

PART ONE: OVERVIEW

"I cannot quit the Indians without mentioning an observation that has often raised my wonder. That in this province, settled in 1670 (since the birth of many a man now alive) then swarming with tribes of Indians, there remains now, except the few Catawba's, nothing of them but their names, within three hundred miles of our sea coast; no traces of their emigrating or incorporating into other nations, nor any accounting for their extinction by war or pestilence equal to the effect."

Lt. Gov. William Bull, Jr. (1770)

## TRIBES AND LOCATIONS

---

This chapter summarizes the locations of the nineteen tribes which were probably indigenous to the lower coast of South Carolina between 1562 and 1751.<sup>1</sup> The locations given are usually the sites of their summer villages. During the summer, the members of each tribe lived near one another in settlements along the coast. During the fall, they moved upstream and divided into numerous smaller communities to spend the winter inland.<sup>2</sup>

From 1562 to 1576, the initial period of French and Spanish occupation, the tribes evidently remained in the same locations. The Escamacu, who were the most important tribe in the Port Royal vicinity, were also the southernmost tribe; they had their main village between the Broad and the Savannah River.<sup>3</sup> Another much smaller tribe, the Hoya, lived nearby.<sup>4</sup> Three other villages were along the southern edge of the Broad River: the major village of the Edisto<sup>5</sup> and the smaller villages of the Touppa<sup>6</sup> and Mayon.<sup>7</sup> Another small tribe, the Stalame, had a village on Port Royal Island.<sup>8</sup> The only other tribe known to have been in the Port Royal vicinity during this period is the Kussah, who lived farther to the north.<sup>9</sup>

The surviving 16th Century accounts refer to two tribes which lived outside the Port Royal area. The Kussoe had a major village near Charleston Harbor.<sup>10</sup> The Sewee, the northernmost tribe considered in this study, were living near the mouth of the Santee River.<sup>11</sup> No tribe is known to have been living between Port Royal and Charleston Harbor before about 1579.

Most of these earliest known villages were probably destroyed during the Escamacu War (1576-1579).<sup>12</sup> The Spanish sent major expeditions against the Kussoe and against another tribe which was probably the Escamacu. The Edisto moved north to Edisto Island. This was the first of a series of northern movements which most Coastal Tribes eventually made to avoid contact with Europeans. The Escamacu War probably left the area between the Broad and the Savannah Rivers deserted.

## Tribes and Locations

Relatively little seems to have happened between 1580 and 1670 that might have caused the Coastal Tribes to move their villages again.<sup>13</sup> During this interval, three more tribes are mentioned, and these tribes as well as those already mentioned probably returned each summer to basically the same locations. In 1605 and 1609, Spanish expeditions encountered the Kiawah,<sup>14</sup> Etiwan,<sup>15</sup> and Stono,<sup>16</sup> who were living on or near Charleston Harbor.

The names of five tribes which are not known to have been mentioned by the French or Spanish appear in English documents soon after the settlement of Charles Town in 1670: the Wimbee,<sup>17</sup> Combahee,<sup>18</sup> and Ashepoo<sup>19</sup> are referred to as living to the south of the Edisto Indians. The Wando<sup>20</sup> and Sampa<sup>21</sup> are referred to as north of the Kiawah Indians. The Wimbee, Combahee, and Ashepoo may be identical to one or more of the small tribes who lived at Port Royal in 1562; but their names are entirely different, and they occupy generally different areas.

After a "war" in 1675 the English forced the Kussoe to "for ever quitt" their lands. By 1675 some other local Indians were already requesting that land be "reserved" for them, and the first reservation was probably "allowed them" then, although it is not described until 1680 as both sides of the Wando River three miles beyond its mouth.<sup>22</sup> A map dated c. 1685 shows that the Etiwan, Wando, Sampa, and Sewee had been "removed" there from lands taken up by the Colonists.<sup>23</sup> By about 1682 the Kiawah had moved from the Ashley River to Kiawah Island.

In 1683 another period of displacement began with the emigration of first the Scots and, shortly afterwards, of the Yemassee into the Port Royal area. The Yemassee came by the hundreds and along with them were the Guale, traditional foes of the Coastal tribes.<sup>24</sup> Some local tribes may have moved north about this time to get away from these recent arrivals.

In 1684 the Proprietors decided to clear their title to the coast between the Savannah and the Stono Rivers (much of which they already had granted to the Scots), so they had eight separate cessions and one general cession made to give them a paper claim to all of this territory.<sup>25</sup> The Witcheaugh (previously unknown),<sup>26</sup> St. Helena (Escamacu), Wimbee, Combahee, Kussah, Ashepoo, Edisto, and Stono surrendered all their claims. Although they were not immediately forced to leave their traditional lands, the maps of the next three decades show that Europeans were continually claiming the best lands, and the Indians were increasingly confined to smaller and less desirable areas.

