December 2019

An Entangled History: Native American and Euro-American National and Cultural Identities (1768-1833)

Paul Edward Jentz
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

AN ENTANGLED HISTORY:

NATIVE AMERICAN AND EURO-AMERICAN

NATIONAL AND CULTURAL IDENTITIES (1768-1833)

by

Paul Jentz

A Dissertation Submitted in

Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in History

at

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

December 2019

ABSTRACT

AN ENTANGLED HISTORY:
NATIVE AMERICAN AND EURO-AMERICAN
NATIONAL AND CULTURAL IDENTITIES (1768-1833)

by

Paul Jentz

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 2019
Under the Supervision of Professor Joe Austin

This study examines political and cultural interactions between Native Americans and Euro-Americans during the transition from imperial colonialism to settler colonialism. It employs the concept of entanglement to convey the inextricable linkages that arose between the two groups over time, linkages also marked by the dissimilar effects of contact between them. As such, this study adopts a world history lens, arguing that no culture has historically existed in isolation, so no culture can be effectively studied in isolation. Five case studies explore accelerated tensions between Indians and Whites that resulted through the shifts in negotiations of power between them as settler colonialism gained traction, and as it did so increasingly challenged the understandings that Native Americans held regarding the integrity of their land base. These case studies argue that one of the means by which some Native Americans attempted to retain their sovereignty was through the adaptation of Euro-American political and cultural ideas into their tribal identities. Consequently, there evolved national Native identities which served as an adjunct to tribal identities, yet the defense of Native sovereignty, the foundation of national identity, was increasingly challenged through settler colonialism, so this study explores how Native nations continued to assert their rights of sovereignty regardless of the provisional status granted them as “domestic dependent nations” by the government of the United States.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Entangled History: Entangled Lives

The word "entangled" first appeared in the English language in the mid-sixteenth century.[1] Indeed, the term's initial documentation is traceable to a description of Columbus's second voyage when, attempting to portray the dense vegetation encountered by Columbus and his crew as they made their way through the island of Cuba, in 1555, the English writer Richard Eden[2] turned the noun "tangle," a term designating seaweed, into a verb:

> When they hadde passed ouer the woode, they came into a greate playne full of grasse and herbes, in which appeared no token of any pathe way. Here attempting to goo throwgh the grasse and herbs, they were soo entangled and bewrapte therin, that they were scarsely able to passe a myle, the grasse beinge there little lower then owre rype corne.[3]

Later the term "entangled" appears in Eden's account of a violent encounter between the Indigenous inhabitants of the island and the Europeans. So the word not only describes the nature of the physical impediments Europeans encountered as they trekked inland, it also designates the difficulties Europeans faced as they tried to flee the island:

> A thousande of the Barbarians assayled theym unwares and unprepared. By reason wherof, they were put to flight, and dyvers of them flayne in the chase. Many that fledde towarde the shippes were entangled in the mudde and maryshes nere unto the shore. Twentie and two, were slayne with arrows, and the resydewe for the most parte, wounded.[4]

---

[1] *Oxford English Dictionary*, second edition, s.v. "entangle."
[2] Eden's book, *Decades of the Newe Worlde*, combined his translations of Peter Martyr's 1530 Latin work *De Orbe Novo* "On the New World" and Gonzalo Oviedo's 1535 Spanish work *La Historia General de las Indias*, with other contemporaneous works regarding the New World.
[3] Richard Eden, *Decades of the Newe Worlde*, in *The First Three English Books on America*, edited by Edward Arber (Westminster: Archibald Constable and Company, 1895), 77.
[4] Ibid., 187.

Though the term "entangled" and its contexts in these earliest records concern Caribbean encounters between Europeans and Indigenous Peoples, echoes of the word seem well suited for describing the historical relationships between Native Americans and Euro-Americans that will be undertaken in the following pages. For as this study sets out to investigate episodes of political and cultural interactions between both groups over the course of approximately two generations from the late eighteenth to the early nineteenth centuries, the explorations of these episodes relies on the verb "entangled" to drive them. Moreover, reflecting on the meaning of that word as defined by the Oxford English Dictionary, that is "to intertwist (threads, branches, or the like) complicatedly of confusedly together; to intertwist the threads or parts of (a thing) in this way,"[5] the term's core characteristics of complication and confusion in turn seem to define the historic asymmetries of power between Indians and Whites. The definition also speaks to the fact that both groups originated in two different worlds, so political and cultural confusions between them invariably informed their interactions over time. As their histories grew increasingly intertwisted, it becomes increasingly untenable to analyze either group in isolation from the other.

Additionally, the asymmetries of power that have marked the historical relationships between Native Americans and Euro-Americans, and the multiple threads that have formed new, complex, inextricable, and often intimate webs between them, together suggest the difficulties of separating various kinds of agency in an interdependent world. These are the features of an entangled history, and as such this study adopts a definition posited by Ralph Bauer and Marcy Norton: "Entangled histories attend to the multiplicity of sources, agencies, directions of

[5] *Oxford,* ibid.

influence, and modalities of intercultural connectedness. [They] attend to the permeability of borders; the negotiations of power [. . .]; the dynamism of intercultural processes; and the inextricability of material and symbolic factors."[6] Moreover, entanglement itself is not an outcome, it does not "dissolve into a final product," as Karen Graubart observes, and as she further notes it "suggests ongoing confrontations, shifts, and revisions: a state of mutual learning and pushback"[7] Another scholar, Eliga H. Gould, proposes "entangled history" as an alternative model for comparative histories that examine more than one national community.[8] Though the communities that he interrogates are the Spanish and British empires, his approach to them as both interconnected and *dissimilar* in power relationships finds its an analogous application in *An Entangled History*, which seeks to illustrate historical power imbalances between Euro-Americans and Native Americans.

A World History Lens

Comparative in nature, world history views any given culture as a combination of influences from any number of other cultures. Because no culture has historically existed in isolation, no culture can be effectively studied in isolation. So adopting a world history lens, *An Entangled History* explores aspects of Indigenous and Euro-American cultures in a mutually informing and always evolving context, and it borrows Patrick Manning's dictum that "the world historian's work is to portray the crossing of boundaries and the linking of systems in the human

[6] Ralph Bauer and Marcy Norton, "Introduction: Entangled Trajectories: Indigenous and European Histories, 1 -17 (*Colonial Latin American Review* 26, 2017), 3.
[7] Karen Graubart, "Shifting Landscapes: Heterogenous Conceptions of Land Use and Tenure in the Lima Valley (*Colonial Latin American Review* 26, 2017), 64.
[8] Eliga H. Gould, "Entangled Histories, Entangled Worlds: The English-Speaking Atlantic as a Spanish Periphery," 764 – 786 *American Historical Review* (June 2007), 768.

past."[9] So *An Entangled History* distinguishes itself from current discussions of both Native and non-Native national identities primarily because it views them as intersecting and cross-fertilizing, while national identity scholarship generally views them as separate entities. More troubling, such scholarship often gives Native Americans little to no coverage.

Recently, for example, Carrol Smith-Rosenberg's *This Violent Empire: The Birth of an American National Identity*[10] contains an illuminating section on the Tammany Society, but her scant material on Native Americans depends exclusively on a simplistic binarism with the Indian merely occupying the space of the Other. Jill Lapore's *These Truths: A History of the United States*[11] barely mentions Native Americans in her vast canvas of the nation's political and social history that claims to identify the central principles that unite the republic. David Waldstreicher's conceptualization of nationalism as performance makes his canonical *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes: The Making of American Nationalism, 1776-1820*[12] relevant to sections of *An Entangled History* that regard the stage as a vehicle for nationalism. His definition of nationalism as a political strategy "responding to the strategies of other groups" is also relevant to some of the issues that the book will cover.[13] However, Waldstreicher's comparative work relies principally on English and French nationalisms, a cross-Atlantic orientation that precludes the Native dimension central to *An Entangled History.*

---

[9] Patrick Manning, *Navigating World History: History Create a Global Past* (New York: Palgrave, 2003), 3.
[10] Carrol Smith-Rosenberg, *This Violent Empire: The Birth of an American National Identity* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010).
[11] Jill Lepore, *These Truths: A History of the United States* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2018).
[12] David Waldstreicher, *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes: The Making of American Nationalism, 1776-1820* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997).
[13] David Waldstreicher, *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes: The Making of American Nationalism, 1776-1820* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 6.

There are several other studies, none of which compares Native American and European notions of nationhood that will, nevertheless, provide valuable material for my comparative work. To mention only three works on Native American nationhoods that will find application in my study, first, James Taylor Carson's *Searching for the Bright Path: The Mississippi Choctaws From Prehistory to Removal*[14] explores the conflicting strategies in Choctaw politics concerning the best way forward as a nation confronting settler colonialism. Of course, such debates occurred universally among Native nations, so the situation of the Choctaw will be part of the book's wider discussion on the impact of colonialism. Second, Stephen C. Hahn's *The Invention of the Creek Nation, 1670-1763*[15] will serve as one of the vantage points from which to explore Creek entanglements with Spanish, French, and English imperial designs. As my study will argue, their conflicts with foreign powers helped to forge their own identity as a nation. And third, David Andrew Nichols' *Red Gentlemen and White Savages* provides insight into the post-revolution geopolitical landscape, especially by arguing that several leaders of the Chicasaw, Iroquois, and Cherokee nations promoted the establishment of the federal government because they feared the motives of state governments. Moreover, it appeared that an alliance with a single government would prove more stable than alliances that entailed the navigation of multiple jurisdictions.[16]

The following chapters establish several categories of entanglement. However, entanglement by nature resists clear borderlines, such categories are to be understood as porous and mutually informing, as "tendencies." Together such tendencies will at least provide an

---

[14] James Taylor Carson *Searching for the Bright Path: The Mississippi Choctaws From Prehistory to Removal* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2003).
[15] Stephen C. Hahn, *The Invention of the Creek Nation, 1670-1763* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004).
[16] David Andrew Nichols, *Red Gentlemen and White Savages* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008).

organizing principle. Thus, among other matters, they will help to tease out the political, cultural, and diplomatic entanglements in marriages between European colonials or Euro-Americans and Native Americans. Offspring of such unions had roots in both Native and non-Native worlds. These children embodied a multi-level entanglement that led to degrees of bilingualism and included differing religious beliefs and divergent cultural practices. What could be termed entanglement by blood grew only more complex with each succeeding generation, as offspring of initial cross-cultural marriages themselves perhaps married across cultural lines. At times perhaps complementing entanglement by blood, political entanglement tended to involve local, national, and international issues. Two types of entanglement between nations possess an ironic inter-relatedness. First, Native nations arose as entangled constructions because they contained components of both republicanism and indigenous governing systems. This situation constitutes an entanglement by political appropriation. Second, White appropriation of Indian history and culture through various media — through novels and theatre, for example— constitutes an entanglement by cultural appropriation. The later darkly mirrors the entanglement by political appropriation noted above.

Over the years Native and non-Native peoples would navigate intertwining political and personal worlds in increasing proximities to each other. The characteristics of these worlds changed significantly in the transition from the imperial colonialism typical of the French to the settler colonialism of the Euro-Americans. Broadly, French imperial colonialism focused on the establishment of trade with Indigenous peoples and was not primarily focused on attaining the land itself. Euro-American settler colonialism aimed at the appropriation of Native land, hence it worked in tandem with federal Indian removal policies to expand White settlement.

Initially, French maps, for example, never matched the reality of Native dominance on the ground. However much the empire's maps boasted the broad geographic swath termed New France, Indians had lived on the continent for millennia. Without Native guides, the French may never have made even their relatively meager inroads. Until the ascendance of the United States and the machinery of its settler colonialism, Native Americans retained the upper hand on much of the continent during the centuries of the European imperial colonial era. As White Americans attempted to disentangle themselves from Native Americans through Indian removal policies, such attempts often resulted in ironic outcomes: White Americans appropriated aspects of Native American cultures and rewrote them to serve their own cultural identities.

What is a Nation?

As noted above, some Indigenous peoples adopted aspects of republicanism into existing tribal governments. This phenomenon originated approximately in tandem with the experiment in republican government that the United States undertook following its political separation from England. Again, the premise of this book being that Native Americans and Euro-Americans are historically interwoven, one of the stories within this weave concerns nationhood, or perhaps more properly speaking, nationhood*s*.

The Revolutionary War led not only to the evolution of a national identity for the United States. Native Americans too, particularly those who fought in the war for either rebel or British forces, also entered a new era of evolving identities as nations, at times invoking the same founding documents sacred to Euro-American identity while simultaneously maintaining the kinship-based identities that had historically defined them as individuated groups.

Though keen differences certainly existed, each national identity held firm beliefs in the rights of sovereignty. But to assert -- and defend -- these rights required the exercise of power. Native power and Euro-American power took different forms. Chief Justice John Marshall exercised his judicial power and famously blurred the issue of Native sovereignty by ruling in *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* (1831) that the Cherokee (and therefore all other Indian peoples) do not belong to a separate sovereign nation, but to a "domestic dependent nation." Marshall's ward/guardian trope denied sovereignty to Indian nations, subjecting the very notion of a Native national identity to a provisional status. This book examines the strategies that Native nations undertook to assert their sovereignty -- to declare their own power -- and how many shaped hybrid political structures that combined Indigenous economic, political, cultural, and social modes with those of Euro-America. Moreover, in each instance these hybrids were analogous to the construction of the United States as a nation, itself a product of European political ideas as applied to American historical conditions, conditions that include wide-ranging historical relationships with Native American nations. By their nature, all nations entangle one another.

An Entangled History builds on Thomas Bender's argument that a "nation cannot be its own historical context,"[17] and on Pauline Turner Strong's and Barrick van Winkle's argument that "Just as the existence of Indian nations within the boundaries of the United States constitutes a challenge to American nationalism, so too the complex imaginings of national identity found among Native Americans call into question some of the basic presuppositions of modern nationalism."[18]

---

[17] Thomas Bender, *A Nation Among Nations: America's Place in World History* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2006), 4.

[18] Pauline Turner Strong and Barrick Van Winkle, "Tribe and Nation: American Indians and American Nationalism," *Social Analysis: The International Journal of Social and Cultural Practice*, 33 (September, 1993): 9-26, at 20.

Indeed, questions of what defines a nation and what determines a sense of nationalism have fueled a wide range of scholarship. Moreover, changes in meaning that the word "nation" itself has undergone over the centuries speaks to that concept's inherently fluid nature. As words tend to do, its redefinitions grew from cultural needs to express new ideas as they arose. Only relatively recently has the word come to entail concepts of citizenship and sovereignty. How and why the European concept of nation -- along with its components of citizenship and sovereignty -- manifested itself in Native American societies that combined it with their own political principles tells us the definition of nation continues to evolve.

"Nation" originates in the Latin *natio* (birth; species/race/stock). In ancient Rome *natio* usually referred to a putatively identifiable foreign group, such as "Germans" (who were anything but united in culture, language, or political organization). In the thirteenth century, "nation" referred to the region of one's language or approximate land of origin. At the University of Paris, for example, students were roughly divided among four linguistic or regional "nations" -- France, Normandy, Picardy (the Low Countries), and England. Later, during the Hundred Years' War, Germany replaced England. Delegates to the Roman Church's Council of Constance (1414-18) voted by nation – England, France, Italy, and Germany (Poles, Scandinavians, and Hungarians were lumped into the German "nation") – with each nation having one vote. In early sixteenth-century England, the word came to designate the people of a country as members of a unique national identity, a nationality. By the time of the American and French Revolutions, "nation" took on the primarily political meaning recognized today as a

collectively sovereign body of citizens. However, nations are not static; they are long-term processes of ongoing redefinition.[19]

The term "nationalism," however, entails certain usage problems for the following pages. After all, it was first coined in 1844,[20] and this, strictly speaking, makes it an anachronism to the time frame of the present study's end date of 1833. But severe adherence to this eleven-year gap would appear to cause more harm than good. So the construction, "what would in 1844 be identified as 'nationalism,'" will be henceforth implied. Moreover, the discussion of nations could not effectively proceed without the concept of nationalism lingering close by. Multiple theories of nations and nationalism complicate issues regarding the cultural and historical preconditions for nationhood, the determining factors of nationhood itself, and the relationship between nations and nationalism. Below, in broad outline, are some of the more influential concepts of nationhood that have attempted to answer the question, what is a nation?

Anthony D. Smith argues that nations originate along ethnic lines, with "myths of origin and descent" providing the community with an explanation of origin, growth and destiny:

> A myth of descent attempts to provide an answer to questions of similarity and belonging: why are we all alike? Why are we one community? Because we come from the same place, at a definite period in time and are descended from the self-same ancestor, we necessarily belong together. The "explanation" brings together the Greek term *ethnos*, the idea of living together and being alike in culture, but adds the secondary meaning of the term, namely, a sense of tribal belonging through common family ties.[21]

---

[19] Guido Zernato and Alfonso G. Mistretta "Nation: The History of a Word," *The Review of Politics* 6 (July, 1944): 351-66, at 351-52. E.J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 14-16. Anthony D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (Malden, Mass., Blackwell, 2002), 212. Kevin Blackburn, "Mapping Aboriginal Nations: The 'Nation' Concept of Late Nineteenth Century Anthropologists in Australia," *Aboriginal History* 26 (2002); 131-158; at 131-132.

[20] Gale Stokes, "How is Nationalism Related to Capitalism?" 591-98. *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* 28 (July 1986), 591.

[21] Smith, *Ethnic Origin*, 24.

Smith further argues that nationalist aspirations have transformed and complicated such ethnic origins: the nationalist conceives of the world as one filled with nations, each unique, and with all political power centered in each nation alone, which also experiences tensions because the nationalist drive leaves people with allegiances divided between nation "and a lingering but explosive solidarity to their own ethnic origins.[22]

Regarding the issue of divided allegiances within Native nations as hybrid constructions containing aspects of the American nation, Vine Deloria Jr. and Clifford M. Lytle raise concerns not unlike those of Smith. For example, they argue that in Native American societies "the simple fact of being born establishes both citizenship and, as the individual grows, a homogeneity of purpose and outlook. Customs, rituals, and traditions are a natural part of life." One the other hand, the homogeneity of diverse peoples through American citizenship tends to rely on the formalized understanding of written documentation regarding the rules, regulations, and principles of good government.[23] How then, what Smith identifies as "a sense of tribal belonging through common family ties" and the political realities of what historically develops as Native nations existing simultaneously "inside" the nation of the United States goes to the heart of the entanglement of cultural and political identities of Native Americans and Euro-Americans.

On the other hand, Ernest Gellner posits that a nation is an artifact of modernity. Shared convictions and loyalties of those who occupy a certain territory or speak the same language become a nation if and when members mutually recognize certain rights and duties. Thus a

[22] Ibid., 130.
[23] Vine Deloria Jr. and Clifford M. Lyte, *The Nations Within: the Past and Future of American Indian Sovereignty* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998), 18.

nation arises through self-determination, not as some naturally occurring cultural condition. Moreover, he argues that "nations maketh man," and herein originates the machinery that drives nationalism. Coincident with the industrial revolution, nationalism gained traction as economic foundations transitioned from relatively localized agrarian forces to an increasingly global market-driven condition.[24] Gellner further argues that nationalism is a product of false consciousness forged by a society's elites. Through its control of education systems and publishing industries, elites claim to defend an old folk society, "while in fact helping to build up an anonymous mass society."[25] In short, only with the rise of industrial society did the tools of reason and science provide the intellectual means for constructing nations. This top down bequeathal of nationhood depends on literacy and the standardization of society based on mass education. Uniformity as Gellner's common denominator for nationhood, would appear to leave little room for the concepts of Native nationhoods as hybrid constructions within the national boundaries of the United States. But at the same time his arguments underscore the challenges faced by Indigenous Peoples as their own national identities evolved during the period covered in the present study.

Thongchai Winichakul's theory of nationhood stands somewhere between Ernest Gellner's argument against nations as naturally occurring cultural phenomena and Benedict Anderson's concept of a nation as an "imagined political community," to be discussed below. Thongchai argues that modern geography and its political maps overlaps the territorial concepts of indigenous geography, with modern geography usurping "properties of indigenous knowledge." A nation as a bounded territorial entity, as one defined by a modern political map, is what he terms a geo-body. The geo-body differs from the geographical understanding of

[24] Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006), 7.
[25] Ibid., 119.

indigenous peoples who formerly occupied – and still occupy -- the territory of a mapped nation. Moreover, the national map as a political statement creates of its own meaning and generates its own history. This sets the stage for nationalism which renders the increasingly marginalized indigenous populations in the mapped region as the historical property of the nation-state, and consequently they become increasingly controlled by it.[26]

Mark Warhus's examination of Native American maps follows a contour similar to Thongchai's argument regarding the usurpation of indigenous knowledge by the nation builders of Siam. For as Warhus argues, the cartographic and physical transformation of the North American continent relied on "the geographic information they received from Native Americans. This information was often appropriated and then translated into western maps where it was used to fill in the details of a land now claimed in the name of western empires and nation states."[27]

Aligning himself with Gellner, E.J. Hobsbawm argues that any criteria for defining a nation based on "language, ethnicity or whatever [are] fuzzy, shifting and ambiguous" and are useful only to the propagandist. He sees the concept of nation neither as primary nor as unchanging. It belongs to a historically recent period, and it is a social entity "only insofar as it relates to a certain kind of modern territorial state." He considers nationalism, however unevenly understood within a society, as the maker of nations. As a Marxist, Hobsbawm regards nations and nationalism as products of social and economic development. He warns against reliance on nationalist ideologies constructed by elitist spokespeople. Their class interests preclude their

---

[26] Thongchai Winichakul, *Siam Mapped: A History of the Geo-body of a Nation* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1997), 60.
[27] Mark Warhus, *Another America: Native American Maps and the History of Our Land* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), 138.

ability to discover the interests of the "ordinary" people.[28] Hobsbawm's narrow view of language and ethnicity as mere tools for the propagandist -- however valid this view is considering the racist programs historically fostered under the banners -- not only differs from Vine Deloria Jr. and Clifford M. Lytle, it may also may appear to problematize any room in his Marxism for concepts of Indigenous nations.

However, the so-called "politics of recognition," which concerns the demands for recognition by oppressed groups, have been fueled by Marxism, especially as argued by Charles Taylor who sees the community as the means by which individuals orient their sense of identity and self worth. Conversely, if the group is demeaned, its members suffer the consequence. Taylor argues that the demand for recognition is one of the driving forces behind Indigenous national movements in politics, and "the struggle for recognition can find only one satisfactory solution, and that is a regime of reciprocal recognition among equals."[29]

But another scholar with Marxist underpinnings, Glen Sean Coulthard, regards recognition on Taylor's terms as a flawed effort. It leaves Indigenous Peoples unable to grapple with the consequences of colonialism, because "recognition among equals" attempts reconciliation with the irreconcilable violence historically committed by the state. Rather, he argues for Indigenous self-recognition and deploys a modified understanding of Marxism in what he calls a "place-based foundation of Indigenous decolonial thought."[30]

As Benedict Anderson notes, Marxism has cast a long shadow over definitions of nation and nationalism. The same can be said for his own influential theory of "imagined communities."

---

[28] E.J. Hobsbawm*, Nations and Nationalism Since 1780* (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2012), 9-11.
[29] Ibid.,50.
[30] Glean Sean Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2014), 54.

He defines a nation as "an imagined political community," and it "is imagined as *limited* because even the largest of them [. . .] has finite, if elastic boundaries, beyond which lie other nations." Furthermore, he argues that the concept of nation "was born in an age in which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying the legitimacy of the divinely-ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm."[31] He argues that the late Middle Ages saw a decline in the cohesive forces of religion and dynastic rule, and the narrow literacy controlled by a theologically oriented intelligentsia loosened because explorations of non-European worlds widened cultural horizons. Reports from afar found increasingly wide European audiences. As publication of such reports continued to expand, printing itself became an increasingly powerful and influential industry. So the "great religiously imagined communities" deteriorated in the face of an expanding world of print culture. Anderson's neo-Marxism leads him to conclude that the origin of national consciousness resides in the book, "the first modern style mass-produced industrial commodity." In other words, the proliferation of print -- especially novels and newspapers -- widened literacy led to a new type of imagined community, one secularized and further consolidated through at least rudimentary state sponsored education.[32]

But how other types of "imagined communities" might arise, especially considering the potency of the trope itself, might remain an open question. After all, the concept of nationhood travelled far from its European origins, and it eventually led a more complicated life across the Atlantic where Native nations arose within the nation of the United States. This situation has meant that ideas of nationhood multiplied, especially as Native Americans asserted their own identities specific to their own histories as foundations for their concepts of nationhood.

[31] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (New York: Verso, 1993), 6-7.
[32] Ibid., 12 – 38.

Regarding the foregoing theories, relative consensus among scholars is matched only by wide latitudes of convergence among them as to what exactly constitutes a nation. Indeed, invoking Anderson once more, "Nation, nationality, nationalism -- all have proved notoriously difficult to define."[33] At the very least then, assumptions as to what constitutes a nation remain problematic. The politically flexible nature of nationhood and issues of self and group identity entailed by it perhaps makes this so. On the other hand, as abstract as are any concepts of identity, arguably the material root of a national identity is land. Therein lies the core historical conflict between Native Americans and Euro-Americans. For this reason, issues regarding land and the control of its resources and borders are threaded throughout *An Entangled History.*

Intersections Between Nationhood and Kinship

Europeans brought the word *nation* to North America, but it would be centuries before it signified any level of self-identity for Native Americans. Even when the word began to show up in treaty negotiations, the foundation of Native self-identity rested on kinship, and when ideas of Native nationhood took root, identities attached to it generally remained secondary to identities derived through kinship. In brief, Native American history cannot be understood without studying the role of kinship networks.[34]

Many colonials could not hope to flourish in the New World unless they too understood the importance of these networks. For example, in North America's interior, where the population of Europeans remained for several centuries proportionally insignificant to the Native

[33] Ibid., 3.
[34]Heidi Bohaker, "Nindoodemag": The Significance of Algonquian Kinship Networks in the Eastern Great Lakes Lakes Region, 1600-1701," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 63, no. 1, 25.

population, French fur traders found that their livelihoods depended on their acceptance into Native communities by establishing kinship ties, often through marriage with Indian women.[35]

With each passing generation, family bonds created by intermarriage between the French and Native peoples grew increasingly complex. Indeed, The Métis, a First Nations people, trace part of their ancestry to these intermarriages. Michif, the Métis language, belongs to both the Algonquian and Indo-European language families, as it combines Cree, French, Ojibwe, and English, linguistically testifying to a history of cultural cross-fertilization reaching back to the early years of contact between Europeans and Indians.[36]

Scholars divide types of kinship into two groups. Blood kinship refers to ties created by marriage and descent. Fictive kinship encompasses ties established by alliances between individuals or groups. Gift exchange cements the bonds of kinship. To maintain these bonds, mutual gifting on a regular basis demonstrates the willingness of the parties involved to continue good relationships. Gift exchange occurs within the context of diplomacy. Diplomacy keeps lines of communication open. The gift itself symbolizes the renewed bonds of alliance, of kinship. Failure to reciprocate a gift sends a message of dissatisfaction with the relationship. Former bonds can then grow frayed; those who at one time united in kinship can become enemies.[37]

Thus good diplomatic relations depended on the health of Indigenous kinship networks. The complex and fluid political and social structures of these networks either established or continued to affirm formal alliances between individuals and groups. The degrees to which

---

[35] Susan Sleeper-Smith, *Indian Women and French Men: Rethinking Cultural Encounter in the Western Great Lakes* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001), 4.
[36] Peter Baker*, A Language of Our Own: The Genesis of Michif, the Mixed Cree-French Language of the Canadian Metis* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 3, 82 and 116.
[37] Bruce M. White, "'Give us a Little Milk': The Social and Cultural Meanings of Gift-Giving in the Lakes Superior Fur Trade," in *Rethinking the Fur Trade: Cultures of Exchange in an Atlantic World*, ed. Susan Sleeper Smith (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009), 114-117.

French and English commercial and diplomatic efforts succeeded depended largely on the depth of the alliances that they formed with Native Peoples. But as U.S. Indian policy developed, its need to rely on Euro-American/Indian kinship networks grew more apparent than real.

Ethnohistorian Sebastian Felix Braun conceives of kinship as a tool for understanding "the position of individuals within local and regional communities, and ultimately universal communities they build through kinship relations."[38] Accordingly, the understanding of kinship can and perhaps should be widely cast enough to better appreciate the degrees of its social, cultural, and political entanglements. And however much kinship stands at the core of Native American societies, Europeans and Euro-Americans have historically also been part of those networks to one degree or another.

For example, in 1774 Virginian Jacob Hite attempted to acquire 150,000 acres of Cherokee land, and his tactic for doing so relied on the Cherokee kinship connections available through George Pearis, the Métis son of his business partner. George Pearis's mother was a Cherokee, so Cherokee headmen saw him as a useful diplomatic bridge to the British and they were willing to promote his interests, thus they agreed to give him the 150,000 acres that he had requested. However, George Pearis then turned around and sold the land to both his father, Richard Pearis and to Jacob Hite. Fearing the sale could anger the Cherokee, a South Carolina court voided the deal in order to avoid the formation of an ant-British confederacy. The salient point here, however, is that the initial grant of the land made to George Pearis by the Cherokee would not have been possible without his Cherokee kinship ties.[39]

---

[38] Sebastian Felix Braun, "Against Procedural Landscapes: Community, Kinship, and History," *Transforming Ethnohistories: Narrative, Meaning, and Community* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2013), 204.

[39] Woody Holton, *Forced Founders: Indians, Debtors, Slaves, and the Making of the Americn Revolution in Virginia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), xv.

Kinship ties were essential for conducting diplomatic relations between the British and the Indians. As Woody Holton notes: "Substantial intermarriage produced children with one foot in each world." For example, Alexander McKee, apparently the son of a British trader and a Shawnee matron, was the British government's principal informant on the Upper Ohio Indians.[40] Another episode regarding the confluence between diplomacy and kinship concerns a wampum belt presented to Wabash chiefs by a Shawnee headman. Indeed, the presentation illustrates that the wives of the chiefs played significant roles in diplomatic relations, as the headman proclaimed: "all of the Wives of as many Tribes as there is Marks upon the Belt received the Wabash women's peace initiative with pleasure."[41]

Diplomacy and kinship could also contain a racial component. During a Spring 1769 attempt by the Shawnee to convince the Cherokee to join an anti-British coalition, a Shawnee diplomat urged Indians to unite with those "of the same Colour." As Holton argues, this signified a transformation from tribal to racial self-identity as a foundation for political unity.[42] This sense of political unity spanned intertribal and inter-nation kinship identity and expanded fictive kin ties for the groups involved.

Diplomatic encounters constitute the meeting of national identities. Thus diplomacy between Native peoples and Europeans, and later Euro-Americans, figures significantly in the following pages. Diplomacy entangles nations. Successful diplomacy requires compromise, or reciprocation, which is manifested in many forms. Reciprocal agreements that made, for example, the Iroquois confederation possible, as will be explored in chapter 1, have been common historically between Native nations. And in their diplomatic relations with Native

[40] Ibid., 24.
[41] Ibid., 15.
[42] Ibid., 20.

Peoples, European colonials generally attempted to adhere to principles of reciprocation. But one means by which the United States has expressed its national identity has been through Indian policy. As chapter 2 illustrates, the ability to impose policy meant the ability to wield power. In turn, the power it wielded manifested itself as the colonialism of Native Peoples.

Moreover, policy is contained within the rubric of diplomacy. Policy designates the decisions reached by governing bodies regarding political, economic, and/or social courses of action intended either within or between any number of mutually recognized polities. Though Indian policy histories tend to concern any one or any combination of imperial, colonial, and federal policies, the above definition also applies to the policy-making institutions, and to the policies developed by them, of Native Americans.

For example, Anishinaabeg policy decisions arose through council deliberations in which representative bodies of all community members partook. Individuals, both men and women, could add their own voice if they so desired. The time devoted to arrive at a decision had little bearing on the process. Consensus opinion stood always as the goal of the proceedings, and this goal could not be rushed. Councils undertook issues concerning all aspects of village affairs, including matters of national and international importance.[43]

Many of the first representatives of Young America were missionaries who ventured into the western Great Lakes region with growing frequency at the dawn of the nineteenth century. Although these missionaries primarily focused on spreading the gospel, they also embodied the American political and cultural values of their time. Thus, by degrees, through the schools missionaries established and the textbooks they used, and through their roles as liaisons between American and Native nations in commercial affairs and during treaty negotiations, the realms of

[43] Cary Miller, *Ogimaag: Anishinaabeg Leadership, 1760 – 1845* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2010), 105-06.

their sacred and the secular responsibilities tended to blur into each another. How early nineteenth century Anishinaabeg dealt with the influx of American missionaries, most of whom were Protestant, relied in part on a history of interaction with Catholic French missionaries who had come and gone throughout the previous centuries. The Jesuit program included a long-range gallicization of the Indians; similarly, American missionaries arrived with a political agenda in tow. They worked to not only convert Indians to Christianity but to transform them economically and culturally, that is, to Americanize them.[44]

Though any given policy frames a nexus of political, social, and economic objectives intended by the signatories, degrees to which parties honor policy implementation provide fuel for historical arguments regarding challenges inherent to cross-cultural communication, larger geopolitical agendas of the parties involved, and the extent to which any policy could adequately address the needs of individuals or sets of groups within the wider populations of the region and its associated polities. Diplomatic relationships and their concordant policies that arose between the federal government and Native Peoples throughout the cis-Mississippi region examined in this study provide lenses through which to compare different cultural values and perspectives at work. Simultaneously, the interrogation of these relationships will shed light on the formation of Indigenous nations as deliberately crafted hybrid constructions.

Entangled Lives

The five case studies in the following pages concern Native nations east of the Mississippi River and their political and cultural interactions with European colonial and Euro-American powers. Two inter-related considerations have determined my study's geographical

[44] Keith R. Widder, *Battle for the Soul: Métis Children Encounter Evangelical Protestants at Mackinaw Mission, 1823 – 1837* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1999), 64-69.

and temporal parameters. Since my primary intention is to explore some of the ideological influences of the Revolutionary War on the genesis of Native national identities, the years directly preceding the American Revolution to the years directly following the 1830 Indian Removal Act appear most immediately consequential. Moreover, those Native nations that to one degree or another played roles in the revolution itself originated in cis-Mississippi regions. The time frame -- 1768 to 1833 -- allows for the examination of some key moments within the arc of the revolutionary period as contextualized first through the examination of some immediately historical preconditions regarding British/Native relations, and then finally to the consequences that the growing assertions of American national identity had for Native nations, namely their increasingly aggressive acts of Indian removal.

Chapter 1, "International Diplomacy and National Identities: The 1768 Treaty of Fort Stanwix," first examines the pre-European contact kinship and diplomatic systems of Eastern Woodlands Indians as it worked interconnectedly with intertribal trading networks. It then addresses the relationship between kinship, diplomacy, and trade between English colonial and Native polities. Exploration of the Fort Stanwix Treaty of 1768 will provide the means for understanding the development, maintenance, and renewal of kinship-based alliances. Furthermore, the chapter will explore the Covenant Chain, the alliance between the English and the Iroquois, especially as Iroquois diplomats consistently reminded English diplomats that both parties were bound by the Covenant Chain to negotiate the treaty in good faith. Also compared in detail throughout the chapter will be the historical significance of the strings and belts of Iroquois wampum and the legal world that the English documented in writing. The treaty brought Native nations and the English nation onto the single space of the treaty grounds, thus

the chapter will explore differing diplomatic protocols as they reveal aspects of national identities.

Chapter 2, "Shifting Entanglements: Kinship, Native Polities, and Colonialism in the Great Lakes Region," examines the transition from an era of imperial colonialism practiced by France and England to the settler colonialism of the United States in the Old Northwest. It will argue that settler colonialism undermined the value of kinship networks as structures for diplomatic relations between Indians and Euro-Americans. The chapter will explore the imperial colonialism of France and England, particularly as it was focused on the extraction of fur resources and on the need to maintain working relationships based on kinship with the Indians who supplied the fur. The chapter will compare this to settler colonialism, in which the land itself constituted the resource, so access to it required the displacement of its indigenous inhabitants. Chapter 2 will also examine the significance of Northwest Ordinance of 1787 as a model for state building not only in the Old Northwest but in the trans-Mississippi west as well.

Chapter 3, "A Crossroads of National Identities: Lafayette's 1824-1825 Visit to the United States," pivots its examination of national identities on Lafayette's visit. The reasons for this narrative design are multifold. Lafayette, known as the citizen of two nations because of his service in the Revolutionary War, serves as a narrative vehicle for examining relationships between European and Euro-American concepts of nation. Furthermore, his extensive interaction with Indians during the Revolutionary War and his reacquaintances with them during his tour of the then-existing 24 states opens the chapter to the analysis of Native nationhoods, which is explored through the stories of several significant Indian leaders. One of the central stories here is that of Joseph Brant, who was internationally recognized as the single most influential Mohawk leader of his time. Another Mohawk leader, Karonghyontye (known also as Captain

David Hill), figures prominently. Karonghyontye sided with the British, and following the revolution, spoke passionately for Mohawk independence. Other figures that will be studied include Seneca leaders Cornplanter and Red Jacket, Choctaw leaders Pushmata and Mushalatubbee, and the Creek leader, Chilly McIntosh. The stories of these individuals help to illustrate the tensions inherent to Native struggles for independence, especially as they faced increasing pressures from the Indian removal policy of the United States.

Chapter, 4, "Cultural Appropriations: American National Identity and the Genre of the Indian Play in the Early Antebellum Era," examines the appropriation of Native American cultural and historical experiences by Euro-American nationalist interests. But furthering the trope central to other chapters in my study, this chapter examines the entangled nature of American national identity and builds on Timothy J. Reiss's argument that, "Cultural categories must float. 'Borders' are more than just porous. Cultures are mutually defining. The fault of European culture was to believe that they are not, that the burden of definition lay wholly on it. [. . .] The challenge [. . .] is to avoid the trap of that belief. Simplified binarisms will not do it."[45] So while the appropriation of certain aspects of Native American culture can be reads as a type of theft, at the same time it points to the entangled nature of American national identity. And at the intersection of Native American cultural appropriation and American nationalism stands the Indian play, a genre popular throughout the Antebellum Era. This chapter focuses on the examination of several significant plays in order to interrogate their relationships between cultural appropriation and burgeoning nineteenth-century American nationalism, particularly through their adoption of the stereotype of the Noble Savage as a symbol of American liberty.

