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INTRODUCTION AND GOAL

The goal of this compilation is to help teachers develop historically accurate teaching materials relating to Native American around A.D. 1650. In particular, we will try to show what life might have been like in a small camp on the South Carolina coast, shortly before contact with the English. In addition, the conclusion offers a brief outline of other major issues and topics which are appropriate to inclusion in associated Native American texts and curricula materials exploring the period from about 12,000 B.C. to A.D. 1650.

As with all such programs, this compilation is limited by the time and funding available. In so far as possible we have attempted to select South Carolina authorities for the documentation. When these were not present, or were not readily accessible, we have moved outward to Southern sources and then Eastern U.S. sources. Obviously there are some areas for which there is better evidence than others. We have tried to indicate those areas where there is major scholarly disagreement.

It is appropriate to note that the period selected for portrayal has received relatively little scholarly attention along the South Carolina coast. Coupled with this is the equally significant problem that there is little ethnohistorical data collected for any one specific group. Historically, the small coastal tribes were quickly destroyed by European contact — through disease, the slave trade, increased warfare, and alcohol.

At the request of many teachers we have emphasized graphical representations in our search, including prose descriptions only when other graphics were not immediately available. Although many graphical representations are based on extensive scholarly research it was beyond the scope of this compilation to evaluate the accuracy of the graphics. Where there was some obvious doubt regarding the suitability of graphics they were not included.

Likewise, it was not always possible to use the target date to sift through the available information. Consequently, we have occasionally taken the liberty of extending the target date by several hundred years in either direction.

Should there be a need to explore any of these topics in greater detail, Chicora Foundation will be happy to work with teachers. We offer a broad range of programs for classes ranging from about third grade through high school. These explore prehistoric life, the techniques for making pottery, and the different types of archaeological sites in South Carolina.
VILLAGE LAYOUT

At about A.D. 1650 there were likely a variety of settlement types -- large villages, small hamlets, and individual households. Each part of the settlement system likely represented different activities and different seasonal activities.

In general ethnohistoric sources suggest that the population came together during the summer and broke into smaller units during the winter (when there were fewer food sources).

A small hamlet may be the easiest for kids to understand. Therefore, we are talking about a fall to winter period of occupation. It is probably also important to convey to the student that this settlement was only one part of a larger whole. There is also some indication that the groups may have moved inland during this period, off the immediate coast.

The single greatest problem is that no such small hamlet has been excavated along the coast or inland -- consequently we have very little information readily available. Much of the information presented here is speculation.

At the most general level, such sites are found in close proximity to the resources being exploited. Internal arrangement usually follows the topography. They are usually found on relatively well drained sandy soils. Water was likely provided by springs -- which were apparently more common during this period. The hamlets may have included two or three structures, with the individuals probably related by blood or kinship (i.e., perhaps extended families).

Associated with each house was likely an outside cooking area, possibly an area for cleaning and preparing deer hides, and other work areas. Given that these hamlets along the coast were seasonal, they may or may not have included activities such as pottery production.

While larger villages, even earlier in the period, were surrounded by defensive stockades, there is no indication that hamlets were protected. In addition, there seems to be little ethnohistoric evidence for unrest or disruption along the coast prior to the arrival of the English.

Figure 1 illustrates the "yard" around a Seminole house in Florida, ca. 1917. Notice that the near yard (i.e., the area immediately surrounding the structures) is nearly
devoid of grass. As you move away from the structure the decreased traffic allows herbaceous or weedy plants to thrive. [Hint: this is a great opportunity to explore an integrated curricula — how do humans affect their environment? And how does that environment also affect human behavior and life ways?] The Indian camp was not gently placed in the midst of the woods, but dramatically affected the immediate environment. A whole series of plants able to thrive adjacent to people were promoted, while other plants were quickly exhausted, either through use or inability to thrive in close proximity to the camp. Some of the weedy species were probably "selected" or encouraged to grow by the Native Americans since they could be used (some as food, others to provide raw materials for weapons or tools).