All of the 1684 cessions extended from the Appalachian

## Tribes and Locations

Mountains to the Atlantic Ocean. The Cherokee were the closest neighbors of these eight tribes to the west and northwest. The Cherokee's villages were in the Appalachian Mountains, but they also claimed most of the Piedmont even though they probably rarely, if ever, hunted below the Fall Line because game was plentiful in the Mountains.<sup>27</sup> The Coastal Tribes probably avoided the lands claimed by the Cherokee, so a section perhaps one-hundred miles wide between the two groups seems to have been largely uninhabited. Using the Appalachians as a boundary for the cessions may have been unnecessary, but Ferguson implies that the Santee, Etiwan, Kiawah, Stono, Edisto, Kussah, and St. Helena "...formerly were chased from the mountains..." so some of these Coastal Tribes may still have thought of the Cherokee lands as legitimately theirs.<sup>28</sup>

Below the Fall Line also, most land was unoccupied much of the time: the 1684 cessions mention partly uninhabited lands north or northeast of the Witcheaugh, north or northeast of the St. Helena, north or northeast and south or southwest of the Wimbee, south or southwest and north or northeast of the Combahee, south or southwest and north or northeast of the Ashepoo, south or southwest and north or northeast of the Edisto, and south or southwest of the Stono.

One additional small tribe, the Bohicket, was first mentioned on a map of c. 1685.<sup>29</sup> Their population was probably too small to make a land cession necessary.

Soon after the Scots arrived at Port Royal, they joined the Yemassee in harassing the Spanish. In 1686 the Spanish retaliated twice by raiding and leisurely burning the Scots settlement, most if not all Indian villages at Port Royal, and the whole of Edisto Island. Only a hurricane saved the lands farther north.

Probably at this time, every indigenous tribe of the Port Royal Region moved north to the vicinity of St. Helena Sound: the Witcheaugh to Witcheaugh Island, the Wimbee to Wimbee Creek, and the Kussah to the south side of the Ashepoo River; the Combahee abandoned Combahee (Ladies) Island; the St. Helena abandoned Parris Island. Even the Yemassee were easily convinced to move inland in 1702, so the entire Port Royal Area seems to have been temporarily deserted again.

English settlers took advantage of the situation and almost immediately began to acquire large tracts of the vacant land. One small island was allowed the Kussah for their return. In 1706 this tribe asked that no more land be granted south of the Combahee River, but even their small reservation was inadvertently granted and had to be recovered for them in 1712. The

## Tribes and Locations

whole of Wimbee (Port Royal) Island, Combahee (Ladies) Island, and Coosaw Island were granted between 1696-1703 and also much of St. Helena Island.

The tribes of the Lower Coast were also greatly decimated by smallpox and other European diseases about the same time, and they occupied smaller and smaller areas. One tribe, probably the Wando, ceased to exist as a separate entity through smallpox.

The Sampa about this time seem to have moved north of the Santee to the Sampit River. The Sewee were greatly reduced by both smallpox and an unsuccessful attempt to cross the Atlantic Ocean. All lands between Charles Town and the Santee were also up for grabs around 1700 and much of it was granted within several years. About 1699 the Kiawah lost all of Kiawah Island and moved north to Wappaoola Creek on the Cooper River.

The population and tribal areas declined again during the Yemassee War (1715-1716). Since the Wimbee, Combahee, Kussah, and Ashepoo are not heard from again, they were probably destroyed by the Yemassee (although the Ashepoo may have joined the Yemassee and moved south with them). All other Coastal Tribes sided with the Colonists except for the Sewee, who at first had also been allies.

After the Yemassee War, only the St. Helena, Edisto, Kussoe, Kiawah, and Etiwan continue to be mentioned as separate tribes. They were "allowed" to live scattered among the settlements, and there are frequent references to them between 1716-1751. Ten widely separated trading posts were set up in 1718 between "Port Royal" and "Wandoe" for the "Indians residing in the Settlement",<sup>30</sup> the phrasing indicates that in less than a half-century, the Indians were occupying English land.

On 29 April 1726 the Assembly proposed to settle all friendly Indians in three bodies,<sup>31</sup> but adjourned the following day with no action. On 18 November 1726, three days after reconvening, the proposal was referred to the Indian Committee.<sup>32</sup> Nothing must have come of the proposal because lists-dated 1733 and 1743 enumerate the remaining tribes separately, and the Kiawah were again requesting land in 1743.

