the later imperial experience, and contact studies for the European–native encounter worldwide. Advances in historical archeology, semiotics, hieroglyph interpretation, epidemiology, and environmental studies increased the general awareness of protohistory, the interval between first contact and settlement, where artifact meets document. The new Indian history has not gone unnoticed. Gregory Evans Dowd (1992: xii–xiii) was among the first to recognize its importance, and Daniel Usner (1998: 1–13) and Theda Perdue (1998b) recently summarized the new literature and positioned it in the historiography.

Historians have long appreciated the significance of Iroquois diplomacy and warfare in the Northeast and of statesmen like the Mohawk Joseph Brant. As neutrals, the Iroquois were masters of the balance of power, maintaining hegemony over other Indians and deflecting the flow of colonial settlement. The southern story differs from the northern on several points. The South had multiple militarized confederacies and three rival European empires – the Spanish having planted themselves in 1565, the English in 1607, and the French in 1698 – and keeping the peace was like walking a balance beam. By the eighteenth century, many native leaders were of mixed descent; the most adroit negotiator may have been the Creek Alexander McGillivray, son of a Scottish trader and a woman of the Wind Clan. Finally, the South entered the national period with the problem of Indian sovereignty unsolved, leaving the states to deal with Indian sanctuaries for fugitive slaves, powerful trading companies speculating in the exchange of debts for land, and citizens made heady by

the rapid expansion of plantation agriculture, who regarded all Indians as conquered and their lands as spoils of war.

Historians of early America appreciate the importance of the European matrix and the classical civilizations of the Mediterranean but give little thought to the ancient peoples of America's Old World. For seventy years textbooks have asserted that the first humans to set foot in America were North Asian nomadic hunter-gatherers who made the crossing from Siberia to Alaska on the Bering Sea land bridge during the Pleistocene epoch some 13,500 years ago, hunting woolly mammoths and other big game with their distinctively fluted "Clovis" spear-points, found in assemblages that archeologists call Paleo-Indian. A revolution against Clovis culture primacy and the Beringian bottleneck is now in progress. One representative theory argues that a separate group of Stone Age explorers, the Solutreans of northern Iberia and southern France, arrived by way of the North Atlantic more than 18,000 years ago, depositing their projectile points from the American desert to Chile. Its opponents counter that the northern British Isles were too glaciated to serve as Solutrean stepping stones (Straus 2000).

Ten thousand years ago, the ice age ended and sea levels began to rise, drowning numerous Paleo-Indian sites beneath the Gulf of Mexico. Whether from climate change or overhunting, the larger, cold-adapted animals disappeared and with them the practice of following the herds. Archeologists of the Southeast tell us that people of the Archaic tradition (8000–700 BC) hunted and foraged from a central base, usually close to wetland sources of fish, clams, and oysters. Late Archaic people made elaborate tools and ornaments of shell, bone, and stone, carved wood, worked fiber into fabric, cordage, and baskets, fired ceramics, and, a thousand years before their descendants adopted Mexican crop husbandry, domesticated numerous plants we now consider sidewalk weeds. Massive earthworks appeared in the Poverty Point culture of Louisiana and Mississippi. The people of the Woodland tradition (700 BC–AD 1000) that followed the Archaic were characterized by larger, more permanent settlements; increasing long-distance trade, a function of greater regional variation; more elaborate mortuary practices; the use of bow and arrow for hunting and war; and increasing reliance on crops such as little barley, knotweed, the pigweeds, sunflower, squash, and bottle gourd.

Archeologists divide the late prehistoric Southeast into five environmental zones. In the Appalachian Highlands, mountain people combined female farming with male hunting and valued their seclusion. The broad alluvial valleys and game-filled forests of the Piedmont Plateau, including the Ozarks, supported sizeable populations. The Mississippi Alluvial Valley had the richest lands and highest population densities. The Coastal Plain, dominated by pine forests, contained three ecological subzones: the alluvial valleys of slow, silt-bearing rivers, the fertile lands between faster-flowing rivers, and the coasts, marginal for agriculture but excellent for seasonal hunting, fishing, and gathering. The fifth and final zone, subtropical South Florida, supported dense populations on marine and estuarine resources alone.

In all of these zones, chiefdoms arose, as the egalitarian eastern woodland communities evolved between AD 800 and 900 into societies of rank supported by economic surpluses. In many inland regions, such as the Mississippian polities, a concomitant of the new political system was a growing dependence on cleared-field agriculture with maize of the cold-resistant eastern flint species developed in the

Mesoamerican highlands as the principal crop. Whether the shift to intensive agriculture is what caused settlements to increase in size or was itself a response to settlement nucleation, the new foods paradoxically supported larger populations in poorer health. According to bioarcheologist Clark Spencer Larsen, the transition to agriculture on the Georgia coast shows up skeletally in decreased body size and stature and increased nonspecific infections, dental caries, and enamel hypoplasia, with females under greater environmental stress than males (Larsen 1987).

