

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Settling with the Indians: The Meeting of English and Indian Cultures in America, 1580-1640. By Karen Ordahl Kupperman.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3v35h2vx>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 5(4)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Salisbury, Neal

Publication Date

1981-09-01

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

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

The above criticisms are, admittedly, trivial. The book is a good introduction to these perhaps lesser known tribes and provides a solid presentation of their relations with whites. In addition, *Oklahoma's Forgotten Indians* gives the reader a basis on which a better understanding can be built of the workings of federal Indian policy and of the pressures American Indians have been subject to.

Tom Holm
University of Arizona

Settling with the Indians: The Meeting of English and Indian Cultures in America, 1580-1640. By Karen Ordahl Kupperman. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1980. 224 pp. \$19.50

For several generations, historians and other scholars have sought to explain European relations with Indians in colonial America by reference to literary expressions of attitudes toward the natives as well as toward other non-Europeans and non-Christians. In *Settling with the Indians*, Karen Kupperman does not question the premise of this strategy but she does attempt to distinguish between its valid and invalid applications. Never far from the surface is her quarrel with the argument that European images of the "wild man" led early English observers to portray the Algonquians of the Chesapeake and New England as essentially bestial and cultureless. Instead, she asserts, a number of the early writers were genuinely "interested" (the word is used with annoying repetition and vagueness) in the natives, regarding them as fellow, cultured human beings. To the extent that a view of Indians as sub-human gained any credence during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, it was among writers who themselves never ventured to the New World. Those writers who actually observed Indian life first hand found qualities which they compared favorably with late Tudor-early Stuart England, e.g., stable social orders in which lines of rank and status were carefully delineated and observed, and a lack of material acquisitiveness that explained the natives' simpler economies and

legal systems. These were qualities which the rise of commercial capitalism had obliterated in England and for which the gentle-born writers were nostalgic.

It is to the values of the English gentry that Kupperman would have us turn to understand early English attitudes toward the natives, rather than to the tales of wild men who were, in fact, described quite differently from Indians. Kupperman argues that the observer-writers perceived and presented the Indians not as cultural aliens but as ordinary English people, most of whom were low-born, a few of whom were fit to rule over the others. Though the writers characterized much of what they saw as "savage," such labeling was no different than the contempt in which they held the English poor. For this reason, as well as for reasons of religion, these writers expected English rulers to dominate the Indians, exacting obedience as part of a dependency relationship much like that which prevailed between older and younger brothers in their own upper-class families. The only drawback with these expectations was that the Indians responded by resisting English domination. Kupperman explains the intensity of English violence, displayed most prominently in Virginia after the Indian uprising of 1622 and in New England during the Pequot War of 1637, as a combination of guilt over the outbreak of hostilities plus a recognition of their own dependence and vulnerability vis-a-vis the Indians. The seeds of later racism were sown at the end of the period under consideration not, as one might suspect, as a result of violent conquest but because some writers' respect for Indian culture went so far as to include advocating retention by the Indians of certain aspects of traditional culture.

By now, readers familiar with early Chesapeake and New England colonial history will recognize that Kupperman's argument combines strong doses of the obvious and the absurd as well as a few intriguing insights. The most apparent problem is that she utterly misrepresents the views of the modern scholars she claims to refute. While citing passages in the works of such authors as Roy Harvey Pearce, Gary Nash, and Francis Jennings that, taken by themselves, sustain her case, Kupperman never considers their arguments in their entirety and on their own terms. Had she done so she would have had to confront the explicit contentions of Pearce and Nash that the English were profoundly ambivalent about Indians precisely

because they perceived them as fellow humans, and the arguments of all three that the dichotomy between "civilized" and "savage" was employed in the New World to explain the cultural differences between Europeans and Native Americans and to rationalize the conduct of the former toward the latter.

Kupperman is hardly more successful in her handling of primary sources. Her counter-arguments to the alleged sins of other scholars consist, again, of quotations and citations out of context, in this case to prove the (incontrovertible) point that early English writers really knew that the Indians were human and were the bearers of legitimate, if inferior, cultures. Thus we are provided with innumerable passages describing native clothing, government, religion, and technology as evidence for this recognition on their parts. Kupperman notices neither that similar passages could also be found in the modern scholars she refutes nor that her method could as readily yield an opposite conclusion. It does not occur to her that in taking the Indians' measure in these areas, the writers were first of all calculating the moral and cultural distance between the two peoples and that they were as concerned about differences and divergences as about similarities and parallels. Moreover, Kupperman never indicates the larger context in which the more thorough descriptions she cites generally appeared, namely in conjunction with descriptions of the "country," that is, of the natural resources and potential productivity of the Indians' land. It was not Indians in and of themselves that interested these writers and their readers at home but rather the English encounter with a new and challenging environment of which Indians were treated as a component, albeit a significant one.

