

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.** Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

# UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA  
313/761-4700 800/521-0600



Order Number 9520531

**Walking "the same path": Indian voices and the issues of  
removal**

Griffin, Frank Winget, Ph.D.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1994

Copyright ©1994 by Griffin, Frank Winget. All rights reserved.

**U·M·I**  
300 N. Zeeb Rd.  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106



WALKING "THE SAME PATH": INDIAN VOICES  
AND THE ISSUES OF REMOVAL

by

Frank W. Griffin

A Dissertation Submitted to  
the Faculty of The Graduate School at  
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro  
1994

Approved by

  
Dissertation Advisor

GRIFFIN, FRANK W., Ph.D. Walking "the same path": Indian Voices and the Issues of Removal. (1994) Directed by Dr. Donald G. Darnell. 273 pp.

The Congressional debate over the Indian Removal Act in the spring of 1830 represented a synthesis of the arguments that had focused national attention throughout the 1820s on the Indians' rights and capacity for becoming part of "the American family." The defining of the issues is evident from a survey of three prominent journals of the 1820s, North American Review, Niles' Weekly Register, and The National Intelligencer. Journalists, academicians, government officials, and clergy considered the fate of the Indians in light of three recurring questions: Who had the rights to the land? Could Indians and whites co-exist? What role should the Indian play in the historical and literary narrating of America?

Viewed in the context of this debate, the novels and narrative poetry produced by American writers in the 1820s suggest a remarkable agreement on the proper terms for discussing the Indian Problem while presenting a variety of "Indian" voices. In narrative poems like The Backwoodsman, Yamoyden, and Escalala, poets made the Indians into epic adversaries or demons whose bloodthirsty yells suggested their natural exclusion from the nation's future. More sympathetic treatment is evident in novels like Hobomok and Hope Leslie, where the Indians appear as advocates of co-existence, before

voluntarily removing themselves from white society. In The Pioneers, The Last of the Mohicans, and The Wept of Wish-Ton-Wish, Indians' claims to rights to the land are juxtaposed against the self-evident design of Providence that dictates Indian extinction. Even the published works by the Cherokee journalist Elias Boudinot and Methodist minister and Pequot William Apess tend to adopt the rhetoric of decline and extinction. Taken together, these Indian voices, whether authentic or the creations of a white imagination, constitute a rhetorical removal that anticipates the political decision of 1830.

© 1994 by Frank W. Griffin



APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Advisor

Donald G. Pearce

Committee Members

Patricia Powers

James E. Evans

Robert H. Stephens

15 August 1994

Date of Acceptance by Committee

15 August 1994

Date of Final Oral Examination

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank all the members of my committee for their guidance in this study, and particularly for his patience, his suggestions, and his encouragement, I want to thank Dr. Donald Darnell.

In January of 1836, the Pequot William Apess stood before an audience in Boston and declared, "My image is of God; I am not a beast." This study is dedicated to Sarah, with the hope that she will see the day in this country when no one is forced to make a public appeal for recognition of her or his equal rights as a human being.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE . . . . .	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	iii
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
CHAPTER	
I. "TRESPASSERS UPON THEIR OWN SOIL": INDIANS AND CONGRESSIONAL RHETORIC IN THE DEBATES OVER THE INDIAN REMOVAL BILL . . . . .	6
Jackson's Opening Address, December 8, 1829 . . . . .	10
Supporters of the Removal Bill . . . . .	15
The Senate: Bad Treaties and Gullible Philanthropists . . . . .	15
The House: Cherokee Israelites and Northern Locusts . . . . .	23
Opponents of the Removal Bill . . . . .	31
The Senate: Legal and Moral Precedents . .	31
The House: " <u>Removal</u> " is a soft word" . . .	42
II. "ARGUMENTS ON ONE SIDE. . . TRUTH ON THE OTHER": PERIODICALS AND THE INDIAN QUESTION . . . . .	56
Rights to the Land . . . . .	60
Are Indians and Whites Meant to Coexist? . .	71
What Role Should the Indians Play in the Narrative of America? . . . . .	86
III. INDIAN VOICES AND THE WHITE MAN'S EPIC: THE WORD AND THE YELL IN <u>THE BACKWOODSMAN</u> , <u>YAMOYDEN</u> , AND <u>ESCALALA</u> . . . . .	113
Paulding's Prophet and the Voice of Madness . . . . .	118
Metacom as Satan, Miscegenation as Minotaur . . . . .	135
The Iliad Revisited: White Pagans vs. Indian Pagans . . . . .	148

IV.	A "NEW VERSION OF AN OLD STORY"? LYDIA CHILD, CATHARINE SEDGWICK, AND THE POSSIBILITY OF INDIAN/WHITE COEXISTENCE . . . . .	161
	<u>Hobomok</u> : Challenging Patriarchal Authority? . . . . .	163
	"children connected in indissoluble bonds": Captivity and Marriage in <u>Hope Leslie</u> . . .	178
V.	COOPER'S EPIDEICTIC INDIANS AND THE RHETORIC OF PROVIDENCE . . . . .	196
	Natty Bumppo as Pallbearer . . . . .	205
	Conanchoet . . . . .	221
VI.	"I AM NOT A BEAST": INDIAN VOICES AND THE ISSUES OF THE REMOVAL DEBATE . . . . .	234
	Boudinot and the Need to Educate White America . . . . .	235
	Apess and the Revision of History . . . . .	245
	Non-Christian Voices . . . . .	253
	CONCLUSION . . . . .	260
	BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	264

## INTRODUCTION

This study is about voices -- primarily about Indian voices, as they were depicted by white writers during a crucial period in our country's history. It is an examination of the debate in the United States in the 1820s over what was called the Indian Problem or the Indian Question and the role that some of our most important poets and novelists may have played in the answering of that question: What is to be done with the Indian? Although I have focused on Indian voices in narrative poetry and novels, I have attempted to place these works of fiction in their historical context by examining the Indian Question as it was discussed in politics and in the leading journals of the day. I have chosen the Congressional debate in the spring of 1830 over the Indian Removal Act as the culmination of this national inquiry. Although the Removal Act did not end the debate over the power of the federal government to force the Cherokees and other Indian nations to remove to the trans-Mississippi West -- Cherokee challenges to the law in the courts occupied much of the 1830s -- the arguments presented in Congress do represent an apex for the rhetorical strategies and representations of the Indian that were employed in the previous decade.

In order to answer the question of what was to be done with the Indian, white Americans had first to confront a number of other questions about the Indians' humanity and about their place in a country that was presumed to be expanding according to the designs of Providence. What was an Indian? Could an Indian be taught to forego the life of the hunt in order to become a farmer? Could an Indian be converted to Christianity? Did the Indian have a role to play in the future of the United States? Could Indians and whites coexist? Or were the Indians destined to extinction as a part of God's plan to replace an inferior race with a superior one? Was there any validity to the Indians' accounts of their conflicts with white settlers? Did they have any rights to the land upon which they lived? These are the issues as they were defined by those (primarily white) speakers and writers of the 1820s, and these questions inform and shape the Indian voices, both fictional and historical of the day.

I have taken three of these key questions to provide the structure for this study: Who has the rights to the land? Can Indians and Whites coexist? What role, if any, should the Indian play in the historical and literary narrating of America? After examining the issues in the Congressional debate in chapter one, I have shown in chapter two how those issues were developed fully in the political and literary discussions throughout the previous decade in prominent

journals like North American Review, Niles' Weekly Register, and The National Intelligencer. In chapter three I focus on the issue of the Indians' right to speak and focus on their treatment in three narrative poems, Yamoyden, The Backwoodsman, and Escalala. The Indian voices in these works are paradoxically capable of ringing rhetorical orations and of bestial shrieks and yells; primarily devoted to creating the frenzy necessary for battle, the Indian voice here is typically depicted in a demonic call-to-arms. Not surprisingly, the recurring motif in these works is racial war. In chapter four I focus on the issue of Indian/white coexistence as it is treated in Lydia Child's Hobomok and Catharine Sedgwick's Hope Leslie. In these works set in the Puritan colonies, the Indians' voices advocate an alternative to the unforgiving depictions of the Indians by Puritan historians. Here the Indians are capable of fashioning an understanding among some whites for the Indian's desire to be treated justly as fellow human beings. This new understanding and sympathy between the races leads to the recurring motif in the novels of attempted miscegenous marriages. Both novels climax, however, with voluntary removals of Indian characters, reinforcing the assumption that Indians and whites must be segregated. In chapter five I have focused on Cooper's treatment of Indian voices in The Pioneers, The Last of the Mohicans, and The Wept of Wish-Ton-Wish. Cooper's Indians

address the issue of rights to the land by acknowledging the superiority of whites and by relenting to the will of Providence or the Great Spirit that seems to demand their disappearance. The recurring motif in these novels is thus American history as Providential design, and the Indian's voice is heard most poignantly in the context of a funeral oration, usually his own.

I demonstrate with each of these white versions of the Indian voice -- the demonic yell, the advocate of an alternative history, the funeral orator -- how that representation is related to a particular issue in the public discourse about Indian/white relations. In chapter six I have briefly examined the speeches and writings of the Cherokee Elias Boudinot and the Pequot William Apess, as well as those of other Indians who were fortunate enough to have their words published for white Americans to read. In this chapter I focus on how these authentic Indian voices were responding to the same issues that shaped the arguments of their white contemporaries. I have not included these Indian voices in order to validate those of the white writers of fiction, although I do point to some similarities in the rhetoric they employ. I have included the authentic Indian voices because they were vital participants in the public discourse of the 1820s but perhaps more importantly because, although they may have been obscured by the more melodramatic rhetoric of



Chingachgook or Magawisca in their day, they should not suffer the same obscurity in ours.

CHAPTER I  
"TRESPASSERS UPON THEIR OWN SOIL":  
INDIANS AND CONGRESSIONAL RHETORIC IN THE  
DEBATES OVER THE INDIAN REMOVAL BILL

When Alexis de Tocqueville reflected upon the removal of Eastern Indians to the trans-Mississippi West during the Jackson administration, he was struck by the remarkable incongruity between the government's lofty rhetoric and the ugly political reality of thousands of people uprooted and emigrating to an uncertain future. The removal, he said, was conducted "with wonderful ease, quietly, legally, and philanthropically, without spilling blood and without violating a single one of the great principles of morality in the eyes of the world." Because of the government's care in acquiring signed treaties that were "inspired by the most chaste affection for legal formalities," de Tocqueville was left to marvel at such a process: "it is impossible to destroy men with more respect to the laws of humanity" (339).

De Tocqueville described a moment in U.S. history with broad political and cultural ramifications for the Cherokees and for other Indian peoples: the nullification of existing treaties, the dissolution of tribal government, the subjection of Indians who refused to emigrate to state laws that denied

them fundamental civil rights, and protracted litigation in the U.S. Supreme Court. This redefining of the relationship between Southern Indian tribes and the U.S. government began officially with Congressional approval of the Indian Removal Act in April (Senate) and May (House) of 1830. The bill urged by the Jackson administration gave the president authority to exchange lands occupied by Indians within the boundaries of existing states for land, with title guaranteed, in territory west of the Mississippi. The President was further authorized to deal with Indians as a nation or as individuals. In either case, Indians were to be paid for any improvements they had made to their land in the East. Emigration was to be voluntary, with the understanding, however, that any Indians who chose to remain in the East would become subject to the laws of the state within which they resided. Individuals and families remaining were to be given an allotment of land. The bill authorized the spending of \$500,000 to effect this reimbursement and emigration.

On its face, the bill appeared to represent, as Mississippi Senator Robert Adams insisted, no change in policy.<sup>1</sup> In fact, it was part of a sequence of events that signalled a dramatic shift in the government's policy toward treating with the Indians, and the debate, as a result, focused almost exclusively on the fate of the Cherokees and their dispute with the state of Georgia. In 1802 when Georgia had ceded its claims to territory that would become Alabama

and Mississippi, the federal government had agreed to extinguish Indian title to all territory claimed within the boundaries of Georgia "as soon as the same could be done peaceably and upon reasonable terms" (360). After waiting twenty-eight years, Georgians were beginning to suspect a breach of faith on the part of Washington. Further agitating the situation, the Cherokees had adopted their own constitution in July, 1827 and insisted upon their political existence as a sovereign nation within Georgia's borders. Laws were passed by the Cherokee government that forbade any individual within the nation to cede lands to another without approval at the national level. This attempt to force the American government to deal with the Cherokees as a nation was in response to a treaty made with unauthorized members of the Creeks at Indian Springs in 1825, an agreement that was later voided when it became clear that the government had attempted to claim rights to land over which these individuals had no power to negotiate. Confrontation between Georgia and the Cherokees seemed inevitable when the Georgia legislature decreed in December, 1828 that all Indian residents would be subject to state laws after six months. When the Cherokees appealed to the federal government to honor its treaty obligations and protect their sovereignty, the president insisted that he could not justify the federal government's use of force against one of its states in order to guarantee Cherokee sovereignty. He then presented the Removal Act for

Congressional approval. The Georgia legislature soon after passed laws declaring all Cherokee government, laws, and customs null and void and denying Indians the right to testify in a state court against a white. Such was the immediate backdrop to this Congressional debate.

But action on this particular bill must be viewed in the larger context of years of proposals during the administrations of Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and John Quincy Adams about how to facilitate the emigration of tribes, even entire Indian nations, from within the boundaries of the United States. The debate in Congress was merely a condensation, an intense focusing, of the rhetoric that had been used in the nation's journals and literature throughout the 1820s to appeal to the American people's sense of justice.

I want to use the debate in Congress over the Removal Act as a convenient and natural apex in the public discourse over the Indian "problem" in this country. In examining the arguments presented on the floor of the Senate and the House of Representatives during the spring of 1830, I hope to demonstrate that this political action is merely the logical, in many ways inescapable, conclusion to the rhetorical treatment of the Indian in the press and in the popular literature of the day. I am not suggesting that the political decisions made in 1830 are the direct result of those characterizations, but rather that the rhetoric of dependency, even helplessness, typified by the phrase "children of the

forest," and the rhetoric of "doom," typified by Cooper's The Last of the Mohicans, contributed to a public attitude that would make such a political solution palatable. In this chapter I want to show how these characterizations of the Indians as a dying race, prostrate before the powerful government of the United States, incapable of comprehending the world of the nineteenth century that would swallow them, permeate the arguments on all sides of the Congressional debate. Those who argued against the Removal Act, it will be clear, often shared and reinforced these assumptions of their opponents about the pitiful nature of the Indian and his relationship with white America. The resulting "voice" on behalf of the Indians, as a result, too often reinforced the sense of the Indian as a fated victim; those who spoke most eloquently for the Indian too often spoke with the voice of defeat.

Jackson's Opening Address, December 8, 1829

Historians continue to dispute Andrew Jackson's motivations for seeking power to resolve the Indian problem through land cessions and emigration west of the Mississippi.<sup>2</sup> Much of the controversy can be traced directly to the enormous disparity between Jackson's benevolent, paternalistic rhetoric and the suffering that resulted from its implementation. The elusiveness of intent when one listens to Jackson is the problem that plagues the historian approaching many of the speeches from this era. Some speakers genuinely believed that

the humanitarian solution to the Indian problem was to remove them from a corrupting white influence. Others adopted the humanitarian rhetoric in order to mask a blatant greed for land and power. Some, on the other hand, openly acknowledged their contempt for any claims the Indians might make against a superior race that they saw was destined by nature and God to obliterate the aborigines. Jackson's opening address to the 21st Congress on December 8, 1829 revealed elements of all three.

Jackson framed his proposal for Indian-white relations in a context of existing contradictory policies, whereby the federal government was simultaneously seeking land cessions that forced Indians to move ever westward and promoting the adoption of civilized ways of life that would bring more stability to Indian society. "Thus," Jackson told Congress, "though lavish in its expenditures upon the subject, Government has constantly defeated its own policy" (14).<sup>3</sup> The resulting confusion, he said, merely served to encourage one of their most unfortunate savage traits, their nomadic lifestyle. While the government worked at "reclaiming them from a wandering life," gradual land cessions "kept [them] in a wandering state" so that "the Indians, in general, receding further and further to the West, have retained their savage habits" (14).

Jackson then excepts the Cherokees from this narrative, attributing their "having made some progress in the arts of

civilized life" to their "having mingled much with the whites" (14). These Indians had instigated a dispute with some of the Southern states by having "lately attempted to erect an independent government within the limits of Georgia and Alabama," followed by an appeal to the President "to sustain these people in their pretensions" (14). Citing the Constitution's injunction against the formation of new states within the boundaries of an existing state without the consent of its legislature, Jackson extrapolated and declared, "much less could it allow a foreign and independent government to establish itself there" (15). The president thus established one of the central issues of the debate that would follow: were the Cherokees seeking to establish a new sovereignty, or were they merely asking the United States to reaffirm and guarantee a sovereignty recognized since the Treaty of Hopewell in 1785? Adopting the former assumption, Jackson reported that he informed the Indians he could not sanction their actions and "advised them to emigrate beyond the Mississippi, or submit to the laws of those States" (15).

The emigration to the West, Jackson insisted, was to be voluntary, "for it would be as cruel as unjust to compel the aborigines to abandon the graves of their fathers, and seek a home in a distant land" (16). The Indians' western territory was to be guaranteed by the United States, and they were to institute "governments of their own choice," with peace on the frontier assured by the United States. With the aid of



benevolent whites, the result might even be "an interesting commonwealth, destined to perpetuate the race, and to attest the humanity and justice of this Government" (16). Those Indians who chose to stay, on the other hand, must submit to state laws "as individuals" who would "without doubt, be protected in the enjoyment of those possessions which they have improved by their industry" (16). In a remarkable consideration of the possibility of Indian-white assimilation, Jackson then reflected how Indians, "Submitting to the laws of the States, and receiving, like other citizens, protection in their persons and property. . . will, ere long, become merged in the mass of our population" (16). Lest this assurance appear blatant coercion and hypocrisy on the President's part, it is important to note that the Georgia legislature did not pass until December 19th, eleven days after this speech, its sweeping laws forbidding Indians to testify against whites or to purchase land ceded by the Cherokee nation. Jackson then cautioned that Indian claims to large tracts of land for reimbursement would be rejected if they were lands "on which they have neither dwelt nor made improvements, merely because they have seen them from the mountain, or passed them in the chase" (16). The question of the "wandering" or agricultural nature of Indian life would be another crux of the Congressional debate.

Stepping back from the logistics of his proposal, the president considered the Indians in light of their contact

with white culture and concluded that "It is too late to inquire whether it was just in the United States to include them and their territory within the bounds of new States whose limits they could control" (15). Their diminished position, in which "some of the tribes have become extinct, and others have left but remnants, to preserve, for a while, their once terrible names," appealed to the whites' sympathies that something be done to remedy the situation. White "arts of civilization. . . doom him to weakness and decay" so that, in a nineteenth century domino effect, "the fate of the Mohegan, the Narragansett, and the Delaware, is fast overtaking the Choctaw, the Cherokee, and the Creek" (15). Appealing to the Congress as individuals and as representatives of the government, Jackson declared, "Humanity and national honor demand that every effort should be made to avert so great a calamity" (15). Those who supported his proposal, he said, were "actuated by feelings of justice and regard for our national honor" (15). Here, too, the president identified a key issue, perhaps the key issue, in the Congressional debate and illustrated, at the same time, the rhetoric historian Brian Dippie calls the "rhetoric of doom" (13). No matter what happened with the legislation, the whites saw in the Indians a dying race, "remnants" facing only "weakness and decay." This rhetorical assumption was particularly crucial to the debate over removal because all the participants accepted its premise of Indian inferiority. Perhaps the

implications of that assumption are best expressed by Ronald Satz when he considers the rhetoric of saving the Indian: "the contrast between the rhetoric and the reality of President Jackson's Indian policy serves as a grim reminder of what can happen to a politically powerless minority in a democratic society" (43). The Congressional debate that followed Jackson's address offers an illustration of how such a powerless minority can hope to speak in a forum, through other "privileged" voices, and to make its case for justice. It also offers an illustration, however, of how rhetorical eloquence does not necessarily translate into political power. Finally, it reiterates the dependence of the minority upon voices which may unwittingly contribute to their political exclusion and silencing.

#### Supporters of the Removal Bill

##### The Senate: Bad Treaties and Gullible Philanthropists

President Jackson's most eloquent supporter in the Senate was Georgia's John Forsyth, a former governor, whose speech was delivered at intervals over three days, April 13th-15th, 1830. Forsyth's argument sought to establish the legal and moral authority for Indian removal while at the same time characterizing the opposition as the voice of extremism. His characterization of the Indian people is enlightening, revealing the basis for the moral authority he claimed.

Forsyth first addressed the issue of Cherokee sovereignty in order to demonstrate the federal government's legal

authority to determine the Indians' fate. Citing the Treaty of Hopewell signed in November, 1785, the senator quoted its opening lines, in which "the United States give peace to all the Cherokees, and receive them into their favor and protection.'" "Strange words," Forsyth added, "to be used to an unconquered and independent nation" (326). He then noted that Congress had "powers, by this article, to legislate at discretion" for the Indians, implying that "A bill to remove them against their consent, if Congress believed such removal necessary for their preservation and prosperity, might be vindicated" based on the wording of this treaty (326). Concluding that the Cherokees had thus relinquished their sovereignty at Hopewell, Forsyth said, "So much for the independence of the Cherokee nation" (326). This issue of Cherokee sovereignty was crucial to both sides of the removal debate not only because it was essential to the question of the Indians' right to establish their own government but also because it determined the negotiating relationship between the United States and the Indians: if the Cherokees were to be dealt with as a sovereign nation, United States representatives would have to seek agreements with Indian leaders binding upon an entire people; if, on the other hand, the Cherokees did not constitute a sovereign entity, the United States would be free to negotiate with small segments of the population, effectively fragmenting resistance to land cessions. In addition to the authority Forsyth found in the

Treaty of Hopewell, he cited the Compact of 1802 in which the federal government, in exchange for Georgia's claim to land extending all the way to the Mississippi, ceded all authority to the state over the territory within its remaining borders. Georgia, Forsyth argued, merely wanted to include under its authority the Cherokee land.

For the moral justification for removal, Forsyth appealed to the Senate to recognize the spiritual exchange being offered the Indians:

All Christendom seems to have imagined that, by offering that immortal life, promised by the Prince of Peace to fallen man, to the aborigines of this country, the right was fairly acquired of disposing of their persons and their property at pleasure. (333)

Congress would simply be acting in accordance with Western Christian tradition, in which "war with infidels, and their forcible conversion to the true faith, or expulsion from their country" was "part of their Christian duty" (333).

The Indians' being likened to the infidel in this part of the speech is actually a step up from Forsyth's earlier characterizations. While some people argued at this time that the Indians should be removed in order to protect them from the corrupting influence of white society, Forsyth acknowledged that removal alone would not have positive benefits: "I do not believe that this removal will accelerate the civilization of the tribes." Drawing a surprising parallel, he continued, "You might as reasonably expect that

wild animals, incapable of being tamed in a park, would be domesticated by turning them loose in the forest." In order to civilize the Indians, he argued, one had to shatter Indian government, "destroying the tribal character, and subjecting the Indians, as individuals, to the regular action of well digested laws" (327). Thus while removal itself would not contribute to the civilizing of the Indian, Forsyth said he supported it because "the physical condition of the Indians will be greatly improved" and, more importantly for the United States, Georgia would be relieved "from a population useless and burthensome" (328). The country would be relieving itself of a population handicapped by racial inferiority:

For the old and for the new States, this important object will be gained: a race not admitted to be equal to the rest of the community; not governed as completely dependent; treated somewhat like human beings, but not admitted to be freemen; not yet entitled, and probably never to be entitled, to equal civil and political rights, will be humanely provided for. (328)

In their existing relationship to white civilization, the Indians were little more than nomadic parasites: living in a state of "involuntary minority," they were "little better than the wandering gypsies of the old world, living by beggary or plunder." Continuing with this metaphor of displacement, Forsyth proclaimed that "In no part of the country have the Indians an admitted right to the soil upon which they live. They are looked upon as temporary occupants" (328). Their lifestyle, he argued, was inherently lawless: "They are

hunters, whose game is every day diminishing, and who must change their place of residence, or their mode of procuring subsistence" (328).<sup>4</sup> Since, remarkably, the Cherokees did have a government, Forsyth insisted that it was "in the hands of a few half-breeds and white men, who, through its instrumentality, regulate the affairs and control all the funds of the tribe" (329).<sup>5</sup>

Given their deplorable condition, how could the Indians have come to have a voice in the Congress of the United States? Here Forsyth drew a parallel between the Indians' notorious intemperance and the arguments of their supporters in Congress: "Recently, great efforts have been made," he declared, "to excite the public mind into a state of unreasonable and jealous apprehension in their behalf. . . . The clergy, the laity, the lawyers, and the ladies, have been dragged into the service" of pressing for Indian protection (326). Even more alarming was the Cherokee ability to speak directly for themselves by sending a delegation to lobby for their cause: "It is thus. . . that the Cherokees have been made so prominent" (329). Dismayed by the success of the Indian efforts, Forsyth depicted those who endorsed Indian protection from white laws as victims of the most insidious sophistry:

That many respectable persons have been deceived is not disputed. They have been the unresisting instruments of the artful and designing, and ministered to political

malignity, while they believed themselves laboring in the cause of justice and humanity. (327)

If these misguided supporters knew the truth about the nature of Cherokee culture, Forsyth argued, they would recognize the "justice and wisdom" of a Jackson administration faced with open conspiracy. Not only had the Cherokees published a constitution hoping to erect a state within a state, but they had plotted to further establish themselves through miscegenation: "The half-breeds and the whites . . . proceeded to convert citizens of the United States into Cherokees, by the short and simple process of marriage or adoption" (332).

When Robert Adams of Mississippi rose to speak, he, like Forsyth, insisted upon the benignity of the proposed legislation and the Constitutional legality of President Jackson's refusal to support Cherokee autonomy; he warned Congress about the dangerous precedent of federal intervention in the internal affairs of a sovereign state, should the General Government try to block Georgia's extending its laws over the Indians within its borders; and he insisted upon Washington's obligation to uphold the promise made in the Compact of 1802 to "extinguish, for the use of Georgia, the Indian title to all the lands situated within the limits of that State" (360).

Adams then set out to undermine the validity of the treaties made between the United States and the Indians.



Again, as with Forsyth's argument, Adams's turned on the assumptions of the superiority of white culture and of the white race. Abstractly, he argued, Great Britain claimed this country "by right of discovery and conquest, and, added to this, the superior claims of an agricultural over a savage and barbarous people," a title "sufficient" for both "the jurist and the statesman" until "the sympathies -- the mistaken sympathies, as I must call them -- of the present day, to call up this title of the savage from its sleep of ages" (361). Concretely, Adams suggested, those who wanted to reverse these rights inherited from Britain and invoke the rights of the Indians should demonstrate "their sincerity and consistency" by giving back their towns and farms, their churches and schools (361). Despite possessing the right to the land by conquest, the United States negotiated treaties; Adams argued, however, that outright conquest was the more legitimate means to acquire territory because the two parties were more equal:

In the one case, the physical strength of the Indian, his daring courage, and his knowledge of his own terrible mode of war, placed him upon something like terms of equality with the white man; whilst, in the other, his ignorance of negotiation, and the arts, and stratagems, and deceptions, always used upon such occasions, rendered him a blind and easy victim. (361)

Adams's argument, then, was that treaties between the United States and the Indian nations provided no legal grounds for guaranteeing their relationship because the Indians lacked the capacity to understand the terms to which they were originally

agreeing. To illustrate his conception of the treaty process, Adams asked the senators to reflect upon a work of art, in the rotunda, depicting William Penn offering a treaty to an old Indian chief:

You can see that the whole savage is tamed, and his terrible spirit, the only power with which nature has endowed him, to preserve unmolested the ancient possessions of his fathers, is subdued and conquered by the irresistible superiority of the white man, and that he is ready to subscribe whatever terms may be dictated. (361).

Adams's strategy of referring to a white artist's rendering of an awed and infantile Indian chief is an interesting means of validating one's sense of historical authenticity. The chief submits because he instinctively recognizes his incompetence and is defeated by a piece of paper, the document itself emblematic of the white race's superiority. The obvious irony was that Adams and the other senators were now being presented with such a piece of paper, the Treaty of Hopewell guaranteeing Cherokee sovereignty, by a group of Indians who did comprehend its terms and who demanded white compliance. This whole issue of Indian sovereignty, as Ronald Satz points out, can be traced to white insistence upon treaty negotiations beginning with the earliest settlements:

Anxious to placate settlers and speculators whose ever increasing demands for Indian land could not be ignored, government officials used force, bribery, deception, and threats, among other things, to convince Indian leaders

to sign land cession treaties. By acknowledging tribal sovereignty to ratify formal purchases of land, the government found a convenient means of justifying its dispossession of the Indians. The purpose of the treaty-making process was to benefit the national interest without staining the nation's honor. (Satz, American 1)

This scrupleless scrupulousness is precisely what de Tocqueville called with such bitter irony "the most chaste affection for legal formalities." By 1830, these treaties, ironically, could become the only hope for protection for an Indian nation like the Cherokees. The fragile nature of their guarantees, however, was demonstrated when supporters of removal like Adams argued that they were meaningless and easily disregarded because they were executed dishonorably. Adams then argued that the honorable remedy for the situation was to acknowledge the dishonorable nature of the original documents and to refuse to comply with their terms. For Adams and others, breaking a treaty became the honorable thing to do.

#### The House: Cherokee Israelites and Northern Locusts

In the House of Representatives, May 17, 1830, Wilson Lumpkin of Georgia focused less on the treaty process than on the dishonorable motivations of the Cherokee chiefs and their congressional allies from the Northern states. To rally support for Jackson's bill, he also invoked the degraded nature of the Indians and their impediment of Providence. His strategy, in other words, was to claim the moral authority, as John Forsyth had done in the Senate, for political action.

The inferiority of Indian character provided the basis for this moral authority. Acknowledging that in the Cherokee territory some families lived in a degree of civilized comfort supported by schools and churches, Lumpkin insisted,

But the principal part of these enjoyments are confined to the blood of the white man, either in whole or in part. But few, very few of the real Indians participate largely in these blessings. A large portion of the full blooded Cherokees still remain a poor degraded race of human beings. . . . whilst their lords and rulers are white men, and the descendants of white men, enjoying the fat of the land, and enjoying exclusively the Government annuities, upon which they foster, feed, and clothe the most violent and dangerous enemies of our civil institutions. (1022)

As John Forsyth had argued, Lumpkin claimed that the Cherokees had to be saved from their own leaders. The true Cherokees were still nomadic hunters (1024) about whom "Experience has clearly demonstrated that, in their present state, it [would be] impossible to incorporate them in such masses, in any form whatever, into our system" (1018).

In order to dramatize this oppressive situation within the Cherokee nation, Lumpkin performed a narrative assimilation of the Indians. Equating the Cherokees to the Israelites in Egypt, he said that, given the opportunity, the Indians would emigrate, "but their lordly chiefs, of the white blood, with their northern allies, 'will not let the people go'" (1017). The common Cherokee, said Lumpkin, lacked a voice and was in fact depending upon Congress to break the grip of the chiefs: "'Hinder me not,' will be their language,

when they are permitted to express their own feelings, unawed by the tyrannical enactments of their mixed blood chiefs" (1017). Not surprisingly, in such a Biblical setting, from the "philanthropic ranks" came Northern intruders "like the caterpillars and locusts of Egypt. . . who devour the substance which of right belongs to the poor perishing part of the Cherokees." These plagues of outsiders "divide the spoil with the Cherokee rulers, and leave the common Indians to struggle with want and misery, without hope of bettering their condition by any change but that of joining their brethren west of the Mississippi" (1022). Attempting to take the moral high ground from the opposition, Lumpkin cited missionary Isaac McCoy's appraisal of those who would be motivated by greed and understandably reluctant to relinquish their accumulated power. McCoy had said that the greatest opposition to Indian removal would come from those who gained from the status quo:

We may prepare to encounter a host of opposers, consisting of traders, both licensed and unlicensed, many of them speaking the Indian language fluently, and in habits of daily intercourse with them, often allied by marriage, and otherwise by blood; and from many others who profit more or less by a commission from our Government, for the performance of services in the Indian Department. Remove the Indians, and the fountain fails. (1019)

Lumpkin then insisted that the opposition to removal in Congress was motivated not by opposition to the policy "but to the man who recommends it" (1021). The president, Lumpkin

insisted, was supported by "Contented majorities, conscious of their strength," a quiet contrast to "the noisy opposition": "But, sir, let it be remembered that weak minorities always make the most noise" (1019).

Lumpkin continued with this metaphor in sounding, on behalf of the irresistible forces of natural progress, the death knell to the opposition:

Pages may be filled with the sublimated cant of the day, and in wailing over the departure of the Cherokees from the bones of their forefathers. But if the heads of these pretended mourners were waters, and their eyes were a fountain of tears, and they were to spend days and years in weeping over the departure of the Cherokees from Georgia, yet they will go. The tide of emigration, with the Indians as well as the whites, directs its course westwardly. (1023)

Those who would try to deflect or impede this tide, Lumpkin argued, placed themselves in opposition to God himself. God was presiding over "agricultural and civilized communities entering into the enjoyment of their natural and just right to the benefits of the earth," said Lumpkin, who saw a world "evidently designed by Him who formed it for purposes more useful than Indian hunting grounds" (1024).

Lumpkin's speech was in large part an ad hominem attempt to seize the role of protectors of the Indians for the pro-Jackson forces. Lumpkin depicted the supporters of removal as the Cherokees' only salvation because the common Indian, the true Indian, would be freed from the tyranny of whites and half-breeds. Ostensibly speaking on behalf of the majority of

these poor Indians (as well as on behalf of the "silent majority" of the whites), Lumpkin argued that government in this case should not protect the rights of the minority because that minority was parasitical and might even be, in fact, defying God.

Two days after Lumpkin's speech, Representative Richard Wilde of Georgia took the floor and spoke initially in a more conciliatory manner, particularly of the anti-removal forces, though his positions were ultimately unbending and his rhetorical treatment of the Indians cutting. He, like Lumpkin, sought to characterize the Indians as savage, nomadic hunters, not farmers, to fix Jackson's removal plan within a Divine plan for the nation, and, above all, to counter the impassioned rhetoric of the opposition with his own "just thoughts in plain language" (1080). Wilde said that he represented the views of "the millions who were silent and satisfied -- the great body of the people. . . content with the course of the Government" (1080). On the other side, many Americans, "pious and benevolent individuals of every age, sex, and condition" had expressed "a deep concern" over the welfare of the Indians; these voices, however, were loudest "in those quarters of the Union which the Indians no longer inhabited, and where least was known relative to their present condition and future prospects." Wilde was concerned that "political agitators had, probably, assisted to excite, or to direct, this ferment," and while he admitted that "the zeal of

the multitude was generally honest," he said "it might not be according to knowledge." Thus the choice for the House, as he saw it, was between "the sober judgment of the many, and the distempered fancies of the few" (1080).

Those able to assess soberly the Indians' condition would recognize a people "rapidly decreasing in numbers, and perishing under their accumulated misfortunes," (1092) people representing no more than "ghosts of old habits and lost dialects -- dim shadows of departed tribes," (1080) "a less respectable order of human beings now, than they were ten years ago" (1096). Like Lumpkin, Wilde argued that the common Cherokees were victims of both whites and of their own chiefs, sinking lower and lower until they had become "a naked, miserable, and degraded race. . . reduced to the necessity of relying upon wild fruits, birds, and fish, for the support of life" (1096).<sup>6</sup> In horrible contrast to this picture of "absolute destitution," Wilde said that twenty-five to thirty people controlled all of the Cherokee nation's wealth, while perhaps two hundred families "composed of the Indians of mixed blood" made up a middle class that lived "in some degree of comfort" (1096). Overall, five thousand Cherokees, he said, occupied six million acres of Georgia land.<sup>7</sup>

Wilde's depiction of the Cherokee character thus was not surprising. As Roy Harvey Pearce has noted, "Universally, Americans could see the Indian only as hunter. That his culture . . . was as much agrarian as hunting, they simply



could not see" (66). The Cherokees, Wilde said, were devoted to the chase and considered "labor. . . a disgraceful employment" (1092). A few moments later Wilde repeated,

The intelligent observer of their character will confirm all that is predicted of their future condition, when he learns that the maxim, so well established in other places, "that an Indian cannot work," has lost none of its universality in the practice of the Indians of the South. (1096)

The Cherokee's inferiority, however, went far beyond his distaste for work, and was, in fact, compounded by a tendency to mix with another inferior race: "Their improvidence, their degraded condition, [is] notorious. They [have] in many States mingled with the free blacks, and sunk, in all respects, to their level" (1093). At the other end of the spectrum, Wilde cited miscegenation between Indians and whites "when the mixed race began to assert its superiority" as the "commencement of the deterioration of the mass of the tribe" (1096). Hastening this decline, "like their brethren of the red race everywhere else," the Cherokees exhibited "the same characteristic traits of unconquerable indolence, improvidence, and an inordinate love of ardent spirits" (1096). Finally, Wilde argued that the Cherokee constitution, so touted as evidence of their growing civilization, proved instead how mired the tribe was in savagery:

Their constitution has barbarism distinctly stamped upon it. . . . The fundamental principle is, that the land is to remain common and inalienable. This, of itself, is

barbarism. Separate property in land is the basis of civilized society. (1093)

Perhaps the most skilled rhetorical maneuver Wilde made was to cite and quote at length from an article that had appeared in North American Review in July, 1820, "a time when the public mind was entirely without excitement on the rights of the Indians" (1081). There, Wilde said, the anonymous author "expressed settled, sober, and deliberate opinions," in an extended justification for European rights to the soil of this continent. Wilde read several pages of the NAR into the record, with perhaps the most memorable lines being that such a debate over rights was "'an excellent question for disputation, for many of the arguments are on one side, while most of the truth is on the other'"\* (1081). The co-author of the article, presumably known to Wilde, was Edward Everett, representative from Massachusetts and vocal opponent of the president's removal policy.

The Cherokees of Senators Forsyth and Adams and of Representatives Lumpkin and Wilde were victims -- of whites who coveted their government annuities, of half-breed leaders who dominated their society and who sought the protection of the United States government to continue their absolute authority, of their own inferior nature that kept them imprisoned by indolence and intemperance, and ultimately of natural and divine forces that compelled an inferior race to give way to a clearly superior one. In perhaps the most

poignant moment of his speech, Representative Wilde asked his colleagues a series of questions, which underscored the threat of victimization if the removal did not take place; it was the threat of assimilation:

When gentlemen talk of preserving the Indians, what is it that they mean to preserve? Is it their mode of life? No. You intend to convert them from hunters to agriculturists or herdsmen. Is it their barbarous laws and customs? No. You propose to furnish them with a code, and prevail upon them to adopt habits like your own. Their language? No. You intend to supersede their imperfect jargon, by teaching them your own rich, copious, energetic tongue. Their religion? No. You intend to convert them from their miserable and horrible superstitions to the mild and cheering doctrines of christianity. (1103)

Wilde concluded that the only sign of Indian identity remaining would be the copper skin, "which marks them -- according to our prejudices, at least -- an inferior -- a conquered -- a degraded race" (1103). Surprisingly, this same rhetoric of helplessness and doom imbued the arguments of many anti-removal congressmen.

#### Opponents of the Removal Bill

##### The Senate: Legal and Moral Precedents

In the senate, the leading spokesman for the opposition to Indian removal was Theodore Frelinghuysen of New Jersey. Frelinghuysen was the former head of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, a Boston-based benevolent organization that had been working through the Congregationalist and Presbyterian churches to defend the

Indians' rights to their land. The organization also was, according to Ronald Satz, "the leading recipient of the federal funds allocated for civilizing the Indians" (American 13).<sup>9</sup> When Frelinghuysen addressed his colleagues, his strategy on the question was clearly to seize the moral high ground by stressing that the whole world would watch and judge the United States' decision. In his zeal to characterize the dependent relationship between the Indians and the powerful federal government, however, Frelinghuysen employed a fatalistic rhetoric that contributed to the sense of the Indians' powerlessness, even, as their spokesman, his own powerlessness, before irresistible forces of nature and politics.