The Mississippian tradition (AD 1000–1600) that accompanied the rise of chiefdoms in the Mississippi Valley and the Southeast was characterized by the construction of great ceremonial centers, places having in common the flat-topped platform mounds, militaristic propaganda, and artistic motifs of the Southeastern Ceremonial Cult. Cahokia, largest of the ceremonial centers, flourished in a floodplain called American Bottoms near the confluence of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers in present Illinois; by the twelfth century it had a population of up to 20,000. How much the Mississippian tradition owed to Mesoamerican influence and how much was indigenous remains a matter of debate.

In the early thirteenth century, Mississippian centers began to show signs of ecological stress, including drought, soil exhaustion, and the depletion of timber and game, and chronic warfare, revealed in defensive fortifications. Population gradually declined until, by the late fourteenth century, places like Cahokia were deserted, their inhabitants dispersed into farming villages. The drought-plagued Anasazi culture centers of the Southwest were abandoned at about the same time. In an important theoretical book with the unlikely title of *Lumbee Indian Histories: Race, Ethnicity, and Indian Identity in the Southern United States*, anthropologist Gerald M. Sider proposes that southeastern stratified societies were “durationally fragile” because they lacked two of the characteristics of early states: centralized management of storage and distribution, and the social or physical barriers to keep people from moving away from state demands (Sider 1993: 218–20). The result was a pattern of cycling in which population flowed between centers and villages as if organically. The question is not why Cahokia declined, but why it appeared in the first place. Maize does not require a floodplain or regimented tilling; a lone farmer can plant it in a forest clearing. The first southerners, like the Mayas, did not really need their cities.

The main language families in the Indian South were Siouan, Algonquian, Iroquoian, Caddoan, the Gulf Languages, and Timucuan. Siouan speakers, who were among the region’s earliest inhabitants, included the Osages and Quapaws, later known as Arkansas, of the Central Mississippi river basin, the Biloxis on the Gulf, several small groups in the Carolina lowcountry, and most of the inhabitants of the Carolina and Virginia piedmont from the Catawba River to the Rappahannock. Algonquian speakers, living in Virginia and the Ohio Valley, included the Pamunkeys, nucleus of the Powhatan confederacy, and the restless Shawnees. Iroquoian languages were spoken by the Cherokees of the Appalachian Highlands, the Tuscaroras of North Carolina, and the Westos, who arrived in Carolina not long before the English. Caddoan speakers, loosely grouped into the Hasinai, Kadohadacho, and Natchitoches confederacies, lived in the trans-Mississippi South in present Louisiana, Arkansas, East Texas, and Oklahoma, separated from the Great Plains by the forbidding “*llano estacado*.” The so-called Gulf Languages included Atakapa, Chitimacha,

Natchez, and Tunica, all spoken in what is now Louisiana, and Muskogean, a wide-ranging family of languages spoken respectively by the Apalaches of North Florida, the Oristas and Cusabos of South Carolina, the Choctaws of Mississippi and Louisiana, the Chickasaws to their north, possibly the Guales and Yamasees of Georgia, and the Muskogees, Alabamas, and Hitichitis (including the Apalachicolas) of Alabama, Georgia, and Tennessee. Even the trade jargon Mobilian, with its eclectic phonology and lexicon, had a Muskogean grammar. Exceptions to the Muskogean norm in the Southeast were three South Florida languages closely related to Tunica and spoken respectively by the Calusas, the east-coast Ais and Jeagas, and the inland Mayacas and Jororos, and the Timucuan language of Georgia and North Florida, an isolate with Amazonian origins. That southern Indians frequently spoke more than one language is revealed by their readiness to federate across language barriers. Thus the Creek confederacy was composed not only of people who spoke Muskogee and other Muskogean languages, but also of Algonquian Shawnees and the probably Siouan Yuchis. In the Catawba confederacy trader James Adair heard more than twenty dialects.

The once crisp contrast between landbound American Indians and sea-roving Europeans no longer holds, as evidence mounts of Polynesian-like canoes and Phoenician-like trade and colonization in the basins of the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea and on both sides of the Gulf Stream. Resemblances between the pre-Columbian art and architecture of the Yucatan and of South Florida suggest that Maya cultural influence reached the Southeast by sea. The Taínos and Caribs knew about Florida and the Yucatan; the Calusas on the west coast of South Florida knew about the Maya; and the Maya knew the currents and roamed the seaways in great, flatbottomed canoes with steering oars.

The first Spaniards to visit the South came to kidnap Indians for the slave markets of the Greater Antilles, where the almost complete annihilation of the Arawaks had created an acute demand for labor. Venture capital flowed into the slave trade, and men of substance like Hispaniola judge Lucas Vázquez de Ayllón looked for loopholes to legalize it, claiming that the Indians were guilty of sodomy and cannibalism, or that they were slaves already. Appointments to govern remote islands and provinces, such as Juan Ponce de León's license to discover "Bimini" and Nuño de Guzmán's assignment to Pánuco, were tacit hunting licenses. The distinction between voyages of discovery and of slavecatching blurred, and Indians died by the thousands in collection pens and the holds of ships. By 1520 slavers had picked the Bahamas clean of Lucayans and were ready to turn their attention to the mainland that Ponce de León had seen in 1513. We have abundant information about the voyages, landings, and possession-taking ceremonies through which Europeans added the southeastern littoral to their maps. But the Indians who initially greeted them, disposed to trade, developed a dislike of the people-stealers that could only be expressed by killing castaways and stray missionaries from Padre Island to the Chesapeake.

Álvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, most unusual of explorers, embarked for "Amichel" (western Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas) with Pánfilo de Narváez in 1528, was raft-wrecked on the Texas coast, and eight years later, as if from the dead, walked into a camp of Spanish slavers on the frontiers of New Spain. The narrative he wrote of his and his companions' adventures combined ethnographic

information with a plan for peaceful conversion persuasive enough to give pause to Charles V and lead to experiments in counter-conquest. Rolena Adorno and Patrick Charles Pautz's (1999) three-volume critical edition and translation, *Álvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca: His Account, His Life, and the Expedition of Pánfilo de Narváez* sets a new standard for the editing of sixteenth-century sources and enlarges our knowledge of southern Indian history by opening a window onto the upper Texas coast, a region of wandering nations that Europeans would not revisit for 150 years.

Rumors of riches beyond the horizon triggered two *entradas* into the wilds of North America, Francisco Vázquez de Coronado riding north from New Spain into the Plains and Hernando de Soto landing in South Florida and heading toward the Appalachian mountains at the pace of his herd of pigs. In the sources of the de Soto expedition (1539–43), *conquistadores* appear at their worst, taking a hard-eyed look at the looting possibilities of a non-Christian world and outraging peoples who received them with the courtesies due a paramount chief and his retinue. Three participants, Rodrigo de Ranjel, Luis Hernández de Biedma, and the anonymous Fidalgo de Elvas, wrote brief accounts of the *entrada*, and a generation later a Peruvian mestizo, Garcilaso de la Vega, produced a semi-fictional history that borrowed from Elvas and, on the principle of Indian uniformitarianism, from Inca ethnography. The four de Soto narratives are available in English translations, but as Patricia Galloway reminds us (Galloway 1997: 11–44), none has yet been published in a critical edition.

In 1986, three years before the 450th anniversary of the de Soto expedition, ten southern governors appointed a regional trail commission to mark a route for National Park Service highway markers. Anthropologist Charles Hudson, prominent in early southern Indian studies, stepped forward, supported by a team of archeologists. Comparing the findings of archeology to a composite itinerary compiled from the three eyewitness sources, Garcilaso, and the reports of two expeditions led by Juan Pardo that covered much of the same ground twenty-five years later, the team quilted prehistory to history, site by site. The route they proposed and circulated for comment, however, drew fire from all sides. Chambers of Commerce were incensed, scholars dissented, and with Columbus quincentenary protesters making old-style celebrations of rapine impolitic, private foundations and state and federal agencies withdrew their support. Hudson published the team's findings anyhow, first in 1994, then in detail in *Knights of Spain, Warriors of the Sun: Hernando de Soto and the South's Ancient Chiefdoms* (Hudson 1997). Spiritedly defending their methodology, he dismissed questions about intertextuality, pseudohistorical genres, and the implicit boosterism of dot-to-dot itineraries as nitpicking, emphasizing the yield of de Soto route research for the prehistory and protohistory of southern Indians. Archeologists have, for example, found the sites of the sixteenth-century chiefdom of Coosa and tracked the descendants of the Coosas into the Creek confederacy.

Scholars continue to debate the impact of the de Soto invasion on the southeastern chiefdoms. The consensus is that Europeans did not trigger the decline of the Mississippian tradition, which had passed its apogee, but that the new diseases that they and their animals introduced probably reduced the aboriginal population to between a twentieth and a twenty-fifth of its size at contact. That all-important size scholars have developed elaborate methods to estimate, calculating the carrying capacity of various environments, noting the mortality rates of documented virgin

soil epidemics and applying them to post-epidemic censuses, developing formulae for the ratios between population size and premodern counts of warriors or hearths or Lenten communicants – plucking “numbers from nowhere,” in the phrase of David P. Henige (1998). Twentieth-century estimates range from Alfred Kroeber’s 1939 low of 8.4 million for the hemisphere, with 0.9 million north of the Rio Grande and 150,000 in the Southeast, to Henry Dobyns’s 1966 estimate of 90 to 112.6 million for the hemisphere, with 9.8 to 12.3 million in the North. William Denevan’s 1976 estimate of a hemispheric population of 57.3 million, with 4.4 million in the North, and Gerald Sider’s 1993 estimate of over 2 million in the Southeast (Thornton 1987: 15–41; Weber 1992: 27–9, 372–3; Sider 1993: 213–14) fall between the two extremes. Whatever their numbers, most American Indians north of Mexico lived in the eastern woodlands and favored regions of agricultural abundance, where soils were fertile, rains sufficient, and the growing season ranged from 180 to 240 days, with a minimum of 120 days frost-free.