Figure 1. Seminole camp, Florida, ca. 1917. Notice the cleared, sandy yard area, with vegetation increasing away from the camp (Nabokov and Easton 1989:27).
HOUSING

There is good evidence that Mississippian house types varied by season, with those erected in the winter being more solid than those built in the warmer months. Generally, then, the type of "hut" discussed should "fit" the winter season thought to be typical of small hamlet settlements. However, again we are faced with scarce data.

Le Moyne shows several Port Royal structures (Figure 2). Each is generally round in appearance with a domed roof. There was only one entrance. Each probably had a central smoke hole in the roof. The roof was probably covered with palmetto thatch. The walls were likely wattle and daub (woven sticks covered with clay) (Figure 3). This building material was hardened by the sun and protected from rain by the thatched roof overhang. Near the ground, however, the daub was likely washed or eroded away. It is also likely that these structures were filled with vermin -- cockroaches, lizards, mud dauber nets, and so forth. [Hint: it's important not to glamorize the past. Help students understand the reality of Native American life.] The building would have been lashed together, possibly using a combination of leather strips and vegetable fibers (Figure 4).

Stanley South has excavated a "hut" probably erected by a Spaniard at Santa Elena about A.D. 1570 and modeled after Native American houses in the region. It was "D"-shaped, measuring 12-feet wide, and was supported by nine posts, each about a foot in diameter (Figure 5). He notes that fiber-temper mud daub about 1 1/2 to 2 inches thick was smoothed against the cane wattle walls. It had a packed (i.e., hard) dirt floor with a central hearth about 1.5 feet in diameter. The roof was palmetto thatch. Trash was thrown out the door (although we can't be certain if this was a Spanish or Native American habit).

Circular houses are also known. One from an Upper Savannah River site measures about 15 feet in diameter (Figure 6). It was constructed using a wall trench, with posts about 1 1/2 foot in diameter placed about 8 inches apart. There was an entrance about 3 feet wide. The walls were probably wattle and daub. There was a central hearth made from puddled clay (i.e., shaped out of wet clay which was then fired) about 18 inches in diameter (Figure 7).

There are also occasional mentions of very insubstantial structures erected as temporary covers, giving rise to the possibility that there may also have been huts erected which were not wattle and daub, but simply thatch. A relatively late example are the Choctaw houses erected in Louisiana during the nineteenth century (Figure 8).
Your explanation should avoid the use of leather (i.e., skins sewn together, such as is typical with "tee-pees") since in our humid climate the leather would have quickly rotted. There are also no trees which could have provided sufficient bark for the construction of the bark houses typical of further north. Likewise, the house construction you help the students understand should avoid being too "neat" or substantial. Houses were likely not considered articles of permanent craftsmanship, but were improvisational and practical. Construction techniques likely followed time-honored rules, but there was little reason to preserve (or conserve) materials. All of the structures described were probably expected to last one or two seasons, after which time there would be wood rot and a heavy vermin infestation. At that time they were probably abandoned and a new structure built at a new settlement.

Figure 2. De Bry engraving of Le Moyne watercolor showing Ribault exploration of Port Royal Sound. Notice the small, circular, domed Indian "huts" in upper center.

Figure 3. Wall construction of wattle, after which daub, or clay, would be applied (Nabokov and Easton 1989:97).
Figure 4. Examples of lashed timbers (Coles 1973:56).

Figure 5. Artist's reconstruction of Santa Elena house (South et al. 1988:62).

Figure 6. Circular house outline, showing wall trench, postholes, and doorway (Anderson and Joseph 1988:1:259).
Figure 7. Examples of clay hearths.