Throughout his six-hour speech, Frelinghuysen appealed to the nation's sense of honor. He saw the executive branch attempting to act without consultation of the legislative, seeking not debate but a rubber stamp, "as if opinion was to be forestalled, and the door of inquiry shut forever upon these grave questions, so deeply implicating our national faith and honor" (310). Suggesting that the administration's intent was the disregarding of all former treaties, the imposition of state laws over the Indians, and their forced removal to the West, Frelinghuysen appealed to the moral obligations of a country that would have to answer the scrutiny of the world -- and of future generations of Americans: "Such a process will disgrace us in the estimation

of the whole civilized world! It will degrade us in our own eyes, and blot the page of our history with indelible dishonor!" (311) In one of many moments of drama, he turned to the Southern senators and asked, "Do the obligations of justice change with the color of the skin?" (312) Through questions such as this, Frelinghuysen demonstrated a powerful sense of an American narrative's being simultaneously acted and recorded. His rhetoric asked his fellow senators to step back and consider the moment from that same sobering perspective.

When he turned to the relationship between the Indians and the United States Government, he tried to force the same scrutiny upon the moment. He detailed how the executive branch had failed to respond to the Indian appeals for treaty-sanctioned protection and had, in fact, through the War Department, advised agents to avoid general councils and to focus on isolated chiefs in order to "move upon them in the line of their own prejudices, and, by the adoption of any proper means, break the power that is warring with their best interests'" (311). He cited another piece of correspondence between agents in the field and the War Department in which the agent advised that the Indians could be subjected to tactics that would persuade them to emigrate, once the federal government had deferred to the states. Frelinghuysen then reminded the senate of the Georgia laws already passed that

voided all Cherokee laws and customs and declared a Cherokee incompetent to testify against a white man:

Sir, here we find a whole people outlawed -- laws, customs, rules, government, all, by one short clause, abrogated and declared to be void as if they never had been. History furnishes no example of such high handed usurpation -- the dismemberment and partition of Poland was a deed of humane legislation compared with this. (318)

Both the federal and state actions, in other words, were redefining the relationship between the Indians and white authority: the Indians were the miserable victims of white power and white willingness to set aside all of the formal documents from the past. "It did not suffice," said the senator, "to rob these people of the last vestige of their own political rights and liberties; the work was not complete until they were shut out of the protection of Georgia laws" (318).

Ironically, when Frelinghuysen set out to plead the Indians' case for justice, his rhetoric, rather than demanding their rights, reinforced that sense of victimization. Although Frelinghuysen referred to the Cherokees early in his speech as "faithful allies," a phrase denoting a degree of equality between parties, more often he referred to the Indians as "adopted children" (320) who had approached their father seeking comfort and safety from the threats of a neighborhood bully: "Deep, indeed, must have been their despondency, when their political father assured them that their confidence

would be presumptuous, and dissuaded them from all expectation of relief" (310). This description of the paternalistic executive and his adopted children was a reminder that these were the "children of the forest," not the white man's natural offspring, and that their relationship to the senators and representatives was equally juvenile. If they were dependent upon the executive to protect them from a threatening situation, they were now dependent upon privileged others to speak on their behalf.

This particular senator chose to represent their case through a fatalistic rhetoric of doom. At times, Frelinghuysen described their demise as the direct result of contact with corrupt whites: "True, sir, many tribes have melted away; they have sunk lower and lower; and what people could rise from a condition to which policy, selfishness, and cupidity conspired to depress them?" (318) Earlier he declared that the American people were "about to turn traitors to [their] principles. . . to become the oppressors of the feeble" (312). "The early and first lords of the soil" were reduced to "feeble fragments of once great nations" now "crowded upon a few miserable acres on our Southern frontier" (311). With even that territory threatened, the Cherokee, "feeble and unoffending," (318) was faced with being driven "from the last refuge of his hopes" (313). Elsewhere the senator described the Indians' demise in more biological and sociological terms; he declared that where the Indians had been given the chance

to civilize, they had "readily yielded to the influence of moral cultivation," proving that they could "rise in the scale of being" (318). He argued that the whites did not have an inherent right to the land simply because they would replace hunting as a way of life with agriculture (311). In each of these cases, Frelinghuysen was arguing for greater understanding of the Indian but ended up reinforcing stultifying stereotypes of the Indian as a lower order of being committed to the chase.

Finally, listening to Frelinghuysen as a voice for the Cherokee, one must consider whether or not he adopted the ethos of the victim. He did not demand that the legislation be amended to ensure that emigration was voluntary; instead, he said, "I beg for the Indian the poor privilege of the exercise of his own will" (318). The voice appointed to speak for the Indian was more supplicating than outraged. He described a vision of the future in which, if "the tide" appeared "nearly irresistible" in the present, "a few more years" would "fill the regions beyond the Arkansas with many more millions of enterprising white men," sweeping "the red man away into the barren prairies, or the Pacific of the West" (319). The senator then closed his remarks with a tone of resignation, suggesting the inadequacy of his rhetoric to the task at hand. "Defeat in such a cause," he said, "is far above the triumphs of unrighteous power" (320). The speech overall is extraordinarily moving in its sincerity --



according to Satz, William Lloyd Garrison was inspired to write a poem honoring Frelinghuysen (American 21) -- but as a voice for the Cherokees, it echoes with the certainty of its own futility.

A much more vigorous, more defiant speech was that of Peleg Sprague of Maine. Focusing more on legal than moral issues, Sprague confronted the supporters of the removal bill with a barrage of legal documents and definitions to refute their right to legislate removal. He began by naming fifteen treaties signed between 1785-1819 guaranteeing the Cherokees' autonomous political existence, "'undisturbed possession'" of their lands, and protection of the United States from anyone threatening their rights (343). Replying to Senator Forsyth of Georgia and his claim that "treaties" did not apply to agreements made with Indians because they were incapable of comprehending them, Sprague asked, "Why not? . . . When any term is used by an author, it is understood to carry with it the ideas which he has previously affixed to it; that he denotes by it what he always has done" (349). He then suggested the devastating political consequences of the opposition's insistence upon redefining such terms and reinterpreting legal documents. He offered the opposition's understanding of the 1802 Compact, which it had cited as grounds for Georgia's claim to the Cherokee lands:

"The utmost good faith shall always be observed towards the Indians," which means that we may violate all our engagements at pleasure; "their lands and property shall never be taken from them without their consent," that is, both may be taken by violence, against their utmost resistance! "In their property, rights, and liberty, they shall never be invaded or disturbed, unless in just and lawful wars, authorised by Congress." "There shall be laws for preventing wrongs being done to them, and for preserving peace and friendship with them;" the true construction of all which is, that a State may make war upon them at pleasure, deprive them of their lands, and annihilate their nation! To such arguments are gentlemen of great ability compelled to resort! (351-52)

Sprague seized upon the opposition's claim of the state's inheriting from Great Britain the right of discovery, which they argued superseded the Indians' right to the soil. The right of discovery, Sprague pointed out, merely assumed "a right to purchase, to the exclusion of all others" and did not guarantee Americans the right "to coerce the Indians" (352). In other words, the right of discovery established claims only against other would-be discoverers. As for the validity of the right of conquest, Sprague said, "To give to conquest -- to mere force -- the name of right, is to sanction all the enormities of avarice and ambition" (353). Such an interpretation seriously called into question the character of its proponents, placing them on the same level as the Spaniards in South America. Besides, the senator pointed out, the Cherokees were never conquered; the United States sued for peace with sixteen thousand Cherokee warriors at Hopewell in 1785.

Examining the proposed federal legislation in conjunction with the already-passed Georgia laws concerning the Indians, Sprague saw a particularly specious evil. He saw a people who had adopted a civilized lifestyle who would be condemned to relinquish their gains in the name of bettering themselves. The Cherokees would become "aliens in their native land: trespassers upon their own soil: outlaws in the bosom of their own nation!" (355) Their Otherness officially proclaimed, they would be told they were being exiled for their own salvation:

They now live by the cultivation of the soil, and the mechanic arts. It is proposed to send them from their cotton fields, their farms, and their gardens, to a distant and unsubdued wilderness -- to make them tillers of the earth; to remove them from their looms, their workshops, their printing press, their schools, and churches, near the white settlements, to frowning forests, surrounded with naked savages -- that they may become enlightened and civilized! (356)

Sprague saw in this argument a recasting of an original plea for removal as salvation. He recalled how the Arch Tempter sought to persuade Adam and Eve, individually, by assuming the guise of a wise friend whose advice would yield eternal happiness. The part of Andrew Jackson in such an historical narrative was obvious, but Sprague's tactic also invited each senator supporting removal to cast himself in the role of the fiend.

Even when Sprague considered the myth of irresistible forces dictating the demise of the Indian, his attitude was

defiant: "It is said we must resort to such measures; they are unavoidable. The plea of state necessity is advanced. And is this great country, with peace in all its borders, now controlled by an irresistible power, that knows no rule and consults no law?" (356) Those who claimed to be motivated by "state necessity," he argued, had relinquished their roles as seducing serpent and become instead "a lion, seizing its prey with open and resistless strength" (356). They were, in other words, confusing their own strength with what they perceived to be a powerful momentum in nature. He reiterated the familiar justification: "It is said that their existence cannot be preserved; that it is the doom of Providence that they must perish." He also cautioned his fellow senators, however, not to confuse their political will with God's: If the Indians had to perish, he said, "let it be in the course of nature, not by the hand of violence." At the same time that Sprague made this sobering distinction, however, he showed his own susceptibility to the argument he resisted: "If, in truth, they are now in the decrepitude of age, let us permit them to live out all their days, and die in peace; not bring down their grey hairs in blood to a foreign grave" (357). Even a speech of defiance, accusation, and warning, such as this one, could not escape the elegiac rhetoric of doom that reinforced the victimization of the Indians. If the supporters of removal were poised to pounce like the lion, the Indians were the helpless, decrepit prey.

Asher Robbins of Rhode Island followed Sprague's lead in addressing the senate as a lawyer searching for legal precedents for the proposed legislation. He considered first the crucial issue of the Indians' competency to enter into treaties:

From the time of the discovery of this new world by the old, down to this time, now more than three hundred years, the competency of an Indian nation, situated within the jurisdiction of another Power, has never been made a question before. No jurist, no writer upon public law, has ever made it a question. (374)

Nevertheless, he asked those senators who would accept the nullification of a treaty based on this argument if they would then be willing to nullify all treaties made with Indians -- and the rights acquired by whites and Indians under them. When he considered the issue of Indian sovereignty, which the opposition was questioning, again he looked for a precedent: "When, or where, I would ask, has any Indian nation been subject within itself, to the law of another jurisdiction? I know of none; I have heard of none" (375). In the matter of Indian rights, on the other hand, Robbins did find a precedent, a common origin as "the gift of nature, and of nature's God" (376). Recalling Frelinghuysen's rhetorical question about the fluctuation of justice according to the color of one's skin, he asked his colleagues, "Is the Indian right less a right because the Indian is a savage? Or does our civilization give us a title to his right?" (376) He then

appealed to the ultimate authority and offered the senate's actions for divine judgment:

The Indian is a man, and has all the rights of man . . . . And if we trample upon these rights, if we force him to surrender them, or extinguish them in his blood, the cry of that injustice will rise to the throne of that God, and there, like the blood of Abel, will testify against us. (376)

Whereas Frelinghuysen had threatened his colleagues with the harsh scrutiny of world opinion and the disbelief of future generations, Robbins offered the prospect of divine retribution. Like Sprague, Robbins tried to recast the current political crisis into Biblical narrative. And, finally, like both of his colleagues, Robbins ended his speech with a lament that would become a voice in a chorus of the Indian's rhetorical victimization:

Ill fated Indians! barbarism and attempts at civilization are alike fatal to your rights; but attempts at civilization the more fatal of the two. The jealous of their own rights are the contemnners of yours; proud and chivalrous States do not think it beneath them to take advantage of your weakness. (377)

On April 24, 1830, all attempts to amend the proposed legislation were defeated and the Indian Removal Act passed by a vote of twenty-eight to nineteen.

The House: "Removal is a soft word"

Opponents of the bill in the House of Representatives spoke, of course, to the issues of the legality of formal treaties, the legality of federal intervention on behalf of

the Cherokees, the adoption of civilized practices among the Indians, and the legislative precedents being set for the scrutiny of the world. They also, however, demonstrated a particularly acute sensibility to the issues of voice and of language, their speeches dramatizing the sense of urgency and frustration over political talk that would have grave consequences for thousands of human beings.

Henry Storrs of New York expressed a confidence in Progress that bordered on bravado as he spoke of how "our immense forests had been reclaimed from the waste in which they lay" and replaced with "our free institutions, our laws, and, I hope, our virtues too." The United States was resounding proof to the world of the strength of our system, "the triumph of that consoling example which we hold out to mankind of the blessings of regulated liberty" (998). Against this glowing backdrop, however, he was forced to consider the proposed legislation, which, by itself, argued "that we and all the world have made no advance, for two centuries, in political science, or the morality of the code of public law" (1005). Storrs said that he would support the removal bill if he thought it genuinely was intended only to offer the option of emigration to "these unfortunate people [who] have become reduced, by a combination of circumstances which now press upon them in some quarters with intolerable severity," to such misery (994). Although Storrs indulged in the familiar rhetoric of doom, he was quick to point to the baffling pro-

removal argument that "When [the Cherokees] have just reached that point which is successfully calling forth their talent, and developing their capacity for moral improvement, we are about to break up their society, dissolve their institutions, and drive them into the wilderness" (1010). It was not just the logic of the argument that Storrs could not comprehend.

Storrs saved his greatest astonishment for the language employed by the executive branch and by the pro-removal speakers to justify actions he considered dishonorable and treacherous. Demanding that the House recognize and acknowledge the administration's criminal tactics in ordering agents to deal with chiefs individually "in the line of their own prejudices," Storrs was disgusted by the precedent set:

Now, sir, disguise these suggestions as we may, there can be no successful dissimulation in language of this sort. It is sheer, open bribery -- a disreputable proposition to buy up the chiefs, and reward them for treason to their people. It is the first time, so far as my knowledge extends, that such a practice has been unblushingly avowed. (1013)

He saw a parallel treason in the language being applied to treaties; reflecting upon the means by which others had argued that treaties could be simply set aside, Storrs wondered, "If the Executive had decided that all our former treaties with the Cherokees and Creeks had been void as to the cessions of land which some of the States have received under them, should we not have witnessed a very different feeling here?" The language would have been reversed along with the situation:



"Should we not have heard something -- and that, too, quite earnestly -- of plighted faith, of solemn treaties, and the constitutional securities of the States?" (1002) Instead, he heard the Committee on Indian Affairs refer to Indian treaties as "'mere names'" and "'forms of intercourse,'" as "'stately forms'" only; Storrs was outraged. He heard language being manipulated to turn his whole world of progress and American idealism on its head. In utter frustration he declared, "Words no longer mean what words import, and things are not what they are!" (1008)

Two speakers who directly asked the House to confront the issue of the Indians' voice were Joshua Evans of Pennsylvania and Isaac Bates of Massachusetts. The very evidence produced by Evans illustrated the difficulty of the Cherokees in being heard by a body that would decide their fate. Evans read to the House a letter from a white man, a Mr. Worcester, who had travelled extensively through the Cherokee nation, in which he sought to answer the charge "that the common people would gladly remove, but are deterred by the chiefs and a few other influential men." Worcester wrote, "It is not so. I say with the utmost assurance, it is not so. Nothing is plainer than that it is the earnest wish of the whole body of the people to remain where they are." Although one immediately questions such an image of universal accord, Worcester did indicate widespread public debate: "It is not possible for a person to dwell among them without hearing much on the subject. . . .

[The people] are not overawed by the chiefs. Individuals may be overawed by popular opinion, but not by the chiefs" (1048). Evans offered the voice of the Cherokee a forum, but it was a voice polled and summarized by a white man in a letter read by a white man to others like himself. The very process of conveying the Indian's voice dramatizes the degree to which it was marginalized. Isaac Bates elected, in his speech, to challenge the House (and the president) with a series of questions that "not only the Indian chiefs, but the American people, expect us to answer"(1050). With this strategy, he appointed himself a voice of the Indian. "If you will not tell us directly what our rights are," he asked, "will you allow us to remind you of your duties? Will you defend our boundary, and protect us where we are, as you agreed to do?" Bates then held up a hypothetical Treaty of Holston signed by Andrew Jackson on behalf of the United States and challenged the president: "Is this your signature and seal? Is this your promise? Will you keep it? If you will not, will you give us back the lands we let you have for it?" (1050) Bates then charged the Congress with avoiding a direct answer that would indicate its intent, choosing instead to "hide. . . in the folds of this bill" with its benign language and its appropriation of funds (1050). This striking metaphor evoked the potential for evil in a rhetoric of benevolence that de Tocqueville recorded so memorably.

Concern for the control of voices and the manipulation of language was central to the speech of Edward Everett of Massachusetts. Everett began by marvelling at the capacity for the Cherokees to have marshalled the forces they had in order to have a voice in the debate, given their marginalized position:

How can it be expected that this friendless, unrepresented people, with no voice in our councils, no access to our tribunals, no place in our community, should, without aid, plead their own cause effectively against the States that surround them, and the General Government itself? (1059)

Everett declared that his advice to the Cherokees would have been to retain the finest legal counsel available in order to combat these seemingly overwhelming forces; his advice, in other words, would have been for the Indians to purchase a voice that would be recognized as legitimate and therefore would be privileged to participate in the public discourse. Perhaps, he reflected, had they retained such a counsel, "their fate would not now be trembling on our decision. . . in a midnight session" (1059).

Everett accepted his role as that surrogate voice, addressing the problem of making his colleagues realize that their decision would affect human beings. He read into the record a long, impassioned letter written by a native Cherokee describing his nation,<sup>19</sup> to which Everett added, "Sir, they are attached to [this land]; it is their own; and though, by your

subtleties of State logic, you make it out that it is not their own, they think it is, they love it as their own" (1071). Attempting to counter the image of the Cherokee as a tribe of half-naked hunters, Everett cited the statistics from the 1824 census, the mills and looms, plows and animals, shops and roads and ferries, concluding, "These, sir, are your barbarians; these are your savages; these your hunters, whom you are going to expel from their homes, and send out to the pathless prairies" (1069).

Like Henry Storrs, Everett saw in the threats to the order and meaning of language and the threats to his concept of justice a sign that his world was collapsing. The law, he said, was supposed to be an earthly extension of Providence and, therefore, was to be revered; yet, here was a group of people seeking refuge from a law that would destroy them: "But protection against the law: protection against the protector! Sir, I cannot understand it: it is incongruous. It confounds my faculties." Most horrifying of all, he lamented that language was the vehicle for this evil: "There must be fatal mischief concealed in so strange a contradiction of language" (1062). Finally, he tried to shock his listeners into empathizing with the Cherokees. First, he reminded them of their distance from the consequences of their rhetoric. "It is very easy to talk of this subject," he said, "reposing on these luxurious chairs, and protected by these massy walls, and this gorgeous canopy from the power of the elements.

Removal is a soft word, and words are delusive" (1070). Then he used his rhetorical power to make that abstract "soft word" concrete; he sought to bring the human reality of removal into that comfortable chamber:

A community of civilized people, of all ages, sexes, and conditions of bodily health, are to be dragged hundreds of miles, over mountains, rivers, and deserts, where there are no roads, no bridges, no habitations, and this is to be done for eight dollars a head; and done by contract. . . . The imagination sickens at the thought of what will happen to a company of these emigrants, which may prove less strong, less able to pursue the journey than was anticipated. Will the contractor stop for the old men to rest, for the sick to get well, for the fainting women and children to revive? He will not; he cannot afford to. And this process is to be extended to every family, in a population of seventy-five thousand souls. This is what we call the removal of the Indians. (1070)

Everett obviously attempted through this speech to make language the vehicle of what he perceived to be justice, to make language serve his concept of law as a guarantor of protection from harm. He tried to connect the abstract word with its potentially devastating human consequences and, in so doing, substitute compassion for what he saw as political expediency.

The bill passed in the House 26 May 1830 by a vote of 103-97. The voting pattern in both the senate and the house, as Satz notes, was exclusively along party lines, with no regard for proximity to Indian populations (American 30). Jackson signed the bill into law two days after the house vote.

The nature of the debate in the House of Representatives is particularly interesting from a rhetorical point of view. In many ways it became an argument about itself as an argument; it revealed the inability or unwillingness of the participants to agree upon common terms: how could one grapple with a political solution to a problem if people could not agree upon the nature of the problem or upon grounding concepts like justice and the power of a majority versus the rights of a minority? when was a treaty no longer a treaty? were the Cherokees savage hunters enslaved by their wealthy chiefs, or were they prosperous farmers and business owners? was removal the official approval for genocide or the only hope to save an endangered people? were the Indians conquered, dependent fragments of once-great nations, or were they independent sovereignties? was removal merely the next self-evident step in the Providential plan for the United States, or was it another confirmation of the whites' insatiable greed? How could people even talk to one another when the terms of discourse were in such flux? Above all, what voices would be privileged to speak? Those who allied themselves with the Indian cause spoke at times with indignation, at others with a deep sense of futility and helplessness -- so much so that their rhetorical situation mirrored the Indians' political one. They tried to minimize the Indians' marginalization by associating the Indian cause with the ideals of justice and protection under the law, of

honor and faith, concepts that most Americans associated with the founding of their country. Despite their impassioned efforts, however, they could not escape the tough political reality that they were arguing on behalf of a constituency whose very humanity many Americans doubted. Peleg Sprague had described the Indians, redefined by proponents of removal, as "aliens in their native land: trespassers upon their own soil" (355). He might just as well have been describing the feeling of his anti-removal colleagues mired in a debate over a benignly worded policy that promised to save a people powerless to prevent their salvation.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> All page references are taken from the Register of Debates in Congress, 21st Congress, 1st session and are cited in the text.

<sup>2</sup> See Ronald N. Satz, "Rhetoric Versus Reality: The Indian Policy of Andrew Jackson," Cherokee Removal: Before and After (Athens, GA: U of Georgia P, 1991): 31-44. Those who condemn Jackson's policy as a plan for genocide and generally subscribe to what is known as the "devil theory" include Bernard W. Sheehan, Ronald T. Takaki, and Michael P. Rogin. More sympathetic treatment of Jackson's Indian policy may be found in the work of Charles Hudson, William Appleman Williams, and Arrel Morgan Gibson. Satz himself argues against "the danger of oversimplified, one-dimensional interpretations of history" (44).

<sup>3</sup> The text of Jackson's speech is taken from the Third Appendix, Register of Debates in Congress, 21st Congress, 1st session. Page numbers refer to this appendix.

<sup>4</sup> For a rather different characterization of Cherokee life, particularly its agricultural orientation, see Douglas C. Wilms, "Cherokee Land Use in Georgia Before Removal," Cherokee Removal: Before and After, ed. William L. Anderson (Athens, GA: U of Georgia P, 1991): 1-28.

<sup>5</sup> There is some justification for this description of Cherokee society, which became popular in the pro-removal ranks because it provided the argument that the Cherokee



people had to be saved from their oppressive leaders. There was, of course, some dissension, but the conflict was between the elite and the growing middle class. See Theda Perdue, "The Conflict Within: Cherokees and Removal," Cherokee Removal: Before and After, ed. William L. Anderson (Athens, GA: U of Georgia P, 1991): 55-74.

<sup>6</sup> Wilde here paraphrases an article written by Lewis Cass, to which he refers elsewhere in his speech, from North American Review 30 (January 1830): 62-121. In that article Cass admits that he has had no personal contact with the Cherokees, yet "We doubt whether there is, upon the face of the globe, a more wretched race than the Cherokees" (70-71). This influential article is dealt with at length in the next chapter.

<sup>7</sup> For census figures that suggest Wilde was grossly overstating the class distinctions and grossly underestimating the population (and ignoring a thirty percent increase in Indian population between 1809-1824), see Wilms, p.7.

<sup>8</sup> This article is dealt with at length in the next chapter. I can find no evidence that Wilde knew Everett was an author of the article; however, Wilde's speech did directly follow Everett's in the House debate.

<sup>9</sup> The success of this organization's campaigning led the Jackson Administration to establish a rival organization, the New York Board for the Emigration, Preservation, and Improvement of the Aborigines of America. Under the

leadership of Thomas L. McKenney, former head of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the Adams administration, the New York Board, subsidized by federal funds that had been earmarked for Indian civilization, worked tirelessly to supply Democratic editors around the country with the Jackson administration's position that "only emigration could bring preservation and improvement" (Satz, American 13-17). Lewis Cass took the opportunity of publication of the New York Board's proceedings to review and laud the organization's activities -- and to endorse the policy of Indian removal -- in a widely influential article in North American Review 30 (January 1830): 62-121.

<sup>10</sup> The letter was written by David Brown from Willstown, Cherokee Nation, 2 September 1825:

The Cherokee nation, you know, is in about thirty-five degrees north latitude. . . . This country is well watered; abundant springs of pure water are found in every part. A range of majestic and lofty mountains stretch themselves across the nation. The northern part of the nation is hilly and mountainous. In the southern and western parts there are extensive and fertile plains, covered partly with tall trees, through which beautiful streams of water glide. These plains furnish immense pasturage, and numberless herds of cattle are dispersed over them. Horses are plenty, and are used for servile purposes. Numerous flocks of sheep, goats, and swine cover the valleys and hills. On Tennessee, Ustanala, and Canasagi rivers, Cherokee commerce floats. The climate is delicious and healthy; the winters are mild. The spring clothes the ground with its richest scenery. Cherokee flowers, of exquisite beauty, and variegated hues, meet and fascinate the eye in every direction. In the plains and valleys the soil is generally rich, producing Indian corn, cotton, tobacco, wheat, oats, indigo, sweet and Irish potatoes. The natives carry on considerable trade with the adjoining States, and some of them export

cotton, in boats, down the Tennessee to the Mississippi, and down that river to New Orleans. Apple and peach orchards are quite common, and gardens are cultivated, and much attention paid to them. Butter and cheese are seen on Cherokee tables. There are many public roads in the nation, and houses of entertainment kept by natives. Numerous and flourishing villages are seen in every section of the country. Cotton and woollen cloths are manufactured here. Blankets, of various dimensions, manufactured by Cherokee hands, are very common. Almost every family in the nation grows cotton for its own consumption. Industry and commercial enterprise are extending themselves in every part. Nearly all the merchants in the nation are native Cherokees. Agricultural pursuits (the most solid foundation of our national prosperity) engage the chief attention of the people. Different branches in mechanics are pursued. The population is rapidly increasing. (1071)

## CHAPTER II

## "ARGUMENTS ON ONE SIDE. . . TRUTH ON THE OTHER":

## PERIODICALS AND THE INDIAN QUESTION

The debate in Congress over the Indian Removal Act of 1830 was impassioned by cries for justice by Indians and by whites. It was conducted with a terrible sense of urgency and filled with apocalyptic imagery. It was deliberated with the sobering awareness that future citizens of the United States, the world community, and perhaps God himself would judge the actions taken there. It was also nothing new. The Congressional debate merely offered a new forum for a national public discourse that had been steadily building for at least a decade in the country's periodicals. I propose to examine in this chapter several of the most influential of those publications in order to demonstrate how the political action of 1830 was anticipated by the writers and editors of publications like The National Intelligencer, Niles' Weekly Register, and North American Review throughout the late teens and 1820s. The National Intelligencer is important in this public discourse because it first published the series of twenty-four essays by Jeremiah Evarts (appearing under the pen name of William Penn) that advocated the Southern Indian tribes' sovereignty guaranteed by treaties with the United

States. These articles provided the inspiration and the arguments for the anti-removal speakers in Congress like Theodore Frelinghuysen and Peleg Sprague (Satz American 21). Niles' Weekly Register, published in Baltimore, achieved national recognition as a periodical-of-record because of Hezekiah Niles' editorial policy of balance and responsibility. Niles, says Norval Luxon,

visualized the value of a publication with the dual purpose of printing significant news for contemporaries and of preserving for posterity speeches, documents, messages, and correspondence of public officials. Thus, he felt, he would mirror for the future a true picture of the period. (1)

Niles reprinted articles and editorials from smaller newspapers around the country and always went out of his way to print opinions on controversial issues that he found personally distasteful (Luxon 38). Because his subscribers included newspaper editors from "Maine to Georgia, and from the Atlantic beyond the Mississippi" (Register Nov 30, 1811) -- editors who often reprinted articles and editorials from the Register -- the publication's influence was immense. If the Register's purpose was "to write for and speak to people -- not the learned and the wealthy. . . but the free laboring people, like ourselves, struggling to get a little forward in the world," (Nov 27, 1830: 217) the North American Review constituted its intellectual opposite, a magazine largely controlled by academics. Nevertheless, Nina Baym points out

that this "most 'serious' American magazine" reached far beyond New England to influence other regions because "the editors of many other journals read it" (16). Such an influence, like that of Niles' Register among newspapers, was significant at a time when most magazines were provincial in both circulation and influence. Frank Luther Mott notes that NAR, particularly after 1824, strove for a more national scope in the issues which it addressed (200). One of those persistent issues was, of course, the Indian Question.

NAR's and the Register's examination of the Indian throughout the 1820s is often more educative than overtly political. The primary question addressed is not so much pragmatic as epistemological: Who (or what) is the Indian? Rare is the volume of either of these publications that does not include at least one article dealing with the Indian. At times the Indian is treated as a curiosity, a subject for systematic study; at others the Indian appears as a blight upon the American landscape. Later, of course, the Indian question does become a matter of policy: What (if anything) do we as white European Americans do with the Indian? But the answer to the first question largely determines the answer to the second. I propose in this chapter to focus upon NAR, Niles' Register, and the National Intelligencer because they establish and maintain positions in this national debate that, taken together, offer the twentieth century reader insight into how the terms and voices are privileged in such

discourse. The "William Penn" essays in the Intelligencer privileged the voice of the missionaries and of the Indians themselves while invoking the legal and moral grounds for protecting Indian sovereignty. The Register printed articles both hostile and sympathetic to the Indians and often, by reprinting speeches and memorials to Congress, allowed Indians a direct voice in the debate; Niles' own editorials urged compassion and restraint when white Americans considered any change in their relations with the Indians. NAR, on the other hand, consistently questioned Indian rights, doubted reports of missionaries who were too sympathetic or too optimistic about Indian progress toward civilization, and privileged voices like that of Lewis Cass, who argued for the removal of Indians as a degraded and dying race.

I will demonstrate that these three publications focused public discourse on the nature and fate of the Indian around three key questions: Do the Indians have any right to the land upon which they live? Are Indian and white cultures meant to coexist? What role should the Indian play in the narrating, both historical and literary, of America? The first question requires legal definition. The second invites more philosophical speculation. The third -- clearly the most important for a literary study -- demands a rhetorical examination of authorship and voice.

## Rights to the Land

The position taken by NAR in its July 1820 issue on the question of "the rightful proprietors of the soil" (94) is one that remains consistent throughout the decade. The writers were brothers John and Edward Everett, the latter the same man who ten years later would speak so eloquently against the Removal Bill in the House of Representatives. In this early essay, however, the speaker's position is that of one who finds himself committed to a regrettable course of action -- dispossession of the natives -- which is nevertheless irreversible. With such a position, the current generation of white Americans could not only see itself absolved of any complicity in the course of events but could in fact see itself as a victim, albeit a victim who stood to gain considerable land and power. The writers base their sense of victimization upon there being no relationship between rhetoric and action:

Nothing seems clearer in the abstract, than that the original incumbents are the rightful proprietors of the soil; that it is not within the right of foreign intruders, under the pretence that they are civilized, while the incumbents are savage, to expel them from their possessions; nor is such a right, not naturally possessed, to be acquired by such sort of purchases, as are commonly made by civilized colonists of savage owners. (94)

The writers go on to expose how frail the right of possession is in practice, however, even among civilized peoples, where too often that right is violated by a simple quarrel between



leaders which escalates into war. Returning to theory, the Everetts assert that while civilized people do not have the natural right to dispossess natives on the basis of their degree of savagery, they do in fact have a natural right to a place on the earth:

Naturally speaking, all men have a right to live on the earth; and a ship's company of exiles, forced by persecution, or a crowded population, or any other cause, to a barbarous coast, have as good a natural right to land and settle on it, as the native tribes to continue there to hunt and fish. . . . it is clear, that they have no more natural property in the soil than you. (95)

The immediate implication of this argument is that these peoples will then coexist, but here again the writers are quick to divorce argument from pragmatic action. They demonstrate the absurdity of the notion of equal rights to the land by suggesting that savages would then have the right to invade civilized countries and insist upon the supremacy of hunting and fishing to "tilling and pasturage" (95):

[W]e answer, that in the dry, special pleading of the theory, this is true; and they must go to war, and the strongest be the rightful owner. . . . But in common sense and practice, there is no confusion in this case; nor would any sincere moralist be inclined to put the settlement at Plymouth on the footing of the invasion of Great Britain by a horde of Esquimaux. (95)<sup>1</sup>

In the second "William Penn" essay, Jeremiah Evarts considers the issue of natural rights to the land not by imagining London besieged by Eskimos but by paralleling the Cherokee claims to those of any ancient civilization:

We might as well ask the Chinese, what right they have to the territory which they occupy. To such a question they would answer, "God gave this land to our ancestors. Our nation has always been in possession of it, so far as history and tradition go back. The nations of Europe are comparatively of recent origin; the commencement of ours is lost in remote antiquity." (54)

Evarts also demonstrates an alternative interpretation of the gulf between theory and common sense. Acknowledging that the powers of Europe admitted the right of the people of the United States to occupy their portion of North America, he asks whether, if those powers did not recognize that right, their "claim" would negate our "right." He then asserts,

The same doctrine is applicable to the condition of the Cherokees. They have a perfect right to their country, -- the right of peaceable, continued, immemorial occupancy; -- and although their country may be claimed by others, it may lawfully be held by the possessors against all the world. (57-58)

Evarts' view evoking continued peaceful coexistence challenges the assumption made by the Everetts that conflicting ideologies will inevitably lead to conflicting armies. Dismissing the possibility of coexistence as a rhetorical position held by "half taught casuists" (94) leads the Everetts to the "common sense" position that war is inevitable and will allow "the strongest [to] be the rightful owner." The reduction of possibilities in the relationship between white America and the Indians is succinctly summarized in a review of Yamovden in the April 1821 NAR: the poem dramatizes

"a conflict in which the existence of one party depended on the destruction of the other" (487).

Evarts counters this assessment of the conflict between whites and Indians in the first of his essays, declaring that "No sophistry can elude [God's] scrutiny." With a strategy that would be emulated later in Congress, he holds up the possibility of divine retribution for the United States: "In many forms, and with awful solemnity, he has declared his abhorrence of oppression in every shape; and especially of injustice perpetrated against the weak by the strong, when strength is in fact made the only rule of action" (51).

A far more extensive commentary written by Edward Everett entitled "On the State of the Indians" (NAR, January 1823) illustrates the power of definition. Everett begins by asking this question: "Are [the Indians] a much injured and oppressed race, or rather is their gradual extinction and disappearance a great and crying injustice?" Demonstrating the power to control the terms of an argument, he answers, "No one, directly challenged on this point, perhaps, will answer in the affirmative" (32). He then creates an aura of factuality, declaring, "It seems to be agreed, on all hands, that barbarous tribes have but a partial and imperfect right in the soil; that they cannot allege a prior occupancy of the forests and plains, which they do not in any civilized sense occupy" (32-33, emphasis added). In other words, barbarous tribes have limited rights to the land because they live like

barbarous tribes. Everett then demonstrates what Lucy Maddox sees as a disturbing compulsion to reduce complex debates -- or what might have been complex debates -- to an either/or dichotomy (24):

Are they "lords of the soil?" they may then sell it to whom they please; and that will be the first trader well furnished with whiskey. Are they not lords, and do they even require reservations made inalienable by government, to prevent their total extinction? then they have not been driven from their own property. (34)

The argument becomes either they have no rights, or they have rights -- which they will readily relinquish.

To return to the tribes possessing land "they do not in any civilized sense occupy," one sees a key element in the argument over rights to the land: the use to which it is put. Article after article in NAR makes the same case, reducing the Indians to roving bands of hunters who never established towns or planted crops. Everett writes in January 1823:

The settlers, possessing the arts of civilized life, enjoying the blessings of government, and backed by powerful countries beyond the sea, are likely to advance in population, much more rapidly than any equal portion of the natives. Forests will soon disappear and be replaced by cornfields. This feeds the white people, but it starves the red people; and yet what hardy moralist will say, that the settlers shall not cut down the trees, because it will destroy the covert of the deer? . . . [T]he hunting ground of fifty savage families would feed and does feed a large city of civilized christians. (33, 38)

Everett here defines the Indians through oversimplification.<sup>2</sup>

Roy Harvey Pearce would point out, however, that Everett's

position is not unusual for his time: "Universally Americans could see the Indian only as hunter. That his culture, at least the culture of the eastern Indians whom they knew best. . . , was as much agrarian as hunting, they simply could not see" (66). At the time Everett's article appeared, for example, the Cherokees in Georgia were operating 36 gristmills, 13 sawmills, 62 blacksmith shops, 9 stores, running 762 looms and 2,486 spinning wheels, and farming with the aid of 2,923 plows, and tending approximately 71,000 cattle, pigs, sheep, and goats (Wilms 7). Reports of these developments in the Cherokee culture and among other Indian nations were published in periodicals like Niles' Weekly Register,<sup>3</sup> leaving one to wonder if Pearce should not have said the whites "simply would not see" Indians as farmers. The argumentative advantages of depicting the nineteenth-century Indian as a savage hunter are obvious. His Otherness would discourage empathy or understanding between whites and Indians, empathy that might call into question the dichotomy between rhetoric, which could be used to assert Indian rights, and common sense, which could be used to point to the irrelevance of such abstractions.

The most systematic of the discussions in NAR on this issue of land rights appears in October, 1826, in a review of Memoirs of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Taking exception to the writer's position in these memoirs that the Indians had claims to the land as strong as those of civilized

settlers, the reviewer immediately launches a familiar flare: "On this topic we do not fully agree with him, believing his reasoning to be more refined than practical" (279). Acknowledging that the Indians did have claims to the land based upon the right of occupancy, the reviewer moves to qualify that right, calling it "unconditional and indisputable, in all cases where the inhabitants bore any proportion to the quantity of land they claimed." As with the earlier article, the Indians are charged with not using the land according to civilized criteria:

But to argue seriously, that a handful of savages has a right to retain exclusive possession of as much land as it can wander over, during the four seasons of the year, in pursuit of game, and reject all other people from this domain, is carrying the metaphysical side of the question a little too far. (279, emphasis added)

The writer here employs a common strategy -- evidenced, for example, in Andrew Jackson's address to open the 21st Congress -- of rhetorically reducing the Indian population in order to diminish its claims to the land. One's natural right, says the reviewer, is "to soil enough to procure his subsistence," according to a civilized understanding of the term. Then reducing the concept of natural right (and the Indian population) to absurdity, the reviewer asks:

Did the first Indian, who stepped upon the western continent, actually possess in fee simple one half of the globe, and had he a right to exclude all the rest of the world from his hemisphere, if such were his will and pleasure? (280)

Having thus dismissed the concept of natural rights to the land, the commentator addresses conditional rights, defined by civilized custom: "The laws of nations have recognized the rights of conquest and purchase, the first chiefly from necessity, and the second from convenience." To these conventional claims is added cultural excellence (279). With these criteria established, the writer concludes,

But take it as you will, the dimensions of the Indian rights become very scanty. As to the dubious right of conquest, we know not enough of their history to say anything on the subject; they made no pretensions to purchase; they were few in numbers and comparatively feeble in strength; and for mental or moral excellence they were not distinguished. (279-80)

The twentieth-century reader is further struck by the debate's remaining focused on the seventeenth century, on the what-might-have-been. In fact, the writer concedes,

When the Europeans came first to these shores, had the native population been dense, the country covered with villages and cultivated fields, the streams and bays filled with commerce, had manufactures and the arts flourished, and had an immensely increased value been given to the soil by the labor and skill of men, there would then have been in the condition of the people all the constituent qualities of a perfect right, whether regarded as the right of nature, superior strength, excellence, or purchase. Encroachments then would have been unlawful, because civilization had stamped the mark of property on every foot of land, and every other desirable object of possession. (280)

Such a concession is easily made when one is confident of the power to define "the mark of property" and to confine one's argument to the original settlers. But this article appeared

in 1826. President Monroe had already presented a plan to Congress calling for removal of Indian tribes east of the Mississippi. The case of the Cherokees was already a part of the national dialogue. And anyone applying the criteria laid out above would be sorely pressed to make a convincing case for removal. The strategy in NAR for discussing rights to the land, in fact, remained largely focused on the past, and when it strayed to the present, the Indians were still depicted as this writer describes their ancestors, "savage in their habits and manners, paying no attention to agriculture or any of the arts of civilized life, roaming from place to place, and exhausting their whole powers of mind and body in gaining a precarious subsistence by the chase" (280). This persistent characterization led the missionary Samuel Worcester in 1830 to remark of Cherokees who lived by the chase, "I certainly have not found them, not even heard of them, except from the floor of Congress, and other distant sources of information" (qtd. in Wilms 6).