Depopulation, accelerating the decline of the Mississippian tradition, forced structural change upon the southeastern chiefdoms. Archeologists have traced these changes in various regions, with Marvin T. Smith (1987) considering the whole. Adoption, incorporation, migration, and confederation, survival strategies for polities in danger of dwindling into unimportance, were old practices capable of creating new collectivities. Patricia Galloway (1995) describes how the Choctaw reinvented themselves after the decline of Mississippian societies in Moundville, Alabama, and Pearl River, Mississippi. As protohistory gave way to history, native polities beyond the pale of European settlement continued to secede, combine, and recombine in fresh confederations, not out of pan-Indian solidarity, but in order to better their chances in a threatening new world.

Europeans came to the South to stay in 1565, when Pedro Menéndez de Avilés, a captain general under contract to Philip II, destroyed a French fort, garrisoned seven harbors along the Gulf Stream, and founded three settlements, including St Augustine. Spanish Florida lay farther north than the present state; the king’s writ did not extend into the southern half of the peninsula, and the first capital of “the provinces of Florida” was in present South Carolina. Although eventually the flag of Spain would fly over the continent from Florida to California, in the sixteenth century the two colonies on the northern frontier, Florida and New Mexico, did not communicate.

The natives who met Menéndez presented a spectrum of cultures. The Oristas, Cusabos, Guales, and eastern Timucuan of central Florida and the coast above St Augustine were part-time agriculturalists who left their fields in wintertime to hunt and gather; the Ais and Jeagas of the lower Atlantic coast, like the Mayacas and Jororos along the St Johns River, were nonagricultural and seasonally nomadic; the Apalache and western Timucua of the upper Gulf coast were sedentary and agricultural; the Calusas of the lower Gulf coast, sedentary and nonagricultural. Despite their variety, most of the Florida Indians lived at least seasonally in towns, most towns belonged to chiefdoms, and many chiefdoms recognized a paramount chief.

The 1560s and 1570s were a time of transition in the Spanish empire, when the High Conquest, with its brutal *conquistadores* and slavetraders, was rejected in favor of Pacification, a conquest by contract, Crown-controlled and covenant-based. On the wild frontiers, the Crown resorted to a policy of pacification by gifts and

a presidial system of fortified outposts and ports. In those places where the Indians accepted Christianity, the *presidios* were reinforced by mission provinces. Where the Indians rejected Christianity, the frontier did not advance. Indians on the edges of empire who could not be pacified by sword, gospel, or gift were apt to be seasonal nomads, unwilling to live “beneath the bell” in Mediterranean-style farming villages, indifferent to the sacraments, governing themselves by consensus, and impossible to quarantine from contact with Spain’s rivals, the French, the English, and the Dutch (Bushnell 1990).

The Jesuits who came at Menéndez’s invitation found Florida unable to sustain a mission program. Eight of them set off in 1570 for “Ajacán” in the Chesapeake Bay, with don Luis de Velasco, a young convert from the area, to make the introductions. The party landed at the James River a few miles east of the later site of Jamestown. Don Luis deserted them, and the mission was wiped out before it was five months old. Franciscans replaced the Jesuits in Florida in 1573, when the colony’s finances had taken better form. Their *modus operandi* was to raise a cross on the town plaza, preach, and invite the chiefs to St Augustine to receive the king’s gifts. There, the lords of the land kissed the governor’s hand, negotiated alliances of trade and mutual defense, and registered a request for teaching friars – acts that in Spanish eyes turned them and their vassals into subjects and neophytes. Those who assented to the covenant became part of the self-governing “Republic of Indians,” sharing the land with the “Republic of Spaniards” in exchange for protection and gifts (Bushnell 1989). Churches and convents rose in the main towns, giving the chiefs access to exotic goods and spiritual power. From these places, the friars serviced strings of *visititas* that matured into *doctrinas* when they received a resident friar and a 1,000–peso baptismal gift of *sacra*: vestments, linens, images, sacred vessels, parish registers, large bells, and an altarstone. Spanish soldiers turning settler looked to the provinces for wives: in 1600, half of the women in St Augustine were Indians.

During the period of nearer pacifications (1580s–1620s), the Spanish followed the waterways to create a line of missions, starting with the Timucians of the St Johns River and ending with the Guales of the Georgia coast. These conquests by the gospel were short-lived; within a generation, every group had rebelled and been reconquered by the sword. The Guale Rebellion of 1597 ended in a famine induced by scorched-earth tactics; half of the 16,000 converts in eastern Timucua and Guale died of the plague between 1613 and 1617; and other epidemics followed, until war and disease had virtually emptied the eastern *doctrinas*. The impulse for the farther pacifications (1630s–1670) came from within the colony, as *floridanos* scented opportunities for agriculture, ranching, and trade in the Gulf. The western watershed was subdued with a gunboat, and soon the friars were planting missions in western Timucua and Apalache. With this, the colony seemed to reach its natural limits. Subsequent efforts to convert the Hitchiti-speaking Apalachicolas failed, as did missions to the Calusas, Mayacas, and Jororos.