Figure 8. Palmetto thatched hut built by Choctaw in Louisiana, ca. 1881 (Nabokov and Easton 1989:112).
FOODS AND FOOD PREPARATION

Plant foods

Discussing a fall to winter occupation (see earlier discussion) it is likely that hickory nuts were being gathered and used (although these can be stored for quite some time). Most accounts agree that the hickory was being used for its high fat content and there are ethnohistoric accounts of the nutshell being cracked open and the mass boiled. Eventually the oil would be released by the nut meat and could be skimmed off the top of the liquid. Acorn meat is high in carbohydrates, but is less commonly found.

Many plant foods known to have been used by the Native Americans fruit during the late summer and early fall -- relatively few would have been available during the late fall and winter. Species possibly present (i.e., available in the fall) include grape, persimmon, goosefoot, knotweed, smilax, and yucca. [Hint: this is another good opportunity to develop an integrated curricula, combining botany and archaeology.] All of these tend to be found in disturbed habitats (i.e., around human settlements as weeds) and produce seeds which are known to have been eaten (for example the goosefoot and knotweed produce starchy seeds).

Corn would not have been present, since there seems to be good evidence that the supply raised was limited and quickly depleted in the late summer and early fall (accounts to the contrary are likely propaganda by the English to make the region seem more prolific). Likewise beans and various gourds or squash are summer crops and would not have been present at the winter encampment.

Animal foods

Animals known to have been exploited during the period include turtle (the carapace might have been used for a rattle), deer, turkey, bobcat, opossum, rabbit, and raccoon. In addition, dog and snake may also have been eaten. It is important to emphasize to students that they must not use their "standards" — even their dietary standards — to "judge" the Native Americans.

One of the few views of hunting is the De Bry engraving which shows the Indians using deer skins to cover their scent and to provide camouflage (Figure 9).

Analysis from one Savannah River site suggests that deer were brought to the camp whole for butchering. The presence of charred bones suggests roasting of the meat.
There are accounts of slow cooking the meat (essentially smoking it) to offer some minor preservative quality. Evidence at some sites suggests that the bones were broken open to obtain the marrow (which can also be boiled out). Carnivore gnawing suggests that those bones not used were discarded on the surface to be gnawed by scavengers (including dogs and rodents).

A winter indicator in the animal foods would be the presence of deer heads with attached antlers.

There is good ethnohistoric evidence that the coastal groups also relied heavily on a wide range of fish. Specifically, fish were caught with hook and line, and gigged (most likely depending on the species). Nets may have been used, but there is relatively little support of this idea. There is also evidence that the great tidal range in Georgia and South Carolina made the use of weirs and tidal traps impractical -- they would not have been used by Native Americans. Species which might be appropriate include rays, mullet, catfish, sheephead, drum, jack, and sea trout. Fish species are only weakly seasonal.

**Shellfish**

Shellfish were apparently a staple at cool weather sites. Typically oyster dominates the collection, although also present are clam, whelk, and occasionally periwinkle. The shellfish were prepared both by steaming and also shucking raw. Shells were discarded underfoot, in abandoned steaming pits, and in small piles adjacent to the dwelling.

**Views**

The White paintings (adapted by De Bry to produce engravings), while from further north, offer a view of fishing (Figures 10 and 11). Keep in mind, however, that the weirs shown in the upper left hand corner are inappropriate for South Carolina. The use of canoes, however, is documented, as is the use of spear fishing. De Bry also illustrates cooking, showing a pot with an array of items -- described as "fruite, flefh, and fifh" -- which is being boiled (Figure 12). [Hint: you can integrate how even the English language has changed over the past 350 years.] This is probably appropriate for the South Carolina coastal area as well.