[45] Timothy J. Reiss, "Mapping Identities: Literature, Nationalism, Colonialism," 649-77), *American Literary History* 4 (Winter, 1992), 651.

Chapter 5, "A Quest for Political and Religious Sovereignty: The Mashpee Revolt of 1833," will examine the conditions that led up the successful effort by the Mashpee to establish tribal sovereignty. It will also explore the equally complex Mashpee campaign to expel Congregationalist minster Phineas Fish in preference to the Mashpee Baptist preacher "Blind Joe" Amos. Central to the chapter will be the examination of the role played by Pequot minister William Apess. Furthermore, the chapter will advance an issue significant to the overall direction of *An Entangled History* by examining the manners in which the Mashpee argued that the same rights of sovereignty claimed by the founders of the United States applied equally to them. Also, as will be seen in the chapter, by comparing themselves to the American revolutionaries who threw off the yoke of British tyranny, the Mashpee leveraged an argument that gained steady traction in the courts and in the press.

An Entangled History interrogates the intersections of Native American and Euro-American national and cultural identities and builds on Philip J. Deloria's argument that, "the almost unavoidable categories 'European-Indian' have always had a perverse way of mapping seemingly coherent political identities onto complex and contradictory social relations and cultural productions."[46] It further attempts to dismantle simplistic notions of victim/victimizer binarism, for this approach too easily mistakes a political agenda for historical analysis and proves particularly invalid as a means for approaching concepts of nationhood. Indeed as Cheryl Walker argues:

> The general assumption in the critical literature has been that Native Americans were the victims of nationalist discourse pure and simple, that they resisted attempts to impose an idea of nation that derived from European models on their Native and essentially tribal

[46] Philip J. Deloria, "Afterword," in *Native Acts: Indian Performance, 1603-1832*, ed. Joshua Bellin and Laura L Mielke (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2011), 315.

> structures of governance and knowledge, because such ideas obviously threatened many aspects of their cultures. But the truth is more complicated than this view allows for, because by the end of the first third of the nineteenth century, there were several understandings of nation at play among both Euro-Americans and Native Americans."[47]

Degrees of political and cultural entanglement varied widely among Native and non-Native peoples during the period examined in the following five chapters. Moreover, *An Entangled History* seeks to ground the abstractions of political and cultural entanglements through biographically intended snapshots -- of case studies as historical moments taken in a deep focus that reveals the interplay of larger historical forces and individual human beings that both produce and are swept up by them. Hence to a wide degree biography is the means through which the book explores the issue of national identity for Native Americans and for Euro-Americans. *An Entangled History* is first and foremost the story of entangled lives.

[47] Cheryl Walker, *Indian Nation: Native American Literature and Nineteenth-Century Nationalism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997), 3-4.

Chapter 1

International Diplomacy and National Identities:

The 1768 Treaty of Fort Stanwix

In the autumn of 1768, over 3,000 Indians from 16 tribes[1] participated in treaty negotiations at Fort Stanwix, a crumbling and soon-to-be abandoned post near present day Rome, New York. Many of these participants reached the fort by crossing a nearby three mile carrying place between Wood Creek and the Mohawk River called the Oneida Carry by European traders, but known as *Deowainsta* to the Iroquois.[2] Deowainsta stood at the heart of Haudenosaunee territory. Also, it linked the Great Lakes and the Mohawk River Valley, effectively connecting North American interior waterways with the Atlantic. Across it had travelled representatives from the six nations of the Confederacy as well as Chugnut, Conoy, Delaware, Minisink, Nanticoke, Shawnee, and Tutelo embassies.[3] Most negotiations involved only the six Iroquois nations that managed to broker a deal with Sir William Johnson and William Croghan in which they sold a vast stretch of Ohio Valley land to the English. However, the land did not belong to them: the Delaware, Shawnee, and Mingo claimed it, but were not extended the courtesy of consultation during the proceedings.

This geopolitical entanglement of Native nations was further complicated by English imperial designs and by the ambitions of colonial land speculators and traders. Indeed, the drama at Fort Stanwix played out in the theater of international politics. Moreover, negotiations on the

[1] William Johnson, *The Papers of Sir William Johnson* Volume 12, edited by William H. Hamilton (Albany: University of the State of New York, 1957), 628 – 629.
[2] William J. Campbell, "Converging Interests: Johnson, Croghan, the Six Nations, and the 1768 Treaty of Fort Stanwix," *New York History* 89 no. 2 (Spring 2008): 127.
[3] Johnson, *The Papers of Sir William Johnson* Volume 12, 629.

treaty grounds proceeded not only along lines of political entanglement but of cultural entanglement as well. Therefore, this complex interplay of politics and cultures can be brought into focus perhaps most effectively through a world historical lens. This will help sharpen an understanding of some of the ways that nations constructed on culturally differing foundations also shared certain common principles. The founding of Iroquois nations, especially as members of a confederacy, also differed from that of other Native nations covered in subsequent chapters. Briefly, as will be explored below, the Confederacy arose in a relatively autonomous manner. European models did not directly influence the construction of its nations. Whereas other nations – the Creek, Cherokee, and Mashpee, for example, did arise syncretically by incorporating Euro-American ideas of government into their own existing governments. While examining each of these nations in isolation may be possible, the broader contextual analysis made possible by world historical methods hopes to underscore the interconnectedness of these human stories.

What could be termed treaty ground entanglement was on display in 1768. Three aspects of the proceedings conducted between the Iroquois and the English contributed to this entanglement. Also, these entanglements were non-equivalent because power differentials between Native and non-Native groups have been historically in flux, and because mutual influences between these groups varied over time. Indeed, this non-equivalency informs every type of entanglement studied throughout *An Entangled History.*

But regarding the first of the three aspects noted above, the Iroquois negotiated from a position of political, cultural, and economic power. The English could not effectively advance their interests without recognizing this. Indeed, as characterized by William N. Fenton: "In the crucible of Indian and White relations the patterns that had governed Iroquois life for centuries became compelling and forced White people to approach the Indian in a highly ritualized way

that was completely foreign to European ways of thinking."[4] Six chiefs of the Confederacy signed their marks to the treaty: Tyohansere (Little Abraham) made a knife blade for the Mohawks; Conoghquieson, a tree for the Oneida's; Sequarusera, a cross for the Tuscaroras; Otsinoghiyata (Bunt), a hill for the Onondagas; Tegaaia, a pipe for the Cayugas; and Guastrax, a hill for the Senecas.[5] Each mark stood not so much for the individual signatory as it did for the entire nation represented by him. Scott Richard Lyons argues that such marks affixed to treaties between Native peoples and both European and American governments constituted signifiers of coercion in agreements made "when there seems to be little choice in the matter. To the extent that little choice isn't the quite same thing as no choice, it signifies Indian agency. To the extent that little choice isn't exactly what is meant by the word *liberty*, it signifies the political realities of the treaty era."[6] Lyons also underscores the historical shift in Indian politics that came with the arrival of the Europeans. Among the Iroquois, for example, wampum belts recorded formal agreements between polities, but the belts contained no signature component.

> Before the arrival of the whites, communities dealt respectfully with each other in a way that encouraged different peoples to retain their ways of life, while at the same time establishing territorial boundaries, conditions of trade, and what would now be called "diplomatic relations." Treaties were different. When made with Europeans -- and especially later when made with Americans -- treaties increasingly introduced new and unfamiliar concepts that situated peoples, parties, lands, and relationships between them differently. Treaties compelled Indians to change how they lived. They addressed the parties who signed treaties in a new way too -- as nations.[7]

---

[4] William N. Fenton, "Structure, Continuity, and Change," *The History and Culture of Iroquois Diplomacy: An Interdisciplinary Guide to the Treaties of the Six Nations and Their League*," Eds. Francis Jennings, William N. Fenton, Mary A. Druke, and David R. Miller (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1995), 6.
[5] *New York State Museum 57th Annual Report*, Volume 2. (Albany: University of State of New York, 1903), 334.
[6] Scott Richard Lyons, *X-Marks: Native Signatures of Assent*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota State University Press, 2010), 1.
[7] Ibid., 1 -2.

Secondly then, the six Confederation signatures on the 1768 Fort Stanwix treaty stood affixed by individuals born into a world in which Europeans had been making treaties with Indians for generations. But pre-European contact diplomatic systems of the Eastern Woodlands Indians worked interconnectedly with intertribal trading networks.[8] For example, by 1606, and likely earlier, production and distribution of wampum beads centered among the Shinnecock, Pequot, and Narrangasett who traded them primarily through northeastward routes as far away as Nova Scotia.[9] The bead trade occupies a place of particular historical significance since wampum belts provided, among other things, a means of documentation for both inner and inter-tribal diplomatic agreements. Pottery and copper also travelled the Eastern Woodland trading network. Goods could not have successfully exchanged hands within the network without the existence of complex human relationships built up over time, and as, as Robert A. Williams argues: "These kinds of extended trading connections probably could not have existed or been sustained [. . .] without benefit of tribal diplomacy. Some form of negotiations over issues of safe passage and other privileges is usually necessary to sustain trade between groups."[10]

Recognition and examination of diplomatic modes that developed concurrently with the exchange of goods in the Eastern Woodland trading networks helps inform an understanding of the Iroquois tactics and strategies employed during treaty negotiations with Europeans. However, the European concept of trade corresponds only roughly with the Iroquois institution of gift giving. As with Native peoples elsewhere, gift giving, not buying and selling as associated with

---

[8] Robert A. Williams, Jr., *Linking Arms Together: American Indian Treaty Visions of Law and Peace, 1600 – 1800* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 32.
[9] Bruce G. Trigger*, Handbook of North American Indians: Northeast*, Volume 15, (Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Scholarly Press, 1979), 166.
[10] Williams, Jr., *Linking Arms Together: American Indian Treaty Visions of Law and Peace, 1600 – 1800*, 32.

the concept of trade networks, cemented kinship ties and served diplomatically as a means for building bonds through reciprocal obligation.[11] As argued by Colin G. Calloway: "What Europeans called diplomacy and what they called trade [. . .] tended, at least on one level, to be identical for people of the Five Nations."[12]

And thirdly, treaty ground entanglement played out in the cross-cultural link between diplomacy and trade. This link meant that when the English negotiated with the Iroquois the relationship between the two by no means seemed alien. The difference arose in the manner in which two polities expressed the relationship, a process that often led to the invention of a type of syncretism in the legal realm. Here Europeans introduced the language of jurisprudence to the Indigenous political landscape, but the European legal framework did not simply cancel out Native law. Rather, a legal pluralism operated during treaty negotiations that resulted in the creation of new legal meanings, a process expressed in Robert M. Cover's notion of jurisgenesis.

Jurisgenesis "takes place always through an essentially cultural medium. Although the state is not necessarily the creator of legal meaning, the creative process is collective or social."[13] Rules regulating the manner in which diplomatic encounters took place between the English and the Iroquois arose in a creative process of compromise, one particularly challenged by the fact that the two cultures operated within frames of reference with only approximate equivalencies between them, at best. However, The collective meaning that did arise established the laws governing diplomatic engagement.

---

[11] Richter, *The Ordeal*, 22.
[12] Colin G. Calloway, *Pen and Ink Witchcraft: Treaties and Treaty Making in American Indian History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 12.

[13] Robert. M. Cover, "The Supreme Court, 1982 Term – Forward: Nomos and Narrative," *Harvard Law Review* 97, no. 4 (1983): 4-68.

The Fort Stanwix Treaty of 1768 provides an example of a jurisgenesis that combined the tradition of English jurisprudence with the tradition of Iroquois constitutional structure, one based fundamentally in the development, maintenance, and renewal of alliances. Consistently, Iroquois negotiators at Fort Stanwix reminded their English counterparts that the long-standing Covenant Chain -- the alliance -- between the two powers entailed mutual responsibility for its endurance; furthermore, the sanctity of the relationship depended on an atmosphere of good feelings — a sincere desire to assure each other's best welfare. Control of the structure in which diplomatic encounters occurred meant control of the diplomatic message.

The Longhouse

The function of both trade and law in the pre-European contact diplomatic systems of the Eastern Woodlands Indians cannot be understood without examining the fundamental operation of kinship networks. As noted in the Introduction, Native American history in general cannot be effectively approached unless premised on the examination of kinship. And regarding the relationships between the Iroquois Confederacy and the English, the function of kinship was essential to the Covenant Chain. European colonials could not enter into trade or diplomacy with Native peoples unless entering into kinship relationships with them.

In Iroquoia kinship and nationhood were linked through the longhouse. The longhouse served the Iroquois not only as a place of residence but also as a symbol of identity. Indeed, the Seneca word *Haudenosaunee*, meaning "the extended house," "the whole house," or "The Longhouse," provides the metaphor of collective self-identity, of nationhood, whereas the word *Iroquois*, derived from the Algonquian language family and lacking clear definition, arose as a

French descriptor.[14] Physically, longhouses usually measured about twenty feet in width and averaged about one hundred feet in length, though houses up to two hundred feet in length were common. Length depended on the number of fires; with one fire for each family, each family sheltered within its walls added about twenty-five feet to the longhouse's length. Each individual within a longhouse drew his or her identity from membership in a kinship network that provided social and political cohesion within and between longhouses.[15]

Through interconnected planes of social, cultural, and political identity, Longhouse families belonged to clans, to moieties, to the nation, and to the confederacy. An Iroquois clan is composed of two or more maternal families in which members of all generations are considered siblings. If links with an original maternal family fade from memory, the family itself becomes extinct: "its ashes get cold." However, clan identity continues. One or more clans constitute a moiety. The typical Iroquois community contained two reciprocating moieties. Historically, for example, when the Seneca council met, two moieties faced each other with the council fire between them. Discussion of a given council issue continued until both moieties reached a mutually satisfactory course of action regarding it. The Grand Council of the Iroquois League adopted this system, one microcosmically represented in the fireside family in which an individual family member could pursue two lines of appeal, the mother's line and the father's line. The two lines defined duties and obligations, particularly to one's mother's brother, who might be the clan chief, but also to one's father's kin. This kinship structure was thus projected into that of the confederacy.[16]

---

[14] Daniel K. Richter, *The Ordeal of the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992), 1.
[15] Ibid., 18 - 19.
[16] William N. Fenton, *The Great Law and the Longhouse: A Political History of the Iroquois Confederacy* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press), 27-28.

Any Iroquoian national identity is linked to the land itself, so the concept of Iroquois nationhood is both kindred and territorial, as the several bands, tribes, or nations are built on the model of the longhouse, which implies both kin and territory. Moreover, the basic patterns of social structure and local organization also extended to the Iroquois view of alliances and treaties. If allied, different nations became members of a kinship network, and, for example, this informed the metaphorical "chain of friendship" between the Iroquois Confederacy and the British Empire. The principles of duality and reciprocity operated throughout alliances.[17]

The Founding of the Iroquois Confederacy

Many stories describe the founding of the Iroquois Confederacy, established at some point between 1400 and 1600. They present Iroquois national life as one grounded in kinship loyalties. Stories often concern the transformation of belligerent individuals and groups into states of peaceful coexistence. They are stories of nation-formation. They describe the origin of the Confederacy's infrastructure; moreover, they illuminate the relationships between oral traditions, religion, and national identities.[18]

Four individuals figure prominently in these traditions -- Tarenyawagon, Deganawida, Hiawatha, and Tadadaho. Levels of historicity for all four remain matters of ongoing debate. The following brief distillation of stories concerning the founding of the confederacy, or league, relies on Christopher Vescey's compilation of the many fragments recorded over time. First comes Tarenyawagon, who defeated monsters, cleared obstructions from the water, indicated the best places for fishing, and established principles for humans to follow. He taught five families

[17] Ibid., 29-30.
[18] Christopher Vecsey, "The Story and Structure of the Iroquois Confederacy," 79-106 in *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 54 (Spring, 1986), 79.

the art of war and the right of expansion. His actions set the stage for instituting the Iroquois constitution. However, a disagreement arose, and the five families dispersed, each speaking a separate language. Deganawida came upon some hunters whose village had been destroyed by intertribal warfare. He told them, "The Great Creator from whom we all are descended sent me to establish the Great Peace among you. No longer shall you kill one another and nations shall cease warring upon each other." Next he visited Djigonsasa, the Mother of Nations, who fed warriors along the road. He told her to stop supplying the war parties and explained his principles of righteousness, peace, and power. She was the first one to accept his message, thus giving clan mothers priority in Iroquoia.[19]

The creation of wampum is attributed to Hiawatha. He cut Elderberry Twigs into lengths and strung them into three pieces, saying, "This I would do if I found anyone burdened with grief even as I am. I would console them." He came upon a lake, startling the ducks there. When they flew off they took all the water with them. Hiawatha then gathered shells along the lake bottom and strung them into beads. Nearby a Mohawk village he sat in a cornfield making wampum. A woman saw him and told the chief of his presence. The chief then sent messengers out to invite him to the village itself. Hiawatha taught the villagers the proper way to deliver messages with wampum and, when asked, explained that he lived a life of wandering ever since Tadadaho killed his family. Next, Hiawatha met Deganawida, who consoled him using eight of the thirteen wampum strings gathered by Hiawatha. His mind clear after the ceremony, he helped Deganawida create the laws that that they would present to all Iroquois, and each nation in turn accepted them. United, and led by Deganawida, the nations sought out Tadadaho in order to transform him, singing the Peace Hymn, which Deganawida taught and which could "soothe the

[19] Ibid., 82 – 86.

angry feelings" of Tadadaho, reconstructing his mind "so that he may again have the mind of a human being." The song thanked the League, peace, ancestors, warriors, women, and kinship. The procession reached Onondaga, performed ceremonies at the edge of the woods, and explained its message to Tadadaho. The procession rubbed him with wampum until his evil spirit left him completely. He agreed to an alliance with them after the procession promised to make him the firekeeper, the main chief, with Onondaga as capital.[20]

In sum, oral tradition claims that Deganawida and Hiawatha established national peace and tranquility throughout Iroquoia. They created one people, united as one great family, and declared that if any one nation was attacked, the injury was felt by all of five nations. They created a confederate government with local autonomy, a constitution, civic order, and law, with each item of law represented by wampum. The League also developed foreign policy. It created laws of adoption, emigration, and laws regarding the rights of foreign nations. The League determined that it shall be a place of refuge for other nations and sent delegations out to Cherokees, Ojibways, and other Indians. If foreign aggressors did not heed warnings, war would be declared. The League reserved the right to battle any "obstinate opposing nation that has refused to accept the Great Peace." The League established the condolence ceremony, a re-enactment of the rite performed by Deganawida for Hiawatha and repeated by them both for the cleansing of Tadadaho. One moiety would console another, when someone -- especially a chief -- has died. The condolence eliminates the mourner's crippling grief and reaffirms life, thus reconciling the living with death and with one another. The thirteen wampum strings of Requickening helps maintain the stability and health of the League's officials and of the League

[20] Ibid., 82 – 88.

itself.[21]

The stories provide the source for Iroquois ritual life -- especially The Condolence ritual, the Peace Hymn, the Ritual at the Edge of the Woods, and Requickening -- and for the political protocols of diplomacy and alliance, as illustrated, for example in the ritual decorum of Hiawatha's invitation to enter the Mohawk village. Also, as illustrated in the transformation of Tadadaho and his integration into the League, the duality of the Iroquois worldview does not preclude the incorporation of an adversary. Thus dualisms are complementary, and reciprocation and compromise are foundational to the Iroquois League. The League then is envisioned as a kinship state, a system of mutuality that extends the kinship structure of the longhouse to a concept of nationhood also based on kinship.[22]

Just as Tarenyawago clears obstructions from the water, Hiawatha's wampum clears the way for the Confederacy. Wampum belts bind nations in alliance. They establish a means to send messages and record agreements. Instrumental in diplomacy, they assure peace. Wampum provides the means for consolation, and just as Tadadaho can be healed, blood feuds can be reconciled. Thus to confront grievances between nations and establish an alliance, diplomacy also required condolence as a means to heal losses inflicted by warfare. Wampum provides the means by which the principles and agreements of the League can be recalled and passed down to future generations, thus it serves as a type of constitution.

Furthermore, the stories illustrate the intervention of the divine in human life. Supernatural power – *orenda* -- is manifested through the heroes. They are embodiments, incarnations, or messengers of Tarenyawagon; therefore, the institutions they create possess the power that derives from the supernatural, so the Confederacy exists as a direct reflection of

[21] Ibid., 88-90.
[22] Ibid., 91-93.

divine law and the result of divine intervention. Thus Deganawida instructed all chiefs to give thanks to the Creator, "the source and ruler of your lives," and the wampum created by Hiawatha served as a channel that led to "communion with the Great Spirit."[23]

The structure of Iroquois diplomacy relied on alliances and reciprocity between its five, and later six, member nations, a structure that operated in concert with leader/follower configurations within Iroquois villages. Within every level of this structure, leaders and powerful orators functioned as Iroquois diplomats, the dignity of their offices symbolized through the act of linking arms. Leader responsibility entailed the accurate conveyance of constituent positions during national or international council meetings. Central to Iroquois diplomacy stood the goal of maintaining and expanding alliances not only among humans but also among other-than-humans and animals as well. Thus diplomacy depended on linking arms between physical and metaphysical dimensions, though the Iroquois sense of seamlessness between the two eluded European worldviews. All beings within these dimensions possessed power that could be either harmful or helpful. The best interests of the individual depended on the negotiation of alliances with these powers that would be of greatest benefit to him or her. These negotiations depended upon relations between leaders, defined by Mark Druke Becker as "people whose talents and traits were valued and respected," and followers, defined by her as "those who were influenced by the qualities leaders were deemed to possess."[24]

The foundation of leader/ follower alliances stood on kinship networks. Iroquois diplomacy depended on multilevel personal relationships that bound leaders and followers

---

[23] Ibid., 94-100.

[24] Mary Druke Becker, "Linking Arms: The Structure of Iroquois Intertribal Diplomacy," in *Beyond the Covenant Chain: The Iroquois and Their Neighbors in Indian North America, 1600-1800*, eds. Daniel K. Richter and James H. Merrell (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003), 30.

together through kinship and clan membership, so if an individual moved from one community or nation to another, he or she did so within a network of alliances. Alliances between similar leader/ follower structures opened opportunities for strengthening the sense of value and power for all members involved because one group did not absorb simply another. Rather, alliance members maintained independence but at the same time extended their relationships. Self-identity stood inextricably linked with group identity.

A circle of fifty wampum strings symbolized the fifty sachems of the Iroquois Confederacy, but all stood as individual leaders who joined to form the council of chiefs. The League consisted of "an alliance of distinct parts forming a united, and therefore stronger, front than any nation or coalition alone could provide."[25] The power of Iroquois diplomacy depended on links formed between member nations, though the diplomatic structure provided opportunity for individual nations to take positions on issues advantageous to their own interests.

Alliances extended outside of the Confederacy as well. Nations endeavored through their spokespeople, their leaders, to link arms with one another, an act that symbolized consensus linked with alliance. Reciprocal gifting assured effective intertribal diplomacy. Iroquois council meetings depended upon continued renewal of personal, national, and international alliances as well as upon fundamental respect for consensus, regardless of the time required for all voices to be heard. Deliberations included the repetition of proposals to ensure their clear understanding by all present.[26] Becker contends that the act of linking arms and the political connotations represented by it accurately captures the structure of Iroquois diplomacy.

As noted earlier, treaty negotiations between Iroquois nations were held at council fires. But treaties presented a means of resolving tensions not only *within* Iroquois society but in

[25] Ibid., 32.
[26] Ibid., 37.

international Iroquoian relationships as well. Regarding the later, the Iroquois premised their society on the idea that everyone should have a name and a niche in its kinship system, and one way of attaining both was through adoption. Therefore, colonial governors were adopted into the Iroquoian kinship network and assigned names, and to maintain peace instead of war, the alliance was reaffirmed by the exchange of wampum belts. In sum, the 1768 Treaty of Fort Stanwix cannot be understood outside of the Iroquoian institution of kinship networks and of the Iroquoian concept of nationhood.

Intercultural Preparations for the 1768 Treaty of Fort Stanwix

Fort Stanwix represented English presence in the northeast; the Oneida Carry, across from which the fort stood, represented the Iroquois dominion. The geographical space of the negotiations stood at the confluence of two cultural centers whose physicality embodied significant symbolic power for the treaty's signatories. The staging of the negotiations involving the largest single land cession at that point in North American history could not have been enacted at a more appropriate location.

Preparations for the treaty negotiations at the fort began with the invitations. Iroquois council protocol required their issuance by the party desiring a treaty conference; both message and accompanying wampum went by runner to those invited.[27] Proper comportment regarding the dissemination of invitations to foreign states stood as a long-standing counterpart in European diplomatic history. A protocol unfamiliar to Europeans involved the use of wampum by the Iroquois as a method of communication. But European diplomats understood the need to

[27] Mary A. Druke, "Iroquois Treaties: Common Forms and Varying Interpretations," *The History and Culture of Iroquois Diplomacy: An Interdisciplinary Guide to the Treaties of the Six Nations and Their League*," Eds. Francis Jennings, William N. Fenton, Mary A. Druke, and David R. Miller (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1995), 92.

conform to the protocol of the Indians with whom they desired to negotiate treaties. For example, on 8 October William Johnson "Sent off two Mohock Indians as Messengers [. . .] and a Belt to hurry the [Ohio nation's delegates] to come to the Congress."[28] Also, on 18 October Johnson "sent an Indian Express with a String of Wampum to *Conoghquieson* chief of Oneida &ca. acquainting him that he had been there a month at Fort Stanwix without seeing them, and therefore desired them to come there without delay."[29] News travelled by wampum belts. Michael K. Foster describes wampum "as a kind of recording device, somewhat in the way we conceive of the function of a tape recorder. Reading a wampum would then be analogous to playing back a taped message."[30]

From the ceremonial opening of negotiations on 24 October to the actual signing of the treaty on 5 November 1768, the process allowed little room for improvisation. The script had been in rehearsal for years. Fenton characterizes treaties as "A species of drama in which the Iroquois were the playwrights, the directors and teaching actors, and the joint producers with the colonial hosts. [. . .] The Indian treaty, like much of American culture, was the product of the interaction of the two cultures."[31] The substantive contents of the treaty itself represented the designs of the treaty's signatories that had been in development since a 8 May 1765 meeting between Iroquois, Delaware, and English diplomats at Johnson Hall. William J. Campbell notes: "Johnson may have been required to formalize treaty proceedings, but much of the bargaining

---

[28] Johnson, *The Papers of Sir William Johnson* Volume 12, 619.
[29] Ibid., 622.
[30] Michael K. Foster, "Another Look at the Function of Wampum in Iroquois-White Councils," *The History and Culture of Iroquois Diplomacy: An Interdisciplinary Guide to the Treaties of the Six Nations and Their League*," Eds. Francis Jennings, William N. Fenton, Mary A. Druke, and David R. Miller (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1995), 105.
[31] Fenton, "Structure, Continuity, and Change," 7.

that took place in the years, months, weeks, and days prior to the opening ceremonies involved careful politicking"[32]

The treaty drawn up in May 1765 marked the beginning of formal negotiations between the Iroquois and the English to set the cession boundary that extended the 1763 Proclamation Line to include the Ohio country, far to the west of Iroquoia. One group of Delawares who lived along the Susquehanna River east of the Alleghany Mountains and another group from the west of the mountains -- the Delawares of the Ohio -- signed the treaty. The treaty also declared that the Delawares occupied a status subordinate to the Iroquois.

The Iroquois negotiators did not initially sign. They demanded that the Indian side of the line include a region in which several white settlements had already been established.[33] One negotiator told Johnson: "We think to continue the line up [the Susquehanna] River to Cherry Valley Lake, and from thence to the German Flatts."[34] Though the Iroquois would agree to a slightly westward modification of the line before signing the treaty, the goal of this opening gambit had its desired effect: to put Johnson on notice that the Iroquois would tolerate no white settlement on their side of the line. Johnson agreed in principle that the boundary should be one "which no White Man shall dare to invade,"[35] but controlling white settlement on the eastern borderlands of Iroquoia had already become a daunting task for the English. To preserve as much of their own homeland as possible, the Iroquois used the Ohio River Valley -- mostly Shawnee land -- as their bargaining chip. However, the Shawnees did not have a place at the negotiating table that May. Three years later at Fort Stanwix they still would not have a place.

---

[32] William J. Campbell, *Speculators in Empire: Iroquoia and the 1768 Treaty of Fort Stanwix* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2014), 6 - 7.
[33] Dorothy V. Jones, *License for Empire* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 80.
[34] John R. Berthold Fernow, and Edmund B. O'Callaghan.eds, *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York* Volume 7 (Albany: Parsons and Company, 1857) 729.
[35] Ibid., 724.

Protocol for Opening the Negotiations

Early on the morning of 24 October 1768, William Johnson opened proceedings at the fort with a condolence ceremony "agreeable to the ancient custom established by our forefathers."[36] The ceremony exemplifies Fenton's observation that Europeans recognized the need to perform in a "highly ritualized way [foreign to their] ways of thinking." Johnson had long been acquainted with Iroquoia and had established deep bonds of trust with many of its peoples.

> With this string of Wamp: I do, on behalf of His Majesty & all His subjects wipe away the Tears from your eyes which you are constantly shedding for your late deceased Chiefs [. . .]. With this String I clear the Passage to your Hearts that you may speak cheerfully and candidly [. . .]. With this Belt I light up, anew your several Council Fires [. . .]. With this belt I dispel the darkness which for some time past has overspread your several Countries [. . .]. I do now [. . .] take the clearest water and therewith cleanse your inside from all Filth and every thing which has given you concern. [. . .]. In performing these ceremonies I can not omit the necessary part, which is, that as there are but two Council Fires for your confederacy, the one at my house and the other at Onondaga, I must desire that you always be ready to attend either of them, when called upon, by which means business will I hope, always be attended & properly carried on for our mutual interest [. . .].[37]

Strings and belts of wampum affirmed the truth and sincerity of messages. They functioned to stress the importance of the words themselves while at the same time serving as mnemonic instruments and records of significant historical events, including agreements made between treaty parties. Though each nation retained belts significant to its own transactions,

[36] John R. Brodhead, Berthold Fernow, and Edmund B. O'Callaghan, eds., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York*, Volume 8 (Albany: Weed, Parsons and Company, 1857), 114.
[37] Ibid., 114 – 115.

particularly important belts went to the Onondaga Council House where a designated wampum keeper took charge of them. Periodically, each belt underwent a rehearsal, the readings necessary to maintain "memory of the particular verbal stream [and] recalled and taught by association with the character and design of the particular belt."[38] Absence of wampum at treaty negotiations would have been inconceivable to the Iroquois.

As Johnson's use of wampum demonstrates, the legal structure of negotiations required the incorporation of Native terms of at least equal weight to the terms of European legal traditions. The resulting jurisgenesis suggests that treaty negotiations occurred in a conceptual space designed to ensure a sense of trust between the signatories. The words of the treaty itself combined with wampum to establish an agreement recognizable to all parties as legally binding within their different frames of legal reference.

For the Iroquois, legitimation of the treaty's provisions depended on adherence to the form taken by the negotiations themselves. Daniel K. Richter identifies this relationship:

> Treaty making was essentially an extension of the Great Peace to a broader stage. The condolence rituals, words of peace, and exchanges of gifts mandated by the Good News of Peace and Power provided the basic paradigm for diplomatic relations with outsiders. In treaty councils between villages and nations, ceremonial repetitions of oral traditions about the history and ties between the peoples paralleled the recitation of the Deganawidah Epic at League councils.[39]

The condolence ceremony resonated deeply for the Iroquois, and as incorporated into the Fort Stanwix negotiations, it did so with many of its aspects intact, though presented in juxtaposition with English worldviews of legality. Moreover, as Michael M. Pomedli argues, the

[38] Fenton, "Structure, Continuity and Change in the Process of Iroquois Treaty Making," 18.
[39] Richter, *The Ordeal*, 41.

use of symbols and ritual language in the condolence ceremony indicates it spiritual basis, one that runs parallel to the "stenographic and legal language" of the Europeans.[40]

The first area of the condolence ceremony, "Journeying on the Trail," concerned the core obligation of the host to graciously provide provisions and allow time for guests to rest from their travels. Pomedli notes that the original form also included songs, laments for loss of any ritual knowledge, the enumeration of hereditary titles, and the announcement of bereaved families as they arrived.[41] Johnson exhibited keen awareness of his responsibilities as a host. Preparations commenced 4 May when Guy Johnson -- William Johnson's protégé and son-in-law -- requested General Gage to use his best judgment but suggested: "If their Number is not greater [than over a thousand] 50 Barrels of Pork, and a proportion of Flour, will be found little enough for them [. . .].[42] As the number of expected attendees elevated over the course of the summer, so did requests for food and housing supplies. On 16 October, with thousands of Indians having already arrived, A frantic William Johnson wrote John Glen at Schenectady: "I [. . .] desire You will Send a large quantity of provisions up here as Soon as possible, otherwise it must overset the design of this Congress, as it cannot be Supposed that Hungry Indians can be kept here, or in any temper without a Bellyfull."[43]

The next phase, "Welcome at the Woods Edge," clears a metaphorical path between the Europeans and the Indians to indicate one another's open and friendly intentions exhibited by expressions of peace accompanied by gift-giving. The full ritual contained congratulations and condolences between clan members and demonstrations of concern for one another's safety and

[40] Michael M. Pomedli, "Eighteenth-Century Treaties: Amended Iroquois Condolence Rituals" (*American Indian Quarterly*, 19 no. 3, 1995), 319.
[41] Ibid., 321.
[42] Johnson, *The Papers of Sir William Johnson, Volume 12*, 489.
[43] Ibid., 608.

health, ministrations accompanied by the kindling of a fire and a pipe smoking ceremony.[44] Johnson's opening words of the condolence ceremony that he conducted indicate his sensitivity to the ceremony's protocol: "I take you by the hand and heartily bid you all welcome to this place where I have kindled a Council Fire for affairs of importance. [. . .] I now, agreeable to the antient custom establishd by our Forefathers, proceed to the ceremony of condolence usual on these occasions."[45] Further along in his presentation he exclaimed: "With this belt I light up anew your several Council Fires."[46] Johnson also knew that gifts served as measures of sincerity and generosity, essential elements for a leader and for a host. He lavished the Indian dignitaries with gifts in the form of merchandise as well as cash, together requiring about £2000 drawn from the Crown treasury.[47]

"Requickening," the third phase, centered on rituals for "opening eyes and cleansing ears and throats." Its complete form prescribed a procession of condolers to the longhouses of the mourners with singing and the recollection of individual titles read from mnemonic canes and wampum strings.[48]

> The Requickening ceremony is neither a funeral ceremony nor a memorial service. The ceremony ensures that the number of federal chiefs remains undiminished. [. . .] The rituals of condolence and installation preserved [. . .] political integrity and welfare. Yet [the Iroquois] had to admit one power, that of death, was sinister and overpowering.[49]

Here again Johnson demonstrated adherence to Iroquois protocol in his role as a condoler:

---

[44] Pomedli, "Eighteenth-Century Treaties," 322.
[45] Brodhead, *Documents*, 114.
[46] Ibid., 114.
[47] Johnson, *The Papers of Sir William Johnson, Volume 12*, 555.
[48] Pomedli, "Eighteenth-Century Treaties," 323- 326
[49] Ibid., 325.

"I [. . .] wipe away the Tears from your eyes which you are constantly shedding for your late deceased Chiefs, and I clear your sight that you may look cheerfully at your bretheren. [. . .] I clear the passage to your hearts that you may speak cheerfully and candidly [. . .] and remove all sorrow & uneasiness from you. [. . .] I am greatly concerned for the many losses you have sustained in your several nations since our last meeting & sincerely condole with you for them all."[50]

The next phase, "Six Songs of Farewell," contained an invocation of dead ancestors and a thanksgiving for the League. Johnson addressed the later with particular concern for the Shawnee and the Delaware, lest they forget their obligations as dependents of the Iroquois:

> I must also advise you to be unanimous among yourselves & reside in your respective Countries, and not think of scattering or settling amongst other Nations [. . .] to the great weakening of your confederacy [. . .] I give you a pouch with a String of Wampum in it, which you are to make use of when you here of the loss of any of the Confederacy, and rise up on such occasions without delay in order to condole for the same. [. . .] I now supply you with a torch or candle which you are to travel with by night upon any extraordinary emergency.[51]

"Over the Great Forest," the fifth phase, involved two parts: lament for loss of ritual knowledge; and recognition of the succession of new chiefs and recognition of the death of any Confederacy chiefs. This phase, as well as "Six Songs of Farewell," constituted adjournment procedures. Adherence to any element relevant to the fifth phase does not appear evident at Fort Stanwix. The final act of the negotiation consisted primarily of the treaty's signing, a strictly English procedure. Johnson's journal states only: "The Deed to His Majesty, [. . .] to the Proprietors of Pennsylvania, [and] to the Traders being [. . .] laid on the Table [. . .] The Chiefs

[50] Broadhead, *Documents,*114.
[51] Ibid., 114 – 115.

of each Nation received the Cash which was piled on a Table [. . .] and then proceeded to divide the Goods amongst their People."[52]

The condolence ceremony centered on the need to unify grieving individuals, tribes and nations in order to comes to terms with death and then to recognize the need to transcend sorrow. Michael J. Pomedli notes: "In treaty celebrations [. . .] Native leaders used the rite as a camping ground in which they freely moved and used its customary words and actions. English leaders also moved within this camping ground, making their own the sentiments, style, and actions of this rite."[53] Iroquois form intertwined with English function to create the space necessary to conduct international affairs between the two powers. Mutual recognition that equal powers sat at the treaty-signing table constructed the essential fiction upon which the authority of the treaty itself rested.