One needs only to glance through issues of Niles' Weekly Register to discover a fundamental difference in the editorial attitude of this publication from the skepticism of NAR. In an editorial from April 29, 1820, Niles writes,

Several of the Indian tribes have made considerable progress in civilization -- they no longer depend upon the chase. . . . They have corn, cattle and hogs more than sufficient for their wants. . . . In sundry instances, they have advanced as fast towards an



introduction into the family of the republic, as could have been expected. (154)

In the May 25, 1822 issue, Niles published a letter from an Indian agent in Ohio among the Shawnees. The agent was convinced by his own observations that he was witnessing a paradigm shift:

The Shawanoese Indians have abandoned their town, and scattered themselves over their reservation, (at Waupaghkonetta), on farms; frolicking, drinking and dancing have almost ceased, and they are doing better than they have ever done before; many of them have now neat farms and dwelling houses. . . . Light and knowledge are gradually advancing; the son of the wilderness quits his bow and arrow, and his tomahawk, and quietly begins to cultivate the earth. (195)

In the August 23, 1823 issue, Niles reported on Indian attacks upon white hunting parties operating beyond the frontier but appended the following editorial remarks:

it appears to us, that the lands yet unceded must be regarded as their own, and if so, we should suppose that a party of white persons cannot have any more right to enter upon it for the purpose of catching and killing the wild beasts of the forest, than the Indians would have to enter our settlements and carry off whatever they pleased. (393)

Niles then added a note interesting in terms of the debate over the issue of how the land was to be used: "The Indian kills only from necessity -- but the white hunter destroys all that he can for the sake of profit" (393). The words could easily have come from the mouth of Natty Bumppo. They would never, on the other hand, have appeared in NAR. Elsewhere,

Niles defends the rights of those Indians who have not abandoned the chase, insisting in a February 7, 1824 editorial that "The game is almost everything to them -- their food, raiment and medium of commerce. Our hunters ought not to trespass on the Indian lands. We would not allow them to trespass on ours. The rule should work both ways" (357).

Since Niles does generally support the conversion of Indians from hunters to Jeffersonian farmers, he endorses evidence that such use of the land according to the civilized model is taking place. He printed the text of the famous David Brown letter in which a Cherokee describes in glowing detail the richness of his native lands and the conversion of the Cherokee people to farming and the mechanic arts [see chapter 1, note 10]. Introducing the text of that letter, Niles writes, "we must conclude, from the facts set forth by Mr. Brown, that, be the fate of the Creeks what it may, the Cherokees never will part with any more of their lands, unless on compulsion." Niles' reasoning was simple: "they have a regularly established government, and as just ideas of the value of property, the necessity of labor, and the usefulness of schools, &c. as, perhaps, are entertained by the body of their immediate neighbors" (Oct 15, 1825: 105). Thus while Jeremiah Evarts argued that the Indians had the same right to the soil that the Chinese or any ancient people had, Niles tended to support the notion that their rights depended upon their adoption of civilized methods of development; he

therefore took every opportunity to print evidence that would contradict those, like the writers for NAR, who would deny the Indian any rights because he did not use the land according to civilized criteria.

#### Are Indians and Whites Meant to Coexist?

Clearly apposite to the debate over removal was the issue of contact between white and Indian cultures, a question I have framed, as did the journalists, in terms of the heavily loaded meant. NAR's commentators approach this question with a number of assumptions, the most prominent being that the Indians are being exterminated because of Providential and natural design, that an inferior creature must naturally stand aside at the advent of its superior. The Indian's inferiority as a human being is evidenced by his failure to improve the land according to civilized standards, as demonstrated above, but also by his failure to control his intemperate nature. Given his inferior nature and the obvious intention of Providence, NAR writers frequently wonder, as did the Everetts in July, 1820, whether the white culture is under any obligation to preserve the last vestiges of the aboriginal: "To take measures to preserve the Indians is to take measures to preserve so much barbarity, helplessness, and want, to the exclusion of so much industry and thriftiness" (96). Even Hezekiah Niles, so attuned to the need to consider conflicts from the Indians' point of view, can apparently endorse the notion of racial inferiority; in the November 14, 1818 issue

of the Review, he reflects upon remnants of "mighty nations" that now constitute "a mere link in the chain that unites man to beast, a remove only superior to the Ourang Outang, or wild man of the woods!" (185) This issue of the Indian's intemperance and the question of whether or not Indian culture should be preserved become core issues for the literature of the 1820s. They become so central, I will argue, that assumptions about the nature of the Indian govern discussions over what will constitute legitimate subjects for American fiction as well as discussions over the effect that literature has on its readers.

Could white and Indian cultures coexist? With the assurance of Dr. Johnson's kicking the stone, John and Edward Everett answer in July 1820, "It is tolerably well ascertained that they cannot support the neighbourhood of civilization, . . . a simple fact, ascertained by experience" (95). They add that the Indians have only rarely mingled with whites and have been assimilated "or remaining distinct, have dwindled away in consequence of necessary checks on their increase, not implying a voluntary oppression on our part" (96). Nearly ten years later in the midst of the debate over the fate of the Cherokees, Lewis Cass writes in NAR the familiar argument:

It would be miserable affectation to regret the progress of civilization and improvement, the triumph of industry and art, by which these regions have been reclaimed, and over which freedom, religion, and science are extending their sway. But we may indulge the wish, that these blessings had been attained at a smaller sacrifice; that

the aboriginal population had accommodated themselves to the inevitable change in their condition, produced by the access and progress of the new race of men, before whom the hunter and his game were destined to disappear. But such a wish is vain. A barbarous people, depending for subsistence upon the scanty and precarious supplies furnished by the chase, cannot live in contact with a civilized community. (64)

Unlike his predecessors who worried over the issue of rights to the soil, Cass has at least determined that conquest is the basis for white claims; however, his more immediate concern is with assigning responsibility for the Indians' failure to assimilate:

In the usual progress of conquest, where permanent possession is retained, the victors and vanquished become connected together, and if they do not form one people, they yet acknowledge obedience to the same laws, and look to them for protection. But from the St Lawrence to the gulph [sic] of Mexico, under the French, or British, or Spanish, or American rule, where is the tribe of Indians, who have changed their manners, who have become incorporated with their conquerors, or who have exhibited any just estimate of the improvements around them, or any wish to participate in them? (69)

Anticipating the obvious objection that the Cherokee example would dispute his claims, Cass reveals the racism at the heart of his argument by declaring that the Cherokee alphabet, constitution, newspaper, schools, and police force are "exaggerated representations" and that Cherokee adaptation to white ways "is confined, in a great measure to some of the half-breeds and their immediate connexions" (71-72). Then, remarkably, having admitted that he has no personal knowledge of the Cherokee people, he declares, "We doubt whether there

is, upon the face of the globe, a more wretched race than the Cherokees, as well as the other southern tribes, present. Many of them exhibit spectacles as disgusting as they are degrading" (72). The vehemence of this attack upon the readiest example of an Indian population that illustrated the possibility of coexistence with whites suggests the strength of the Cherokee case. It also demonstrates the vital link between rhetoric and political action.

Despite his Ourang Outang remark, Niles remains a steady voice arguing for coexistence and the eventual assimilation of Indians and whites. In the same editorial that contains the slur, he expresses "a hope. . . that step by step they may advance in improvement, and finally to be merged into the great family of the republic as a part of its citizens -- an event that ought to be looked to as probable and be provided for" (186). The tone of Niles' January 30, 1819 commentary offers a dramatic contrast with the future as envisioned by the Everetts and Lewis Cass: "how great is the inducement to foster every measure that may kindly lead the untutored savage to happiness, and fit him to become a citizen in the land of his fathers!" (421) In the same article, Niles then reprints a Quaker report on missionary successes whose optimism no doubt would have made, perhaps did make, Lewis Cass's blood boil:

That the native genius of the aborigines of America is susceptible, under a mild system of laws and a wholesome

domestic discipline, of being improved in well regulated schools, so as to enable them to become competitors, with their white brethren, for the rewards due to excellence in virtue, in knowledge and in all the acquirements that adorn the most enlightened in civil life, is, we conceive, a fact that can no longer be doubted. (423)

In the April 29, 1820 issue, Niles declares simply, "We shall not neglect this subject -- for we are deeply interested in the incorporation of this people into our own improved society" (155).<sup>4</sup>

One of the key arguments for removal assumed the inability for Indians to coexist with white society because of the Indian's savage intemperance. Two articles from NAR may be examined as presenting typical arguments that rely upon these assumptions. Edward Everett, who argued that barbaric people had no claim to the land they did not occupy according to civilized definition (Jan 1823) is quick to identify liquor as a primary source of conflict between the two cultures. The fatalistic attitude here propels irresistible calamity as the writer explains "the nature of things":

The settler brings with him the art of extracting a strong liquor out of potatoes and rye, which taken in small quantities and with great discretion is a cordial; but, in large quantities and without discretion, a poison. The savage has an ungoverned appetite for this liquor; and though it be always made penal to furnish him with it, it is impossible, in the nature of things, to enforce the restriction, and it is put within his reach. [This vice] leads to other vices, to quarrels, to violence, to murders; and thus to wars of retaliation, punishment, and self-defence [sic]. (33)

On this point, Niles agrees with his NAR counterparts. Compare his remarks from November 14, 1818: "Like the poor squaw, about to be precipitated in her canoe down the cataract of Niagara, who was last seen with a bottle of rum at her mouth, they will drink of the destructive liquor though absolutely certain that death is about to overtake them" (185). When Lewis Cass takes up the same topic twelve years later, he does not confine himself to the Indians and liquor but rather sees the abuse of liquor as only one manifestation of a general pattern of intemperance. Not surprisingly, he speaks of a "recklessness" that is symptomatic of racial inferiority. Arguing that agriculture has never been vital to the Indians' survival, he notes, "although seed-time came, no harvest followed; for before their corn was ripe, it was generally consumed, with that utter recklessness of the future, which forms so prominent and unaccountable a feature in their character" (65). He further argues that Indians were responsible for depleting their own game in order to trade furs for rifles, blankets, and cloth (65). "Reckless of consequences," says Cass, the Indian is "the child of impulse," (74) incapable of knowing how to plan for a future of which he has little conception. Cass then proceeds rhetorically to divest the Indian of the capacity to understand or to care about his place in the history of this country:



It is difficult to conceive that any branch of the human family can be less provident in arrangement, less frugal in enjoyment, less industrious in acquiring, more implacable in their resentments, more ungovernable in their passions, with fewer principles to guide them, with fewer obligations to restrain them, and with less knowledge to improve and instruct them. We speak of them as they are. (73)

That final comment is important. Cass is contemptuous of those, like the Quakers quoted by Niles or like Cooper, Child, Eastburn, Sands, and Sedgwick, who have offered a too-sympathetic portrait of the Indian to the world: "the world has had enough of romantic description. It is time for the soberness of truth and reality." In contrast to his temperate account, writers have distorted the truth until their passions have overwhelmed reason, reducing them to the level of the savages they celebrate: "Rousseau and the disciples of his school, with distempered imaginations and unsettled reason, may persuade themselves of the inferiority of civilized to savage life" (73). I will return to this metaphor linking the irresponsible writer of fiction with the ungovernable savage when I consider the issue of the Indian's place in American literature and the effect of that literature on an impressionable reader.

While the Indian was thus often considered a threat to civilized law and social stability, many articles in both NAR and Nile's Weekly Register treat the aboriginal culture as a resource, a treasure, a relic that is crumbling before the public eye. Discussion typically endorses the responsibility

white Americans had for preserving Indian culture. Such a task was certainly a challenge, given the level of misunderstanding, both deliberate and unintentional, that whites had about their aboriginal neighbors. As Jeremiah Evarts writes in the introductory "William Penn" essay, "So great a diversity of opinion is principally owing to want of correct information" (48). The resulting appropriation of Indian culture by white America sounds in fact more like the acquisition of an enigma; consider, for example, this excerpt from the Everetts' review in NAR from July 1820:

Little, however, as we join the regret which is sometimes expressed at the vanishing of the Indian tribes, we heartily participate the wish that, before they are gone forever, no pains should be spared and no time be lost in collecting their traditions, describing their manners, and above all preserving specimens of their language; which the late investigations have shown to be a philological phenomenon of the most striking kind. . . . [Such studies might be] the only means now existing of tracing the descent of these once mighty nations, and of solving the great problem of the settlement of America. (96-97)

Another review in the same volume of NAR looks at a comparative study of Indian languages, reprinting page after page of similar words in various dialects. The writer, J. Pickering, then asks, "After such evidence of the copiousness of these languages, what shall we say to the theories of ingenious men, who have represented them as destitute of almost all the powers of the cultivated languages" (112). Some of the discussion then is about the Indians' ability to

speak for themselves. Niles' practice of printing Indian speeches makes it clear that the issue was not so much the Indians' ability to speak but rather their having access to a translator and journalist to record their words. Those writers sympathetic to the Indian, like Pickering or Niles, obviously realized that the more familiar whites became with Indian culture, the more complex they discovered it was. This question clearly has immense ramifications for the debate over what would constitute our national literature, over what voices would be heard and how people would be depicted. However, some of the discussion, often blatantly hostile to the Indians, considers whether or not white Americans have any responsibility to preserve an inferior culture, one that it finds both enigmatic and revolting. In a review (NAR 16, January 1823) that attacks Jedidiah Morse's sympathetic pleas for white understanding of the Indian, Edward Everett argues that neither the Indians' manners, languages, mode of life, nor religion, whose "conceptions are notoriously of the grossest and most degrading kind, their traditions mere bloody recollections of prisoners scalped and tomahawked," are worth preserving (39). Most revealing of all, however, is the review from October 1826 of An Address to the Whites; delivered in the First Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, on the 26th of May, 1826. By Elias Boudinot, a Cherokee Indian. The review opens in astonishment: "A BOOK written by an Indian is a novelty, even in this native land of Indians"

(470). Here is an Indian voice, speaking directly to whites in their own tongue, the voice of the editor of the Cherokee newspaper, the Cherokee Phoenix. True to the format of NAR, the review consists of several pages of excerpts from Boudinot's work, in which he seeks to enlighten white Americans about Cherokee lands, their adoption of farming, their conversion to Christianity, their development of an alphabet, their organization of a government with a legislature and a Superior Court. The reviewer's first comment following these excerpts is disbelief that an Indian has the power to speak so eloquently, perhaps to speak at all: "Our readers will agree with us, we believe, that these particulars savor a little of the marvellous [sic], especially when considered as uttered by the voice of an Indian; yet we have no doubt of their truth" (474). Both the description of Cherokee culture and the ability to present it to a white audience without a white mediator challenge the image of barbarism so often presented in the magazine's articles. But it is the reviewer's closing comment that demonstrates the judiciary power of a magazine like NAR to condemn and execute:

The Cherokees exhibit a novel spectacle; but the result is not difficult to conjecture. A community of civilized Indians is an anomaly that never has existed, nor do we believe it ever will exist. Bring the Indians up to this mark, and you put them on a level with whites; they will then intermarry, and the smaller mass will be swallowed up by the larger; the red skin will become white, and the Indian will be remembered only as the tenant of the forests, which have likewise disappeared before the march of civilization. (474)

The commentator's astonishment thus gives way to smug assurance that, rather than presenting a challenge to white assumptions about racial superiority, Boudinot's description of Cherokee adoption of white ways only confirms the Indians' fate: they will disappear, will in fact be devoured -- will in either scenario be reduced again to silence.

This conclusion caps the issue of Indian contact with white America by absolving white settlers of any responsibility for the demise of Indian culture, answering the question Were Indians and whites meant to coexist? with a confident, emphatic No. White Americans, Lewis Cass declared with unshakable confidence, were merely, by taking the North American continent, fulfilling God's design:

There can be no doubt, and such are the views of the elementary writers upon the subject, that the Creator intended the earth should be reclaimed from a state of nature and cultivated; that the human race should spread over it, procuring from it the means of comfortable subsistence, and of increase and improvement. (NAR 30: 77)

His only concession to the Indians is that they "are entitled to the enjoyment of all the rights which do not interfere with the obvious designs of Providence, and with the just claims of others" (76). That it was up to the whites to interpret both those designs and just claims was equally self-evident. Nowhere is there a better illustration of Roland Barthes's concept of myth making than in the assurance of Cass and others that they speak on behalf of the self-evident, not for

"a historical intention" but for "a natural and eternal justification" (130, 132). In this case, the irresistible forces of nature which seem to presage the extinction of the Indian and the incontestable design of God are invoked and applied interchangeably. The result is an odd hybrid of Darwin and Calvin.<sup>5</sup>

According to this vision, nature yields to white hands like a docile, grateful beast that is happy to serve in its own remaking, a central issue in Cooper's Pioneers. In July of 1820, John and Edward Everett exult in the transformation presented to the traveller to the Mississippi:

If he travelled on the great watery turnpike of the west, he would descend it, together with an immense amount of produce and population, on its natural railways, and meet its thousands of tons of steam navigation returning with the conveniences and luxuries, which this produce had purchased. He would find the Indian population extinct, and an individual of their nation a spectacle in the streets; and in its place an enlightened society, with the vigour and spirit of youth, and the habits of hardihood and intelligence, which belong to the nature of the enterprise they have just achieved. And lastly, he would see in the spirit of emigration, so universally extended, the means provided by nature to assimilate and unite these spreading bands of citizens into one national character. (102-03)

Nature thus conspires to aid the emigration of those who would use it, not in the conservative, respectful way of the Indian or the backwoodsman, but in a radical reshaping. In such a "new" world the Indian becomes, instead of a part of the assimilated nation, an alien, a representative of old, primitive man who must inevitably give way to the young

revolutionary. In January 1823, Edward Everett declares, "We maintain only, that the extinction of the Indians has taken place by the unavoidable operation of natural causes, and as the natural consequence of the vicinity of white settlements." He then adds a note that suggests national policy should not oppose the self-evident laws of nature: "Wherever, by the interference of the state, they have been preserved, it has been by a greater violation of their supposed rights, than that which has led to their extinction" (34). Turning then to those who empathize with the displaced and dispossessed, Everett suggests that any argument made on the Indian's behalf itself violates nature: "Has any thing happened to the native inhabitants of this country, which has not happened at the same time to the whites, which has not always happened in all ages and to all the tribes of men?" Shifting the argument from the preservation/extinction dichotomy to mortality/immortality, he declares, "The natives driven from the soil, destroyed, extinguished! What then, would they not have died; is it the Europeans, that have made them mortal and their generations transitory?" (36) Finally, in a description that sounds like a remarkable anticipation of the survival of the fittest, Everett speculates,

Had not the Europeans come, the Indians would have died in the course of nature as before, and been succeeded by other generations of Indians, to lead a barbarous and wretched life, and die like their fathers. The Europeans came; and -- by causes as simple and natural, as they are innocent -- the barbarous population, as it has passed

off, has been replaced by one much better, much happier.  
(37)

Although he too spoke of the apparent inevitability of Indian extinction, Hezekiah Niles does not endorse the natural cause of the decline. In the Register as early as August 14, 1819, he writes,

From the lights afforded by the history of our country from its first settlement -- from the result of our own experience and remark, it must be obvious to all that the policy hitherto pursued by our ancestors and ourselves, carries with it a decree for the deliberate and unnecessary annihilation of the Indian race. . . . This people are hunted by avarice to the fountains of the Missouri and Mississippi, and the worst passions encouraged and most abominable vices introduced among them, for temporary advantages to be gained in trading with them. (405)

And there is even one article in NAR (October 1826: 275-94) that expresses ambivalence over the "course of nature" argument and certainly denies that the Indians died "by causes as simple and natural, as they are innocent"; while the writer at first invokes "the wise and beneficent designs of Providence, as seen in the progress of human affairs, and the government of the world," (281) he then acknowledges that progress depended too often upon the white settlers' waging "unprovoked war against the natives, to drive them back, and seize the lands which they valued as being the dwelling place of their fathers." Even the settlers at Plymouth, he says, "seemed to have a contempt for the Indians, and to regard and treat them as possessing but few of the attributes of human



beings," creating among the natives the natural desire for revenge, so that "nine times in ten, we are convinced, these calamities were the direct consequences of the fanaticism, indiscretion, ignorance, or cupidity of the whites" (281). "They drove the Indian to his ruin," he asserts, remarkably, "but they nerved his arm with revenge, and brought a blow down upon their own heads, from the deep effects of which they did not soon recover" (282).

That this voice represents a minority in NAR is evident from the survey I have presented, and even this writer, who wishes to fashion history in less stark relief, ultimately bows to the prevailing wisdom of natural law and Providence. The issue of Indian contact with white culture is dominated by the concept of the Indians' self-destruction, despite attempts like the ones above to note white complicity in their demise. One of the most moving rebuttals against the extinction-as-Providence argument appears in Niles' Weekly Register on January 28, 1829. Reprinted from the Cherokee Phenix [sic], it was probably written by Elias Boudinot:

It is frequently said that the Indians are given up to destruction; that it is the will of heaven that they should become extinct, and give way to the whiteman. Those who assert this doctrine, seem to act towards these unfortunate people in a consistent manner, either in neglecting them entirely, or endeavoring to hasten the period of their extinction. For our part, we dare not scrutinize the designs of God's providence towards the Cherokees. It may suffice to say that his dealings have been merciful and very kind. (40-41)

The Cherokee editor then directly challenges the historians who invoke nature and the Christian God to explain the conflict in nineteenth century America:

The causes which have operated to exterminate the Indian tribes, that are produced as instances of the certain doom of the whole aboriginal family, appear plain to us. These causes did not exist in the Indians themselves nor in the will of Heaven, nor simply in the intercourse of Indians with civilized man; but they were precisely such causes as are now attempted by the states [sic] of Georgia; by infringing upon their rights; by disorganizing them, and circumscribing their limits.  
(41)

Pleas such as this -- articulate, thoughtful, restrained -- by their very existence challenged the rhetoric of writers like Lewis Cass. Nevertheless, the images that prevailed were those of Cass, not Boudinot. Because of the Indians' notorious intemperance which reduced them to toddlers battling uncontrollable passions, their repulsive and degrading displays of "religion" which angered the true Christian God, their refusal to abandon a hunting life of subsistence, and, most importantly, their racial inferiority to which nature's design dictated an end -- whites came to understand that the New World, a term only they could assign, was their world.

#### What Role Should the Indians Play in the Narrative of America?

The same NAR reviewer who was bold enough to suggest that the white settlers were often responsible for the destruction of the Indians shows himself acutely aware of the voices that

dominated the public discourse on the Indian question. He is particularly aware of the issue in a country in the process of defining itself, gathering its notes, as it were, to write its history, a country simultaneously hoping and doubting that it could produce a native literature -- a country, in other words, in the process of narrating itself. Roy Harvey Pearce calls this the problem "of comprehending cultural history even as it was being made," adding, with his own apparent endorsement of cultural determinism, "of simultaneously defining, directing, and rationalizing the inexorable progress of civil society in a new world" ("Civilization" 92). What place was there for the Indian in the narrative that resulted from this defining and rationalizing? Aware of their obligations to narrate the struggle between whites and Indians as an integral chapter in the nation's history, many writers and editors asked questions about the role the Indian would play. Could the historian include the Indian without romanticizing him? Could the historian include the Indian without further victimizing him? Could Indians have a voice in the making of the historical narrative? Could the writer of romance include the Indian without distorting historical events? Might romances or epic poems depicting Indian passions have a corrupting effect upon impressionable readers?

Although Hezekiah Niles was an advocate of an American literature, he was more interested in the political record of

the times. The Register's motto, "The Past -- the Present -- for the Future," indicates the editor's confidence in his ability to participate fairly in the narrative of America, and that participation meant including Indian voices -- as well as white voices both sympathetic and antagonistic. The importance of Niles' Weekly Register is indirectly emphasized by a commentator for NAR in October 1826 who observed

It has been the fate of all the tribes to be like the Carthaginians, in having their history written by their enemies. Could they now come up from their graves, and tell the tale of their own wrongs, reveal their motives, and describe their actions, Indian history would put on a different garb from the one it now wears, and the voice of justice would cry much louder in their behalf than it has yet done. (283)

Such commentary seems out of place, and indeed represents a minority voice, in a publication like NAR that regularly published articles hostile to authors and works too willing to consider the Indians' point of view. What this writer is conscious of, what NAR as well as Niles' Weekly Register is always conscious of, is their interpretive role. The NAR writer has identified a distinction between history -- the events of a given locale participated in by a given people -- and ideology -- the incorporation of those events into a meaningful narrative. As Pearce notes in The Savages of America, that narrative was made by whites who felt free to define history as a white domain (8). Cathy Davidson, conscious of this appropriation, employs the gap between event

and narrative to provide context for the popularity of the novel, to see the early American novel as a vehicle for conflicting ideologies, but the distinction is derived from consideration of historical narratives:

In a word, ideology persists and is both less and more than history. It is an attempt to sell history, to sell an interpretation of the time and place in which men and women live their lives to those same men and women. As Anthony Giddens has observed, ideology represents "the capability of dominant groups or classes to make their own sectional interests appear to others as universal." Ideology, by this definition, succeeds when those to whom it is directed assume that it is normal, natural, definitive, and thus destined to endure. (39)

To read someone like Lewis Cass admitting that he has little personal knowledge of the Cherokees and then declaring, "We doubt whether there is, upon the face of the globe, a more wretched race," (70) is to witness the "selling" of history that Davidson describes. Similarly, the review in NAR of the Elias Boudinot book [NAR 23 (October, 1826): 470-74] reveals the painful process of separating history -- "these particulars [about Cherokee government, education, farming] savor a little of the marvellous . . . yet we have no doubt of their truth" -- from the need to advance a particular ideology -- "A community of civilized Indians is an anomaly that never has existed, nor do we believe it ever will exist" (474). The Boudinot book itself stands as a refutation of this ideology, a challenge that can only be dismissed with a reassertion of a "universal" interpretation.

In an April 1828 review of Schoolcraft's Travels in NAR, Lewis Cass is confident that history can be separated from ideology and that Schoolcraft succeeds in doing so because he "enjoyed favorable opportunities for investigating the character and condition of the people, and he has surveyed them with the eyes of a cautious and judicious observer" (366).<sup>6</sup> Anticipating the emphatic tone of his 1830 commentary, Cass applauds Schoolcraft's narrative because the writer "has avoided the extremes of reproach and panegyric, and has seen and described [the Indians] as they are" (366). Remember that Elias Boudinot had reported on the Cherokees "as they are" two years earlier, while David Brown's letter purporting to do the same had been published by Niles three years earlier, but these accounts did not jibe with the prevailing narrative. Schoolcraft's steady eye (and voice) is then contrasted with those of Heckewelder, who "has surveyed the character and manners and former situation of our aboriginal inhabitants under a bright and glowing light." Heckewelder's narrative is thus "a pure, unmixed panegyric":

The most idle traditions of the Indians, with him become sober history; their superstition is religion; their indolence philosophical indifference or pious resignation; their astonishing improvidence, hospitality; and many other defects in their character, are converted into the corresponding virtues. (366)

The prevailing ideology is not difficult to extract from this criticism: the Indians are an inferior race, superstitious,

indolent, and astonishingly improvident. The real danger in Heckewelder's sympathetic account of Indian life, according to Cass, is also readily apparent: narratives that offer ideologies challenging the prevailing one could interfere with political expediency. In the following comment, Cass shows that his concern is ultimately for political policy; Schoolcraft's account is privileged because

It is certainly important, that a correct estimate should be formed of the situation and prospects of our aboriginal neighbors. It is important in relation to our general knowledge of the human family. And it is still more important in its application to the great moral problem, whose solution attracts the attention of the American government and people, and upon which must depend the renovation or extinction of this devoted race. (366, emphasis added)

Interestingly, writing 125 years after this NAR attack on Heckewelder, Paul Wallace echoes the nineteenth-century dismissal:

It was John Heckewelder's great virtue as a missionary and teacher that he not only lived among the Indians he had come to help but lived with them as well -- attuned his mind to theirs and absorbed their interests. A generous warmth of temperament, which is evident everywhere in his life and writings, led him to sympathize with them, to try to see life as they saw it. (426)

Heckewelder can justifiably be criticized for presenting Indian folk tales as historical accounts (Wallace, 426-27), and the Manichaeism that informs his description of the North American Indians sensationalizes and promotes the demonic

stereotype so pervasive in the literature of the 20's (not just Cooper). Nevertheless, his far greater offense appears to be that in trying "to see life as they saw it," he gives the Indian a voice. With that voice comes the potential for persuading readers that the Indian is understandable, that Indian culture and manners are not, in Lewis Cass's words, "as disgusting as they are degrading." In short, Heckewelder's narrative asserts the possibility of the Indians' being less the Other, being more a part of "the human family." The danger in such a rhetorical position during the debate over removal policy is obvious.

Niles' editorial policy of printing Indian speeches also gave voice to the Indians' point of view. These authentic Indian voices and their responses to the growing conflict with white Americans, specifically their views on the desirability of coexistence or assimilation, will be considered in chapter six.

Just as challenging to those who would write American history from an exclusively white point of view were some of the early writings of Washington Irving, who had also entered the simmering pot of historical narrative in 1815 with articles in the Analectic Magazine entitled "Traits of Indian Character" and "Philip of Pokanoket, An Indian Memoir." These articles, republished in the 1824 and subsequent editions of The Sketch Book -- thus remaining current during the debate over removal-- are important not only because they illustrate



the public discourse over the Indian's role in the new nation's account of itself but also because they influenced, or were said to have influenced, writers like Sands and Eastburn [NAR 12 (April, 1821):485], Paulding, Child, and Cooper. "Traits of Indian Character" espouses some familiar stereotypes-- describing, for example, Indians as "the poor wanderers of the forest" (225) whose "spirits are humiliated and debased by a sense of inferiority" yet whose "sensibilities are not diffused over so wide a surface as those of the white man" so that the Indian "feels silently, but acutely" (227). Despite such assumptions, Irving largely finds the Indian a victim of the white man's word so that he is "doubly wronged." The Indians, he says, "have been dispossessed of their hereditary possessions by mercenary and frequently wanton warfare" while "their characters have been traduced by bigoted and interested writers" (225). "The author," he says, having witnessed the extermination by the settler, "has endeavored to justify him in his outrages," it being easier "to vilify than to discriminate" (225). The Indians thus were "persecuted and defamed, not because they were guilty, but because they were ignorant" (225). Perhaps a more appropriate phrase would be because they were without a voice. Irving's article attempts in a small way to provide an answer to "the rude annals of the eastern provinces. . . recorded with the colouring of prejudice and bigotry" (231) by forcing his readers to consider conflicts with whites from the

Indian point of view, recounting in "cold blooded detail" the "indiscriminate butchery" of a village of Pequods (231). In his closing comments, however, Irving succumbs to the rhetoric of doom and anticipates a near-future in which the Indians exist only through the writings of the whites, either through "the romantic dreams of the poet" or through that white poet's willingness to confront and narrate a history that undermines the prevailing ideology:

should he venture upon the dark story of their wrongs and wretchedness; should he tell how they were invaded, corrupted, despoiled; driven from their native abodes and the sepulchres of their fathers; hunted like wild beasts about the earth; and sent down with violence and butchery to the grave; posterity will either turn with horror and incredulity from the tale, or blush with indignation at the inhumanity of their forefathers. (233)

In "Philip of Pokanoket," Irving again addresses the issue of the Indian's place in American history, noting how many heroic sachems of the early colonial period have been vilified but more typically, more effectively perhaps, have been relegated to obscurity:

Worthy of an age of poetry, and fit subjects for local story and romantic fiction, they have left scarcely any authentic traces on the page of history, but stalk, like gigantic shadows in the dim twilight of tradition. (235)

Philip was not the victim of such obscurity, but he was, according to Irving, the victim of inauthentic traces. Irving sets out, then, in this brief document to revise the

historical narrative. He describes Philip's relationship with the white settlers, following the death of his brother at their hands, as one of "a secret and implacable hostility." Considering the situation from Philip's point of view, Irving writes, "He considered them as originally but mere intruders into the country, who had presumed upon indulgence, and were extending an influence baneful to savage life" (237). The whites, on the other hand, grew increasingly suspicious of Philip's intentions and his influence with neighboring tribes, to which Irving appends the following:

It is difficult at this distant period to assign the proper credit due to these early accusations against the Indians. There was a proneness to suspicion, and an aptness to acts of violence, on the part of the whites, that gave weight and importance to every idle tale. Informers abounded where talebearing met with countenance and reward; and the sword was readily unsheathed when its success was certain and it carved out empire. (237-38)

When a disaffected Indian made accusations that Philip was plotting against the white settlements, the whites held an inquiry at which none of the charges could be proved. Irving continues to insist that the historical record take into account the motivations of the whites:

The settlers, however, had now gone too far to retract; they had previously determined that Philip was a dangerous neighbour; they had publicly evinced their distrust; and had done enough to ensure his hostility; according, therefore, to the usual mode of reasoning in these cases, his destruction had become necessary to their security. (238)

Irving then narrates the events that led to the "war," but his real concern is with the writing of history. Those contemporaries who recorded the events and interpreted them according to religious ideology revealed "the diseased state of the public mind." The white settlers were as inclined to superstition as their Indian neighbors:

The gloom of religious abstraction, and the wildness of their situation, among trackless forests, and savage tribes, had disposed the colonists to superstitious fancies, and had filled their imaginations with the frightful chimeras of witchcraft and spectrology. They were much given also to a belief in omens. (239)

Reading the account of an historian so infected is, not surprisingly, to hear "horror and indignation on every hostile act of the Indians, however justifiable" and "applause" for "the most sanguinary atrocities of the whites" (240). Irving does, however, discover a moment of doubt when another historian, a Rev. Ruggles, describes how, after setting fire to an Indian enclave sheltering women, children, and the elderly, the settlers "were in much doubt then, and afterwards seriously inquired, whether burning their enemies alive could be consistent with humanity, and the benevolent principles of the Gospel'" (242-43). The remaining account, Irving notes, is untroubled on this score and is devoted to describing "with exultation" Philip's demise, a narrative Irving insists should be of a "brave, but unfortunate King" "persecuted while living, slandered and dishonoured when dead"

(246). Irving would substitute for the dark "disease" of "religious abstraction" the dark melancholy of romance and tragedy so that Philip becomes "a wanderer and a fugitive in his native land," who "went down, like a lonely bark foundering amid darkness and tempest -- without a pitying eye to weep his fall, or a friendly hand to record his struggle" (247). His "heroic qualities and bold achievements," given one's ability to recast the bigoted history, would make Philip finally "the theme of the poet and the historian" (247). Irving's eloquence suggests the power of romance to become its own bigotry, yet his account of the fallen sachem raises an important question about who will write American history and, most significantly, whether or not that history can be written to allow the Indian a role with which the public can empathize. In a rather different mode from the solemn appeal for Philip's narrative, Irving demonstrates how ludicrous the rhetoric of some historians is justifying the conquest of the American continent in his History of New York:

Thus were the European worthies who first discovered America, clearly entitled to the soil; and not only entitled to the soil, but likewise to the eternal thanks of these infidel savages, for having come so far, endured so many perils by sea and land and taken such unwearied pains, for no other purpose under heaven but to improve their forlorn, uncivilized and heathenish condition -- for having made them acquainted with the comforts of life; for having introduced among them the light of religion, and finally -- for having hurried them out of the world, to enjoy its reward! (47)

Needless to say, Irving's "history" is atypical; however, the literary community appears to have hearkened to the call for revision more than did the historians. This is not to say that the possibility of including sympathetic Indian characters, indeed any Indian characters, in works of literature did not occur without considerable public debate. The literary narrative of the new nation emerged from and was coexistent with the political debate over the fate of the Indian population, so it is not surprising that the discussion takes on the same elegiac tone: many argued that the Indians had no place in our national literature, while those who argued the contrary, like poet Robert Sands, insisted upon the viability of all facets of American experience, but singling out the Indians because of their

cool and calculating courage. . . united to the passive bravery of the nobler animals; the knowledge assimilated to instinct. . . ; their reserve; their acquired suppression of passion. . . ; their adherence to a promise made; their faith in ancestral superstitions; their predominant and inextinguishable lust of revenge. (104-05)

Unfortunately, Sands is drawing his exemplary attributes based on a character from Gertrude of Wyoming, a narrative poem written by the Scot Thomas Campbell. Sands immediately compensates by contrasting Campbell's idealized Indian with Cooper's more realistic portrait of drunken John Mohegan. Also citing the various travel books published with accounts of Indian customs and rituals, he insists that "they offer

different resources to the writer of fiction" while "their fabulous legends and religious superstitions have a great variety of character" (106). Sands thus vacillates between endorsing the idealized and realistic Indian as a part of the new national literature. Even when he arrives at an historical impasse like the legends of the gigantic race of mound builders, he freely acknowledges the whites' prerogative to appropriate the Indian voice: "That the facts are meager, and the tradition imperfect, is true; but there is therefore more room for invention; and there are no records or vouchers to contradict what might be invented" (107). Sands is far more concerned with American writers experimenting with American subjects than worrying over the legitimacy of such an appropriation of history. In this position, he and Irving stand opposed. But part of the justification for Sands's stance is the familiar assumption that the artist would be preserving "the vanishing forms of our aborigines" (114). If the preservation was enhanced by the powers of imagination, so much the better: the discussion is over whether or not the Indian belongs in our romances (103).

North American Review had certainly taken up this topic a number of times in the context of reviewing various works of domestic production. While reviewing Cooper's The Spy in July, 1822, the commentator quite naturally assumes, as Sands had, that the Indian not only belongs in American literature but that white writers are free to reshape and adapt Indian

culture to suit their tastes and the demands of their narratives: "At the present day, enough is known of our aborigines to afford the ground-work of invention, enough is concealed to leave full play for the warmest imagination" (258). While the poet or romance writer could exploit the enigmatic Indian culture, he or she could also appropriate its religion:

we see not why those superstitions of theirs, which have filled inanimate nature with a new order of spiritual beings, may not be successfully employed to supercede the worn out fables of Runic mythology, and light up a new train of glowing visions, at the touch of some future wizard of the West. (258)

Clearly, then, if the white writer offers the reading public an "historical romance," emphasis is to be on the latter at the expense of the former. Finally, perhaps with Indian characters like Paulding's Prophet or Sands and Eastburn's Metacom in mind, the reviewer declares, "we are confident that the savage warrior . . . is no mean instrument of the sublime and terrible of human agency" (258). One can hear in literary terms foreshadowing of the same Manichaeism for which Heckewelder was so universally criticized, a role for the Indian in our national literature that invited a melodramatic and allegorical portrait.

Four years earlier [NAR 8 (December, 1818)] while expounding upon "National Poetry," the commentator displays the elegiac rhetoric employed, ironically, to include the



Indian, asserting "A country is undeniably the more endeared by the multitude of its tender and heroical tales and memoirs, fabulous as well as authentic. Let us then not slight even its barbarian annals" (175). In fact, the writer insists that white culture is obligated to enrich the national literature by appropriating what it has destroyed:

let us hasten to acquaint ourselves with the earlier native. Let us hasten;-- for already has the cultivator levelled many a monumental mound, that spoke of more than writings might preserve. Already are the lands cleared of their heaven-planted forests, once hallowed by the visits of the Wakon bird, before she ascended into other regions, indignant at the approach of a race, who knew not the worship of nature. Already are the hills surmounted, and the rocks violated by the iron hammer, which the Indian regarded with distant awe, as the barriers of his "humble heaven." (176)

This crescendo of parallelism goes on to invoke the sublimity of the American landscape which must be preserved in art because, even in 1818, its survival, like the Indian's, was threatened by the plow and the iron hammer. This elegiac theme will of course serve as the engine that propels Cooper's *Leatherstocking Tales*. John Gorham Palfrey critiquing Yamoyden in April 1821 for NAR, a review to which Robert Sands, not surprisingly, refers for support, is more specific, if less impassioned, about the ways in which Indian life is suited to art. Palfrey's comments reveal the assumptions about the perquisites for legitimate art; he says that the Indians' "superstitions furnish abundant food to an imagination inclined to the somber and terrible," that,

appealing to the reader's sensibility, "their primitive habits admit of pathos in the introduction of incidents of private life," and, linking literature with historical background, he points out how "in public there occurred events enough to find place for the imposing qualities of heroism." Finally, with the assurance of a writer whose position must be under question from other sources, he declares, "The attitude of the Indian tribes, for nearly a century after the landing at Plymouth, was one of high poetical interest" (484).