A military outpost in a maritime periphery, St Augustine provisioned itself with Indian agriculture, secured its perimeter with an Indian buffer zone, and policed the long coastline with Indian surveillance. Garrison detachments were stationed in the provincial capitals. From San Luis de Apalache, settlers, chiefs, and Franciscans conducted a lively trade with Havana merchants in agricultural and ranch products and, by midcentury, deerskins from Apalachicola. Pack animals being scarce and the

waters around the peninsula pirate-infested, Spanish authorities employed Indian burdeners, vying for their services and accusing one another of misusing them. Two revolts and an epidemic interrupted this modest economic progress. The Apalache Rebellion of 1647 was a Civil War between Christian and non-Christian chiefs. Yellow fever reached Florida in 1650, felling Spaniards and Indians alike. That, and the Timucuan Rebellion of 1656, triggered by the mobilization of Indian militia after the English invasion of Jamaica, left central Florida so depopulated that the governor resettled the remnants of the Timucuan to service the transpeninsular road to Apalache.

At their height in the mid-seventeenth century, the wattle-and-daub missions of Florida numbered as many as forty *doctrinas* with up to 26,000 Christians. To maintain the “divine cult” in all these places, the friars trained the sons and nephews of chiefs in the duties of sacristans, musicians, interpreters, catechists, and overseers and raised orphan boys to serve as gardeners, cooks, and grooms. Like the soldiers, the friars received their support from two sources: the *situado*, an annual subvention from the Mexico City treasury’s defense account, and the *sabana* system, the native method of public finance. Each planting season the commoners of a town planted one *sabana* of maize for each leader and one for the community. After joining forces with Spaniards, they planted other *sabanas* for the service of the convent and the service of the king. In times of scarcity the governor pressed them to sell part of their communal surplus to the *presidio* on credit, in what amounted to a forced loan. The colony became increasingly dependent upon the various transfers of labor and produce from the hinterland, sanctioned and brokered by the chiefs. The Florida governor rewarded the rulers of the Republic of Indians with ceremonial staves of office, entertained them at his table, and made them gifts: European clothing and weapons for themselves and cloth, blankets, beads, and tools to satisfy their followers. The expense of “regaling” the Indians was the one open-ended fund in the *situado*.

Unaware of this seventeenth-century frontier in Spanish North America, much less of the sixteenth-century Chichimeca one, Jeremy Adelman and Stephen Aron claim, in a forum essay on borderlands and borders, that Spain, having a “lack of experience handling non-tributary aboriginal peoples,” was forced in the 1790s to abandon “the principle of paternalistic pacification” and “belatedly, in response to threats from colonial rivals, . . . turn to the diplomacy of gift-alliances and commercial exchange” (Adelman and Aron 1999: 829–35). In consenting to solemnize agreements by the exchange of gifts, however, traders and officials in the colonial South – Spanish, and in due time English and French – were accommodating to Indian diplomatic protocols. The importance of these agreements to the course of European empire can be gauged by the large sums Spain, France, and Great Britain authorized their governors to expend annually on Indian allies and trading partners.

Anticipating by two hundred years the adobe missions of California, the Florida missions were little known outside the circle of southeastern historians and historical archeologists until the mid-1980s, when scholars began to put southern Indians within the Spanish sphere of influence before a larger audience. David Hurst Thomas (1990) and David J. Weber (1992) gave the Southeast parity with the Southwest in the Spanish Borderlands; Kathleen A. Deagan (1985) treated Florida as part of the Greater Caribbean; and Amy Turner Bushnell (1994) presented it as a maritime periphery comparable to Chile or the Philippines. After years in the historical backwaters,

the provinces of Florida entered the mainstream as an adjunct of historical archeology – the state of Florida having farmed out its non-English past to cultural resource management – and the results have been uneven. The two most productive archival scholars, John H. Hann (1988, 1991, 1996) and John E. Worth (1995, 1998), avoid historical interpretation, while Jerald T. Milanich, foremost interpreter of the archeological literature, wields it with abandon, stating: “Missions *were* colonialism. The missionary process was essential to the goal of colonialism: creating profits by manipulating the land and its people” (Milanich 1999: xiii) – although it is no secret that Spanish Florida was a deficit operation, subsidized out of defense funds.