Mutually Beneficial Political Fictions

As William J. Campbell argues, a symbiotic political fiction allowed the English to gain the Ohio country by claiming to recognize the Shawnees and the Delawares as Iroquoian dependents due to the Six Nation's right of conquest over them. Therefore, the valley could be sold to the English Empire without either Shawnee or Delaware approval. In turn, the Iroquois signatories hoped to gain legitimation of their imperial ambitions because of Whitehall's recognition of their authority. The mutual fiction bound the Iroquois Confederacy with the English Empire:

[52] Ibid., 134.
[53] Pomedli, "Eighteenth-Century Treaties," 327.

> The 1768 land cession agreement reveals the extent to which those seeking to create and project the authority of either the Grand Council or Crown benefitted from working in concert. Many Iroquois may have laughed at the idea of their obedience to a European king, but the Grand Council was well aware of the benefits of appearance and collusion. [. . .] Both authorities became dependent on the survival of the other.[54]

Thus, the Treaty of 1768 served as a point of intersection between the Iroquois and the English in which mutual interests built a legal foundation to secure mutually beneficial status and authority in the Northeast and in the Ohio Valley.

On Tuesday afternoon, the day following Johnson's opening address, Oneida Chief Conoghquieson addressed the assembly. He acknowledged Johnson's message from the previous day, thanked him for adhering to the ancient customs of the Six Nations, promised Johnson that the chiefs would consult with their young warriors, and assured him that all "the six nations, with the Shawanese, Delaware & all their dependents as far as great Plains of the Sioto," would observe Johnson's recommendations.[55] However, he did not mention that the recommendations stood as the product of three years worth of negotiations between the Iroquois and the English. As William J. Campbell argues: "Johnson's 'decisions,' [came] as no surprise to those gathered at the Oneida Carry."[56]

The first portion of Conoghquieson's speech went unrecorded by the treaty scribe who remarked only: "Gave 3 Strings Then repeated all that Sir William had said on the Black Belts given at the Condolence."[57] Conoghquieson's words susbsequent to the reported wholesale repetition did enter the record. But the narrative structure of that speech relied largely on the repetition of Johnson's own phrases to which Conoghquieson amended words of appreciation

---

[54] William J. Campbell, *Speculators in Empire: Iroquoia and the 1768 Treaty of Fort Stanwix* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2014), 9.
[55] Broadhead, *Documents*, 116.
[56] Campbell, *Speculators in Empire,* 147.
[57] Broadhead, *Documents*, 116.

and gratitude. Conoghquieson's response followed Iroquois Council protocol. Repetition served as a ritual acknowledgment that a speaker's words had been heard and understood.

> In contrast to impatient officials, who wanted quickly to get to their point and who stressed a concluding document -- the treaty -- the Iroquois emphasized the slow process of discussion. [. . .] From an oral culture, the Iroquois recognized but distrusted the power of written documents. [. . .] Indians preferred the methodical and rhythmic repetition of shared sentiments and histories expressed through prolonged rituals and speeches.[58]

The speeches of both Johnson and Conoghquieson also recognized that the Grand Council fire of the Confederacy, traditionally kept by the Onondogas, burned in parallel with the fire at Johnson Hall: dual flames that symbolized a bond of alliance between the two empires. As Johnson noted in a speech quoted earlier, "There are but two Council Fires for your confederacy, the one at my house and the other at Onondaga, I must desire that you will always be ready to attend either of them [. . .] for our mutual Interest."[59] Emblems and expressions of solidarity between the Iroquois and the English made multiple appearances throughout the proceedings at Fort Stanwix.

Conoghquieson played a major role during the thirteen days of official negotiations. Ceremonially "raised up" in 1755 and given the same name as his deceased predecessor to become one of the fifty League chiefs, he both defended the right of the Iroquois people to remain in their lands and, in conversations with William Johnson predating the treaty, advocated the sale of the Ohio Valley to the English Empire.[60] Thus the role he played at Fort Stanwix in 1768 had long been in rehearsal.

---

[58] Alan Taylor, *The Divided Ground: Indians, Settlers, and the Northern Borderland of the American Revolution* (New York: Vintage, 2006), 23.
[59] Broadhead, *Documents,* 115.
[60] Colin G. Calloway, *Pen and Ink Witchcraft: Treaties and Treaty Making in American Indian History* (New York: Oxford University Press: 2014), 54.

Along with the Oneida chief, other Iroquois chiefs played significant roles at Fort Stanwix that culminated in their treaty signatures. For example, Mohawk chief Tyohansere (Little Abraham), who fought prominently during the Seven Years War and later negotiated to save Mohawk land from speculators,[61] also served as one of William Johnson's translators at Fort Stanwix.[62] Tyohansere's village stood east of the proposed line.[63] On 26 October he demanded that Johnson change the treaty boundary to protect his region. Adjusting the line exceeded the Administrator's authority; however, that night "Sir William had a private conference with the Chiefs of the most influence with whom he made use of every argument to bring matters to an agreeable issue."[64] The line would be adjusted.

At nine o'clock on Sunday evening, 30 October, six Oneida chiefs came to see Johnson and proposed a boundary line that would keep the Oneida Carry in their hands. Johnson rejected the idea, offered $500 to the Oneida nation, and promised "a handsome present for each of the Chiefs" if they could persuade the nation to give up the Carrying Place. The chiefs withdrew for the evening then returned at ten o'clock the next morning to tell Johnson "that the people positively refused to agree to any other Line than they had proposed the last night [. . .] as by Keeping horses and Carriages there [. . .] to carry over the Traders Goods, they might earn somewhat for the support of their families." Johnson countered by declaring his surprise because they had "neglected carrying goods for so many years." The Oneida chiefs responded with their final offer. They would take $600 "over and beside the several Fees which were given in

[61] Francis Jennings, et. al. eds., *The History and Culture of Iroquois Diplomacy*. 252
[62] Calloway, *Pen and Ink Witchcraft: Treaties and Treaty Making in American Indian History,* 70.
[63] Ibid., 72.
[64] Broadhead, *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York*, *Volume 8*, 122.

Private," and they would share the Carrying Place with the English. Johnson "acquiesced for the present leaving it to be confirmed or rejected by his majesty."[65]

Johnson's quarters served as the site for many similar conversations as Iroquois chiefs either singly or in groups demanded adjustments beneficial to their interests. Since the sale of the Ohio valley had been worked out to the satisfaction of both the Iroquois and the English, the Iroquois focused their last minute negotiating energies on retaining control of areas in near proximity to their own homeland. They drove hard bargains, as illustrated by the demands made by Tyohansere and by the Oneida Chiefs. Johnson exceeded his authority to accommodate the demands, but reprimands from the Crown would be perfunctory; the larger prize for the English, clear title to the Ohio country, would more than compensate for any relatively minor legal infractions. Land speculators and Whitehall recognized the treaty for what it truly represented: the largest American land cession in the colonial history of the English Empire.

The Iroquois chiefs knew that they negotiated from a position of power. They controlled -- or claimed to control -- something that the English wanted: the Ohio country. For example, on Friday, 28 October, Tyohansere told Johnson that the Crown needed to recognize Iroquois claims to land beyond the Kanawha River with a "very good & clear Title to the Lands as far as the Cherokee River, which we cannot allow to be right of any other Indians without doing wrong to our Posterity and acting unworthy those Warriors who fought and conquered it."[66] Thus, Tyohansere claimed an Iroquois right of title based on right of conquest over a region counter-claimed by the Cherokee nation. He knew that the English maintained high regard for the sanctity of the right of conquest and would recognize it as a legally valid means for trumping

[65] Ibid.,124 – 125.
[66] Ibid., 121.

Cherokee land claims. Johnson accepted Tyohansere's argument and redrew the line.[67]

The Suffering Traders and the Cessions

Iroquois negotiators navigated talks not only with Crown officials but also with a group of land speculators, the Suffering Traders. Their primary spokesman, William Croghan, demanded Johnson's assistance in securing compensation for property allegedly lost at the hands of western Indian nations during the French and Indian War and Pontiac's Rebellion. Two other Suffering Traders, William Trent and John Hughs, had bought the rights to claims of other traders who claimed losses in the wars then transferred those rights to the Illinois Company. Johnson's work on behalf of the Suffering Traders began in earnest with in the May 1765 conference with representatives from the Delaware and Iroquois nations, the conference that established the land cession's general outline that would be finalized at Fort Stanwix three years later. Johnson told the Iroquois negotiators that they would need to agree to the trader's grant or risk losing them as valuable trading partners. The Confederacy's negotiators agreed to include land north of the Ohio River to compensate the traders "in order to shew that we love justice, we expect the Traders who suffered by some of our dependents in the wars five years ago, may have a grant for the Lands we now give down Ohio, as a satisfaction for their losses."[68] The traders received about one quarter of present day West Virginia. The Iroquois also granted William Johnson two hundred thousand acres in New York to further show their "Love for the King and make his people easy."[69] Acquiescence to the Suffering Traders empowered the Iroquois since it provided them with an opportunity to demonstrate their largesse to the English, regardless of

[67] Ibid., 122.
[68] Ibid., 128
[69] Ibid., 128.

Shawnee and other Ohio country Indian protests against the right of the Iroquois to sell the land to the English in the first place.

The cession went forward regardless of Ohio Country protests. The Indians there had been effectively disenfranchised by the Iroquois Confederacy, a situation enabled by its collusion with the English Empire. The self interests of both parties required sacrificing the interests of Ohio Indians. Within the Iroquois perspective, mutual interests between the two powers relied on a long-standing alliance, the Covenant Chain, and on Tuesday, 1 November Tyohansere read from the Covenant Chain wampum belt "of 15 rows with human figures at each end."[70]

> On our first Meeting [. . .], when you came with your ship we [. . .] entered into an alliance with you, [. . .] we entered into a Covenant Chain [. . .] and fashioned your ship therewith, but being apprehensive the Bark would break and your ship be lost we made one of iron [. . .] but perceiving [it] was liable to rust; we made a silver chain. [. . .] We now tell the King that we have given him a great and valuable Country, and we know that what we shall now get for it must be far short of its value — We make it a condition of this our agreement concerning the Line that His Majesty will not forget or neglect to shew us His favor or suffer the Chain to contract Rust, but that he will direct those who have management of our affairs to be punctual in renewing our antient agreements. [. . .] Our words are strong and our resolution firm & we expect that our request will be complied with in so much as we have so generously complied with all that has been desired .[71]

Thus Tyohansere reminded the English that a state of long-standing alliance existed between the two peoples. Furthermore, the bond only grew stronger over the years. The Iroquois demonstrated a willingness to continually renew and improve the covenant -- from bark to iron to silver -- so they expected the Crown to honor the alliance at Fort Stanwix by adhering to the conditions of the treaty.

The Covenant Chain symbolized a dynamic network of alliances that the Iroquois

[70] Ibid., 118.
[71] Ibid., 127.

Confederacy entered into with other nations. The manner in which the Covenant Chain in its conceptual flexibility actually functioned as a political instrument continues to drive scholarship. Arguably, however, Tyohansere may have enlisted its service as a political tool to remind the English that they and the Iroquois stood on the same imperial plain. Accordingly, the treaty signified an agreement between equal powers. Iroquois generosity came with the condition that the English reciprocate by showing favorable treatment of the Iroquois that included continual renewal of the alliance.

Another point firmly and successfully argued by Iroquois negotiators concerned the Mohawk Valley, which had become increasingly populated by settlers and threatened by speculators. The Mohawk nation demanded its rights for border security in the region. Negotiators managed to extract guarantees from the English that led to the insertion of a clause in the treaty underscoring Mohawk control over unpatented land east of the boundary with authority to sell it to the buyers of their choice. The Mohawk negotiators intended to take advantage of the market to earn lucrative rewards for them.[72]

On Saturday, 5 November 1768, the Iroquois and European negotiators convened for the treaty signing ceremony. On the fort grounds that morning stood the largest amount of currency and merchandise collected to date for an exchange between North American Indians and Europeans. Over twenty boatloads of goods had been transported to the site.

The opening paragraphs of the treaty listed those nations that the Iroquois brought under the roof of the Longhouse of the League: "To all to whom These presents shall come or may concern; We the Sachems & Chiefs of the Six Confederate Nations, and of the Shawanoes, Delawares, Mingoes of Ohio and other Dependent Tribes on behalf of ourselves and of the rest

[72] Ibid.,128.

of our Several Nations."[73] The treaty listed names of thirty-seven leaders along with tallied numbers of all groups in attendance: over two hundred Mohawks, four hundred Oneidas, three hundred Tuscaroras, three hundred Onondagas, eight hundred Cayugas, four hundred Senecas, and seven hundred Nanticokes and Conoys.[74] The power of numbers provided a powerful illusion, one meant to demonstrate the treaty's legitimacy through broad support of all parties with a stake in the cession.

However, as stated by William Campbell: "All signatories sacrificed the fate of the Ohio nations by promoting the authority of an empire that promised to protect their self-interests."[75] Within a few years of the treaty, thousands of settlers had moved into southwestern Pennsylvania, western Virginia, and Kentucky. Droves of surveyors in the employ of land speculators mapped new tracts for settlement.[76] Tensions escalated between Shawnees and settlers in particular. Though Iroquois right of conquest over the Ohio Country justified the Confederacy's right to dispose of it as they saw fit, at least in the eyes of the English, this did not negate the reality of Ohio Country Indian resistance to settlement. Conditions in Ohio Country rose to the level of an Imperial crisis for the British. Whitehall weighed the cost effectiveness of maintaining a military presence in the region to protect the settlers and opted for retrenchment. Abandonment of frontier outposts in the Trans-Appalachian west, particularly the 1772 closure of Fort Pitt, led to escalating chaos, and, as characterized by David L. Preston, "on the eve of the Revolution [. . .], the Ohio Valley was utterly decentralized, unstable, and verging on anarchy."[77]

The entry point of the Ohio country chaos could be found in the fiction of Iroquois

---

[73] Ibid.,128.
[74] Ibid.,128.
[75] Campbell, *Speculators in Empire: Iroquoia and the 1768 Treaty of Fort Stanwix,* 165.
[76] David L. Preston, *The Texture of Context: European and Indian Settler Communities on the Frontier of Iroquoia, 1667 – 1783* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009), 261.
[77] Ibid., 262.

hegemony over the region, a fiction in which the English Empire had invested heavily. As Stephen Warren argues, the English colonial officials had for decades worked to construct the narrative of Iroquois conquest of the Ohio country. For example, William Penn's secretary, James Logan, worked with Conrad Weiser and Oneida diplomat Shickellamy "'to inflate the Six Nations authority over the lands and affairs of the Shawnees, Delawares, and other allies in the region.'"[78] The Mohawk nation considered Conrad Weiser as one its member. This, along with his fluency with the Mohawk language, positioned him with authority enough to sign the 1737 Walking Purchase on the Nation's behalf.

Warren notes that during the Seven Years' War British and Iroquois negotiators signed a series of treaties that divested the Shawnees, Delawares, and others of their western Pennsylvania lands. Furthermore: "Between 1754 and 1760, the British laid claim to Iroquois military history and used it to creatively imagine British sovereignty, from the Atlantic Ocean to the Mississippi River. British cartographer John Mitchell explicitly linked Iroquois and British military history [. . .] in his 1757 map."[79] Mutual recognition of each other's imperial status served the interests of both the Iroquois and the English. The Iroquois gained by English recognition of their presumed authority over the affairs of the Ohio Indians and stood to profit by this recognition; the English gained by creating a legal channel through which to acquire the Ohio Country. These geopolitical machinations required extraordinary diplomatic skills to move each part into its proper place, and both the Iroquois and the English knew what they wanted at Fort Stanwix in 1768.

The international diplomacy conducted at Fort Stanwix led to profound geopolitical

[78] Stephen Warren, *The Worlds the Shawnees Made: Migration and Violence in Early America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014), 182.
[79] Ibid., 225.

shifts, particularly in the Ohio Country. Both the Iroquois and the English worked in concert to profit off of the region, and at the same time they worked to benefit their own self-interests. Curiously, however, as William Campbell states, there has been a tendency of historians to bypass the treaty's full significance and present it "as a passing reference to the myopic policies of the Crown on eve of the American Revolution, or within the context of [. . .] William Johnson's land-speculating interests."[80]

The American Revolution uprooted of the Iroquois/British alliance, so Iroquois negotiators had to reshape their national course in order to continue to promote their own self-interests, and to reposition themselves as a political power on the stage of international diplomacy as they bargained with diplomats from young America. Furthermore, as argued by Mary A. Druke: "The protocol of Iroquois councils in which Euramericans were involved was primarily Indian in form with modifications arising through interaction."[81]

Interactions between the Iroquois and the English explored in this chapter serve as only a single snapshot of historical entanglement. Moreover, the chapter has attempted to be both integral and unique to the upcoming pictures of entanglement that will be brought into focus in each of the following chapters. The integral aspect has been its focus on intersecting political and cultural points between Native and non-Native worlds. Its unique contribution has been its examination of the treaty grounds as a point of intersection between these two worlds. Also, the forgoing analysis of kinship and of diplomatic entanglement is further integrated into the wider work as these issues remain perennial to issues undertaken throughout *An Entangled History*. For example, kinship will receive further investigation in the next chapter's focus on the Anisshinaabeg, as the geographical focus shifts from the eastern Great Lakes to the western

[80] Campbell, *Speculators in Empire*, 5.
[81] Druke, "Iroquois Treaties: Common Forms, Varying Interpretations," 91.

Great Lakes, and diplomatic entanglement will take on new dimensions as this study's temporal focus shifts and charts the course from Native entanglements with imperial colonialism to that of settler colonialism. And regarding issues concerning the construction of Native national identities, the Iroquois provide a relatively unique case because, as discussed at length in this chapter, the construction of their nationhoods generally relied on their own historical and cultural conditions. However, the post-revolutionary era introduced a new phase regarding Native nation building. The following chapter provides one of the remaining four pictures in this study, each taking up different aspects of new entanglements out of which new types of Native Nations arose by incorporating elements of Euro-American republicanism into their existing forms of government.

Chapter 2

Shifting Entanglements:

Kinship, Native Polities, and Colonialism in the Great Lakes Region

The Anishinaabeg lived within kinship networks -- nindoodemag – based on bonds of mutual dependency between individuals and between groups. Such networks encompassed similar bonds between humans and those termed "other than human," a category that includes manitous (spiritual beings), the animals the Indians hunted, and an array of spiritually animated plants and minerals. Reciprocal obligations existed between humans and other than humans. For example, the later may, as spiritual grandfathers or grandmothers, at times take "pity" and come to the aid of the individual in need.[1] Nindoodemag identities were inherited from fathers. These inheritances ultimately linked back to other than human progenitor beings such as catfish, crane, beaver, and bear, to name only a few.[2] Moreover, reciprocity in the form of gift giving signified the mutual obligations inherent to kinship. In diplomatic and political affairs, the mutual exchange of gifts established and maintained kinship networks in Anishinibeewaki and elsewhere throughout the Great Lakes region. Kinship made diplomatic relations possible. Gifting both initiated and sustained those relations.[3] Because gift giving and the implied kinship obligations attached to it were essential ingredients in acts of diplomacy, breaches in gift giving jeopardized diplomatic relationships between people.

---

[1] Bruce M. White, "'Give us a Little Milk': The Social and Cultural Meanings of Gift-Giving in the Lakes Superior Fur Trade," in *Rethinking the Fur Trade: Cultures of Exchange in an AtlanticWorld*, ed. Susan Sleeper Smith (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009), 117.
[2] Heidi Bohaker, "Nindoodemag": The Significance of Algonquian Kinship Networks in the Eastern Great Lakes Lakes Region, 1600-1701," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 63, no. 1, 25.
[3] Charles E. Cleland, *Rites of Conquest: The History and Culture of Michigan's Native Americans* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2011), 55-56.

The seamlessness between metaphysical and physical realms illustrates an entanglement central to the individual and group identities of the Anishinaabeg. Moreover, these identities should not be divided into separate spiritual and temporal categories, as this would introduce a false dichotomy alien to the Anishinaabeg worldview. Kinship-based relationships cross such categories, and the symbiotic nature of these relationships serves as a sort of baseline principle that informs many aspects of Anishinaabeg life, including the diplomatic and political decisions made by village councils.

Anishinaabewaki inter-village and international diplomatic concerns and other village matters were deliberated in councils that considered all viewpoints during lengthy discussions before reaching consensus regarding a given issue. The leading women and men of a village voiced their positions during council discussions as well as during informal meetings on matters of war and peace, adoption of captives taken in war, treaty-making, usufructory rights, trade relations with other polities, and other issues relevant to community life. Persuasion, not coercion guided council decisions; furthermore, consensus among leaders depended upon the consensus of the wider community.[4] Honoring multiple viewpoints took time, and the process adhered to few deadlines. The viewpoints expressed during such village wide discourse can also be seen as separate strands of thought interwoven. Acknowledgment of the importance of each voice and the derived consensus demonstrated the entanglements that arose due to council protocols.

When Euro-American fur traders and American missionaries and military officials wanted to build in native communities, they needed first to receive council permission and then present it with annual gifts. These gifts maintained fictive kinships -- the basis for alliances,

[4] Charles E. Cleland, *Rites of Conquest*, 60.

without which animosity and conflict would result.[5] Without gift-giving there would be no kinship; without kinship diplomatic relations would not be possible. Acceptance of a gift signaled agreement with the gift-giver's political terms and served as a record of them; rejection of the gift signaled rejection of the terms.[6] The fictive kinships thus established also served to broaden entanglement cross-culturally. Moreover, the Anishinaabeg defined two groups, the inawemaagan and meyaagzid, the insider and outsider, kin and non-kin, though the extension of either fictive or blood kinship ties remained paramount.[7] Kinship, as the preferred means for establishing alliances, institutionalized entanglement, which in turn combined spiritual, social, and economic elements.

Before the advent of Euro-American interests in Anishinibeewaki, French fur traders learned that by integrating themselves into long-established kinship networks through both gift giving and marriage they could enter into the kind of binding business relationships analogous to their familiar world of written contracts that stated legally-binding trade agreements between parties.[8] Kinship ties with fur traders provided the Anishinaabeg with access to French manidoog -- power -- as manifested in the iron tools and the firearms of European manufacture exchanged for beaver peltry that the Anishinaabeg hunted. But the diplomatic protocol that made the fur trade possible in the first place remained rooted in the Anishinaabeg practice of gift giving, which included marriage that exogamously extended families outward when daughters became wives of other groups, effectively becoming "precious gifts given from one family, band, or clan

[5] Cary Miller, *Ogimaag: Anishinaabeg Leadership, 1760-1845* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2010), 183.
[6] Ibid., 32-33.
[7] Michael Witgen, *An Infinity of Nations: How the Native New World Shaped Early North America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), 122.
[8] Bruce M. White, "'Give us a Little Milk,' 119.

to another," and provided a "conduit for cooperation between social groups."[9]

Such marriages constituted another example of cross-cultural entanglement. Indeed, profoundly so because the offspring of these unions had roots in both Native and non-Native worlds. The offspring embodied a multi-level entanglement that led to degrees of bilingualism and included differing religious beliefs and divergent cultural practices. They lived between worlds, and they were to one degree or another torn between these worlds but at the same time perhaps found multiple means for reconciling differences between them. What could be termed entanglement by blood grew only more complex with each succeeding generation. Offspring of initial cross-cultural marriages themselves perhaps married across cultural lines. Such lines may even have grown less distinct with each succeeding generation.

Alliances between the French and the Anishinaabeg were established on what has been called "a middle ground" that "merged the French politics of empire with the kinship politics of the village."[10] Tension between the French concept of the father as a coercive authority figure over his children and the Anishinaabeg understanding of the father as one who bears a noncoercive obligation for the welfare of his children marked the fictive kinship based alliances. Alliances depended on "creative misunderstandings" a hybrid of practices, rituals, and beliefs neither distinctly French nor distinctly Anishinaabeg. Both groups forged alliances maintained through gift giving.[11]

The theory of the middle ground provides a means for broaching the issue of political entanglement between the French and the Anishinaabeg. In an alliance cemented through kinship, the hybrid understandings -- or *mis*understandings -- between the two groups were at the

[9] Charles E. Cleland, *Rites of Conquest*, 57-58.
[10] Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 36-37.
[11] Ibid., xiii.

core of an evolving political relationship. However analogous to the blood entanglement discussed above, political entanglements effectively involved local, national, and international issues. They did not generally touch on the personal terrains of individuals bonded by marriage. Yet this matter of scale perhaps only underscores the growing complexity of entanglement between Native and non-Native peoples. Over the years both groups would navigate intertwining political and personal worlds in increasing proximities to each other. Indeed, as will be seen later in this chapter, the characteristics of these worlds changed significantly in the transition from the imperial colonialism typical of the French to the settler colonialism of the Euro-Americans.

Nindoodemag and Diplomatic and Cultural Entanglements

The central aim of Native American diplomacy consisted of negotiations for alliances. The foundation of alliances stood on dual pillars -- the determination to extend fictive kinship networks and the desire to enhance the solidarity of clan membership. Heidi Bohaker employs linguistic evidence and oral history to support her argument concerning the deep antiquity of kinship networks and clan identities in the Algonquian worldview. Indeed, her linguistic evidence points to a Proto-Algonquian origin of the term *nindoodemag,* or kinship networks. She also traces the significance of iconographic signatures affixed to the 1701 Montreal peace treaty, itself a product of decade long diplomatic negotiations between the Haudenosaunee and the French and their multiple Indian allies.

"An amalgam of European and Native American diplomatic protocols"[12] preceded the signing ceremony for several weeks. In addition to French signatures, treaty documents contain

[12] Heidi Bohaker, "*Nindoodemag*: The Significance of Algonquian Kinship Networks in the Eastern Great Lakes Region, 1600 – 1701," *William and Mary Quarterly* 63 no. 1 (January, 2006): 23.

nearly forty pictographic signatures of Indian diplomats, though names of only twenty-five Indian polities appear in the document's language. Noncorrespondence between the number of polities and the number of signatures "foregrounds the challenge of understanding Native American collective identities."[13] Twenty images bear similarity to those appearing on late-eighteenth- and nineteenth-century treaties concerning the Ojibwe, Odawa and Potawatomi that, as Bohaker argues, represent *nindoodemag*, or kinship networks, of Anishinaabe signatories.[14]

The treaty itself, as true for treaties in general between Indians and Whites, entangled both worlds, as demonstrated in the previous chapter. And following Bohaker's argument concerning the 1701 treaty, Native signatories expressed collective identities rooted in kinship. Affixed to the same document, French signatories represented the interests of the French empire. Two types of identities met in the document. And that document, however much a legal vehicle of European origin, entangled the interests of the French empire with those of the Indian diplomats who represented their own kinship based polities.

Moreover, the historical context of the treaty involved an entanglement of power differentials. Fundamentally, imperial illusions of French maps never matched the reality of Native dominance on the ground. Indeed, the demographic insignificance of the French presence in North America compared to the Indigenous populations with whom they traded indicates a central weakness in French imperial ambitions. However much the empire's maps boasted the broad geographic swath termed New France, Indians had lived on the continent for millennia. Therefore, the Native geographic knowledge base ran both deep and wide.[15] Without Native guides, the French may never have made even their relatively meager inroads. As characterized

[13] Ibid., 24.
[14] Ibid., 25.
[15] Michael Witgen, *An Infinity of Nations*, 27 – 28.

by one scholar, a 1669 French map of North America remained "blank space revealing both the fantasy and the reality of empire."[16] French political and economic influence dropped off precipitously beyond Montreal. Furthermore, as noted by Mark Warhus, "The maps Native Americans made for Europeans before and during the French and Indian War portray the conflict from their perspective, [and] Native American scouts and geographic information were essential for both the British and French military campaigns."[17] Regardless of future power shifts, particularly with the ascendance of the United States and the machinery of its settler colonialism, Native Americans retained the upper hand on much of the continent during the centuries of the European imperial colonial era.

Regarding French attempts to understand the Native world, in the mid to late seventeenth century, French missionaries and traders recorded oral traditions concerning *nindoodemag*. For example, Nicolas Perrot's *Mémoire sur les moeurs, coustumes et relligion des sauvages de l'Amérique septentrionale* attempted to explain its basis in the connections made between an individual and an other-than-human progenitor. But further complicating this relationship, as explained by Bohaker, *Nindoodem* transcends physical realms: "The Great Lakes region is a political space that accommodated and still accommodates a more inclusive category of personhood."[18]

Based on evidence drawn from observations of cyclical migrations across the land, kinship networks also entail relationships between geographic space and collective identity. These "politically negotiated movements"[19] involved the understanding that existed between different groups of Anishinaabe peoples that usufructory rights were mediated by kinship

[16] Ibid., 117.
[17] Mark Warhus, *Another America*, 100.
[18] Heidi Bohaker, "*Nindoodemag*," 37.

[19] Ibid., 43.

networks. However, collective identities did not depend on possession, occupation, or geographic boundaries; "but in shared descent from other-than-human progenitors, in spiritual practices, and in origin stories."[20] *Aadizookaanag*, or the grandfathers, consisted of stories that explained how all beings originated and how each being stood in relationship to one another.

This collective sense often stood at odds to European worldviews. Indeed, French organization of indigenous populations into distinct nations attempted to politically reify them. The French failed to recognize that annual patterns of relocation followed carefully negotiated routes based on environmental concerns, trade, and the expansion of kinship networks through intermarriage with geographically distant peoples.[21] Kinship expansion equaled the expansion and renewal of alliances negotiated between culturally and politically distinct neighbors. The diplomatic entanglements of kinship dominated the political landscape on which the Indians and the French met. But to certain degree, the French attempt to define Native peoples as members of nations at least foreshadowed a time when the Indians would themselves adopt national identities. As will be seen, these evolved as hybrid identities that retained tribal political structures, which in turn depended on kinship.

Kinship networks held together through gift exchange assured the health of regional and trans-regional political relationships. Gift exchange established a need-based relationship in which "the social obligation to assist was more important than equalizing the assistance given."[22] But the diplomatic nature of gift-exchange did not translate well in Anishinaabeg relations with Europeans and Euro-Americans whose cultures prized both economic and social self-support. This individualism, which often attached an economic value to goods and services exchanged

[20] Ibid., 45.
[21] Ibid, 47.
[22] Cary Miller, "Gifts as Treaties: The Political Use of Received Gifts in Anishinaabeg Communities, 1820-1832," *American Indian Quarterly* 26 (2002), 223.

between parties, did not recognize gift exchange as an act of diplomacy, rather it viewed the act generally through an economic lens.

Dependence meant weakness in the Eurocentric value system, so the mutual obligation of gift exchange expected by the Anishinaabeg, to whom dependence meant strength, did not register. To the Anishinaabeg, independence signified hostility, an unwillingness to enter into an alliance, into a fictive kinship. The resulting diplomatic failure contributed to growing tensions between Euro-Americans and the Anishinaabeg. Indeed, American officials (mistakenly) blamed their French and British predecessors for using gifts as bribes to coerce Indians into alliances.[23]

Kinship networks eventually controlled much of the Great Lakes fur trade, an evolution with a strong Catholic component as many Native women converted to their husband's faith, thus providing a means for the further extension of familial bonds when these marriage partners served as godparents to the children of others in the trade. Because both Catholic and Indigenous kinship networks operated simultaneously, Native wives of fur traders retained significant authority as mediators during the exchanges of fur for trade goods.[24] The Catholic component constituted another stratum of entanglement that informed Native identities in the Great Lakes Region. The legacy of Jesuit inroads, Catholicism, however, did not replace Indigenous religious beliefs but tended to serve as an adjunct to them.

Official fur trade policies for Native/non-Native unions navigated what other colonial authorities regarded problematic in marriage *à la façon du pays* between women from Ojibwe, Cree, Chinook, and other nations and traders who worked for the Hudson's Bay Company and the Northwest Company. Within French fur trade society, such unions remained unsanctioned by

[23] Ibid., 228-232.
[24] Susan Sleeper-Smith, *Indian Women and French Men*: *Rethinking Cultural Encounter in the Western Great Lakes* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001), 9.

the Church, so Jesuits condemned them. But both companies either overtly or covertly gave their blessings to these marital ties made "after the custom of the country" for reasons directly related to the fur industry's financial well-being.[25] The fruits of economic entanglement effectively cancelled out qualms registered by moral authorities regarding entanglement by blood.

The establishment of a distinctive Métis population in the western Great Lakes fur trade communities of Michilimackinac and Green Bay, among others, served as a particularly significant example of entanglement by blood. Indeed, these descendants of French traders and Native women exemplified "the malleable boundaries that characterized colonial society." The Métis also wielded a degree of economic power that may have leveraged bids made by some nineteenth-century Indian communities to avoid removal, as their agraraianism assisted in their "construction of whiteness [and] facilitated indigenous persistence over Native lands in the western Great Lakes."[26] On the other hand, some Métis opposed mid-nineteenth-century Ojibwe leaders whose agrarian plans appeared to threaten their fur trade livelihoods. These Métis argued that settled farms would limit habitat for fur-bearing animals, and traders also feared the decrease in the number of Ojibwe whose agricultural pursuits left them with little or no time for trapping.

Métis ethnic identity and political stature both came under attack by American settlers who began to populate the region. By the 1850's, the destruction of their familiar economic order based on the fur trade left the Métis impoverished and largely marginalized by both Ojibwe and American societies.[27] A few decades earlier, the Métis community at Mackinac faced Americanization following the War of 1812, and through the 1830s generally managed to make

---

[25] Sylvia Van Kirk, *Many Tender Ties: Women in Fur Trade Society, 1670-1870* (Winnipeg: Watson Dwyer, 2011), 14-15.
[26] Susan Sleeper-Smith, *Indian Women and French Men*, 8-9.
[27] Rebecca Kugel, *To be the Main Leaders of Our People: A History of Minnesota Ojibwe Politics, 1825-1898* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1998), 112-113.

adaptations but to retain their customs when possible, thereby "perpetuating the middle ground." Indeed, by reaffirming their Roman Catholicism, the Métis asserted a central component of their identity, one that provided a firm foundation as their society adapted to changes at Mackinac.[28] The variety of historical trajectories experienced by the Métis illustrates the contingencies of entanglement by blood, which must be further contextualized by the interplays of political, economic, and diplomatic entanglements.

A further illustration of these multi-layered entanglements concerns the roles common to women who married fur traders. Because of their knowledge base in the language, culture, and landscape of Anishinaabewaki, women served in valuable political positions as diplomats for their fur trade husbands. The economic and political role of Ojibwe women indicates that the fur trade functioned with a complexity far greater than a simple male-centered exchange of goods for furs. Furthermore, mixed-heritage children extended European/Ojibwe community ties, thus creating likely alliances that culturally fused two otherwise disparate identities and concepts of family.[29] The children of Ojibwe women and fur traders generally recognized their mother's kin and retained aspects of Ojibwe culture, yet clan descent being patrilineal, and since Europeans did not have clans, these children remained outside the Ojibwe clan system. At the same time, their fluency with Ojibwe, French and/or English meant that as intercultural brokers they played a valuable diplomatic role in Anishinaabewaki.[30]

---

[28] Keith W. Widder, *Battle for the Soul: Métis Children Encounter Evangelical Protestants at Mackinaw Mission, 1823-1837* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1999), 47-61.
[29] Brenda Child, *Holding our Worlds Together: Ojibwe Women and the Survival of Community* (New York: Viking, 2012), 39-47; Laura Peers and Jennifer S.H. Brown, "'There is no End to Relationship among the Indians': Ojibwe Families and Kinship in Historical Perspective," 14 https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:4b813385-c7c8-49d0-a6f0-facdd0b9deba
[30] Laura Peers and Jennifer S.H. Brown, "'There is no End,' 15-16.

As Euro-American settler colonialism encroached on the Old Northwest the role of Ojibwe women as cultural brokers began to disintegrate, as it did, for example, with the onset of the lead rush in the early 1820s. Until then, mines had been in Indigenous hands for at least four thousand years. But as thousands of Americans flooded the region and seized most of the mines -- traditionally worked by women -- lead mining community culture deteriorated. The dearth of relationships -- especially marital relationships -- between Indian women and American men meant that the diplomatic role of women as cultural brokers could not easily take root, as it did among the French. Thus language barriers prevailed between Americans and Indians, and respect for economic spheres traditionally controlled by women failed to materialize. Though miners tended to be itinerants and not settlers, the license they took with the region's Indian peoples and their resources speaks to the larger pattern of encroachment.[31]

A July 1829 meeting between Federal officials and Winnebago representatives provides one example that illustrates the clash between settler colonial interests and Native interests. Serving the interests of the lead mining industry, the government demanded Winnebago land cessions for mine development, but Winnebago leader Huwanjkga (The Little Elk) denounced the demand. He enumerated the waves of encounters between his people and European colonials, then he declared angrily that only the Americans hungered for the land itself.

> The first white man we knew, was a Frenchman [. . .], he painted himself, he smoked his pipe with us, sung and danced with us and married one of our [women], but he wanted to buy no land of us! The "Redcoat" came next, he gave us fine coats, knives and guns and traps, blankets and jewels: he seated our chiefs and warriors at his table [. . .], but never asked us to sell our country to him! Next came the "Blue Coat," and no sooner had he

[31] Lucy Eldersveld Murphy, "To Live Among us: Accommodation, Gender, and Conflict in the Western Great Lakes Region, 1760-1832." *Contact Points: American Frontiers from the Mohawk Valley to the Mississippi, 1750-1830*, edited by Andrew R.L. Cayton and Fredrika J. Teute (Chapel Hill; University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 270-303.