These writers share the belief that the Indian, then, should, indeed must, be included in our national literature, though they also assumed that the Indian would be freely recast by white voices to suit the demands of their narrative; most importantly, they assumed that a primary motivation for including the Indian -- ironically even the white imagination's stylized version -- was the preservation of a dying culture.

Others begged to differ. The reviewer considering Escalala, an American Tale in NAR for January, 1825, pronounced the death sentence on this and its kindred poetical "experiments": "the character of the North American Indian affords but a barren theme for poetry" (210). The Indian, he goes on to argue, is racially unfit for a role in poetry: "When you have told of generosity, contempt of danger, patience under suffering, revenge, and cruelty, you have gone through with the catalogue of the Indian's virtues and vices,

and touched all the chords that move his feelings or affections" (211). He then argues an assumption that, I will show in the next chapter, poets like Paulding, Sands and Eastburn, and Beach adopted even as they created Indian-based narrative poems -- that is, Indian character must be portrayed in terms of earlier classical or Christian epics: "To analyse and combine these [virtues and vices] in a poem of high interest, without extensive aid from other sources than the real Indian character, is no easy task" (211). Furthermore, he insists that "the rough features of their social habits" are incompatible with art itself (212); evoking a particularly un-American image to make his point, he declares, "The minstrel's harp would recoil at its own notes in hazarding such a strain, and the Muses would deny inspiration to a votary bent on so desperate an enterprise" (212). Robert Sands had earlier anticipated this argument, pointing out that "The creative faculty is wanting; not the materials to be wrought upon" (107). A poet with enough self-assurance would simply dismiss the rhetoric of the minstrel's harp and the Muses. In any case, this reviewer's voice typifies the attitude that the Indian should be excluded from our national literature and thus argues for a cultural removal or silencing: "the day is not to be expected, when the exploits of the Iroquois and Mohawks. . . shall be faithfully committed to the numbers of ever enduring song" (211-12).

This line of argument raises troubling questions about to what extent the writing of "history" becomes a matter of taste, particularly when history is grafted onto romance. It also recalls many of these writers' assumption that rhetoric is totally dissociated from truth. "Rhetoric" is specious argument that results when "reality" is deliberately clouded or defaced by compassion or empathy: Thus an NAR reviewer writes in October 1824 of "some tender hearted persons [who] allow themselves to be carried, in deploring the fatality by which the Indians have been made to resign a part of their ancient domain, and leave a portion of the soil for the foot of the white man" (464). The tender hearted are "carried" by rhetoric. Presumably, the writer's next lines are not rhetoric, but reality: "In our view, the sum of human happiness is quite as great, and the glory of the creation quite as much advanced, by the ten millions of white, civilised, enterprising people now spread over the United States" (464). The "glory of the creation" is not a rhetorical figure but a self-evident fact, one that Lewis Cass would still be insisting upon in 1830. Again, one shies from being forced to be an advocate for Heckewelder, but clearly his sympathetic treatment of Indian culture is rhetoric, "pure, unmixed panegyric," while Schoolcraft's account shows the Indians "as they are" [NAR 26 (April, 1828): 366]. One recalls, too, the reviewer considering the issue of rights to the soil who admits, "This is an excellent question for

disputation, for many of the arguments are on one side, while most of the truth is on the other" [NAR 11 (July, 1820): 93-94]. To make the case for the Indians' right to the soil is to indulge in sophistry; to make the case for the whites' right to the soil is to be an advocate for truth. Of "the supposed melancholy fact of the disappearance and extinction of the natives of this country," writes the truthful NAR reviewer, "We are much mistaken, if it be not one of those confusions of ideas, which result from rhetoric turned into logic" [16 (January, 1823): 36].

The rhetoric of these attacks upon writers speaking on behalf of the Indian, in fact, has far-reaching implications for authors and readers of the novel. The novel was itself under attack, as Cathy Davidson has pointed out, in part because it threatened to supplant religious and other instructional reading, but also because it represented a new, potentially-revolutionary voice:

The crucial matter was not so much a question of how common citizens invested that time allowed for reading but the question of where the society vested the voice (or voices) of authority. While the novel was widely censured in Europe, the criticism in America may well have reached its particular level of vehemence because the novel was established here in the wake of the Revolution, at a time when disturbing questions (witness the Constitutional debates) about the limits of liberty and the role of authority in a republic were very much at issue. (41)

My concern is with the rhetorical treatment of the Indian within this larger debate over what would constitute our

privileged national literature. Davidson argues that the novel or romance posed a particular threat to American society because the form appealed and spoke directly to the common people. Whether or not it constituted a threat, the novel's popularity means that its portrait of the Indians and the effect that rhetorical presentation might have on the reading audience are magnified. The link between the Indian, the novel, and the reader is most evident when one considers the issue of temperance: To what extent do intemperate readers of romance become like the passionate savages that appear in their narratives? Further, to what extent was the novel like a predatory savage? It, Davidson argues, "was, formalistically, voracious." She describes how it "fed upon and devoured more familiar literary forms" (13) so that it both indulged and invited indulgence; the novel was in fact "a dangerously inchoate form appropriate for and correlative to a country first attempting to formulate itself" (14). While Davidson is largely concerned with whether or not women constituted "the legitimate audience of literature," she does point out that "the woman reader. . . is also the implied reader of most of the fiction of the era" (45). The critic in NAR for July 1827 certainly has this implied reader in mind when he describes the novel metaphorically as a drug that will

sweetly soothe the dull ear of sickness; exalt the fainting spirit with draughts that 'cheer but not inebriate'; brighten the horrors of a rainy day, dispel the tedium of a winter's evening; and even give zest and

animation to that saddest of all earthly formalities, a family party. (183-84)

Other less playful commentators were legitimately concerned about readers indulging not in a single glass of novelistic narrative but in the whole bottle. If, at the same time, that narrative depicts, for example, as Hobomok does, love and passion between a white woman and an Indian, might not the reader be swayed to condone -- or worse, contemplate -- miscegenation? On a larger scale, if this literary narrative presents the reader with a sympathetic portrait of Indian life, if the narrative depicts the Indian not as a beast but as a human being with a family and a village, might not the reader be compelled to reconsider a political proposal like Indian removal? John Gorham Palfrey was greatly disturbed by the unfavorable portrait of the Puritans and the sympathetic treatment of the Indians in Yamoyden, taking pains to remind his readers that the Indians

encamped at night by the blaze of christian dwellings, and rose in the morning to the quest of blood. Not a New England mother slept but with the image before her mind of her infant dashed against the rocks, nor woke but to fancy every wind through the forest burdened with a savage yell. [NAR 12 (April 1821): 487]

In other words, attacks on popular fiction, upon its susceptible readers, and attacks such as this one, and the many others already cited, upon the character of the American Indian forge a potentially disturbing alliance of outcasts.

And, as Davidson says, together they would be participating, even in the relatively private act of reading, in an act of sedition against authority. While it is true that women were unable to vote, they were not politically impotent. They were active in missionary work, they were active through Congregationalist and Presbyterian churches, they were active in organizations like the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and they were prolific in flooding Congress with memorials on the Indians' behalf. The issue of the Indians' place in the narrative of America and the potential threat they represented are evident finally from the amount of discourse devoted to the question. Echoing Habermas, Davidson points out, "Had the novel not been deemed a potent proponent of certain threatening changes, there would have been little reason to attack it" (40). I would suggest that the same applies to the role of the Indian in the popular fiction and poetry of this era. If Lewis Cass saw no harm in Cooper's portrayal of the Indian, why should he bother to attack the novelist so vehemently?

Perhaps the most disturbing aspect of the NAR articles on the Indians is how little real variety there is, despite the review format, in the discourse over who the Indian was and where the Indian people belonged. Voices arguing for assimilation, even merely for understanding, are routinely ridiculed or dismissed. The homogeneity is particularly striking when NAR's editorial content is contrasted with that



of Niles' Weekly Register; some of the variety in points of view one finds in the Register, granted, results from its "news magazine" format, but aside from the format, Hezekiah Niles made a conscious effort to record a multitude of voices and to urge in his editorials a national spirit of tolerance. Moreover, he assumes a national goal of transforming the Indian population into United States citizens. Elias Boudinot, on the other hand, is treated in NAR as a sideshow freak, capable of speaking only because he is a "half-breed." Reading NAR during this potentially convulsive period is, in fact, an excellent opportunity to witness how a public debate can be controlled by a rigorous limitation of the "legitimate" issues. As Lucy Maddox has noted,

Throughout the period of this tremendous growth in the country. . . the terms of the public debate about the Indians remained essentially unchanged. The limits of the debate were largely defined by a few primal questions and the rhetoric they generated in response; once these were in place, they remained virtually fixed. (21)

Given NAR's determination to "establish an American intellectual presence and to lead educated public opinion," (Baym, 16) its role in controlling the boundaries of public discourse-- and influencing the fate of the Indians -- offers insight into the "narration" of this country. While Niles' Weekly Register offered a forum for alternative voices, coupled with a desire to have a national influence, its message of tolerance and protection for a minority had little

effect in the political process. The Register stands more as a record of the times -- as Niles hoped it would -- a record of the voices who asked and attempted to answer questions about that minority, its rights, its relationship to white society, and its place in the narrating of America.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Had the writers chosen an example less remote than the situation in Massachusetts in 1620 -- Ohio and Indiana during the previous twenty years, for example -- they would have faced the "common practice" of whites' treaties with the Shawnee over possession of these lands. In those cases, the Shawnee were assured possession based not only on natural rights but on legal treaties, treaties later ignored or broken as white settlers poured across the Ohio River. For an account of treaties and conflicts between the Americans and the Shawnee in Kentucky, Ohio, and Indiana, from the Shawnee point of view, see Allan W. Eckert, A Sorrow in Our Heart: The Life of Tecumseh (New York: Bantam, 1992), chapters 4-8.

<sup>2</sup> For an excellent account of Cherokee settlements, crop production, and businesses, see Douglas C. Wilms, "Cherokee Land Use in Georgia Before Removal," in Cherokee Removal: Before and After, ed. William L. Anderson (Athens: U of Georgia P, 1991); see also Eckert, 267 ff. on Kekionga, the principal village of the Miamis, with its cabins, half dozen trading posts, streets with board sidewalks, and taverns; also passim on Shawnee settlements.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, Niles' Weekly Register 15 (Jan. 30, 1819): 420-23; 18 (April 29, 1820): 154; 22 (May 25, 1822): 195; 22 (June 8, 1822): 231; 26 (May 1, 1824): 140.

<sup>4</sup> True to his policy of printing opposing views, Niles not only printed commentary by whites opposed to assimilation

but also by Indians desiring separation and autonomy. See, for example, "Cornplanter's Speech," Niles' Weekly Register 22 (Aug 10, 1822): 383; "Indian Opinions," Niles' Weekly Register 23 (Sept 14, 1822): 20; and "Seneca Indians," Niles' Weekly Register 28 (July 9, 1825): 16. For an Indian speech endorsing assimilation, see "Indian Speech," Niles' Weekly Register 15 (Feb 6, 1819): 436.

<sup>5</sup> For a discussion of the parallels between Calvinism and Darwinism, see Richard Drinnon, "The Manifest Destiny of John Fiske" and the accompanying bibliographical essay, in Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian-Hating and Empire-Building (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1980): 232-42, 504-09.

<sup>6</sup> Roy Harvey Pearce offers a different assessment of Schoolcraft's objectivity in The Savages of America, pp. 120-28.

### CHAPTER III

## INDIAN VOICES AND THE WHITE MAN'S EPIC:

THE WORD AND THE YELL IN THE BACKWOODSMAN.

## YAMOYDEN, AND ESCALALA

"Sleep soundly, yet, ye curs'd -- devoted train,  
Ere long ye'll slumber ne'er to wake again,  
Or wake to hear the death-denouncing yell,  
Rouse for the last time, with its echoing swell,  
To see your dwellings wrapt in midnight flames,  
Hear helpless babes, and wives invoke your names,  
And call upon the Christian God in vain,  
To be their safeguard, yet, yet once again"  
Metacom, from Yamovden

The Word and the Yell. The text and the amnesitic life. The farm and the forest. Progress and indolence. Purpose and chaos. These dichotomies that pervaded the public debate over the Indian question in the popular press of the 1820s (as well as the 1830 Congressional debate over removal) defined, from the whites' perspective, the dilemma facing the nation. White civilized society represented an orderly, linear progression, progress from a known, recorded past toward a future designed by nature and its God, a future sanctioned by His Word. As I showed in the previous chapter, one of the central issues raised by writers in the periodicals of the day was where or how the Indian fit into this plan for America's future. The Indian was the "child of the forest," devoted to a life of subsistence and indolence, a life with no history and no

purpose -- at its worst and most terrifying, a chaotic life best typified by the savage yell.

The NAR had already declared the Indian a fitting "instrument of the sublime and terrible," (July 1822: 258) an indication of a role the Indian could fill in the literary narrative of America -- but also a limitation that poets and novelists had already begun to test. These writers confronted the same issues that the periodicals considered: What rights did the Indians have to the land? Were Indians and whites meant to coexist? What role was the Indian to play in our national narrative? The first two questions were implied by the dramatic conflicts which the writers developed, but to the last question their own works provided the answer. If the Indian war was to be a fitting subject for American literature, then certainly the role of the Indian was to be the "instrument of the sublime and terrible," but should the Indian be given a voice besides the bloodthirsty yell of the savage? Could the writer develop the Indian as someone with a family, a village, a tribal identity, someone with loyalties and a sense of honor as unyielding as those of his or her white neighbors? And if the writers allowed the Indians to speak for justice and honor and love of their land, how would that treatment undermine the popular dichotomy (and the understanding of history it implied) between the white man's word and the savage's yell?

All of the Indian "voices" in early literature are, of course, appropriated expressions of the imagination of white writers, writers like James Kirke Paulding and Robert Sands who were far more concerned with the parallel issue of what narrative format was most appropriate to express the American experience. In Paulding's The Backwoodsman (1819), Sands and James Eastburn's Yamoyden (1820), and Samuel Beach's Escalala (1824), the search for an American narrative appears unable to escape the confines of European or classical poetry: the poems present American characters and an American setting through an epic narrative structure appropriated from The Iliad or from Paradise Lost. The resulting works present the reader with a burgeoning sense of narrative tension as the writer attempts to define the American narrative by simultaneously appropriating the history of Metacom, for example, and grafting that narrative onto a Homeric or Biblical model. If the poets' concern was to insist upon the stature of the American narrative, the readiest way to do so was apparently to adopt already privileged texts.

Each of these poems allows the Indians to express themselves in more than a subhuman yell. In each, at least one Indian character is allowed to address an audience in an articulate and eloquent speech. In Yamoyden and Escalala readers are given glimpses of Indian culture that emphasize the natives' fundamental human integrity and compassion. Yet in the end, each poem dissolves into a bloodbath in which

white and Indian cultures battle for control of a portion of the American landscape. Whites enter the battles secure in the knowledge of their racial superiority; Indians, with their terrifying yell that symbolizes their inescapable, subhuman savagery. In the context of these poems, silencing that yell implies far more than the suppression of war and its devastation. It implies the inevitable triumph of white civilization. Silencing the Indians' yell is a part of their inevitable extinction. Although Lucy Maddox focuses her study of this issue primarily on later writers, her comments about Melville and his consideration of the need in American culture to silence the voice of minorities are apt:

Only Melville offers anything like a radical critique of the civilization-or-extinction argument (and its rhetoric), and even he is ultimately incapable of dislodging or replacing the models he is resisting. He can offer his critique only by populating his texts with significantly silent presences who, by their silence, call attention to their exclusion from American public discourse. (11-12)

While the writers of these early poems may not offer "a radical critique" of this rhetorical dichotomy, I will demonstrate that they are in fact acutely aware of this issue, in both its historical and its literary manifestations, and its implications for the future of the peoples of this country. Each poem gives voice to the Indian cause, allowing sympathetic Indian characters to present themselves through morally convincing arguments that eloquently challenge white



assumptions of supremacy. However, these speeches that invite a reader's empathy are ultimately presented in a larger narrative of a fated and hence irresistible silencing and extinction of the Indian before the supremacy of white Christianity, technology, and education. I want to examine these poems, then, both as opportunities for the "Indian" voice to be heard in something other than a primal yell but also as larger narratives that revert to the Word/yell dichotomy and the extinction of the latter. The rhetorical situation within these poems, in other words, parallels the debates in the press and in Congress where, despite evidence of Indians adopting the life of farmers and traders, apparently demonstrating the feasibility of Indian/white assimilation, the Indian was ultimately depicted as a half-naked savage hunter who quite literally had no place in the nineteenth-century United States.

The Backwoodsman and Yamoyden were published well before the policy of Removal was seriously debated by the federal government while Escalala appeared closer to the legislative process, but what is important about these works is their rejection of the possibility of cultural assimilation or coexistence and the narration of the Indian into oblivion.<sup>1</sup> They all anticipate the assumptions about the Indian "problem" that later in the 1820s and 30s made Indian removal an acceptable political solution.

### Paulding's Prophet and the Voice of Madness

James Kirke Paulding's position on Indian removal is adamant in his letter to Richard Henry Wilde of Georgia in August of 1830, three months after the Removal Act became law. He tells Wilde that he has read Wilde's speech to Congress "with particular attention and pleasure";<sup>2</sup> he says that "if I had not been already convinced, it would have satisfied me of the necessity as well as humanity of removing the Indians from the bosom of Georgia and Alabama" (Letters 110). Paulding then considers the arguments of the pro-Cherokee speakers:

But the absurdity & impossibility of a Community of Savages residing in the centre of a civilized state, to whose laws they will not submit, is in itself so glaring, that nothing less than the madness of Fanaticism or the wilfulness of Hypocrisy could shut their eyes to it. I rejoice that the measure was carried against the combined forces, & that the Holy Alliance of Folly, Fanaticism & Political interests was defeated. (110-111)

When he was writing The Backwoodsman twelve years earlier, Paulding says in the poem's prologue that he is more concerned with demonstrating the potential for a native American literature than with engaging in political debate. However, the poem, set in the Ohio Valley during the War of 1812 when Tecumseh and his brother Tenskwatawa led Indian forces against the Americans, contains much anti-British and even more anti-Indian sentiment. Paulding's mad Prophet, who dominates the poem with his powerful rhetoric, is probably based upon

Tenskwatawa (Reynolds 63). The problem posed by the character in The Backwoodsman is the tension that develops between the narrator's assessment of the Prophet's speeches as lunatic ravings and the articulation and eloquence of the speeches themselves. Considered as isolated discourse, the Prophet's voice makes a strong argument for the justice of the Indian cause. But the poet has been careful to place that discourse within a larger narrative framework that works to negate that eloquence and finally to silence it.

In The Backwoodsman the worlds of the Indian and the backwoods white are irreconcilable, dividing the poem, in fact, as severely as if it had been struck by a bloody tomahawk. The first three books follow Basil, a tenant farmer in the Hudson River Valley, who resolves to move his family to the Ohio frontier. The last three books focus upon the "mad" Prophet and the tribes who respond to his call for a final stand against the invading whites. As the poem evolves, Paulding acknowledges the emerging dichotomy by invoking the aid of two radically different muses. The first is a gentle, pastoral muse who helps the poet celebrate the agrarian hero:

our meanest farmer's boy  
Aspires to taste the proud and manly joy  
That springs from holding in his own dear right  
The land he plows, the home he seeks at night. (11)

Thus she is the muse of civilization, of a culture that values and seeks to guarantee the individual his right to the land.

Basil's dream is the stability of a small farm and a chance to improve his condition and that of his family, the very image used later in the debate over the Indian problem to define white civilization as the antithesis to the nomadic Indian. Crucial to this understanding of Basil's narrative is the myth of the American wilderness as an empty, virgin land, unused and unimproved. The narrator insists that Basil and the other pioneers are invading "distant wilds, and haunts to man unknown," (20, emphasis added). In fact,

Nothing appear'd, but Nature unsubdu'd,  
 One endless, noiseless, woodland solitude,  
 Or boundless prairie, that aye seem'd to be  
 As level, and as lifeless as the sea;  
 They seem'd to breathe in this wide world alone,  
 Heirs of the Earth -- the land was all their own! (66)

This glorious rhetoric of exclusion makes a number of assumptions: "heirs" are the documented, legal owners of a plot of land, designated by an orderly transfer from an equally documented, legal owner; they represent, therefore, the stability of the community from generation to generation. In this case, the transfer is from Creator to those who will help the creation to fulfill its original design. This transfer is made manifest by Paulding's strategy of making Basil into Moses leading his people to "refuge in the promised land," (38) leading his little band to freedom "freely given/ By the sweet bounty of approving Heav'n" (21). Later, the poet offers the reader a striking parallel between Basil and Noah, both being presented with a "new" cleansed world and a

new Covenant (45-47). Thus the American landscape becomes entangled in a racist vision; a promised land assumes a chosen people; the myth of a chosen people means there is an excluded people whose lives have been watched and judged by a disapproving Heaven. Relating the narrative of American settlement then as a recasting of a master Narrative whose Authority could not be challenged grants instant legitimacy to the new narrative. These myths of the virgin land as a gift from an approving, steering God simultaneously imbue Basil and his family with sublimity while reducing the Indian to sub-human status, evident in the dichotomy represented by the Ohio River, which separates "The prowling savage from the christian man" (52). This rhetoric typically reduces the Indian to a pre-verbal predatory creature and elevates the white settler by defining him in terms of the Text.<sup>3</sup>

As the settlers leave behind the last little civilized village and turn to the dark forest, the poet bids the pastoral muse farewell and welcomes another, for

rougher scenes demand a loftier verse.  
Come then, our native Muse -- bred in the wild,  
Drear Solitude and lonely Fancy's child! (63)

This gothic muse will help the poet tell a "bloody tale,/ That thrills with wild and terrible alarm" causing the reader to "shiver and turn pale" (63-64). This sensationalizing of the setting is also perhaps meant to have another effect upon the reader: a depoliticizing of the story. The pioneers enter a

world that supposedly has no connection with the order of law and language, a world of shrieks, howls, and groans. Not surprisingly, in such a state, the poet casts his Indian characters as Miltonic devils. The Prophet, "lord of cruelty and wile," roams the dark forest, broods, and curses "the white-man, and the white-man's God" (89). The night before the battle, having shown the reader the pensive but steady white encampment, the poet moves to the Indian fires where "howling," "The many-colour'd daemons caper'd rare;/ Sometimes clasp'd hand in hand they whirl'd around,/ Like winged fiends, that hardly touch the ground" (157). Like their Miltonic and Biblical antecedents, these demons intend to destroy the wilderness promised land:

the red Indian, dancing round his fire,  
Broke the dread silence with his yellings dire,  
And seem'd as damned imps had burst their chain,  
To vex and mar this beauteous world again. (157)

The American narrative of war thus is Milton's war in Heaven brought once again to earth, its combatants the demon/savage and the Christian/man, the former with no hope of becoming either of the latter.

If these devils are pitted against those who represent the fulfillment of God's plan for the New World, the Prophet stands as the greatest obstacle to that fulfillment. He is repeatedly described as mad -- "His brain to moody madness was beguil'd,/ And broke into a chaos dark and wild"

(91) -- because he is consumed with the desire for revenge against those who have taken his land and killed his people:

one intense desire,  
That scorch'd his brain and heart with quenchless fire;  
His very life and being it had grown,  
He liv'd, he breath'd, in that, and that alone. (91)

Like the white man, he believes that he has "commission from his God receiv'd," but his charge is to "drive the white-man o'er the boundless wave,/ The remnant of his fallen race to save," (93) [note the rhetoric of doom, my emphasis] so he sets about inspiring the various tribes with his monomania: "And wheresoe'er he went, his words of flame,/ Rous'd them to rage, or blanch'd their cheeks with shame" (95). But how, one might wonder, can an Indian function as a powerful rhetor if he exists in a nightmarish pre-verbal world and if he is distracted to the point of madness? He employs "The eloquence which Frenzy oft inspires" (94) and easily sways the simple minds of the savages. Despite this characterization of the speech, Paulding does, perhaps mistakenly, allow the reader to hear the Prophet speak. Even though the speech is the predictable product of the white man's narrative, it nevertheless conveys the sincere grievances of a people confronted with a threat to their survival.

At first, the narrator intercedes between the Prophet and the reader, insisting upon the incomprehensibility of the message, and then relying upon summary of the argument, as

though he is wary of allowing the character to speak directly. The Prophet begins with the history of the conflict with whites. Recalling the Indians' peaceful reception and aid of the first white settlers, he recounts how because of the Indians' naivete, the whites "Cheated them of their lands with fraud and lies,/ False, fair deceitful words, and falser eyes" (95). The Prophet then offers what becomes a standard justification for removal of the Eastern Indians, ie. contact between the cultures corrupts the Indian and robs him of his identity. The argument becomes then doubly ironic since the Indian's speech has been appropriated by the white poet:

their own brothers, like the whites betray'd,  
Drank, cheated, swore to that which was not true,  
And chang'd with every changing wind that blew,  
Renounc'd their ancient gods throughout the land  
For other creeds they could not understand,  
And in the downhill path, at length, became  
Worthy associates in the Christian name. (96)

In the Prophet's account, then, the Indian "progresses" from the war whoop to the Word by first learning to lie and then living a lie by adopting an incomprehensible creed. The result is not only loss of identity but death or, worse, humiliation. Here the poet allows the Prophet to speak directly:

"debas'd by Christian arts,  
Weaken'd their bodies, and corrupt their hearts,  
Tribe after tribe, soon found a timeless grave,  
Or liv'd to be the white-man's abject slave,  
Linger'd amid the scorn of every fool,  
And lick'd the dust, where they were born to rule;



Or if they 'scap'd this most degen'rate fate,  
 Join'd some more distant tribes, that soon or late,  
 Fell like the rest, or driv'n from their home,  
 Far from their fathers' graves were doom'd to roam."  
 (96)

Here is the fundamental problem of the sympathetic Indian. Despite Paulding's continual reminder that the Prophet is mad, his portrait and his words create a charisma which draws the reader's sympathy to the old Indian. Furthermore, the truth is that the Prophet has a morally compelling case. Paulding's most recent editor, Larry Reynolds, curiously adopts the poet's assessment of the Prophet, saying that he is "obviously raving mad," yet notes "the Prophet, benefitting from Paulding's ability to empathize, transcends the weaker role intended for him and through the dignity of his character and the truth of his words enlists the sympathies of the reader in his cause" (64, 66-67). Given the dispossession and loss of identity the Prophet so skillfully articulates, his call for the Indians' identity and white rhetoric to merge seems appropriate: "Look like the fiends," he cries, "and be ye what you seem" (97). As though he realizes that the speech is too persuasive, Paulding has the Prophet close with a justification for killing white infants, employing a fitting agricultural image: "Vainly we kill the root, if still the seed,/ Within the soil is left, more foes to breed" (98). The poet's tactic here -- following an Indian's morally defensible position with a reprehensible position or bloodthirsty act --

is the strategy later in this poem but also is employed in Yamovden and Escalala to compromise the reader's identification with the sympathetic Indian.

Paulding's problem is that he has made the Prophet into a tragic figure, with the pride of a Lucifer or Lear, the fatalism of an Achilles or Hector, the courage of a Roland or Agamemnon. The storm scene in which the tempest feeds his inner turmoil, his rage at the injustice of his condition, recalls the suffering, not the insanity, of Lear. Even when the Prophet is first introduced, his description as a wasted ruin, despite the forest imagery, conjures up a picture of a lost kingdom:

Now, like a girdled tree, unleaf'd he stood,  
The only relick of a stately wood;  
The last of all his race -- he lived alone,  
His name, his being, and his haunts unknown. (89)

Here the rhetoric of doom relies upon the image that will recur throughout the poetry and romances of the 1820's, an image that later will also figure prominently in the Hudson River School of art. Once the epitome of forest grandeur and power, the Indian now is reduced to anonymity, brought out of hiding among the shadows and in caves only through the voice of the white poet. But while the image suggests a natural cause for the demise of his people, a position that, as I have shown, was commonly held, it is important

to remember that Paulding's narrative insists upon the operation of a supernatural law. The result is a fatalism, itself a myth, that relies upon a curious hybridization of irresistible natural and supernatural forces, a grafting of Darwinism onto Puritanism. Of course, in choosing to cast the narrative in this way, Paulding risks the same undermining of his work that Blake saw in Milton's Satan. Making it a struggle between the Prophet and the Christian God enhances the Indian's stature and, after his second speech, recommends his argument for justice.

The scene for the second speech shows the Prophet gazing down on the pioneer settlement at sunset, hearing the tinkle of a cowbell, seeing the gleaming church spire. The community is a perfect picture of the agrarian myth. He recalls that "on this spot he once had reign'd a king" (120) and, giving in to the emotion of the moment, he remembers lost happiness. The poet's rhetoric insists upon the Prophet's nomadic status -- "Back shrunk the madbrain'd wand'rer stung with spleen,/ And sick'ning at this peaceful village scene" (119) -- while, ironically, implying precisely why the Indian is a solitary wanderer:

In this fair haunt, from boy to man he grew,  
And tasted all the bliss the savage knew;  
Here he had seen his people happy dwell,  
Here had they fought, were conquer'd, and all fell.  
(120)

The Indian is alone because his people have all been killed. He is "nomadic" because a white village now stands where once his Indian village was established. Further, the poet counters sympathy for the Prophet by undercutting the image of a pastoral joy with a reminder that the Indian could not have known real (Christian) happiness but only an illusory savage bliss. Whether his happier past was real or imagined, the memory of its loss only renews his bitterness: "His swelling heart with keener vengeance burn'd,/ And all his tenderness to fury turn'd" (120).

The Prophet's stature peaks in the confrontation with the "aged pilgrim" from the white settlement, for here he presents the Indians' view of Christianity and of history, not in a frenzy, but with a moving appeal to the white man's sense of justice. Employing the common rhetoric of condescension, the white patriarch says that he has come to preach the truth to "Nature's erring child. . . / The Bible's holy eloquence to speak" (123). And following the pervasive dichotomy between the yell and the Word, the old man insists that the Indian's acceptance of Christianity will "Make thee a man while living" (125). The offer invites the Prophet's evaluation of the white man's religion. "[Y]ou have no other god than gold!" pronounces the Prophet, who then offers a vision in which the white men, crazed with avarice, will corrupt the wilderness:

"For this you murder, plunder, cheat, defame,  
With false aspersions blast your brother's name.

Sell mothers, daughters, nay, your very wives,  
 Barter religion, trade in human lives,  
 Break Heaven's high mandates, spurn the law's control,  
 And stake 'gainst money an immortal soul!  
 Come not to our lone woods, old man, I say,  
 But bear your crazy frame some other way,  
 And ere for distant converts thus you roam,  
 See if there's nothing left to do at home." (123-24)

Thus, rhetorically deepening the gulf between cultures, each ascribes the other's actions to madness; for the Prophet, the white man's Word represents not manhood but degradation and ultimately annihilation of his identity. When the old man counters with the promise of teaching the Indian agriculture and allowing him to "taste the sweets of knowing what we know," (124) -- an assimilationist position such as Hezekiah Niles would advocate -- the Prophet angrily declares

"I know what things your Christian Indians are!  
 O! I have seen them naked and forlorn,  
 Of every attribute of manhood shorn,  
 Skulking from town to town, a worthless race." (125)

Here is the myth of the Indian who cannot be integrated into white society, a myth that will be the starting point in the Leatherstocking tales for Chingachgook as the drunken John Mohegan. Having the Prophet reject the possibility of assimilation is a momentous rhetorical move, given the world of absolutes within the poem. Genocide appears the only alternative. In fact, in the next exchange, the Prophet asks if the free and courageous Indian is not a man, only to hear "True. . . ye are men, I know,/ Men that disgrace their Maker,

here below" because they love "the bloody dripping scalp to wear" (126). Paulding has the Prophet answer with a defiant death wish: What kind of mercy do the whites show the Indians when they spare their lives only to

"drive them from their home,  
Like scouting beasts in distant wilds to roam;  
You did not kill them, like a generous foe,  
And end their sufferings with one manly blow;  
You spar'd them for long exile, and disgrace,  
Spar'd them to see the ruin of their race."

Then, in a rhetorically astute move, the Prophet asks the old man to apply the Golden Rule by imagining how he would react if the Indians had landed and suddenly begun burning European villages and killing people because they did not worship the Indians' Great Spirit. Yet the Indians' world has been devastated in just this manner. Pointing to the bones of his people "bleaching on the plain," he suggests that it is the coming of the Word that has reduced his world to a ghostly land of demonic yells:

"Their shadows haunt me wheresoe'er I stray,  
Their howling shades still cross my fearful way;  
I have no other kindred now but these,  
I hear no other music in the breeze;  
They call upon me in shrill dismal screams,  
They haunt my waking thoughts, my nightly dreams. . . .  
With shades I dwell, they haunt me every where,  
And howl for vengeance in the midnight air." (129-30)

While from the poet's point of view, the gothic elements in the poem may be an attempt to depoliticize the narrative, from the Prophet's point of view, this world of horrors is the

direct result of a politics of genocide. And his argument, though understandably impassioned, is cogent and persuasive.

Indeed, the white patriarch's explanation for the whites' triumph must sound like savagery: "'Tis impious the ways of GOD to scan./ For so it is, alas! or right or wrong,/ The weak are ever victims of the strong" (130). This is the ultimate truth the Christian has to offer. At best he offers only a mysterious, unknowable God; at worst, a cold, Hobbesian determinism. Either is presented as an irrefutable fact. The white man here has, surprisingly, described justice in the same words used earlier by the Prophet addressing his people: "The spirits tell me they will try ere long/ Which has the right -- that is, which is the strong" (97). Nina Baym has observed how frequently "white characters in Indian stories confronted by arguments they cannot counter, must simply remain silent, thereby acknowledging that the Indians are right" ("How" 80). In this case, the patriarch opts for a supernatural mystery in lieu of silence and avoids the appearance of acquiescence.

The power and insight of the Prophet's speech allow the reader, then, to understand the Indian's motivation, and even allow the reader to contemplate his bloodthirstiness in the context of a struggle for survival or the relief of a noble death. But the poet must guard against understanding becoming sympathy. When he again seizes control of the narrative, the poet casts the Indian in another, quite predictable light in

which eloquence gives way to primal screams. He shows the Indian exulting the night before battle, imagining the triple pleasure of mutilation, cannibalism, and desecration of the dead:

Their dripping scalps with glorious fury tear,  
And mid our fathers in proud triumph wear,  
Eat up their hearts, hang their white flesh to dry,  
And leave their bare bones in the sun to fry -- (158)

The poem produces an overwhelming sense of futility that appears to endorse an extreme resolution to the conflict because the world is presented in irreconcilable absolutes. The poet speaks for the pioneers, who finally cannot comprehend why the Indian refuses to acknowledge "The justice of the white-man's claims," why the Indian refuses to admit that the white man "A better claim had to this smiling earth" (90). The certainty of the divinely ordained triumph of white culture precludes any hint of irony here. Similarly, the poet lashes out against the evils "that proud Ambition rains on Europe's villages" (137) when some tyrant's desire for power and/or land leads to war, but only the mad Prophet sees that the whites represent the same Ambition as they take the Indians' land. So too with the issue of vengeance. When the Indian seeks vengeance, he is an animal, a cannibal, a devil. But when the whites strike back, then the pioneers

join'd heart and hand  
To lend her help to free the bleeding land,



Revenge the murders of the lone frontier,  
And make the butcher buy his victim dear. (143)

Richard Slotkin's central argument, of course, is that the whites' giving in to savagery is a temporary necessity: "The pioneer submits to regression in the name of progress; he goes back to the past to purify himself, to acquire new powers, in order to regenerate the present and make the future more glorious" (63). Not surprisingly, then, the poet's purpose is not merely to justify the farmers' revenge but to celebrate their heroism in exacting it. Paulding's faith in the common man tied to the land is the ultimate hope for America:

It is alone the Peasant's honest hand,  
When all is lost, can save a sinking land;  
No power on earth a nation can subdue,  
When a brave people to themselves are true. (149)

Paulding's version of the American narrative is the truth of Land, Labor, and Progress pursued under the protective eye and guiding hand of a Christian God. The power of the Word is, for the short span of the battle, joined to the bloody cry of vengeance in one of the most poignant images in the poem, an emblematic extension of the agrarian ideal: The euphoric farmer/soldiers follow the defeated Indians from the battlefield and mow them down "like the ripen'd harvest ear" (62). Thus, briefly the humble, pastoral swains are transformed into gothic agents of Death. The image is also

appropriate because it points to the only apparent resolution to the conflict.

In the debate with the Prophet, the white patriarch has offered two possible visions of the future. Both, however, represent a symbolic death to the Indian. The old man suggests that the Indian may choose to adopt the Christian God and to become integrated with white society. The suggestion is doubly ludicrous. The whites do not even recognize the humanity of the Indian, and, even if they did, the Indian does not recognize any truth to Christianity, seeing it instead as verbal justification for hypocrisy, deceit, and the slaughter of his people. The second option eventually becomes the political expedience of the 1830's. The Indians will move west where the white man will "Give them rich lands, where they may dwell in peace,/ And every passing year their stores increase" (132). The Prophet sees the offer as a bribe seducing him into disgracing his brothers who have died fighting the white man and says that he would prefer death; in his mind, there really is no difference. The scene, again, is layered with irony and futility, as the old white man cannot believe that men like the Prophet "were born with such a stubborn mind,/ And hearts so hard, and eyes so wilful blind" (133). In truth, neither side can free itself from its culture long enough to empathize with the other. Because the choices are literally life or death, the characters become little more than pawns of conflicting ideologies. In a world

of such "blissful clarity," to adopt Roland Barthes's phrase, hypocrisy is simply not an issue, for each individual is a soldier of his God. As the poem itself testifies, the God of the Word triumphs, the god of the yell is silenced, and that, according to Paulding, is the narrative of America.

Metacom as Satan, Miscegenation as Minotaur

At the heart of Yamoyden is that which in Paulding's narrative is unthinkable: a union of white and Indian cultures. This attempt at an American epic poem is set during the final days of King Philip's War with the Puritans, but its focus is on the tragic consequences of that war for Nora, daughter of the Puritan Fitzgerald, and Yamoyden, a noble, Christianized Indian, and their infant son. Written in 1817-1818 by twenty-year-old James Eastburn and eighteen-year-old Robert Sands, Yamoyden is the story of a family that must survive while the rest of their world struggles for control of the land. Because the story is told in six cantos from varying points of view, however, the result is at least the appearance of a greater balance in presenting the various factions. The same rhetoric and the same dichotomies governing Paulding's poem surface in Yamoyden, and the writers, allowing their natives to speak, were faced with the same problem of having created a sympathetic Indian. Eastburn and Sands, however, achieve a more tragic tone by maintaining the focus on the human consequences of the struggle. While it is true that tragedy can be the vehicle for a racist vision as handily

as can a work whose purpose is more overtly ideological, the tragic or the sentimental mode does at least invite the reader to escape his or her narrow assumptions and to contemplate a struggle like Philip's War with an eye for its human, rather than its political, consequences. John Gorham Palfrey in NAR saw the connection, however, between the human and the political and vigorously objected to what he perceived as too much understanding for the Indians: at first he declares nonchalantly, "We certainly do not feel particularly concerned to vindicate the policy of the early settlers towards the natives" and then proceeds to do so: "in this particular instance, where the contest was equally on both sides for existence, it strikes us as no better than sentimentality to represent [the whites] as remorseless oppressors, and the other party as cruelly wronged" ("Yamoyden" 486).