By 1721 the Winyah, Cape Fear, and Tuskarora were sharing the Lower Coast with the St. Helena, Edisto, Kiawah, Kussoe, and Etiwan. By 1733 the Pee Dee were there. In 1739 the phrase "or any other Indians incorporated with them..." is added to a list of Coastal Tribes.<sup>33</sup> The St. Helena, Edisto, Kiawah, and Kussoe are last mentioned in 1743. The Etiwan alone are mentioned in 1751.

## POPULATION

---

Physical Appearance Ashe's 1682 description probably refers to the Coastal Indians: "The Natives of the country are from time immemorial, ab Origine Indians, of a deep Chestnut Color, their Hair black and streight...; their Eyes black and sparkling, little or no Hair on their Chins, well lim'd and featured...."<sup>34</sup> In 1707 Archdale explained that "the Natives are somewhat Tawny, occasioned in a great measure, by Oyling of their Skins, and by the naked Raies of the Sun...."<sup>35</sup> He also agrees that "they are generally very streight Bodied, and Comely in Person...."<sup>36</sup>

On the Lower Coast only one tribe, the Etiwan, is known to have practiced deformation to make themselves conform to an artificial ideal. In 1711 Dennis saw a child among them "stretcht straight down" to a kind of cane cradle with a "small bag of sand fillited hard to his forehead...."<sup>37</sup> Lawson describes an almost identical procedure among the Waxsaw,<sup>38</sup> who were living on the Wateree River and almost certainly spoke Siouan,<sup>39</sup> like the Etiwan.<sup>40</sup> The Waxsaw also used a small bag of sand, which Lawson compares to those used by engravers, but they placed it at the back of the child's head. They then bound him to a board and placed a strip across the forehead to compress the skull against the bag. This procedure made "...the Eyes stand a prodigious Way asunder, and the Hair hang over the Forehead like the Eves of a House, which seems very frightful...."<sup>41</sup> When Lawson asked why, he was told that this flattening improved vision and enabled a man to be a better hunter, their greatest ambition; then the informant added that "he that is a good Hunter never misses of being a Favorite amongst the Women; the prettiest Girls being always bestow'd upon the chieftest Sports-Men, and those of a grosser Mould upon the useless Lubbers."

Only one representation of Coastal Indians is even likely to be authentic. One of Le Moyne's illustrations of Port Royal shows five Indians.<sup>42</sup> They resemble classical statuary, and their proportions may be idealized. Their physique probably was

## Population

extraordinary, though, because their way of life demanded a variety of physical exertions.<sup>43</sup>

Size The only census that is even nearly complete for the Coastal Indians was taken about 1682. Ferguson recorded that no nation had more than fifty bowmen. He gives the following specific totals: St. Helena--30, Kussah--50, Edisto--10, Stono--16, Kiawah--40, and Etiwan--20.<sup>44</sup> His figures are the best starting point for estimating population totals because they are the most specific ones available and because they compare reasonably well with other figures recorded for individual tribes.

The number four will be used here somewhat arbitrarily to determine the total population of these tribes. Most bowmen probably had a wife and only one or two children who reached maturity. The number of children was kept low through abortion, as elsewhere throughout North America; "nowhere was it considered a crime."<sup>45</sup> Ferguson wrote that despite the Indian's longevity,

...it's improbable they should ever grow numerous, because the Women destroy their Bellies with the decoction of a certain Bituminous Root, that grows every where amongst them; which Root occasions Sterility. And this ancient Custom, because practised from Generation to Generation, is so rivited into the faith of their Females; that neither Art, nor Argument can prevail upon them to relinquish this Barbarity of destroying their Bellies, till arriving at the Age of twenty seven (or thereabouts) and then they fancy to themselves that their Children (at such years) will grow most active, vigorous, and valient; when their best Advance is but preferment to Bowmen. So that to me this seems an odd Practice; but who shall reclame it, except otherwise heaven it self reduce them. Yet I'me convinc'd this Relation is true from the certainty of a worthy and honourable Person, that assured me such are their Principles (and their Native Discipline) and because conveyed from the Loins of Posterity, its received as an Oracle amongst them....<sup>46</sup>

Milliken-Johnston, a physician, stated that Indian women used "herbs to procure an abortion, an operation that destroys many of them, and greatly contributes to depopulate them."<sup>47</sup> Smyth (while among the Catawbas, but speaking of "the Indian nations" generally) mentions "frequent abortions of the young unmarried women...by medicinal simples that promote abortion, in which fatal science they are very expert.... Such practices in their early youth subject them to miscarriages ever afterwards,

## Size

and when it happens otherwise, they commonly have not more than two children, very seldom three, during the whole course of their lives."<sup>48</sup> The stability of population enabled these tribes to subsist easily within their traditional boundaries, as will be shown in the section on Food.