> seen a small portion of our country, than he [. . .] wished us to sell it all to him. [. . .] Why do you wish to add our small country to yours, already so large? When I went to Washington, to see our great father, I saw great houses all along the road, and Washington and Baltimore, Philadelphia and New York are great and splendid cities. [. .] You ask us to sell all our country, and wander off into the boundless regions of the West. We do not know that country, and the deer, the elk, the beaver, the buffalo and the otter now there, belong not to us, and we have no right to kill them. Our wives and our children now seated behind us, are dear to us, and so is our country, where rest in peace the bones of our ancestors. Fathers! Pity a people, few in number, who are poor and helpless. [. .] Do you want our wigwams? You live in palaces. Do you want our horses? Your's are larger and better than our's. [What] can be your motive?[32]

The French attempted to meet the Indians on their own terms. These European visitors valued the cultures with which they dealt and recognized the importance of integrating themselves into them, of forming kinship based alliances through marriage. What they did not desire was the land itself. The British brought trade goods, and they treated the Indians with respect. They too, like the French, did not seek to buy Indian country itself. Finally, in comparison with their French and English predecessors, the Americans are described by Huwanjkga through an impassioned litany of the crimes he feels they committed against his people. The Americans were both alien and alienating. The litany is driven by the question, "why do you wish to add our small country to yours, already so large?" This fundamental absurdity appears to defy any basis in Anishinaabeg rationality. Furthermore, the designs that the Americans have for the Native Peoples themselves lack any understanding of Native historical, cultural, and spiritual attachment to the land itself. Huwanjkga rejects the idea that Indians could simply exchange one piece of land for another, and could travel far away and somehow resume their lives in a region that was already home to other Indians. By turning the tables on his White audience, he underscores the hypocrisy in its hunger for land. Why do want our wigwams if you

[32] Quoted in Caleb Atwater, *Remarks Made on a Tour to Prairie du Chien; Thence to Washington City, in 1829* (Columbus: Isaac N. Whiting, 1831), 121-122.

live in palaces? Why do you want our horses, you who already possess far better horses? Reiterating the absurdity that Huwanjkga sees in the entire American project, he demands to know what kind of worldview drives such hunger for possession. He attempts to appeal to the American conscience, perhaps by appealing to his audience's better angels. How that particular audience itself reacted went unrecorded. However, the larger arc of settler colonialism generally appeared to justify the program of westward expansion. That justification occurred on a number of levels, and it only gained momentum as U.S. Indian policy focused increasingly on serving settler interests.

Such interests effectively served to reverse the history of French and English cultural and political entanglements, those of blood and diplomacy as explored thus far. In other words, White Americans attempted to disentangle themselves from Native Americans. However, as will be seen below and in succeeding chapters, this disentanglement often resulted in ironic outcomes on many levels in American society.

The 1787 Northwest Ordinance and Settler Colonialism

Beginning with the earliest days of the Republic, Indian policy commonly served the interests of settler colonialism at the expense of Native American sovereignty. Though settlers chafed against federal interference, they also relied on federal machinery -- its laws and it military force -- to defend their claimed land against Indians and for Indian removal. Yet this machinery took time to construct. The 1787 Northwest Ordinance, initially launched piecemeal with little federal or territorial coordination, did usher in the "treaty polity" that ostensibly legalized the transfer of Indian land into federal hands. However, following the War of 1812, "a new national confidence redoubled Antebellum American's postcolonial expectations, and it

bolstered the central government's conviction of its authority over Indian nations."[33] The period of years between the 1787 Ordinance and the War of 1812 set the stage for disentanglement by policy, the chief feature of which was an increasingly aggressive Indian removal.

Settler colonialism is marked by ownership of land and the creation of new societies upon it, yet settler colonialism in American history has not operated as such a monolithic force that it precludes Native American resistance.[34] Indeed, the pan-Indian movement arose in opposition to settler colonialism. But the movement was often undermined by Anglo-Americans who fostered ethnic and regional rivalries among Indians. One scholar sees the pan-Indian movement as an expression of nativism, which sought "native-directed solutions, based primarily upon a cosmology composed by Native Americans, to the problems of European, and more particularly Anglo-American, ambition."[35] Moreover, the transformation of Indian country into titled ownership by White Americans relied not only on the complex process of legal, economic, and cultural justifications for disentanglement on institutional levels. This process also took place on the ground in sometimes peaceful and sometimes violent personal interactions between Indians and Whites on a daily basis.

The transition from imperial colonialism to settler colonialism marked the transition from a kinship economy based on reciprocity to a market economy based on title. Kinship relationships served little purpose in this new regime, though treaty language sometimes retained a nominal kinship vocabulary. Moreover, the notion of the Great White Father speaks to the paternalism of United States Indian policy. Dissimilar to the "creative misunderstanding" of the

---

[33] Bethel Saler, *The Settlers' Empire: Colonialism and State Formation in America's Old Northwest* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015), 4.
[34] John P. Bowes, *Land too Good for Indians: Northern Indian Removal* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2016), 12.
[35] Gregory Evans Dowd, *A Spirited Resistance: The North American Indian Struggle for Unity, 1745-1815* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), xxii.

father in the theory of the middle ground, the Great White Father tended to be an instrument of Indian removal. And in part, the trade instrumentality central to the father of the middle ground appeared motived to drive Indians off land by driving them into debt.

Settler colonialism could not unmake the entanglements by blood across many generations that bonded Native and White lives together. However, as Saler further argues, "a central part of the transformation of a trading economy into one based on private property was the replacement of kinship with the American national state -- the political instrument of an abstracted American 'people'-- as the governing agent."[36] For example, the 1796 Trade and Intercourse Act that established the factory system aimed to change local trade from a reciprocity economy to a more depersonalized exchange. "Ideally, prices were to be fixed according to a monetary standard; gift-giving or establishing personal relations had no part in the factors' instructions."[37]

In part, the first Trade and Intercourse Acts strove to slow the supposed extinction of Native Americans by protecting them from unscrupulous White traders, essentially an act of paternalism that saw Indians as children unable to look after their own interests. American fur companies regarded the Acts as hindrances to their trade with Indians, arguing that Congress' ban on the sale of liquor to Indians permitted an unfair advantage to less scrupulous traders and to British and French rivals operating on U.S. soil. The 1796 act that established the factory system further angered the fur companies. The idealized driving force behind the factory system stemmed from benevolent designs to ensure that Indians could purchase quality goods at reasonable prices.

Long-range national security interests also operated through the factory system. Good

[36] Ibid., 165.
[37] Ibid., 137.

trade relations could help build military alliances in the event of future conflict with the Canadian English. Indeed, the War Department managed trans-Mississippi factories like armies, as "The North American Indian trade wasn't merely a commercial or diplomatic enterprise—it was also war by other means."[38] At the same time, Jefferson reportedly saw the factory system as a beneficial means for drawing Indians into debt with the U.S. government. To pay off the debt, Indians would be forced to cede their land.[39]

The 1787 Northwest Ordinance provided the legal mechanism that arose in response to the demographics of White settlement and paved the way for the ongoing westward migration of newly minted White American citizens. The 1787 Northwest Ordinance built on two previous ordinances. Among other measures, the 1784 Ordinance called for the creation of new states, following a period of political incubation as territories, in the land north of the Ohio River and between the Appalachian Mountains and the Mississippi River--a region acquired from England by the 1783 Treaty of Paris. Moreover, the ordinance granted settlers the right to territorial and state self-government. Central components of the 1785 Ordinance established a land survey system and provided a mechanism for land sales to settlers, following, of course, the federal acquisition of the land itself by treaties with Indian peoples. Finally, the 1787 Ordinance established a greater degree of federal guidance over western territories than that formerly granted in 1784 by replacing temporary settler-driven self-governments with what amounted to a temporary colonialism of these territories. The ordinances contained not only political blueprints for the uniform admission of new states to the union. In line with leading intellectual lights of the time, they articulated the social and cultural uniformity expected of the Union's new republican

[38] David Andrew Nichols, *Engines of Diplomacy: Indian Trading Factories and the Negotiation of American Empire* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016), 68.
[39] Ibid., 92.

citizens. Above all else, the virtuous citizen must, following the classical republican model, place the common good above self-interest: moreover, the vision of gendered agrarian households migrating westward in civil harmony remained foremost in the minds of the nation's planners.[40]

However, conditions on the ground in the Old Northwest militated against notions of social, cultural, and political uniformity. Two hundred years of French and, later, British inroads, and above all else, thousands of years of Native American presence in the region made for a multicultural polyglot geopolitical reality unaccounted for in distant Philadelphia where the nascent republic's congress chartered its domestic colonial empire according to rational Enlightenment ideals. Adding further complexity to the Northwest, early American settlers there hardly conformed to the notion of placing national interests above their own struggle for survival and hopes for prosperity. The transformation into states controlled by White Americans, and the necessary orchestration of an interdependent relationship between states and the federal government, therefore required significant social, economic, and political engineering. But before any headway in that direction could be made, Indians must first be cleared from the land.

The advent of settler colonialism marked another shift in power differentials between Native Americans and Euro-Americans. As discussed above, Native Americans continued to maintain a significant -- even overwhelming -- demographic edge over colonizing powers for hundreds of years following the initial point of European contact. This translated into long-standing and advantageous positions of Native political and economic power. However, the rise of Young America and its rapidly expanding White population base began to tip the scales of power.[41] Euro-American demographic superiority over Native Americans reconfigured power

[40] Bethel Saler, *The Settlers' Empire*, 20-22.
[41] Colin G. Calloway, *The Victory With No Name: The Native American Defeat of the First American Army* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 30.

differentials, and this led to a growing existential threat to Native Peoples, and to an escalation of Native resistance to White encroachment.

Native Resistance and Origins of Native National Identities

Native Americans in the western Great Lakes grappled with settler colonialism as a new historical condition. To survive it required innovative political solutions. Also, to a certain degree throughout the region east of the Mississippi, Native identities cohered around the challenges arising from White encroachment. Here too may be traced some of the early ideas out of which evolved increasingly complex Native nationhoods. Usually hybrid constructions, Native nations would tend to combine Indigenous social, economic, and political structures -- kinship, communal land ownership, and consensus driven tribal councils -- with republican innovations that included elections, term limits, and written constitutions. Local and regional contingencies invariably informed unique features of specific Native nations. The examples below, along with those of the following chapter and in this book's final chapter, will attempt to give some sense of the variety of forms taken by tribes as each added national identity to an existing tribal identity. Growing alarm over White encroachment may provide at least one point of departure out of which Native national identities evolved.

In the years following the Revolutionary War, a cooperative network of resistance against White trans-Appalachian settlers drew Native Peoples together across great distances, giving common cause in a line stretching from the southeastern Creeks to the Great Lakes Ojibwes. This network fit within a larger historical context of pan-Indian movements that originated in the mid-eighteenth century during a "Great Awakening" led by charismatic Indian prophets. Though united in their desire to rid their world of White people, some prophets adhered to passive

measures while others demanded militant approaches.[42]

From the Revolutionary War years through the 1794 Battle of Fallen Timbers, militant nativists in the Northwest sometimes received ammunition and other goods from the British, augmenting their resolve to prevent trans-Appalachian American settlement. In October 1790, Shawnee warriors under Blue Jacket, Miami warriors under Little Turtle, along with support from the Delawares, Potawatatomis, Chippewas, and Ottawas, forced Josiah Harmar's troops into retreat. On the Wabash River in 1791, American forces suffered their greatest defeat by Native forces in history, with Arthur St. Clair, first governor of the Northwest Territory, losing nearly half of his 1,400 men in a single battle against a combined force of warriors drawn from at least nine Northwest Indian tribes. Elsewhere, a Creek, Cherokee, and Shawnee alliance prevailed against Americans in the Cumberland region.[43]

On October 7, 1792, The Shawnee leader Painted Pole spoke to a council leaders from over a dozen tribes that met at the Glaize, near present-day Defiance, Ohio. He attributed recent victories against the Americans "to the Great Spirit who governs all things and who looks on us with much or perhaps more compassion than those of the fairer complexion."[44] Painted Pole's message attracted military cooperation as well as the exchange of religious ideas and the recognition of cultural common grounds between Indian peoples throughout the trans-Appalachian region.[45]

Against the resolve of united Native forces, the United States government stood little chance for negotiating land cessions from Indian nations in the Northwest. Also troubling,

---

[42] Gregory Dowd, *A Spirited Resistance: The North American Indian Struggle for Unity, 1745-1815* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), 59-60.
[43] Ibid., 106.
[44] Painted Pole. Quoted in ibid., 105.
[45] Ibid., 109.

British/Indian alliances -- actual or perceived -- continued to haunt American settlement projects. What happened at Fort Miami during the 1794 Battle of Fallen Timbers dealt a significant blow to such alliances and meant a setback to ongoing Native militancy against White settlers. Defeated on the field, Native forces fled to the British for aid at Fort Miami, but the British refused to open the fort gates to them. In the following months, the Americans solidified their victory by establishing posts from Cincinnati to Fort Wayne.[46]

The 1795 Treaty of Greenville that resulted from Wayne's success at Fallen Timbers marked the end of two decades of militant nativist cooperation. (Also, in 1795, Jay's Treaty resulted in British flight to Ontario, further severing their support for Northwest Indians. The treaty required English surrender of several pre-revolutionary forts on the Great Lakes to the United States; however, British and French traders could remain at the forts and operate on American soil.) Not only did the Treaty of Greenville's signatories agree to the cession of most of present day Ohio, it instituted the annuity system, and instead of cash payments, leaders could opt for annuities in the form of agricultural tools and supplies, an option that White authorities believed instrumental in the "civilizing" mission to transform Indians into yeoman farmers. Overall, as Dowd characterizes, "The annuities gave the Americans a permanent lever within a tribal power structure formalized in concurrence with federal agents."[47]

The 1768 Treaty of Fort Stanwix served as a colonial template for securing land cessions from Indians that would be repeated by the United States until the end of the treaty era in 1871. As addressed n the previous chapter, Indian signatories of the 1768 treaty received twenty boatloads of goods and £10,000 for several million acres of Ohio land in the largest land cession

[46] Ibid., 113

[47] Ibid., 114.

in American colonial history.[48] Competing claims by tribes not represented in the treaty negotiations led to decades of inter-tribal warfare throughout the Ohio River valley. At the same time, militant Native resistance to White settlers remained ongoing. The newly formed United States inherited this volatile situation as it sought entitlement to formerly held British claims. Indeed, in the 1784 Treaty of Fort Stanwix federal authorities promised to protect the Oneidas and Tuscaroras because they had supported the Americans revolutionaries during the war. However, the fledgling federal government possessed little authority. Powerful interests in the state of New York led by Governor Clinton bought a large tract of land from the Oneidas through the 1785 Treaty of Fort Herkimer, and subsequent land deals took Onondaga, Cayuga, and Seneca land, though Indian signatories had understood that they were merely leasing their land, not selling it.[49] Similar power struggles between land companies and state and federal authorities (though private land interests commonly prevailed among these authorities) would inform the Marshall Court's findings regarding the authority of the Federal government over Indian land cessions.

Early attempts to stipulate that only the U.S. government could deal with transactions with Indians were stated in the Trade and Intercourse laws. The 1790 Indian Trade and Intercourse Act banned states from purchasing Indian land; however, the 1793 Act allowed states to buy Indian land under federal supervision. Both the 1796 and 1802 Acts called for the distribution of agricultural supplies to Indians with the aim of "civilizing" them.[50] But overall, as Francis Paul Prucha argues, "The laws were not primarily 'Indian' laws, for they touched the

[48] Colin G. Calloway, *Pen and Ink Witchcraft: Treaties and Treaty Making in American Indian History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 49.
[49] Ibid., 100-101.
[50] David Andrew Nichols, *Red Gentlemen and White Savages: Indians, Federalists, and the Search for Order on the American Frontier* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008), 123, 182, 160, 193.

Indians only indirectly. The legislation, rather, was directed against lawless whites and sought to restrain them from violating the sacred treaties."[51]

A further complication requiring resolve by the Supreme Court involved settler encroachment on Indian lands that often led to conflicting claims. Such claims also informed the sanctity of borders, and the need to enhance existing border controls, in Native national identities. The issue of border control arose in *Johnson v. McIntosh* (1823), which addressed the case of two claimants to the same land. Johnson received title to a parcel of land from the Piankeshaw, and McIntosh claimed the same parcel through a patent that he received from the government. The court upheld McIntosh's claim. This meant that Indians could sell land only to the federal government, not to states or individuals. Prucha argues that early-nineteenth-century U.S. policy assumed that White settlement would continually advance while Indians simultaneously withdrew westward. Moreover, the government hoped to maintain this process in an orderly fashion, further hoping to preserve good relations with Indians so that they would continue to cede land, while adhering to the ultimate aim of "civilizing" Indians so that they would assimilate into White society. But the government usually did not remove illegal settlers on Indian land and more often sided with settler interests by seeking further cessions from Indians through treaties, thus rewarding and perpetuating White encroachment.[52]

Chief Justice John Marshall's interpretation of the doctrine of discovery guided a series of decisions -- the Marshall trilogy -- that profoundly influenced the federal government's legal relationship, especially as expressed in its treaty relationships, with Indian peoples throughout the United States. The doctrine of discovery, as Marshall noted, belonged originally to European

[51] Francis Paul Prucha, *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986), 32.
[52] Ibid., 47.

states that "discovered" lands across the Atlantic. According to their own legal traditions, such discovery automatically granted to Europeans a title to those lands, a title superior to that of Indigenous populations. Having defeated Great Britain in the Revolutionary War, the United States inherited that nation's rights of discovery. However, as understood by both Great Britain and the United States, the doctrine did not entail their absolute sovereign authority over the land, as both nations believed that Indians *did* retain a type of ownership of the soil, however different it may be to a fee-simple title that could be transferred through sale. Accordingly, the United States gained title then only to the land that Great Britain had already purchased from Indians. Marshall creatively built on a legal understanding of the conditional rights to the land that were retained by Indians and how such rights could be transferred to the U.S. government.[53]

The War of 1812 stood as a watershed in United States Indian policy. During the war, Indians belonged to one of three categories-- pro-British, pro-American, or neutral. After the war, the federal government abandoned cis-Mississippi Indian assimilation efforts and transitioned fully to a policy of Indian removal, though assimilation efforts would re-emerge following the Civil War.[54] Moreover, the removal experience for Native Americans preceded the 1830 Indian Removal Act and continued throughout the nineteenth century.[55] One scholar says that this calls for a reconfiguration of Indian removal history in order to recognize "the pure relentless power of the removal and dispossession that framed the lives of Indian men and women," and move removal stories from the periphery to the center of our histories of White

[53] David E. Wilkins and K. Tsianina Lomawaima, *Uneven Ground: American Indian Sovereignty and Federal Law* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2002), 55.
[54] Reginald Horsman, *Expansion and American Indian Policy, 1783-1812* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992), 170.
[55] John P. Bowes, *Land Too Good for Indians*, 4.

settlement.[56]

The issue of tribal sovereignty stands at the heart of removal, as demonstrated by *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* (1831). Asked whether the Cherokee Nation constituted a foreign state, Marshall said no; rather, he defined it as a "domestic dependent nation," a contradictory political concept that continues to inform the legal relationship between the federal government and Indians. Marshall's 1832 decision in *Worcester v. Georgia* refined the earlier decision and affirmed Cherokee sovereignty. President Jackson ignored the *Worcester v. Georgia* decision and declared that Cherokee removal would commence on May 23, 1838. Thus began the Trail of Tears.

But the Trail of Tears has overshadowed the removal experience of Indian nations in the Old Northwest that underwent removal on a smaller, but no less traumatic, scale, than the Southeastern Indians.[57] Indeed, the Sauk removal resulted in the Black Hawk War, initiated when Black Hawk, a Sauk war captain led approximately one thousand followers across the Mississippi River in 1832 to reoccupy ceded Illinois land. Combined state and federal forces commanded by Brigadier General Henry Atkinson annihilated the Sauk band after four months of combat, even as it attempted to return back across the Mississippi. But the war cannot be explained merely as the effect of a White landgrab. This would not explain why over seven hundred Menominees, Dakotas, Ho Chunks, and Potawatomis forged a pan-Indian alliance with Black Hawk to combat Atkinson's forces.[58] These allied forces had each attempted to navigate a means for avoiding removal, and while some Ho Chunk and Potawatomi bands, for example, joined Black Hawk, others feared federal reprisal. Thus some bands allied with the United States

[56] Ibid., 225.
[57] Ibid., 6.
[58] John W. Hall, *Uncommon Defense: Indian Allies in the Black Hawk War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009), 2.

against Black Hawk. But those who allied with the government did so not as manipulated pawns, but as "architects of an alliance that served their own ends first and always," by fighting against traditional tribal enemies and leveraging economic and political gains from the Americans. [59] Decisions to ally with either Black Hawk or with the Americans always occurred on the local level, so they did not represent "tribal" alliances. But as John W. Hall succinctly states, after the four month long Black Hawk War, "the last chapter of the colonial history of the western Great Lakes gave way to the subsequent narrative of Manifest Destiny."[60]

Northwestern removal history must also take into account the experiences of tribes that successfully resisted removal, as the outcome of the Wisconsin Death March illustrates. The attempted removal of the Wisconsin Ojibwe to the newly created Minnesota Territory that led to the deaths of an estimated 12% of their population resulted only to strengthen the resolve of Wisconsin's Ojibwe bands to resist any further attempted removals. Redix sees the tragedy as an act of ethnic cleansing: "worthy of inclusion in narratives of Minnesota history and American history."[61]

The transition from imperial colonialism practiced by France and England to the settler colonialism of the United States undermined kinship networks as structures for diplomatic relations between Indians and Euro-Americans. Generally, imperial colonialism focused on the extraction of the Great Lake region's fur resources and on the need to maintain working relationships based on kinship with Indians who supplied the fur. In settler colonialism, the land itself constituted the resource; access to it required the displacement of its Indigenous

[59] Ibid., 10-11.
[60] Ibid., 10-11.

[61] Erik M. Redix, The *Murder of Joe White: Ojibwe Leadership and Colonialism in Wisconsin* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2014), 55.

inhabitants. Under these conditions, the maintenance of kinship networks between Americans and Indians retained little purpose. In the interests of settler-driven westward expansion, the government signed treaties with Indians to gain title to their land; subsequent Indian removals benefitted settler colonial efforts, as did the institution of federal Indian policy that often focused both on removal and on restricting access of Indians to their own titled land ownership.

Indian peoples in the Old Northwest actively engaged in organized resistance against White settlement. Contingencies of the region's history help to contextualize the complex relationships between Indians and Whites. The dynamic interplay of local, regional, and national events during the antebellum era of the Old Northwest militates against a victim/victor polarity and calls for a narrative that identifies shifting powers between groups, and the story of these power shifts is never over.

Chapter 3

A Crossroads of Identities:
Lafayette's 1824-1825 Visit to the United States

Wherever the Marquis de Lafayette appeared during his year-long tour of the United States, he often did so before adoring audiences that ranged from mere handfuls to many thousands. Word of this widely paraded figure spread enthusiastically throughout the nation's twenty-four states, each of which he visited. His presence provided a focus for Euro-Americans to celebrate the sanctity of their national identity as forged in the Revolutionary War. His travels also brought him into contact with a number of Native Americans who had served under his command in the war. They too revered him as a leader primarily because he treated Native warriors as having a stake equal to that of the Americans in the fight to secure independence from Britain. However, as Lafayette became reacquainted with some of his old Indian friends, he learned that their service in the revolution appeared forgotten as they grappled with the federal government's increasingly aggressive Indian removal policy.

Lafayette had returned to a trans-Atlantic world much changed since his years as a general in the Continental Army. Political and cultural identities among both Euro-Americans and Native Americans were marked by vulnerability and insecurity, though for different reasons. For both groups, however, the forging of post-war identities entailed ideas of nationhood that shared some common ground, but at the same time differed dramatically. And Native Americans who began to incorporate national identities into existing tribal identities simultaneously contended with the growing resolve of Young America to deny their quest for sovereignty over their own land and to violently remove them from it. Lafayette's year-long journey provides a

vantage point from which to view rising antagonisms between Native Americans and Euro-Americans in the early national period, a view best seen through a world historical lens, especially because of the trans-Atlantic connections made possible through him.

Beneath the surface of Euro-America's enthusiasm for Lafayette's return lurked certain fears. Would he see a revolution betrayed?[1] For them, Lafayette emerged from out of an increasingly idealized past. As Fred Somkin argues, the idealization sometimes reached such shrill levels it seemed more as a refuge from an uncertain future than as the result of honoring a national hero. Because he reappeared during the political and economic shift from the age of the founders to the age of steam, "a disturbing feeling was abroad that the American world of the 1820s, with its dedication to a cheerful commercialism, might have parted company somewhere with the shades of the '*ancient worthies*.'"[2] The notion that Americans felt compelled to revere Lafayette suggests a confidence gap between revolutionary ideals and changing economic and political realities as the nation neared its fiftieth anniversary. For example, an editorial in *Niles' Weekly Register* nearly commanded its readers to love Lafayette:

> No one like La Fayette has ever *re-appeared* in any country. To us he is like a venerated father, returned from the grave, to bless and receive the blessings of a mightily increased and joyous posterity. [. . .] It is impossible to doubt the good dispositions of La Fayette's heart—it is impossible to suppose that the people of the United States should not love him, if they love themselves and their country.[3]

Risen phantomlike from out of a fiercely imagined time, Lafayette performed before White audiences that saw in him their individuated dreams of American nationhood. For some,

---

[1] Anne C. Loveland, *Emblem of Liberty: The Image of Lafayette in the American Mind* (Louisiana State University Press: Baton Rouge, 1971), 37.
[2] Fred Somkin, *Unquiet Eagle: Memory and Desire in the Idea of American Freedom, 1815-1860* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967), 169.
[3] *Niles Weekly Register*, No.10. V. 3, November 6, 1824.

founders blurred into gods. But benefitting from the 1783 Treaty of Paris, a progeny of flawed mortals at least inherited sovereignty. Others went unmentioned in that treaty. Nonetheless, they too demanded their own rights of sovereignty, at times invoking the same documents and ideas upon which the United States constructed its nation. Built then on differing foundations of political reality arose Euro-American and Native American concepts of nationhood. This chapter uses Lafayette as a narrative vehicle because his interactions with Indians left documentary evidence regarding the sovereignty they claimed as benefactors of the Revolutionary War in which they fought under the command of Lafayette himself or under other Revolutionary War commanders, and his records lend insight into Native national sovereignty claimed through treaties entered into with British signatories.

Such evidence, along with the laudatory press accounts of his journey, and the voices of statesmen who perhaps praised him as a means for bolstering their visions of a shining America, also raises the question: to what degree was the quest for an American national identity dependent on the momentum of the rhetoric produced by local boosters who introduced him to podiums across the country, by newspapers, and by the speeches of politicians? Similar questions can be asked regarding the formulations of Native national identities. How did the Indian leaders rhetorically manage the rationale for incorporating republican innovations into existing tribal political structures? At the very least, these questions bring to the surface the dependency of political realities upon words. Arguably then, the national identities explored in the present study were talked into being as much as they were forged through the act of a revolutionary war.

Returning to the world history lens through which this chapter peers, Lafayette's visit viewed as a trans-Atlantic travel narrative builds on Patrick Manning's argument that "the world

historian's work is to portray the crossing of boundaries and the linking of systems in the human past."[4] Lafayette's visit placed him in contact with people in nearly every corner of the United States. His experiences with Iroquois, Choctaw, Creek, and Cherokee men and women, with African American slaves, Euro-American laborers, traders, and farmers, as well as with Presidents and congressmen all occurred during a period of rapidly escalating Indian removal policy, of a nation economically dependent on slavery, and of a new era launched by the 1823 Monroe Doctrine.

On his own side of the Atlantic, Lafayette had seen his efforts to steer the French revolution into a constitutional monarchy lead him only to exile, his wife's imprisonment, and the state confiscation of his fortune. When political winds shifted, he briefly recovered, fell prey again to his enemies, and then decided to make one last American visit. Indeed, he had remained forever enamored of Young America, even landscaping his entire French estate with flora and fauna indigenous to the United States.

But French fascination with the United States depended not only on Lafayette. Indeed, the number of scholarly publications immediately preceding his voyage suggest an almost fashionable curiosity with the young republic. The journal, *Nouvelles Annales des voyages de la géographie et de l'histoire* (*New Annals of Travel, Geography, and History*) published four issues a year starting in 1819 and extensively covered the United States; *Résumé sur l'histoirie des Etats-Unis* (*Summary on the History of the United States*) by Charles-Ogé Barbaroux appeared in 1824, with republication in 1826; and Arnold Scheffer's *L'Histoirie des Etate-Unis de L'Amérique septentrionale* (*History of the United States of North America*) appeared in 1825. Thus Lafayette's French biographer Jean-Pierre Bois saw no coincidence in the 1826 publication

[4] Patrick Manning, *Navigating World History* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 3.

of what until then was the most famous French book on the United States, *Voyage en Amérique*, (*Journey to America*) by François-René de Chateaubriand.[5]

One Final Journey to America

In February 1824, Lafayette lost his re-election to the Chamber of Deputies, crushing his liberal efforts to turn France against the Bourbons. Furthermore, his financial support for republican causes throughout Europe to overthrow the Holy Alliance wiped out his once sizable personal fortune. Perhaps another visit to the United States would shift European attention to the example provided by that nation's success story. So he enlisted his son, George Washington Lafayette, (named in honor of Lafayette's wartime friend and first president or the United States) and a liberal ally, Auguste Levasseur, to accompany him across the Atlantic and to send regular reports back to France celebrating America's republican glories that, he hoped, would provide a template for the liberal transformation of not only France but of all Europe.[6] Financing the venture remained thorny until Thomas Jefferson came to Lafayette's aid by prevailing upon President Monroe to convince Congress for an adequate appropriation.[7] Thus granted a township

[5] Jean-Pierre Bois, *La Fayette* (Paris: Perrin, 2015), 344. "Et est ce vraiment un hasard si Chateaubriand lui-meme publie son voyage d'Amérique en 1826?" ("And is it really a coincidence that Chateaubriand himself published his journey to America in 1826?)
[6] Anne C. Loveland, *Emblem of Liberty*, 97-98.

[7] Thomas Jefferson to James Monroe, Feb 5, 1824. *The Thomas Jefferson Papers at the Library of Congress*: Series 1: General Correspondence, 1651-1827, Microfilm reel 54. Jefferson wrote: "I hope Congress is prepared to go thro' with their compliment worthily. That they do not mean to invite him merely to dine. That provision will be made for his expences here, which you know he cannot afford, and that they will not send him back empty handed. This would place us under indelible disgrace in Europe. Some 3 or 4 good townships in Missouri or Louisiana or Alibama &c should be in readiness for him, and may restore his family to the opulence which his virtues have lost to them. I suppose the time of the visit will be left to himself, as the death of Louis

and $200,000[8] -- a portion of which he sent to assist French, Spanish, and Italian political exiles in London[9] -- Lafayette left for America on 25 August 1824. He returned to France on 8 September 1825.

Lafayette's place in the pantheon of revered revolutionary figures rested on three pillars – the military campaigns he led against British forces; his friendship with George Washington; and his diplomatic instrumentality in convincing Louis XVI to throw France's full military and economic support to the American cause, likely assuring its victory over British forces. No friend of republican ideals, Louis XVI desired primarily to inflict pain on his arch nemesis England as payback for his empire's North American loses in the Seven Years' War.

Lafayette's leadership and diplomacy inspired not only Euro-American forces. Early in his campaigns he recruited Oneida warriors into battle against the British, though most Iroquois nations allied against the Americans.[10] In 1784, during his initial post-revolution return to the United States -- and as prelude to events further played out in his 1824 visit -- he hoped his influence might benefit all Iroquois nations whose leaders gathered for the 1784 Treaty of Fort Stanwick.[11] Negotiations for this treaty occurred within a context dramatically different from the

---

XVIII which had probably taken place or soon must do so, will produce a crisis in his own country from which he could not absent himself by a visit."

[8] *Register of Debates in Congress,* 18th Congress 2nd Session, 34, 56.
[9] Lafayette to his daughters, December 24, 1824, Box 26, Folder 20, Dean Lafayette Collection, Division of Rare Manuscript Collections (Cornell University Library: Ithaca, N.Y).
[10] But as Colin G. Calloway advises, "Any overview of Indian dispositions and allegiences is difficult and hazardous. [Most] people fluctuated in their sentiments, and participation in the fighting was often relatively brief." Colin G. Calloway, *The American Revolution in Indian Country: Crisis and Diversity in Native American Communities* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 32.
[11] Referencing an earlier letter, now lost, he noted in his 4 October 1784 letter to his wife, Adrienne de Noailles: "Je vous ai mandé que mon influence pouvoit être utile au traité qui se négocie avec toutes les nations; [. . .] mon crédit personnel sur les sauvages, tant amis qu'ennemis s'est trouvé bien plus grand que je ne l'avois imagine." Trans.: "I wrote you that my

pre-revolutionary 1768 Treaty of Fort Stanwix covered in Chapter 1. Largely discounted by the American officials was the recognition of Iroquois power that British negotiators displayed sixteen years before. Of particular relevance to the current chapter is a speech made by Mohawk chief Karonghyontye regarding Native sovereignty. Relevant too is speech made by Lafayette in which he reminds the Iroquois diplomats that British/Iroquois alliances made during the war complicate their demands for the United States to now recognize Iroquois sovereignty.

Accompanied by James Madison, Lafayette travelled the three hundred miles from New York City to the fort, which he had not seen since the war. The 1784 Treaty of Fort Stanwick provided opening gambits for three powers in the post-revolutionary world. The Iroquois, the State of New York, and the federal government all demanded recognition of their sovereign status. On 11 January 1784, General Schuyler told tribal leaders at Schenectady that the 1783 Treaty of Paris said nothing about Indians; "they are therefore left to settle matters with Congress."[12]

But during treaty negotiations in October, the Mohawk chief Karonghyontye claimed otherwise. "We have hitherto been bound by the Great King," Karonghyontye intoned. "But he having broke the chain and left us to ourselves, we are free again and independent." The treaties entered into by the two nations existed only between them. Perhaps inferred, The United States at best inherited only broken contracts from England. Karonghyontye reminded The United States of its obligation to recognize Mohawk independence, and proclaimed: "Upon this

---

influence might be useful for the treaty that is being negotiated with all the Nations. [. . .] My personal credit with the savages, who are as much friends as enemies, has proved to be much greater than I had supposed." Stanley J. Idzerda and Robert Rhodes Crout, ed. *Lafayette in the Age of the American Revolution: Selected Letters and Papers, 1776-1790*, 5 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983), 416.

[12] General Schuyler, quoted in Henry S. Manley, *The Treaty of Fort Stanwix,1784* (Rome, N.Y.: Rome Sentinel Company, 1932), 34.

principle we wish that the Commissioners would consider what we say of ourselves." The principle of Mohawk independence stood on the nation's freedom to conduct its own national affairs, which in turn inferred its rights of sovereignty over its own lands. Karonghyontye then admonished both the United States and England for neglecting Native interests altogether in the 1783 Treaty of Paris: "You also assured us that the Great King, in settling peace with the United States made no mention of us, but left us to treat for ourselves. Certainly the Great King did not look up to that Great Spirit, which he had called as a witness to that treaty." Here, probing deeper into the issue of neglect, Karonghyontye broached its attendant hypocrisy and charged England's invocation of divine validation as false. Had the English king indeed taken sincere guidance from the Great Spirit, "common justice would not have suffered him to be so inattentive, as to neglect those who had been so just and faithful to him." Karonghyontye leveled the same charge against the United States. "We think that our brothers, the United States did not think of the Great Spirit, otherwise they would have mentioned to the Great Spirit those persons who had been so faithful to him, when they found that he had entirely neglected them." [13] Categorically, Karonghyontye staked out the Mohawk position. He admonished Americans for shirking moral obligations and religious convictions without which their political decisions cannot rise to the level of magnanimity they claim as defenders of liberty.

One of the commissioners shot back and denied Native independence: "It is not so. You are a subdued people; you have been overcome in a war which you entered into with us. [. . .] The great spirit, who is at the same time the judge and avenger of perfidy, has given us victory against all our enemies. We are at peace with all but *you*."[14]

---

[13] *Olden Time*, 418.
[14] Ibid., 424.

While the federal government claimed the Iroquois possessed no sovereignty, the state of New York claimed that the federal government possessed no right to treat with the Iroquois: the state alone possessed sovereignty in this matter. New York's Governor Clinton based his argument on advice he solicited from James Duane who provided his interpretation of Indian policy according to constitutional law. He argued that according to the 9th Article of the Articles of Confederation, Congress claimed the right to declare peace,

> and if the Tribes are to be considered as an independent Nation, detached from the State, and absolutely unconnected with it, the Claim of Congress would be uncontrovertible. [However,] there is then an indispensible Necessity that these tribes should be treated as *antient Dependants on this State*, placed under its protection, with all their territorial Rights, by their own Consent publicly manifested in solemn and repeated Treaties. On this Ground the Tribes in Question may fall under the Character of *Members of the State* with the management of whom Congress hath no Concern. [. . .] These tribes should be reconciled to the Idea of being members of the State, dependent upon its government, and resting upon its protection. If we adopt the disgraceful System of flattering them as great and mighty Nations, [the] Revolution, in my Eyes, will have lost more than half its Value.[15]

The Articles of Confederation adopted in 1781 by the states gave to Congress, by the provisions of Article IX, "the sole and exclusive right and power of determining peace and war" [and of] "entering into treaties and alliances." The article also granted Congress the exclusive right of "regulating the trade and managing all affairs with the Indians, not members of any of the states, provided that the legislative right of any state within its own limits be not infringed or violated." New York's action raised a constitutional issue by entering into a treaty with the Indians. How could either the federal or state government enter into treaties with its own citizens? But the article does not use the term "citizen." Rather it enlists the ambiguous phrase,

[15] Manley, *Treaty*, 57.

"not members of any of the states," following the equally ambiguous "all affairs with the Indians."

On April 6, 1784, the New York State Legislature authorized Governor Clinton and three Indian commissioners to negotiate a peace and land cession treaty with Iroquois nations. As these nations possessed territory that fell within the state's boundaries, New York claimed jurisdiction over them. Though both federal and state governments merely continued legal concepts of sovereignty inherited from the colonial era, no European power ever conquered or occupied more than slight portions of Iroquois territory that fell within state boundaries of New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. But the Iroquois defined themselves as an independent sovereign power, not as subjects to any colonial or state power. Their concept of sovereignty remained incompatible with the European, and consequently, American view.[16]

Arthur Lee, one of the commissioners appointed by Congress, expressed misgivings over New York's action. He wrote to the chairman of the Committee of the States of the Continental Congress: "How far this State as a right to hold such treaties the Committee must judge." The action placed the state in competition with Congress. "While the Indians are induced to believe, by such proceedings, that there are distinct, independent and perhaps jealous Powers to treat with them, they will certainly avail themselves of it, much to the disadvantage of the general Confederacy."[17]

Within the context of these competing claims to sovereignty, and serving no official capacity regarding the treaty, Lafayette spoke when negotiations opened on 3 October. What he had to say did not endear him to American negotiators.