A brief look at the structure of the poem will demonstrate why Palfrey was upset with the problem of the reader's sympathies but also will demonstrate how the poets tried to anticipate and placate the very complaint made by the reviewer. Canto one focuses on Metacom's council with his allied chiefs and his appeal for a final attempt to stave off defeat and oblivion; a rival chief, Agamoun, appeals for a retreat to the western frontier and is slain by an enraged Metacom, who then reveals a plot to capture the white wife and child of Yamoyden. In Canto two, the scene and point of view shift to the forest retreat Yamoyden has constructed to shield

his family from the bloodshed of the war; the reader witnesses the depth of the couple's affection for each other and also hears of Yamoyden's divided loyalties between his wife and his fellow Indians. At the end of the canto, Nora and the baby are captured by Metacom's warriors. Canto three shifts to the village of Nora's father, Fitzgerald, and the whites preparing for battle with Metacom's forces. Fitzgerald readies the men by invoking God and his Word, and he recalls the loss of his daughter to Yamoyden. In a captivity within a captivity narrative at the end of the canto, Nora, but not the baby, has been rescued from Metacom's brutes; rescued and held by the whites, she, nevertheless, to her father, cannot escape her defilement and guilt at marrying an Indian. Canto four is corrective; lest the Indians become too sympathetic in the face of Puritan bigotry, this section focuses on Indian initiation rites orchestrated by a witchlike harridan, a ceremony culminating in the ritual sacrifice of an infant -- Nora's and Yamoyden's, of course. Just as the infant is about to die, a violent storm engulfs the scene, a ghostlike stranger appears from the forest, and as the sacrificial flames are doused by the downpour, stranger and baby disappear. In a note to this section, Sands apologizes for the scene, admitting that such sacrifices were fictitious and that this description amounted to little more than gross sensationalism.<sup>4</sup> In fact, the rite is extremely useful within the poem for deflecting the reader's overly enthusiastic

empathy with the Indian cause. Canto five returns to the forest retreat where Yamoyden discovers his wife and child missing and assumes that Nora's father and the whites have reclaimed her; despairing, he resolves to join Metacom's forces to battle the whites. Meanwhile, Metacom prepares himself for what he assumes will be his last battle, the canto ending with his Death-Song, in which he recalls the glory of his ancestors and vows to honor their memory by dying for the land and honor they have shared. The final canto follows Nora, led through the wilderness by a friendly Mohegan, to the battle scene, where she hopes to reclaim Yamoyden. When Metacom's forces are routed, the sachem himself refuses to run, and, in the final, climactic confrontation, he is killed by the brother of Agamoun, Metacom's defier in canto one. At the same moment, Fitzgerald faces an Indian who swings a tomahawk at the old man; Yamoyden diverts the blow, only to have the axe strike his chest. The battle over, Nora rushes to the dying Yamoyden's side and embraces him. Despite the pathos of the scene and despite Yamoyden's having spared his life, Fitzgerald remarkably declares through his tears, "Farewell, misguided one!/ Dim light along thy path was shed;/ There may be mercy, even for thee!" (6.25) He then offers a prayer to heaven and resolves to rear the child. When Fitzgerald attempts moments later to separate Nora and Yamoyden, he realizes that she has died in her husband's arms.

The poem then closes by appropriating the narrative of Metacom as Christian parable, effectively silencing the Indians' yell:

'Tis good to muse on nations passed away,  
For ever, from the land we call our own;  
Nations, as proud and mighty in their day,  
Who deemed that everlasting was their throne,  
An age went by, and they no more were known! (concl.)

Like Paulding, then, Eastburn and Sands finally see no alternative to the Indians' obliteration. The child of the mixed marriage, to whom Fitzgerald refers as "my daughter's child," (4.35) has been appropriated by the white Christian community in the same way that the narrative has.

From the beginning of the poem, however, the poets cast their narrative and their characterization of Metacom in terms of a master Text that will lend credibility to the sublimity of their tale and its most dynamic character. The council of Indians led by Metacom is a deliberate recollection of Satan's council in Book one of Paradise Lost. Eastburn and Sands describe Metacom in terms of the sublime American landscape in order to impress the reader with his stature, recalling Milton's similar strategy with Satan. (PL 1.283-315); here the landscape is one of primitive grandeur:

he, in power, in thought alone,  
Not like the sentenced outlaw sate,  
The abandoned child of wayward fate,  
But as of those tall cliffs a part,  
Cut by some bolder sculptor's art,  
The imaged God, erect and proud,  
To whom the simple savage bowed. (1.14)

Like the arch-fiend, who, although all his glory has been lost, all celestial light given way to eternal gloom, resolves to defy superior authority, to assert his freedom, and to dedicate himself and his followers to revenge, Metacom -- "Brooding mid scenes of perished state,/ He mused to madness on his fate" (1.12) -- gathers around him his vanquished followers to rally them for a final, glorious battle. Like the arch-fiend, who "with high words, that bore/ Semblance of worth, not substance, gently rais'd/ Thir fainting courage, and dispell'd thir fears," (1.528-30) whose forces then raised "A shout that tore Hell's Concave," (1.542) Metacom, defiant, like "the bolt of living fire. . . Kindling the pine," rouses his flagging forces by appealing to their pride:

"O slaves! the children of the free!  
The hunted brute cries shame on ye!  
At bay each threatening horn he turns,  
As fierce the enclosing circle burns; --  
And ye are baited in your lair,  
And will ye fight not for despair?" (1.21)

Like the devils' shout from hell, "Loud rose the war-whoop, wild and shrill;/ The frowning rock, the towering hill/ Prolonged the indignant cry" (1.22). These conscious parallels between Metacom and Satan inflate the Indian's stature yet ultimately undermine any credibility and/or sympathy the Christian reader might be willing to grant his cause. Metacom cast as Satan asserts the legitimacy of this American narrative as a fit subject for poetry, but at the



same time it opposes his cause, not to the theocracy of the Puritans, but to God himself.

So despite all the rhetoric that insists upon the abuses of the whites, the rhetoric that so alarmed the NAR, the Christian reader will always hear those charges deflected by the narrative context the poets have imposed. They may say that the Indians' "valour could no longer save/ From [the Puritans'] soulless bigotry" or that they endured repeated "foul oppressions" (intro.). The poets may describe how "on the felon gibbet high/ Their mangled members hung proclaim/ Their constancy -- their conquerors' shame" (1.10) or describe the frontier as "The forests broad his fathers swayed, /O'errun beneath the oppressor's tread" (2.13). They may insist that "bigot zeal, to bosoms brave,/ The callous thirst of slaughter gave" (3.3). Nevertheless, any abuses committed by the whites are blunted by their alliance in the great narrative with God, the Indians with the forces of hell and their rebellion against a divinely mandated order. As with Paulding's narrative, the pioneers become the Chosen.

And again, as with Paulding, the justification for and the vehicle of the whites' cause is the Word. The whites in their war hymn in canto three without a doubt see themselves as soldiers of God who, like the forces of Heaven in PL, will vanquish the forces of hell:

They shall fade like the smoke which is lost in the air,

They shall melt from thy wrath when its fury shall  
glare;  
Unblenched shall we track them, through wild flowing  
war.  
By the light of our battle, thy conquering star! (3.2)

The poets' attitude toward this "exultation's crimson glow" (3.3) is clearly one of discomfort; they follow the war hymn with the comment about "bigot zeal" and "The callous thirst of slaughter" (3.3) to which NAR objected. Yet the NAR's comments are instructive: the Christian reader can turn to a master Text for numerous precedents of slaughter in the name of God. The issue, that is, is always reduced to the same dichotomy of the Word/Yell and its resolution in favor of the Word:

They felt, as if on promised land,  
Like Israel's guided host,  
They followed heaven's directing hand,  
To every isle and coast;  
They felt as if his word had bade  
Their ranks unsheath the glittering blade. . . .  
No throb was there of pity's mood,  
For native of the solitude. (3.3)

A few lines later, a "gray old man" appears before the whites to preach a pre-battle sermon, with much the same effect as the pre-battle debate between the Prophet and the patriarch in The Backwoodsman, though without any offer of reconciliation. His purpose is to explain why the killing must occur, and his reason is the Word:

the book of God  
Was in his hand; with holy verse

That spoke the ancient heathen's curse,  
 He bless'd the murders they had done,  
 And called on Heaven the work to crown. (3.8)

The oxymoron "bless'd the murders" reveals the poets' hesitation with the whites' cause while at the same time repeating the familiar dichotomy; the "holy verse" will silence the blasphemy of the "heathen's curse," so that "murders" become "the work" of Heaven.

Not surprisingly, when the Indians hear the strains of the war hymn coming from the white camp, they hear the

Omen of sorrow, deep and dire,  
 Of rending sword, -- of wasting fire, --  
 Of hopes destroyed, -- of bosoms torn, --  
 Of exile, cheerless and forlorn, --  
 Of power extinct, and glory gone, -- (3.5)

This familiar rhetoric of doom recalls the opening lines of Yamoyden, where a more piercing sound, the yell of the Indian, announces the conflict to follow:

HARK to that shriek upon the summer blast!  
 Wildly it swells the fitful gusts between,  
 And as its dying echoes faint have pass'd,  
 Sad moans the night-wind o'er the troubled scene.  
 (intro.)

This yell, however, is immediately placed within the context of the rhetoric of doom, the struggle, for naught, for "'Tis the death wail of a departed race, --/ Long vanished hence, unhonoured in their grave"; the silence that follows this shriek is their history, until it is resurrected by white

poets, poets unfamiliar, as they admit, with Indian culture: "Their story lost to memory, like the trace/ That to the greensward erst their sandals gave" (intro.). These four lines demonstrate perfectly the implications for the white historian/poet appropriating the Indian voice. When the poets adopt the Indians' point of view, the yell conveys the same message as the war-hymn. When Metacom addresses his warriors at the council, he rightly appeals to the issue of the triumphant voice:

"Oblivion? O! the films of age  
Shall shroud yon sun's resplendent eye.  
And waning in his pilgrimage,  
His latest beam in heaven shall die,  
Ere on the soil from whence we fled,  
The story of our wrongs be dead!" (1.20)

That these words should be written by white poets is bitingly ironic. Ostensibly a cry of defiance akin to Satan's from hell, the yell finally is said to be -- and heard as -- a cry of despair over an inescapable doom.

The imagery supporting this rhetoric of doom, particularly in the case of Metacom, recalls Paulding's treatment of the Prophet. Both rely upon the imagery of trees to convey the Indian's status.

Introducing the council of chiefs, the poets define the Indians' resilience:

Know ye the Indian warrior race?  
How their light form springs in strength and grace.

Like the pine on their native mountain side,  
That will not bow in its deathless pride. (1.15)

But Agamoun, arguing for removal instead of further warfare, embraces the rhetoric of doom and offers a different image:

"From earth when nations perish, ne'er  
Again their leaflets shall appear. . . .  
Perchance, like yon dwarf firs that grow  
Rooted in rocky cleft on high. . .  
Of all our tribes, the heirs of want,  
A feeble few our land may haunt." (1.27)

It is precisely this image of a broken, humiliated people that leads Metacom to think of himself like the solitary remnant of a once-towering tree, such as might command the focus in a Hudson River canvas:

"This have my widowed fortunes found,  
When all I love lie cold around; --  
When like a blasted trunk, alone,  
Leaf, blossom, bud, and scion gone,  
I stand." (1.34)

As Paulding does with a similar image of the Prophet, Eastburn and Sands evoke the sachem's nobility through his awareness of the tragedy he must endure while at the same time they endorse the myth of his people's doom as natural evolution.

If the Indians' demise is a natural process, the possibility of white/Indian assimilation assuredly is not. In the third canto the poets effectively depict the Puritan's superstitious fear of the natural world as the haunt of Satan. Recalling how Yamoyden would listen entranced by Fitzgerald's

Christian doctrine, the father then remembers how the Indian would entertain Nora for hours with Indian legends of adventure until eventually the two fell in love. Fitzgerald can only think of an image that ironically evokes the lion lying down with the lamb:

"I should have looked to see as soon  
The uncaverned wolf in frolics boon,  
With bounding fawn unfeared agree,  
As that between them love should be." (3.28)

Nora's early love of the natural world, he believes, may have engendered her susceptibility:

"For sinful phantasy still loves  
To people mountains, caves, and groves;  
By whispering leaves and murmuring rill,  
The tempter speaks, when all is still." (3.28)

Then, demonizing Yamoyden, the father suspects him of employing "herb and spell" until "By fiendish craft he won her heart" (3.28). He is unable to entertain the notion that a white Christian could simply fall in love with an Indian, even a converted one, though Fitzgerald insists upon referring to Yamoyden as "the Pagan." Yamoyden belongs to a fallen nature, the haunt of the Tempter, the association proven by his successful temptation of Nora to disobey patriarchal authority.

Surprisingly, for poets ostensibly committed to recording the wrongs perpetrated by the Puritans upon their neighboring Indians, Eastburn and Sands employ an image of the

Yamoyden/Nora marriage that supports the Puritan point of view. Yamoyden has hidden Nora and their infant in a retreat "Deep in the forest's bosom green,/ . . . Enveloped in its woven screen," so well disguised that "One eye alone its labyrinth knew" (2.6). The reader immediately wonders where the minotaur is who lurks in the heart of the labyrinth. Is it Nora, monstrous in the world's eyes because of her union with a savage? Is it the infant, like the original, the product of a human/bestial passion? Is it Yamoyden, whose loyalties are divided between Christianity and his Indian culture, between his wife and his people? (2.9, 2.11) I would suggest that the marriage itself is the minotaur, the product of an unnatural union that must be exiled from the rest of humanity. It is the marriage after all, not the infant, which is destroyed at the end of the poem. Carolyn Karcher notes, "What becomes of this child the poem's epilogue does not specify, but the concluding lament over the tragic outcome of the marriage and of the Indian uprising intertwined with it does not portend for the child a hopeful resolution of the racial conflicts that have doomed the parents" (xix). In fact, the poem's silence on the fate of the child, other than to have Fitzgerald announce that he will take it, is perfectly fitting to resolve the conflict between the Word and the Yell. The child is reclaimed by the forces of the former, and his history, along with the history of his father's people, is appropriated by the triumphant white Christians.

The Iliad Revisited: White Pagans vs. Indian Pagans

The most curious, by far, of these three American epics is Samuel Beach's Escalala: An American Tale, curious because it is so inadequately named. A more appropriate subtitle might have been An American Tale in which the Indians Win a Battle but Lose the Racial War. The historical/ mythic origins of this potpourri, with its echoes of Homer, Walter Scott, and Snorri Sturluson, are announced in the preface, where Beach says that he wanted to write a poem that would help explain the mysterious ruins located near the confluence of the Ohio and the Mississippi. He voices a common assumption of his day that the ruins

demonstrate, that, long anterior to the first voyage of Columbus, the section of country which I have designated, was inhabited by a nation more civilized than the wandering tribes in whose possession it was found by the English and French. (v)

Rather than project that this more civilized nation was Indian, he declares that the remains "proclaim the country to have been . . . the seat of a people, numerous, warlike and civilized, far beyond what can be predicated of either the present aborigines, or their ancestors" (v).<sup>5</sup> Beach then casts about for a European alternative and discovers the myth of Naddohr, a Norwegian chieftain, who was lost on a voyage with colonists headed for Greenland in the ninth century. The poet hypothesizes that Naddohr's group was not lost but merely blown off course, that it landed in America, that it travelled



inland and there established a colony. By the twelfth century, the setting for Escalala, that colony has grown into the empire of Scania, population 600,000, ruled by King Gondibert. The Scanians occupy the land with Indian nations, the most of which is the Algonquin, led by Warredondo. One feature that distinguishes this poem from the other two is the absence of a Christian/Pagan conflict, since Gondibert's nation worships still the old Norse gods. Nevertheless, Beach makes it clear that a European pagan is racially superior to an Indian pagan:

In peace they dwelt; the Indian, wild,  
Bland nature's free but simple child,  
Beheld, with terror and surprise,  
Their race increase, their cities rise,  
And hid him in some wildwood glen;  
Deeming the gods had left the skies  
To tabernacle there, like men. (1.13)

Not only does Beach employ the usual rhetoric of the Indian as infant, but he, like Paulding, reduces him to yet another creature of the forest:

Those woodland haunts since time began  
Till then, were unexplored by man:  
Save when the tawny Indian strayed  
In silence through their twilight shade;  
Stealing along his trackless way  
To seek his foe, or snare his prey. (2.31)

One might think he wanders the wilderness in silence because he is in the act of hunting, but Beach clarifies the matter by appropriating not only the Indian's voice but his capacity for thought; the Indian is a tabula rasa:

Little he thought, and less he said;  
 But stretched him in some greenwood shade  
 And listless, through the livelong day,  
 Slumbered the lazy hours away. (2.32)

This characterization shows the influence of those writers, like Lewis Cass, who insisted upon the Indians' inherent shiftlessness, always in contrast with American industry and progress. But such a characterization, here implied by the rise of Scania's cities, undermines the epic struggle Beach wants to develop. He must, after all, create a worthy adversary for Gondibert, so, abandoning the rhetoric of "nature's simple child," he develops the character of Warredondo and almost immediately creates the same problem that Paulding, Eastburn, and Sands do: the sympathetic Indian.

Beach's strategy is first of all to draw upon classical history to insist upon the stature of the Indians. Warredondo

Was nobler far, in reason's eye,  
 And worthier of his dignity,  
 Than Ammon's self-created son,  
 The mad-brained king of Macedon. (3.48)

The poet characterizes the king's followers with the same technique:

there his warriors bold,  
 A braver and a hardier host  
 Than haughty Rome could ever boast,  
 Assembled; with that willing zeal,  
 That martial pride, that purpose high,  
 Stainless to live and fearless die,  
 Which only free-born bosoms feel. (3.48)

So much for dozing the day away beneath the old elm tree. Not only are these Indians model warriors, but they also live in a primitive democracy, which Beach celebrates, no doubt while thinking of America in the 1820s:

O, 'tis a godlike task, to be  
The leader of the brave and free!  
To be elected by the voice  
Of equals, to assume the sway  
O'er equals, whose free wills obey  
The man of their unbiased choice. (3.48)

Complicating the reader's sympathies is the characterization of King Gondibert's son, Ruric. The source of the central conflict, he is a swaggering, loud-mouthed heir to the throne who, while hunting with his followers, comes upon Warredondo's beautiful daughter, Escalala, hidden in a forest retreat resembling Nora's. Treating the Indian princess as a prized trophy, he calls out,

"Upon her, lads! but harm her not;  
For fate has cast her happy lot,  
At Scania's royal court to shine  
My slave -- perchance my concubine!" (2.45)

So Escalala, who is betrothed to the Chippoway (sic) chief, Teondetha, is kidnapped and taken back to Scania. What follows is certainly the most interesting appropriation of the American Indians' history by a white poet searching for an American narrative, as the kidnapping of Escalala and the resulting conflict become a retelling of the Iliad, set in the twelfth century American wilderness.

Teondetha, of course, leads an army of warriors against Ruric and the Scanians, and the poet's descriptions revert to the familiar rhetoric of demonizing the Indians, who give "a yell/ As wild, as though the fiends of hell/ Were howling there, in agony" (3.57). The battle is joined, and in true Homeric fashion, "Fate held the scales of victory long/ In even poise above the throng" (3.58). When Ruric, who appears about to be overwhelmed, is saved by a reinforcing band of his father's knights, Teondetha is killed instead. However, seeing their leader fall, the Indians do not run but rather nobly fight until all are dead. Canto three closes with a lament for the Scanian dead. The reader's sympathy is complicated by the nagging reflection that Ruric has caused the conflict.

That sympathy is further swayed when canto four switches point of view to the "court" of Warredondo, where in council,

each warrior's breath  
Cries -- "vengeance, for the chieftain's death,  
And for our friends, and for the maid,  
Decoyed, insulted, and betrayed!" (4.63)

With the Indians resolving to send a messenger to the court of Gondibert, the poet finds himself moving toward a common dilemma. When the Indian's yell is replaced with eloquence and he is allowed, even through the medium of the white voice, to make his case, all of the rhetoric of infancy or of the demon, certainly of the tabula rasa is negated. Instead, as

with Paulding's Prophet or Sands and Eastburn's Metacom, the reader hears the impassioned rhetoric of the call for justice:

"[The Spirit] hung in air yon glorious orb of day --  
Then formed the Red-man of his finest clay  
And gave him, free, his native woods to roam,  
The heavens his covering, and the earth his home."  
(4.65)

Into this natural balance come the white men, "heaved upward by the yawning sea, / Moved with the breath of some bad deity," "a small and feeble band" that had to be nurtured by the Indians, who

"Taught them where, hidden in the bounteous earth,  
The yellow dust they worshipped, had its birth;  
Taught them each recess where the red deer strays,  
To tame the mammoth, and to rear the maize;  
And gave them, unannoyed, amid our plains  
To dwell in peace, and share our wide domains." (4.65)

And for this generosity, the messenger declares, the whites have now violated not only nature but have insulted Warredondo and his people by violating their princess.

The haughty Ruric then answers for the Scanians, revealing ironically, as was the case with the exchange between the white patriarch and the Prophet, that the whites have only the rhetoric of exclusion to justify their position. Significantly, Ruric begins by denying the Indians a voice, nullifying their right to take part in debate:

"Spare they vaunts  
For those who heed them: Scania's lords  
Contend not, in a war of words.  
Spare too, the fabled tale, which claims

For you and your uncultured line,  
 To lord it o'er these wide domains  
 Exclusively, by right divine."

This latter strategy is particularly interesting since it was the predominant myth of Beach's own Christian Americans. Ruric then indicates why he refuses to debate with the Indian, for debate assumes at least the appearance of equality between rhetors:

"Our valiant sires, in ages past,  
 Sought and secured this savage waste;  
 Known only, then, to beasts of prey,  
 Or men as unreclaimed as they." (4.67)

Ruric, then, denies the Indian his humanity, denies him the right, therefore, to voice his cause -- even as the messenger's eloquence stamps him as Ruric's equal, if not his superior.

Beach, in allowing this exchange, must have realized the problem he was forging with his sympathetic Indians, because he then goes to work to show the Indians to be the beasts Ruric claims they are. On the eve of the battle to be fought between sixty thousand Scanians and one hundred thousand Indians, the Indians capture an unfortunate Scanian sentinel. What follows is a grisly gothic description of the sentinel's torture, scalping, and burning. A brief example will illustrate the technique:

For, thickly as the bristling quill  
 Peeps from the hedgehog's rounded spine,

His swell'n and quivering flesh they fill  
 With splinters from the pine;  
 And from its bubbling socket, pry  
 With flaming brands, each bursting eye." (4.75)

Thus the Indians are rhetorically removed from the ranks of the human and placed again in the more comfortable confines of the demon. Warredondo, not surprisingly, has shed the nobility of canto three and finds his warriors, "all darkly shone," gathered like "Lost angels, round the Fallen One" (5.80). At the same time, the disgusting Ruric is compared now to Thor come down to fight for his people (5.78). Finally, to cap the battle scene, after Warredondo is killed and the Indian lines begin to waiver, who should appear on the battlefield but Escalala, riding on a mammoth! "Like a fearless and beauteous Amazon," she crushes and kills Ruric (5.88). She rallies the Indian forces who proceed not only to win the battle but ultimately to destroy the entire empire of Scania: "Naught remains of that empire's glory,/ But heaps of ruins, in mournful decay. (5.91) Perhaps a more appropriate conclusion would read, "Naught remains of that empire's glory,/ But heaps of ruins, and this foolish story." Certainly, for its sheer, colorful improbability, for its unwieldiness of character and story, for its unflinching dispossession of the Indians' history, their voices silenced by the white man's Word, Escalala is unsurpassed.

These three poems share a sense of the poets wanting to embrace an American narrative yet a timidity to divorce that native story from the familiar master Texts of Biblical, or Classical, or European authority. The resulting problems with control of the narrative, management of the reader's sympathies, and the wildly vacillating portrait of the Indian are symptomatic of this need to privilege an American narrative while simultaneously declaring its independence. Narrating America through Milton or the Bible, as I have shown, requires a role for the Indian that is allegorical. The very structure of the narrative requires an adversary who never escapes from the confines of his Otherness. Yet the characters as they develop -- whether Paulding's Prophet, Sands and Eastburn's Yamoyden or Metacom, even Beach's Warredondo -- are given a voice with which they constantly test and break the restrictive rhetoric that reduces them to infants/beasts/demons. Although that voice is unauthentic, the creation of a white writer, it nevertheless reveals their essential humanity and pleads for justice.

However, the risk of allowing the Indian to speak and to create sympathy turns out in practice to be spurious. Each of these works in some way compromises the Indians' eloquence and any potential empathy between rhetor and reader: in The Backwoodsman and Yamoyden the larger narrative structure counters moving speeches by the Prophet and by Metacom by reminding readers that these characters are analogous to



Satan; in Escalala the Indians follow articulate pleas for justice with disgusting tortures designed to remind the reader of the Indian's true nature; even noble Indian characters like Yamoyden and Escalala move in a narrative world that guarantees, finally, oblivion for their people.

The narrative of the new nation according to these early poets was to be the triumph of the farm over the forest, the Word over the Yell. For these poets, there could be no accommodation; the marriage of Yamoyden and Nora was something ultimately monstrous. Admittedly, each of these poems allows the Indians vicariously to argue their position; Eastburn and Sands even assert that Yamoyden will resurrect and give voice to "a departed race, --/ Long vanished hence, unhonoured in their grave;/ Their story lost to memory" (intro). The voice may speak, but it is the voice of "a departed race." Each finally replaces the Word/Yell opposition with a new, "inevitable" opposition offered as the narrative of America and the logical conclusion to the history of the Indian wars: the Word/silence.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> I can find no record of Robert Sands and/or James Eastburn's position on Indian removal; one Indian in Yamoyden does propose emigration to the west, only to be killed for suggesting such cowardice. Neither can I find any record of Samuel Beach's position on removal.

<sup>2</sup> See Chapter 1 for discussion of Wilde's speech. For the text of that speech, see Register of Debates in Congress, 21st Congress, 1st session, May 19, 1830: 1079-1103.

<sup>3</sup> Paulding's treatment of the backwoods culture, in which he perpetuates the severity of the dividing line between "prowling savage and christian man," is particularly interesting in light of historical evidence. While Paulding's rhetorical need to elevate the backwoodsman to agrarian hero is understandable in terms of the narrative he is constructing, he has reshaped the backwoods pioneer into a settlement-builder.

In the poem the primeval forest gives way to a community, fashioned in part by Basil, complete with schoolhouse and church, an image suggesting that the institutions of the East have been, to use an appropriate metaphor, transplanted into the Western wilderness. Terry Jordan and Matti Kaups have demonstrated, however, that the authentic backwoods culture, those who ventured west and who set about clearing the forests, was, in Foucault's terms, more nomadic. These people showed "a lack of appreciation or respect for centralized

social institutions such as law, education, religion, and landownership" and were characterized by "locational instability, amounting to an almost compulsive mobility"; this compulsion led them to flee the encroachment of the second wave of settlers who were in fact committed to establishing more conventional villages (Jordan 3). Acknowledging that Frederic Jackson Turner's description of these waves of settlement is too neatly episodic, that there was more intermingling of the backwoods pioneers with later settlers, Jordan and Kaups nevertheless assert the distinctness of backwoods culture. This distinctness was in fact insisted upon by nineteenth century observers and settlers:

Clearly, the backwoods pioneers were not highly esteemed. Depicted as shiftless, lazy, dirty, drunken, ignorant, and sinful, as 'land butchers' whose careless practices damaged the countryside, the backwoods people constituted, in the eyes of those who followed and observed them, an undesirable element. (Jordan 6)

These contemporary observers already were engaged in myth-making, but so too is Paulding, who clearly intends his Basil to be seen as representative of those who bravely sought to "subdue" the virgin wilderness while simultaneously aligning his individual quest for independence with the establishment of religious and legal institutions.

In a strategy even more revealing of the demands for narrative clarity, Paulding presents a scenario in which the backwoodsman is faced with eradicating the forest's most

troublesome predator, the Indian. According to Jordan and Kaups, the true backwoodsman was more likely to integrate with the native American culture, living in "a zone of contact with alien cultures and ethnic mixing" (20).

Observers of the backwoods pioneers often described them as living in a semi-savage state, devoted as much to hunting and fishing as to agriculture, frequently having Indian wives (Jordan 3-4). Paulding's narrative allows for no such blurring of cultural distinctions. The worlds of the backwoodsman and the Indian are as diametrically opposed as the banks of the Ohio at Pittsburgh, where on the east one finds labor, development, and industry -- "The manufacturer's black and sparkling smoke,/ Where Industry and useful Science reign'd" (52) -- while on the west side "mid the howling forest dark and drear,/ Rov'd the wild Indian, wilder than the deer" (53).

<sup>4</sup> "It is fully manifest that there was no such thing as the sacrifice of children among our Indians. The plot of the poem was hastily formed, when we had scarcely read any thing on the manners of the Indians, or even the history of the times. This ignorance led us, not only to introduce a rite which never had any existence, but to ascribe to Philip a useless piece of treachery and cruelty, with scarcely any necessity for it, even in supporting the fiction" (Eastburn 378).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. NAR 15 (July 1822): 257-58.

## CHAPTER IV

## A "NEW VERSION OF AN OLD STORY"?

LYDIA CHILD, CATHARINE SEDGWICK, AND THE POSSIBILITY  
OF INDIAN/WHITE COEXISTENCE

Catharine Sedgwick, presumably anticipating and addressing Cooper and others who might be critical of her narrative,<sup>1</sup> opens Hope Leslie with a disclaimer that the novel is "not offered to the public as being in any degree an historical narrative" and that her purpose is "to illustrate not the history, but the character of the times" (5). She admits that some of her characters are based loosely upon actual early New England settlers; she points out that she has conducted "a patient investigation of all the materials that could be obtained" (5) from Puritan sources at the time of the Pequod War.<sup>2</sup> Despite these links to a historical enquiry, Sedgwick is clearly uncomfortable with the manner in which those sources depict the Indians as "surly dogs," noting that Indian historians would no doubt "have extolled their high-souled courage and patriotism" (6). She offers instead "a representation which supposes that the elements of virtue and intellect are not withheld from any branch of the human family" (6) and, unlike those writers, from the Puritans to Sedgwick's contemporaries, whose favorite metaphor for the

Indian was a demon from hell, Sedgwick presupposes that her story is one of human conflict subject to hermeneutical treatment. Her text, therefore, incorporates not only the Puritans' account of the conflict with the Indians but also the Indians' account; Sedgwick may insist that she is not writing history, but her narrative relies upon histories for developing much of its tension.

In fact, both Sedgwick and Lydia Maria Child (earlier, in Hobomok) consciously engaged in presenting alternative accounts of the wars between Puritans and Indians. By considering the Indians' point of view and giving voice to it, they present their readers with what Sedgwick calls a "new version of an old story" (53). Lucy Maddox considers this correction of the Puritan text and explains the problem Child and Sedgwick faced in writing historical fiction, noting that "although Child and Sedgwick might attempt to revise the Puritan characterizations of Indians, they could not reinstate the Indians in the trajectory of American history as easily as they could reinstate women" (97). What they could and did do was to shift the focus from the macrocosm of the battlefield to the microcosm of relations between whites and Indians within particular families. Within this domestic setting, both Child and Sedgwick consider the possibility of close association, even the mingling, of the races, and both give white women and Indians, excluded from original Puritan histories, a voice. For the Indians such tolerance allows

them a fundamentally different role; although still capable of bloody and brutal acts, the Indians in the fiction of Child and Sedgwick speak not as epic adversaries but rather as advocate/historians who would force white Americans to consider the possibility of peaceful coexistence, if not a miscegenous union with the native peoples. In the end, however, both possibilities are rejected and the "trajectory of American history" is allowed to stand intact. In this chapter I want to consider exactly how new this alternative voice is and to demonstrate how entertaining a new version of the old historical narrative does not necessarily lead to an embracing of that new text. In fact, I will argue that while Child and Sedgwick tantalize the reader with the possible coexistence, even union, of white and Indian cultures, their narratives ultimately endorse the "inevitable" separation of the races. But what Child and Sedgwick do, regardless of their predictable endings, is to challenge the monolithic notion of history by replacing its recurring motif of racial war with an alternative motif of attempted marriages.

Hobomok : Challenging Patriarchal Authority?

Lydia Child's Hobomok might at first appear a radical book. Its title suggests that, despite its setting in the newly established Puritan settlement at Naumkeag, its center of attention, perhaps its main character, will be an Indian. It documents this Indian's wooing and winning of the white Puritan Mary Conant. It narrates Mary's disaffection with the

severe intolerance of Puritanism, represented by her father, Roger Conant. It describes her marriage to Hobomok and their joy in each other and in their son. When Hobomok dissolves the marriage, relinquishing her to her former suitor, it even depicts Mary's return with the racially-mixed child and her reassimilation to the Puritan community. The plot indeed represents a challenge to a Puritan authority that would find such a union between whites and Indians an abomination, a view confirmed by the depiction of the debauchery at Thomas Morton's settlement at Merry-mount.

Yet Child has embedded her radical plot in a narrative structure that, while it makes the reader acutely conscious of a narrator's control of any text, assures this story will remain within the bounds of conventional history. She has presented the novel as being written by a man. This male persona is editing and narrating a male friend's manuscript, which tells the story of fictionalized historical characters who "write" their lives according to a typology from God's Text. I count therefore five layers of authorship and, I believe, the source of much of the tension in this novel -- as well as the source of its reversal of the happy miscegenous marriage and Hobomok's voluntary removal.

As Carolyn Karcher has noted, "Until 1833 Child succeeded in infiltrating radical ideas into her writings while apparently remaining within the bounds of accepted opinion" (xiii). "Accepted opinion," of course, demanded that the



narrator express outrage and disbelief at Mary Conant's marriage to Hobomok; even more so, opinion demanded that the marriage fail. Before it does, abruptly, with the "resurrection" of Mary's Episcopal suitor, Charles Brown, the marriage bond is apparently secure. Critics have rightly focused on the assimilation of the Indian to white society and argued that such loss of Indian identity as occurs to Mary's son, Charles Hobomok Conant, amounts to genocide. But the marriage itself tentatively suggests the possibility of a union of cultures. Mary tells her friend Sally Oldham Collier, "I speak truly when I say that every day I live with that kind, noble-hearted creature, the better I love him" (137). She has adopted the Indian life, has given birth to a beautiful son, and fully expects to live to old age with Hobomok (136). He, on the other hand, is depicted as a devoted husband and father, seen playing games with the toddler. Sally remarks of his domestic transformation, "within these three years he has altered so much, that he seems almost like an Englishman" (137). Mary has become more Indian-like, he more English. Furthermore, the brief scene in which little Hobomok and Sally's young daughter, "accustomed to see each other, [begin] to peep in each other's faces, and look up to their mothers, their bright, laughing eyes beaming with cherub love" (137), suggests the natural affinity between the races. This whole domestic scene takes place, however, in a kind of limbo, in isolation from both Indian and white

settlements. Of course it takes place in another kind of limbo as well, under the erroneous assumption that Charles has been drowned at sea. At the very moment in the narrative when the action most insistently urges a liberal tolerance for such a marriage by allowing the reader to share the couple's quiet happiness, Charles Brown returns.

The narrator must account for how this marriage could have taken place. His justification requires that he demonstrate (1) the severity of Roger Conant's intolerance of any competing doctrine, (2) the appeal to Mary's imagination of Hobomok's stories and accounts of his people, and (3) Mary's despair and near-madness when she believes that Charles Brown has been lost at sea. The pains that the narrator takes to explain this miscegenous union create for the reader who might be repulsed by an Indian-white marriage a basis for sympathy, if not tolerance.

The origin of the conflict in this novel is the Puritans', and especially Roger Conant's, intolerance of any challenge to the authority of the ruling elders of the infant Naumkeak settlement. Given the vulnerability of such a colony and the turmoil of natural and manmade forces that encircle it, what amounts to a siege mentality is hardly surprising. Nature itself constitutes a threat to the Puritan settlement because the Puritans are struggling to survive in a foreign environment amid savage natives who might attack at any moment. Nature is also a threat to the settlement, Conant

knows, because it offers a dangerous alternative to Puritan order, the temptation to live the life of natural man.<sup>3</sup> Added to these natural forces are the temptations of competing Episcopal doctrine, of which the Rev. Mr. Higginson says in Chapter 9, "Liberty of conscience is the gilded bait whereby Satan has caught many souls. The threshold of hell is paved with toleration" (65). Thomas Morton's Merry-mount, of course, symbolizes this triumvirate of fallen nature/savagery/blasphemous doctrine. In the novel's first exchange, Conant chastises his daughter, Mary, for her inquiries about life in England, charging her with "looking back for the flesh-pots of Egypt" and then raising the specter of Morton: "'Wot ye not that the idle follower of Morton, who was drowned in yonder bay, was inwardly given to the vain forms of the church of England? -- and know ye not, that was the reason his God left him, and Satan became his convoy?'" (9). This first mention of Morton and Merry-mount introduces what will become the novel's central conflict: the rejection of Puritan authority and the union of white and Indian blood. Conant's intolerance is so extreme Nina Baym has argued that the novel, despite its title, is focused almost entirely around Mary's rejection of patriarchal authority and that Hobomok is merely a "pawn" in the struggle between father and daughter (70). There is no doubt that the union between Mary and Hobomok is in large part a result of her conflict with Conant; however, I am more interested in how

the miscegenous marriage is made palatable to the reader by the narrator's presentation of the Puritan. When Mary has watched her mother die and then has learned of the apparent drowning of her Episcopalian love, Charles, Mary and her father come together in a scene that promises a reconciliation as the two share their grief. The moment explodes suddenly, however, when Conant finds Mary with a Book of Common Prayer and shouts, "'Have it out of my sight. . . . My soul abhorreth it, as it doth the spirits of the bottomless pit'" (122). The reader then learns how "That single act decided the fluctuating fate of his child" (122). Much later, after Mary has assumed her intimate life with Hobomok, Conant reflects upon her rebellion as an act of divine retribution, not, however, for his intolerance of her wishes but for his having briefly considered allowing her to marry Charles and thus "'to countenance the doings of the unrighteous'" (133)! I would suggest that rhetorically this hyperbolic intolerance on Conant's part serves a vital purpose because it undermines his authority. For the reader being asked to accept a miscegenous marriage, Conant's vitriolic outbursts have the ironic effect of making the reader more receptive to Mary's retreat to the arms of Hobomok, if not condoning it.

Conant's authority is further undermined by the gentle questioning of his wife. Her quiet challenge to textual authority represents, nevertheless, a rebellion. Mary Conant's rebellion is only the most blatant because she allies

herself first with the competing doctrines of the Episcopalian, then is drawn into the "fallen" world of Hobomok. But even Mary's dutiful mother is disturbed by the rigid intolerance of her husband and the other men. She expresses her concern to Mary in words that could come straight from Emerson's Divinity School Address:

"Matters of dispute appear more and more like a vapor which passeth away. . . . the Bible is an inspired book; but I sometimes think the Almighty suffers it to be a flaming cherubim, turning every way, and guarding the tree of life from the touch of man. But in creation, one may read to their fill. It is God's library -- the first Bible he ever wrote." (76)

Nowhere in the novel is the link between male authority and Biblical authority made more explicit. But, as both Carolyn Karcher and Nina Baym have argued, Child also challenges that authority more subtly by bringing women to the foreground of the narrative, women who are "literally invisible in the [Puritan] chronicles" (Karcher xxiii). For Baym, a "female-centered narrative" like Hobomok represents "a challenge to white male ownership of the Indian-white narrative, which is to say white male ownership of history itself" (71). In a novel where Puritans fear and rail against the dangers of rebellious doctrine, the book itself represents the best example of where such practice can lead. Indeed, the narrator seems to justify this reading by saying that the primary interest in his friend's manuscript lies in its "varying tints of domestic detail" that have been left out of the Puritan

histories, "concealed by the ivy which clusters around the tablets of our recent history" (6). In this manuscript, women like Mary and her mother are given a voice to challenge male authority.