Southern Indians had their first experience with English-speaking colonists in the mid-1580s, when Sir Walter Raleigh sponsored a reconnaissance of Virginia and northern North Carolina, leading to a settlement at Roanoke on the Outer Banks. War between England and Spain prevented the timely relief of the colony and delayed further colonizing ventures until 1606, when the Virginia Company was chartered. In the thirty-seven years since the Jesuit mission to the Chesapeake, the Pamunkey chief Powhatan had extended his rule over some thirty southern Algonquian chiefdoms and a good half of tidewater Virginia in the paramount chiefdom of Tsenacommacah, better known as the Powhatan confederacy. Moderately Mississippian, on the fringes of the Southeast but with ties to the Algonquian North, Tsenacommacah was less southern than part of the larger culture of the eastern woodlands and less a confederation than an empire of conquest (Rountree 1989: 15, 140–52; 1993). Frederic W. Gleach (1997: 106–22) suggests that Powhatan and his brother, the war chief Opechancanough, sought to bring Jamestown itself into Tsenacommacah, adopting the newcomers in the person of Captain John Smith. But the English were unassimilable. Many of them veterans of the Irish and Spanish wars, they reduced Powhatan power in three Anglo-Indian wars (1609–14, 1622–32, and 1644–6) and seized the confederacy’s forests and farmlands in order to grow Indian tobacco. The survivors, congregated in “dependencies,” were quiet; when Nathaniel Bacon raided Pamunkey encampments in 1676, he broke a peace of thirty years. After Bacon’s Rebellion, the king’s commissioners tried to rebuild the Powhatan confederacy for their own purposes, reuniting the chiefdoms under the Pamunkey queen, but the Chickahominy and Rappahannocks refused to be her tributaries, preferring to deal with the English directly. By 1700 the number of free Indians in coastal Virginia had declined to under 2,000. The Virginia of the eighteenth century was effectively post-Indian, which is why historians of that place and period have little to say about them.

Sufficient written records exist to answer the important question of how many people – Indian, African, and European – actually did live in the colonial South. In an important statistical study, Peter Wood (1989) has come up with estimates for all three groups at fifteen-year intervals between 1685 and 1790 for ten subregions, each one the home of Indians important to southern history. According to his calculations, the South contained 199,400 Indians in 1685. Seven out of eight of them, or 176,500, lived in one of seven non-English subregions: 16,000 in Florida; 15,000 in Georgia and Alabama south of the Appalachian mountains, where the Creek confederacy was taking shape; 32,000 in southern Appalachia, home of the Cherokees; 35,000 in Mississippi, mainly Choctaws and Chickasaws; 42,000 in Lower Louisiana, with the largest nations, the Natchez and the Quapaw, located in the Central River area between the mouths of the Red River and the Arkansas; 28,000 in

East Texas, home of the Caddos; and 8,500 below the Ohio River in the “Shawnee interior” of West Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee. The remaining 22,900 Indians lived east of the Appalachians in one of the three subregions that at the time had English settlers: 10,000 in North Carolina, 10,000 in South Carolina, and a bare 2,900 in Virginia. In 1685 Indians outnumbered non-Indians four to one in the South, which had a non-Indian population of 50,200 (46,900 white and 3,300 black), four-fifths of whom lived in coastal Virginia. With that one subregion removed, the South was 95 percent Indian.

Gerald Sider divides southern Indian societies of the colonial period into two groups: (1) the confederations of towns, each town a chiefdom with a society of rank, and (2) the small, relatively egalitarian communities. As in pre-Columbian times, population flowed in and out of the confederations, which paradoxically gained strength from the social dislocations produced by epidemic disease and endemic warfare. What confederated the towns were ties of language, religion, clan membership, marriage, mechanisms to override origins and create fictive kin, a jural community for resolving inter-town disputes, shared attachments to “mother towns,” inter-town games to channel competition into mock combat, a common trade network, and common enemies, although the towns might disagree on how to meet them. During the colonial period, while the smaller confederations of Catawbas, Tuscaroras, Natchez, and Yamasees struggled to maintain their autonomy, the Cherokee, Choctaw, Creek, and Chickasaw confederacies became what he calls “great trading, warring, slaving, and slaveholding regional empires,” useful to the colonies as sources of deerskins and Indian slaves, military allies, and bounty hunters for the recovery of fugitive slaves and indentured servants. Colonial governments insisted on treating the confederations as nations, pressuring the towns to form a single political entity by holding them responsible for each other’s behavior (Sider 1993: 231–2).

The smaller, relatively egalitarian hamlets and settlements survived by attaching themselves as clients to one of the colonies. Sider classifies them as either settlement or tributary, based on their location *vis-à-vis* the pale, or frontier, defined as the line of white settlement. Settlement Indians lived inside the pale, integrated into the colonial political economy; tributary Indians lived outside the pale, serving as buffers and mercenaries (ibid: 226–7). The self-governing “republics of Indians” represent a third, Spanish type in which the pale is religious rather than racial, a line between Christians and non-Christians, with the latter drawn into the colony’s sphere of influence by agreements of trade and invitations to join the Pax Hispana (Bushnell 1989).

