

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

A Strange Likeness: Becoming Red and White in Eighteenth-Century North America. By Nancy Shoemaker.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6hs811kc>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 29(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Kugel, Rebecca

Publication Date

2005

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/>

Omaha Tibbles provided pages of coverage and provocative front-page headlines, such as “Criminal Cruelty—The History of the Ponca Prisoners Now at the Barracks” and “A Tale of Cruelty That Has Never [Been] Surpassed” (73).

Crook already had announced his disgust at how Standing Bear’s party was being treated and became a major conduit of a legal case (*Standing Bear et al. v. Crook*) that he had every intention of losing. Following a trial during the spring of 1879, which included a speech by Standing Bear that provoked tears from the bench, federal district court judge Elmer Dundy ruled during 1879 that an Indian is a person within the meaning of the law, and no law gave the army authority to remove them forcibly from their lands. Some of Dando-Collins’s best narrative writing describes the trial, for which many records remain, including Tibbles’s daily journalism and two books, as well as court transcripts. One can nearly see Standing Bear, whose words were translated by the U’ma’ha woman Bright Eyes (a.k.a. Suzette LaFlesche, whom Tibbles later married), tell the packed courtroom that his blood was the same color as that of any white man and that everyone feels pain.

Dundy’s opinion and the *Herald’s* advocacy sparked opposition. The *Chicago Times*, on 14 May 1879, branded Dundy’s verdict “sentimental idiocy” (140). The Interior Department instructed Omaha’s federal district attorney to prepare an appeal, fearing that the verdict would allow Indians freedom to go anywhere they pleased, at any time. (Dundy had limited the ruling to the case at hand.) The *Daily Commonwealth* of Topeka, Kansas, raised the specter of Indians deserting Indian Territory en masse, heading for their old homelands (141).

Shortly after Dundy denied the army’s power to relocate Standing Bear and his party forcibly, his brother Big Snake tested the ruling by moving roughly one hundred miles in Indian Territory, from the Poncas’ assigned reservation to one occupied by the Cheyennes. He was arrested by troops and returned. On 31 October 1879, Ponca Indian agent William H. Whiteman called Big Snake a troublemaker and ordered a detail to imprison him. When Big Snake refused to surrender, contending he had committed no crime, he was shot to death. The Interior Department maintained that the shooting was an accident, but many of the Poncas believed that Big Snake was murdered. Thus, Standing Bear’s efforts produced a victory, but nearly his entire family died. In 1890 Standing Bear and his cohort returned to their homeland. This book presents a cardinal episode in US history in terms both humane and historical.

Bruce E. Johansen

University of Nebraska at Omaha

A Strange Likeness: Becoming Red and White in Eighteenth-Century North America. By Nancy Shoemaker. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004. 224 pages. \$29.95 cloth.

A prolific and thoughtful scholar of Native American history, Nancy Shoemaker probes two important and interrelated issues of theory and use of

evidence in this new collection of six discrete but overlapping essays. Each essay considers the constructs of difference and sameness by which Eastern Woodlands Native peoples and European colonizers comprehended each other during the first half of the eighteenth century. Shoemaker draws from a wide sample of Natives and incoming Europeans. Among the Native peoples whose views she presents are the Iroquois, Delawares, Mahicans, Shawnees, Cherokees, Creeks, and Chickasaws; the Europeans are mainly the British, though secondarily the French, Dutch, Spanish, and Swedish are occasionally represented. Surveying this diversity of peoples and opinions, Shoemaker challenges the present-day theoretical assumption, widely held by scholarly and popular audiences alike, that Native Americans and Europeans differed so radically from one another in nearly every facet of their cultures that, both literally and figuratively, they could not understand each other. Eighteenth-century Native peoples and Europeans did not emphasize their difference from one another, she asserts; to the contrary, in major areas of life they were strikingly similar. In their views about land, leadership, writing, alliance making, gender, and race, Native peoples and Europeans not only were similar, but they also recognized their similarities. Even more important in Shoemaker's view, they initially believed their sameness overshadowed their differences, and they made sameness the foundation of their earliest interactions with each other.

Shoemaker relies on a rich body of primary sources to document her claims to sameness and difference. It is a problematic body of sources, however, because it is almost completely generated by Europeans, cultural outsiders to the Native worlds that they were describing and interpreting. Shoemaker acknowledges the limits posed by such sources but insists this evidence cannot simply be dismissed as too biased and uncomprehending of Native realities to have any value in the reconstruction of the Native past, a position she feels has gained some currency among scholars. She reminds us that part of the historian's craft is to evaluate sources critically for bias, compare accounts, and consider the perspectives or agendas of given authors. If we do these things, European sources have important things to tell us about historic Native peoples. Europeans, she reminds readers, recorded "meticulous transcripts" of their political meetings with Native peoples, with the result that "hundreds, probably thousands" of Native speeches exist (9). The amount and variety of Native speech that was preserved extends beyond formal council speeches to include informal conversations between Native peoples and a host of Europeans, including traders, missionaries, travelers, and ordinary colonists. Such material, Shoemaker argues, when used with the care historians ought to exercise respecting all of their sources, reveals much about Native peoples that is simply not available anyplace else.