Hobomok is also given a voice, and his words are crucial for the narrator's justification of Mary's actions. The narrator's rhetorical treatment of the Indians is particularly interesting. On the one hand, he employs the usual rhetoric of condescension, calling the Indians "poor, unlettered. . . .untutored people" who know only "brutal force" (29). The reader hears the familiar rhetoric of infantilism in a description like the gathering of "the dark children of the forest" (16) or, even more strikingly, in the description of Hobomok in what can only be described as a proto-pensive mood: "In moods like these, thoughts which he could not grasp, would pass before him, and he would pause to wonder what they were, and whence they came" (34). Yet the narrator celebrates the vitality of the natives, in a contrast with the white settlers that anticipates Conrad's narrative of the Congo seventy-five years later: "there were but one or two who seemed like Englishmen. The remainder, sickly and half starved, presented a pitiful contrast to the vigorous and wondering savages who stood among them" (8). This vitality is complemented, in Hobomok at least, by a capacity for natural reverence that tempers his brutality (and no doubt begins to provide the justification for his relationship with Mary):

there was within him a voice loud and distinct, which spoke to him of another world, where he should think, feel, love, even as he did now. He had never read of God, but he had heard his chariot wheels in the distant thunder, and seen his drapery in the clouds. (34)

Such an account of Hobomok's natural spirituality clearly allies him with Mrs. Conant's bible of nature and with the more liberal women in the story. As he is drawn naturally to an emotional communion with God, Hobomok similarly experiences a natural attraction to and reverence for Mary, who has "administered cordials to his sick mother" (33) and revived her when the Indians had pronounced her condition hopeless. The narrator is careful to characterize Hobomok's attraction to Mary as a non-sexual one: "ever since that time, he had looked upon her with reverence, which almost amounted to adoration. If any dregs of human feeling were mingled with these sentiments, he at least, was not aware of it." And when he first realizes that he loves Mary, he dismisses it as "a kind of blasphemy" (33). As he does with Hobomok's natural religious sentiments, the narrator is preparing the reader for the shock of the miscegenous relationship by simultaneously elevating the Indian's emotions while reducing him to the status of a suppliant. Neither stance represents a sexual threat.<sup>4</sup>

This strategy at the same time helps the narrator prepare the reader to understand and accept the effect that Hobomok has on Mary. Certainly part of her affection for the Indian

is attributable to his devotion, part to the desolation of her life once Charles has been banished from the colony:

During the long and dreary winter which followed, there was nothing to break the monotony of the scene, except the occasional visits of Hobomok. . . . A woman's heart loves the flattery of devoted attention, let it come from what source it may. (84)

But the narrator identifies in particular the Indian's voice and his "descriptions of the Indian nations, glowing as they were in the brief, figurative language of nature" (84). Again the link is made between the women and the natural world. It seems that in their openness, they are receptive to the Indian voice, and so they hear it. Conant's severity, on the other hand, invites only silence:

Hobomok seldom spoke in Mr. Conant's presence, save in reply to his questions. He understood little of the dark divinity which he attempted to teach, and could not comprehend wherein the traditions of his fathers were heathenish and sinful; but with Mary and her mother, he felt no such restraint, and there he was all eloquence. (85)

Hobomok has a voice when he knows it will be heard. But in all of its manifestations, his is a voice of rhetorical power. To Mary, it is the voice of the poet, simple yet elegant in its persuasion (121). To the Puritan Conant, it is the voice of the tempter, a metaphor taken from the heart-broken father in Yamoyden and serving as the epigraph to chapter 17:

The tempter speaks, when all is still,  
And phantoms in the wind will raise,



That haunt the path of after days.  
 . . . . .  
 On one sad night she left her home;  
 She parted with the tawny chief,  
 And left me lonely in my grief. (120)

Even Hobomok's own people find his power difficult to comprehend, so that "Hobomok's connexion with her was considered the effect of witchcraft on his part, and even he was generally avoided by his former friends" (135-36).

Instead of emphasizing the power of Hobomok's words, however, the narrator focuses upon Mary's vulnerability as the ultimate justification for her actions. She is vulnerable first of all because she believes that fate has dictated the Indian will be her husband and, second, she goes nearly mad at the apparent loss of Charles. Clearly uncomfortable with miscegenation, the narrator remarks, "powerful indeed must have been the superstition, which could induce so much beauty and refinement, even in a moment of desperation, to exchange the social band, stern and dark as it was, for the company of savages" (122). At the moment Mary agrees to marry Hobomok, the narrator intercedes to explain the incomprehensible:

There was a chaos in Mary's mind;-- a dim twilight. . . rapidly darkening into misery. . . . The sudden stroke which had dashed from her lips the long promised cup of joy, had almost hurled reason from his throne. . . . in the desolation of the moment, she felt as if [Hobomok] was the only being in the wide world who was left to love her. . . . In the midst of this whirlwind of thoughts and passions, she turned suddenly towards the Indian. (121)

The narrator's discomfort works to reassure the reader who may be willing to forgive Mary's actions if she is understood to be mad. The explanation above is soon followed by another that claims her lack of responsibility for her behavior, adding, of her reasons, "It is even doubtful if their victim could have defined them" (124, emphasis added). Finally, the narrator presents the marriage of Mary and Hobomok in terms not merely of madness, but of death. As he takes her across the water in his canoe away from the white settlement and toward his world, the image suggests one being carried across the Styx to the underworld, and when Mary takes her wedding vows, the narrator emphasizes her unconscious participation: "Mary raised her head with a look, which had in it much of the frightful expression of one walking in his sleep . . . . Mary continued listless and unmoved, apparently unconscious of any change in her situation" (125).

What is the reader to make of this strident rhetoric of madness, victimization, and death? Most importantly, it seems to me, given the novel's questioning of authority and undermining of interpretation, is the obvious fact that the narrative is being related by a white male who sees the marriage of Mary and Hobomok in much the same way as does the Puritan father. While his disbelief serves to allay the concerns of those readers who would be equally horrified or squeamish about such a union, readers alert to his authorial stance should be prepared to challenge it; the novel, after

all, invites its readers to challenge all narrators, including its own. Surprisingly, although Karcher comments on Child's choice of a male narrator as a device to insure legitimacy as he chooses to edit the old manuscript (xx-xxi), she does not see the resulting text as a threat to its own narrative voice. I believe the discrepancy between the novel's radical plot with its sympathetic presentation of the Indian and Puritan women and its narrator's rhetoric of disbelief and justification, reveals a writer carefully soothing uneasy readers through her male narrator while her story, at least until the final reversal, challenges readers to entertain a history that is taboo.

Charles's reappearance signals an exchange of places with Hobomok. Charles will assume the role of Mary's husband and father to her son, and Hobomok will sacrifice his life. The narrator's rhetoric emphasizes that the Indian's voluntary removal is a death: "He paused on a neighboring hill, looked toward his wigwam till his strained vision could hardly discern the object, with a bursting heart again murmured his farewell and blessing, and forever passed away from New England" (141).

The narrator's willingness to endorse this removal is not surprising; what is jolting to the reader is Hobomok's sudden willingness to sacrifice the tender joys as little Hobomok's father that he has just experienced. At this point the Indian unexpectedly ceases to employ the rhetoric of advocacy, and he

becomes instead the elegiac speaker at his own funeral. He tells Charles, "'Hobomok will go far off among some of the red men in the west. They will dig him a grave, and Mary may sing the marriage song in the wigwam of the Englishman. . . . I will be buried among strangers, and none shall black their faces for the unknown chief'" (139-40).

Although Mary returns to white culture on her own terms, Hobomok is deprived of wife, son, community, and any hope for the future. The elevated sentiments that made Hobomok more acceptable as a husband for Mary, here at the end of the narrative, manifest themselves as a willingness to endure self-exile, to sacrifice all ties to the land and the people who have made his life, so that she may be happy. The story demonstrates on a microcosmic scale, in other words, the tragedy of removal. The story appears to condone a strict racial segregation that, five years later, urged removal as a solution to the Indian problem. As Carolyn Karcher, Nina Baym, and Lucy Maddox have said, the end of the novel is difficult to square with Child's later militant ideology. They suggest that in Hobomok, in Karcher's words, "Child evidently had a much lower level of political consciousness on the Indian question" (xx) than she would exhibit only a few years later. Perhaps that is true, but I am reminded again of the discrepancy between Mary's sense of tragic loss and the narrator's emphasis on the country's tragic gain. What Mary

says of Hobomok describes the horror of removal, whether voluntary or forced:

"to have Hobomok a wanderer, for my sake, and to have him die among strangers, without one relation to speak those words of comfort and kindness, which he has so often uttered to me, I cannot -- I cannot endure it. I only have sinned; and yet all the punishment has fallen upon his head." (147)

The narrator, on the other hand, sees a tragedy necessary for the nurturing of the nation: "his faithful services to the 'Yengees' are still remembered with gratitude; though the tender slip which he protected, has since become a mighty tree, and the nations of the earth seek refuge beneath its branches" (150). Karcher, and others, describe the novel's ending in less glowing terms: "Child has succumbed here to the familiar white fantasy that the Indian will somehow disappear" (xxxii). Given the number of male authors that Child places between herself and this narrative, I would qualify that assessment with a simple but significant change: The white male narrator indulges the familiar fantasy that the Indian will somehow disappear. By 1830, the fantasy that allows the resolution of Hobomok was transformed into a government policy with broad tragic consequences.

"children connected in indissoluble bonds":

Captivity and Marriage in Hope Leslie

The experience of reading Hope Leslie recalls the North American Review article (July 1820: 93-94) that declared most of the arguments were on one side of the Indian Question while most of the truth was on the other. Sedgwick's prefatory defense of her dynamic Indian character Magawisca suggests not only the sort of dichotomy the NAR article endorses but which of the two will be her concern: "Without citing Pocohontas, or any other individual, as authority, it may be sufficient to remark, that in such delineations, we are confined not to the actual, but the possible" (6). Coupled with her insistence that the book's intent "was to illustrate not the history, but the character of the times" (5), the reader should be forewarned that conventional dichotomies -- light/dark, civilized/savage, truth/rhetoric, culture/nature, history/fiction -- will be challenged, perhaps collapsed. As in Child's work, the women, Magawisca and her white double, Hope Leslie, are the principal voices that speak against Puritan oppression and intolerance. While Hobomok's voice was largely confined to a private, domestic realm, however, in Sedgwick's novel, Magawisca's advocacy of her people and their claims commands both the private audience within the Fletcher household, where she lives as a captive/servant, and the public podium of her trial for witchcraft and conspiracy. Because she is therefore such a prime example of the Indian as

advocate/historian, I intend to focus on her re-narration of the Pequod War, on her views of Indian/white marriages, and on her final vision of the inevitable separation of the races. Most of the arguments in the book -- for tolerance, for a liberal humanitarianism, for inclusion and understanding among people -- are on the side of Magawisca, yet the truth which even she ultimately embraces is that the Indians and whites cannot coexist. Mary Kelley, editor of the most recent edition of Hope Leslie, is right to place the novel in the midst of the debate over the fate of the Cherokees, Chickasaws, and Choctaws in the 1820s, but her conclusion that the book "resounded with an unmistakable challenge to the morality of a nation" (xxviii) has to be examined in light of not only its arguments for tolerance but also its embracing of segregation.

Magawisca is the daughter of the Pequod chief Mononotto. Captured along with her brother, Oneco, by the whites, she matures in the household of William Fletcher, who employs her as a servant. Both Indian children, however, soon become so much a part of the family that a natural affection springs up between Magawisca and young Everell Fletcher and between Oneco and Faith Leslie (Hope and Faith Leslie are daughters of William's cousin and former fiancée, Alice, and they become his wards upon her death). So close are the children, in fact, that Mrs. Fletcher says to her husband of Magawisca and Everell, "Two young plants that have sprung up in close

neighbourhood, may be separated while young; but if disjoined after their fibers are all intertwined, one, or perchance both, may perish'" (33). Their eventual separation is assumed. Mrs. Fletcher also notes what a remarkable child Magawisca is, in particular her voice, which "'hath a natural deep and most sweet melody in it, far beyond any stringed instrument,'" coupled with "'such rare gifts of mind'" (32). The Puritan woman is forced to contemplate God's providence in "'bestowing on this child of the forest'" such abilities that she is able to make young Everell Fletcher into a "'charmed bird'" (32). Quickly discarding the serpent imagery, however, she declares that Magawisca's presence "'bring[s] to mind the lofty Judith, and the gracious Esther'" (32). Mrs. Fletcher ignores the warnings of the superstitious servant Jennet, who tells the mother, "'I would sooner, in faith, cast him into the lion's den, or the fiery furnace, than leave him to this crafty offspring of a race that are the children and heirs of the evil one'" (39).

Magawisca's effect on the children in the Fletcher household is demonstrated in the following chapter, and, to a bigot like Jennet, the Indian girls's account of how she came to be separated from her parents and their village, no doubt is inspired by the devil. William Fletcher's account reveals the prevailing Puritan attitude toward the Pequods: "'when this wolfish tribe were killed, or dislodged from their dens, she, her brother, and their mother, were brought with a few



other captives to Boston'" where the soldiers either sold them to Christian households or sold them into slavery in the West Indies (21). Magawisca's version of her narrative is remarkable to Everell (and, presumably, to the reader) only because it shifts his point of view and forces him to empathize with the Pequods. He must see them not as wolves or dogs or demons but as human beings.

She achieves this perspective primarily by recasting the destruction of her village from a battle between soldiers and warriors to a slaughter of women and children. Acknowledging that the surprise attack by the English is met by the Pequot warriors roused from sleep, she nevertheless succeeds in showing that the Indians are fighting for their families: "Our warriors rushed forth to meet the foe; they surrounded the huts of their mothers, wives, sisters, children; they fought as if each man had a hundred lives'" (48). In a particularly effective image that dramatizes the genocidal consequences of this attack, she describes how the English soldiers take "'from our hearth-stone, where the English had been so often warmed and cherished, the brand to consume our dwellings'" (49). She describes watching her sixteen-year-old brother beheaded with a sabre and how her mother spared her and Oneco by hiding them beneath a rock. Those who survived this attack, she says, retreated to a swamp where once again they were surrounded by the English, who continued to fire bullets "alike on warriors, women, and children" (52) until a

final assault which was met with no resistance. Magawisca once again casts the slaughter in terms of families and genocide: "all about sat women and children in family clusters, awaiting unmoved their fate. . . . None resisted -- not a movement was made -- not a voice lifted -- not a sound escaped, save the wailings of the dying children" (53).

Forced to endure this "new version of an old story," (53) Everell recalls the old story, the history with which he is familiar, penned by Governor Bradford in which he writes, "it was a fearful sight to see them thus frying in the fire, and the streams of blood quenching the same, and the horrible scent thereof; but the victory seemed a sweet sacrifice, and they gave the praise thereof to God" (54). This oxymoron of the sweet stench is followed by Bradford's interpretation of Pequod resistance; Everell recalls that

the courage of the Pequods was distorted into ferocity, and their fortitude, in their last extremity, thus set forth: "many were killed in the swamp, like sullen dogs, that would rather, in their self-willedness and madness, sit still to be shot or cut in pieces, than receive their lives for asking, at the hands of those into whose power they had now fallen." (54)

This exchange occurs early in the novel, and, following the preface which raises the issue of historical truth, it prepares and expects the reader to accept the legitimacy of an alternative historical narrative. Mary Kelley suggests that Sedgwick "has effectively complicated readers' reactions and rendered a facile outrage against the Indians impossible"

(xxxiii). Whether or not we want to go so far as to add, with Kelley, that the book "resounded with an unmistakable challenge to the morality of a nation" (xxviii) is another matter. Magawisca's new history certainly refutes the Puritans' providential hermeneutics, but Hope Leslie does not necessarily endorse her narrative; indeed, I will suggest that the novel ultimately embraces if not the providential design, at least its historical outcome.

While Hope Leslie is bold in its depiction of the possibility of Indian/white coexistence, even marriage, it nevertheless relies upon the captivity motif as a prelude to such mingling.<sup>5</sup> Captivity first brings the Pequod children to live in the Fletcher household, where the Everell/Magawisca and Faith/Oneco relationships have their adolescent and pre-adolescent beginnings; and captivity carries Faith to live with Mononotto once he has attacked the Fletchers in order to reclaim his children. In the context of this extended captivity, Faith abandons white culture and marries Oneco. And, finally, by recapturing and holding Faith against her will, the Puritans attempt to break her bond to Oneco. This captivity context, as Slotkin points out, makes the novel quite conventional.

Michael Bell has argued that Sedgwick's treatment of the Everell/Magawisca/Hope triangle is also dictated by a conventional choice in which the young hero must reject the "dark heroine" who "represents the nature that cannot be

reconciled with civilization" (183). He must, rather, be joined with the blonde heroine, who represents a tame nature, and thus their union symbolizes the promise of a "new civilization" (183-84). As Sandra Zagarell points out, however, Hope is in fact a brunette, and what Sedgwick does is to blur the conventional dichotomy between heroines, to double Magawisca and Hope, thus "imagining the possibility of a sisterhood that crosses racial boundaries" (237). But Sedgwick does more than focus on an interracial sisterhood. She has the servant Digby say to Everell, "'time was, when I viewed you as good as mated with Magawisca.'" Digby immediately feels the need to apologize because "she was but a tawny Indian after all," (214) but his suggestion leads to a discussion of the natural separation between races. Everell's reaction is interesting because he seems to take Magawisca's disfigurement -- her arm is severed as she fends off a blow intended to kill Everell -- as a sign that their union would defy natural order: He tells the servant, "you do me honour, by implying that I rightly estimated that noble creature; and before she had done the heroic deed, to which I owe my life -- Yes, Digby, I might have loved her -- might have forgotten that nature had put barriers between us'" (214). When Digby then counters that "'things would naturally have taken another course after Miss Hope came among us,'" (214, emphasis added) the narrator undercuts him for having all arranged in his mind "according to what he deemed natural

and proper" (214-15). Presumably the same comment could apply to Everell. Is the reader meant to understand that the scene in which Magawisca saves him is an emblem of Indian savagery instead of a reminder of her ennobling sacrifice?

A similar, and much more interesting, invocation of nature imbues Magawisca's explanation of why Faith Leslie cannot and will not abandon her husband, Oneco, and return to the white community. Through a series of metaphors, Magawisca tells Hope that her sister's captivity has become an adoption into the Indian community: "I cannot send back the bird that has mated to its parent nest; the stream that has mingled with other waters to its fountain'" (187). "'Your arms. . . could no more retain thy sister,'" she continues, "'than a spider's web. The lily of the Maqua's valley, will never again make the English garden sweet'" (188). Magawisca's figurative rhetoric does more than merely signify the naturalness of the union between Faith and Oneco; it asserts its naturalness by appealing to the self-evident context of the natural world. Furthermore, against the backdrop of this figurative landscape, the reader hears Hope's revulsion -- "God forbid! . . . My sister married to an Indian!" (188) -- and her reaction sounds particularly unwarranted, narrow-minded and cruel, quite out of character for Hope. What Sedgwick manages here is a rhetorical reversal of reader expectations, akin to the strategy early in the book of prefacing the attack on the Fletchers with Magawisca's account of the English massacre of

the Pequods. If she does not achieve a complete reversal of those expectations, she at least blunts or deflects any tendency the reader might have to empathize with Hope's sense of horror. For this reaction, Magawisca shows nothing but contempt. "'Yes -- an Indian,'" she declares,

"in whose veins runs the blood of the strongest, the fleetest of the children of the forest, who never turned their backs on friends or enemies, and whose souls have returned to the Great Spirit, stainless as they came from him. Think ye that your blood will be corrupted by mingling with this stream?" (188)

When Hope begins to cry, Magawisca's tone softens, and she returns to the reassuring figurative language used earlier, this time to insist "'your sister is well with us. She is cherished as the bird cherishes her young. The cold winds may not blow on her, nor the fierce sun scorch her'" (188). She also insists, in a description that recalls Hobomok's gentlemanly, nonsexual treatment of Mary Conant, that "Oneco worships and serves her as if all good spirits dwelt in her'" (188). Finally, to Hope's expression of Christian revulsion and her invoking of her mother's grave, Magawisca answers,

"And here. . . is my mother's grave; think ye not that the Great Spirit looks down on these sacred spots, where the good and the peaceful rest, with an equal eye; think ye not their children are His children, whether they are gathered in yonder temple where your people worship, or bow to Him beneath the green boughs of the forest?" (189)

Magawisca's conception of a democratic Great Spirit explains why to the Indian the whites' insistence upon the exclusive

truth of their narrow doctrine and form of worship appears unworthy of the bounty of the creation. Reassuring Hope that her sister still "bows to the crucifix," (189) having encountered a French priest, Magawisca even acknowledges that "there may be those that need other lights," but then she explains her faith. Her explanation has a dramatic effect upon how the reader is to view her earlier figurative account of the relationship between Faith and Oneco:

"to me, the Great Spirit is visible in the life-creating sun. I perceive Him in the gentle light of the moon that steals in through the forest boughs. I feel Him here," she continued, pressing her hand on her breast, while her face glowed with the enthusiasm of devotion. "I feel Him in these ever-living, ever-wakeful thoughts. . . ." (189)

Magawisca's conception of nature infused with the spirit of its creator perhaps reveals the influence of William Ellery Channing's Unitarianism on Sedgwick (Foster 44-45), but within the novel it underscores the theological basis for Magawisca's natural imagery. When she invokes the nesting of birds or the flowing of waters to explain Faith's immersion in Indian culture, she signifies that Faith has assumed a natural position in the creation. Her rhetoric, in other words, is inseparable from the truth of her religious faith. Mr. Fletcher reinforces this connection later in the novel when Faith has been recaptured by the Puritans and he remarks how "she goes from window to window, like an imprisoned bird fluttering against the bars of its cage; and so wistfully she

looks abroad, as if her heart went forth with the glance of her eye'" (266). The rhetorical appeal to nature thus serves throughout most of the novel to reverse reader expectations and to reverse or deflect reader judgments of Indian/white coexistence and the miscegenous marriage.

In order to arrive at its conclusion, however, Sedgwick reverses those reader expectations again by having Magawisca appeal to nature as the basis for separation of the races. Lucy Maddox accounts for this jarring reversal by arguing that Sedgwick ultimately has to make her novel conform with the historical record of Indian removal. Sandra Zagarell agrees that "Sedgwick is ultimately bound by what occurred in Massachusetts Bay Colony," but while she sees the narrative reverting to stock formulas "by which frontier and historical romance cast historical movement as progress," she also argues that "This proliferation of devices [necessary to accomplish the reversal] underscores the heavy fictional artillery needed to bring the forces Sedgwick has unleashed under control" (239). Zagarell insists, in fact, that because the Hope/Everell wedding is left unnarrated, the Faith/Oneco marriage survives, and Esther rejects marriage as a necessity for women, "those forces remain stubbornly and openly unresolved" (239). The novel's conclusion, in either of these readings, points to the artificiality of all narratives, the Puritan account of the Pequod conflict as well as Magawisca's.



The most dramatic instance of the novel's having to capitulate to the historical record occurs in the trial of Magawisca on charges of witchcraft and inciting the Indians to attack Puritan settlements. In this chapter (II:9), Magawisca appears at her most noble and speaks with a rhetorical power that defies her Puritan captors' assumptions of superiority. She enters her trial with "neither guilt, nor fearfulness, nor submission" on her face, but rather revealing in her magnificent presence a natural aristocracy: "her erect attitude, her free and lofty tread, and the perfect composure of her countenance, all expressed the courage and dignity of her soul" (282). She stuns the court with her defiance when she refuses to acknowledge the Puritans' authority: "'I am your prisoner, and ye may slay me, but I deny your right to judge me. My people have never passed under your yoke -- not one of my race has ever acknowledged your authority'" (286). When Magawisca is told by the judge that she must either deny or confess to the charges against her, she denies the moral authority of the whites and acknowledges only their power to destroy: "'I neither confess nor deny aught. . . . I stand here like a deer caught in a thicket, awaiting the arrow of the hunter'" (287). Through this refusal to participate in what she considers a mockery of a trial, she establishes herself as both emblem of and martyr for the pride of her people.

Even when Magawisca echoes the ubi sunt theme so prevalent in the works of Cooper, her tone is fundamentally different; rather than elegiac, her speech strikes the reader as more defiant than resigned. In answer to a magistrate's assertion that her "`race have been swift witnesses to that sure word of prophecy'" and his question, "`thy people truly -- where are they," the reader hears her unbending will:

"My people! where are they?" she replied, raising her eyes to heaven, and speaking in a voice that sounded like deep-toned music, after the harsh tones addressed to her, -- "my people are gone to the isles of the sweet south-west; to those shores that the bark of an enemy can never touch: think ye I fear to follow them?" (287)

Yet even in such a moment of noble defiance, the reader can hear Magawisca's endorsement of racial separation.

That part of her speech in which she clearly advocates racial separation must not have seemed as open-ended to the nineteenth-century audience as it might to a twentieth-century reader like Zagarell. Granted, the rhetorical situation is such that it demands an absolute dichotomy: Magawisca demands to be freed from the whites' prison one way or the other. In that context, she declares, "`Do you wait for him to prove that I am your enemy? Take my own word, I am your enemy; the sun-beam and the shadow cannot mingle. The white man cometh -- the Indian vanisheth. Can we grasp in friendship the hand raised to strike us?" (292) Later, in her farewell to Hope and Everell, she reiterates, "`My people have been spoiled --

we cannot take as a gift that which is our own -- the law of vengeance is written on our hearts. . . . the Indian and the white man can no more mingle, and become one, than day and night'" (330). Hope begs Magawisca to "'return and dwell with us'" and so that the Indian and Hope and Everell "'will walk in the same path,'" an echo of the exchange at the end of Last of the Mohicans where Hawk-eye tells Chingachgook, "'The gifts of our colors may be different, but God has so placed us as to journey in the same path. . . . Sagamore, you are not alone'" (414). But Magawisca replies, "'It cannot be -- it cannot be'" (330). Sedgwick's position, dramatizing the inevitable, unresolvable conflict between Puritan and Pequod, yet addressing an audience in 1829, appears to endorse the impending political policy of removal. Zagarell sees the end of the novel as open-ended, but it is only as open-ended as the policy itself was: the Indians would be removed beyond the Mississippi; what would happen to them when white settlers moved across that frontier would be decided with the further advancement of the frontier.

Magawisca's stature is enhanced still more by her emotional "anticipation" of one of the great rhetorical performances in the name of revolution, here applied to justice: "'to my dying mother, thou didst promise, kindness to her children. In her name, I demand of thee death or liberty'" (293). So affecting is her speech that there is "in the breasts of a great majority of the audience, a strange

contrariety of opinion and feelings. Their reason, guided by the best lights they possessed, deciding against her -- the voice of nature crying out for her" (294). Here, once again, Sedgwick accomplishes a reversal of reader expectations that recalls the NAR article insisting that all the arguments were on one side of the Indian question, all the truth on the other. In this instance, all the arguments are in favor of Magawisca's guilt and execution, all the truth for her liberty. The reaction of Everell and others in the audience -- "'In the name of God, liberty!'" (293) -- suggests the assumed reaction of the reader, but the court is never allowed to rule. Hope Leslie plans and carries out Magawisca's escape from prison before a judgment is rendered.

Magawisca's destination is significant. To Hope Leslie it is a wilderness of "'hideous solitudes'" (332); to Magawisca, it is an Emersonian paradise wherein "'the Great Spirit, and his ministers, are every where present and visible to the eye of the soul that loves him'" (332); but, most significantly, to the Puritans and to an 1829 audience, it is "the deep, voiceless obscurity of those unknown regions" (339, emphasis added). Her escape removes her to a place where voices like hers cannot be heard and where whites are not forced to consider questions like the conflicting demands of reason and nature.

Both Magawisca and Hobomok function as advocate historians who would challenge the white voice of authority,

not by displacing it, but by offering an alternative account of values, of humanity's relationship to nature, of myth, and of historical conflict. Both novels offer Indian/white marriages as emblems of a marriage of cultural voices. While Hobomok's marriage to Mary Conant is conveniently renounced, Oneco successfully rescues Faith Leslie and carries her once again into the wilderness; the marriage survives, however, only in the "voiceless obscurity" of the unknown West. Although Hobomok and Hope Leslie reject the need for bloody sensationalism to resolve their narratives, the pattern, ultimately, in these novels differs little from bloodbaths like Yamovden or The Backwoodsman. The Indians are removed, their voices silenced, a troubling question dismissed, if not answered: whites and Indians cannot coexist.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> That Sedgwick was writing with an awareness of Cooper and of other critical eyes is evident from the defensive tone of the preface; Nina Baym says that the whole novel is a reaction to Cooper's assumptions about history and fiction: Sedgwick's Hope Leslie which appeared [the year after Last of the Mohicans] "might have been subtitled The Last of the Pequods, so closely did it invoke its precursor while at the same time spiritedly challenging it. The challenge begins with the preface, which cheerfully grants that this novel, like all novels, is not history but fiction and implicitly mocks Cooper's insistence that his own story is anything else. Throughout the novel, Sedgwick counters Cooper's male severity and rigidity with a feminine sprightliness. . . . More somberly, Sedgwick denies that any account of Indians and whites told from an exclusive white viewpoint can be true; by promising an Indian perspective she in effect offers her own account as more historical than Cooper's" (81). See also Edward Halsey Foster (91-92) on Hope Leslie as a recasting of the captivity, conflicts, and marriage in Last of the Mohicans.

<sup>2</sup> I follow Sedgwick's spelling rather than the more common "Pequot."

<sup>3</sup> Chapter 3 of Richard Slotkin's Regeneration Through Violence, "A Home in the Heart of Darkness," provides an excellent discussion of the Puritans' fear of the wilderness

and of its native inhabitants, a world emblematic of original sin (66). See also, Slotkin (125) and (205).

<sup>4</sup> For a discussion of similar treatment of the Indian as natural gentleman in the works of Cooper, see Donald Darnell (49-51) and Edwin Cady (129-34). Darnell, in particular, notes that in Cooper's work, Indian characters, otherwise capable of the worst forms of brutality, do not rape (50).

<sup>5</sup> Slotkin notes, "[The Puritans] might go to the Indians as missionaries bringing light, as warriors to scourge the devils, or as involuntary captives -- but never as husbands" or wives (66).

CHAPTER V  
COOPER'S EPIDEICTIC INDIANS AND THE  
RHETORIC OF PROVIDENCE

Lewis Cass -- military man, territorial governor, and negotiator with Plains Indians -- began a dispute with America's best-known novelist when the government official wrote in the North American Review in January 1826 that "the last of the Mohegans' is an Indian of the school of Mr. Heckewelder, and not of the school of nature" (67). In an April 1828 article in NAR praising the work of Schoolcraft and contrasting Schoolcraft with the distortions of Heckewelder's "bright and glowing light," Cass repeated the charge against Cooper's fictional Indians, claiming that they

have no living prototype in our forests. . . . They have the never failing impress of civilization in the dignity of their sentiments, and in the whole spirit of their conduct and conversation. They are the Indians of Mr. Heckewelder, and not the fierce and crafty warriors and hunters, that roam through our forests. (376)

The dispute between Cass and Cooper would last for twenty-five years. Cooper readily admitted that he "was never among the Indians" and said, "All that I know of them is from reading and from hearing my father speak of them" (qtd in Spiller 11). Nevertheless, and predictably, Cooper claimed the freedom of the writer of romance to treat his materials -- and



the Indians were essential literary materials -- according to the dictates of the narrative. But of Cass's supposed superior familiarity with "real" Indians, Cooper considered the circumstances under which Cass had gathered his knowledge -- the humiliation of treaty signings, in which the Indians relinquished their lands -- and fired back in the 1850 preface to the Leatherstocking tales,

Heckewelder was an ardent, benevolent missionary, bent on the good of the red man, and seeing in him one who had the soul, reason, and characteristics of a fellow-being. The critic is understood to have been a very distinguished agent of the government, one very familiar with Indians, as they are seen at the councils to treat for the sale of their lands, where little or none of their domestic qualities come in play, and where, indeed, their evil passions are known to have the fullest scope. As just would it be to draw conclusions of the general state of American society from the scenes of the capital, as to suppose that the negotiating of one of these treaties is a fair picture of Indian life.

Despite these conflicting claims to authenticity of their knowledge and representations of the Indians, Cooper and Cass shared a conviction of white supremacy that presupposed the Indians' inability to adapt to a changing, white-dominated world. When Cass wrote in the North American Review (January 1830) of the Indian that

The opinions, traditions, and institutions of his own tribe, are endeared to him by habit, feeling, and authority; and from early infancy he is taught, that the Great Spirit will be offended by any change in the customs of his red children, which have all been established by him, (74)

he, ironically, is reiterating the central tenet of Cooper's treatment of the Indian in his novels of the 1820s. And in the same breath with which Cooper claims freedom from a portrait of the Indian bound by personal knowledge, he endorses Cass's accounts of the Indian's fallen state: "to suppose that the red-man is to be represented only in the squalid misery or in the degraded moral state that certainly more or less belongs to his condition, is, we apprehend, taking a very narrow view of an author's privileges" (1850 preface, *Leatherstocking Tales*).

On the government's policy of removal that stirred the passions of so many Americans in the 1820s and 30s, Cooper is remarkably silent. One wonders how a writer like Cooper, who relied so much upon the Indians' fate to make his name and his fortune, could ignore such an issue. Yet in the correspondence, I can find no reference by Cooper to the debate over forced Indian removal. Granted, he was in Europe during the height of the debate, but he did receive regular news from the United States, including a letter from H. N. Cruger of Charleston dated 22 November 1830 that mentions "the extinguishment of Indian Titles" as one of the "subjects of vast moment now afloat on the public mind" (Beard). Perhaps the best explanation for Cooper's apparent silence stems from his limited familiarity with the various Indian peoples outside of his region and his extrapolation of their general condition based upon his experience in New York. Both Spiller

and Grossman emphasize in their biographies that the predominant feature of Indian culture for Cooper growing up in New York was its disappearance. In Notions of the Americans (1828) Cooper's bachelor narrator insists upon this point:

I wish you to understand that, a few peaceable and half civilized remains of tribes that have been permitted to reclaim small portions of land excepted, an inhabitant of New-York is actually as far removed from a savage as an inhabitant of London. The former has to traverse many hundred leagues of territory to enjoy even the sight of an Indian in a tolerably wild condition. . . . A few, degraded, descendants of the ancient warlike possessors of this Country are indeed seen wandering among the settlements, but the Indian must now be chiefly sought west of the Mississippi, to be found in any of his savage grandeur. (209-10)

The passage suggests, in other words, that in Cooper's mind, Indian "removal" had already taken place. His novels of the 1820s reflect this understanding of an inevitable withdrawal of an inferior strain of humanity and thus perpetuate the myth of the Vanishing American. Another observation from Notions of the Americans shows that racism is the source of this view of history:

There is no doubt, that the Free blacks, like the aborigines, gradually disappear, before the superior moral and physical influence of the whites; but the rate of their decrease is not to be calculated by that in the State of Massachusetts, nor even by that of the native possessors of the soil. A black man, unlike an Indian, can be easily civilized. . . .<sup>4</sup> (242)

The observation that an Indian could not be civilized would have a direct bearing on the removal issue.

One of the central questions of the day related to the removal debate was whether or not the Indians could be converted to Christianity (and thus become citizens of a Christian United States).<sup>2</sup> Cooper obviously had this question in mind when he presented the Christianized John Mohegan in The Pioneers and when he wrote of the effects of the Puritans' faith upon the impressionable young Conanchet in The Wept of Wish-Ton-Wish. The possibility of converting the Indians, if one considered these portraits of Indians unwilling to forsake the beliefs of their ancestors, however, would be slim. W. H. Gardiner drew precisely this conclusion in his review of "Cooper's Novels" in the North American Review (1826), noting that the death of John Mohegan clearly was "designed to exhibit the apparent incapacity of the red man to conceive the religion of the whites" (196). Similarly, another issue raised repeatedly in the 1820s was the possibility of the Indian's conversion from hunter to farmer.<sup>3</sup> The unfavorable contrast in Notions between blacks, who could be trained to work, and Indians, who could not, is made explicit in chapter 27 of The Redskins (1846) where the elderly Susquesus, an Onandago chief, and the former slave Jaaf are presented as "two aged memorials of past ages" (440). Of the black man, the narrator says, "Accustomed to labor from childhood, he could not be kept from work, even by his extreme old age. He had the hoe, or the ax, or the spade in his hand daily, many years after he could wield either to any material advantage"

(441). On the other hand, "Susquesus never worked," the reader is told, because "He deemed it to be beneath his dignity as a warrior. . . . So long as the boundless forest furnished the deer, the moose, the beaver, the bear, . . . he had cared little for the fruits of the earth" (441).<sup>4</sup> Although the assumption of the Indian's intractability is stated less overtly in the earlier novels of the 1820s, Cooper's depiction of the Indians would lend support to the argument for removal because he not only presents his Indians in the context of a culture devoted exclusively to hunting, but he also idealizes the world of nomadic hunters in the Indian afterlife as the happy hunting-grounds. If religion and agriculture were considered cornerstones of the nation's future, the Indian failed to meet either of these standards; the Indian, in other words, would not and could not escape his Otherness.

Most importantly for Cooper's portrait of the Indian in the 1820s is the author's endorsement of the myth of the Vanishing American and consequently his emphasis upon death. The deaths of Chingachgook, Uncas, and Conanchet, which act as a climactic refrain to the novels, suggest both a literal and a figurative removal from a world in which the Indian is truly "out of place." The funerals of these Indian leaders are symbolic -- each is "the last" of his people -- but they also, as a result, tend to minimize the prospect of political removal in the 1820s as a social upheaval. Cooper's

treatment, regardless of his silence in the Indian removal debate, encouraged Americans to think of Indians in terms of a few dying remnants of tribes, not of thousands of men, women, and children forced to abandon their homes. The funerary motif thus is significant.

While it is legitimate to argue that Cooper's major concern in the first two novels of the Leatherstocking series is with laying the foundation of the country's future, symbolized by the marriage of Oliver Effingham and Elizabeth Temple in The Pioneers (1823) and Duncan Heyward and Alice Munro in The Last of the Mohicans (1826), I want to examine Cooper's concern for laying the past properly to rest. The usual argument for reading the books in the order of publication rather than according to the chronology of Natty Bumppo's life is that, as Kay Seymour House says, the reader can witness how Cooper takes an important but peripheral character like Natty in The Pioneers and shapes him into one of the dominant figures in American literature (262). For D.H. Lawrence, reading in the order of publication allowed one to move from a world approximating reality to the realm of enduring myth; again the focus is on Natty. For Richard Slotkin, reading in the order of publication allows Natty to achieve an Indian heaven in which he recaptures eternal youth (493). No one is more adamant, however, in reading the Leatherstocking tales as Natty's story than Roy Harvey Pearce, who declares,

The Indian and his fate were intelligible only in their relationship to the white man and his future, as savagism was intelligible only [in] its relationship to civilization. . . . The Tales are Leatherstocking's; and the Indians serve only to define him and his nature and his end. (201)

If one is interested in how Cooper performs the last rites for the Indians, however, rather than in the various manifestations of Natty Bumppo, reading in the order of publication becomes even more important. The novels from the 1820s that depict the Eastern American Indians, The Pioneers, The Last of the Mohicans, and, a non-Leatherstocking book, The Went of Wish-Ton-Wish, exploit a common theme of the Vanishing American and rely upon the death of a great chief to symbolize the fate of a people. The Pioneers establishes Cooper's attitude toward the "problem" of the Indian and presents that attitude in a tone of mourning. House describes the treatment of the Indian that Cooper shared with many of his contemporaries: "Since it is far easier to lament a race than preserve it, Americans accepted Indian extinction as inevitable and indulged themselves in sentimental nostalgia for a lost cause that was assuredly lost but that had never truly been a cause" (61). Significantly, the Leatherstocking tales begin with a portrait of the drunken and humiliated John Mohegan: focusing on the end of his life and that of his people produces a finality of statement that hovers over and qualifies all of the heroics and sublimity of the other novels. It is equally significant that the novel's action is

largely built around the deaths of two deer, of old Major Effingham, who had been given the land upon which Templeton is built, and, of course, of Mohegan; the old order of conflict but also of mutual respect between white pioneers and the Indians is passing away. The Last of the Mohicans, though set decades earlier when Chingachgook and Hawk-eye are in the prime of their adulthood, is nevertheless structured in large part around the inevitable extinction of the Delaware people and around the climactic funeral of Uncas. The Wept of Wish-Ton-Wish, set in a remote Puritan settlement at the time of King Philip's War, climaxes with the sacrificial death of Conanchet, young sachem of the vanishing Narragansetts. In other words, the recurring motifs in these works of the 1820s are the marriages of the young whites who will assume the leadership of the young nation and the funerals for the Indians who must relinquish the land.