Later population statistics such as Johnson's in 1715 indicate that for some tribes the men capable of bearing arms should only be multiplied by three, rather than four, to get the total population, but the Coastal Tribes even then seem to have averaged about three women, children, and elderly for each warrior listed. Multiplying by four to determine the population totals, in 1682 each tribe had approximately the following number of members: St. Helena--120, Kussah--200, Edisto--40, Stono--64, Kiawah--160, and Etiwan--80; the overall total is 664. The Kussoe and Sewee are omitted and they might have brought the total to roughly one thousand.

The population in 1562 must have been greater. How much greater can only be roughly estimated on the basis of fragmentary evidence. Laudonnière mentioned that in 1562 the Kings Audusta and Maccou (Edisto and Escamacu) visited Charlesfort with at least two hundred of their followers.<sup>49</sup> This may have been most of the men of the Port Royal Region. Gomes wrote in 1577 that "more than five hundred Indians" attacked Fort San Felipe,<sup>50</sup> but this figure represents most men of military age from as far away as twenty leagues (about eighty miles), including the Guale and probably the Coçapoy (exactly twenty leagues away).<sup>51</sup> When Menéndez Márques attempted to pacify "the province of Oristan... the Indians of said province, with as many as 300 bowmen, fell upon" his men. This smaller figure does not include the Guale, who may have totaled two hundred (subtracting three hundred from the previous figure of five hundred). One hundred of these three hundred were possibly from Coçapoy because when Menéndez Márques attacked it, its population was about four hundred; thus about one-fourth or one hundred were probably bowmen.<sup>52</sup> Subtracting this hundred from the three hundred again produces a figure of two hundred for the Port Royal region.

Using these possible totals of about two hundred warriors at Port Royal and of about one hundred at Coçapoy and multiplying times four produces a total of about twelve hundred inhabitants. This would not include the Sewee or Etiwan, and we have no figures for the smaller tribes. An estimate of half-strength (fifty bowmen) for the Sewee and Etiwan and perhaps a total of as many more bowmen for the other tribes adds one-hundred-fifty bowmen or altogether it adds four-hundred-fifty to the total. This very rough estimate of 1,750 Indians for the entire Lower Coast between c. 1562-1576 is nearly twice



## Population

the estimate for 1682, but it seems reasonable when their losses between 1576 and 1682 are considered.

Without mentioning the name of a tribe, Oré says that Menéndez Márques in a single assault of 1577 "killed and captured a hundred and twenty persons...."<sup>53</sup> In addition, the Guale had turned against their Indian allies and raided them at least once prior to 1578.<sup>54</sup> In 1579 "some Indians were slain" before the campaign of total devastation even began. Soon afterwards "many Indians were slain." Menéndez Márques also attacked Coçapoy at dawn, burned the village and slew some of the Indians...." These vindictive campaigns reduced the population by several hundred, possibly by as many as four hundred, which would account for more than half of the Indians who are estimated to have been killed between 1580-1682.

Another several hundred Indians may have been killed by the Westo when they devastated the coast between St. Helena and Kiawah just prior to 1670. The Westo killed and enslaved others in occasional raids during the 1670's and early 1680's.<sup>55</sup>

In 1671 and in 1674 the Kussoe and, also on one if not both occasions, the Stono were at war with the Colonists and were probably substantially reduced through killing and through being the initial victims of the Indian slave trade. About this time, northern tribes were also beginning to raid the coast.<sup>56</sup> Wilson in 1682 seems to be referring at least partly to the Lower Coast when he says "...the Indians have been always so engaged in Wars one Town or Village against another...that they have not suffered any increase of People, there having been several Nations in a manner quite extirpated by wars among themselves since the English settled at Ashley River...."<sup>57</sup> Altogether, the loss of about seven-hundred-fifty people between 1576-1682 seems minimal. Since the population was kept artificially low by custom, it did not return to its former numbers.

After 1682, we have additional specific information about population figures. In 1683 Crafford says that all Port Royal had no more than one-hundred-sixty Indians "for we made it a part of our work to know the Number...."<sup>58</sup> This was just before the arrival of the Yemassee, and the count must have been largely for the St. Helena, who had about one-hundred-twenty people by the 1682 estimate. The Kussah with about two hundred were probably already living on the Ashepoo River.

In 1686 the Spanish attempted to destroy Charles Town and managed to destroy much of the Port Royal Region and nearly everything that would burn on Edisto Island. They undoubtedly killed many of the St. Helena and Edisto.<sup>59</sup>

## Size

Some years before 1701, the Sewee lost most of their men at sea when they attempted to sail to England. Lawson says they were "formerly a large Nation...", and he implies that they, like "all other Nations" decreased more through disease than any other reason, "...the Indians being a People very apt to catch any Distemper....The Small-Pox has destroyed many thousands of these Natives...." He also mentions accidents through drunkenness, but disease was by far the greatest cause of the decrease in population.<sup>60</sup>

Disease seems to have killed nearly all of the Wando in 1699, and every other tribe probably suffered greatly from it, perhaps losing an average of one-third their population.<sup>61</sup> Archdale believed that it "pleased Almighty God to send unusual Sicknesses amongst them, as the Smallpox, etc., to lessen their Numbers...", and he thought "the Hand of God was eminently seen in Thining the Indians, to make room for the English." The decreases from disease were thus impressively substantial.