Shoemaker's concern that scholars have seen difference where early-eighteenth-century Europeans and Native peoples saw sameness forms the major theme of each of the volume's essays. In the essay on land, for instance, she reminds readers that Native peoples "conceptualized territorial sovereignty" in much the same way that Europeans did and marked tribal boundaries using such natural landmarks as rivers or rock outcroppings, methods of

marking that Europeans readily grasped (17). In the essay on kings she argues that both Native peoples and Europeans recognized individual persons as leaders, or kings, and both recognized that leaders fulfilled the dual functions of acting and personifying, that is both of governing and of symbolizing the nation in their corporeal person. She argues, too, for an essential sameness between written records and oral narratives, noting that written records, because they could be forged (and often were), proved no more reliable as methods for ascertaining and fixing truth than the supposedly less-reliable Native oral traditions. Native peoples and Europeans also understood alliances between nations similarly, recognizing alliances between equal powers and those between a weaker and a stronger nation. In a provocative analysis of gender she argues that Native peoples and Europeans shared an understanding of gender differences between men and women and utilized them in their political dealings with each other, usually in metaphoric ways that were demeaning to women. The infamous Iroquois description of the Delawares as women is only the best-known example of this. The final essay on race also describes examples of acknowledged sameness, as when Native peoples referred to themselves and their European allies as being of one mind or of one heart.

If sameness existed and both Native peoples and Europeans recognized it and embraced it as the foundation on which to build their earliest alliances, what happened to change things? Shoemaker argues that Europeans came to focus on difference only when they no longer needed to see sameness. As they grew more powerful, with larger numbers of their own colonists settled on the land, with colonial rivals driven out or subdued to harmlessness, they no longer needed Native allies or feared Native military strength. Shoemaker places this turning point in the middle of the eighteenth century, as British-French colonial rivalries heated up in prelude to the Seven Years War. At the same time, Native peoples, whipsawed by the disease epidemics and warfare of the first half of the eighteenth century, also began to see difference where they had seen similarity before. Fearful of their former allies' growing numbers and military might, they, too, began to emphasize difference rather than sameness.

Shoemaker is right to urge scholars to consider European-generated records seriously as source materials, but when all is said and done, the records do reveal more about the Europeans than the Native actors in the colonial drama. Native motivations for recognizing sameness between themselves and Europeans and for building alliances based on that recognition remain less clearly developed than those of Europeans. Nor is Shoemaker entirely persuasive when explaining why Native peoples would come to emphasize difference in the mid-eighteenth century at the same time that the British did. If the British no longer needed Native allies by the mid-eighteenth century, and this provided the rationale for their gradual shift toward seeing difference, why were Native peoples also emphasizing difference when they were operating not from a position of growing strength like the British but from a position of increasing weakness? The logic of Shoemaker's argument, carefully constructed in previous chapters, would have them emphasizing sameness.

The answer may lie in Shoemaker's characterizations of the earliest Native and European perceptions of sameness. Seventeenth-century and early-eighteenth-century encounters may have contained more difference and less harmonious agreement on sameness than she allows for. To give an extended example, Shoemaker finds evidence of sameness in Native and European views about land possession by a sovereign political entity, noting difference only in form rather than function. "Europeans also memorialized events and individuals by artificially marking the land; they just adhered to a different aesthetic" (15), she observes. Such characterizations are accurate as far as they go, but they ignore the fundamental reality at the heart of the Native-European experience in eastern North America. Europeans were coming to North America from elsewhere, from lands they were already in sovereign possession of, to lands they recognized as possessed by other sovereign peoples. This was murky terrain legally and ethically, and Europeans knew it. At the heart of the Native-European encounter in eastern North America was the nature of their differing relationships to the land. That Native and European relationships to the land differed should not be viewed as the romanticized construct incapable of scholarly analysis and so rightly critiqued by Shoemaker. Rather, it should be seen for what it was: the cold political fact of territorial possession and dispossession. Here was surely the most self-evident and insurmountable difference of all. The many European observations of similarities were each, on some level, filtered through their uneasy recognition that they were dispossessing lawful sovereigns of their land. Thus difference, rather than similarity, underlay the colonial venture from its inception.

Shoemaker has raised a compelling series of issues in this slim volume (there are only 143 pages of text). Each begs for further sustained analysis; each should generate insightful scholarly debate. Scholars of Native history should consider seriously whether our existing theoretical understandings of Native peoples and Europeans adequately describe the complex relationships they developed. Likewise, we should evaluate to what degree and with what safeguards we should utilize European-derived sources. Gender analysis, leadership and the uses of literacy, too, are topics that can be productively examined in more depth. Nancy Shoemaker has offered important initial thoughts on these and other subjects; it is to be hoped she will continue to contribute her insights to the ongoing discussion.

Rebecca Kugel

University of California, Riverside

"The Utes Must Go!": American Expansion and the Removal of a People. By Peter R. Decker. Golden, CO: Fulcrum, 2004. 236 pages. \$17.95 paper.

This book examines how westward expansion and national economic development dictated the dispossession of the Utes and their forced removal from Colorado to Utah. Peter Decker focuses on the relationship between the Utes and the federal government from the mid-nineteenth century until the tribe's