I want to focus not only upon those funerals but upon the epideictic rhetoric in the set speeches of Natty, Chingachgook, and Conanchet, with its emphasis upon panegyric and eulogy, as the means to marking an end to Indian claims. In examining the speeches of Cooper's characters, I will follow a structure borrowed from another funerary tradition -- the questioning of the loss, the acceptance of a purpose for that loss, and the consolation for those left behind -- that marks the elegy. In the political debate during the 1820s over how to resolve the Indian problem, the funeral orations



that surround and lay to rest Cooper's Indian characters, I will argue, have immediate political implications; they constitute a self-evident truth that Providence dictated progress for white America and for the Indians, doom. The dead do not inherit the land.

Natty Bumppo as Pallbearer

In the scene at the Bold Dragoon in Chapter 14 of The Pioneers, old Major Hartmann has listened to Natty insist that shortage of game is caused by farmers, who clear the land, not by hunters, to which he replies, "'Ter teer is not so plenty as in ter olt war, Pumpo . . . put ter lant is not mate, as for ter teer to live on, put for Christians'" (161). Here in this brief reply is the argument that justifies the white settlers' transformation of the landscape and the displacement of both game, and, by implication, the Indians. Although Natty rails against the intrusion of the "'troubles and diviltries of the law,'" (356) and wonders at the rate at which the settlers have "'driven God's creators from the wilderness, where his providence had put them for his own pleasure,'" (356) he nevertheless acknowledges that if the authorities of Templeton wish to exercise their power over him, then their ability to do so must be in accord with "'God's pleasure'" (357). Richard Slotkin points out that for a Christian like Temple "the settlement of Templeton and the conversion or destruction of the Indians are part of a providential plan," but Slotkin also insists that "To the

Indian, the settlement of Templeton is a breach in nature, a violation of natural law that must culminate in tragedy" (488). I would point out, however, that Chingachgook's rhetoric suggests acceptance of the conquest of the Indian by the white settler as evidence of God's plan for the two races: "Daughter," he tells Elizabeth Temple near the end of the novel, "the Great Spirit gave your fathers to know how to make guns and powder, that they might sweep the Indians from the land. There will soon be no red-skin in the country" (403). This invocation of a providential design for the continent and for the country taking shape there is universally endorsed by Cooper's characters with a fervor and conviction that suggests the rhetorical situation of the pulpit. As Hugh Blair describes it in his lecture on "The Eloquence of the Pulpit" (1785), the pulpit speaker is not so much trying to persuade his audience of the truth of his words as he is "dressing truths which they knew, and of which they were before convinced, in such colours as may most forcibly affect their imagination and heart" (301). This is the fundamental tone of Cooper: inspiring an audience to reaffirm its belief in a design of which it is a vital part. He is not persuading his audience of the truth of Providence and progress; he is merely reaffirming the self-evident truth which that audience already knows. Within the novel, Natty may dispute with Major Hartmann or with Judge Temple over the particulars of that design, but all agree that its end is

inevitable.<sup>5</sup> Chingachgook accepts the notion of the Great Spirit's design, though he cannot be expected to acknowledge that its end is good.

Even the Chingachgook who appears so powerful in The Last of the Mohicans, who recounts in chapter 3 the proud history of his Delaware people as warriors and conquerors, at the death of Uncas expresses an acceptance of and faith in a design: "He was good: he was dutiful; he was brave. Who can deny it? The Manitto had need of such a warrior, and he has called him away" (349). This attitude of acceptance is reinforced by the speeches of the ancient patriarch Tamenund, who expresses repeatedly the Delaware concept of a circular, not a linear, history, signified by the appearance of the youthful Uncas as Tamenund is ready to end his days on earth. Then, seeing that hope destroyed with the death of the young chief, Tamenund makes it clear that the whites are not the sole possessors of the myth of a chosen people when he declares,

"Men of the Lenape. . . . The face of the Manitto is behind a cloud! his eye is turned from you; his ears are shut; his tongue gives no answer. You see him not; yet his judgments are before you. Let your hearts be open, and your spirits tell no lie. Men of the Lenape, the face of the Manitto is behind a cloud!" (341)

The circular pattern of this speech reflects the old man's conception of time and history, a belief that allows him to say both that "The palefaces are masters of the earth" and

that "the anger of the Manitto is not done" yet also to express a flicker of hope amid the grim acceptance of the tragedy of his people that "the time of the red-men has not yet come again" (350). Donald Darnell prefers to distinguish linear history, associated in the novel with the speeches of Magua, and myth, associated with "Uncas, the Messiah, [who] tells myth -- what is true, what will be" (265). Such a distinction is useful because Magua's history, which relies upon revenge, is overshadowed by the myth and/or circular history of Tamenund, which is fatalistic. The acceptance of their loss of land and their loss of stature when cast in terms of a grand design -- whether that plan is described as the linear Providence of the Christian God or the desires of the Manitto in a circular rise and fall of favor -- makes the speeches of these respected Indian leaders crucial for the groundwork of mourning. Peter Sacks notes in his discussion of the elegy the importance of placing a loss in a context that allows for those left behind to accept the loss and to go on living: "The unique death is absorbed into a natural cycle of repeated occasions, and the very expression of mourning is naturalized as though it too were but a seasonal event" (24). Chingachgook's and Tamenund's acceptance of the loss also has significant rhetorical implications for readers seeking justification of the whites' triumph: Even the Indians admit that the "pale-faces are the masters of the earth" because the eye of the Divine Being is turned toward the whites.

Acceptance of loss does not preclude protest over the fate of those lost and those left behind. Sacks has pointed out the therapeutic effects of giving voice to questions whose repression would be harmful to the mourner: "One obvious function of elegiac questioning is to set free the energy locked in grief or rage and to organize its movement in the form of a question that is not merely an expression of ignorance but a voicing of protest" (22). Both Uncas and Tamenund may ultimately summarize their sense of loss and deferred hope with the simple "'It is enough'" (311, 349) but not without questioning what the narrator calls "their desolate fortune" (127). The best example of questioning that follows the ubi sunt formula, however, is reserved for Chingachgook.<sup>6</sup> In chapter 3 of The Last of the Mohicans, Hawk-eye asks Chingachgook, "'But where are to be found those of your race who came to their kin in the Delaware country, so many summers since?'" (33). The Indian's reply naturalizes the decline of his people and presages their demise:

"Where are the blossoms of those summers!-- fallen, one by one: so all of my family departed, each in his turn, to the land of spirits. I am on the hill-top, and must go down into the valley; and when Uncas follows in my footsteps, there will no longer be any of the blood of the Sagamores, for my boy is the last of the Mohicans." (33)

The dramatic irony of this scene is intensified when one considers that this exchange between Hawk-eye and Chingachgook is an echo (or, in narrative time, an anticipation) of an

exchange in The Pioneers between the dying Indian and Elizabeth Temple, who has asked, "'And what has become of your family, John, your wife and your children?'" (402). He replies, "'Where is the ice that covered the great spring? It is melted, and gone with the waters. John has lived till all his people have left him for the land of spirits'" (402). In both cases, the lament voices a protest over the losses that have torn at the Indian's world by placing those losses in a context of constant change. But the ubi sunt formula does more than place the sense of loss in an understandable context of nature's mutability; by linking the fate of the Delaware to the natural cycle, the speaker is able to invoke by implication the hope that the autumn and winter of hopelessness will lead to the rebirth of spring and summer. Tamenund, in fact, employs precisely this rhetoric when he first beholds Uncas returned to claim his position as chief of the Delawares: "'What voice is at his ear! Have the winters gone backward! Will summer come again to the children of the Lenape!'" (308). As Darnell says, "The fate of the Delaware is tied to the fate of Uncas" (266). If the end of Last of the Mohicans seems to cling to this hope, with Tamenund's "'the time of the red-men has not yet come again,'" (350) the conclusion of The Pioneers ends Chingachgook's life with a much greater sense of finality for his people. Akin to the simple benediction, "'It is enough,'" Chingachgook's "'his

time has come, and he is ready'" (402) pronounces the end of the hope for rebirth of the red man in this world.

The voice of protest over this fate is even louder when the Indian recalls past glories and laments the decline of a great people. In terms of epideictic rhetoric, this is the realm of panegyric. In his lecture on the "Constituent Branches of Rhetoric," (1810) John Quincy Adams links demonstrative rhetoric to "great purposes of public benefit, . . . that of stimulating genius, patriotism, and beneficence, by honorable eulogy; and that of teaching useful lessons of national virtue" (180). Adams, of course, does not assume that panegyric will be in celebration of a vanishing people, because he notes that in the finest panegyric, "Every line of praise upon the fathers should be received, as a line of duty for the children" (237). The proper realm of demonstrative rhetoric, in other words, is public, its purpose, to inspire its audience to emulate the greatness of those being eulogized. When Cooper's Chingachgook or Tamenund recalls the past glories of the Delawares, however, it is with the sinking sense of speaking to an audience of white observers attending the funeral for a lost people and a lost world. Indians' panegyric is not the public invocation of virtues that will be adopted by future generation; it is, rather, a private eulogy at their own funerals. The very purpose of celebrating past glory, in other words, is the lament over its loss.

When the reader first encounters Chingachgook, Uncas, and Hawk-eye in Last of the Mohicans, the two elder men are discussing the history of Chingachgook's people. The chief recalls the days when white men first appeared among the Indians: at that time, he says,

"Hawk-eye, we were one people, and we were happy. The salt lake gave us its fish, the wood its deer, and the air its birds. We took wives who bore us children; we worshipped the Great Spirit; and we kept the Maquas beyond the sound of our songs of triumph!" (33)

The greatness of the past is also recalled in chapter 13 when the travelling party seeks shelter in a forest blockhouse that also is the site of the graves of Mohican warriors. There Uncas pauses to listen to Chingachgook relate "a narrative, that redounded so much to the honour of those, whose names he had long revered for their courage and savage virtues" (127). When Uncas has been struck down by Magua at the end of the novel, he becomes the subject of panegyric, as the warrior Uttawa asks,

"Who that saw thee in battle, would believe that thou couldst die! Who before thee has ever shown Uttawa the way into the fight. Thy feet were like the wings of eagles; thine arm heavier than falling branches from the pine; and thy voice like the Manitto, when he speaks in the clouds." (344)

The rhetorical situation for each of these eulogies is funerary, either explicitly or implied. Even in the exchange between Chingachgook and Hawk-eye, the Indian is recalling the



history of his people as a prelude to his prophecy of Uncas as being the last of those people, and Chingachgook is painted so that his body "presented a terrific emblem of death, drawn in intermingled colours of white and black" (29). In The Pioneers when John Mohegan sheds the clothing of the white man and prepares himself for his own death, he becomes again the warrior and chief Chingachgook, who delivers his own eulogy:

"Six times ten hot summers have passed, since John was young; tall like a pine; straight like the bullet of Hawk-eye; strong as the buffalo; spry as the cat of the mountain. He was strong, and a warrior like the Young Eagle. If his tribe wanted to track the Maquas for many suns, the eye of Chingachgook found the print of their moccasins. If the people feasted and were glad as they counted the scalps of their enemies, it was on his pole they hung. . . . then Chingachgook struck his tomahawk into the trees; it was to tell the lazy ones where to find him and the Mingos -- but he made no baskets." (400-01)

When he abandons English and resumes his native tongue, Chingachgook completes his eulogy with a celebration of his reunion with his people: "'I will come! to the land of the just I will come! The Maquas I have slain! -- I have slain the Maquas! and the Great Spirit calls to his son. I will come! I will come! to the land of the just I will come!'" (419). As Natty remarks to the minister's inquiry if Mohegan is singing the praises of the Redeemer, "'tis his own praise that he speaks now. . . and a good right he has to say it all, for I know every word to be true'" (420).

These moments of high praise serve to remind the reader of how much Chingachgook and his people have lost. The loss of life is only the final episode in a life that has experienced a continual erosion of dignity. In The Last of the Mohicans Chingachgook tells Hawk-eye how the Dutch settlers brought rum for the Delawares, who "drank until the heavens and the earth seemed to meet, and they foolishly thought they had found the Great Spirit. Then they parted with their land" (33). The land becomes emblematic of the Indians' loss of dignity, so that "they were driven back from the shores, until I, that am a chief and a Sagamore, have never seen the sun shine but through the trees, and have never visited the graves of my fathers" (33). In The Pioneers when young Oliver Effingham asks John Mohegan why "one so noble by nature" should degrade himself through drink, the Indian replies in "mournful tones,"

"John is a beast. . . . My fathers came from the shores of the salt lake. They fled before rum. . . . But warriors and traders with light eyes followed them. One brought the long knife, and one brought rum. They were more than the pines on the mountains; and they broke up the councils, and took the lands." (185)

When Chingachgook resolves to die, Elizabeth's first impulse is to distract the old man from his purpose, but his transformation from the wasted John Mohegan to the worthy Sagamore and the regaining of human dignity that accompanies it prevent her interference, so that "there was a dignity in

his sorrow, and in his fortitude, that repressed her efforts to speak" (403). All of these examples illustrate how removal from the land of his fathers has meant a life of lamenting for a loss, the shame of which Chingachgook reflects in the "beast" he has become. For Chingachgook, unlike Magua, for example, protest at the fate of the Indians does not prevent him from being transformed into a hollow man, a warrior and scout turned basket-maker and drunk. As House notes, "Only when preparing to die does Chingachgook comb his hair back from his face; otherwise it hangs as a veil for his shame" (275).

The formal process of grieving demands that expressions of acceptance of fate and questioning the loss of one so skilled and virtuous be followed by expressions of consolation. And it is here that Cooper's Indians differ most radically in their response to their losses. The most obvious source of consolation, the inheritance and emulation of a younger generation, is in the narrative of Chingachgook and Uncas perverted. Of the funeral of Uncas, the narrator says, rather coldly, Chingachgook "had not yet spoken, and something consolatory and instructive was expected from so renowned a chief, on an occasion of such interest" (349). And although the father is able to remind his listeners that the Manitto must have had need of so great a warrior as Uncas, this consolation pales beside his sense of desolation as the father becomes the inheritor of the son: "As for me, the son and

the father of Uncas, I am a 'blazed pine, in a clearing of the palefaces'" (349). The world that he inherits is a world of loneliness, made bearable only by his friend, Hawk-eye. House rightly points out that the "true death of the real Chingachgook" occurs here in Last of the Mohicans, presumably meaning that the spirit of the chief and warrior is crushed by the realization of this ultimate defeat, for which there is no consolation in this world.

If this world is dominated by white Christians, Chingachgook's refuge lies in the promise of an afterlife. For Elizabeth Temple he describes how "he will go to the country where his fathers have met. The game shall be plenty as the fish in the lakes. No woman shall cry for meat. No Mingo can ever come. The chase shall be for children, and all just red-men shall live together as brothers'" (403). This final removal surpasses a return to the golden age of the Delawares, before the arrival of the Dutch, that Chingachgook describes in the history he relates to Hawk-eye in Mohicans (31-33). It recalls and surpasses the vision Tamenund has of the rebirth of his people with the appearance of Uncas. The afterlife to which Chingachgook goes as warrior and hunter is an idealized reincarnation of the lost life. As Natty explains to the Rev. Mr. Grant, who is so concerned for Mohegan's lost soul, "'Lord! man, . . . he knows his ind is at hand as well as you or I, but, so far from thinking it a loss, he believes it to be a great gain'" (420).

The dramatic irony that dominates the death scene of Chingachgook as a result of his rejection of his Christian identity as Indian John and his reversion to his native tongue and convictions makes the Indian's death more poignant and distinguishes Chingachgook from the English-speaking Conanchet. While Chingachgook is still speaking in English, the old Indian describes the blissful vision of an afterlife with a look "that might be supposed to border on the inspiration of a prophet" (403). Yet the gulf between white and Indian cultures will not allow Elizabeth a sympathetic ear. Refusing to acknowledge the transformation in the Indian's appearance and in his expectations, she cries in horror, "'John! this is not the heaven of a Christian!'" (403). This disparity between the Indian and Christian heavens is exploited by Cooper with great irony when the Rev. Mr. Grant appears on the burning mountainside in time to witness Chingachgook's death. More accurately, he is there to preside over the death of John Mohegan, while Natty and young Oliver are there to witness the death of Chingachgook. The reverend's first remarks establish the ironic situation, when he declares, "'Oh! how consoling it is, to know that he has not rejected the offered mercy, in the hour of his strength and of worldly temptations! The offspring of a race of heathens, he has in truth been 'as a brand plucked from the burning''" (419). But when the reverend addresses Chingachgook directly, offering the church's formal prayers to

mark the moment, he meets only the Indian's "ghastly face" and vacant stare; it is at this moment that Chingachgook begins his own eulogy in his native language. The exchanges that follow, with Natty acting as go-between and interpreter, symbolize the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of Christian conversion of the Indian. The minister asks, "sings he the Redeemer's praise?" (420) when in fact Chingachgook sings his own praise, according to Indian custom. Hearing Natty's translation, the minister condemns "such self-righteousness" and asks, "what says he now? is he sensible of his lost state?" (420) Natty's rebuff of the minister in which he relates the "great gain" Chingachgook sees before him dramatizes the irony: the minister cannot see how "lost" Chingachgook has been as the humiliated John Mohegan. Natty, of course, sees the truth of his friend's regained dignity, while acknowledging the truth that the minister has "scripter gospels" (421) to support his fears for John's fate. Still, unlike Reverend Grant, Natty is willing to trust that Chingachgook is "to be judged by a righteous Judge" (423) and to see his friend's death, while a personal loss, as a triumph for the old chief. He is not troubled by Chingachgook's rejection of Christian consolation and his embracing of his native belief. Natty is willing to grant Chingachgook the dignity of dying as his own true self. While Hugh Blair believes that the minister who has spoken to his congregation from his own conviction will be successful in

inspiring good Christians, he also acknowledges that "he who would work on men's passions, or influence their practice, without first giving them just principles, and enlightening their minds, is no better than a mere declaimer" (304). I do not mean to question the faith of Reverend Grant, but merely to point out that Chingachgook cannot be saved by acknowledging or giving voice to doctrines which he does not in his heart accept.

The death of Chingachgook implies several key ideas with significant bearing upon the removal debate. Foremost, it suggests the futility of converting the Indians to Christianity, a practice that almost universally was believed a necessary basis for any future relationship between white America and the Indians. Chingachgook's vision of heaven, in which he is reunited with his people to resume the life of the hunt, reinforces the myth that Indians were nomadic hunters with no ties to the land. And the old chief's reversion to his native language and his refusal or inability to communicate with Rev. Grant dramatize the Indian's otherness, here with the implication that he can no longer belong to this world. His only recourse, as Hemingway would eventually discover and exploit, is to find and assert one's dignity at the moment one faces death.

Chingachgook embraces death without the fear of the Christian God that Elizabeth Temple invokes when she realizes, in horror, that the Indian is not contemplating a Christian

afterlife. She believes that he has gained by forsaking warfare for weaving baskets: "'since then, your people have disappeared, and in place of chasing your enemies, you have learned to fear God and to live in peace'" (401). He knows that the transformation she describes has been a simultaneous loss of land and of dignity. In the name of fearing God, he says, he has watched "'his English and his American Fathers burying their tomahawks in each other's brains'" and seen the land which the Delawares gave to Major Effingham taken: "'they tore it from him, as a scalp is torn from an enemy; and they that did it looked not behind them, to see whether he lived or died. Do such men live in peace, and fear the Great Spirit?'" (401). Clearly, for Chingachgook, the invocation that he fear the Christian God implies not only cowardice on his part but allies him with those who have most abused the rights of his people and of their friends. One cannot separate Christianity from the loss of land and hence from loss of dignity.

Chingachgook thus delivers his own funeral oration, but it is an Indian funeral. He appropriately eulogizes himself as warrior and wise leader, he protests not so much his own death as he protests the losses in land and honor for his people, yet he embraces the consolation of a utopian Indian afterlife. He embraces, above all, the reclamation of his dignity as the Sagamore Chingachgook, as he abandons the shameful Christian, John Mohegan.



## Conanchet

Cooper tempers the Indian's rejection of the white man's religion when he develops the character of Conanchet in The Wept of Wish-Ton-Wish (1829). In this narrative of the clashes between an isolated Puritan settlement led by the Heathcote family and the Narragansetts and Wampanoags, Cooper shifts his focus from an exclusive concern with the captivity of white women among Indians to include the captivity of a young Indian boy among white settlers and its consequences. Nevertheless, this pattern of the captivity narrative is the engine for the plot. It is the means by which Puritans and Indians are brought together and allowed to ask and contemplate whether or not the two races can coexist, but with Cooper more so than with Sedgwick or Child, asking that question leads to questions about the existence of a design in nature and the rightful occupation of the land. As with The Pioneers and The Last of the Mohicans, Wish-Ton-Wish broods over a funerary atmosphere born of the conflict between the worlds of red and white, and, as with those earlier novels, it builds toward a climactic funeral for those whose way of life is not to represent the future of this American continent.

Conanchet's rhetoric follows the same funeral oration pattern as Chingachgook's, reflecting an acceptance of nature's design and of the will of its Manitou, a lament for the losses of his Narragansett people, and finally the consolation of his removal to an afterlife. With Conanchet,

however, Cooper creates an Indian character who, from his youth, perhaps because of his youth, is more receptive to the influence of the white settlers' faith.

Even when he is a stripling of fifteen, Conanchet realizes that his world is threatened by the white Europeans establishing new homes in the wilderness. When Content Heathcote -- ignoring that the Heathcotes are holding the young son of Miantonimoh captive -- asks the boy, "what have the people of my race done, that thy warriors should seek their blood to this extremity?" (151), Conanchet replies with a question of his own, "See! this world is very wide. There is room on it for the panther and the deer. Why have the Yengeese and the red men met?" (151) The boy's response anticipates the words of Metacom in the second half of the novel, but without the bitter hatred that imbues the Wampanoag's query: "why hath the Great Spirit made thy race like hungry wolves? . . . Tell me, why is the mind of a Yengeese so big, that it must hold all that lies between the rising and the setting sun?" (305) The Indians, of course, see the white invasion as a sign of greed and an intent to destroy the red man.

Cooper allows the Puritans to answer these protests, however. Although the narrator clearly has little sympathy for the strident, vengeful attitudes of the aptly named Meek Wolfe, the scene in which young Ruth Heathcote asks her mother why the Indians are attacking the settlement allows for a more

sympathetic treatment. The genuine faith of the mother and her vulnerability at this moment of siege give her explanation added moral authority. To the child's question, "'Have we ever done evil to them?'" the mother replies, "'I may not say. He that hath made the earth, hath given it to us for our uses, and reason would seem to teach that if portions of its surface are vacant, he that needeth truly, may occupy'" (154). The argument is familiar: the land was "empty" and unused, i.e. unimproved. The child reiterates this point with her simple statement, "'Surely, we are here rightfully. I have heard my father say that when the Lord made me a present to his arms, our valley was a tangled forest, and that much toil only has made it as it is'" (154). Interestingly, however, when the child then asks, "'Have [the Indians], too, valleys like this, and do the Christians break into them to shed blood in the night?'" the elder Ruth does not answer the question. Instead, she says, "'They are of wild and fierce habits, Ruth, and little do they know of our manner of life'" (154). The child is satisfied with her mother's response, but her question anticipates the massacre of the Narragansett village and the death of Conanchet's father, Miantonimoh. Later in the novel, when Content Heathcote answers the same question, the charge "'of coveting [the Indians'] lands, and of bearing minds filled with the corruption of riches,'" he tells his Indian audience,

"This earth is [God's] footstool; yonder heaven his throne! I pretend not to enter into his sacred mysteries, or to proclaim the reason why one half of his fair work hath been so long left in that slough of ignorance and heathenish abomination in which my fathers found it; why these hills never before echoed the songs of praise, or why the valleys have been so long mute. These are truths hid in the secret designs of his sacred purpose, and they may not be known until the last fulfillment. But a great and righteous spirit hath led hither men, filled with the love of truth and pregnant with the designs of a heavily-burdened faith." (307)

The sincerity of the Heathcotes, of course, is contrasted with the religious zealotry of Meek Wolfe, for which Grossman's comment that "The sheer good conscience of these people, their certainty that their own self-interest is the divine will, are terrifying" (69) seems particularly apt. The white man's appeal to Providential design in nature is shared by the Indians, who place their faith in the workings of the Manitou. For Conanchet, the teachings of his people about the Manitou and the teachings of the whites about their God create a tension that Kay Seymour House describes as the young warrior's tragic confusion (248).

Like Chingachgook, Conanchet believes in a presiding spirit that orders nature and the affairs of human beings. In a long speech that is the prelude to his funeral oration, he describes to his white wife the divisions that pervade nature as a sign of order but also of an intent to keep nature's creatures bound to their prescribed niche:

"The Spirit that made the earth. . . is very cunning. He has known where to put the hemlock, and where the oak

should grow. He has left the moose and the deer to the Indian hunter, and he has given the horse and the ox to a pale-face. Each tribe hath its hunting-grounds and its game. The Narragansetts know the taste of a clam, while the Mohawks eat the berries of the mountains." (395)

The purpose of this speech is to extrapolate this wisdom for his own family: "'Conanchet is a tall and straight hemlock,'" he tells his wife, "'and the father of Narra-mattah [Ruth] is a tree of the clearing, that bears the red fruit. The Great Spirit was angry when they grew together'" (395). Grossman notes that the death of Conanchet which follows "is only in part the unjust historical dooming of the Indian by the white man; he has been doomed as well by the author for violating one of his taboos" (70). Within the story, however, Conanchet's very faith in nature's order reinforces his fatalism, for he has seen his people destroyed and finds his family on the brink of destruction. An "expression of bitter melancholy" (395) overwhelms him as he contemplates the apparent intent of the Manitou to allow the whites to triumph. Ironically, as House has pointed out, while Conanchet "assents intellectually to the idea that the two races are forever opposed," at the same time "the racial polarities he surrenders to are denied by his experience" (248-49). What brings him to this acceptance, however, aside from Cooper's need to reinforce the taboo about miscegenation, is not an intellectual process but an emotional response.

Conanchet is awed by the conduct of the white settlers in defeat; he is the only Indian who listens to the words of Content Heathcote after the successful raid on the settlement, who declares "'The God of an Englishman is the God of men of all ranks, and of all time'" (307). While the other Indians, particularly Metacom, ignore this pronouncement, Conanchet's "eye never varied its direction while the other spoke, each word appearing to enter deep within the recesses of his mind" (307). When Content declares, "'In defiance of these signs of blasphemy, do I still proclaim the power of him I worship," (307) only Conanchet is moved. That the whites could suffer such a defeat and still proclaim faith in "'the secret designs of his sacred purpose'" (307) impresses the young Indian with the power of the white man's God despite the appearance of His powerlessness. Part of the reason for the Indian's respectful attitude is revealed a few pages later when Conanchet confesses to Metacom that the white people who stand before them were burned alive in the earlier attack on the settlement. This fear of the white man's God leads him to ask Metacom, when the Wampanoag suggests scalping the settlers, "'I like your counsel -- it is full of wisdom. Yet an Indian is but a man! Can he fight with the God of the Yengeese? He is too weak. An Indian is but a man, though his skin be red!'" (313) Later, when Conanchet has decided that his marriage to Narra-mattah is wrong, he explains to her by invoking the power of the whites' God:

"The Great Spirit of thy fathers is angry, that thou livest in the lodge of a Narragansett. His sight is too cunning to be cheated. He knows that the moccasin, and the wampum, and the robe of fur are liars; he sees the color of the skin beneath" (328).

Conanchet's fear hearkens back to Elizabeth Temple's words to Chingachgook when she hears him recalling his glorious days as a warrior: "Those times have gone by, old warrior; . . . since then, you people have disappeared, and in place of chasing your enemies, you have learned to fear God and to live at peace" (401). Fearing the white man's God and determining to live in peace certainly describe Conanchet far more than they do Chingachgook.

Like Chingachgook, Conanchet faces his death with a minister of the whites in attendance. Like Chingachgook, he is urged to accept "Christian charity" (398) at his moment of judgment. But Conanchet does not have a Natty Bumppo to act as mediator and translator, nor does he need him. When Meek Wolfe begins to threaten the Indian with visions of a suffering afterlife, Conanchet responds simply, "My father forgets that the skin of his son is red. The path to the happy hunting-grounds of just Indians lies before him" (399). Like Chingachgook, Conanchet finds consolation for his loss in the vision of an afterlife that, rather than being prescribed by the white man, affirms his identity as an Indian and constitutes a removal from this land of loss to a land where he is reunited with his people and restored to a position of

dignity. To Wolfe, of course, the Indian's words are vehicles of Satan, Conanchet himself an "idolatrous and idle-minded infant in the form of adult man!" (399). But while Chingachgook's death-scene is a clear rejection of Christian consolation, Conanchet's is more ambivalent. If Chingachgook rejects Christian consolation outright, Conanchet acknowledges its possible truth, telling Narra-mattah, "'A just and great chief cannot shut his ear to the Good Spirit of his people. Mine calls his son to hunt among the braves that have gone on the long path. Thine points another way. Go, hear his voice and obey'" (402). His rhetoric then surprisingly reduces him at this moment of stoic triumph to a helpless infant: "'They say that one just man died for all colors. I know not. Conanchet is a child among the cunning'" (402). Acknowledging that there may indeed be only one heaven, as the whites say, Conanchet tells his wife, "'If this be true, he will look for his woman and boy in the happy hunting-grounds, and they will come to him'" (402-03). Still, the overriding impression given by this climactic death scene is one of separate-but-equal heavens.'

The Wept of Wish-Ton-Wish was published on the eve of the debate in Congress over the Indian Removal Act. Although set in colonial America, its theme of racial separation and the triumph of intolerance adds a poignant voice to the discussion of the Indian question among the American people. The voice of the narrator and the voices of the Indians agree that the



American people were acting out the final scenes of a tragedy whose outcome, in retrospect, like that of a Sophoclean myth, was governed by an irresistible fate. As Pearce puts it, Cooper was reflecting the American understanding of their relationship to the Indian. He was "taking [the Indians] as his culture gave them to him. And he was to give them back to his culture imaged so powerfully that they could never be rejected, yet imaged so powerfully that no one could doubt that they had to be destroyed" (201). I have focused on the funerary aspects of his novels of the 1820s in order to demonstrate how that destruction is presented as a formal act of mourning but also as a necessary part of the natural growth of the nation, a necessity acknowledged by the voices of Chingachgook and Conanchet. If the Indians find consolation only in their removal to an afterlife that recaptures the world their people knew before the coming of the white man, the white readers of Cooper find consolation for the tragedy in the assurance that the loss of these people is but a part of the greater gain for America as the Providential design unfolds.

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> The passage continues:

and perhaps there are no peasants in the world, who require a greater indulgence of their personal comforts than the people of colour in the Northern and middle States of this Union. In this respect they are like the menials of most other nations, having acquired from their masters a reflected taste for luxury. But it is well known, that cold is not congenial to the physical temperament of a black. The free blacks are found hovering as near as possible to the Slave States, because the climate of the south is what they crave. Thus, in Pennsylvania, they increase, while in New-York they decrease. . . . But on the whole I think it must be assumed as a fact for our future reasoning, that the free blacks rather decrease than otherwise (always excepting the effects of manumission); and it is well known, that the whole white population grows rather faster than the whole black. (242-43)

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, Niles Register for November 14, 1818; January 30, 1819; October 21, 1820; June 8, 1822; May 1, 1824; July 9, 1825; March 14, 1829. See also "Civilization and Conversion of the Indians," North American Review 28 (April 1829): 354-68.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, Niles Register for November 14, 1818; January 30, 1819; April 29, 1820; October 21, 1820; May 25, 1822; June 8, 1822; May 1, 1824; October 15, 1825; March 14, 1829.

<sup>4</sup> Cooper relates the Indian's refusal to cultivate the land to the right of possession when he has Corny Littlepage reflect upon the whites' conception of land ownership in Satanstoe (1845). Corny insists, however, that the Indians be compensated for their relinquished lands:

We white people can very well understand that a humane government, which professes, on the principles recognised by civilized nations, to have jurisdiction over certain extensive territories that lie in the virgin forest, and which are used only, and that occasionally, by certain savage tribes as hunting grounds, should deem it right to satisfy those tribes, by purchase, before they parcelled out their lands for the purposes of civilized life. . . . we have the power to grant these lands without "extinguishing the Indian title," as it is termed, but it presents difficulties to the understandings of those who are not accustomed to see society surrounded by the multifarious interests of civilization. In point of fact, the Indian purchases give no other title under our laws, than the right to sue out, in council, a claim to acquire by the grant of the Crown. . . . (348)

<sup>5</sup> A clear statement of Cooper's conviction is found in the 1848 preface to The Oak Openings:

For ourselves, we firmly believe that the finger of Providence is pointing the way to all races, and colors, and nations, along the path that is to lead the East and the West alike to the goal of human wants. Demons infest that path, and numerous and unhappy are the wanderings of millions who stray from its course . . . . Nevertheless, the main course is onward; and the day, in the sense of time, is not distant, when the whole earth is to be filled with the knowledge of the Lord. . . . One of the great stumbling-blocks with a large class of well-meaning, but narrow-judging moralists, are the seeming wrongs that are permitted by Providence, in its control of human events. . . . [Yet] Good appears to arise out of evil, and the inscrutable ways of Providence are vindicated by general results, rather than by instances of particular care.

The words of the preface are then echoed in the text where the narrator pauses to explain the limitations of Scalping Peter:

Peter is not to be judged too harshly. It is always respectable to defend the fireside and the land of one's nativity, although the cause connected with it may be sometimes wrong. This Indian knew nothing of the principles of colonization, and had no conception that

any other than its original owners -- original so far as his traditions reached -- could have a right to his own hunting-grounds. Of the slow but certain steps by which an overruling Providence is extending a knowledge of the true God, and of the great atonement through the death of his blessed Son, Peter had no conception; nor would it probably have seemed right to his contracted mind, had he even seen and understood this general tendency of things. To him, the pale-face appeared only as a rapacious invader, and not a creature obeying the great law of his destiny, the end of which is doubtless to help knowledge abound, until it shall "cover the whole earth as the waters cover the sea." (200)

<sup>6</sup> For discussion of the thematic significance of the ubi sunt formula, see House (278) and Darnell.

<sup>7</sup> Chingachgook's rejection of Christianity and Conanchet's acknowledgment of its possible truth should be contrasted with Cooper's Onoah/Scalping Peter in The Oak Openings (1848). Peter's conversion to Christianity and his denunciation of every vestige of Indian life and culture end the novel on such a note of smug absolutism that one appreciates the dignified embracing of their Indian identity by Chingachgook and Conanchet all the more. Peter's speech, one presumes, is supposed to sound like the glorious thanksgiving of one saved from damnation, but it sounds more like an Indian traitor celebrating the end of his own people: "When he got de force of de Holy Spirit, de heart of stone is changed to de heart of woman, and we all be ready to bless our enemy and die. I have spoken. Let dem dat read your book understand'" (476). The destruction of the Indians by the

whites thus becomes, from the Indian point of view, an act of Christian emulation and sacrifice.

## CHAPTER VI

## "I AM NOT A BEAST":

## INDIAN VOICES AND THE ISSUES OF THE REMOVAL DEBATE

"I am inclined to think, after all that has been said of the aborigines, after all that has been written in narratives, professedly to elucidate the leading traits of their character, that the public knows little of that character," (77) the Cherokee Elias Boudinot told a Philadelphia audience in May of 1826.<sup>1</sup> Boudinot was on a speaking tour of major U.S. cities designed to solicit funds to help the Cherokees establish a printing press (with both English and Cherokee characters), as well as to found a national Cherokee academy. In Philadelphia, Boudinot arranged to have his An Address to the Whites published so that his appeals might reach a broader audience; it was this publication that so confounded the North American Review critic and caused him to exclaim, "Our readers will agree with us, we believe, that these particulars savor a little of the marvellous, especially when considered as uttered by the voice of an Indian" [NAR 23 (October 1826): 474].

The confounding "particulars" of Boudinot's Address and of other Indian voices directed to a white audience during the debate that led to the Removal Act of 1830 are the focus of

this chapter. By comparing the rhetoric of the Indians with that of the white writers of the day, I want to show how the Indians were obligated to respond to the issues and terms as defined by the whites: specifically, the Indian's right to speak, the possibility of Indian/white coexistence, and the possibility of converting Indians to Christian farmers. Boudinot's Address and William Apess's autobiography, A Son of the Forest, published in 1829, and Eulogy on King Philip (1836) are necessarily my primary concern because each speaker was consciously seeking to redefine his audience's concept of the Indian and simultaneously to argue for and represent the Indian's potential for a civilized coexistence with white Americans. I also, however, want to draw upon Boudinot's editorials in the Cherokee Phoenix and upon Indian speeches reported in Niles' Weekly Register.

#### Boudinot and the Need to Educate White America

Boudinot begins his address mindful of the conventional dichotomy between the white man's Word and the Indian's Yell. He must, in other words, first overcome his audience's resistance to his ability as well as his right to speak to a civilized gathering, a rhetorical situation that savors "a little of the marvellous." Acknowledging that

Some there are, perhaps even in this enlightened assembly, who at the bare sight of an Indian, or at the mention of the name, would throw back their imaginations to ancient times, to the ravages of savage warfare, to the yells pronounced over the mangled bodies of women and children, (Address 68-69)

Boudinot counters the bloody connotations of the savage yell by suggesting that such imagery has no place in the 1820s. Rather, these fears, "originating as they frequently do, from infant prejudices. . . do great injustice to many of this race of beings" (Address 68). The "Indian problem" as Boudinot defines it is attributable in large part to whites "who are unacquainted with the manners, habits, and improvements of the Aborigines of this country," (Address 68) and this lack of understanding prevents the Indian's voice from being heard. With this optimistic assumption -- that a better white understanding of the Indian will lead to better relations -- Boudinot presents himself as an advocate: "I now stand before you delegated by my native country to seek her interest, to labour for her respectability, and by my public efforts to assist in raising her to an equal standing with other nations of the earth" (Address 69).

To that end, Boudinot is specifically seeking funds for a Cherokee printing press and an academy, both means by which God's Word will fill the Cherokee people. In a rhetorical flourish that anticipates Content Heathcote's hymns-in-the-valley image from The Wept of Wish-Ton-Wish, Boudinot declares, appropriating Isaiah 35:1, "The shrill sound of the Savage yell shall die away as the roaring of far distant thunder; and the Heaven wrought music will gladden the affrighted wilderness" (Address 74). The new Cherokee alphabet and the translation of the New Testament into



Cherokee have "swept away that barrier which has long existed, and opened a spacious channel for the instruction of adult Cherokees" in "the precepts of the Almighty" (Address 74).

Speaking as a Christian to an audience of Christians, Boudinot makes the need for a printing press a fulfillment of God's plan to fill the wilderness with knowledge of His power. The speaker here is thus skillfully linking the audience's new knowledge of the Indian's potential for leading a civilized life with the Indians' greater knowledge of God's Word. He affirms his right to speak as an equal of those in his audience and asks the audience to share in recognizing the equality of the Indian people: "What is an Indian? Is he not formed of the same materials with yourself? For 'of one blood God created all the nations that dwell on the face of the earth'" (Address 69). This strategy suggests a more secular purpose for the Cherokee printing press; doubtless it would be used to spread the Christian God's Word, but it would also represent the means by which the Indian's voice could be heard on issues affecting Indian society, "the feelings, disposition, improvements, and prospects of the Indians" (Address 76).