Beyond the borders of colonial provinces and dependencies, whites and Indians met each other mostly for reasons of exchange, an activity that drew white traders into the interior and that mercantilist-minded governments in England, France, and Spain distrusted as likely to lead to ungovernable territorial expansion. Trade between Virginia and the people of the piedmont, for example, was against the law from 1631 to 1659. But there was always a way to get around a regulation. In 1644, a time of falling tobacco prices, the colonial government established several fall-line forts and leased them to private individuals, and soon James River traders began to travel beyond the falls with packhorses, returning with deerskins and the occasional Indian slave. Hunters taking their own skins to market found Indian middlemen astride the trading paths. That in the mid-1640s Spanish Florida opened a similar deerskin trade

out of Apalache province, employing burdeners, suggests that the time was right for southern Indians to participate in an Atlantic market. Gregory A. Waselkov (1989) and Amy Bushnell (1994: 126–32, 169) describe this little-known trade.

Due north of Apalache, the headwaters of three southeastern river systems ran parallel between the north–south ranges of the Appalachians. From west to east, they were the Coosa and Tallapoosa, which joined in the Alabama, the Chattahoochee and Flint, which became the Apalachicola, and the Oconee and Ocmulgee (known in its upper reaches as Ochese Creek), which met to form the Altamaha, flowing into the Atlantic Ocean. On the banks of these rivers were towns with the autonomy of Greek city-states: Coweta, Cussita (or Kasihta), Abeika (or Coosa), Tallapoosa (or Okfuskee), Apalachicola, Alabama (or Alibamon), and more. English-speaking traders named them Creeks. J. Leitch Wright Jr. (1986) argues that there was a deep division in the confederacy between Muskogeans and non-Muskogeans, the *estenkos*. Differences between the two moieties, he suggests, were responsible for most of the conflicts among the Creeks.

Spanish Florida had ceased to enslave southern Indians in the 1570s and was under strict orders not to sell them firearms. The latter policy was often breached – two Virginians visiting the Overhill Cherokees in 1673 reported sixty Spanish flintlock muskets in their possession, and in the 1680s a Dutch captain out of New York entered the St Augustine harbor with suspicious regularity – but Florida lacked the wherewithal to be a major weapons dealer. When the firearms revolution reached the South, Spain lost its trading partners and with them its sphere of influence. People with firearms were not only safer, they could deliver deerskins in volume; they could, furthermore, raid their neighbors with impunity and sell their captives to the English and the French, whose consciences were silent on the subject of Indian slavery. Southern Indians had their own forms of slavery, which left some leeway for adoption or repatriation. Theda Perdue (1979), finding no economic reason for aboriginal bondage, posits a cultural one: a slave, lacking the legal rights and protections afforded by a kinship group, had no claim to humanity; he was an anomaly, and in the Cherokee world deviants confirmed the norm. When southern Indians were drawn into the Atlantic market, however, slaves became commodities. Confederacies that participated in the slave trade, like the Cherokees and Creeks, had a choice of markets. They could take their captives to Virginia, which in 1683 made it legal to enslave any Indian brought into the colony; to South Carolina, which offered bounties for captives as early as 1674; or to Louisiana, where in 1707 a Chitimacha woman or child brought 200 livres. The leitmotifs of Leitch Wright's *The Only Land They Knew: The Tragic Story of the American Indians in the Old South* (1981) are the human cost of the southern Indian slave trade and the submerged Indian heritage of African-Americans.

Shock waves from the Iroquoian wars reached the South in 1659, when the Westos (Chichimecos to the Spanish), an Iroquoian people armed with muskets from Virginia who lived by plunder and slavetaking, emerged from the woods to attack the coastal missions of Guale. They would remain a danger until the English armed their enemies and destroyed them at a remove in the Westo War (1680). In 1683 a group of migratory Shawnees set in motion by Iroquois raids on the Ohio Valley in the 1660s and 1670s settled on the Savannah River and began to raid the Spanish provinces, armed and encouraged by a group of Scots who had recently, to the

dismay of Carolina merchants, positioned themselves at the Altamaha River to intercept slaves and deerskins. When a Spanish–Indian expedition of reprisal wiped out the Scottish settlement, Charles Town did not retaliate.

With the Westos and Scots removed, traders from Charles Town burst into the interior. Finding trade to the north monopolized by Virginia – as many as fifty or sixty Virginia traders made the annual trip to the piedmont and the Appalachian Highlands, home of the Cherokees – they pushed westward to the Mississippi and southward into the Spanish sphere of influence. The towns along the Chattahoochee welcomed envoy Dr Henry Woodward in 1685 and helped him to build a stockade. The governor of Florida tried to counter the Anglo advance with hastily founded missions, a trading post, and the torching of empty towns, but the lure of English trade goods was too powerful. Some of the pro-English towns moved east to settle on Ochese Creek, 150 miles from Charles Town. English traders called them Creeks, then extended the name to all of the towns on the trading path westward, the people along the Chattahoochee, Flint, and Ocmulgee Rivers becoming Lower Creeks, and the ones on the Coosa, Tallapoosa, and Alabama Rivers farther “up” the trading path, Upper Creeks.