In 1706 Thomas says most of the tribes had no more than fifty people.<sup>62</sup> In 1712 Le Jau mentions at least forty Etiwan preparing for a feast, so they still had about one-hundred-sixty people.<sup>63</sup> The following year Le Jau says, "I am positively told also the rest of our Indian Allies and Neighbours [besides the Yemassee, whose fighting force had dropped in half from eight hundred to barely four hundred] are in the like case, they decrease apace, the Reason of it is the continual Warr they make against their Indian Neighbors subject either to the French or Spanish....I suspect there is no other Necessity for those Nations to Warr against their Neighbors but that of making slaves to pay for the goods the traders sell them, for the skins trade do's not flourish as formerly."<sup>64</sup>

Another general census was taken about 1715, and the Etiwan had eighty men and one-hundred-sixty women and children for a total of two-hundred-forty.<sup>65</sup> The estimate in 1682 was a total of eighty, in 1713 at least one-hundred-sixty or twice as much, and now by actual count, it turned out to be three times more (and this figure seems confirmed by 1724 estimates), so Ferguson must have underestimated the Etiwan's size unless several other tribes had since joined and increased it.

The only other group mentioned in the 1715 census as "Mixed with the English Settlements" is the "Corsaboys," which in this case is a designation used for every tribe remaining between Charleston Harbor and St. Helena. Since this group is said to have five villages, it probably represents the combined totals for the St. Helena, Edisto, Kussoe, Kiawah, and Stono; these five are called "Cusabes" in 1707, along with the Etiwan, Sewee,

## Population

and Santee, who each appear separately in this census.<sup>66</sup> In 1715 these five villages had ninety-five men and two-hundred women and children for a total of 295. In 1682 four of these tribes and the Kussah had a population of about 584. Assuming that the Kussah and Kussoe were about the same size, these groups would seem to have decreased almost by one-half. The overall totals for the tribes from St. Helena to Charleston Harbor in 1682 and for 1715 compare too closely for the tribes north of the Ashley River to have declined so drastically during those thirty-three years. The thousand, then, for the entire Lower Coast in 1682 possibly dropped only to about eight hundred in 1715 at the outbreak of the Yemassee War.

The Sewee, the only one of the tribes known to have still been living north of Charleston Harbor on the coast itself, are listed as having a total of fifty-seven men, women, and children. This figure is confirmed the following year, when they were captured and counted as twenty-two men and forty women and children or a total of sixty-six.<sup>67</sup> This figure, however, represents the final one for they were soon probably shipped out of the colony to be sold elsewhere as slaves.

During the Yemassee War (1715-1716), the Kiawah and Etiwan were rewarded for their assistance. The survival of the St. Helena, Edisto, and probably Kussoe indicates their assistance also. After the war, the designation of ten plantations as trading posts from Port Royal to Wando suggests that many Indians were still living throughout the Settlements.<sup>68</sup> The distribution of these posts is probably significant: seven ring Charleston Harbor; the remaining three were south of the North Edisto River, two on the South Edisto River and one at Port Royal. This implies that the Yemassee had left few Indians alive in the Port Royal Region, and only the St. Helena are mentioned afterwards; the other tribes which had probably moved north during the Yemassee occupation (the Witcheaugh, Wimbee, Combahee, and Kussah) evidently ceased to exist by the end of the War, if not before.

In 1724 Ludham mentions about fifty families of Indians (about two hundred) in Goose Creek Parish.<sup>69</sup> These were probably Etiwan from their number and location because no other tribe is known to have lived in Goose Creek Parish and the Etiwan were often mentioned there earlier. Also in 1724 Hunt says ten or twelve Etiwan families (about forty people) were in St. John's Parish (adjacent to the north of Goose Creek Parish).<sup>70</sup> This would make an overall total for the Etiwan of two-hundred-forty, which is exactly the total Johnson gave in 1715. They seem to have passed through that war relatively untouched as one of the tribes living closest to the protection of the Settlements. The St. Helena and Edisto may well have been reduced by half, though,

## Size

and with the elimination of the Sewee and the disappearance of several other tribes, the estimate for the total Indian population following the Yemassee War should perhaps be about three hundred less than at the beginning or a remaining total of about five hundred, half of them Etiwan and the rest (the St. Helena, Edisto, Kussoe, and Kiawah) with about sixty-five persons each.