![Figure 9. De Bry engraving showing hunting techniques with deer skins.](image)
Figure 10. John White’s composite drawing of a fishing scene (compare with the elaborations shown by De Bry in Figure 11).
Figure 11. De Bry’s "Their manner of fishynge in Virginia," showing spear fishing and canoe fishing. Ignore the use of weirs.
Figure 12. De Bry's "Their feetheynge of their meate in earthen pots," showing one cooking method. Also used was roasting of meats over an open fire.
TOOLS

This section will detail a variety of common tools which might be expected at seasonal low country hamlets ca. A.D. 1650, although no such sites have been excavated and much of this discussion is speculative. Pottery and basketry, for which there is somewhat more information, are considered in a following section.

It is likely (and supported by the limited archaeological evidence) that the small, seasonal hamlets contained a very sparse assemblage since many tasks were not done at these sites.

Stone Tools

The typical projectile point of this period was a small triangular point (Figure 13) often flaked from a gray rhyolite or a white quartz. Through time the points got smaller and, after contact, it is possible that even very rough flakes may have been used. Points were lashed to straightened wood or possibly cane shafts (Figure 14). Although not yet found on the coast, it is likely that the Indians would have also begun to adopt European goods to their own needs. For example, elsewhere copper pots were cut into small triangular arrow head points (Figure 15).

Other stone tools include scrapers, used both to scrape (deflesh) hides and also to prepare wood objects (Figures 16 and 17).

Ground stone celts, while often ceremonial, were also utilitarian objects used for cutting wood (Figures 18 and 19). They were hafted in short wood stocks, similar to those shown in Figure 20 and 21. Very similar adz tools were used to work wood (a good example being the removal of burnt wood in the construction of canoes, see Figure 22).

"Nutting" stones or, more properly, anvils are found at these late sites and may have been used in food preparation to open nutshells. They may also have been used in a particular type of stone tool production where the stone to be flaked is placed on the anvil and hit from above to remove flakes. Figures 23 and 24 show a variety of such implements.

Drills are also common (Figure 25) and were possibly used on soft stone (i.e., soapstone), bone, and wood. These items were likely hafted and some were made from broken projectile points.
Lithic Technology

It seems likely that these small hamlets produced few finished tools from raw material. Instead, the primary activity was resharpening already existing tools. This process of "curating" or keeping existing tools would leave behind few or no large primary flakes, and few or no hard hammer tools (like hammerstones). What would be present are small secondary flakes, perhaps soft hammer or pressure flaking tools (Figure 26), and tools which have obviously been resharpened. A large collection of small flakes (ca. \( \frac{1}{4} \) to \( \frac{1}{2} \) inch in size) would be found around an area where tools were resharpened.

Bone Tools

Bone, particularly in stone poor areas like along the coast, was used for a variety of tools. There are examples of bone fish hooks (Figure 27), bone awls (probably used as perforating tools) (Figure 28), and bone beamers (used as hide scrapers or defleshers) (Figure 29). Antler batons would have been used in stone flaking.

Wood Tools

There is evidence from wet sites such as Key Marco in Florida where wood is preserved that there were a variety of wooden objects at Native American sites — as might be reasonably expected. There is, however, no directly comparable evidence from small Mississippian hamlets. Items which might have been used would include wooden vessels (Figure 30), dart and arrow shafts (Figure 31, showing a bone tip), paddles (Figure 32), adz and other tool handles (Figure 33).

Included in this category are also bows and arrows. De Bry illustrates a relatively long bow, with a Virginia Indian carrying a quiver on his hip (Figure 34). In contrast, the Indians shown by Le Moyne, in another De Bry engraving, have shorter bows (Figure 35). Arrows all appear to be about 3 feet, and an early twentieth study of the Catawba found arrows about 30 to 31 inches in length. Catawba bows were about 40 inches long. Figure 36 shows these Catawba bows and arrows, including the feather attachment to help the arrow fly truer.

Figure 37 shows several varieties of Catawba fishing spears, primarily made from cane and used to gig or spear the fish.

