

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

Negotiating for Georgia: British-Creek Relations in the Trustee Era, 1733-1752. By Julie Anne Sweet.

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/470199rs>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 29(3)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Frank, Andrew K.

**Publication Date**

2005-06-01

**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/>

Northwest Coast, but—not surprisingly for a book in the New Mexico Artist Series—there is a distinct New Mexico flavor to the work as a whole.

The true value of *NDN Art* is in its lavish illustrations. There are full-page color reproductions of five artworks by each of the thirty artists included in *NDN Art*. In its wealth of visual information, *NDN Art* positively shines. Contemporary Native art receives so little exposure that any richly illustrated book on the subject is of great value.

*Lara M. Evans*

Evergreen State College

**Negotiating for Georgia: British-Creek Relations in the Trustee Era, 1733–1752.** By Julie Anne Sweet. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2004. 267 pages. \$39.95 cloth.

In *Negotiating for Georgia*, ethnohistorian Julie Anne Sweet recaptures a harmonious yet all-too-brief era in colonial Georgia. Sweet demonstrates that Creeks and early British settlers in Georgia coexisted peacefully as a result of carefully negotiated alliances and reciprocal friendships. This era of diplomatic good feelings would not last and by the end of the Trustee period, which lasted from 1733 to 1752, mutual mistrust and tensions characterized Creek-Georgian relations. The result is an insightful analysis of the Lower Creek Indian's relationship with British Georgia.

Sweet credits the banished Yamacraw Indian leader Tomochichi and British governor James Oglethorpe for creating and sustaining the era of mutual assistance. Both leaders had ample reason to negotiate with each other. Oglethorpe and the Trustees needed the assistance of Georgia's Creek Indians because the settlers brought neither the means nor the desire for military conquest. Outnumbered and wishing to find Christian converts, the Trustees called upon Oglethorpe to secure Indian alliances. Tomochichi and the Lower Creeks similarly had interests of their own. They saw in the newcomers possibilities for better trade terms and diplomatic alliances that would provide security in the contentious Southeast. These reasons set the stage for two remarkably effective leaders to forge an intercultural alliance.

The strength of Sweet's argument lies in her analysis of the personal motives that led Oglethorpe and Tomochichi to pursue diplomatic negotiations. At a time when intercultural discord prevailed in colonial America, these two men chose a different path. Tomochichi became a broker between the Creeks and Georgians in an attempt to reassert his own importance within Creek society and to "redeem some of his lost status and heal broken kinship ties" (25). Oglethorpe also had personal reasons to enter negotiations with the Creeks. Believing in the humanity of Indians, he acted in ways that "mixed respect and admiration" for his Indian neighbors. As a result, Sweet explains, Tomochichi and Oglethorpe became both diplomatic allies and personal friends. They participated in complex negotiations that combined English and Indian customs and rituals, carefully exchanged gifts and political

compromises in an attempt to secure a meaningful peace, and engaged in negotiations that were characterized by politeness and respect.

Creeks and Georgians did not create what Richard White described as a “middle ground.” As much as Natives and newcomers negotiated with one another and found common causes in early Georgia, they did not create a common or shared culture. Instead, they “came to tolerate and respect their dissimilarities . . . the two civilizations retained their own values, working within their differences, and learned to cooperate in spite of their distinctive conventions” (134). As a result, they forged somewhat surprising connections. They agreed to a Treaty of Friendship and Commerce in 1733 that provided a framework for peaceful relations for nearly a decade; Oglethorpe created and armed two Indian militia companies and commissioned two Indian captains; Indian warriors fought alongside British soldiers against the Spanish; and in 1734 Tomochichi traveled as Oglethorpe’s guest to England, where he personally presented his concerns and negotiated agreements with the Trustees. In subsequent years, the two leaders continued to forge agreements and resolve disputes between their communities. Oftentimes, though, their negotiations culminated in treaties with “plausible” but “overly ambitious” details that defied easy implementation (39). Structural differences and national ambitions made compromises difficult and often incomplete.

The centrality of Oglethorpe and Tomochichi to Creek-Georgia relations cannot be overstated. Sweet demonstrates that in Georgia and elsewhere “individual players could make or break any deal” (65). Unlike leaders elsewhere in British North America, these two leaders found the means to avoid armed conflict. This became evident when the two traveled to England in 1734. While they were abroad, the “task of maintaining the cooperative relationship” fell “to ordinary citizens” (61). These individuals, many of whom wanted to maintain the peace, did not have the “diplomatic experience” or a “working relationship” to negotiate with confidence and without making cultural blunders. As a result, warfare almost engulfed the region. When Oglethorpe and Tomochichi returned from England, they spent several months repairing the damage caused by their absence.

Issues of religious conversion reveal the limitations of mutual cooperation and understanding in early Georgia. Whereas Tomochichi and some other Creeks asked for religious instruction for various theological and political purposes, Christian missionaries such as John Wesley and George Whitfield insisted that conversion could only occur as part of a broader “civilization” process. They built schools to teach English culture and in the process demonstrated very little understanding of Creek culture. Wesley, for example, “had a specific plan for conversion. He appeared unwilling to consider other approaches to instructing the Indians or to question whether his ideas about them might be mistaken” (88). As a result, his and other efforts to convert and civilize Indians faced stiff resistance and resulted in very few converts. A religious middle ground was not achieved.