The Kussoe's total in 1743 was also exactly that; Orr gives it as sixty-five.<sup>71</sup> He mentions "formerly they consisted of about 1000, as they say." They may at some time earlier than 1579 have been larger than the approximately four hundred of Coçapoy, but the figure of one thousand is probably an exaggeration, as Orr suspected.

The year 1743 marks the last mention of the St. Helena, Edisto, Kussoe, and Kiawah. In that year "about fifteen Keywaw Indians men women & c" asked for and may have been granted lands south of the Combahee. Their descendants, as well as those of the St. Helena and Edisto may still be living south of the Ashley River.

The hundreds of people of Indian descent still living near the head of the Ashley probably are largely Kussoe, since these people were often mentioned there between 1675 and 1743. The Etiwan are also mentioned in 1743, but they are again mentioned in 1751, the last time any Coastal Tribe is mentioned as a separate entity. Since the Etiwan are usually said to have resided on the Cooper River (with one possible exception), the Indians near the head of the Cooper today are likely their descendants.

During the 1740's and early 1750's, the remaining Coastal Indians were constantly being harrassed by tribes in alliance with the French. Adair mentions that for eight years the French policy was to exterminate "those dangerous scout-parties" which provided the Colony with warnings of inland attack.<sup>72</sup> The Indian Commission's Journal of this period frequently mentions these raids.<sup>73</sup> White summarizes the attempt: "...a number of tribes from as far away as Canada and New York, and also the Cherokee, spent a great deal of time and effort from 1748 to the outbreak of the French and Indian War in 1756 trying to hunt down and exterminate South Carolina's Settlement Indians."<sup>74</sup> The Indian Books also mention the great lengths the Colony took to warn, protect, and secure a treaty to stop these raids.<sup>75</sup>

In 1755 Atkin, who was concerned primarily with the large interior tribes, nevertheless confirms the continued existence of the Coastal Tribes: "I have taken no particular Notice of the few Remains in our Several Colonies, of the Ancient Natives

## Population

and Possessors of those Territories, still living in our Settlements among the plantations. I think they cannot in the whole much exceed four hundred Men."<sup>76</sup> Since this total is for all the Colonies, the Tribes of the Lower Coast by this time may have been reduced from the approximately five hundred in 1724 to half that or even fewer, but hardly more than two-hundred-fifty of the entire four hundred. That would leave only one-hundred-fifty for all the other colonies combined, but the northern colonies probably eliminated most of their competitors for land before South Carolina was even settled. Perhaps, though, as few as one or two hundred Indians of the Lower Coast survived the eight years of raids.

In 1761 Glen says in passing "There are among our Settlements several small Tribes of Indians, consisting only of some few Families each...." They are at least still being called tribes.<sup>77</sup> Adair in 1775 simply says "In most of our American colonies, there yet remain a few of the natives who formerly inhabited those extensive countries...." He adds correctly "...as they were friendly to us, and serviceable to our interests, the wisdom and virtue of our legislature secured them from being injured by neighbouring nations."<sup>78</sup>

The 1970 Census gives the following totals for Indians living within each county of the Lower Coast: Beaufort, 76; Berkeley, 43; Charleston, 195; Colleton, 74; Dorchester, 136; Jasper, 5; Hampton, 4. The total is 533 or about the total following the Yemassee War.<sup>79</sup> Their distribution also is remarkably like the situation in 1716 with few if any Indians near the Savannah (after the Yemassee were forced out), with about one-fourth of the total centered at St. Helena Sound and with nearly three-fourths in the Charleston-Berkeley-Dorchester area.<sup>80</sup>

In summary, the population of the Lower Coast seems to have been approximately 1,750 between 1562-1576. The Escamacu War (1576-1579) reduced it to roughly 1,350. The Westo devastation (c. 1670) and raids (1672-1682) reduced this to about 1,000 in 1682. From 1682 to 1715, the population was further reduced to about 800 by the Spanish attack of 1686, the Sewee voyage, and diseases. The Yemassee War (1715-1716) reduced it to roughly 500. Eight years of raids (1748-1756) reduced it to approximately 250 or perhaps even fewer.

In two centuries of contact with Europeans, nearly six of every seven Indians on the Lower Coast died of causes directly related to them. Although it had been to the advantage of the Coastal Tribes that their populations had stabilized before contact with Europeans, their numbers did not recover after the

## Size

introduction of new competing forces, new methods of killing, and new diseases.