Having extrapolated, by questionable methods, a particular viewpoint from the writers she discusses, Kupperman proceeds to attribute that viewpoint to the early settlers in general as the basis for her interpretation of Indian-English relations. She overlooks the fact that the writers she most frequently cites were not on the scene, actively engaging with Indians, by the time they wrote. Thomas Hariot, John Smith, Thomas Morton, and William Wood all published their works from England, having willingly or unwillingly left the colonies behind. Only Plymouth's Edward Winslow wrote and published while a settler; but as he did so his missionary hopes were being dashed by the colony's military approach to Indian relations. These facts alone suggest that the writers had personal perspectives,

if not motives, which need to be distinguished from those of other colonists. Yet in her contention that the intensity of English violence expressed the guilty rage of would-be older brothers who "were let down by their own preconceptions and wishful thinking" (p. 170), Kupperman presupposes that most settlers shared the idealistic hopes of these writers.

Such an assumption is simply not warranted, least of all for the major wars with which Kupperman ends her book. The writers she discusses witnessed and, in some cases, participated in the earliest conflicts in the Chesapeake and New England, conflicts which arose over English efforts to subjugate the natives politically (while, in some cases, remaining dependent on them economically). While many of these earlier skirmishes were characterized by gratuitous English violence, they were fought on a small scale compared to the wars of the mid-1620s in Virginia and mid-1630s in New England. These wars came about when demographic and economic pressures in areas already settled by the English created political demands for more Indian land, heightening inter-cultural tensions to the breaking point. Most of those seeking land had never entertained the writers' quaint notions of coaxing the Indians, little brother-like, into becoming English Christians: they were propelled instead by fantasies (variously defined) of prosperity and mastery which originated in the social, economic, and religious upheavals then erupting in England—where there were no Indians. The natives dashed their hopes not by their seeming "treachery," as Kupperman would have it, but by their mere presence. In these wars, the English sought not to subjugate but to extirpate their enemies. (Kupperman's efforts to locate images of Indian humanity in English justifications of these wars, e.g. pp. 178–79, 185–86, are too pitiful and belabored to detail here.) It is no coincidence either that none of Kupperman's major writers played an important role in these conflicts or that their kind of ethnographic sensitivity had largely disappeared in each region by the time these wars erupted. For these reasons, if for no others (and there are others), such respecters of native culture as William Wood and Thomas Morton hardly deserve the blame for the racist policies later adopted by the colonies (p. 187).

As strictly intellectual history, *Settling with the Indians* is not entirely without merit, especially for its focus on a body of ethnographic literature and its authors. But Kupperman stumbles

when she ventures into the history of Indian-English relations, largely because she does not seem to notice the boundary between the two sub-disciplines. Her book reminds us that the history of those relations has to encompass the dimensions of culture, society, economics, and politics on both sides of the ethnic divide, not just the perspectives of a few semi-marginal Englishmen.

Neal Salisbury
Smith College

The Yaquis: A Cultural History. By Edward H. Spicer. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1980. 393 pp. pap. \$14.50.

Professor Edward Spicer's work, *The Yaquis: A Cultural History*, is the culmination of over forty years of association with the remarkable Yaquis of Arizona and Mexico, who have endured the challenges of nature, Spanish, Mexican, and American social forces, tourists, governmental hostility or indifference, and the romantic curiosities of readers of Carlos Castaneda's writings. Professor Spicer's status as the foremost university based scholarly authority was well assured even before the publication of *The Yaquis*. The book constitutes a comprehensive summation of his previous work and is destined to be the benchmark of anthropological scholarship on the Yaquis.

Professor Spicer's scholarship and his labor of love on behalf of Yaquis makes him less vulnerable than most other anthropologists to the now common criticism of anthropological predatory curiosities that was best stated by Vine Deloria in *Custer Died for Your Sins*. In his academic career Professor Spicer directed his graduate students to do "useful" research, i.e., research that presumably would be useful to the community involved. Also, Professor Spicer gave of his own time to the Tucson Yaqui community including being a project director of the Pascua Yaqui Association in Tucson in its formative stage.

The book attempts to be a comprehensive "cultured" history. It begins with Yaqui interaction with Jesuits in the 17th century and ends with contemporary Yaqui life in Mexico and in Arizona, where the Yaquis now have an official tribal status.