European Tools

A.D. 1650, is early for any substantive inclusion of European items. At this time it is likely that a few items would have been obtained from Spanish explorers, but the items would be so numerically rare and so highly valued they likely would not show up at a small coastal hamlet. The Indians might have salvaged items, such as brass nails, from wrecked ships, but these also would have been rare items. The influx of trade goods,
such as glass beads, hoes, guns, clothing probably didn't arrive in large numbers until about A.D. 1700.

Figure 13. Examples of small triangular "arrow heads" (Wauchope 1966:161).

Figure 14. Attaching point to arrow shaft (Brose 1991:65).

Figure 15. Examples of brass projectile points (Gibson 1980:174).
Figure 16. Example of scraper and how it might have been used (Brose 1991:25).

Figure 17. Examples of scraper use (Semenov 1976:85).

Figure 18. Example of ground stone celt.
Figure 19. Example of tree felled using a ground stone tool (Coles 1973:Plate 3).

Figure 20. Examples of hafted celt-like tools from a dry Southwest cave (Moore 1905:Figure 69).

Figure 21. Possible hafting of an adz (Semenov 1976:135)
Figure 22. De Bry engraving of canoe building, showing the use of fire and adz.

Figure 23. Examples of nutting or pitted stones (Wauchope 1966:184).

Figure 24. Examples of nutting or pitted stones (Wauchope 1966:200).
Figure 25. Examples of stone drills (Titterington 1938:22).

Figure 26. Pressure flaking (left), soft hammer or baton technique (right) (Joukowsky 1980:315; Nickels et al. 1979:230).

Figure 27. Examples of bone fish hooks (Bareis and Porter 1984:226).
Figure 28. Examples of bone awls (Black 1967:449).

Figure 29. Bone beamer (Black 1968:451).
Figure 30. Wooden vessels (Gilliland 1975:57).

Figure 31. Wood spear with bone point (Gilliland 1975:70).
Figure 32. Wood paddle (Gilliland 1975:125).

Figure 33. Wood handles for adzes (Gilliland 1975:140).
Figure 34. De Bry view of Virginia Indian bow, arrows, and quiver.

Figure 35. De Bry view of Port Royal Indians with bows and arrows.
Figure 36. Catawba bow and arrows.

Figure 37. Catawba fish spears.
POTTERY, BASKETRY, AND FABRICS

**Pottery**

The pottery produced by coastal groups south of Charleston at about A.D. 1650 is called Altamaha. It is a complicated stamped pottery, typically in deep urn or shallow bowl shapes. Figure 38 provides examples of several typical vessel motifs, while Figure 39 indicates typical vessel forms.

The pottery was called "complicated stamped" since the "designs" are "complicated" and since they are stamped on the pot. Figure 40 illustrates several typical paddles used to stamp the pottery. These paddles would have been carved using a small stone flake to make the negative impression in the wood paddle.

While beyond the scope of this review, Fewkes (1944) provides an excellent review of Catawba pottery making which would be appropriate for additional technological information on pottery production. The only evidence which the archaeologist might find of pottery production would be an at or slightly below grade firing hole (Figure 41) or perhaps pottery which accidentally broke during firing (such accidents have a very characteristic fracture, different from breakage through normal use).

White illustrates the use of a pottery vessel (Figure 42). While from Virginia, the vessel form is similar and it is likely that the use would have been identical here in South Carolina.

Once broken, pottery was ground into circular disks, possibly for use as gaming stones (Figure 43). Pottery was also used as hones and abraders.

Clay was formed into tobacco pipes, a variety of which are shown in Figure 44. Each would have had a reed stem.

**Basketry**

Although not yet found at coastal sites, it seems reasonable that Native Americans would have used basketry. Based on Le Moyne's visit among the Florida Timucua, De Bry shows Indians using baskets to carry foods (Figure 45). Basket remains have been found preserved at other late Mississippian sites (Figure 46).
Fabrics, Fibers, and Netting

Again, these items have not been found at coastal sites, yet they are seen in De Bry's drawings and they are found at a few sites — preserved either by their association with copper or because the site was very wet. Figure 47 - 49 provide examples of a few of the better preserved items.