With their new firearms, warriors from the towns on the trading path launched raids on the missions of Florida, then hurried their captives north to the receivers of stolen persons, who shipped an undetermined number of them to other mainland colonies and the West Indies. Facing unequal odds, the greater part of the Christian Indians deserted their *doctrinas*. First to secede were the Guales, whose towns on the sea islands were also dangerously exposed to pirates. Although their declining numbers were temporarily masked by a countercurrent of Yamasees, by 1696 all that remained of Guale province were three towns of refugees on Amelia Island.

To open Queen Anne’s War (1702–13) a combined force of Creeks and Carolinians under the leadership of Governor James Moore overran Amelia Island and destroyed St Augustine, without taking the castillo. The object of their next winter’s campaign was the destruction of Apalache province, from which Moore returned to Charles Town with 4,000 women and children and up to 300 men. Some of the Apalaches fled to Pensacola and Mobile, where they continued to practice Catholicism. Some, led in exodus by the chief don Patricio de Hinachuba, migrated first to Timucua, then to St Augustine, hoping to find safety under the guns of the fort (Bushnell 1979). Others left for parts unknown, saying they would not stay to die with Spaniards.

Continuing the southeastern version of the proxy war, the Creeks raided the Indian villages in the outskirts of St Augustine, Mobile, and Pensacola, attacked the Choc-taws, who were French allies, and laid siege to what was left of Timucua province. In 1708 the Spanish governor reported that since the beginning of the war, the enemy had carried off between ten and twelve thousand persons. With the mission buffer gone, the Creek conquest pushed into South Florida, driving once elusive peoples into the arms of Spaniards to ask for asylum in languages so strange that the friars despaired of indoctrinating them. Some of the Creeks, tempted by the abandoned cattle and grasslands of Apalache and central Florida, remained, exercising a right of conquest that the British would assent to in 1763. The name these settlers went by, “Seminole,” came from the Spanish word *cimarrón*, for something that has reverted to the wild. They must have felt like outlaws, for although the Creeks appreciated the

strings of packhorses that came loaded with trade goods and left with peltry, most of them objected to cow keeping and, especially, to cattle drives.

For many southern Indians, the years of warfare, flight, and loss marked a new beginning, as uprooted peoples settled near one another in informal alliance. As in the psychological process of “creative disintegration,” in which a dysfunctional personality breaks down and is replaced by a functional one, new societies emerged from the ruins of the old. In the Carolina piedmont, shielded to the north by the Dismal Swamp, refugees from societies shattered by epidemics, slave raids, and war gathered near the Catawba River. By 1677, when Susquehannocks driven out of Maryland joined the Five Nations to make war on the Occaneechees and other Siouan speakers to the south, the Catawba had constructed a nation powerful enough to match them warrior for warrior. James Merrell (1989) uses the Catawba experience – assimilating traders and trade goods but not missionaries, leasing their land to settlers, fighting on the American side in the Revolution, redefining their government as a republic, and becoming part of the local exchange network – to reveal how Indian peoples transformed themselves in response to a series of challenges.

For 150 years after routing the army of de Soto, the Indians who lived along the Mississippi River went about their business unobserved by Europeans, secluded by the inability of Gulf pilots to thread the maze of channels that concealed the river mouth. The exploration of the Mississippi, when it finally occurred, was part of a geopolitical plan by New France to extend the fur trade beyond the Great Lakes and secure a warm-water port. In 1682 René-Robert Cavalier, Sieur de La Salle, journeyed downstream to the Mississippi mouth, claimed the drainage basin for France, and returned upstream, pausing to establish a trading post among the Illinois. Two years later he was back, this time straight from France with ships and colonists, overshooting his destination to land at Matagorda Bay in present-day Texas. As a base, the colony was a failure, but Spain’s response, sending eleven expeditions out to find it, generated excitement and focused attention on the Gulf. Five of the expeditions came by land from Coahuila, crossing the territory of the non-agricultural Coahuiltecas into the pine-forested “kingdom of the Tejas,” as the Spanish called the Caddos. European rivalry in the Caddo world, as in Florida, took the form of a contest between strategic evangelism and mercantile capitalism. David La Vere (1998) lifts the lid of European rivalry to expose the bitter warfare between the Caddos and their competitors in the hide and horse trades – Quapaw, Osage, Apache, and Choctaw.

As the 300th anniversary of La Salle’s first expedition came around, scholars sifted the record for material on all Gulf Indians. Patricia Galloway (1982) edited a collection describing the Choctaw, Chickasaw, and Natchez peoples on the eve of colonization. When Europeans converged on the Lower Mississippi Valley – the French from Canada, the Spanish from New Spain and Florida, and the English from Carolina – they found its peoples familiar with European trade goods and ready for an expanded deerskin market. The first European outposts were fortified warehouses. By 1690 the English had a post among the Alabamas at the forks of the Coosa and Tallapoosa Rivers. In 1698 the Spanish founded Pensacola. The French, led by Pierre Le Moyne, Sieur d’Iberville, founded Biloxi in 1699 and Mobile in 1702. The Indians tolerated French soldiers and settlers and sold them food; the French, undersupplied and outnumbered, used their leverage to keep the Indians at war and undertook an