

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Native American Landscapes of St. Catherine's Island, Georgia. 3 vols.
By David Hurst Thomas with contributions by twenty-five other authors.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1cn2c381>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 32(4)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Garrison, Ervan G.

Publication Date

2008-09-01

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

not fallen into such binary trappings when she distinguishes many groups on the left as organizing against something, and the Christian right as actually fighting for something: a world based on biblical principles (253). If we limit our idea of religion to that which is defined by theology, then we overlook the ways in which groups on the left are perhaps religious. We may also fail to perceive how some leftist groups are fighting for something and not just against something, if we focus on theological justifications to the exclusion of other possibilities.

Native Americans and the Christian Right is not a manual for how to negotiate an alliance between a Native group and evangelical conservatives. If one looks for such guidance or answers, then he or she is sure to be disappointed. People who are interested in understanding how rethinking the politics of alliances can further the goals of Native American studies programs and Native activists will find this book insightful. *Native Americans and the Christian Right* is also sure to stimulate further conversation on the benefits and dangers of building alliances with those whose political positions are different from our own.

Micheline Pesantubbee
University of Iowa

Native American Landscapes of St. Catherine's Island, Georgia. 3 vols. By David Hurst Thomas with contributions by twenty-five other authors. New York: American Museum of Natural History, 2008. 1,136 pages. \$100.00 paper.

This well-produced work presents a synthesis of more than twenty-five years of archaeological research on St. Catherine's Island, Georgia, led by David Hurst Thomas, who has organized and written the bulk of the text. Twenty-five other authors have contributed to the thirty-five chapters. Like all previous publications by the American Museum of Natural History, little fault can be found with the quality of *Native American Landscapes*. Although the individual volumes are all readable, if taken out of sequence and read alone, the reader will lose the context the author has provided by his choice of organization. For instance, reading part 2 is useful to researchers or students of southeastern prehistoric archaeology. Part 2 contains an excellent discussion to determine the appropriate "Reservoir Correction" for 239 radiocarbon dates for St. Catherine's. A beginning student would benefit from Thomas's clear exposition of the so-called Reservoir Effect encountered in marine radiocarbon dates, most notably those derived from the carbonate shells. Chapter 27, co-authored by Elizabeth Reitz and her former student Joel Dukes, has a comprehensive study of "change and stability in vertebrate use" from two important sites on the island: Meeting House Field and Fallen Tree. Reitz is a world-class zooarchaeologist whose participation in this publication gives it added scientific value. Chapter 15, wherein Thomas melds the North Georgia coastal ceramic sequence (presented in chapter 14) with radiocarbon chronologies, gives a

thorough up-to-date summary of ceramic periods from 3000 BC to AD 1700. Part 2 will serve as a valuable reference for future researchers.

For the student of southeastern prehistory, parts 1 and 3 will engage their interest much more than part 2. In my review, I took fourteen handwritten pages of notes on part 1 and thirteen pages for part 3. Part 2? Six pages. Why this disparity? In part 1, Thomas lays out the research questions and his chosen perspective on how to address them. In part 3, Thomas presents his (and others) findings in a well-reasoned synthesis that ranges from the geomorphology of St. Catherine's, during five thousand years, to the rise of social inequality in late prehistory. This book is an ambitious work by a first-rank archaeologist who is at his peak as a scholar.

Part 1 is, as Thomas states, "a context for inquiry." An inquiry that consolidates and synthesizes more than twenty-five years of archaeological study of an undeveloped barrier island, occupied for more than five thousand years, is an important one. During the past thirty years, Thomas has not been idle with regard to publishing his research on St. Catherine's. A brief glance at the bibliography shows his first publication (regarding St. Catherine's) for the American Museum of Natural History was in 1977. Over the years, he has regularly authored or co-authored seven monographs, and he promoted the publication, by the museum's press, of half that number of monographs by his collaborators, notably Clark S. Larsen and John E. Worth.

Thomas began his study of St. Catherine's Island in the 1970s by first conducting an innovative transect-based survey of the entire island. This survey, together with a shoreline survey by Chester Depratter, located more than two hundred archaeological sites on this sixteen-mile-long island. In part 2, the description and results of this transect survey take up 16 percent of the total page count. It is no surprise that Thomas's team began its work in such a manner. In 1986, he published *Figuring Anthropology*, a textbook on basic statistics for anthropology. His understanding of statistical methods is exceptional for a social scientist, and it should come as no surprise to see him implement a rigorous transect sampling strategy on St. Catherine's Island.

Beyond this initial decision to use sampling theory to guide his team's survey, Thomas has always attempted to ground his research in a methodology that is at base scientific. For this monograph he chose human behavioral ecology as the heuristic vehicle for evaluating the many data generated over the years on St. Catherine's. He has sought to use this methodological perspective to bring together the various archaeological phenomena on this unique island. By structuring his inquiry thus, he can, in his view, more adequately compare human adaptation and continuity across five thousand years.

Thomas and his co-authors give a thorough description of this "island in time" regarding the archaeology of the lost Mission Santa Catalina de Guale that was discovered by Thomas. Readers who are knowledgeable of the extensive research, led by Thomas and Larsen, on that mission may wonder why it is not more central to this monograph. This is not to say enough has been written about St. Catherine's most visible archaeological discovery. Thomas has chosen to focus on all the "other" archaeology that has been done before, during, and since the discovery of the mission. For instance, little in the way of

in-depth analyses has been written on the Guale pueblo, the Fallen Tree site. This monograph, which highlights Alan May's excavations (chapter 26) and Reitz's subsequent zooarchaeological studies (chapter 27), corrects that.