---

[16] Barbara Graymont, *The Iroquois in the American Revolution* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1972), 273.
[17] Ibid.

"The American cause is just, I told you then," he proclaimed, referring to his attempts to dissuade Iroquois nations from alliance with British forces during the Revolutionary War. "At least remain neutral, and the brave Americans will defend their liberty and yours. [. . .] 'Do not listen to Kayeheanla,' they cried to you before." Using the name given him by the Iroquois, he recalled that the British promised them Washington "would be forced to leave the country. [But] my predictions having been fulfilled, listen to the new advice of your father, and may my voice resound among all the nations." Congressman Arthur Lee, among other federal dignitaries, likely grew alarmed by this point in Lafayette's address, and certainly what followed fueled the disdainful comments that Lee would later register, as "The Nation's Guest" took the opportunity to remind the Iroquois of the greatness of Onontio, their French father, the king.

> Do not forget that the Americans are close friends of your fathers the French; this alliance is as enduring as it has been fortunate. The great Onontio gives his hand forever to your brothers who offer you theirs, and by this means we shall form a salutary chain. To assure yourselves of this, trade with the Americans and with those of your fathers who cross the great lake. The products of France are known to you, and you are clever enough to prefer them. They will be for you the symbol of your alliance. In selling lands, do not consult a barrel of rum to give them up to the first who come, but let the American chiefs and yours, joined together around the fire, conclude reasonable bargains.[18]

Indeed, Arthur Lee's disdain for Lafayette's presence on the treaty grounds is underscored by Lafayette in a letter to his wife, a letter that also mentions the French commercial relationship that Lafayatte hoped to establish with the Iroquois.

> Although the congressional ambassadors were led by Mr. Arthur Lee, who certainly did not care to be under obligation to me, they were obliged to have recourse to me, [. . .] and

[18] Edzerda and Croat, eds. *Lafayette*, 256. Lafayette's address first appeared translated from French in *The Maryland Journal*, 26 November, 1784 and was reprinted in *The Olden Time*, 2, 470-473.

> Mr. Lee's final observation to me was that the savages had been too occupied with me to pay attention to the commissioners. They made me great promises, and I love to think that I have contributed to a treaty that will give us a small commercial outlet and will ensure the tranquility of the Americans.[19]

The Mohawk chief, Karonghyontye (Captain David Hill); an unidentified speaker from one of the Native American allied nations; an unnamed Huron chief; and the Seneca chief, Cornplanter responded to Lafayette. Karonghyontye expressed regret for the Mohawk alliance with the British: "My father, [we] acknowledge having been led astray and enveloped in a black cloud, but now we return so that you will find in us again good and faithful children." He affirmed that the "alliance between France and America was an indissoluble bond that would never be broken," and he hoped for Lafayette's words to "spread throughout all of the Six Nations, [as] they are bound to renew and strengthen the bond of friendship that we wish to see endure forever." The unidentified speaker invoked the 6,000 bead wampum belt presented by General Montcalm in 1757, recalling it as the belt that "was given us twenty years ago by our fathers. They told us that we must hold one end of it and France the other, and that one day their voices would be heard among us again." The Huron chief recalled that the "nations of the north have been the children of the great Onontio for a long time," and added that "we received exhortations from the governor of Canada [. . .] to speak only soft words at the treaty negotiations that are going to be held with the thirteen United States."[20]

This perhaps smoothed the open secret that General Hadimand promised the Mohawk and other Iroquois nations a permanent home in Canada to reward their loyalty to the Crown, though he indeed duplicitously counseled cooperation with Congress. Of greater complexity, Hadimand's geopolitical strategy counted on Iroquois military allies to buffer potential American

[19] "Letter to Adrienne de Noalis de Lafayette," Edzerda and Croat, eds. *Lafayette*, 260-61.
[20] Edzerda and Croat, eds. *Lafayette*, 258.

campaigns and as loyal warriors for potential offensive attacks against the southern neighbor. Working in concert with Hadimand for a Mohawk removal to Canada, Joseph Brant first approached Sir John Johnson and proposed settlement in the St. Lawrence River region, with Loyalists settled nearby to aid the development of his people. Lord North not only approved the plan, he promised farming implements for them and sent Hadimand the king's desire to offer Canadian settlement for all friendly tribes. As argued by Barbara Graymont, American negotiators at Fort Stanwix, keenly aware of British plans and of Joseph Brant's political acumen, attempted to steer a diplomatic course that maintained Iroquois settlement peacefully on their land within the United States, until White settlement cleared land, drove away game, and attained density enough to make livelihoods untenable for Indians, driving them to sell their land cheaply.[21]

Cornplanter's reply to Lafayette also sent a message to the American negotiators. He acknowledged "no nation is free from error, and we have been led into very great mistakes, at Great Britain's instigation, in uniting against the American states." But he went further, choosing his words to address not only the Frenchman, but, with more precise political measure, to remind the American negotiators of their obligations:

> We were vanquished, but it is fitting for all nations to be concerned about each other in misfortune, and it especially becomes the victors to show their compassion to those who are vanquished. You have heard our voice, my father. Our ideas are all brought together around this council fire lit by Congress, whose representatives are here at this moment. Our hopes, our trust, are concentrated in this treaty negotiation. If the Americans speak to us kindly, all will go well and peace will spread over all the nations.[22]

[21] Graymont, *The Iroquois*, 264.
[22] Edzerda and Croat, eds. *Lafayette*, 257-59.

Acerbic responses to Lafayette demonstrate the range of Native opinion, as illustrated by Mohawk leader David Hill:

> . . .we thank you Father for the fine Speech you thought proper to make to us, we understand you what you mean, and do not disown of having acted for our King for we do not slight or forget old Engagements and agreements which have been handed down to us by our Ancestors, which they made and entered into with our ancient protectors and Friends the Great Kings of England; and we now tell you we always joined them when at War against you the french for you always begun unjust Disputes; and now have joined those Bostonians against their King, who never were your Friends and hated you french mortally and we the Indians only begun to fight hearty when you espoused their unjust Cause. These Father are our sentiments with regard to you for we Indians love what is just and honest.[23]

Thirty years later, Lafayette's tour took him back to the Fort Stanwix region in Western New York, though by then little remained of the long-abandoned post. One of his stops included Buffalo, the city prospering again after its near total destruction by British forces. Tens of thousands of cheering citizens turned out for his grand reception, after which he and his entourage retired to their lodgings at the Eagle Tavern. There, among the dignitaries pressing around him, appeared the Seneca leader Red Jacket. Lafayette immediately recognized him from the Fort Stanwix treaty grounds, but jokingly, as Levassuer related, asked him "if he knew what had become of the young Indian who had so eloquently opposed the burying of the tomahawk." Red Jacket answered: "He is before you."[24] As Rosemary K. Bank argues, Red Jacket's presence at the Eagle Tavern "testified to a history that had, in the forty years separating the Revolutionary War from Lafayette's return, located the Senecas outside the national past of

[23] Ibid.
[24] Levasseur 186.

which Lafayette was the living emblem."[25]

Three Oneida chiefs, Taniatakaya, Sangouxyonta, and Doxtator, who fought for the rebels reacquainted themselves with Lafayette in Utica, yet another paraded stop on his western New York itinerary.[26] Taniatakaya struck a diplomatic tone:

> "The chase is no longer productive, it does not supply our wants, and we are obliged to provide for our subsistence by agriculture, which renders us very unhappy; but it is not owing to our white brothers of the state of New York; they act generously towards us; they permit us to live in peace near the bones of our fathers, which they have not obliged us to transport to a strange land; and the government often succours us when our harvests fail; hence we sincerely love our white brothers, the Americans. We formerly fought for them against the English, and we are still ready to raise the tomahawk in their favour, whenever occasion requires it."[27]

The Oneida chiefs privately recounted to Lafayette the failing fortunes of their nation, but their discussions were interrupted by a group of White Oneida County officials who invited him to lay the cornerstone for a monument commemorating Major General Baron de Steuben in nearby Steubenville. Lafayette declined the invitation, citing an obligation elsewhere. The monument illustrates a certain irony of a county named after a Native nation allied with the rebels but whose service garnered large-scale removal far to the west. However, the citizens enshrined the disinterred bones of the Prussian general (originally buried in 1795) beneath a stone monument to preserve his memory for the ages.[28] Baron de Steuben famously trained the Continental Army and with Lafayette wrote the Blue Book, the army manual used until the war

[25] Rosemarie K. Bank, *Theatre Culture in America, 1825-1860* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 22.
[26] Levasseur, 195.
[27] Levasseur, 195-96.
[28] Levasseur, 197.

of 1812.[29] Less famous but still living, Taniatakaya, Sangouxyonta, and Doxtator, grew only increasingly marginalized in the county's selective memory.

The next day, Lafayette and his entourage embarked for Schenectady on the recently opened Erie Canal. When their horse drawn barge passed beneath a bridge a few hundred yards outside Utica, a young Oneida man, who had been running along the towpath hailing the vessel already for some distance, sprinted ahead to the bridge and jumped aboard from it. "Where is Kayewla? I wish to see Kayewla." Lafayette walked toward him, smiling while the young man excitedly explained, "I am the son of Wekchekaeta, of him who loved you so well, that he followed you to your country when you returned there after the great war; my father has often spoken to me of you."[30] Lafayette first met Wekchekaeta (Peter Ostiquette) at Fort Stanwix in 1784 and noted in his 10 October letter to Adrienne: "I'll confide to you that I may well bring back a young Iroquois Indian, but that negotiation is not yet completed."[31] His letter to Jeremiah Wadsworth in Boston the following April sheds light on this "negotiation." "There is a young Indian, Son to a french Man By the Name of Stephanus, whom I intend to take with me to France as a favourite Servant. The Young Man Has a Regard for me, as I was Spoken off to Him By His deseased [sic] father. [. . .] The whole family who are Oneidas, Consented to His Coming with me."[32]

But Oneida genealogist Amelia Cornelius (1938-2016) provided evidence for a more complicated story. In 1784 Lafayette asked the Oneidas for permission to take *two* of their young men to France. Probably the children of his former clerk, Otsiquette, and an Oneida woman,

---

[29] Paul Lockhart, *The Drillmaster of Valley Forge: The Baron de Steuben and the Making of the American Army* (New York: Harper Perennial, 2010), 169.
[30] Levasseur, 196.
[31] Idzerda and Croat, *Lafayette. . .* , "Et je vous confierai que je pourrois bien ramener un jeune sauvage iroquois: mais cette négociation n'est pas encore terminée." 417.
[32] Idzerda and Croat, *Lafayette. . .*, 319.

Sarah Hanyost, they lived with their mother after Otsiquette returned to France. The Oneida granted permission; however, one of the boys, Edward (Neddy), "ran off into the woods and rebelled by throwing stones at those who pursued him." So Lafayette took only his brother, Peter, across the Atlantic. Peter learned French fluently, received a classical education, and spent several years as a member of Lafayette's household. But when he received word that the Oneida nation faced a growing range of problems, he returned, only to find himself involved with the French trader, Peter Penet, "who attempted to weasel his way into Oneida affairs and secure a personal empire in the late 1780s." Neddy eventually rose to the leadership of the First Christian party and in 1823 brought an early group of Oneida's to their Duck Creek Reservation near Green Bay, Wisconsin.[33]

Peter Otsiquette died in March 1792 in Philadelphia. His funeral procession took on the dimensions of a respectful and stately affair as it wound through the city toward the Presbyterian cemetery on Mulberry Street. Ahead of the coffin marched a detachment of light infantry, weapons reversed, muffled drums playing a dirge; behind the coffin walked 49 Iroquois leaders and warriors, "clergy of all denominations," the Secretary of War, federal army and state militia officers, and a multitude of Philadelphia citizens. By one estimate, the procession included over 10,000 people.[34]

The number of Euro-American and Native American dignitaries present resulted from a previously scheduled meeting that brought the two groups to the city to seek "confirmation of

---

[33] Amelia Cornelius with the assistance of Todd Larkin, "The Archiquette Genealogy," in *The Oneida Indian Journey: From New York to Wisconsin, 1784-1860*, ed. Laurence M. Hauptman, L, Gordon McLester, and the Oneida History Conference Committee (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1999), 126-27. Cornelius adds: "Over time, the Otsiquette surname became Archiquette, the family name of one of the leading Oneidas of the twentieth century, Oscar Archiquette."

[34] *The Universal Asylum and Columbian*, March, 1792.

former treaties, and the promotion of peace and good understanding between Whites and the Indian tribes of the Five Nations."[35] Coincidence aside, the attendance of these many officials at Peter Ostiquette's funeral underscores his story as one that links Native American, Euro-American, and French national histories. His association with Lafayette lent to him accolades and political clout, credentialing that likely played into his role as one of the Iroquois leaders who travelled to the Philadelphia to meet with federal officials, including George Washington. Otsiquette died only days after meeting Washington. His Lafayette connection raises the question: when Americans buried Peter Otsiquette, to what degree did the reverence they exhibited include a note of something they lost of Lafayette?

Lafayette and Native Leaders in Washington D.C.

On Wednesday, November 24, 1824 in Washington D.C, the Choctaw leaders Pushamata, Mushalatubbee, and Robert Cole left their rooms at Tennison's Hotel and headed down Pennsylvania Avenue to Gadsby's hotel, there to confer with "The Nation's Guest," the Marquis de Lafayette.[36] They regarded Lafayette highly, but what initially led them to Washington concerned Secretary of State John Calhoun's request to renegotiate the 1820 Treaty of Doak's Stand. Original negotiations revealed deep fissures in Choctaw politics, and the federal government's bid to renegotiate merely accentuated them. Ironically, from out these divisive strains arose outlines of Choctaw nationalism, the story of which involves details the

[35] *The Universal Asylum and Columbian*, March, 1792.
[36] At the time, Tennison's Hotel comprised a group of six buildings on Pennsylvania Avenue. G. Martin Moeller, *AIA Guide to the Architeture of Washington D.C.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012), 112. Regarding Gadsby's Hotel: http://www.streetsofwashington.com/2009/11/national-hotel.html (Accessed October 29 2018). "Sons of the Forest," *Niles Weekly Register* December 4, 1824. Precise date and place of the meeting also indicated in Bennet, *Lafayette in America*, 260.

delegation shared with Lafayette that revealed Choctaw national identity relied in part on the same Revolutionary War touchstones as did Euro-American national identity. Those thouchstones included George Washington and The Marquis de Lafayette himself.

Mushalatubbee placed both within the context of Choctaw relations with European powers preceding the creation of the American state.

> You are one of our fathers that fought in the war with general Washington. We take you here by the hand as a friend and a father. We have always walked in the White paths of peace; and in those paths we have travelled to visit you. We offer you pure hands, which have never been stained with the blood of Americans. We live in the south, where the sun shines hot upon us. We have been neighbors to the French, neighbors to the Spaniards, and neighbors to the English; but now our only neighbors are the Americans, in the midst of whom we live as friends and brothers.[37]

Pushamata went into greater detail:

> About fifty years ago you drew your sword, the companion of general Washington. With him you travelled and warred against the enemies of America. In spilling the blood of your foes, you generously shed your own, thereby consecrating your devotion to the cause in which you were engaged. After the termination of the war, you returned to your country, and now you revisit this land, blessed by the benedictions and honored with the grateful attentions of a numerous and powerful people. You see everywhere around you, crowding in your presence, and clasping your hands with filial affection, the children of those with whom you fought in defense of their country. We had heard of these things, even in our remote habitations, and our bosoms were depressed with anxiety to see you. We have come. We take you by the hand and are satisfied. It is the first and the last time. We shall meet no more. We part, on earth, forever. This is all I have to say.[38]

Finally, Robert Cole added:

[37] "Sons of the Forest," *Niles Weekly Register* December 4, 1824.
[38] Ibid.

> I am a man of mixed blood. I consider all white men as my fathers. You come from a far distant land. I salute you as my father, because you are a white man and the old and constant friend of America.[39]

Mushalatubbee underscores both the history of Choctaw military alliance with the Americans and the desire to live in peace with them. Lafayette, as friend and father, as first among equals, the Choctaw "take by the hand," and they regard the Americans too as "neighbors," or, again, as equals. In times past, they lived – or hoped to live – as equals to the Spanish, French, and English. Now, however, the Choctaw recognize only the United States as equal to the Choctaw, a relationship likely inferring that the Choctaw nation claims for itself the same sovereign status as that accorded to young America.

The leaders seated in Lafayette's room represented the interests of only one Choctaw faction, which has been termed "primoridalist," that stood in opposition to the "cosmopolitan" faction.[40] The former adhered to a traditional kinship-based polity, and the later generally envisioned a nation-state based not on kinship but on merit. Therefore, the historical context of the delegation cannot be adequately understood without surveying the multiple dimensions of Choctaw politics.

As had been the case for generations, the Eastern, Western, and Southern divisions of the Mississippi Choctaw were governed by division chiefs and councils. All chiefs inherited their positions based on kinship. Mushulatubbee, leader of the Eastern division, adhered to a long-established Mississippian system of divisional autonomy and redistribution of prestige goods. His allies included James and Peter Pitchlynn, his nephews; Pushmataha, chief of the Southern division; Puckshunubbee, chief of Western division; and Robert Cole, Puckshunubbee's council

---

[39] Ibid.
[40] James Taylor Carson, *Searching for the Bright Path: the Mississippi Choctaws From Prehistory to Removal* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), 88-89.

speaker. But David Folsom, Greenwood LeFlore, and others championed constitutional government and sought to replace divisional governments with a unified national government. They saw ethnic identities and kinship affiliations as divisive and advocated for civic membership in a Choctaw state. This concept of a nation was modeled on the constitutional republic of the United States.[41]

Fearing that reform-minded Folsom threatened the authority of division chiefs, James Pitchlynn initiated correspondence with Andrew Jackson. One letter reads:

> I take this pleasure to inform you I have got several families of the Choctaws who are willing to move west of the Mississippi; and I believe, if there was a treaty held in the nation, there would be one-third or half of the nation would move his fall. I find all the rich white people living in the nation; they give bad talks to the Indians; they tell them not to exchange lands, and some public men in the nation. Some of the Indians has threatened to knock me in the head on this account. I have never heard from you nor the President of the United States about my business. You wrote for me at your house. I hope you will write to me soon as you receive answer. Excuse my bad writing, as I told you I never went to school but six months.[42]

Pitchlynn lobbied President Monroe as well, claiming that "It is the wish of [the Six Towns district] of the Choctaw Nation to cede their lands to you for lands west of the Mississippi."[43] However, on 13 September 1820, Edmund Folsom informed Andrew Jackson that the Six Towns "generally appear to be in complete opposition toward selling or making any exchange of their lands."[44]

---

[41] Loveland, *Emblem of Liberty*, 92-94.
[42] James Pitchlynn to Andrew Jackson, 18 March 1819, *American State Papers: Documents, Legislative and Executive of the Congress of the United States*. Class II. Indian Affairs, ed. Walter Lowrie and Matthew St. Clair Clarke (Washington DC: Gales and Seaton, 1832-34), 2: 229.
[43] Quoted in Arthur H. DeRosier, Jr., *The Removal of the Choctaw Indians* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1999), 54. James Pitchlynn to James Monroe, 29 January 1820, *Letters Received by the Secretary of War 1801-1860*. MSS.
[44] Edmund Folsom to Andrew Jackson, September 13, 1820, *American State Papers*, 2:232.

Pitchlynn's campaign led in part to the aforementioned Treaty of Doak's Stand, by which the Choctaw exchanged about six million acres of their nation for about thirteen million acres in Arkansas Territory.[45] During treaty negotiations in October 1820, Andrew Jackson who, along with Thomas Hines, had been appointed by President Monroe to represent the interests of the United States, did not recognize the Choctaw nation as sovereign, as would become abundantly clear during his future presidency. Therefore, some comments he made to Secretary of War John C. Calhoun must be measured accordingly, for at variance stood the definition of "nation." Jackson wrote:

> The wish of the real Indian chiefs is (as I am advised) to perpetuate the existence of their nation, by concentrating the whole of a country that will support them as a nation. At present, they are scattered and wandering over a great space of country, and, if not shortly united, will be lost to their nation in other tribes. The pride of a real Indian is in the strength of his nation; and this is a chord I mean to touch, to obtain the object in view. I therefore wish to have it in my power to point to the land, and to describe its bounds where their father the President of the United States means to settle his red children, concentrate and perpetuate them as a nation, and thereby make his children happy.[46]

The phrase "real Indian chiefs" references Choctaw factionalism noted above, and in his correspondence with Jackson, Pitchlynn positioned himself in alliance with those chiefs who obtained their status by kinship, and -- supplying Jackson's advisement parenthetically noted by him -- he argued their legitimacy as "real" chiefs according to Choctaw tradition. Next, Jackson argues that only by concentrating the "scattered and wandering" Choctaw into a smaller area could their nation survive, a nation based, on "pride," a word choice suggesting that Jackson

[45] Clara Sue Kidwell, *Choctaws and Missionaries in Mississippi, 1818-1918* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1997), 48.
[46] Andrew Jackson to John C. Calhoun, Nashville, 19 June 1820, *American State Papers* 2: 231.

believes he understands the key to the identity of a "real Indian." Moreover, Jackson's logic foreshadows a central element in the as yet unpenned *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* and invokes an already established rationale for removal based on White largesse. First, "pride" not, by inference, political autonomy, defined the Native nation in Jackson's estimate. Hence will Marshall's concept of Indians as members of "domestic dependent nations" also sidestep Native national sovereignty. Second, Jackson's call for the geographic concentration of Indians builds on the notion of a moral obligation for Whites as purveyors of Christianity and Civilization to lead the wandering "red children" paternalistically to happiness, at least as defined on Euro-American terms. Moreover, Jackson rhetorically compounds his logic by twice repeating both the word "real" and forms of the word "concentrate," and though he repeats the word "nation" five times, the repetition perhaps only disguising the difference he sees between Native American and Euro-American nationhoods.

The 1820 Treaty of Doak's Stand provided that fifty-four sections of good land out of the ceded territory should be sold "for the purpose of raising a fund, to be applied to the support of the Choctaw schools, on both sides of the Mississippi."[47] But shortly after Puckshunubbee, Pushmataha, Mushulaatubbe, James Pitchlynn, and Robert Cole signed the treaty on 18 October 1820, the federal government called for a renegotiation. American citizens, it turned out, already claimed some of the Arkansas land that been ceded to the Choctaws. Thus Secretary Calhoun invited the Choctaw leaders to Washington in order to retrocede the occupied portion of the Arkansas parcel. Mushulatubbee and Pushmataha possibly recognized this as an opportunity to discharge the heavy debts they had accrued at the federal factory, where they purchased goods for distribution to their partisans. However, Chief Puckshunubbee carried no debt and saw no

[47] Francis Paul Prucha, *American Indian Treaties: The History of a Political Anomaly* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997),12.

value in retrocession. Though David Folsom opposed the Treaty of Doak's Stand, he hoped now, at least, to gain concessions to finance Choctaw schools.[48]

The three chiefs along with Robert Cole, John Pitchlynn, and David Folsom left for Washington by stagecoach in early October 1824. On 10 October, shortly after they arrived in Maysville, Kentucky, Puckshunubbee went out for a walk, slipped, fell down a steep bluff, and died of his injuries two days later. In a ceremony attended by some six hundred locals, the chief was buried with full military honors that included a fife and drum corps and three musket rounds fired by the Maysville militia.[49]

The delegation arrived in Washington on 27 October 1824. Mushulatubbee and Pushmataha spent much of their time touring Washington taverns, which scandalized Folsom, and likely as result of his expeditions, Pushmataha sickened. Doctors doubted he would long survive. Indeed he died a few days after meeting with Lafayette. Perhaps remembering Puckshunubbee's funeral honors, he requested that he too receive a military funeral, but on a grander scale than what Maysville had mustered. Thus he was interred in the Congressional Cemetery in his American military uniform, and cannons—not mere muskets--fired in salute.[50]

The two funerals represent yet another example of Native American and Euro-American entanglement. Both chiefs fought under American Commanders in the Revolution, and they remained proud of their service, as signaled even in their deaths.[51] Moreover, only the early

[48] Loveland, *Emblem of Liberty*, 92-94.
[49] Ibid.
[50] Ibid.
[51] Acknowledgement of the Choctaw military contribution on behalf of American forces appeared in Article 11 in the Treaty of Doak's Stand: "Those Choctaw Chiefs and Warriors, who have not received compensation for their services during the campaign to Pensacola, in the late war (War of 1812), shall be paid whatever is due them over and above the value of the blanket, shirt, flap, and leggins, which have been delivered to them." 1820 Treaty of Doak's Stand,

nineteenth century did the Choctaw begin to practice internment and move away from the previous century's scaffolding and bone-picking rituals. George Gaines, a trader who spent two decades working among the Choctaws, believed they adopted the practice after the Creek War (1813-1814):

> Previous to the late war the ancient custom of scaffolding their dead until decomposition had progressed to the point where the services of the professional Bone Picker was required, unanimously prevailed. But the services of the Choctaw volunteers with our troops on the eastern frontier seemed to convince them that burying the dead was better than scaffolding. Etc. They relinquished their ancient custom and buried, though they did not believe this mode as respectful to the memory of the deceased.[52]

Burials, however, were accompanied by ceremonies that reflected the continuing importance of the scaffolding rites. Kinfolk buried the deceased in a sitting position either near his or her home or under the bed inside the house, a practice common among the Chickasaws. The bone pickers of each moiety continued to play an important role, but they no longer handled the corpse. Instead, at the beginning of the mourning period they erected around the grave several red poles eight feet long and a fifteen-foot pole topped with a white flag. Female mourners gathered around the graves, shrouded in blankets, and uttered, one missionary commented, "the most piteous lamentations." They despaired of the sundering of their matrilineal lines by death and. asked aloud, "O! Why did you leave us. Were you not content with your children? Did you not have corn enough here?" During the time of the pole setting, Choctaws took great care to appease the spirit of the dead. Family members kept a fire burning near the deceased's home lest "their departed friend might be distressed or angry, especially if

---

https://www.choctawnation.com/sites/default/files/2015/09/29/1820_Treaty_of_Doak's_Stand_original.pdf (Accessed November 12, 2018).

[52] George Strother Gaines, *The Reminiscences of George Strother Gaines: Pioneer and Statesman of Early Alabama and Mississippi, 1805-1843*, (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1998),76.

the nights were cold, dark, or stormy." At the end of mourning, the bone pickers pulled down the poles to signal the departure of the spirit. What LeFlore and Folsom sought to end through law was the pole pulling, because the ceremony perpetuated the moity system that divided their society in half. In an effort to further unite the Choctaws as a nation, the cosmopolitans tackled the complicated rites of Choctaw funerals.[53]

Mushalatubbee would be the only surviving Chief of the Choctaw delegation to Washington, and he would return to Mississippi fearing for his life. As he sat in Lafayette's room, his precarious political entanglements must have weighed on his mind, and he perhaps hoped that Lafayette might lobby president Monroe on his behalf, as Lafayette certainly understood what had brought the delegation to Washington in the first place. At least, according to the *Niles Register*, "During these addresses from the Indian chiefs general La Fayette was agitated by strong emotions, and was evidently much affected at the marks of respect which they shewed him. He several times cordially pressed their hands." The paper also noted that "The chiefs accompanied the general on his departure from Gadsby's, beyond the capitol, on the road to Baltimore, when mutually bowing farewell, they parted."[54] However, Pushalamata died a few days after the Gadsby's meeting. According to Lafayette's secretary and biographer Auguste Levasseur, Pushalamata "expressed a desire that the Americans would bury him with the honors of war and fire a salute over his grave, which was promised."[55]

The rest of the delegation and John C. Calhoun signed a treaty on 2 January 1825 that extinguished the debts of Pushmataha and Mushulatubbee and retroceded the inhabited Arkansas

---

[53] H.F. Bruckner, "Burial Among the Choctaws," *The American Antiquarian* 2 (July – September 1879) 55-58.
[54] *Niles Register*
[55] Auguste Levasseur, *Lafayette in America in 1824 and 1825* (Philadelphia: Carey and Lea, 1829), 2:10. Precise date and place of the meeting are indicated in Bennet, *Lafayette in America*, 260.

land to the United States in exchange for financial considerations. The delegation also obtained a guarantee of Choctaw sovereignty and the right to determine for themselves when they were ready to become citizens of the United States. Although he regretted ceding the Arkansas land, Folsom also obtained from Calhoun more funding for the missionary schools, particularly for the construction of a Choctaw secondary school. [56]

Vilified for having agreed to yet another land cession, and facing efforts by David Folsom to remove him as chief, Mushulatubbee resigned as chief in April 1826. Because Folsom promised that he would sell no land and that he would support mission schools, the council installed him ad chief for a four-year term. Many people in the Western division demanded that Chief Robert Cole step down because of his opposition to Folsom and to the mission school's program of agricultural education. Instead, Cole advocated for the Choctaw to learn trades like blacksmithing or carpentry. Folsom prevailed, removed Cole from office, and engineered the appointment of his nephew Greenwood LeFlore to serve a four-year term as chief. The newly installed leadership of the Choctaw divisions jointly opposed land cession and removal and hoped to reinvigorate the Choctaw through education. So in August 1826, the East and West division councils established a constitutional government that united the divisions in a a complex chiefdom, one focused on agricultural education and the refusal to either cede land or remove from Mississippi. Indeed, when Senator Powhatan Ellis of Mississippi succeeded in passing his bill to negotiate Choctaw removal, the national council remained firm in their resolve, refusing to consider either cession or removal. By 1829, the Choctaw national government had passed twenty-two laws. Many of these laws were designed to aid and to regulate the Choctaws engagement with the American market economy and to bring Choctaw culture into conformity

[56] Carson, 92.

with American norms. Control of Choctaw land was illustrated by one law that required that prospective American husbands secure permission from the division chief and a license from the federal agent before proceeding with the marriage. These measures prevented Americans from marrying Choctaws simply to establish claims to land and asserted some control over the pace of intercultural interaction. As James Taylor Carson argues, the appropriation of Anglo-American political culture assisted the creation of a new Choctaw polity, and as David Folsom stated, "Our nation," is beginning to wear a different aspect—As a Nation she is easing and is already high as to look down with contempt upon dissipation."[57]

Lafayette's Journey Through Indian Territory

Lafayette's journey from Washington in February of 1825 led through North and South Carolina to Charleston, to Savannah and Augusta, Georgia. This itinerary put him in contact with members of the Creek Nation that, like the Choctaw, were confronting removal. Levasseur remark repeatedly on the high productivity of Creek agriculture, the comfort of Creek homes, and the permanence of their villages. This led him in turn to question the removal rhetoric that characterized Indians as primitive and savage wanderers. The presence in Indian Territory of fugitive slaves repaying refuge with labor fueled removal sentiment among local whites. Significantly, local newspapers covered Lafayette in detail, but Levasseur noted that the press showed little to no interest in their time with the Creek and "passed lightly over this part of the journey."[58]

When Lafayette's party forded the Chattahoochee River and entered Alabama, they crossed the western boundary of the thirteen original states. Levasseur recorded Lafayette's

[57] Carson, *Searching for the Bright Path*, 95-102.
[58] Auguste Levasseur, *Lafayette* 342-43.

reception by the Creek leader Chilly McIntosh and his people as being staged as a royal progress, "his carriage borne palanquin-like from the Chattahoochee into the Creek village, [and hailed] as "one who, in his affection for the inhabitants of America, had never made a distinction of blood or colour," and called "the honoured father of all the races of men then dwelling on that continent."[59]

Chilly McIntosh joined the white Alabamans escorting Lafayette from Augusta, Georgia, through the Indian Territory in Alabama to Montgomery. Levasseur described the Indian presence in detail, refuting accounts of Indian women as abused and subservient chattel and commending the courtesy of Indian men in assisting Lafayette's party over flooded roads and bridges. McIntosh, who interpreted for the Indians they met along the way, explained the Creek identification of Lafayette with freedom from English tyranny and so their own identification with the Revolutionary past that their forebears had supported. Levasseur's account condemns exploitation of Indians by territory whites, whose behavior in many instances, he observes, excelled "in cruelty and want of faith."[60] His journal, however, carefully differentiates between these whites and the American government, and extends Lafayette's council to the Creeks to live in harmony with their American "friends and brothers," as Levasseur characterizes the federal government:

> The conduct of the American government is of an entirely different character, as regards the Indian tribes. It not only protects them against individual persecution, and sees that the treaties made with them by the neighbouring states are not disadvantageous to them, and are faithfully adhered to, but it also provides for their wants with a paternal solicitude. It is not a rare circumstance for Congress to vote money and supplies to those tribes, whom a deficient harvest or unforseen calamity have exposed to famine.[61]

[59] Ibid., 344.
[60] Auguste Levasseur, *Lafayette* 345.
[61] Ibid.,

Levasseur's fatherly democratic government stands in sharp contrast both to the federal government's history with respect to Native Americans by 1825 and to the conditions under which the Indians Lafayette encountered during his travels were actually living.

Sovereignty stands as the supreme political power from which all other legal, social, cultural, and economic powers emanate, and its attainment by the United States figured as the most significant outcome of the American Revolution. Yet as Article 1 of the 1783 Treaty of Paris established that "His Britannic Majesty acknowledges the said United States [. . .] to be free sovereign & Independent States,"[62] the sovereign status historically retained by Native American nations grew increasingly challenged in the face of subsequent expansion into Indian Country by the United States. Indeed, two month's before the signing of the 1783 Treaty of Paris, the July 23 council between American officials and a number of Iroquois chiefs initiated a line of reasoning that would become increasingly prominent. Abeel, a Seneca Chief, recalled the speech that General Philip Schuyler made before a number of Iroquois Chiefs that day:

> I am directed by Congress to call you together & in form you that Peace is at last agreed on between the Kings of Great Britain, France, Spain and the Americans. [. . .] As we are the Conquerors we claim the lands & property of all the white people as well as the Indians who have left & fought against us. We enquired of the King what he intended to do for the Indians, as we expected that he would have been very particular about them. He being the person who should have considered their situation; but the King answered, *What can I do? Nothing ! You have conquered me therefore do with them what you please."*[63]

---

[62] *National Archives: Founders Online*, "Definintive Treaty of Peace Between the United States and Great Britain, 3 September 1783," https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Franklin/01-40-02-0356

[63] Samuel Hazard, editor, *Pennsylvania Archives*, Volume 10 (Philadelphia: Joseph Severns, 1854), 64.

Schuyler embodied the will of the nascent republic and declared its resolve to reset the national stage. He likely elicited a range of reactions from his Iroquois audience that day. But the threat to seek retribution for Iroquois alliance with Britain by taking their land as spoils would not be passively met.[64]

And elsewhere, immediately following the 1783 Treaty of Paris, Alexander McGillivray (1750-1793), an Upper Creek chief, used that document to leverage a case for Creek independence.[65] Alarmed by the treaty's complete silence on Indian rights, and by Great Britain's agreement in Article 1 to relinquish "all Claims to the Government Propriety and Territorial Rights,"[66] McGillivray sought protection from the Governor of Spanish West Florida, Arturo O' Neil, to help defend Creek land from American settler incursions. In his January 1, 1784 letter to the governor he wrote:

> Having received Information a few days ago by letter from St. Augustine that the Definitive Treaty of Peace between their Britanick & Most Catholic Majestys Was ratified and Signed on the 3d day of September last in Paris, I take the liberty to Congratulate Your Excellency on the happy event. As the Floridas are Confirmed to the Crown of Spain by the Peace, I solicit in behalf of the Creek Nations his Majestys most Gracious Protection for themselves and Country, as is by them claimed and now held in actual possession. If in the event of War Brittain has been Compell'd to withdraw its protection from us, She has no right to transfer us with their former possessions to any power whatever contrary to our Inclination and Interest. We Certainly as a free Nation

[64] Stuart Banner, *How the Indians Lost Their Land: Law and Power on the Frontier* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005), 112-113.
[65] Melissa A. Stock, "Sovereign or Suzerain: Alexander McGillivray's Argument for Creek Independence after the Treaty of Paris of 1783," *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* 92 (2008), 151. Convincingly, Stock further argues that McGillivray bolstered his claim to sovereignty by citing the Royal Proclamation by which Indians west of the Appalachian Mountains were to live in possession and control over their land; moreover, subsequent treaties between the British and the Creeks "reinforced and refined that idea, so that by 1783 McGillivray could rely not only upon the language of the documents but the force of custom in making his case for Creek sovereignty."
[66] *National Archives: Founders Online*.