Based on the few items preserved from unique sites it seems clear that the Native Americans of this time period were able to produce a wide range of cordage and rope, spit cane mats (with dyed patterns and designs), and fabrics (including many with rabbit fur).

Figure 38. Indian pottery motifs typical of the South Carolina coast area, ca. A.D. 1650 (Caldwell 1943:40, 42).
Figure 39. Pottery vessel forms (DePratter and Howard 1980:40).
Figure 40. Examples of pottery paddles (Holmes 1903:78, Plate 113).

Figure 41. Example of pottery being fired on the surface (Rye 1981:97).
Figure 42. John White painting of vessel over a fire.

Figure 43. Examples of pottery discs (Holmes 1903: 141).
Figure 44. Clay tobacco pipes (Holmes 1903: Plate 124).

Figure 45. De Bry drawing of Florida Indians using baskets.
Figure 46. Fragments of basketry (Hamilton 1952:186).

Figure 47. Textile fragments with what has been described as "eagle feather" design (Hamilton 1952:187).
Figure 48. Historic Native American cane mat from Louisiana (Fundaburk and Foreman 1957: Plate 134).
Figure 49. Example of netting and cordage from the Key Marco site (Gilliland 1975:240).
DRESS AND ORNAMENTS

Waddell (1980:43) observes that several of the early La Moyne drawings show coastal Indians (of both sexes) naked. Given ethnohistoric data this is not unreasonable, especially for the common person or individuals not involved in ceremonial activities. Waddell goes on to mention that the first act of the Spanish was probably to get the Indians to wear cloths, also a reasonable conclusion given their religious zeal.

Many of the preceding De Bry illustrations provide a glimpse of Native American dress. Those such as Figures 10 - 12, 22, 34 -35 show both males and females with minimal clothing and are probably reasonable representations of normal, daily dress -- at least during warm weather.

There are, however, historic accounts of more substantial clothing. For example, the Ayllon colonists mention that the Indians were dressed in skins or a net-like material made of Spanish moss. DeSoto found the Indians at Cofitachequi wearing well-prepared skins with multi-colored designs. An account mentions that these skins were worn with the fur turned in during the winter and turned out during the summer. An English account from 1670 mentions deer skins and Spanish moss robes.

It is certainly understandable to speculate that, at winter settlements, there may have been greater use of hides and other clothing than suggested by the De Bry prints. We have evidence that the Indians were skilled at dressing hides (and that rabbit hair was woven into fabrics), and that hides were used as clothing.

The De Bry illustrations also reveal several additional features. Many of the Native American groups appear to be painted and probably tattooed. There are a number of works which attempt to reconstruct Native American decorative patterns, although much of this work is fairly speculative.

It is also likely that groups in the low country also made extensive use of shell, bone, and perhaps clay beads. Figure 50 illustrates a variety of bead styles. By A.D. 1670 it is likely that trade beads had been introduced by the Spaniards, although they were probably restricted to the elite until the English flooded the "market" in the early eighteenth century.

There are a number of other personal decorative objects -- ear spools, shell gorgets, shell bracelets, and shell pins -- these may have primarily been items worn by the elite, or by individuals during special ceremonies. Based on limited occurrences in
grave settings, relatively few individuals appear to have had these items. Consequently, it is probably best not to include them in a "typical" hamlet scene. In addition, personal adornment items (other than possible ceremonial items) were likely not removed, but were constantly worn.

Figure 50. Examples of shell beads (Moorehead 1905: Figure 94).
EUROPEAN CONTACT AND TRADE GOODS

With European contact came tremendous changes -- disease, slavery, alcohol, environmental degradation, and eventually almost total destruction of the native culture. Only 12 years after Charles Towne was settled the coastal Native American population had decreased by 50% to no more than about 1,000 individuals. Six out of every seven Indians along the South Carolina coast died through contact with European groups — primarily the Spanish and later the English. Students should fully understand the consequences of the European "invasion" of the "New World."