Thomas presents the historical context for his study, beginning with that early antiquarian so frequently seen on sites in the southeast, Clarence B. Moore. An archaeological site located in the American Southeast may gain more recognition if Moore didn't visit it. In 1897 Moore visited and dug at St. Catherine's at the King's New Ground Field. Moore's work is a footnote to the real archaeology that began in 1959 with Lewis H. Larson and, later, Joseph R. Caldwell. Larson's dissertation dwelt on much of what would later define a large part of what would become the "Guale Problem," which is so central to this monograph. Caldwell, then at the University of Georgia, was almost three decades past his monograph of the eponymous site of Irene, whose people are largely viewed as the cultural antecedent to the Guale. Thomas dedicates his monograph to Larson.

Probably more central than Caldwell, who died before Thomas began work at St. Catherine's, was Grant Jones, an ethnohistorian who took issue with Larson's archaeological characterization of Guale and pre-Guale (Irene). It was Jones who first named the Guale Problem. What is the Guale Problem such that it would prompt a researcher like Thomas to bring so much of his own research to bear on "solving" it? The Guale Problem is, simply stated: Were the Guale sedentary horticulturalists or were they heirs to thousands of years of a coastal foraging tradition with the attendant seasonal movements that such subsistence typically entails? Larson (1969) originally thought the Guale, and the antecedent Irene culture, were basically nonsedentary foragers who happened to farm. Later workers like M. R. Crook Jr. (1986) agreed. Jones (1978) did not agree and called the Jesuit records of a miserly Guale existence a cover for their own failure to missionize these people in the 1570s. Enter Thomas and, as a result, this monograph.

To assess the sedentism versus foraging question, Thomas must, in his view, address it with a thoroughgoing analysis of foraging by using "optimal foraging theory" and its rubric of terminology and models, such as diet breadth aka "prey choice," patch choice, and central place foraging analysis. This review cannot discuss the basis of these analytical approaches only to say that they dominate the monograph from an epistemological standpoint. In the end Thomas proposes to us that his approach can adjudicate the Guale Problem. To what end? His analyses support Jones in that the Guale were sedentary foragers who farmed. Certainly by the Mission Period, the Guale on St. Catherine's were completely given over to maize agriculture. In part 1, Thomas poses the question for Guale agriculture, but this is more of a "straw man" than a real stance on his part (210). By part 3, Thomas agrees that maize agriculture arrived in coastal Georgia by AD 1300, and that it was adopted by the Irene culture. So the real question is not "did they (the Guale) raise corn?" but rather "why did they raise corn?" Thomas believes that corn is the reason for the population increase, in pre-Mission times, along with social inequality, in Irene/Guale times. The evidence is sedentism and economic intensification. Perhaps these are not the complete reasons for the adoption

of maize agriculture in the prehistoric southeast, as suggested by other workers, like Baden and Beekman who promote “looking beyond historic yields and determinants of techniques, maize varieties, soil types, climate and socioeconomic contexts” (*American Antiquity*, 2001, 515).

There is much to consider in *Native American Landscapes of St. Catherine’s Island, Georgia*. It is not a perfect monograph, but it is an important one. New data are presented and the interpretative stance, taken by Thomas, is a refreshing change for archaeological studies of ancient American Indians.

Eruan G. Garrison

The University of Georgia, Athens

The Orayvi Split: A Hopi Transformation. 2 vols. By Peter M. Whiteley. New York: American Museum of Natural History, 2008. 1,137 pages. \$100.00 paper.

Why care about the Orayvi split of 1906—a tiny civil war in some small tribal town in northeastern Arizona? Peter Whiteley reminds us in his comprehensive two-book series that people love everything Hopi (and I am not just saying this because I am one). Hopis, he says, have long attracted external interest as they seem to provide the missing link to a mysterious past attested by the impressive prehistoric structures in North America at Chaco Canyon and Mesa Verde and that Hopis preserve more pre-European culture than perhaps any other Native North American society. At times, while reading through Whiteley’s review of the work of his predecessors and contemporaries (Fewkes, Stephen, Voth, Titiev, Levy, Bradfield, Clemmer, Rushforth, and Upman, to name only a few), I could not help but compare the small army of “ologists” that has peered into Hopi society during the last hundred years to the fictional Talamasca in Anne Rice’s witch and vampire novels—who, for the sake of knowledge, are busy researching and documenting everything supernatural over the ages, while supposedly not interfering. I mean no disrespect to Whiteley who has undertaken a monumental task in producing a comprehensive, up-to-date decoder ring on Hopi history, society, and culture. He clearly has done so with deep respect for the Hopi-insider perspective and with meticulous attention to the mountain range of data across disciplines. No other work compares here.

I understand why Hopis are so interesting to outsiders, but why the Orayvi split in particular? According to Whiteley, at the formal beginnings of engagement with the United States around 1900, Orayvi was the largest and oldest of the Hopi towns. It was remote, politically and economically autonomous, and a relatively pristine indigenous American society. He says that anthropologists in the late nineteenth century were attracted to the marked persistence of pre-European culture and matrilineal kinship as a topic of special academic interest. Whiteley claims that by the 1930s the split became the subject of formal anthropological inquiry as a window into social structures in crisis and because of its comparative import for societal transformation globally. Apparently those in the British structural-functionalist school speculated as