> have a right to chuse our protector and on our Search what power is so fitting as the Master of the Floridas.[67]

The 1784 Treaty of Pensacola formalized relations between the Creek Nations and Spain. By it, Spain promised to serve as a Creek protector; however, a Creek war council's April 1786 decision to drive all Americans from Indian lands tested Spain's willingness to abide by the 1784 Treaty and in so doing risk war with the United States by aiding Creek military endeavors against Georgian and Cumberland settlers. So by early 1787, Spain had significantly curtailed support for the Creek war effort. As Thomas D. Watson argues, Spain's equivocation strained its relations with the Creeks to the point that McGillivray began to entertain ties with the United States, but only if the young nation could guarantee protection equal to that of Spain's.[68] McGillivray's negotiations with the federal government led to the 1790 Treaty of New York. Representing the interests of both Upper and Lower Creeks, McGillivray signed the treaty, satisfied that he had secured Creek sovereignty. He died twenty years before the Creek civil war and forty years before Creek removal, but as Melissa A. Stock argues, these later affronts to his efforts do not undercut his achievements as a champion of Indigenous sovereignty.[69]

The historical conditions that led to the rise of the Creek nation as a hybrid construction entailing indigenous kinship and governing structures with elements of republicanism provides just one example of Native nationhood. Subsequent chapters will examine the conditions that led to the development of Mashpee and of Cherokee nations. The specter of removal hung the over the evolution of these and of other Native nations, more so with each passing year. And as the

---

[67] Alexander McGillivray, qtd. in John Walton Caughey, *McGillivray of the Creeks* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2007), 64.
[68] Thomas D. Watson, Strivings for Sovereignty: Alexander McGillivray, Creek Warfare, and Diplomacy, 1783-1790, *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 58 (1980), 410.
[69] Stock, 176.

pace of White settlement only accelerated over the course of the nineteenth century, Indian policies transformed as well. Indian policy from the early years of the republic have been characterized by historian Robert Berkhofer as an attempted "expansion with honor" that appeared to rest on the optimistic possibility that White frontier settlement could be achieved through peaceful nation-to-nation treaties with Indians by which the sale of their land would be negotiated.[70] Secretary of War Henry Knox and others believed that land transfer by treaty, in which the Native American "occupancy" type of ownership would be replaced by titled ownership by Whites, would be most effectively achieved if Indians would adopt "civilization." This could be achieved, it was thought, if Indians learned from their White neighbors and by their example become Christianized, take up settled agrarian lifestyles, give up their tribal identities, and eventually become American citizens. The desired result of these transformations would be that the Indians would realize that they needed less land as settled agriculturalists than as hunters who migrated across the landscape for their survival. Therefore, they would be willing sell their excess acres to White settlers.[71] But this policy premised on ideas of bringing civilization to Indians was never without its critics, and the America that Lafayette left on 8 September 1825 was rapidly transforming into a nation shaped by notions of Manifest Destiny. Moreover, that nation's growing belief in its God-given right to appropriate Native land was accompanied by an accelerating White appropriation of Native histories and cultures. As noted in this study's Introduction, this appropriation through various media -- through novels and theatre, for example – constitutes yet another type of entanglement, one that will be examined in the following chapter.

---

[70] Robert Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present* (New York: Knopf, 1978), 38 – 49.
[71] Bernard Sheehan, *Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Philanthropy and the American Indian* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), 1 – 5.

Chapter 4

Cultural Appropriations:

American National Identity and the Genre of the Indian Play in the Early Antebellum Era

As Young America attempted to find its place politically and culturally in the world, and as the Euro-American population swelled, the project of appropriating Indian land grew apace with the incorporation of a growing body of stereotyped notions about Indians into the nation's self-image. In short, American national identity relied partly on the appropriation of certain aspects of Native American culture and history. But as the infant republic groped its way in the dark, all good bets were placed on its early demise, and it suffered from profound insecurity in terms of its own identity, an insecurity arguably masked by brash swagger. After all, it had thrown off the yoke of not only British tyranny but had sent the hoary old institutions of Europe packing.

This chapter argues that the appropriation of Native American identities by Euro-Americans divests Indians of their own histories and cultures as understood on their own terms and replaces them with sanitized, essentialized, and commoditized Indian images for consumption by White audiences. My argument builds on Kathryn W. Shanley's idea that "cultural appropriations" belong to an overall "totalization" effort in "the domination of indigenous peoples by the West, politically and economically."[1] The Indian Play was one means by which this "totalization" and "domination" gained traction in the decades following the American Revolution. Moreover, through content, theme, and performance the Indian Play arose as an entanglement of cultural appropriations that attempted to convey a uniquely American

[1] Kathryn W. Shanley, "The Indians America Loves to Love and Read: American Indian Identity and Cultural Appropriation," 675-702 (*American Indian Quarterly* 21, no. 4, 1997), 683.

sense of national identity. But the Indian Play was a paradoxical vehicle here because its frequent idealizations of Indians were staged while the contours of American national identity was also forming through the violent reality of Indian removal.

Salient features in the genre of the Indian play are perhaps best detected and analyzed through a world historical lens. To begin with, the performance of these plays on the American stage is only incidental and reveals only part of the story. Indeed, as will be seen, British dramatic conventions permeated the theatrical world in the United States during much of the Antebellum era. Though the discussion of what constitutes a uniquely "American" play is beyond the scope of this study, the quest for an American national identity led straight through the nation's theatres where its definition was sought by playwrights, performers, and critics. Independence from British cultural influence went hand in hand with the struggle for political independence from the former mother country, and in many ways the former took much longer to establish than did the later. But the British/American cultural entanglement involves yet another strand, one drawn from the Native American world, and its influence on American national identity significantly differed from anything of British origin. For as much as American cultural brokers attempted to gain distance from English influence, they eagerly embraced and appropriated aspects of Native American cultures into something supposedly uniquely "American." The genre of the Indian play demonstrated this appropriation in action. Because of its hybrid nature involving American, British, and Native American elements, the Indian play embodies an array of connections, and the examination of such connections is a core goal of the world historian.

The great number of Indian plays written -- at least 75 by one count -- in the nineteenth century tells much about the evolving quest for an identity that would set Americans apart from

the world on the other side of the Atlantic.[2] Before turning to examinations of some of the most significant plays, beginning with the next section's focus on plays deeply invested in the mythologization of Pocahontas, an overview of some early Indian plays will provide context for later developments in the genre.

Though never performed, the first Indian play was likely *Ponteach: Or the Savages of America. A Tragedy* (1766) by Major Robert Rogers. Since it was published in England during the colonial era, the play should probably be considered more English than American. The play recounts Pontiac's Rebellion (1763 -1766) and employs the stereotype of the noble savage in its portrayal of the Ottawa leader. This sets the direction, as Roy Harvey Pearce argues, in which the genre of the Indian play would continue to move.[3] Ponteach's speech at the end of the play provides an example of Roger's use of the noble savage stereotype, but it deserves examination for what it reveals about the appropriation of Native American culture and history:

> And though I fly, 'tis on the Wings of Hope.
> Yes, I will hence where there's no British foe,
> And wait a Respite from this Storm of Woe;
> Beget more Sons, fresh Troops collect and arm,
> And other Schemes of future Greatness form;
> Britons may boast, the Gods may have their Will,
> Ponteach I am, and shall be Ponteach still.[4]

This speech strikes a defiant note. However, I argue that it and others like it, as will be seen, only superficially express Native resolve in the face of wrongs committed against them by Whites.

---

[2] Richard Moody, ed. *Dramas from the American Theatre, 1762 – 1909* (Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1966), 203.
[3] Roy Harvey Pearce, *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 171.
[4] Tiffany Potter, ed. *Ponteach: Or the Savages of America. A Tragedy* by Major Robert Rogers (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 46.

Rather, Indians served as metaphors for Whites reflecting on the struggle against tyranny in the Revolutionary War, or against such struggles in general. American identity, in James Axtell's words, was forged on an Indian anvil. "Without the steady impress of Indian culture, the colonists would probably not have been ready for revolution in 1776, because they would not have been or felt sufficiently Americanized to stand before the world as an independent nation. The Indian presence precipitated the formation of an American identity."[5] Moreover, White Americans could see themselves as Indians from the comfort of their own Whiteness.

London composer James Hewitt worked with librettist Ann Julia Kemble Hatton to produce the opera *Tammany (America Discovered); or the Indian Chief*, first performed in New York by the Old American Company on 3 March 1794. Its subject was likely meant to appeal to the Tammany Society, named for the legendary Delaware chief. Its score was based on the British operatic models long familiar to American audiences.[6]

Tammany tells the story of doomed love between an Indian man and woman, Tammany and Manana. In their death song, she sings:

Beneath the morn's pale light to rove,
The aloed wood or palmy grove,
These, these are sweet; but not to me
So sweet as is my Tammany.

To which he responds:

Fury swells my aching soul,

[5] James Axtell, *The European and the Indian: Essays in Ethnohistory of Colonial North America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), 308.
[6] G. Bordman, *American Musical Theater: A Chronicle* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 4; G.M. Sayre, *The Indian Chief as Tragic Hero: Native Resistance and the Literatures of America from Moctezuma to Tecumseh* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 15.

Boils and maddens in my veins;
Fierce contending passions roll
Where Manana's image reigns.[7]

Of course, the dramatic convention of the time meant that characters were in general cast in similar melodramatic modes. But the general arc of Indian plays to ennoble Indians speaks to deeper -- and more troubling -- cultural motivations to present Indians as having such high degrees of nobility that they were doomed to extinction in the face of White malevolence. And according to this line of logic, Whites, however undeserving, will prevail. The convention of melodrama does not cancel out the convention of the noble savage.

In Joseph Croswell's *A New World Planted* (1802) noble Indians come to the aid of struggling Pilgrims, one of whom, Hampden, falls in love with the Indian princess, Pocahanta. Because she is the member of a royal family, his fear of miscegenation is somewhat tempered. He nonetheless complains: "I know she's browner than European dames / But whiter far, than other natives are." He concludes that Pocahanta needs further ennobling. She needs to be whitened by becoming civilized. Pocahontas figures in a number of Indian plays, and in the next section, she is at least returned to Virginia; otherwise, as in *A New World Planted*, the plot revolves upon a love story with her at it center.

Pocahontas and the Staging of American National Identity

John Nelson Barker's *The Indian Princess; or, La Belle Sauvage* did much to elevate the Pocahontas story to the level of a national foundation myth, and however much Barker hoped to write the first uniquely American play, as an operatic melodrama it belonged to a popular British

[7] "*The Songs of Tammany, or the Indian Chief, A Serious Opera*" (*Magazine of History*, 1931), 8 – 12.

musical genre in addition to the American genre of the Indian play. Thus the play combined a Native American story with a Georgian theatrical model. This combination underscores the ironic interplays of intention, content, and form that makes *The Indian Princess* well suited for a discussion concerning the post-revolutionary quest for an American national identity.

The Indian Princess premiered at the Chestnut Street Theatre in Philadelphia on 6 April 1808,[8] and it opened in New York's Park Theatre later that June.[9] Looking back on his play's popularity, in 1832 Barker told theatre historian William Dunlap that it had been performed, at least by his own estimate, in "all the theatres of the United States."[10] The play also fell prey to pirating by British theatres, a fate common to American stage productions. Perhaps most famously, in 1820 the Drury Lane Theatre mounted it under a different title and produced it without Barker's permission. This also made *The Indian Princess* the first American play "to be exported to a British stage after first opening in the United States."[11] Moreover, the play's appeal to English audiences speaks to their familiarity with the genre of the operatic melodrama to which the play belonged. The genre, in a sense, had come home.

What drew American audiences to *The Indian Princess* cannot be definitively ascertained. However, two central elements in the play's content likely charmed them -- its romanticized myth of Pocahontas as the love interest of two Englishmen, and that myth's association with Jamestown, regarded by Euro-Americans at the time as the country's first White settlement, through later generations in the North would shift the location of its founding myth to

---

[8] Richard Moody, ed. *Dramas from the American Theatre, 1762 – 1909* (Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1966), 203.
[9] John S. Bak, "James Nelson Barker's *The Indian Princess*," 175 - 193 in *Studies in Musical Theatre, Volume 2* (Bristol: Intellect Ltd., 2008), 175.
[10] John Nelson Barker qtd. in M.J. Moses, ed. *Representative Plays by American Dramatists, Volume 1: 1765 – 1819* (New York: Benjamin Publishing, 1946), 570.
[11] J.H. Richards, *Drama, Theatre, and Identity in the American New Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 203.

Plymouth as sectional divisions sharpened between North and South.[12] Nonetheless, the Pocahontas/Jamestown combination likely made for a compelling means to help establish a national identity through the telling a supposedly unique American tale. And however much the play's production as an operatic melodrama owed its origin to the British stage, American theatre was at the time generally a British derivative.[13] Therefore, the familiarity of the genre as the only one that American audiences knew likely meant that they saw little or no irony in it as a dramatic vehicle for an "American" story.

The attempt to tell an American story may, as Jeffrey D. Mason and J. Ellen Gainor argue, rely on a "broad capacity for self-invention and self-contemplation." And as they further argue, the stage is "an explicit site for performing national identity, one that serves to focus [its] issues, rhetoric, and images," and through creative freedom it takes risks to "encourage attempts to develop, explore, test, and dispute conceptions of national character. In the performance arena, in the interchanges among artists and spectators, we can enact narratives of nation."[14] As will be seen below, Barker sought to "enact a [narrative] of nation" through *The Indian Princess* on a number of levels. As such, his production was a site of cultural entanglement that combined Native American, Euro-American, and British strands. These strands will be separated for the sake of analysis, but the theatrical experience of the play itself must be kept in sight as one woven together into whole cloth as a form of entertainment and, circuitously, why it succeeded as entertainment must also be considered.

Barker likely experienced some degree of "the anxiety of influence," to employ Harold

[12] Paul Jentz, *Seven Myths of Native American History* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2018),4 -7.
[13] John S. Bak, "James Nelson Barker," 176.
[14] J.D. Mason and J.E. Gainor, eds. , *Performing America: Cultural Nationalism in American Theater* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999), 1 – 2.

Bloom's concept,[15] through which he felt the need to clear space in order to express his own artistic vision outside of British influence, but he could not function very far away from the center of British cultural gravity. However much he hoped to produce an "American" play, *The Indian Princess* was inescapably British in form, yet Barker's choice of a storyline did gain some distance for him. This choice could not be otherwise, since the use of traditional British characters, themes, or situations would be antithetical to a purportedly American play. On the other hand, these could not be entirely dismissed from Barker's stage, since he needed to package his play in terms familiar to his audiences lest he risk alienating them by presenting ideas too novel for their tastes.[16]

In an attempt to remedy what he termed British "mental colonialism," Barker looked to Native American material to forge a national myth.[17] And as one scholar notes, Barker wrote at a time when "interest in American history was enjoying a new popularity, especially as post-Revolutionary Americans searched the archives and their own memories for traces and traits that would foster some sense of national identity."[18]

Barker's interest in colonial history was "manifest by his return, time and time again, to Colonial records for dramatic material," and fittingly Barker chose Jamestown as the site of his drama, at the time celebrating the bicentennial of its founding.[19] Captain John Smith's *The Generall Historie of Virginia* (1624) provided Barker with his historical material. Coyly admitting to his significant departures from Smith's record, he said he adhered as closely "to

---

[15] Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997)
[16] J. H. Richards, *Drama Theatre, and Identity in the American New Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 172.
[17] Barker quoted in J. W. Crowley, "James Nelson Barker in Perspective," 363 – 69 (*Educational Theatre Journal* 24, 1972), 363.
[18] J. H. Richards, *Drama Theatre, and Identity*, 170.
[19] Moses, *Representative Plays*, 569.

historic truth [. . .] as dramatic rules would allow."[20] But Barker constructed his own myth of national origin on Smith's mythology of colonialization, so his manipulation of Smith's work must, as theatre historian J.H. Richards argues, "be read in the context of mediating arts, primarily the theatre, and the forms through which mythologies of colonialization were practiced."[21]

But Barker's loyalty to Smith's account is of less interest than are his inventions of people, places and events, for through them the issues of American national identity of his own time emerge.[22] For example, John Smith appears not as an English colonial but as a patriotic American as, for example, through his criticism of "stagnant Europe."[23] He also alludes to an expression perhaps evocative of American revolutionary resolve against the British: "let not any mutinous hand unravel / Our close knit compact. Union is its srength: / Be that remember'd ever."[24] Moreover, Smith's crew apparently sailed with him to the New World not in search of wealth but to build a new society, a vision emphasized by John Rolfe in the opening lines of Act One,

> Let our dull, sluggish countrymen at home
> Still creep around their little isle of fogs,
> Drink its dank vapours, and then hang themselves.
> In this free atmosphere and ample range
> The bosom can dilate, the pulse play,
> And man, erect, can walk a manly round.[25]

[20] Barker quoted in Moses, 578.
[21] J. H. Richards, *Drama Theatre, and Identity*, 171.
[22] John S. Bak, "James Nelson Barker," 178.
[23] *The Indian Princess*, in Jeffrey H. Richards, ed., *Early American Drama* (New York: Penguin, 1997), 119.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Ibid.

Smith's reply to Rolfe upon their having "a noble stage, on which to act / A noble drama,"[26] seems as much a plea to audiences to recognize the play as American, not British, as it is a tribute to the integrity of American nationhood. One critic writing in 1827 addresses what by then had become a prevailing notion regarding the political mantle that American theater should assume: the theatre must appeal "directly to the national feelings. [. . .] There is no object more worthy the exercise of the highest attributes of the mind, than that of administering to the just pride of national character, inspiring a feeling for the national glory, and inculcating a love of country."[27]

The "stage" upon which this drama is to be acted is also a gendered space. On the one hand it is the feminized landscape of Virginia: "Is't not a goodly land? Along the bay, / How gay and lovely lie its skirting shores, / Fring'd with the summer's rich embroidery!" On the other hand, tt is a land seen as receptive to masculine self-assertion, a land where "The bosom can dilate, the pulses play, / And man, erect, can walk a manly round." And the the stage is one history as well as one of masciline adventure: "for ye are men / Well worth the handing down; whose paged names / Will not disgrace posterity to read." America, the "empty" land awaited the heroic action of European settlers. The theatrical stage provided the imaginative space in which the American national identity could be molded according to culturally familiarized roles of male and female domains.[28]

The land is an undomesticated wilderness, a "devil of a country, where there's never a girl nor a house." Following this to its rhetorical conclusion, romantic love and the assertion of domestic values will conquer that wilderness. Indeed, the play's romantic plot involves several

[26] Ibid.
[27] "American Drama," *American Quarterly Review 1* (June 1827): 339.

[28] Susan Scheckel, "Domesticating the Drama of Conquest: Barkers Pocahontas on the Popular Stage," 231 – 43 (*American Theatre Quarterly*, September 1996), 234.

intertwined courtships. Moreover, they lend the element of romantic comedy, and this helps to obscure the violence of conquest by translating it into domestic terms of love and marriage. Indeed, the central national conquest, as represented through Pocahontas, is accomplished through the love that she feels for John Rolfe, her Euro-American conqueror, and his culture.[29]

Once transformed through Christianization and through her zealous embrace of Euro-American cultural values, Pocahontas serves not only as the model "good" Indian but as a national hero as well. This heroic status also relies on her gendered role as a mother protecting her White settler family, as suggested in his preface to *The Indian Princess*. There Barker stresses the play's significance as an American production, and he underscores the national pride that the audience must feel as they watch the drama unfold on stage. "Dramatic genius, with genius of every other kind, is assuredly native of our soil, and there wants but the wholesome and kindly breath of favour to invigourate its delicate frame, and bid it rapidly arise from its cradle to blooming maturity." Yet Barker also reveals the uncertainty of young nation's cultural identity, referring to the "children of the American drama" as orphans doomed "to wander, without house or home, unknown and unregarded." But just as the nation was born through rebellion against the mother country, the "orphan" play goes out into the world as an "independent urchin."[30] Though independent of parental authority, this orphan still seeks legitimacy in a new home. And regarding the play's orphanhood, Barker appeals directly to the women in the audience who must feel a special maternal responsibility for it: "To your bosoms, ladies, sweet ladies! the little stranger flies with confidence for protection; shield it, I pray you, from the iron rod of rigour, and scold it yourselves, as much as you will, for on your smooth and

[29] Ibid., 237.
[30] Barker in Moody, 115.

polished brows it can never read wrinkled cruelty."[31] And as one critic argues, Barker's invocation of "maternal responsibility" anticipates the play's story of Pocahontas, who shields John Smith, and in the words of the play serves as 'foster mother' protecting the 'infant colony' of Jamestown from famine and Indian attack, thereby achieving mythic stature as heroic mother preserving, nurturing and legitimizing what will become the American nation. "Thus the play and the nation are made equivalent metaphorically and the survival and legitimacy of both depend upon the maternal power and domestic virtues of women."[32]

Pocahontas proves herself as a "true woman,"[33] according to nineteenth-century Euro-American standards, through her recognition of European superiority over Native culture. Moreover, demonstrating an apparently innate sense of Christian mercy, she pleads for the release of Captain John Smith. Indeed, his first response upon being freed through her famous intercession is, "O woman! angel sex! Where'er thou art, Still art thou heavenly. The rudest clime Robs not thy glowing bosom of its nature."[34] Pocahontas is legitimized through feminine virtues as defined by Euro-American culture. She is the mother of the "infant colony," and she embodies innocence and fruitfulness. As such, she is well positioned for adoption as a national hero.[35]

In terms of nationalistic rhetoric, formerly colonized Americans attempted to formulate a national identity independent of British influence. Pocahontas provided an ideological means through which this effort could be legitimized. As an object of conquest and as a maternal

[31] *The Indian Princess*, 116.
[32] Susan Scheckel, "Domesticating the Drama," 232.
[33] The Indian Princess, 117.
[34] The Indian Princess, 118.
[35] Ibid., 235.

symbol of the new nation, she united her citizens/children in a national family.[36] Through the domestic themes of love and marriage Barker negotiates the dangerous political realities of his time regarding Indian removal and the long history of White violence perpetrated upon Native Americans. Such issues are dissolved through melodramatic conventions and comedy. Concerning the later, Barker's subplots involving love and marriage between invented White characters in Jamestown add to this deflection, as will be seen below.

Barker uses not only Native Americans to establish a national American play. In a further departure from historical verisimilitude, European women also appear on the stage, likely for a combination of political, economic, and artistic reasons. As J.H. Richards speculates, Barker hoped to fill the theatre with as many paying customers as possible, and "female customers often meant the difference between success and failure."[37] Barker's band of "sweet ladies." Kate, Geraldine and Alice, left their European homes for a new life in America, the same as did the men in Smith's crew. (Of course, historically, that crew contained no women.) For example, in response to her husbands question regarding her level of happiness in the "Wilds of Virginia, she responds:

> In this wild wood will I range; [...]
> Nor sigh for towns so fine, to change,
> This forest, forest drear:
> Never, never weary,
> And while love is in thine eyes,
> Ever, ever cheery.[38]

She recalls her abandoned homeland, no without some nostalgia, but asserts her resolve

[36] Scheckel, 235.
[37] Richards 2005: 172
[38] Moses 1946: 581

to leave it behind. America is now her home.

Furthermore, Barker employs a plot device with decidedly English roots as Kate and Geraldine, disguised as male pages, play out roles of false identities in manners commonly found in Shakespeare's comedies. As John S. Bak argues, "When both men prove faithful to their women, their unions promise peace and prosperity in the New World."[39]

In addition to the European women, Barker adds Irish immigrants to the Pocahontas myth, likely, as Richards argues, in order to "recognize the new ranks of Irish [political] supporters."[40] And as Alan Ackerman argues:

> The social and musical harmony with which Barker's play begins reflects the optimism of a burgeoning "republican" society, but it also glosses a crisis in early American public policy indicated by the Naturalization Act (1798) and the Alien Act that were largely targeted against immigrants from Ireland. The merits of Irish immigrants are a major theme of *The Indian Princess*. Moreover, while the United States government largely favored a policy of assimilation towards Native Americans until 1820, that policy was neither successful nor enforceable, nor was it desired by many native peoples themselves.[41]

For example, when the Irishman Larry meets an Irish pageboy (the disguised Kate), he asks, "What say you, master page, isn't this a nice neat patch to plant potatoes -- I mean, to plant a nation in?"[42] As Richards further argues, "the playwright tries to make Larry serve two competing ends: the 'brave' Irish member of the American national founding and thus a good republican; and the comic stage Irishman, present in the play for laughs."[43]

---

[39] John s. Bak, "James Nelson Barker," 177.
[40] J. H.Richards, *Drama, Theatre, and Identity*, 203.
[41] Ackerman 2002
[42] *The Indian Princess*,
[43] Richards 2005, 207

The political implications of the domestic drama are apparent in wedding preparations for Pocahontas' marriage to the Susquehannock Prince Miami. Pocahontas underscores the political nature of the marriage because it benefits the designs of Powhatan, her father. "The Susquehannocks are a powerful nation," she remarks, "and my father would have them for his friends." Pocahontas' marriage to John Rolfe is a twofold political act. It establishes ties between Powhatan and the English, and it establishes Pocahontas as free agent in control of her own destiny. Though Powhatan eventually acknowledges her right to marry Rolfe, Initially, in choosing him over Miami she defies paternal authority, an act echoing America's origins through an act of Revolution.[44]

Pocahontas falls in love not only with John Rolfe but with European culture as well.

> O! 'tis from thee that I have drawn my being:
> Thou'st ta'en me from the path of savage error,
> Blood-stain'd and rude where rove my countrymen,
> And taught me heavenly truths, and fill'd my heart
> With sentiments sublime and sweet and social...
> Hast thou not heaven-ward turn'd my dazzled sight,
> Where sing the spirits of the blessed good
> Around the bright throne of the Holy One?
> This thou hast done; and ah! what couldst thou more,
> Belov'd preceptor, but direct that ray,
> Which beams from Heaven to animate existence,
> And bid my swelling bosom beat with love!

As the good Indian, Pocahontas instinctively recognizes the superiority of Euro-American beliefs, values, and customs. Furthermore, the gifts of civilization, especially the gift of Christian salvation, are considered by Pocahontas to be more than just recompense for the

[44] Susan Scheckel, "Domesticating the Drama," 235.

losses Indians suffered through their contact with Euro-Americans. “Thou art my life!” Pocahontas exclaims to Rolfe, “I lived not till I saw thee, love.”

Her new love of European “civilization,” leaves her repulsed by the “savagery” of Miami, her Indian suitor, so she rejects him: “Thine eyes are as the panther’s; thy voice like the voice of the wolf. Thou shouldst make my heart beat with joy; and I tremble before thee. Oh no! Powhatan shall give me to my lover [Rolfe]. I will be my lover's bride!” To seek vengeance for losing Pocahontas, Miami’s declares war against Powhatan, and this means that the first violence in the play involves “good” and “bad” Indians.

Pocahontas represents the American land -- that “fairy land of fertility” with its “gay and lovely . . . skirting shores” hiding treasures for adventurous explorers to discover and claim. The conqueror wins the Indians' treasures, this metaphor suggests, not through the power of superior military force but through the power of love inspired by the conqueror's cultural superiority.

With the death of the Indian warrior, Miami, the primary barrier to the resolution of the romantic comedy has been removed. As Pocahontas and Rolfe embrace, Geraldine, an Englishwoman who has come to the New World disguised as a page to defend her virtue and reclaim her husband, reveals herself and flies to her husband's welcoming arms. At the same moment, another settler, Robin, declares that he plans to marry the Indian woman Nima. As Smith calls all the couples to join in a circle, he steps forward to announce the new social order that is the culmination and resolution of the play's action:

> Wild Nature smooths apace her savage frown,
> Moulding her features to a social smile.
> Now flies my hope-wing'd fancy o'er the gulf
> That lies between us and the aftertime,
> When this fine portion of the globe shall teem
> With civilized society; when arts,

And industry, and elegance shall reign,
As the shrill war-cry of the savage man
Yields to the jocund shepard's roundelay.
Oh, enviable country! thus disjoin'd
From old licentious Europe! may'st thou rise,
Free from those bonds which fraud and superstition
In barbarous ages have enchain'd her with;
Bidding the antique world with wonder view
A great, yet virtuous empire in the west![45]

The new social order that Smith announces is distinctly American. Leaving behind the "savage cry" of the native inhabitants of the New World and the vices of "old licentious Europe," this "virtuous empire" is indeed a new nation. The song that ends the play, a hymn to "Freedom," points to the American Revolution through which the United States achieved its official status as a nation by declaring its political freedom from England. This historic moment of founding, however, is imagined not in the past but in the future as a prophecy to be fulfilled.

In the play's final lines, Barker locates the roots of American national identity in its earliest colonial history and marks the revolution as a predestined outcome. As the fulfillment of prophecy, the separation from "old licentious Europe" achieves divine sanction. Even the natural world approves the founding of the American nation, from play's first lines when [She] "dimples o'er with smiles" upon the colonists' arrival to the final scene when she "mould[s] her features to a social smile" as Smith envisions a "virtuous empire in the west."

The final scene illustrates his melodrama's ability to simplify complex political and cultural problems and to provide mere emotional and romantic resolutions to them. This leaves no room for the reality of greed, violence, and treachery that characterized Native- and Euro-American relations. Even Powhatan is forgiven for his betrayal of the settlers, and celebrates the

[45] *The Indian Princess*, 165.

marriage as the curtain falls on a scene of social integration that dissolves distinctions of race and class. Only the "bad" Indian, Miami, has been removed.

Cultural and national issues find their resolve through the marriage of John Rolfe and Pocahontas. As Susan Scheckel notes, the princess is asked "to represent and legitimize American colonialist and nationalist projects, to serve both as the implicitly sexualized object of conquest and as the sanctified figure of the nation, the mother who unites all her citizens/children in a unified national 'family.'"[46] All these bonds combine to become the metaphor of America, with Smith's final benediction announcing the building of a nation: "A great, yet virtuous empire in the west!"[47]

George Washington Parke Custis' *Pocahontas*

The success of Barker's *The Indian Princess* encouraged other nineteenth-century playwrights to adapt the Pocahontas story, including George Washington Parke Custis' *Pocahontas; or, The Settlers of Virginia* (1830) and John Brougham's *Po-ca-hon-tas*; *or, The Gentle Savage* (1855). These melodramas were more than entertaining love stories for audience of their time. They were also about nation building, as A. Ackerman argues:

> In the first decades of the nineteenth century, the uncertainty about just what constituted "America" or "Americans" was at the crux of a disturbingly fluid and often intransigent set of historical problems. Any understanding of the importance of genre [of the Indian play] must begin with a radical contextualizing [of] the repressed hybridity of early American society.[48]

---

[46] Scheckel 1996: 235
[47] Moses 1946, 627
[48] A. Ackerman, ""Imperial Ears: The Power of Melodrama In James Nelson Barker's *Indian Princess*." (ASTR Conference: Philadelphia, 2002), 19.

This recalls that however much Barker hoped to create an American national drama, what he eventually staged was a hybrid of British and Native American elements. Yet at the same time, the play's popularity appeared to legitimize it as an American cultural product, if only because it appeared on American stages before American audiences.

George Washington Parke Custis, step-grandson and adopted heir of George Washington, originally adhered to federalism, later became an avid Jacksonian, and finally added the Whig Party to his collection of political sympathies.[49] Responding to the political climate of Indian removal, Custis developed his own version of the national story of Pocahontas with a play entitled *Pocahontas, or The Settlers of Virginia*, which premiered on 16 January 1830. He presented his Captain John Smith as an idealized Andrew Jackson. Indeed, Smith/Jackson only reluctantly defeats the Indians as he attempts to resolve his sympathy for their plight.[50]

The national myth that Custis constructed relied a romanticized tale of Pocahontas to voice his views of Indian policy issues in his own time. As did Barker, Custis played freely with historical events and characters for both political and artistic reasons. For example, he ended his play not with Rolfe's marriage to Pocahontas, as might be expected, but with Captain John Smith's so called "rescue" by Pocahontas, an arrangement that Custis thought would make the best dramatic sense.[51] Custis also altered history in order to place John Smith and John Rolfe in Jamestown at the same time. Moreover, he places Pocahontas's conversion to Christianity as an event preceding the arrival of Smith and his Jamestown settlers, when historically Christianity

---

[49] Ann Uhry Abrams, *The Pilgrims and Pocahontas: Rival Myths of American Origin* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1999), 109.
[50] Ibid., 110.
[51] Murray H. Nelligan, "American Nationalism on the Stage: The Plays of George Washington Custis (1781-1857)," 299 – 324 (*Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 58 (1950), 312.

remained as yet unknown in Virginia.[52] Though Pocahontas had been portrayed in previous Indian plays primarily as a love interest and as a benefactor to White settlers, Custis turned her into a saintly Christian. This eliminates any role Rolfe played in her conversion – which historically occurred in conjunction with her marriage to him and to their journey to London. As Robert S. Tilton argues, her former "wantonness" is excused because her relationship with Rolfe is decidedly dignified and non-sensual because Custis dared not offend prominent Virginians who claimed ancestry from Pocahontas through Rolfe. Indeed, The biracial marriage of Rolfe and Pocahontas is excluded from the play. Instead, love affairs between minor characters invented by Custis end in biracial marriages. As a Virginian, Custis retold the Pocahontas story as a national story to please Virginia's assertion as the birthplace of the nation.[53]

Powhatan's defeat at the end of the play insinuates that the Indians have only themselves to blame for their removal. Failure to assimilate, like his daughter, means that he is doomed to vanish, enabling the advancement of Anglo-American civilization.[54] Powhatan speech at the end of the play peers optimistically into the rise of the American nation:

> And may the fruits of this union virtue and honour be a long line of descendants, inheriting those principles, gifted with rare talents, and the most exalted patriotism. Now it only remains for us to say, that looking thro' a long vista of futurity, to the time when these wild regions shall become the ancient and honour'd part of a great and glorious American Empire, may we hope that when the tales of early are told from the nursery, the library, or the stage, that kindly will be received the national story of Pocahontas, or the Settlement of Virginia.

Indians have only two choices. They can either resist Euro-American settlement and suffer the consequences – removal, and in the thinking of time, extinction -- or they can be good Indians,

[52] Ann Unry Abrams, *The Pilgrims*, 112.
[53] Robert S. Tilton, *Pocahontas*, 73-74.
[54] Ann Unry Abrams, *The Pilgrims*, 113.

like Pocahontas, and assimilate completely and vanish by other means into the White world.

John Brougham's *Po-ca-hon-tas*; *or, The Gentle Savage*

On 24 December 1855, John Brougham's *Po-Ca-Hon-Tas; or, The Gentle Savage* premiered at Wallack's Lyceum Theatre in New York. From then until 1884 it remained a staple not only at Wallack's, but in the Bowery and National theatres as well.[55] As a burlesque, the play provided social and political commentary on White notions of superiority over Indians and on the violent reality of Indian removal.[56] Moreover, Brougham satirized the stereotype of the Noble Savage, especially as it had been used as a politically expedient tool by which to help formulate both a myth of national origin and a romantic dream of ongoing westward expansion.[57]

The play parodied the Pocahontas myth, and in the process lampooned her conversion to Christianity, her renunciation of her own people, and her marriage to an English colonizer. Accordingly, Brougham set out to satirically attack the genre of the Indian play that had proliferated on the American stage, for aside from the two particularly popular Indian plays, Nelson Barker's *The Indian Princess* and George Washington Parke Custis's *Pocahontas: or, The Settlers of Virginia* examined above, dozens of similar plays had proliferated over the decades. Also, as suggested by the subtitle of *Po-Ca-Hon-Tas* , "a Per-Version of Ye Trewe and Wonderrefulle Hystorie of Ye Rennownned Princesse," he satirized the blatant disregard for historical accuracy that characterized the genre by providing absurd "historical" details of in the

[55] Richard Moody, ed., *Dramas from the American Theatre, 1762 – 1909* (Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1966), 401.
[56] Alexander Saxton, "Blackface Minstrelsy and Jacksonian Ideology," 114 – 39, *Locating American Studies*, ed. Lucy Maddox (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), 128.
[57] Zoe Detsi, "Burlesquing 'Otherness' in Nineteenth-Century American Theatre: The Image of the Indian in John Brougham's *Met-a-mora; or the Last of the Pollywogs* (1847) and *Po-Ca-Hon-Tas; or The Gentle Savage* (1855), 101-124 (American Studies 48, 2007), 108.

Prolegomena: “The deeply interesting incident upon which the Drama is founded, occurred in Virginia, on Wednesday, Oct. 12, A.D. 1607, at twenty- six minutes past 4 in the afternoon.”

Following this, the “Song of Pocahontas,” parodies Longfellow's recently published poem *The Song of Hiawatha.* Brougham substitutes Longfellow’s Noble Savage stereotype with a comic commentary on the conquest, violence, greed of White settlers in their ongoing displacement of Native Americans from their land. For example:

> Now the natives knowing nothing
> Of the benefits intended
> By this foreign congregation,
> Who had come so far to show them
> All how much they'd been mistaken;
> In what darkness they were dwelling,
> And how much obliged they were to
> These disinterested people,
> Who had journeyed to enlighten
> Their unfortunate condition,
> Through these potent triunited
> Anglo-Saxon civilizers,
> Rum, Gunpowder, and Religion.[58]

Through humor and irony, Brougham undermines not only White notions of Indians as racially inferior but also the idea that they are child-like and in need of radical readjustment to the “civilized” life of the dominant white culture. And as Smith reveals to the King (Powhatan), the acquisition of wealth was the only motivation for White settlement in the New World:

> King. What *iron* fortune led you to our shores?
>
> Smith. *Ironic* Monarch, 'twas a pair of *oars.*
> Between ourselves, though, if the truth be told,

[58] *Po-Ca-Hon-Tas; or, The Gentle Savage* in Richard Moody, ed. *Dramas from the American Theatre, 1762 – 1909* (Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1966), 405.

Our goal we' ll reach when we have reached your gold. (...)
My very noble and approved good savage,
That we are come out here your lands to ravage,
It is most true: for this you see us banded.

Moreover, Brougham dispels the sanitized romantic idealism that attached only altruistic goals to Smith and his colonial ambitions, and by extension he critiques the appropriation of Indian land -- the displacement of the already existing inhabitants -- in the service of American republican interests:

King. Conquering lands without a single resident,
Such a *Republic's clearly without precedent!*

Smith's rescue by Pocahontas is presented with absurd humor, undercutting melodramatic convention and the supposed dignity of her action:

Smith. It's a hard pill — but a much harder pillow!

[Reclining. Pocahontas rushing in heroineically distressed and dishevelled, followed by sailors]

Poca. Husband! For thee I s*cream!*

Smith. *Lemon* or *Vanilla?*

Brougham satirically dismantles the image of Pocahontas produced by the White American imagination that celebrated the supposed rejection of her Indian identity and her full embrace of Euro-American values. Brougham deconstructs of the myth of Pocahontas and her position as a national symbol by exposing the romaticized version of the encounter between Pocahontas and the English colonizers, Smith and Rolfe, and the American playwrights' license

to distort the facts in any way they pleased. By exposing the essential discrepancy between myth and reality in white-Indian relations, *Po-Ca-Hon-Tas* inverted a romantic tradition that had blurred the historical reality of settler colonialism's political and economic machinery that drove Indian removal.