To put the original figure in perspective, 1,750 people occupying an area roughly one hundred miles long and eighty wide works out to be one person to every 4.6 m<sup>2</sup> or 11.8 km<sup>2</sup>. Kroeber estimates the original population of North America north of Mexico as about 900,000, which works out to be about one for every eight square miles.<sup>81</sup> The Lower Coast, then, was nearly two times more densely populated than the rest of the continent north of Mexico, including uninhabited and uninhabitable lands.

Kroeber's own estimate for the population of the "Stono, Cusabo, etc." was a density of about 39 per 100 km<sup>2</sup>, which is near the mean for a coastal region. This figure is substantially higher, though, than one based on 1,750 people within an area of about 20,720 km<sup>2</sup>; this produces an estimate of about 11.8 persons per km<sup>2</sup>, which is almost exactly the 12 per 100 km<sup>2</sup> that he estimates for the Creek and Eastern Siouan.

These figures are useful but misleading. Inland towns generally had larger and more concentrated populations, but their towns were within larger areas. Although these tribes had room to live in small villages, they chose not to. The reasons why the Coastal Tribes had smaller political units will be discussed in the next chapter.

## INTERTRIBAL RELATIONSHIPS

---

Within the Area Each tribe of the Lower Coast was evidently autonomous. From the earliest contact in 1562 to the last specific mention in 1751, all of the nineteen tribes are not known to have confederated for any purpose. Several temporary alliances were arranged, but only an English alliance included most of the tribes, and it was not a confederation because the tribes were not full partners; they had no voice in policy making, and they provided no leadership. All of the alliances that are known were for military rather than for political purposes, and they existed only during periods of conflict.<sup>82</sup>

The disunity of Coastal Tribes was clearly evident when the Stono and Kussoe joined against the Colonists in 1674. On 25 July, the Council thought it sufficient to send only ten men against the Stono and instructed Maurice Mathews "to use his discretion" about killing as many of them as he thought necessary. On 3 August, the Council instructed Mathews and several others to attack the Kussoe and "to take or destroy all or any of them, the whole matter being left to their advisement." These actions show the Council was completely confident that no general offensive or defensive alliance existed among the Coastal Tribes. The Government of Carolina correctly believed that it could do as it pleased with these two tribes without risking that other tribes would join in.

Earlier on 27 September 1671, when the Colony was even smaller and was having difficulty surviving, the Governor and Council sent troops against the Kussoe and probably against the Stono as well, and no general uprising occurred. If the tribes had been at all organized then, they could have driven the English colony out, as they had the Spanish in 1576.

## Within the Area

Alliances prior to 1670 were numerous, but they were local, involving only a few tribes for a short period, and in all instances except one, they were probably only temporary. Laudonnière wrote that the French alliance in 1562 with Audusta (Edisto) automatically included the tribes of four other chiefs: Mayon, Hoya, Touppa, and Stalame.<sup>83</sup> These somewhat smaller tribes seem nevertheless to have been independent because the Spanish later visited each one separately to conclude the formalities of an alliance.<sup>84</sup> The smaller tribes probably confederated not because of any force by the Edisto, but because of the adjacent threat of Guale.

This Port Royal alliance is not known to have included the tribe of the neighboring chief Maccou (Escamacu).<sup>85</sup> He later allied with the French and accompanied Orista at least three times to Charlesfort, so the two were on good terms, but when the men from each of their villages were about to join in helping the French to rebuild a house destroyed by fire, each group was exhorted by his respective chieftan; one did not speak for both. In 1576 the Edisto joined the Escamacu to force the Spanish out, but so did the Guale, who earlier in 1566 were at war with the Edisto, who about 1577 turned against their allies and raided them, and who in 1598 were again at war with them. Thus, alliances on the Lower Coast were occasional.

The Port Royal confederation was definitely limited to Port Royal because when the Spanish raided Coçapoy, they said the Kussoe had never been friendly to them, while all the Port Royal tribes had been. The Kussoe probably did become allies of the Port Royal tribes to drive the Spanish out in 1576 because Indians from as far away as twenty leagues are said to have attacked San Felipe.

Although there must have been little connection between the Indians of Port Royal and Charleston Harbor from 1562-1580, the chiefs of Escamacu and Kiawah seem to have been friends later. In 1598 the two raided Guale together and in 1609 Ecija found them at Charleston Harbor together in a canoe with the Chief of Stono. This meeting of the three chiefs does not imply unity, though. The Stono and Escamacu did not have the authority to act for one another or for any other Coastal Tribe between the Savannah and the Stono because in 1684, when they ceded their lands, separate cessions were made with each tribe.<sup>86</sup> Even though a general cession was also made, representatives of each tribe signed separately.