What that voice might say is also hinted at in Boudinot's Address. In the most forceful terms, Boudinot argues for the kind of peaceful coexistence of Cherokees and white Americans that the novelists and poets of the day consider impossible. As an advocate of an alternative history, one that includes a

future for the Indians, the Cherokee asks his audience to consider the real possibility that his nation will "arrive at that state of advancement, when I trust they will be admitted into all the privileges of the American family" (Address 75). Before he can make his audience entertain that possibility, however, Boudinot realizes that he must overcome white ignorance about their Indian neighbors. Foremost, he must make his audience see that its knowledge is based upon histories written by whites, histories that fail to include the conflicts and suffering from the Indians' point of view: "here let me say, that however guilty these unhappy [Indian] nations may have been, yet many and unreasonable were the wrongs they suffered, many the hardships they endured, and many their wanderings through the trackless wilderness" (Address 70). He even anticipates what the fictional Magawisca calls "a new version of an old story" when he considers how the struggles of chiefs like Metacom will one day, in Washington Irving's words, "be dwelt upon with applause and sympathy when prejudice shall have passed away" (Address 70). If the audience's knowledge of the past is colored by the prejudices of white historians, so too is its knowledge of the present, he argues, a dangerous gulf that threatens the future of his people. The Cherokee nation has advanced toward civilization, he says, despite this ignorance and prejudice, and he cites the growth from the 1810 census to the 1824 census to illustrate the boom in livestock, mills,

blacksmith shops, schools, ferries, and public roads.<sup>2</sup> Boudinot then speculates that the Cherokee Nation "will finally become. . . one of the Garden spots of America," adding the "fond wish, that she may thus become under those who now possess her; and ever be fostered, regulated and protected by the generous government of the United States" (Address 71). The exact nature of this future political relationship is not clear, but Theda Purdue notes that Boudinot "did not mean assimilation. He believed that when the Cherokee government had reached a certain level of sophistication, the Cherokee people as a distinct political entity could enjoy the rights and privileges of other Americans" (Address 81). The Cherokee Nation would thus become "a faithful ally of the United States" in peace and in war (Address 77). Yet Boudinot is clearly aware of the fragility of this vision of coexistence. The Cherokee Nation offers a test case to the people of the United States, one that challenges the American people to extend their ideals to those they have the power to conquer:

She pleads for this assistance. . . because on her destiny hangs that of many nations. If she complete her civilization-- then may we hope that all our nations will --then, indeed, may true patriots be encouraged in their efforts to make this world of the West, one continuous abode of enlightened, free and happy people. (Address 78)

Boudinot's vision, based upon his knowledge of the advances the Cherokees had already made and based upon the established

relationship of autonomous coexistence between the Cherokees and the United States, assumes that the Indians will be included in the general development and progress of North America.<sup>3</sup>

This is not to suggest that Boudinot was naively unaware of the popular rhetoric of doom that foresaw the extinction of the Indian. He is bitterly aware of the myth of the Vanishing American and the argument that Providential design dictated oblivion for the Indians. His rhetorical strategy, however, is to acknowledge Providence while insisting that his people have a role to play in the design -- a role of renewal and vitality. Instead of the Vanishing American, Boudinot argues that the Cherokees have the phoenix's potential for rebirth: "It needs not the power of argument on the nature of man," he says, "to silence forever the remark that 'it is the purpose of the Almighty that the Indians should be exterminated.'" The fallaciousness of that argument is demonstrated by what the world should be able to see: "what we have done in the few last years" and therefore "to foresee what yet we may do with the assistance of our white brethren, and that of the common Parent of us all" (Address 70). Boudinot himself, of course, stands before the audience as proof of the Indian's potential. Though he was born in a "lonely cabin" and reared in "a language unknown to learned and polished nations," he declares, "I am not as my fathers were -- broader means and nobler influences have fallen upon me" (Address 69). While

Boudinot does not present himself as a typical Cherokee in his learning or sophistication, he does insist that his fellow Cherokees are civilized and becoming civilized according to other white criteria, that they are "rapidly improving in all those particulars which must finally constitute the inhabitants an industrious and intelligent people" (Address 72).

The two most crucial tests are those assumed by Cooper and others to be unattainable -- that the Indian will become a Christian and a farmer. One typical explanation for the disappearance of the Indians was that the white settlements depleted the supply of game upon which the "children of the forest" depended;<sup>4</sup> Boudinot admits that "Game has. . . become so scarce that little dependence for subsistence can be placed upon it," but the result, he argues, is not the disappearance of the Indians but rather their conversion from hunters to farmers: "In fact, there is not a single family in the nation, that can be said to subsist on the slender support which the wilderness would afford." Indians still enjoy hunting, he acknowledges, but no more so "than among all frontier people, whether white or red" (Address 72). In an editorial for April 21, 1830, responding to depictions on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives of the Cherokees as starving and helpless hunters, Boudinot lashes out:

Whoever really believes that the Cherokees subsist on game, is most wretchedly deceived, and is grossly

ignorant of existing facts. The Cherokees do not live upon the chase, but upon the fruits of the earth produced by their labor. We should like to see any person point to a single family in this nation who obtain their clothing and provisions by hunting. We know of no one. (Phoenix 114)

He then explicitly addresses the myth that Cooper endorses in Notions of the Americans and through the elderly Susquesus:

The maxim of our enemies, "that an Indian cannot work," the [House] committee suppose "well established," and it would most certainly be well established if they could but prove their naked assertions. We know of many Indians who not only work, but work hard. Who labors for the Cherokee and builds his house, clears his farm, makes his fences, attends to his hogs, cattle and horses; who raises his corn, his cotton and manufactures his clothing? Can the committee tell? Yes, they have an answer at hand. He has no house, no farm, no hogs, cattle, no corn to save him from starvation, and clothing to cover him from nakedness. (Phoenix 115)

One can hear the frustration and anger Boudinot feels at those who are willing to accept as fact what he knows to be a distortion of reality. The myth of the "intractable Indian" appears too entrenched to allow for the possibility of a nation of Cherokee farmers.

Given the setting for Boudinot's Address and his appeal for support for a printing press to spread God's Word, his primary concern obviously is to convince his audience of the successful conversion of Cherokees to Christianity. "In many places the word of God is regularly preached and explained, both by missionaries and natives," Boudinot says; "there are numbers who have publicly professed their belief and interest

in the merits of the great Saviour of the world" (Address 73). Those numbers, according to Theda Purdue, were actually no more than seven percent of the Cherokee population (Address 80), yet Boudinot declares that "the true state and prospects of the Cherokees" would reveal "that the means which have been employed for the christianization and civilization of this tribe, have been greatly blessed" (Address 75). The printing press, he insists, will guarantee the continued success of conversion. Drawing upon the imagery of the phoenix, with its Christian parallels, Boudinot foresees a Cherokee nation rising out of the darkness of savagery:

Yes, methinks I can view my native country, rising from the ashes of her degradation, wearing her purified and beautiful garments, and taking her seat with the nations of the earth. I can behold her sons bursting the fetters of ignorance and unshackling her from the vices of heathenism. She is at this instant, risen like the first morning sun, which grows brighter and brighter, until it reaches its fulness of glory. (Address 77)

Reversing the common assumption about the "untutored savage" who can never be civilized, Boudinot argues not only for the glorious potential of the Cherokees but also that whites who cling to the notion of Providential genocide are either "those who are uninformed with respect to us, who are strongly prejudiced against us, or who are filled with vindictive feelings towards us" (Address 69). Far from dying out, the Cherokee population is increasing, Boudinot claims, citing the census figures from 1810 and 1824. Those who claim

that the nation is headed for extinction, he says, are like those members of Congress who prefer myth to quantifiable fact.

In the closing moments of the Address, however, Boudinot himself, surprisingly, employs the rhetoric of the Vanishing American, so that the end of his presentation sounds quite similar to the funeral orations of fictional Indians like Cooper's Chingachgook and Conanchet. First, he echoes the rhetoric of natural decline: "There is, in Indian history, something very melancholy, and which seems to establish a mournful precedent for the future events of the few sons of the forest, now scattered over this vast continent." As though recalling Chingachgook's image of the Delewares as melting snow, Boudinot says, "We have seen every where the poor aborigines melt away before the white population" (Address 79). He even achieves the same effect that Cooper achieves when he reduces the Indian population to a few fragments: "We have seen, I say, one family after another, one tribe after another, nation after nation, pass away; until only a few solitary creatures are left to tell the sad story of extinction" (Address 79).

This rather sudden reversal is no doubt intended to convince the audience of the immediacy of the need he has described, but it has the effect of undermining all of his optimistic visions for the Cherokees' future. Instead of the imagery of promise symbolized by the phoenix, he closes with



the rhetoric of victimization: "shall they be swept from the earth? . . . . Must they all, like the unfortunate Creeks, . . . go down in sorrow to their grave?" (Address 79). Rather than a proud people seeking equality and coexistence, his final image is a supplicant grovelling before its superior: "They hang upon your mercy as to a garment. Will you push them from you, or will you save them? Let humanity answer" (Address 79). Even the editorial in the Cherokee Phoenix for May 15, 1830, which takes a much more defiant stand, compromises that strength. On the one hand, Boudinot writes,

We will no more beg, pray and implore; but we will demand justice, and before we give up and allow ourselves to despondency we will, if we can, have the solemn adjudication of a tribunal [the Supreme Court], whose province is to interpret the treaties, the supreme law of the land. Let us then be firm and united. (Phoenix 118)

Yet he also sounds this elegiac note: "let both Houses of Congress decide as they may, we confidently think justice will be done, even if the Cherokees are not in the land of the living to receive it -- posterity will give a correct verdict" (Phoenix 118). Such an assurance must have been small comfort to a people facing the loss of their homes and exile to an unknown territory.

#### Apress and the Revision of History

William Apress, among the Indian writers of this period, is the one most likely to, as his most recent editor comments, "induce historical vertigo" (O'Connell xix). A Pequot and an

ordained Methodist minister, Apess wrote a number of works in the 1820s and 30s, including his own autobiography, A Son of the Forest, that insist upon a white audience's hearing the history of its relations with the Indians from the Indian point of view. He specifically, in Barry O'Connell's words, "seeks most to expose to whites the way they have melded Christian language and ideas into an ideology of righteous subjugation and outright racial extinction" (lxix). Apess's tone of indignation resembles that of Sedgwick's fictional Magawisca, as he ridicules the perversion of Christianity represented by the original European settlers -- and their descendants, "who are in possession of his soil, and only by the right of conquest" (Eulogy 277): "How they could go to work to enslave a free people and call it religion is beyond the power of my imagination and outstrips the revelation of God's word" (Eulogy 279). He then addresses a white audience, both past and present:

as the seed of iniquity and prejudice were sown in that day, so it still remains; and there is a deep-rooted popular opinion in the hearts of many that Indians were made, etc., on purpose for destruction, to be driven out by white Christians, and they to take their places; and that God had decreed it from all eternity. (Eulogy 287)

In these opening remarks, Apess, like Boudinot, asks his audience to consider Indians as creatures formed by the same God they worship: Apess's purpose is "to bring before you beings made by the God of Nature, and in whose hearts and

heads he has planted sympathies that shall live forever in the memory of the world" (277). He wants the audience to

"understand the purposes of good better than they do: that the favor of the Almighty was good and holy, and all his nobler works were made to adorn his image, by being his grateful servants and admiring each other as angels, and not, as they say, to drive and devour each other." (Eulogy 287)

The speaker then confronts white prejudice directly and declares his right to speak: "My image is of God; I am not a beast" (Eulogy 278).

By asserting his right to express the Indians' point of view, Apess asks the whites to consider the interpretive nature of their own histories. He does so by coalescing accounts of settlement, such as the Pilgrim landing at Plymouth, where

without asking liberty from anyone they possessed themselves of a portion of the country, and built themselves houses, and then made a treaty, and commanded [the Indians] to accede to it. . . . And yet the Indians (though many were dissatisfied), without the shedding of blood or imprisoning anyone, bore it. And yet for their kindness and resignation toward the whites, they were called savages and made by God on purpose for them to destroy. (Eulogy 280-81)

Then, with biting poignancy, Apess adds, "We might say, God understood his work better than this" (Eulogy 281). Apess thus succinctly tries to undermine the white presumption of interpreting on behalf of the Almighty. He follows the same strategy when he confronts the issue of forced removal of the

Indians and the argument that Indians had to be removed from white influence before they could become good Christians. Again, he defers to the omniscience of God:

Why, my brethren, the poor missionaries want money to go and convert the poor heathen, as if God could not convert them where they were but must first drive them out. If God wants the red men converted, we should think that he could do it as well in one place as in another."  
(Eulogy 287)

Aware of the difficulty of resurrecting a figure like Philip, to whom whites attached such savage connotations, Apess follows the story of Pilgrim abuses of the Indians with others of violated treaties, of Indians taken captive and murdered, of Indian graves robbed and crops destroyed, asking repeatedly, "who, my dear sirs, were wanting of the name of savages -- whites, or Indians? Let justice answer" (Eulogy 283).

His purpose in presenting such a litany of abuses is to allow the audience to see Philip through history, as he would have understood it. Seen in this light, Apess argues, Philip deserves the same honor as the whites accord Washington: "such is the immortal Philip honored, as held in memory by the degraded but yet grateful descendants who appreciate his character," for he "died a martyr to his cause, though unsuccessful, yet as glorious as the American Revolution" (277).

If Apess forces his audience to reconsider the history of New England colonization from the Indians' point of view in the Eulogy, in A Son of the Forest he presents his personal history; however, while this book is an intensely personal account of his conversion to Christianity, his failings and temptations, and his rise to ordination as a Methodist minister, Apess never allows the reader to forget that the writer's story is inseparable from that of his people. Taken from an abusive household in which his intoxicated grandparents regularly beat him and his sister, indentured to a series of white families, some of whom encouraged his education and Christian conversion, Apess moved within two worlds. He became intimately familiar with white culture, from the rural life of a cooper's family, to military service during the War of 1812, to the temptations of "finery and show" in towns like New London, New Haven, and Hartford (Son 16). So much was the young Apess caught up in the white world, that he actually became not only alienated from his Indian people but fearful of them. He confesses that his white masters had only to utter "a mere threat" of his "being sent away among the Indians into the dreary woods" in order to put an end to any misbehavior (Son 10); the young boy associated terror with his fellow Indians, "occasioned by the many stories I had heard of their cruelty toward the whites -- how they were in the habit of killing and scalping men, women, and children" (Son 11). At the same time that he sympathized

with white attitudes and habits, however, he was never allowed to forget his Otherness. The turmoil he experienced over what constituted his proper world is evident in his youthful brooding over the word Indian:

I know of nothing so trying to a child as to be repeatedly called by an improper name. I thought it disgraceful to be called an Indian; it was considered as a slur upon an oppressed and scattered nation, and I have often been led to inquire where the whites received this word, which they so often threw as an opprobrious epithet at the sons of the forest. I could not find it in the Bible and therefore concluded that it was a word imported for the special purpose of degrading us. (Son 10)

The sting of drawing one's identity from a racial epithet is pervasive in this narrative; although he says he prefers the term native, and he, ironically, adopts the white man's trite phrase for his own title, the mature Apess both acknowledges his Indian-ness and his belonging to the larger Christian family. Apess is descended from King Philip through his grandmother, he admits, yet, despite his royal blood, he declares, "We are in fact but one family; we are all the descendants of one great progenitor -- Adam. I would not boast of my extraction, as I consider myself nothing more than a worm of the earth" (Son 4). This insistence upon an identity shared with white America is a recurring theme in the autobiography -- that Christianity, at least protestant fundamentalist Christianity, is ultimately democratic.

Recalling his conversion at age fifteen, Apess writes of his overwhelming sense of inclusion: "I felt convinced that

Christ died for all mankind -- that age, sect, color, country, or situation made no difference. I felt an assurance that I was included in the plan of redemption with all my brethren" (Son 19). This message that other "untutored sons of the forest" will also embrace Christianity is clearly one of the intended messages for the white reader: "the natives are on the whole willing to receive the Gospel," he says, "and of late, through the instrumentality of pious missionaries, much good has been done" (Son 33). The problem with converting the natives, he insists, is not with their incapacity for comprehending Christian doctrine but with the natives' attempts at squaring Christian doctrine with white behavior:

How much better would it be if the whites would act like a civilized people and, instead of giving my brethren of the woods "rum!" in exchange for their furs, give them food and clothing for themselves and children. If this course were pursued, I believe that God would bless both the whites and natives threefold. (Son 33)

Furthermore, when whites "allege that they have tried the experiment [of improving the natives] and failed" (Son 33), they are ignoring, deliberately, reports that indicate that "The forests of Canada and the West are vocal with the praises of God" as the natives are "flocking to the standard of Emmanuel" (Son 34). If Apess's rhetoric here is hyperbolic, he would no doubt counter that the white verdict of failure at improving the natives was a greater distortion of the truth.

Behind that willingness to declare the intractability of the natives lies the issue of rights to the land:

No doubt there are many good people in the United States who would not trample upon the rights of the poor, but there are many others who are willing to roll in their coaches upon the tears and blood of the poor and unoffending natives -- those who are ready at all times to speculate on the Indians and defraud them out of their rightful possessions. Let the poor Indian attempt to resist the encroachments of his white neighbors, what a hue and cry is instantly raised against him. It has been considered as a trifling thing for the whites to make war on the Indians for the purpose of driving them from their country and taking possession thereof. (Son 31)

Yet, despite the grounds for enmity and the bitterness over the prejudice which has filled his life, Apess's narrative demonstrates the healing power of Christian conversion that allows him to say, "The works of God praised him, and I saw him in everything that he made. My love now embraced the whole human family" (Son 21). He concludes his work with a similar image of the equality within God's creation and an exhortation of his white audience to embrace his vision:

I can truly say that the spirit of prejudice is no longer an inmate of my bosom; the sun of consolation has warmed my heart, and by the grace of God assisting me, I am determined to sound the trump of the Gospel -- to call upon men to turn and live. Look, brethren, at the natives of the forest -- they come, notwithstanding you call them "savage," from the "east and from the west, the north and the south," and will occupy seats in the kingdom of heaven before you. (Son 51)

Both Elias Boudinot and William Apess represent Indian voices that sought to speak to white America first of all as



fellow Christians, with the hope that their conversion would represent a similar potential in their Indian brethren and, therefore, the possibility that all could one day, in Boudinot's words, "be admitted into all the privileges of the American family" (Address 75). Able to read, write, and speak the white man's language, and having been educated by whites, they enjoyed a rhetorical advantage that to some extent made amends for obvious racial differences. When they spoke of attaining a measure of equality with white Americans, they themselves stood as evidence for that potential. While Boudinot lapses into the white man's rhetoric of doom more so than does Apress, both of these speakers found it necessary to balance their indignation at the treatment of their people with pleas for white understanding and aid. Their arguments for understanding and justice, in other words, just like those of the Cherokees' advocates in Congress, ultimately reinforce the notion of the Indians' helplessness.

#### Non-Christian Voices

Niles' Weekly Register often reprinted speeches by Indians that had been published in other newspapers from around the country, but these Indian voices, with few exceptions, offer quite a contrast with the Christian appeals of Boudinot and Apress. Most do not ask for the help of the whites in improving or civilizing the Indians. Most do not insist upon the triumph of God's Word among the Indians. Most do not try to redefine the whites' conception of the Indian.

In short, these speeches are more autonomous and more defiant. That they are spoken by members of Western tribes might also reflect a different, more adversarial, less accommodating relationship with the whites than existed between white America and the threatened or subjugated Eastern and Southern Indians.

Under the title "Indian Lands in Georgia," NWR published a memorial from John Ross, George Lowry, Major Ridge, and Elijah Hicks, delegates from the Cherokee Nation, to the House of Representatives. Although they declare their intention "never again to cede another foot of land," their conclusion reflects the desire to be accepted as civilized people and reveals the reliance of the Cherokees upon the powerful U.S. government:

The Cherokees have turned their attention to the pursuits of the civilized man; agriculture, manufactures and the mechanic arts and education, are all in successful operation in the nation, at this time; and, whilst the Cherokees are peacefully endeavoring to enjoy the blessings of civilization and Christianity on the soil of their rightful inheritance. . . they are threatened with removal or extinction. . . . We appeal to the magnanimity of the American congress for justice, and the protection of the rights, liberties and lives of the Cherokee people. (140)

Five years earlier, an article simply titled "Indian Speech" offered another example of an Indian seeking a peaceful coexistence with the whites. Slafuche Barnard saw the world around him in decline, lamenting, "We may go to the graves of our fathers, and with hooks among them who were buried ten

thousand moons ago, and catch better men, than some who now bear the names of great men among us, both red and white." Nevertheless, he expressed his desire not only for coexistence of white men and red but assimilation: "I wish the white and red may become one people; that there shall be no distinction of color or feeling" (436).

Far more typical of the Indian speeches in the Register, however, is that of Walk-in-Rain, an Osage chief, reprinted October 14, 1820. Accusing the whites of hypocrisy, he wanted nothing to do with them until they had mended their ways:

You call us Americans -- then, when we go among the Americans and want victuals and to smoke the pipe, your children ought not to kill us. When your children come among us we give them meat and corn, and tobacco, and use them like brothers -- our great father told us to do so and that his children would do the same to us. . . . You tell us to open our eyes and to walk in the good road. Your men have killed three of our men, and we cannot walk in the good road and let your men walk in the bad road. (112)

"Cornplanter's Speech," appearing in the Register August 10, 1822, expressed a similar distrust of white Americans, particularly their willingness to mix their blood with that of the Indians: "The Great Spirit looked back on all that he had made. The different kinds he made to be separate, and not to mix with and disturb each other; but the white people have broken his command, by mixing their color with the Indians; the Indians have done better by not doing so" (383). An Osage named Big Soldier perceived the threat from white America in

a different way. With a nineteenth-century eye, he makes the twentieth-century observation that the very technology that allows the whites to subdue nature ironically makes them dependant upon it: "In short, you can do almost what you please. . . . You are surrounded by slaves. Every thing about you is in chains, and you are slaves yourselves; I fear if I should change my pursuits for yours I should become a slave" ("Indian Opinions" 20). He concludes, "I was born free! and wish to die free!! I am perfectly content with my condition" ("Indian Opinions" 20). Finally, another speech rejecting the ways of the whites is that of Red Jacket, Seneca chief, denouncing the intention of missionaries once again to live and work among the Senecas. He says that "We are willing to be taught to read and write, and work, but not by people who have done us so much injury" ("Seneca Indians" 16). The missionaries, according to Red Jacket, "tell us many things that we do not understand and cannot believe; they tell us we must be like white people," yet "they are lazy and won't work, nor do they teach our young men to do so" ("Seneca Indians" 16). Most seriously, however, the missionaries undermine the Senecas' most sacred convictions: "They deceive every body. They deny the Great Spirit, which we, and our fathers before us, have looked upon as our creator. They disturb us in our worship; tell our children they must not believe like our fathers and mothers" ("Seneca Indians" 16).

These are the voices of mistrust, of resistance to a force others, like Elias Boudinot and William Apess, would appease through accommodation. Regardless of their response, however, to the force of white encroachment on their native cultures, all are clearly motivated by the perceived threat of physical and/or spiritual annihilation of their people. And, ironically, the very nature of responding to this perceived threat created opportunities for Indian writers to appear to be providing support for myths that encouraged whites to take their land. To the extent that Indian writers sought to accommodate themselves to white demands that Indians become Christian farmers, they risked appearing weak, reinforcing the myth of Indian helplessness and racial inferiority. To the extent they employed the rhetoric of doom in order to emphasize the urgency for aid, they risked diminishing the scope and human cost of forced removal, as well as endorsing the myth of Providential extinction. To the extent that Indians resisted, questioned, or rejected white culture, they reinforced the myth that Indians and whites could not coexist, that they could not share America. All of these arguments led to the same conclusion -- the Indians would have to remove.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> All references to the works of Elias Boudinot will be from Cherokee Editor: The Writings of Elias Boudinot, ed. Theda Purdue (Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 1983), cited in the text by individual titles.

<sup>2</sup> The census figures can be found in Douglas C. Wilms, "Cherokee Land Use in Georgia Before Removal," Cherokee Removal: Before and After, ed. William L. Anderson (Athens: U of Georgia P, 1991): 7.

<sup>3</sup> This optimistic vision of the future should be contrasted with Boudinot's bitter sense of betrayal expressed in the Cherokee Phoenix editorial, 17 June 1829, at President Jackson's intention to support Georgia's claims to Cherokee lands:

It is to be regretted that we were not undeceived long ago, while we were hunters and in our savage state. It appears now from the communication of the Secretary of War to the Cherokee Delegation, that the illustrious Washington, Jefferson, Madison and Monroe were only tantalizing us, when they encouraged us in the pursuit of agriculture and Government, and when they afforded us the protection of the United States, by which we have been preserved to this present time as a nation . . . . But how happens it now, after being fostered by the U. States, and advised by great and good men to establish a government of regular law; when the aid and protection of the General Government have been pledged to us; when we, as dutiful "children" of the President, have followed his instructions and advice, and have established for ourselves a government of regular law; when everything looks so promising around us, that a storm is raised by the extension of tyrannical and unchristian laws, which threatens to blast all our rising hopes and expectations? (Phoenix 108-09)

<sup>4</sup> See, for example, North American Review 11 (July 1820): 96ff .; 16 (January 1823): 33-34; 30 (January 1830): 64.

## CONCLUSION

One cannot conclude that the rhetorical treatment of the Indian -- not even the rhetorical treatment in the Congressional debates -- led to passage of the Removal Act of 1830. Too many other influences were involved to allow for such a tidy connection to be drawn. The question of allowing a sovereign nation, such as the Cherokees had declared themselves, to exist within the boundaries of a state belonging to another sovereign nation was a legitimate concern. On a far more mundane level, the discovery of gold on Cherokee lands in July of 1829 enhanced the already lucrative Cherokee territory. And, as the debate and vote in Congress revealed, the political struggle between the General Government and states' rights was an important factor. Considering, too, intense personal and political opposition to President Andrew Jackson, one can begin to appreciate the difficulty of tracing a political decision like the Removal Act to a rhetorical pattern of thought and expression.

One can demonstrate, however, a remarkable consistency in the way issues were defined and addressed and suggest that those issues and their discussion contributed to an acceptance of a political act like removal. My purpose has been, in large part, to explore those issues. As for the Cherokees --



and they clearly were the focus, the test case, as Elias Boudinot himself declared -- they were forced to defend themselves as though they were nomadic bands of hunters or starving drunkards who not only represented obstacles to the progress of the young United States, but who stood opposed to the Almighty's Providential design. Boudinot correctly identified white ignorance of the truth about the Cherokee people as the greatest obstacle he faced.

The troubling question for students of American literature is to consider the extent to which American writers -- like Paulding, Beach, Sands, Eastburn, Cooper, Child, and Sedgwick -- contributed to that ignorance, by exploiting and perpetuating myths about the Indians' inability to join in nineteenth-century America and about God's determination to allow the destruction of inferior parts of His creation. As I have shown, even those writers who were most sympathetic to the Indians, Child and Sedgwick, ultimately reinforced the impossibility of Indians and whites sharing this country. Less sympathetic writers made the Indians into devouring demons and/or, paradoxically, into helpless infants incapable of comprehending the modern world. Cooper made the Indian an example of an inferior race to whom the Christian God was an enigma. These writers may or may not have had a direct influence on the political debate over the fate of the Indians, but they clearly effected a rhetorical removal of the Indian, long before the political removal began. The Indians

were denied simultaneously the preservation of their culture on their existing lands and denied their chance to adapt to white America. In the popular imagination, the Indians had already become, long before Peleg Sprague uttered the phrase in Congress, "trespassers upon their own soil."

If the Indians' voices in literature contributed to what amounted to a rhetorical removal, to what extent did authentic Indian voices counter those images of drunks, warriors, hunters, intellectual infants, heathens, and demons? How many Americans had their conceptions of the Indian dramatically altered upon hearing or reading Boudinot or Apess? That question deserves further study. How did these Indian advocates unwittingly contribute to the damaging myths so entrenched in white America about the Indians' unfitness for the modern world? To that question I have suggested that when these advocates indulged in the rhetoric of doom in order to convince their audiences of the urgency of the plight of their peoples, they risked reinforcing the sense of a loss that was inevitable and inescapable. Again, the question deserves further study. The ultimate irony of examining Indian voices from this period in our history may well be that authentic voices like those of Boudinot and Apess will garner more attention in our day than they did in theirs. With their speeches to church gatherings and their small publication runs, could they really hope to be heard over the ravings of Paulding's Prophet, the tragic funeral oration of

Chingachgook, or the dramatic rejection of white culture and the departure of Magawisca? Yet one can sense that they expected a fairer hearing would come. For the minister Apess, it might be before "that God who is the maker and preserver both of the white man and the Indian, whose abilities are the same and who are to be judged by one God, who will show no favor to outward appearances but will judge righteousness" ("Indian's Looking Glass" 155). For Boudinot, writing in the Phoenix in response to Senate passage of the removal bill, justice will be secular: "we confidently think justice will be done, even if the Cherokees are not in the land of the living to receive it -- posterity will give a correct verdict" (118). One hears in the voices of Apess and Boudinot, above all, the hope that the rhetorical removal, of which the popular literature in the 1820s was such a big part, would one day be balanced by the acceptance of the Indians as human beings who belong in "the American family" (Address 75). The result might be termed a rhetorical restoration.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, John Quincy. Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory. 1810. 2 vols. New York: Russell and Russell, 1962.
- Apess, William. Eulogy on King Philip, as Pronounced at the Odeon, in Federal Street, Boston. 1836. On Our Own Ground: The Complete Writings of William Apess, A Pequot. Ed. Barry O'Connell. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1992.
- . "An Indian's Looking-Glass for the White Man." 1833. On Our Own Ground: The Complete Writings of William Apess, A Pequot. Ed. Barry O'Connell. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1992.
- . A Son of the Forest: The Experience of William Apess, A Native of the Forest; Written by Himself. 1829. On Our Own Ground: The Complete Writings of William Apess, A Pequot. Ed. Barry O'Connell. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1992.
- Barnett, Louise K. The Ignoble Savage: American Literary Racism, 1790-1890. Contributions in American Studies 18. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1975.
- Barthes, Roland. "Myth Today." A Barthes Reader. New York: Hill and Wang, 1982. 93-149.

- Baym, Nina. "How Men and Women Wrote Indian Stories." New Essays on "The Last of the Mohicans". Ed. H. Daniel Peck. New York: Cambridge UP, 1992.
- . Novels, Readers, and Reviewers: Responses to Fiction in Antebellum America. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1984.
- Beach, Samuel B. Escalala: An American Tale. Utica, NY: W. Williams, 1824.
- Beard, James Franklin, ed. The Letters and Journals of James Fenimore Cooper. Vol. 2. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1964. 6 vols. 1960-68.
- Bell, Michael. Hawthorne and the Historical Romance of New England. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1971.
- Blair, Hugh. Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres. 1785. 3 vols. New York: Garland, 1970.
- Boudinot, Elias. An Address to the Whites, Delivered in the First Presbyterian Church, on the 26th of May, 1826, by Elias Boudinott, A Cherokee Indian. 1826. Cherokee Editor: The Writings of Elias Boudinot. Ed. Theda Purdue. Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 1983.
- . "Selections from the Cherokee Phoenix." Cherokee Editor: The Writings of Elias Boudinot. Ed. Theda Purdue. Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 1983.
- Cady, Edwin Harrison. The Gentleman in America: A Literary Study in American Culture. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse UP, 1949.

[Cass, Lewis.] "Documents and Proceedings Relating to the Formation and Progress of a Board in the City of New York, for the Emigration, Preservation, and Improvement of the Aborigines of America, July 22, 1829." North American Review 30 (January 1830): 62-121.

---. "Heckewelder on the American Indians." North American Review 26 (April 1828): 357-403.

---. "North American Indians." North American Review 22 (January 1826): 53-119.

Child, Lydia Maria. Hobomok: A Tale of Early Times By an American. 1823. In Hobomok and Other Writings on Indians. Ed. Carolyn L. Karcher. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 1986.

Cooper, James Fenimore. The Last of the Mohicans; A Narrative of 1757. 1826. Eds. James A. Sappenfield and E.N. Feltskog. Albany: State University of New York P, 1983.

---. Notions of the Americans, Picked Up by a Travelling Bachelor. 1828. Ed. Gary Williams. Albany: State University of New York P, 1991.

---. The Oak Openings; or, The Bee Hunter. 1848. Mohawk Edition. Vol. 32 of The Works of James Fenimore Cooper. New York: G.P. Putnam, [1906].

---. The Pioneers, or the Sources of the Susquehanna; A Descriptive Tale. 1823. Ed. James Franklin Beard. Albany: State University of New York P, 1980.

- . The Redskins; or Indian and Injin. 1846. Mohawk Edition. Vol. 25 of The Works of James Fenimore Cooper. New York: G.P. Putnam, [1906].
- . Satanstoe, or The Littlepage Manuscripts: A Tale of the Colony. 1845. Eds. Kay Seymour House and Constance Ayers Denne. Albany: State University of New York P, 1990.
- . The Wept of Wish-Ton-Wish: A Tale. 1829. Mohawk Edition. Vol. 22 of The Works of James Fenimore Cooper. New York: G.P. Putnam, [1906].
- Darnell, Donald. James Fenimore Cooper: Novelist of Manners. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1993.
- . "Uncas as Hero: The Ubi Sunt Formula in The Last of the Mohicans. American Literature 37 (1965): 259-66.
- Davidson, Cathy. Revolution and the Word: The Rise of the Novel in America. New York: Oxford UP, 1986.
- De Tocqueville, Alexis. Democracy in America. 1835. Ed. J.P. Mayer. Trans. George Lawrence. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor, 1969.
- Dippie, Brian. The Vanishing American: White Attitudes and U.S. Indian Policy. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan UP, 1982.
- Drinnon, Richard. Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian-Hating and Empire-Building. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1980.
- . White Savage: The Case of John Dunn Hunter. New York: Schocken, 1972.

- Eastburn, James Wallis, and Robert C. Sands. Yamoyden, A Tale of the Wars of King Philip, in Six Cantos. 1820. In The Writings of Robert C. Sands, In Poetry and Verse. 2 Vols. New York: Harper, 1834.
- Eckert, Allan W. A Sorrow in Our Heart: The Life of Tecumseh. New York: Bantam, 1992.
- Evarts, Jeremiah. Cherokee Removal: The "William Penn" Essays and Other Writings. Ed. Francis Paul Prucha. Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 1981.
- Foster, Edward Halsey. Catharine Maria Sedgwick. Twayne's United States Authors Ser. 233. New York: Twayne, 1974.
- Foucault, Michel. "Docile Bodies." The Foucault Reader. Ed. Paul Reuben. New York: Pantheon, 1984.
- [Gardiner, W. H.] "Cooper's Novels." North American Review 23 (July 1826): 150-97.
- Grossman, James. James Fenimore Cooper. American Men of Letters Series. New York: William Sloane, 1949.
- Herold, Amos L. James Kirke Paulding: Versatile American. New York: Columbia UP, 1926.
- House, Kay Seymour. Cooper's Americans. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1965.
- Irving, Washington. A History of New York. Ed. Michael L. Black and Nancy B. Black. Boston: Twayne, 1984. Vol. 7 of The Complete Works of Washington Irving. Gen. eds. Henry A. Pochmann, Herbert L. Kleinfield, and Richard Dilworth Rust. 10 vols. to date. 1976- .



- . "Philip of Pokanoket, An Indian Memoir." The Sketch Book of Geoffrey Crayon, Gent. Ed. Haskell Springer. Boston: Twayne, 1978. Vol. 8 of The Complete Works of Washington Irving. Gen. ed. Richard Dilworth Rust. 10 vols. to date. 1976- .
- . "Traits of Indian Character." The Sketch Book of Geoffrey Crayon, Gent. Ed. Haskell Springer. Boston: Twayne, 1978. Vol. 8 of The Complete Works of Washington Irving. Gen. ed. Richard Dilworth Rust. 10 vols to date. 1976- .
- Jordan, Terry G., and Matti Kaups. The American Backwoods Frontier: An Ethnic and Ecological Interpretation. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1989.
- Karcher, Carolyn, ed. Hobomok. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 1986. . . .
- Luxon, Norval Neil. Niles' Weekly Register: News Magazine of the Nineteenth Century. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1947. . . .
- Maddox, Lucy. Removals: Nineteenth-Century American Literature and the Politics of Indian Affairs. New York: Oxford UP, 1991.
- Milton, John. Paradise Lost. John Milton: Complete Poems and Major Prose. Ed. Merritt Hughes. Indianapolis, IN: Odyssey, 1957.
- Mott, Frank Luther. A History of American Magazines, 1741-1850. New York: Appleton, 1930.

Niles' Weekly Register

Niles, Hezekiah. "The American Aborigines." NWR 15 (Nov 14, 1818): 185-87.

---."Amelioration of the Indians." NWR 15 (Jan 30, 1819): 420-23.

---."Indian Speech." NWR 15 (Feb 6, 1819): 436.

---."Indian Affairs." NWR 16 (Aug 14, 1819): 405-08.

---."Our Indians." NWR 18 (Apr 29, 1820): 154-55.

---."Chronicle." NWR 20 (Oct 14, 1820): 112.

---."Missions to the Indians." NWR 20 (Oct 21, 1820): 122-23.

---."Indian Civilization." NWR 22 (May 25, 1822): 195.

---."Civilization of the Indians." NWR 22 (June 8, 1822): 231-32.

---."Cornplanter's Speech." NWR 22 (Aug 10, 1822): 383.

---."Indian Opinions." NWR 23 (Sept 14, 1822): 20.

---."Indian War." NWR 24 (Aug 23, 1823): 392-93.

---."Miscellaneous." NWR 25 (Feb 7, 1824): 357.

---."Indian Lands in Georgia." NWR 26 (May 1, 1824): 139-40.

---."Indian Eloquence." NWR 28 (July 9, 1825): 296.

---."Seneca Indians." NWR 28 (July 9, 1825): 16.

---."The Cherokee Indians." NWR 29 (Oct 15, 1825): 105-07.

---."The Cherokees." NWR 36 (Mar 14, 1829): 40-41.

North American Review 8 (Dec 1818): 169-76.

---.11 (July 1820): 68-103.

---.11 (July 1820): 103-113.

---.12 (April 1821): 466-88.

---.15 (July 1822): 224-50.

---.16 (Jan 1823): 30-45.

---.19 (Oct 1824): 463-65.

---.20 (Jan 1825): 210-14.

---.23 (Oct 1826): 275-94.

---.23 (Oct 1826): 470-74.

---.25 (July 1827): 183-203.

---.26 (April 1828): 357-402.

---.30 (Jan 1830): 62-121.

[Palfrey, John Gorham.] "Yamoyden." NAR 12 (April 1821): 466-88. Paulding, James Kirke. The Backwoodsman: A Poem. Philadelphia: M. Thomas, 1818.

---. The Letters of James Kirke Paulding. Ed. Ralph M. Aderman. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1962.

Pearce, Roy Harvey. "Civilization and Savagism: The World of The Leatherstocking Tales." English Institute Essays, 1949. Ed. A.S. Downer. New York: Columbia UP, 1950. 92-116.

---. The Savages of America: A Study of the Indian and the Idea of Civilization. Rev. ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1965.

Perdue, Theda. "The Conflict Within: Cherokees and Removal." Cherokee Removal: Before and After. Ed. William L. Anderson. Athens, GA: U of Georgia P, 1991: 55-74.

- Reynolds, Larry J. James Kirke Paulding. Twayne's United States Authors Ser. 464. Boston: Twayne, 1984.
- Sacks, Peter M. The English Elegy: Studies in the Genre from Spenser to Yeats. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1985.
- Sands, Robert C. "Domestic Literature." 1824. Vol. 1 of The Writings of Robert C. Sands, in Prose and Verse. New York: Harper, 1834. 2 vols.
- Satz, Ronald N. American Indian Policy in the Jacksonian Era. Lincoln, NE: U of Nebraska P, 1975.
- . "Rhetoric Versus Reality: The Indian Policy of Andrew Jackson." Cherokee Removal: Before and After. Ed. William L. Anderson. Athens, GA: U of Georgia P, 1991: 29-54.
- Sedgwick, Catharine Maria. Hope Leslie; or, Early Times in the Massachusetts. 1827. Ed. Mary Kelley. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 1987.
- Slotkin, Richard. Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan UP, 1973.
- Spiller, Robert E. Fenimore Cooper: Critic of His Times. New York: Minton, Balch, 1931.
- U.S. Congress. Register of Debates in Congress. 21st Cong. 1st session.
- Wallace, Paul A. W. "Cooper's Indians." New York History 35 (1954): 423-46.

- Wilms, Douglas C. "Cherokee Land Use in Georgia Before Removal." Cherokee Removal: Before and After. Ed. William L. Anderson. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1991.
- Zagarell, Sandra A. "Expanding 'America': Lydia Sigourney's Sketch of Connecticut, Catharine Sedgwick's Hope Leslie." Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature 6 (Fall 1987): 225-45.