When the era’s diplomatic and economic realities threatened Creek-English relations, Oglethorpe and Tomochichi used their personal connections

to soothe matters. In the late 1730s, for example, the deerskin trade and property disputes brought new tensions to the frontier. Warfare with Spain in Florida magnified the atmosphere of distrust, making Oglethorpe even more dependent on Tomochichi and the Creeks. By the end of the decade, Spain became an ever-greater threat to Georgia's southern border, the French in the Lower Mississippi Valley had powerful Indian allies, and traders from South Carolina threatened the stability between settlers and Creeks. With such dire circumstances, Oglethorpe took the risk of accepting an invitation to re-secure the peace at a conference within Creek country.

Relations between the Creeks and the Georgians began to unravel with the death of Tomochichi in October 1739. Without a committed Creek mediator who had personal and diplomatic ties to the colony, Oglethorpe could rely only on written rather than personal promises to keep the peace. The limitations of this reality emerged during the War of Jenkins' Ear in late 1739. A few hundred Creeks assisted Oglethorpe as scouts and soldiers in the war against Spain, but most Creek men refrained from participating. Refusing to be led by white officers who treated them with contempt, frustrated by formal British military tactics, and otherwise unmotivated to intervene in a European war, most Creeks chose neutrality. Without Tomochichi to explain the obligations of the treaty to assist Georgia militarily, Oglethorpe had little ability to enlist more Creeks warriors.

After the war, Oglethorpe returned to England to defend his military actions. In following years, the era of mutual trust and cooperation rapidly disintegrated. The death of Tomochichi and the departure of Oglethorpe resulted in the rise of new English and Indian leaders, men and women who were "less accommodating" and thus unable and unwilling to maintain the peaceful relations that were forged in the Trustee period.

Sweet contends that Mary Musgrove personified and facilitated the breakdown. The child of a Creek-English intermarriage, Musgrove spent many years as a trusted interpreter for Oglethorpe. In 1745, Musgrove demanded payment owed to her for services rendered and formally claimed Yamacraw lands that Tomochichi had ceded her in 1737. For several years the Trustees rejected her requests while she worked to maintain the peace. To protect her property rights, Musgrove declared her allegiance to the Indians and withdrew as a neutral intermediary.

Although Sweet convincingly demonstrates the importance of Oglethorpe and Tomochichi, she is less convincing in her treatment of the other Indian and English participants on the southern frontier. She chastises Musgrove because "her ambition nearly started a war" (187). Leaders who followed Tomochichi and Oglethorpe "let their personal goals interfere with the pursuit of the common good, resulting in the collapse of trust" (187). Yet Oglethorpe and Tomochichi also used their authority to improve their own positions in early Georgia. They were not committed to intercultural peace for its own sake; they pursued it in order to further personal ambitions. Tomochichi began the era as an outcast and by securing treaties that at times mandated tremendous sacrifices by Lower Creeks, he too let private objectives detract from the Creek's good.

Sweet's careful reconstruction of the political and social context of early Georgia demands the attention of scholars of the colonial and Native American past. By placing Indians at the center of her analysis she counters the prevailing view that Trustee-era Georgia was a failure. In addition, her analysis carefully illuminates how various individuals made choices within the geopolitical contexts of early Georgia. These contexts, though, did not determine behavior.

Andrew K. Frank  
Florida Atlantic University

**North American Indian Art.** By David W. Penney. New York and London: Thames and Hudson, Ltd., 2004. 232 pages. \$30.00 cloth; \$16.95 paper.

A long-standing frustration shared by faculty teaching North American Indian art has been the limited availability of good texts for teaching the topic at the college survey level. Institutionalizing art of the Americas into the art history curriculum has been a slow, difficult process impeded as much by the scarcity of a suitable literature for instruction as by the Eurocentrism and lingering primitivist frameworks that still affect the way students are trained in the discipline. Specialization in North American Indian art has been one of the latest developments in visual arts scholarship, introduced into most academic programs even more recently than the related study of Mesoamerican art. The latter has been supported from its beginnings by excellent survey texts that provide a discursive tradition (extending from George Kubler's *The Art and Architecture of Ancient America* [1962], to later handbooks by Mary Miller, Esther Pasztory, and others) that integrates pre-Columbian coursework into programs of study with an assurance that is less readily achieved in North American courses. Faculty who have taught both fields are strongly aware of how the presence or absence of high-quality textbooks written from an art historical point of view shapes both the effectiveness of those courses and their reception in the academic world. The publication of new, up-to-date, authoritative texts like David W. Penney's *North American Indian Art* shifts North American courses away from the margins of art history—where they often serve as exemplars of such exotica as “tribal arts,” “art in small-scale societies,” and “non-Western art”—to a less segregated place in educational programs. Penney's book succeeds the earlier Thames and Hudson handbook *Native Arts of North America* by Christian Feest, which has served as a staple for survey teaching and a source for general readers since its publication in 1980. It joins *Native North American Art* (1998) by Janet Berlo and Ruth Phillips as a competitor for those same markets today.

*North American Indian Art* is a compact publication that covers a very satisfying range of topics in a lean, tightly focused text. The work features 181 illustrations and three black-and-white maps that illustrate the locations of North America's ancient cultures, archaeological sites, and historical tribes from the Arctic to the Mexico border. In addition, the author provides