The autonomy of these tribes is also indicated by the terms used to refer to them. They are almost invariably called nations, countries, or kingdoms and their chiefs are called kings or



## Intertribal Relationships

queens. Laudonniere calls all six of the Port Royal chiefs "kings."<sup>87</sup> Hilton refers to the "King" of St. Ellens.<sup>88</sup> Sandford refers to the Edisto "Nation."<sup>89</sup> Newe refers to "40 severall Kingdoms," which included the separate tribes of the Coast.<sup>90</sup> Wilson refers to "several Nations" and mentions that "...the Indians have been always so engaged in Wars one Town or Village against another (their Governments being usually of no greater extent)..." (emphasis added).<sup>91</sup> Mathews refers to "ye severall Countryes" of the Coast.<sup>92</sup> A 1696 Statute refers to "every respective nation."<sup>93</sup> Mrs. Coming refers to a "nation."<sup>94</sup> Governor Johnson lists "all the Indian Nations."<sup>95</sup> A 1721 Statute mentions five local "nations."<sup>96</sup> The references to Indian "kings" are equally numerous. This implies nothing necessarily about their power, but it implies a definite autonomy. Bartram notes for the Creeks that "Every town and village is to be considered as an independent nation or tribe having its Mico or chief."<sup>97</sup> The same probably applies for the tribes of the Lower Coast because none is known to have been subject to any outside authority.

Two apparent exceptions can possibly be explained: The first is Ahoyabee, which in 1566 is said to be "subject" to Ahoya (Hoya) and near it was an unnamed "Village of an overseer of that of Cozao." Both these references are by Vandera, and he does not explain the relationship of these smaller villages. Since they were encountered in November, they were probably inland plantations or groups of people who in the summer returned to their main villages.<sup>98</sup> Rogel says the inhabitants of Orista divided into about a dozen "different villages" in the winter.<sup>99</sup>

The second apparent exception is also perhaps a problem in semantics: The Ashepoo Cacica is said to have "ordered" an Escamacu Cacique and four other Indians (at least one of whom was a Combahee) to carry information to the Spanish in 1671. These Indians also are said to have come "by order & permission." This implies authority over them which the Cacica is not otherwise known to have had, so the Spanish military who reported this may have been thinking within their own regimented framework in which no one acted without orders. If, instead, this indicates a real authority, it was a new arrangement because the Escamacu earlier were the principal tribe of the area, and the arrangement could not have lasted long because in 1684 both the Escamacu and the Combahee separately ceded lands in addition to the Ashepoo.

Several other references further illuminate the relationships the Coastal Tribes had. When thirteen English survived shipwreck on 23 July 1663, the Stono killed three and divided the other ten equally between the Edisto and St. Helena. This does not necessarily imply a relationship between these three tribes because

## Outside the Area

the account does not say why the English were taken to the Edisto and St. Helena. They may well have been traded to them. It does imply, though, that the Stono were not at this time allied with the Kussoe, as they were later, or the Kussoe probably would have received some or all of the prisoners.

Sandford in 1666 says the Kiawah, Edisto, and Escamacu competed with one another "concerning us and our Friendshipp, Each contending to assure it to themselves and jealous of the other though all be allyed..." (emphasis added).<sup>100</sup> An Edisto Indian saw Sandford make the agreement with the Escamacu to leave Woodward in place of the Chief's nephew, and "seeing this kindnes & mutuall obligation between us & the people of this place that his Nacon or tribe might bee within the League voluntarily offered himselfe to stay with mee alsoe and would not bee denied...." Sandford's use of "allyed" must mean, then, that no tribe was in any way subject to another, even though each was ready to cooperate for mutual benefit. This seems to be confirmed by Mathews in 1671: "...I find noe tributaries [i. e., no tribe paying tribute], butt intermariages & poverty causeth them [the Coastal Tribes and several inland] to visit one Another; never quareling who is the better man...."<sup>101</sup>

By the time Europeans arrived, the Coastal Tribes seem to have settled into an acceptance of well established boundaries. There was plenty of land so territorial expansion was probably not a reason for war until Europeans began to displace tribes elsewhere, tribes such as the Westo and Savannah, or until warfare became an opportunity to capture slaves for sale.

Within the Lower Coastal, resources were so evenly distributed that one section offered little advantage over another. No tribe seems to have had particular advantages to arouse the jealousies of the others or to enable it to outstrip them in any way and to become relatively so much larger as to reduce the others to servitude. Overall, the fairly equal size and resources of nearly all tribes seems to have been the basis for a small-scale balance of power.

Outside the Area Some mention has been made of the relationship of the Indians at Port Royal with the Guale. In this section it and other relationships with tribes outside the Lower Coast will be discussed in detail.

In 1562 when the French at Charlesfort had given out of food and the Indians at Port Royal were no longer able to supply them, the Indians advised them to ask two kings to the south for food. The chief Maccou (Escamacu) provided a guide when the