There are a wide range of English trade goods — ceramics, beads, iron and brass kettles, axes, hoes, adzes, strike-a-lights, copper bangles, scissors, thimbles, guns and powder flasks, bells, kaolin pipes, and fabrics (blankets and cloth). At A.D. 1650, however, there were relatively few trade goods. The major "watershed" is ca. A.D. 1705-1710, after which time the Indians were using European clothing, arrows were commonly tipped with brass, and glass beads were exceptionally common.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL NATIVE AMERICAN CONCEPTS

The focus of these curricula materials will provide students with a greater understanding of Native American life ca. A.D. 1650 and this is good. However, that period must be understood in context of Native American cultural development (i.e., 12,000 B.C. to A.D. 1650) and in context of the European intrusion (i.e., A.D. 1650 to ca. A.D. 1720).

One obvious route is to use the commonly accepted cultural and temporal divisions:

- **Paleoindian Period**, 12,000 - 8,000 B.C.
- **Archaic Period**, 8,000 B.C. - 1,000 B.C.
- **Woodland Period**, 1,000 B.C. - A.D. 1200
- **Mississippian Period**, A.D. 1200 - A.D. 1650
- **Contact and Historic Periods**, A.D. 1650 - A.D. 1720

This allows easy comprehension by most students, since it is chronologically organized. It allows easy "time-line" study and teaching techniques. And it can be related to by most students with adequate preparation.

While the goal of this brief booklet is not to lay out the total curricula, major topics should include:

- The Native American's use of the environment and descriptions of that environment, including climate and, especially, sea level changes -- topics of relevance to coastal islands like Hilton Head, Daufuskie, James, Kiawah, and Seabrook, and which can be easily tied to other, nature based, threads promoting an integrated curricula.

- The manufacture of the first pottery in North American — Stallings — and how it helped change Native American culture.
• The formation of year-round village life on the coast during the Late Archaic and how this is tied to ecology issues.

• How the coast participated in broader cultural themes, such as the Hopewell Burial Mound Tradition and the South Appalachian Temple Mound Tradition.

• The impact of disease, slavery, alcohol, trade, and warfare on the small coastal tribes met at contact. It is essential that students understand the terrible consequences of the European invasion of North America. Without understanding these consequences their understanding of Native Americans is sterile.

• Finally, the issue of "settlement indians" should be addressed, since it is the remnants of these Indians who are today the Edisto and similar groups in South Carolina.

In teaching about archaeology it is critical to avoid emphasizing the manual skills or techniques to the exclusion of other archaeological activities. Digging is only a very small part of the archaeological "story." Teachers should also:

• explore the analysis of the artifacts,
• explain the need to conserve excavated artifacts,
• illustrate the use of computers and other techniques to help understand the excavated data,
• show the publication process -- so the public understands that the goal of the excavations is not to collect artifacts, but to understand how people lived, and
• show that all of the artifacts are permanently curated -- again to dispel the public's impression that the artifacts are kept by the finder.

In addition to these issues, there should also be an effort to help the student understand the nature and science of archaeology. Students too often thinks of Indiana Jones, fossils, or treasure hunting when archaeology is mentioned. One goal of any classroom examination of archaeology should be to help students understand what archaeology is and why it is important to us all. Students must not come away thinking that archaeology is "digging square holes" or "collecting old things" since this defeats the purpose of teaching about the past. Students must come to realize that archaeology is a
way of exploring how people in the past lived. They must understand that archaeology helps explain and explore those who are "invisible people" — the common people who have left little or no historical record. And students must understand that to do this requires thought and both inductive and deductive reasoning. Archaeology, therefore, offers an exceptional opportunity to help students learn how to think — this is far more important than memorizing time lines or names of Indian groups.
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