Metamora

Even by 1819, after the national fervor of the war of 1812 had died down, playwright Mordecai Noah still felt the need to defend American plays, writing in the preface to his play *She Would Be a Soldier; or, the Plains of Chippewa* (1819):

> National plays should be encouraged. They have done everything for the British nation, and can do much for us; they keep alive the recollection of important events, by representing them in a manner at once natural and alluring. We have a fine scope, and abundant materials to work with, and a noble country to justify the attempt.[59]

Nor would the success of John Augustus Stone's *Metamora* (1829) improve the image of American drama. An 1827 *American Quarterly Review* demanded a national drama that would appeal "directly to the national feelings" and portray "those great and illustrious peculiarities of situation and character" that distinguished America from other nations.[60] Stone's play was a conscious answer to that call, but Metamora's vast appeal did little to chase British plays from US theatres. Although "much of the prejudice against republican plays had subsided by 1830," Harold Nichols concludes, "[i]mported pieces still composed the greater part of the repertory and were welcomed by the public."[61] As Nathaniel Parker Willis, author of *Tortesa, The Usurer*,

[59] Noah in Moses, 641.
[60] Nichols, 287.
[61] Ibid., 288.

would note as late as 1839, American drama was doomed to literary vassalage: "Farewell nationality! The English language now marks the limits of a new literary empire, and America is a suburb."[62] Most early nineteenth-century American plays contained prefaces that apologized to their audiences for any dramatic shortcomings and called for critics to establish new standards by which to judge them.[63]

The most famous Indian play, John Augustus Stone's *Metamora; or the Last of the Wampanoags* (1829), illustrates the ironies involved in the removal of Indians on one hand and their idealization on the other. Metamora represents Metacom (1638–76), the sachem of the Wampanoags who lived in southern New England. Known also as King Philip, he led an attack against English settlers in 1675, sparking the so-called King Philip's War. When word of Metacom's death reached Captain Benjamin Church, a principal leader of colonial forces in the war, Church commanded his soldiers to drag Metacom's corpse from the swamp where he had been slain. Church declared that since the sachem "had caused many an Englishman's body to be unburied, and to rot above ground, not one of his bones should be buried."[64] Thus he had the body hacked into quarters, ordered his men to hang each limb on four neighboring trees, and then hauled the sachem's head to Plymouth. The Indian's severed head, hung high above the ground, provided the thanksgiving centerpiece.[65] Fifty-five years earlier, Massasoit, Metacom's father, attended the 1621 thanksgiving, the gathering now memorialized every November in the United States as the "Pilgrims' First Thanksgiving."[66]

---

[62] Willis in Kliewer, 12.
[63] Bak, 177.
[64] Benjamin Church, quoted in Jill Lepore, *The Name of the War: King Philip's War and the Origins of American Identity* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1999), 173.
[65] Ibid., 174.
[66] Sally L. Jones, "The First but Not the Last of the 'Vanishing Indians': Edwin Forrest and the Mythic Re-creations of the Native Population," 13-27 in *Dressing in Feathers*: *The Construction*

Though denigrated through his representation as a murderous savage throughout the colonial period, Metacom's identity shifted following the American victory in the War of 1812. Sally L. Jones provides one argument that might account for this transformation: "The romantic imagination combined with the urge to create a mythic past separate from England's, and the Indian came to stand as a symbol for past virginity of the continent." Consequently, within an environment of increasing nationalism, American actor Edwin Forrest advertised for a play with an "aboriginal" hero, and Stone won the commission. Stone characterized Metacom sympathetically; he gave the sachem a conscience and a sense of righteous indignation over the wrongs committed against him and his people. In redface, Forrest played the lead role as Metamora for over forty years, work that won him fortune, fame, and the title of "the American tragedian."[67]

The play's long run coincided with the early decades of the Indian Removal Era. Arguably then, Metamora served the nationalist interests of Jacksonian America. In Jones's words, Forrest's performance "refracted through Jacksonian sensibility [by combining] both the 'pesky injuns' and 'noble savages,' advancing the ideology of a necessarily vanishing race."[68] It seems likely that *Metamora* confirmed the preconceptions of its audiences that Indian removal, however tragic, remained essential to the larger project of nation building. The play's popularity may have relied on telling the audience something it already believed. Americans did not have to be convinced that Indians would vanish as "civilization" advanced across the continent. Moreover, the play's recognition of White aggression against Indians may have allowed audiences to first acknowledge and then to cathartically dismiss any associated guilt for such

---

of the Indian in American Popular Culture, ed. S. Elizabeth Bird (Boulder: Westview Press, 1996), 14.

[67] Ibid., 15.

[68] Ibid., 22.

injustices; the goodness of the nationalist project outweighed any evil committed along the way.

At the same time, questions about the play's reception linger, fueling critics to speculate on the multiple levels of significance that *Metamora* may have had for its audiences. For example, Scott C. Martin argues against a nationalist reading of the play, citing the historical absence of audience response data that might support it. He rejects Jones's argument as an overstated distortion, claiming instead that Edwin Forrest's own celebrity primarily accounted for the play's long-lived popularity by raising an otherwise shallow melodrama to the level of tragedy through his powerful stage presence. However, Martin does allow for the possibility that the play offered Jacksonian audiences an "opportunity to celebrate" their national identities and suggests that "the Indian theme" probably assisted in the play's appeal.[69]

By the time of Stone's 1829 play, Metacom transformed in the popular imagination from a "bloody and crafty wretch,"[70] as Puritan divine Increase Mather wrote in 1702, into a sentimentalized tragic hero. Felled by Church and his soldiers, Metamora (Metacom) utters a curse at the end the play:

> My curses on you, white men! May the Great Spirit curse you when he speaks in his war voice from the clouds! Murderers! The last of the Wampanoag's curse be on you! May your graves and the graves of your children be in the path the red man shall trace! And may the wolf and panther howl o'er your fleshless bones, fit banquet for the destroyers! Spirits of the grave, I come! But the curse of Metamora stays with the white man![71]

Here, and throughout the play, Stone establishes a relatively sympathetic understanding of

---

[69] Scott C. Martin, "Interpreting 'Metamora': Nationalism, Theater, and Jacksonian Indian Policy, 73-101 (*Journal of the Early Republic* 19, 1999), 87.
[70] Increase Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana: Or the Ecclesiatical History of New England*, Vol. 1 (London: Thomas Parkhurst, 1702), 54.
[71] John Augustus Stone, *Metamora; or the Last of the Wampanoags* (Brookline, ME: Feedback Theatrebooks, 2009), 38–39.

Metacom. However overwrought dramatically, the sachem at least possesses a voice, a conscience, and a sense of righteous indignation over the wrongs committed against him and his people. Most previous histories denied him these human qualities and did not miss opportunities to venomously condemn him, although the level of sadistic violence committed by both Whites and Indians during King Philip's War made it difficult to discern which side committed the greater evils. At the same time, fulfilling the Nobel Savage stereotype, Metacom was doomed as being too noble to live since he was faced the ever-westward advancement of rapacious Whites. This allowed the audience to respond emotionally to the melodramatic tragedy and to feel safe pangs of guilt for an added sentimental reaction to the play.

Approvingly or not, critics noted Stone's transformation of Metacom from demon to tragic hero. However, they tended to focus less on the historical figure of Metacom and more on the actor Edwin Forrest, identified in the play's epilogue as "a native actor,"[72] not because he possessed a Native American heritage, but because he stood on the stage as a native-born *American*. Forrest saw his performance as a statement of American artistic independence from British culture. Indeed, one critic noted in 1848: "He has created a school of art, strictly American, and he stands forth as the very embodiment, as it were, of the masses of the American character."[73] Forrest appropriated a historical Indian figure and retooled him for the nation's ongoing quest for an identity separate from old Mother England and from Europe in general.

Forrest played Metamora for over forty years, work that won him fortune, fame, and the title of "the American tragedian."[74] Stone's play made him a nineteenth-century superstar. Stylistically, he relied on an expansive and forceful stage presence, while English actors of the

[72] Ibid., 39.
[73] Lepore, *Name of the War*, 199.
[74] Sally L. Jones, "The First but Not the Last of the 'Vanishing Indians': Edwin Forrest and the Mythic Re-creations of the Native Population," in Bird, *Dressing in Feathers*, 13.

time tended to deliver their lines in a reserved and somewhat cerebral fashion. But aesthetic differences in stage presence also embodied potent political statements in the often bitter antipathy between England and the United States that continued to simmer long after the revolution. Indeed, rivalry between Forrest and his equally famous British counterpart, Charles Macready, came to a head on the night of May 10, 1849. That night Macready starred in Shakespeare's *Macbeth* at the Astor Opera House in New York. An estimated 10,000 people filled the streets outside the theater, all fueled to one degree or another with nationalist disdain for the British, and Macready provided a ready focus for their energies. The mob laid siege to the theater, pelting its windows with rocks, attempting to burn it to the ground, and terrifying the audience trapped inside. Macready managed to finish his performance. Meanwhile, the Astor Place Riot left at least 22 people dead and 150 wounded.[75]

A redface performance stood at the heart of the combat, as did the issue of the purported "authenticity" of that performance. According to one of his biographers, "When [Forrest] came to impersonate Metamora . . . it was the genuine Indian who was brought up on the stage. . . . The counterfeit was so cunningly copied that it might have deceived nature herself."[76] Other critics joined in the chorus over the decades to sing the praises of Forrest's "authentic portrayal" of the Wampanoag sachem. Thus at the center of a nationalist effort to identify the United States as a country uniquely separate and even superior to hoary old England stood not a living Indian but a White Indian. That White Indian, Forrest's Metamora, focused his mighty curse on England itself. Put another way, the Indian made Forrest authentically American.

Matamora, as well as the great number of other Indian plays like it, depended on the

---

[75] Ibid.
[76] William Rounseville Alger, *Life of Edwin Forrest, The American Tragedian*, Vol. 1 (Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott, 1877), 240.

mythologized stereotype of the noble savage to define the characteristics of a distinctly American national identity. In the service of that identity, the Indian symbolized American ideals of freedom, virtue, and democracy. However, the actual historical presence of Indians proved problematic because they were regarded as counterproductive to expansion, progress, and civilization. The solution to this problem was to stereotype Indians as doomed to destruction and elimination. On the American stage, the stereotype of the Noble Savage blurred the Indians' historical reality and promoted the Euro-American desire to establish a homogeneous national identity to the exclusion of all other cultures. As White America accrued greater and greater degrees of political and cultural capital, the ability to appropriate Native land and Native identity, and then to utilize both according to their designs, speaks to the inherently nonequivalent nature of both political and cultural entanglements. Witness to this is the long record of violence and discrimination practiced by Euro-Americans against Native Americans. However, as will be seen in the following chapter, Native political and cultural forces also wielded the power to shape national identities based in part on selective elements of Euro-American origin.

Chapter 5

A Quest for Political and Religious Sovereignty: The Mashpee Revolt of 1833

Until the early nineteenth-century encroachment by Euro-American settlers, the Mashpee tribe on Cape Cod had enjoyed control of about 10,500 acres of well-watered forestland for several centuries.[1] So seeing their land base increasingly jeopardized, the Mashpee launched an eventually successful effort to establish tribal sovereignty, thus providing the tribe with the legal right to regulate its borders. The characterization of these efforts in 1833 as a "revolt" arose from the pages of the local and national press. For example, fueled by alarmist reports of an insurrectionary uprising against Whites, one headline blared "Hostilities Commenced in Marshpee!"[2] But, as will be seen, reports of Native violence were highly exaggerated. The Mashpee fought their battles with language. Their spokesmen and their allies also used newspapers and published columns to defend their aims. Other fields of Mashpee battle included pulpits, podiums, and, of course, courts of law.

But how the Mashpee Revolt figures as an example of entanglement becomes a particularly complicated question when it also attempts to take Mashpee religious affiliations into account. For equally significant to the control of its land was the tribe's victory in its campaign to expel Congregationalist minister Phineas Fish in preference to the Mashpee Baptist preacher "Blind Joe" Amos. Pequot minister William Apess also played an instrumental role in the tribe's legal and religious struggles. Indeed, by the early nineteenth century, if not earlier, the Mashpee sought their religious identification in Christianity to the exclusion of any indigenous

[1] Donald M. Nielsen, "The Mashpee Indian Revolt of 1833," 400-420, *The New England Quarterly* 58 (1985), 401.
[2] *Boston Daily Advocate*, 4 July 1833.

belief systems. This situation raises another question: what distinctions, if any, can be drawn between entanglement and assimilation for the early nineteenth-century Mashpee? The same question can be asked of William Apess. For that matter, what is meant by the problematic term "assimilation" itself?

As noted in the Introduction, I place entanglement within the rubric of world history, and as such this study has often employed the concepts of syncretism and hybridity. But assimilation appears to elude both concepts, especially as they may lack the precision for discussing its continually fluid and individually specific nature. Indeed, as William B. Taylor argues, syncretism runs the risk of reifying otherwise dynamic historical processes and "miss the loose ends, reworkings, conflicts, and contradictions," and it further risks the focus "on an end state of completion and wholeness."[3] Similar hazards may also attend hybridity, at least as argued by Carolyn Dean and Dana Leibsohn who question its conceptual precision and consider it an unwieldy tool for exploring the complexity of cultural exchanges, since most cultures "are inherently heterogenous," made so through "millennia of travel and trade [that] have insured that mixing and interaction is the norm." This leads them to ask why "certain mixtures become naturalized over time, losing their visibility and potency as mixtures?" Regarding Indigenous cultures, Dean and Leibsohn also underscore the problem with the notion that their indigeneity relies on a pre-European contact state and argue that this "denies the radical transformations of the lives of indigenous people brought about by colonization [and] betrays desires to freeze indigenous people in the past" as romanticized relics.[4]

In brief, the terms syncretism and hybridity are not beyond interrogation as analytical

[3] William B. Taylor, *Magistrates of the Sacred: Priests and Parishioners in Eighteenth-Century Mexico* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996), 56, 59.
[4] Carolyn Dean and Dana Leibsohn, "Hybridity and its Discontents: Considering Visual Culture in Colonial Spanish America," 5 -35 (*Colonial Latin American Review* 12, 2003), 5, 14 – 15.

tools for the world historian, and the story of the Mashpee provides one example for testing the conceptual limits of these terms. Moreover, the term "assimilation," often applied pejoratively, runs the risk of painting over syncretism and hybridity -- however problematic they may be -- with too wide a brush. For example, Indigenous literature scholar Daniel Heath Justice defines assimilation as "the wholesale rejection of Indigenous values and their replacement with Eurowestern values, either through choice, coercion, or violence."[5] His insistence on "wholesale rejection" denies nuance and runs the risk of negating individual agency, and he collapse complex historical processes into two actions, "rejection" and "replacement." So while remaining sensitive to the highly charged political, economic, and cultural issues surrounding assimilation, use of that term alone, if applied as an absolute marker, may not be able to contain the whole story of shifting cultural and political identities of Native Americans over time relative to their history of interactions with Euro-Americans. The story of the Mashpee Revolt, particularly its religious dimension, provides an example of why it is necessary to complicate concepts of hybridity, syncretism, and assimilation. While keeping in mind their problematic natures, this chapter argues that all three inform aspects of entanglement, specifically of the entangled history of the Mashpee and the colonial and state governments and religious institutions of Massachusettes.

The Mashpee did not seek to define themselves as a nation, so their story may seem anomalous in a study concerning the evolution of Native national identities. Yet the demand to control their own destinies has been the central issue for Native Americans throughout the entangled history of Native Americans and Euro-Americans, and by identifying themselves as nations, Native American tribal identities did not disappear. So this final case study, this fifth of

[5] Daniel Heath Justice, *Our Fire Survives the Storm: A Cherokee Literary History* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005), xvi.

five snapshots, examines some of the political and religious influences originating, at least provisionally, in Euro-America, and how aspects of those influences informed the manner in which the Mashpee conducted the defense of their sovereign status. The defense of sovereignty straddles both tribal and national identities, and that defense as an essential thread throughout the previous chapters also runs through this chapter to further illustrate the complexity of the weave between Native American and Euro-American political and cultural identities.

The Backstory of the Revolt

To understand the revolt first requires an exploration of the historical relationship between the Mashpee and the colonial and state governments of Massachusetts. The economic base of the Mashpee had relied exclusively on the seasonal harvests of food resources on their land, but beginning in the seventeenth century they supplemented that base by marketing lumber and handicrafts to English colonials. This economic relationship grew apace with religious and political connections between the Mashpee and the Puritans. Indeed, religion and politics intertwined when, recognizing an opportunity to convert the Mashpee to Christianity, Puritan minister Richard Bourne built not only a church for them, he also assisted in the construction of a system of Mashpee government. Moreover, Bourne successfully defended Mashpee rights to their timber resources before the General Court in Boston.[6] In 1685 the Court documented the geographic outlines of 10,500 acres of forestland as the exclusive property of the Mashpee, also known at the time as the South Sea Indians.

The decision's unambiguous language would prove vital to subsequent claims of Mashpee sovereignty:

[6] Frederick Freeman, *The History of Cape Cod: The Annals of Barnstable County, Including the District of Mashpee* (Boston: George C. Rand and Avery and Cornhill, 1858), 677 – 679.

> This Court [confirms and secures] to said South Sea Indians & their children for ever, soe as never to be given, sold, or alienated from them without all theire consents. [The court] doth soe far confirme said land to the said Indians, to be perpetually to them & their children, as that no part of them shall be granted to or purchased by any English whatsoever, by the Courts allowance, without the consent of all the said Indians.[7]

But in 1691 jurisdictional changes made by the Province of Massachusetts Bay directly affected the Mashpee when it extended its borders to include Plymouth colony. This meant an increase in the legal authority that the General Court in Boston weilded over the tribe. Initially, this change had little impact on the Mashpee. Indeed, the tribe reformed its own governing structure to assure that the Mashpee retained control of its land usage that it had historically enjoyed. In the early 1720s, the Mashpee elected a group of overseers to safeguard inheritance rights of tribal members known as proprietors. In line with the tribe's traditional understanding of land use, a proprietor could leave his land to his children; however, lacking heirs, that land returned to tribal ownership. But in 1746, the General Court created a system of guardians who could distribute the tribe's lands according to their own arbitrary judgments. So guardians could lease tribal lands to other Englishmen without the Mashpees' permission as long as rental income belonged to the tribe. Presumably, the change arose in response to pressure from settlers anxious to establish at least some precedent for further encroachment.[8]

Mashpee objections to guardianship culminated when the tribe sent Reuben Cognehew to London to argue on its behalf, and in 1763 his success there resulted in the Massachusetts provincial government's decision to grant the right of self-government to the Mashpee.[9]

---

[7] *Records of the Colony of New Plymouth in New England*, 6 vols. (Boston: William White, 1856), 6: 159-60.
[8] Gura, *The Life*, 74.
[9] Freeman, *The History of Cape Cod*, 687.

Massachusetts further declared that only two Englishmen could be elected to the council of five overseers with the authority to regulate fishing, allot land, and lease surplus land to outsiders. Also in 1763, the Massachusetts court granted the Mashpee the right to admit tribal status to African Americans with Mashpee spouses. This took on particular significance following the Revolutionary War: many Mashpee men died fighting for the rebels. Indeed, by 1820 the Mashpee population of 320 contained only 50 or 60 who had not married either African Americans or Hessian mercenaries who remained in the country after the war.[10]

Mashpee sovereignty took another blow in 1788 when the Massachusetts State legislature created a board of overseers composed of three men with the power to regulate Mashpee land. Governor Levi Johnson declared that this would protect the Indians "against the frauds and wicked devices of unprincipled and profligate white men."[11] The paternalism displayed here infantilizes the Mashpee, likely in order to lay the groundwork for justifying further encroachment on their land, as they supposedly lacked the mental capacity to control their own resources.

In 1827, the Mashpee filed a complaint with the Massachusetts legislature to seek legal protection from trespassing settlers. White overseers had diverted Mashpee resources by selling the tribe's timber and hay to outsiders, and promised state funding for schools for Mashpee children remained meager. Finding their complaints consistently stonewalled, in 1827 the tribe took measures that effectively asserted its sovereignty. In town meetings, tribe members took control of their own municipalities, and they chose their own clerks and overseers. Alarmed,

[10] Gura, *The Life*, 74.
[11] Levi Lincoln to Josiah Fiske, 27 June 1833, cited in Donald M. Nielsen, "The Mashpee Revolt of 1833, 400 – 420. *The New England Quarterly* 58 (1985), 402.

White overseers attempted to reassert their control by ignoring Mashpee authority.[12] Throughout a six-year period of legal wrangling, the Mashpee argued that the same rights of sovereignty claimed by the founders of the United States applied equally to them. More than a rhetorical device, this compelling tactic lent credence to the Mashpee quest for liberty. By comparing themselves to the American Revolutionaries who threw off the yoke of British tyranny, the Mashpee leveraged an argument that gained steady traction in the courts and in the press. But the political and legal dimensions of the Mashpee Revolt cannot be fully understood without also addressing attendant religious issues.

Religious Conflicts on Mashpee Land

Following Richard Bourne's death in 1685, his pulpit went to the Mashpee minister Simon Popmonit. Henceforth, Native Christians retained spiritual authority on Mashpee land, an authority that did not go unchallenged by Euro-American ministerial interests. These interests came in the form of Congregationalist minister Phineas Fish. Funded through a Harvard endowment designated for individuals desiring to spread the Christian message to Indians, he began his tenure among the Mashpee in 1811. However, he demonstrated little to no interest in reaching out to the Mashpee. For the most part, local Whites filled his pews. The Mashpee preferred their own Baptist preacher, "Blind Joe" Amos. Only a handful of Mashpee ever attended Fish's services.[13]

One of the most significant figures in the Mashpee Revolt was also a significant religious figure in Massachusetts, William Apess. His compelling sermons, especially those that championed the rights of Native Peoples, as well as his connections with Boston abolitionists,

[12]Ibid.
[13] Gura, 75 – 76.

expanded the tribe's network of alliances and solidified its resolve during the 1833 revolt.[14] In his autobiography, *A Son of the Forest*, William Apess claimed descent from "the royal family of Philip, king of the Pequot tribe" through his grandmother.[15] Though King Philip belonged to the Pokanoket, not the Pequout, the kinship he felt with the famous leader of the 1637 rebellion against Massachusetts Bay Puritans reveals an aspect of his identity that helps inform his involvement in the 1833 Mashpee Revolt. Moreover, perhaps building on this identity, the condemnation of White aggression against Native Peoples constitutes a central theme in his conversion narrative, *The Experiences of Five Christian Indians*. This pamphlet also alludes to White appropriation of timber on Native land, an issue central to the Mashpee revolt, to be discussed below.

But in his estimation, their failure to live as Christians comprised the greatest crime committed by Whites. The theme of this failure runs throughout the pamphlet, and it illuminates the reasoning behind his own decision to convert to Christianity. He charged Whites as devoid of principle: "They would think it no crime to go upon Indian lands and cut and carry off their most valuable timber, or anything else they chose; and I doubt not but they think it clear gain."[16] Painfully aware of the poverty and alcoholism that afflicted many Native Peoples, he advocated education and preached temperance as the best means for restoring their dignity, and he chastised White resistance to healing the wounds that they bore direct responsibility for inflicting on Indians in the first place.

---

[14] Philip F. Gura, *The Life of William Apess, Pequot* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015), 71 – 76.

[15] William Apess, *A Son of the Forest* in *On Our Own Ground*, 3.

[16] William Apess, *The Experiences of Five Christian Indians*, in *On Our Own Ground*, 156.

> Perhaps some unholy unprincipled men would cry out, "The skin was not good enough": but stop, friends – I am not talking about the skin but about principles. I would ask if there cannot be as good feelings and principles under a red skin as there can be under a white. And let me ask: Did not this bad principle proceed from the whites or their forefathers? And I would ask: is it worthwhile to nourish it any longer? If not, then let us have a change, although some men no doubt spout their corrupt principles against it, that are in the halls of legislation and elsewhere.[17]

Such language marked him as a dangerous man in the eyes of many Whites, as subsequent press accounts would demonstrate. He perhaps especially raised White ire when by peering into "an Indian's Looking-Glass for the White Man" he asks: "Why are we not protected in our persons and property throughout the Union?" And his answer condemned what he saw as the political, moral, and religious cravenness and hypocrisy of many White people who regarded skin color other than their own as a permanent barrier to the freedoms and protections guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States. Such a mindset he argued stemmed from taking "the skin as a pretext to keep [us Indians] from our unalienable and lawful rights." Again, employing his Looking-Glass, he asked if Whites "would like to be disfranchised from all your rights, merely because your skin is white, and for no other crime. I'll venture to say, these very characters who hold the skin to be such a barrier in the way would be the first to cry out, 'Injustice! Awful injustice!'"[18]

Likely of most lethal consequence, he charged White people with turning their backs on Christ's message, unable to "imitate him and have his spirit." He leveraged his attack with numerous citations from scripture, including the precept: "If any man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar" (1 John 4:20), and asked "Did you ever hear or read of Christ teaching his disciples that they ought to despise one because his skin was different from theirs?"

[17] Ibid., 156.
[18] Ibid.

> Jesus Christ being a Jew, and those of his Apostles certainly were not whites – and did not those who completed the plan of salvation complete it for the whites as well as for the Jews, and others? And were not the whites the most degraded people of the earth at that time? And none were more so, for they sacrificed their children to dumb idols! And did not St. Paul labor more abundantly for building up a Christian nation among you than any of the Apostles? And you know as well as I that you are not indebted to a principle beneath a white skin for your religious services but to a colored one.[19]

Direct, logical, and based on the "fact" of scripture, Apess's argument categorically refuted any White claim to Christian conduct. Simultaneously, his radicalism demonstrates that neither his own conversion to Christianity nor his decision to train as a Methodist preacher arose as acts of assimilation. Rather, they stemmed from a sincere -- even militant -- desire to spread the messages of Christ and his disciples, messages that cannot be separated from political action, as revealed through his role in the Mashpee revolt.

Indigenized Christianity

Over the course of the eighteenth century, many Native Peoples in southeastern New England slowly warmed to Christian ideas and practices. So by the time of the First Great Awakening in the 1740s, the foundation had been established for a period of rapid, though eventually unsustained, Native conversion. As with White conversions during the Awakening, Indians reacted to the emotionally charged preaching of impassioned New Lights who spread their message of salvation throughout the region.[20]

For Native Americans, however, conversion -- and the issue of assimilation attending it -- was rarely totalizing. Rather, they tended to incorporate Christian ideas into their own belief

[19] Ibid., 158.
[20] Linford D. Fisher, *The Indian Great Awakening: Religion and the Shaping of Native Cultures in Early American* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 79.

systems, and this complicates the term "conversion" itself. For that matter, even among Anglo Americans, conversion in the context of Great Awakening ideology was the end result of a highly dramatic spiritual process. The concept of "affiliation" perhaps more accurately applies to the Native experience with Christianity not only during the Awakening but also in the years subsequent to it. Indeed, as historian Linford D. Fisher argues, "Native affiliation in the Great Awakening seems less like a momentous point of religious and cultural disjuncture for Indian communities -- wholesale conversion -- and more like one more step in the ongoing decades-old engagement with Christian ideas and Euroamerican culture, all with an eye toward community and cultural survival and revitalization."[21]

The Mahican minister Sampson Occam was the product of the First Great Awakening, and his involvement with Brothertown exemplifies the complex role played by Christianity in Native religious identities, a complexity comparable to Appes and the Mashpee, however much Brothertown and the Mashpee followed different historical trajectories.

In November 1785, about twenty Mohegan, Narrangasett, and Niantic families of Christian Indians migrated to Oneida land in upper New York and organized a "Body Politick" named Brothertown. The move represented commitment to a Euroamerican economy based on subsistence agriculture instead of one based on hunting, fishing, craft making, or the leasing of tribal land to White farmers. But within a few years both Brothertown and nearby New Stockbridge, settled by Christian Narrangasett migrants from Stockbridge Massacchusetts, were shaken to the core by religious discord as well as by political factionalism.

Initially Brothertown coalesced around Samson Occom's ministry. Occom, after all, had been one of the town's principle founders. However, doctrinal divisions soon drove him to

[21] Ibid.,101.

relocate and serve the Church in nearby New Stockbridge. But even there, Native Christian factions preferred the ministry of John Sergeant Jr. and not that of Occom. On the other hand, when Occom died in July 1792, over three hundred Indians from Brothertown and New Stockbridge attended his funeral.

Fisher argues convincingly that divisions over issues of relocation, accommodation to European culture, and Christianization followed generational lines, with most Brothertown leaders born after the First Great Awakening, the period in which Occom's religious identity crystalized. For example, James Niles Jr., the nephew of a New Light minister, fell out with his uncle and criticized Narragansett Separates for their lack of discipline and "Rule of Conduct." His outspokenness led to his censure, so for him migration to Brothertown meant escape from the type of Indian Christian doctrine with which he disagreed.[22]

Also, migration did not solve problems of land dispossession. Indeed, the Oneida soon contested the land grant that made Brothertown possible, and within a few years that land began to fall into the hands of the local White population through long-term leases, rentals, and purchases. In 1791, Brothertown officials told the New York Assembly that "White People have Come [with their] Children, Horses, Cattle, Hogs, and Dogs, and they bring Rum, [creating a] Deplorable situation." Both Brothertown and New Stockbridge Indians proclaimed their identity as civilized Christians to leverage ongoing struggles with local and state governments in their fight for equal rights. For example, in February 1792, Brothertown leaders petitioned the state legislature asking to "be put on the footing of free white citizens [for] they have been brought up in a civilized life, and that they profess the Christian religion." In 1818, in another attempt to escape ongoing land loss and increasing pressures of White settlement, many Brothertown and

[22] Ibid., 190.

New Stockbridge Indians again moved westward, first to southern Indiana and then in the 1830s to the Lake Winnebago region in Wisconsin.[23]

The experiences of Brothertown and New Stockbridge paralleled that of other post-Revolutionary War Native communities as they dealt with religious and economic issues and shifting national identities during the early years of the American republic. Native peoples across southeastern New England balanced religious identities as Christians who prized private land ownership with deeply rooted beliefs in tribal sovereignty and its attendant kinship based cultural identity. So it is within this broader regional context that the Mashpee revolt can be best understood.

Apess and the Mashpees

Through the efforts of several sympathetic ministers, Apess received permission from Phineas Fish, the Congregationalist assigned to the Mashpees, to take the pulpit for a Sunday service. Eagerly anticipating a meeting house filled with members of the Mashpee tribe, Apess, however, found pews filled with only white worshipers. As he later discovered, the local white population had for several years already effectively taken over the meeting house, one originally designed for the Mashpee Indians when constructed nearly a century ago. Dismayed, he wrote, "these pale men were certainly stealing from the Indians their portion of the gospel, by leaving their own house of worship and crowding them out of theirs."[24]

Apess soon learned that most Mashpees reviled the Congregationalist Fish. Instead they flocked to the Wampanoag Baptist minister, Blind Joe Amos. Fish, in turn disdained Amos, and

---

[23] Ibid., 198.
[24] William Apess, "Indian Nullification of the Unconstitutional Laws of Massachusetts Relative to the Marshpee Tribe; or, The Pretended Riot Explained" in *On Our Own Ground*, 169 – 171.

in answer to Apess's inquiries claimed that the Indian lacked proper training as a minster because he had educated himself by ear -- being blind -- and therefore did the Mashpee more harm than good. Such censure meant little to Apess. He sought out Amos and within days struck up a close bond with him as well as with the other Mashpees. Indeed, they readily invited him to a tribal council meeting, there to apprise him in greater detail of the dire civil and religious problems confronting them. Moreover, knowing that they had found a sincere ally, they wanted to hear more about the help Apess proffered.[25]

The meeting led to his adoption into the Mashpee tribe so that he could more effectively advocate it interests. Ebenezer Attaquian, one of the prayer leaders, summarized the tribe's ethical and religious responsibility to Apess and the political rationale for the adoption: "If we get this man to stand by us, we must stand by him, and if we forsake him after he undertakes for us, God will forsake us also."[26]

The meeting also led to the drawing up of a petition signed by about 100 Mashpee and directed to Massachusetts governor, Levi Lincoln:

> *Resolved*, That we, as a tribe, will rule ourselves, and have the right to do so; for all men are born free and equal, says the Constitution of the country.
>
> *Resolved*, That we will not permit any white man to come upon our plantation, to cut or carry off wood or hay, or any other article, without our permission, after the 1st of July next.
>
> *Resolved*, That we will put said resolutions in force after that date (July next), with the penalty binding and throwing them from the plantation, if they will not stay otherwise.[27]

Asserting their right as a people to control their own destiny, and echoing Rousseau as in

[25] Ibid., 171 – 73.
[26] Ibid., 173.
[27] Ibid.,175.

turn his ideological shadow falls across the Constitution, Mashpee resolve rested squarely on republican principles with which no one in their intended audience could argue against lest they reveal their own hypocrisy. Furthermore, the assertion of their sovereign right to control their own borders, to reserve to their own judgment the conditions under which outsiders may enter their land, determinedly warns would be intruders that they will incur Mashpee wrath and will be summarily expelled.

The Mashpee also put Harvard College on notice with another petition, one that invoked the Preamble to the Constitution of the United States. The petition's refrain of "we, as a people," drove home the unambiguous message that the tribe claimed the same language, or, more precisely, it staked claim to the same set of laws held sacred by the United States. The petition also declared that, as did the United States, the Mashpee will suffer no oppression by Imperial tyrants. Specifically, the Harvard petition demanded the removal of Phineas Fish, stating, "We, as a people, have not been benefited by his preaching; for our moral character has not been built up, and there has been no improvement in our intellectual powers, and we know of no Indian that has been converted by his preaching." Turning the tables on its intended audience, the petition identifies the central irony of Fish's ministerial tenure: "We wonder how the good citizens of Boston, or any town would like to have the Indians send them a preacher and force him into the pulpit and then send other Indians to crowd the whites out of their own meeting house, and not pay once cent for it."[28]

The petition makes yet another connection -- perhaps its most lethal -- when it mockingly delivers a calculated sting: "Perhaps you have heard of the oppression of the Cherokees and lamented over them much, and thought of the Georgians were hard and cruel

[28] Ibid., 176-177

creatures; but did you ever hear of the poor, oppressed and degraded Marshpee Indians in Massachusetts, and lament over them?"[29]

> *Resolved*, That we will rule our own tribe and make choices of whom we please for our preacher.
> *Resolved*, That we will have our own meeting house, and place in the pulpit whom we please to preach to us.
> *Resolved*, That we will publish this to the world; if the above reasons and resolutions are not adhered to, and the Rev. Mr Fish discharged.
> The foregoing addresses and resolutions were adopted by a vote of the tribe, almost unanimous. Done at the Council House at Marshpee, May the 21st, 1833.[30]

Alarmed by such language, the governor sent Josiah Fiske to investigate the Mashpee. As Fiske would soon learn, The Pequot minister William Apess played a central role in advancing the Mashpee cause, and as Barry O'Connell argues, "The pressing of the Mashpees' grievances [. . .] might have been tolerated, barely, had Apess not had the genius and the presumption to expropriate the language of American democracy in the name of Native Americans."[31]

The Cherokee Context

On April 29, 1832, Elias Boudinot and William Apess shared the rostrum at the Federal Street Church in Boston.[32] The billing underscores a significant context of the Mashpee Revolt, as it occurred against the backdrops of the Cherokee Nation's bid for sovereignty and of the unfolding consequences of the 1830 Indian Removal Act. The content of their speeches went unrecorded, yet the symbolism of these embattled figures sharing a stage speaks of the potent

[29] Ibid.
[30] Ibid.
[31] Barry O'Connell, ed. *On Our Own Ground: The Complete Writings of William Apess*, *A Pequot* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1992), 164.
[32] Gura, 66.

simultaneity of Native American endeavors for the recognition of national identities. Moreover, Apess's comment above regarding the Cherokee suggest that he hoped to elevate the struggle of the Mashpee to the same level of importance as that of the nationally famous Cherokee case and to give the Mashpee quest for sovereignty the attention that he believed it deserved. Apess elsewhere remarked on the relevance of the Cherokee to the Mashpee cause, noting that the Cherokee have been "sacrificed" by Jackson:

> [And] if Georgia, under her union nullifier, Governor Lumpkin, is permitted to set the process of the Supreme Court as defiance, it will be a foul dishonor upon the country. But while we condemn the conduct of General Jackson toward the Southern Indians, what shall we say of the treatment of our own poor defenseless Indians, the Marshpee tribe, in our own state? [. . .] These Indians fought and bled side by side, with our fathers, in the struggled for liberty; but the whites were no sooner free themselves, than they enslaved the poor Indians.[33]

Significantly, again, Apess took the opportunity in this last sentence to underscore the bond created between the Mashpee and the White founders during the revolution, the patriot blood that the Indians shed in the cause of American liberty rewarded by enslavement.

Both the Cherokee and the Mashpee worked through the machinery of state and federal legislatures and courts to establish sovereignty. Both leveraged their claims to sovereignty by underscoring their incorporation of Euro-American values – Christianity and property rights – regardless of how much these values altered as they melded with indigenous belief systems and concepts of tribal property. Moreover, the Mashpee bid for sovereignty occurred under the threatening shadow of the 1830 Indian Removal Act and its legal foundation in *Johnson v. M'Intosh* (1823), which ruled that the title of the land "discovered and conquered," belongs to the conquering nation, and Indigenous Peoples held only "a right of occupancy," which could be

[33] Apess, "Indian Nulllification," 239.

abrogated. Also looming was the Marshall Court's decision in *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* (1831) that asked whether the Cherokee Nation constituted a foreign state. Marshall said no and defined it as "domestic dependent nation." But since nations exist with inherent autonomy, how could one nation be dependent on another? Marshall attempted to solve this paradox in *Worcester v. Georgia* (1832) in which he wrote that the Cherokee nation "is a distinct community, occupying its own territory, with boundaries accurately described, in which the laws of Georgia can have no force," a decision that appeared to affirm Cherokee sovereignty. Since the 1833 Mashpee Revolt occurred before Cherokee removal, effectively the result of President Jackson's decision to ignore *Worcester v. Georgia*, Apess and the others who engineered the revolt could have at least have possessed guarded optimism regarding the outcome of their own bid for Mashpee sovereignty.[34]

Sovereignty

In June 1833, William Apess and Blind Joe Amos travelled to Boston and delivered their resolutions to the Secretary of State, the matter to be taken up in the upcoming council session. A few weeks later, the Mashpee council met and issued a notice "to the former board of overseers, and the public at large,"

> Having heretofore been distressed, and degraded, and robbed daily, we have taken measures to put a stop to these things. And having made choice of our own town officers to act instead of the whites [. . .] we acted in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution. [. . .] And now we would say to our white friends, we are wanting nothing but our rights betwixt man and man.[35]

[34] The Marshall Trilogy, http://teachmyaamiahistory.org/contents/section6/readings/104-marshall-trilogy (accessed July 17, 2019).
[35] Apess, *Indian Nullification*, 178 – 80.

Not only a declaration of independence, the proclamation also grounds itself in the rights that the Mashpee believed their due under the protection of the U.S. Constitution. Alarmed by the tribe's assertions of sovereignty, The guardians sent Gideon Hawly, a politically influential local White resident, to Governor Lincoln with a letter from Fish "to whom he represented," in Apess's words, "the state of affairs in colors which we cannot acknowledge to have been faithful. He stated that the Indians were in open rebellion and that blood was likely to be shed."[36]

Alarmed by Fish's report, Lincon sent Josiah Fiske to investigate and directed him that

> If there should be any seditious or riotous proceedings, let the ringleaders be arrested and delivered over to the civil power, under the ordinary processes of Law, and if more serious consequences than are now apprehended are like to ensue, advise me by express, if necessary, or otherwise, as the urgency of the case may require.[37]

A test to Mashpee resolve arose when two White brothers from the Sampson family attempted to haul off a cartload of wood from tribal land. They disregarded Apess, who ordered them to stop, but shortly thereafter the Mashpee landowners themselves arrived and unloaded the wagon. Infuriated, one of the brothers, a justice of the peace, "threatened to prosecute them for [. . .] protecting their own property." Josiah Fiske, as Apess recounted, highhandedly ordered the Mashpee landowners to meet him at Ezra Crocker's tavern to resolve the confrontation, a demand refused by Mashpee president Daniel Amos, who instructed Fiske to instead meet with the council a few days later -- on July 4. The council would meet with Fiske under its own conditions, not those imposed upon it by him. Indeed, Amos, and the other council members, most certainly recognized the symbolism of the date as they prepared to defend Mashpee

---

[36] Ibid., 180.
[37] Levi Lincoln to Josiah Fiske, 20 June 1833, cited in Maureen Konkle, *Writing Indian Nations: Native Intellectuals and the Politics of Historiography, 1827 – 1863* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 121.

sovereignty as absolute.[38]

Josiah Fiske, John Reed, the high sheriff of Barnstable County, and the state appointed White overseers spent that Fourth of July confronted by the Mashpee Council's angry demands and detailed reports regarding the attacks on their declared sovereignty committed by White overseers and other local Whites. Furthermore, the Council underscored its long-standing demand for the removal of Phineas Fish for his ongoing willful neglect of Mashpee spiritual welfare. Reed summarily dismissed the council's impassioned testimonies and said, as paraphrased by Apess in his description of the meeting, "merely declaring a law to be oppressive could not abrogate it; and that it would become us, as good citizens whom the government was disposed to treat well, to wait for the session of the Legislature and then apply for relief." Apess further noted that "Surely it was either insult or wrong to call the Marshpee citizens, for such they never were, from the Declaration of Independence up to the session of the Legislature in 1834." And in response to Fiske's warning that any intention by the Mashpee to violate the law would be met by "awful consequences," Apess demanded that unjust "laws ought to be altered without delay; that it was perfectly manifest that they were unconstitutional." For his heated remarks, Reed placed him under arrest, along with several Mashpee who attended the meeting bearing firearms, though as Apess noted, they did so merely because they had just returned from hunting.[39]

If designed as a warning to Mashpee rebels, his thirty-day sentence and one hundred dollar fine only reified Mashpee resolve to pursue sovereignty. Moreover, escalating press coverage of the revolt attracted the attention of a particularly significant ally, William Lloyd Garrison, who on 25 January, 1834 published an article in his own paper, *The Liberator*. The

[38] Apess, *Indian Nullification*, 181- 82.
[39] Ibid., 183 – 85.

article recognized distinct differences between African American slavery and the oppression faced by the Mashpees. However, Garrison recognized the Mashpee struggle as righteous, so it deserved defense by anyone who desired abolition of oppression faced by any marginalized groups.

> There is a small tribe comprising four or five hundred persons residing at the head of Cape Cod, in Barnstable county. They have long been under the guardianship of the State, treated as paupers, and subjected to the control of a board of Overseers. [Recently] they set forth the grievances which are imposed upon them, the injustice [. . .] of the laws inflicting their tribe, the arbitrary and capricious conduct of the overseers, and the manner in which they are defrauded of the fruits of their labor; and earnestly [beseeched] the Legislature to grant them the same liberty of action as is enjoyed by their white brethren, that they manage their own concerns, and be directly amenable to the laws of the State, and not to their present overseers.[40]

Garrison then recounted the woodcart incident and the sentencing of William Apess, acts he roundly condemned, then he summarized a speech Apess recently made before the legislature: "Mr. Apes wished to know from whence the right to tax them, without their consent, and at pleasure, and subject them to the arbitrary control of a Board of Overseers was derived? He knew not himself; but he feared it was from the color of their skin." Garrison demanded that the "spontaneous, earnest upward movement of our red brethren [should not] be stigmatized as turbulent, but applauded as meritorious. It is sedition, it is true; but only the sedition of freedom against oppression. [. . .] We protest against the natural order of things; and now that the case has come under our cognizance, we shall not abandon it hastily."[41]

An anonymous letter written by a member of the Mashpee tribe appeared in the July 25 issue of the *Barnstable Journal*, and it equated the Mashpee cause with that of the Founders. The

[40] "The Marshpee Indians," *The Liberator*, 25 January, 1834.
[41] Ibid.

writer asked: "Will not the good people of Massachusetts revert back to the days of their fathers when they were under the galling yoke of the mother country? when they petitioned the government for a redress of grievances, but in vain?" The letter then invoked the Boston Tea Party and compared that iconic act of rebellion enshrined in the American national identity with the wood cart incident. Indeed, the writer claimed, the Mashpee faced an even greater existential crisis than that of the American colonial rebels: "And now we ask the good people of Massachusetts, the boasted cradle of liberty, whom we have petitioned for a redress of wrongs, more grievous than what your fathers had to bear [. . .] and there was no other alternative but like theirs, to stake our stand, and as we have on our plantation but one harbor, and no English ships of tea, for a substitute, we unloaded two wagons loaded with our wood." Finally, the writer reminds his readers of the sacrifices made by the Mashpee in their alliance with American forces during the Revolutionary War:

> And now, good people of Massachusetts, when your fathers dared to unfurl the banners of freedom against the hostile fleets and armies of Great Britain, it was then that Marshpee furnished them with their bravest men to fight your battles. Yes, by the side of your fathers they fought and bled, and now their blood cries to you from the ground to restore that liberty so unjustly taken from us by their sons.[42]

After months of deliberation, in March 1834 the Massachusetts General Court ruled in favor of the Mashpee. Thus the "Marshpee District" received the right to govern itself as an incorporated community, the same as any other Massachusetts community. And two years later, the Mashpee finally ousted Phineas Fish and installed the ordained Baptist minister E.G. Perry in his place; moreover, this arrangement allowed Blind Joe Amos to focus on the congregation on

[42] *Barnstable Journal*, July 25, 1833, cited in Apess, *Indian Nullification,* 195.

Martha's Vineyard that he had been maintaining for several years already.[43]

The Mashpees' historical relationship to the land on which they lived, combined with their own understanding of Christianity, provided bonds central to their tribal identity. Moreover, they felt entitled to the same benefits of liberty enjoyed by Euro-Americans because of their sacrifices in the American Revolution. The dynamic interplay of Native American and Euro-American political and cultural elements meant that Mashpee history was one of ongoing innovation.

As active historical agents, their inherent heterogeneity meant that contact with European colonials and Euro-Americans led to further cultural and political entanglements. However, the asymmetric power relationship between Indians and Whites meant that such entanglements often led to a range of conflicts. Attempts at resolution of these conflicts sometimes led to bloodshed, or, as with the Mashpee, they also relied on the implementation of strategic intellectual tools. As a community the Mashpee were victors in hard fought battle with the state Massachusetts, and as such they earned the right to control their own political and religious matters within their own borders.

[43] Gura, *The Life of William Apess*, 96.

Conclusion

This study set out to investigate five episodes of political and cultural interactions between Native Americans and Euro-Americans over the course of approximately two generations from the late eighteenth to the early nineteenth centuries. The explorations of these episodes have relied on the verb "entangle" to drive them. Reflecting on the meaning of that word as defined by the Oxford English Dictionary, that is "to intertwist (threads, branches, or the like) complicatedly of confusedly together; to intertwist the threads or parts of (a thing) in this way," the term's core characteristics of complication and confusion in turn seem to define the historic asymmetries of power between Indians and Whites and to the underscore the fact that both groups effectively originated in two different worlds, so political and cultural confusions between them invariably informed their interactions over time. Moreover, as the histories of both groups grew increasingly intertwisted, it becomes increasingly untenable to understand either group in isolation from the other.

By exploring various permutations of entanglement and its conceptual possibilities, each chapter has attempted to tease out some of threads in the interwoven history of Native Americans and Euro-Americans. But however inextricably linked the two may be in some aspects, their historical relationship has always been marked by the dissimilar effects of contact between them. Moreover, during the period covered in these pages, the effects of settler colonialism increasingly challenged the understandings that Native American held regarding the integrity of their land base. These challenges accelerated tensions between Indians and Whites, and negotiations of power between them entered a phase distinctly different from the previous era of imperial colonialism.

An Entangled History has attempted to explore some of these differences, some of the changes in negotiations of power between Indians and Whites, by exploring an episode emblematic of imperial colonialism in the first chapter, "International Diplomacy and National Identities: The 1768 Treaty of Fort Stanwix," and an episode that explores the transition to settler colonialism in the second chapter, "Shifting Entanglements: Kinship, Native Politics, and Colonialism in the Great Lakes Region." Attending the shifts in negotiations of power, some Native American tribes adopted aspects of republicanism into their existing political identities, thus shaping hybrids of national identities. Chapter three, "A Crossroads of National Identities: Lafayette's 1824 – 1825 Visit to the United States," explored such hybrid political constructions as they evolved among the Creek Indians. Then to examine the role played through the appropriation of Native American history and culture into the evolving national identity of the United States, chapter four, "Cultural Appropriations: American National Identity and the Genre of the Indian Play in the Early Antebellum Era," concerns the era of Indian Removal (an issue examined in detail in the previous two chapters) as it gained momentum in the early decades of the nineteenth century. That chapter addresed the relationship between the settler colonialism's appropriation of Native land and the commercialization of Native American histories and cultures as the marketplace of American popular culture gained traction. Finally, a negotiation of power explored in Chapter Five, "A Quest for Political and Religious Sovereignty: The Mashpee Revolt," concerned the rights of Native sovereignty successfully defended.

An Entangled History also positioned itself as a world history. At the same time its final chapter interrogated some fundamental terms used by world historians. Thus hybridity and syncretism were problematized because as much as these concepts can help us understand the past, ironically, they may potentially interfere with that understanding through an unexamined

reliance upon them. Similarly, comparative history, also found in the toolkit of world historians, may also run the risk of examining cultures as static entities because it may artificially freeze the moving parts of not only one but of multiple cultures in its analytical processes.

This study has been episodic in nature, as it presents five case studies that examine various permutations of entanglement. Yet there appears no reason why a sustained historical narrative could not also be cast as an entangled history, since the nature of entanglement, that of the continually changing complexity of the human story, would appear to possess a relatively universal application regardless of the narrative form that a historian chooses to produce.

An entangled history should cast a wide net. In itself, it does not possess any encoded narrative; it is a tool, a way of seeing. On the other hand, the nature of entanglement, as proposed above, might also possess qualities subversive to the construction of any type of historical account. At least if taken to its logical limit, entanglement could lead to a labyrinthine density Joycean in magnitude. However, in sum, this study has proposed the concept of entanglement, and at the very least, use of this concept has attempted to resist an outcome oriented history and to suggest the dynamism of the human story which has no stop.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Newspapers

American Quarterly Review, June 1827. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uva.x004215483&view=1up&seq=1 (accessed September 20, 2019).

Niles Weekly Register, November 4, 1824. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=njp.32101064077074&view=1up&seq=242 (accessed September 10, 2019)

The Universal Asylum and Columbian, March, 1792. https://archive.org/details/universalasylumc17911phil/page/n6 (accessed September 10, 2019).

Government Documents

American State Papers, Indian Affairs, vol. 2. https://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llsp&fileName=008/llsp008.db&recNum=4 (accessed September 10, 2019).

Broadhead, John R., Berthold Fernow, and Edmund B. O'Callaghan, eds., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York*, vol. 8. Albany: Weed, Parsons and Company, 1857.

Pennsylvania Archives, vol. 10. Philadelphia: Joseph Severns, 1854. https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=sPUPAAAAYAAJ&hl=en&pg=GBS.PP1 (accessed September 10, 2019).

Fernow, John R. Berthold, and Edmund B. O'Callaghan.eds, *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York* vol. 7. Albany: Parsons and Company, 1857.

New York State Museum 57th Annual Report, Volume 2. (Albany: University of State of New York, 1903)

National Archives: Founders Online, "Definintive Treaty of Peace Between the United States and Great Britain, 3 September 1783," https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Franklin/01-40-02-0356

"Treaty of Doak's Stand,"1820, https://www.choctawnation.com/sites/default/files/2015/09/29/1820_Treaty_of_Doak's_Stand_original.pdf (accessed September 10, 2019).

Freeman, Frederick. *The History of Cape Cod: The Annals of Barnstable County, Including the District of Mashpee* Boston: George C. Rand and Avery and Cornhill, 1858.

Gadsby's Hotel: http://www.streetsofwashington.com/2009/11/national-hotel.html (accessed September 10, 2019).

Records of the Colony of New Plymouth in New England, vol. 6. Boston: William White, 1856.

Register of Debates in Congress, 18th Congress 2nd Session. https://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=llrd&fileName=001/llrd001.db&recNum=4 (accessed September 10, 2019).

Moeller, G. Martin. *AIA Guide to the Architecture of Washington D.C.*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012.

Memoirs and Papers

Atwater, Caleb. *Remarks Made on a Tour to Prairie du Chien; Thence to Washington City, in 1829.* Columbus: Isaac N. Whiting, 1831.

Apess, William. "The Experiences of Five Christian Indians." In *On Our Own Ground: The Complete Writings of William Apess*, *A Pequot,* edited by Barry O'Connell, 117-61. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1992.

---. "Indian Nullification of the Unconstitutional Laws of Massachusetts Relative to the Marshpee Tribe; or, The Pretended Riot Explained" In *On Our Own Ground: The Complete Writings of William Apess*, *A Pequot,* edited by Barry O'Connell, 163-274.. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1992.

Gaines, George Strother. *The Reminiscences of George Strother Gaines: Pioneer and Statesman of Early Alabama and Mississippi, 1805-1843*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1998.

Johnson, William *The Papers of Sir William Johnson*, vol 12, edited by William H. Hamilton. Albany: University of the State of New York, 1957.

Idzerda, Stanley J. and Robert Rhodes Crout, eds. *Lafayette in the Age of the American Revolution*: *Selected Letters and Papers, 1776-1790*, vol. 5. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983.

Levasseur, Auguste. *Lafayette in America in 1824 and 1825*. Philadelphia: Carey and Lea, 1829.

Plays

Stone, John Augustus. *Metamora; or the Last of the Wampanoags.* Brookline: Feedback Theatrebooks, 2009.

Moody, Richard. *Dramas from the American Theatre, 1762 – 1909*. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1966.

Moses, M.J. *Representative Plays by American Dramatists, 1765 – 1819.* New York: Benjamin Publishing, 1946.

Secondary Sources

Abrams, Ann Uhry. *The Pilgrims and Pocahontas: Rival Myths of American Origin*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1999.

Ackerman, A. *Imperial Ears: The Power of Melodrama In James Nelson Barker's Indian Princess*. Philadelphia: American Society for Theatre Research. 2002.

Alger, William Rounseville. *Life of Edwin Forrest, The American Tragedian*. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1877.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. New York: Verso, 1993.

Axtell, James. *The European and the Indian: Essays in Ethnohistory of Colonial North America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Bak, John S. "James Nelson Barker's *The Indian Princess*." *Studies in Musical Theatre,* vol. *2* (2008): 175-193.

Baker, Peter. *A Language of Our Own: The Genesis of Michif, the Mixed Cree-French Language of the Canadian Metis*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Bank, Rosemarie K. *Theatre Culture in America, 1825-1860*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Banner, Stuart. *How the Indians Lost Their Land: Law and Power on the Frontier.* Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005.

Bauer, Ralph and Marcy Norton, "Entangled Trajectories: Indigenous and European Histories." *Colonial Latin American Review*, vol. 26, no. 1 (2017): 1-17.

Becker, Mary Druke. "Linking Arms: The Structure of Iroquois Intertribal Diplomacy," in *Beyond the Covenant Chain: The Iroquois and Their Neighbors in Indian North America, 1600-1800*, edited by Daniel K. Richter and James H. Merrell. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003.

Bender, Thomas. *A Nation Among Nations: America's Place in World History.* New York: Hill and Wang, 2006.

Berkhofer, Robert. *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present*. New York: Knopf, 1978.

Blackburn, Kevin. "Mapping Aboriginal Nations: The 'Nation' Concept of Late Nineteenth Century Anthropologists in Australia." *Aboriginal History*, vol. 26 (2002): 131-158.

Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Bohaker, Heidi. "Nindoodemag: The Significance of Algonquian Kinship Networks in the Eastern Great Lakes Region, 1600-1701." *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, vol. 63, no. 1 (January 2006): 23-52.

Bois, Jean-Pierre. *La Fayette*. Paris: Perrin, 2015.

Braun, Sebastian Felix. *Against Procedural Landscapes: Community, Kinship, and History: Transforming Ethnohistories: Narrative, Meaning, and Community*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2013.

Bordman, G. *American Musical Theater: A Chronicle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Bowes, John P. *Land Too Good for Indians: Northern Indian Removal*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2016.

Bruckner, H.F. "Burial Among the Choctaws." *The American Antiquarian,* vol. 2 (July-September 1879): 55.

Calloway, Colin G. *The American Revolution in Indian Country: Crisis and Diversity in Native American Communities*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

---. *Pen and Ink Witchcraft: Treaties and Treaty Making in American Indian History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.

---. *The Victory With No Name: The Native American Defeat of the First American Army*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Campbell, William J. "Converging Interests: Johnson, Croghan, the Six Nations, and the 1768 Treaty of Fort Stanwix." *New York History*, vol. 89, no. 2 (Spring 2008): 127-142.

Campbell, William J. *Speculators in Empire: Iroquoia and the 1768 Treaty of Fort Stanwix.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2014.

Carson, James Taylor. *Searching for the Bright Path: The Mississippi Choctaws From Prehistory to Removal.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2003.

Caughey, John Walton. *McGillivray of the Creeks.* Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2007.

Child, Brenda. *Holding our Worlds Together: Ojibwe Women and the Survival of Community.* New York: Viking, 2012.

Cornelius, Amelia with the assistance of Todd Larkin, "The Archiquette Genealogy," in *The Oneida Indian Journey: From New York to Wisconsin, 1784-1860*, edited by Laurence M. Hauptman, L, Gordon McLester, and the Oneida History Conference Committee, 126-45. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1999.

Coulthard, Glean Sean. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2014.

Cleland, Charles E. *Rites of Conquest: The History and Culture of Michigan's Native Americans.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2011.

Cover, Robert M. "The Supreme Court, 1982 Term -- Foreword: Nomos and Narrative." Faculty Scholarship Series, 1983. http://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/fss_papers/2705 (accessed Septemnber 10, 2019).

Crowley, J. W. "James Nelson Barker in Perspective." *Educational Theatre Journal*, vol. 24, no. 24 (December 1972): 363-69.

Dean, Carolyn and Dana Leibsohn, "Hybridity and its Discontents: Considering Visual Culture in Colonial Spanish America." *Colonial Latin American Review*, vol. 12, no. 1 (2003): 5-35.

Deloria Jr, Vine and Clifford M. Lyte. *The Nations Within: the Past and Future of American Indian Sovereignty*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998.

Deloria, Philip J. Afterword to *Native Acts: Indian Performance, 1603-1832*, 309-16.Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2011.

DeRosier Jr., Arthur H. *The Removal of the Choctaw Indians*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1999.

Destri, Zoe. "Burlesquing 'Otherness' in Nineteenth-Century American Theatre: The Image of the Indian in John Brougham's *Met-a-mora; or the Last of the Pollywogs* (1847) and *Po-Ca-Hon-Tas; or The Gentle Savage* (1855)." *American Studies*, vol. 48, no.3 (2008): 101-124.

Druke, Mary A. "Iroquois Treaties: Common Forms and Varying Interpretations." In *The History and Culture of Iroquois Diplomacy: An Interdisciplinary Guide to the Treaties of the Six Nations and Their League*," edited by Francis Jennings, William N. Fenton, Mary A. Druke, and David R. Miller. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1995.

Dowd, Gregory Evans. *A Spirited Resistance: The North American Indian Struggle for Unity, 1745-1815*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.

Fenton, William N. *The Great Law and the Longhouse: A Political History of the Iroquois Confederacy*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Fenton, William N. "Structure, Continuity, and Change." In *The History and Culture of Iroquois Diplomacy: An Interdisciplinary Guide to the Treaties of the Six Nations and Their League*," Eds. Francis Jennings, William N. Fenton, Mary A. Druke, and David R. Miller. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1995.

Fisher, Linford D. *The Indian Great Awakening: Religion and the Shaping of Native Cultures in Early American*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Foster, Michael K. "Another Look at the Function of Wampum in Iroquois-White Councils." In *The History and Culture of Iroquois Diplomacy: An Interdisciplinary Guide to the Treaties of the Six Nations and Their League*," edited by Francis Jennings, William N.

Fenton, Mary A. Druke, and David R. Miller. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1995.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006.

Hobsbawm, E.J. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780*. New York, Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Gould, Eliga H. "Entangled Histories, Entangled Worlds: The English-Speaking Atlantic as a Spanish Periphery," *American Historical Review*, vol. 112, no. 3 (June 2007): 764-86.

Graubert, Karen. "Shifting Landscapes: Heterogenous Conceptions of Land Use and Tenure in the Lima Valley." *Colonial Latin American Review*, vol.26, no. 1 (2017): 62-84.

Graymont, Barbara. *The Iroquois in the American Revolution.* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1972.

Gura, Philip F. *The Life of William Apess, Pequot*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015.

Hahn, Stephen C. *The Invention of the Creek Nation, 1670-1763*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004.

Hall, John W. *Uncommon Defense: Indian Allies in the Black Hawk War*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Hobsbawm, E.J. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Holton, Woody. *Forced Founders: Indians, Debtors, Slaves, and the Making of the American Revolution in Virginia*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.

Holm, Tom J. , Diane Pearson, and Ben Chavis, " "Peoplehood: A Model for the Extension of Sovereignty in American Indian Studies," *Wicazo Sa Review,* vol. 18, no.1 (Spring 2003): 7-24.

Horsman, Reginald. *Expansion and American Indian Policy, 1783-1812*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992.

Jennings, Francis, et. al. eds., *The History and Culture of Iroquois Diplomacy*

Jentz, Paul. *Seven Myths of Native American History*. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2018.

Jones, Dorothy V. *License for Empire*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Jones, Sally L. "The First but Not the Last of the 'Vanishing Indians': Edwin Forrest and the Mythic Re-creations of the Native Population." In *Dressing in Feathers*: *The Construction of the Indian in American Popular Culture*, edited by S. Elizabeth Bird, 13-27. Boulder: Westview Press, 1996.

Justice, Daniel Heath. *Our Fire Survives the Storm: A Cherokee Literary History*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.

Kidwell, Clara Sue. *Choctaws and Missionaries in Mississippi, 1818-1918*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1997.

Konkle, Maureen. *Writing Indian Nations: Native Intellectuals and the Politics of Historiography, 1827 – 1863*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

Kugel, Rebecca. *To be the Main Leaders of Our People: A History of Minnesota Ojibwe Politics. 1825-1898*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1998.

Lepore, Jill. *The Name of the War: King Philip's War and the Origins of American Identity.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1999.

---. *These Truths: A History of the United States*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2018.

Loveland, Anne C. *Emblem of Liberty: The Image of Lafayette in the American Mind*. Louisiana State University Press: Baton Rouge, 1971.

Lockhart, Paul. *The Drillmaster of Valley Forge: The Baron de Steuben and the Making of the American Army*. New York: Harper Perennial, 2010.

Lyons, Scott Richard *X-Marks: Native Signatures of Assent*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota State University Press, 2010.

Manning, Patrick. *Navigating World History: History Create a Global Past*. New York: Palgrave, 2003.

Mason, J.D. Mason and J.E. Gainor, eds. , *Performing America: Cultural Nationalism in American Theater*: Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999.

Miller, Cary. "Gifts as Treaties: The Political Use of Received Gifts in Anishinaabeg Communities, 1820-1832," *American Indian Quarterly*, vol. 26, no. 2 (Spring 2002): 221-45.

---. *Ogimaag: Anishinaabeg Leadership, 1760 – 1845*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2010.

Moon, William Least Heat, *PrairyErth (a deep map)*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1999.

Manley, Henry S. *The Treaty of Fort Stanwix,1784*. Rome, N.Y.: Rome Sentinel Company, 1932.

Martin, Scott C. "Interpreting 'Metamora': Nationalism, Theater, and Jacksonian Indian Policy" *Journal of the Early Republic*, vol.19, no. 1 (Spring 1999): 73-101.

Mather, Increase. *Magnalia Christi Americana: Or the Ecclesiatical History of New England*. London: Thomas Parkhurst, 1702.

Murphy, Lucy Eldersveld. "To Live Among us: Accommodation, Gender, and Conflict in the Western Great Lakes Region, 1760-1832." In *Contact Points: American Frontiers from the Mohawk Valley to the Mississippi, 1750-1830*, edited by Andrew R.L. Cayton and

Fredrika J. Teute, 270-303. Chapel Hill; University of North Carolina Press, 1988.

Nelligan, Murray H. "American Nationalism on the Stage: The Plays of George Washington Custis (1781-1857)." *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, vol. 58, no. 3 (July 1950) 299-324.

Nichols, David Andrew. *Red Gentlemen and White Savages*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008.

Nichols, David Andrew. *Engines of Diplomacy: Indian Trading Factories and the Negotiation of American Empire*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016.

Nielsen, Donald M. "The Mashpee Indian Revolt of 1833." *The New England Quarterly*, vol. 58, no. 3 (September1985): 400-20.

Pearce, Roy Harvey. *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Peers, Laura, Theresa Schenck, and Jennifer S.H. Brown. "'There is no End to Relationship among the Indians': Ojibwe Families and Kinship in Historical Perspective." *History of the Family* 4, no. 4 (1999), 529-55.

Pomedi, Michael M. "Eighteenth-Century Treaties: Amended Iroquois Condolence Rituals." *American Indian Quarterly*, vol.19, no. 3 (Summer1995): 319-35.

Potter, Tiffany Potter. *Ponteach: Or the Savages of America. A Tragedy by Major Robert Rogers.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010.

Preston, David L. *The Texture of Context: European and Indian Settler Communities on the Frontier of Iroquoia, 1667 – 1783*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009.

Prucha, Francis Paul. *American Indian Treaties: The History of a Political Anomaly.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

---. *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986.

Redix, Erik M. The *Murder of Joe White: Ojibwe Leadership and Colonialism in Wisconsin.* East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2014.

Reiss, Timothy J. "Mapping Identities: Literature, Nationalism, Colonialism." *American Literary History*, vol. 4, no. 4 (Winter, 1992): 649-77.

Richards, J. H. *Drama, Theatre, and Identity in the American New Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Renan, Ernest. *Qu'est-ce qu'une nation?* Paris: Presses-Pocket, 1992.

Richter, Daniel K. *The Ordeal of the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.

Saler, Bethel. *The Settlers' Empire: Colonialism and State Formation in America's Old Northwest*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015.

Sayre, G.M. *The Indian Chief as Tragic Hero: Native Resistance and the Literatures of America from Moctezuma to Tecumseh*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005.

Saxton, Alexander. "Blackface Minstrelsy and Jacksonian Ideology" In *Locating American Studies*, editred by Lucy Maddox, 114-39. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.

Scheckel, Susan. "Domesticating the Drama of Conquest: Barkers Pocahontas on the Popular Stage." *American Theatre Quarterly*, vol. 10, no. 3 (September 1996): 231-43.

Shanley, Kathryn W. "The Indians America Loves to Love and Read: American Indian Identity and Cultural Appropriation." *American Indian Quarterly*, vol. 21, no. 4 (Autumn 1997): 675-702.

Sheehan, Bernard. *Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Philanthropy and the American Indian.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986.

Sleeper-Smith, Susan. *Indian Women and French Men: Rethinking Cultural Encounter in the Western Great Lakes.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001.

Smith, Anthony D. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Malden, Mass., Blackwell, 2002.

Smith-Rosenberg, Carol. *This Violent Empire: The Birth of an American National Identity.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010.

Somkin, Fred. *Unquiet Eagle: Memory and Desire in the Idea of American Freedom, 1815-1860.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967.

"The Songs of Tammany, or the Indian Chief, A Serious Opera." *Magazine of History* (1931):

Stock, Melissa A. "Sovereign or Suzerain: Alexander McGillivray's Argument for Creek Independence after the Treaty of Paris of 1783." *The Georgia Historical Quarterly,* vol. 92, no. 2 (June 2008): 149-67.

Stokes, Gale. "How is Nationalism Related to Capitalism?" *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* vol. 28, no. 3 (July 1986): 591-98.

Strong, Pauline Turner and Barrick Van Winkle, "Tribe and Nation: American Indians and American Nationalism." *Social Analysis: The International Journal of Social and Cultural Practice*, vol. 33, no. 3 (September, 1993): 9-26.

Taylor, Charles. "The Politics of Recognition." In *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Multiculturalism*, edited by Amy Gutman, 25 -73. Princeton" Princeton University Press, 1994.

Taylor, Alan. *The Divided Ground: Indians, Settlers, and the Northern Borderland of the American Revolution*. New York: Vintage, 2006.

Taylor, William B. *Magistrates of the Sacred: Priests and Parishioners in Eighteenth-Century Mexico.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.

Thongchai, Winichakul, *Siam Mapped: A History of the Geo-body of a Nation*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1997.

Trigger, Bruce G. *Handbook of North American Indians: Northeast*, Vol. 15: Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Scholarly Press, 1979.

Van Kirk, Sylvia. *Many Tender Ties: Women in Fur Trade Society, 1670-1870*. Winnipeg: Watson Dwyer, 2011.

Vecsey, Christopher. "The Story and Structure of the Iroquois Confederacy." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, vol. 54, no. 1 (Spring 1986): 79-106.

David Waldstreicher, David. *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes: The Making of American Nationalism, 1776-1820.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Walker, Cheryl. *Indian Nation: Native American Literature and Nineteenth-Century Nationalism.* Durham: Duke University Press, 1997.

Warhus, Mark. *Another America: Native American Maps and the History of Our Land*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.

Warren, Stephen. *The Worlds the Shawnees Made: Migration and Violence in Early America.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014.

Watson, Thomas D. "Strivings for Sovereignty: Alexander McGillivray, Creek Warfare, and Diplomacy, 1783-1790." *The Florida Historical Quarterly*, vol. 58, no. 4 (Apri1 1980): 400-14.

White, Bruce M. "'Give us a Little Milk': The Social and Cultural Meanings of Gift-Giving in the Lake Superior Fur Trade." In *Rethinking the Fur Trade: Cultures of Exchange in an*

Atlantic World, edited by Susan Sleeper Smith, 114-36. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009.

Widder, Keith R. *Battle for the Soul: Métis Children Encounter Evangelical Protestants at Mackinaw Mission, 1823 – 1837*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1999.

Williams, Jr., Robert A. *Linking Arms Together: American Indian Treaty Visions of Law and Peace, 1600 – 1800*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Wilkins, David E. and K. Tsianina Lomawaima, *Uneven Ground: American Indian Sovereignty and Federal Law*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2002.

Witgen, Michael. *An Infinity of Nations: How the Native New World Shaped Early North America*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.

White, Richard. *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Zernato, Guido and Alfonso G. Mistretta "Nation: The History of a Word." *The Review of Politics*, vol. 6, no. 3 (July, 1944): 351-66.

Paul Jentz

Department of History
162 Center for Liberal Arts
North Hennepin Community College
7411 85th Avenue North
Brooklyn Park, MN 55445

Ph.D. Candidate
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Research Fellow
Newberry Library

Master of Arts in History
St. Cloud State University

Master of Arts in English
University of North Dakota

Bachelor of Arts in English
University of Minnesota

EMPLOYMENT

North Hennepin Community College (NHCC)
History Instructor
2003 – present. Tenured in 2007.
Created the following courses and currently teach them at NHCC:
Colonial History of the Americas, History of the American West, Race in America, American Labor History, American Indian History, levels one and two

Redesigned the following courses and currently teach them at NHCC:
United States History to 1877, United States History Since 1877, World History to 1300, and World History Since 1300
Taught Colonial American Literature, Department of English, NHCC

Anoka-Ramsey Community College
Adjunct English Instructor
2000 – 2002
Composition, The Short Story, Early American Literature

College of St. Benedict
Adjunct English Instructor
1999 – 2001
American Renaissance Literature

St. Cloud State University
Adjunct English Instructor
1995 - 2001
Composition, 20th Century American Literature

University of North Dakota
Adjunct English Instructor
1990 - 1994

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Founding President of Midwest World History Association, 2009 to 2011.
http://www.mwwha.org/
http://www2.css.edu/app/depts/HIS/historyjournal/index.cfm?auth=yes&id=4

Elected Member of the Executive Council of the World History Association for a three year term, 2011 to 2014.
http://www.thewha.org

Assistant to Vice President of the World History Association, 2011 to 2015.
http://www.thewha.org

Chair of Conferences Committee for the World History Association, 2012 to 2015.
http://www.thewha.org

Founder of *The Middle Ground: An Online Journal for World Historians.*
http://www2.css.edu/app/depts/HIS/historyjournal/

Vice President of Midwest World History Association, 2018-2020.

Liaison responsible for bringing the World History Association's Annual Conference to North Hennepin Community College in 2013 for its 22nd conference. Nearly 300 world historians attended.

Established the World History Lecture Series at North Hennepin Community College in 2011 with permanent funding stream. This is an annual series presented over the course of three days by an individual who has made significant contributions to the study of world history and who has been recognized as a leading authority in the field.

World History Consultant for the Minnesota Department of Education, 2011 to present. Assisted the Director of Standards with establishing standards and benchmarks for required 8th grade global history course.

Advisory Board Member of the Minnesota Council for Social Studies, 2011 to present.

Elected as vice-chair of the Academic Affairs and Standards Committee at North Hennepin Community College during the 2007 academic year.

Elected as chair of the Academic Affairs and Standards Committee at North Hennepin Community College during the 2008 academic year.

Elected to serve on the Shared Governance Committee at North Hennepin Community College during the academic years 2005 – 2008.

Served from 2005 – 2007 on the Accreditation Committee responsible for establishing AQIP accreditation for North Hennepin Community College.

AWARDS

Awarded "Outstanding Academic Title of 2018" by *Choice* magazine for *Seven Myths of Native American History*.

Recipient of the 2013 Chancellor's Grant through the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee to fund my History Ph.D. program of study.

Nominated for Most Distinguished Thesis of 2003 in Minnesota from St. Cloud State University for "The Theater of *Demons*: A Study of Nihilism in 19th Century Russia."

PAPERS PRESENTED

"The Texas Textbook Massacre: Sourcing the Texas Textbook Pseudo-History"
October 2010. Midwest World History Association Conference, Loyola University, Chicago.

"The Algerian Middle Ground: By Way of Introducing Pontecorvo's *Battle of Algiers*" October 2010. Midwest World History Association Conference, Loyola University, Chicago.

"Environmental Impact in the Colonial Americas: Humans and the Rest of Nature"
June 2012. 21st Annual World History Association Conference, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

"From the Pristine Myth to the Pleistocene Overkill to the Quantitative Global Analysis of the Role of Climate and People in Explaining Late Quaternary Megafaunal Extinctions." August,

2012. Joint Conference of the International Big History Association and the Midwest World History Association.

"Moving on From *The Middle Ground*: A Historiographic Contextualization of Richard White's Great Lakes Scholarship" June 2013. 22nd Annual World History Association Conference, North Hennepin Community College, Minneapolis MN.

"The Great Lakes Borderlands." July 2014, 23rd Annual World History Association Conference, University of Costa Rica, San Juan, Costa Rica.

"The Great Lakes Fur Trade." June 2015, 24th Annual World History Association Conference, Savannah,
Georgia.

"The Mashpee Revolt: The Ground Between Religion and Politics in Native Sovereignty." Tenth Annual Midwest World History Association Conference, Minneapolis.

JOURNAL PUBLICATIONS

The Horse in Human History, By Pita Kelekna. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
Book Review. *Middle Ground Journal*, 2011.

Bonds of Alliance: Indigenous and Atlantic Slaveries in New France, by Brett Rushforth. University of North Carolina Press, 2012. Book Review in *Middle Ground Journal*, 2012.

"Quantitative Analysis of Megafaunal Extinctions and the Tenacity of Plesitocene Overkill: Archeology and the World Historian." *World History Bulletin*, Fall 2013.

Editor of *Indigenous Histories in a Global Context*, World History Bulletin, Fall 2014.

BOOKS

Seven Myths of Native American History
Myths of History: A Hackett Series
March 2018
Awarded "Outstanding Academic Title of 2018," by *Choice* Magazine.