

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Demanding the Cherokee Nation: Indian Autonomy and American Culture, 1830-1900. By Andrew Denson.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9960p04m>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 29(3)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Clark, D. Anthony Tyeeme

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/>

James Shaffer (Yamasee) and James Howard wrote “Medicine and Medicine Headresses of the Yamasee,” *American Indian Tradition* 8, no. 3 (1962). In 1948, William H. Gilbert referred to the existing Yamasee band in *Surviving Indian Groups of the Eastern United States*, Smithsonian Institute Annual Report (1948). As a Yamasee Indian and academic historian, I have written a chapter on Yamasee history in Donald A. Grinde and Bruce E. Johansen, *Ecocide of Native America* (1995), as well as an essay on “Yamasee Political and Legal Traditions” in Bruce E. Johansen, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Native American Legal Tradition* (1998). I list these works because such omissions are frequently found in Southern colonial Native American history even though the data is in annual reports by the Smithsonian Institution and journals like the *American Anthropologist*. American Indian historians of the Southeast still use John R. Swanton’s *Early History of the Creek Indians and Their Neighbors* (1922) uncritically and do not dig deeper to realize its severe historical and ethnological shortcomings. I confess that I feel ambivalent about touting the works of anthropologists and ethnologists, but their work must be consulted in writing histories of Native peoples. I just wonder why these omissions of Yamasee ethnology and history were not caught by readers at the University of Nebraska Press.

But I digress; in general, this book expands our understanding of the American Southeast compared to the earlier works on the subject. We are treated to a deeper examination of the motives of the South Carolinians, the Spanish, the French, African Americans, and to a lesser degree the Native peoples in the clash of cultures and empires. It is a much-needed update on the imperial history of the American Southeast, and, in a limited way, it gives us some new insights into the American Indian history of the Southeast. Realistically, Oatis achieves a limited degree of success in his stated goal of portraying a more balanced view of the colonial empires of the Southeast. In the end, despite my criticisms of this book relating to the omissions of Yamasee history and ethnology, I still highly recommend it for graduate students and research scholars of Southern American history. It is well researched on the European empire side, and perhaps the tribal and cultural histories of Southeastern Indians such as the Yamasees are best left to those who have a more multidisciplinary and multicultural frame of mind.

Donald A. Grinde, Jr.
State University of New York, Buffalo

Demanding the Cherokee Nation: Indian Autonomy and American Culture, 1830–1900. By Andrew Denson. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004. 327 pages. \$55.00 cloth.

In the English-language translation of the treaty negotiated in November 1785 between representatives of the governments of the United States and the Cherokee Nation at Hopewell, South Carolina, both parties agreed that Cherokee political leaders “shall have the right to send a deputy of their

choice, whenever they think fit, to Congress” (*Indian Affairs: Laws and Treaties*, vol. 2: *Treaties*, ed. Charles J. Kappler, 1904, 11). This provision of the 1785 treaty was reiterated in the treaty struck at New Echota in 1835. However, fifty years after Hopewell, representatives of the Cherokee Nation surrendered the authority for doing so to Congress. Under staggering pressure, they also transferred to the federal government of the United States those Cherokee Nation lands located east of the Mississippi River.

Congressional delegates are not uncommon in the history of the United States Congress. During the period of the Articles of Confederation and since the adoption of the U.S. Constitution, U.S. citizens living in territories not recognized as states have elected delegates to the House of Representatives. While certain delegates have joined representatives of congressional districts, the U.S. Congress continues to ignore solemn treaties and the wishes of Cherokee citizens. Fortunately, this has not meant that Cherokee citizens were (and, for that matter, are) not engaged with politics in the United States generally and Congress in particular.

Almost 168 years after their representatives signed the treaty in their national capitol at New Echota in July 2003, citizens of the Cherokee Nation in Tahlequah, Oklahoma, ratified their third constitution. In the article that defines the limits of legislative power in their national government, citizens of the Cherokee Nation reasserted their long-established desire to send a delegate to the U.S. Congress, in the language of the most recent constitution, a “citizen of the Nation” who “shall endeavor to participate in congressional activities and shall at all times advocate the best interests of the Cherokee People” (see Article VI, Section 12, 1999 Constitution of the Cherokee Nation).

In *Demanding the Cherokee Nation*—his first book—Andrew Denson describes how particular Cherokee spokespersons who were engaged with U.S. political culture represented their nation in the English language. Tracking these spokespersons during the six decades after their forced removal to Indian Territory in what he designates “a Cherokee literature of Indian nationhood” (title of introduction), “a Native American political literature” (3), and “Cherokee messages to America” (7)—in editorials, pamphlets, and speeches, as well as public relations campaigns constituted in formal appeals and petitions to the U.S. Congress and president—Denson became aware of a sustained effort to call attention to the countless contradictions in U.S. policies, which have deployed benevolent rhetoric while dismantling indigenous nations. Crucially, he also noticed in this Cherokee political literature unbroken efforts to articulate, defend, and promote a form of Cherokee nationhood that would not simply coexist with the United States but that also might sustain the well-being of both Cherokee citizens and their characteristically antagonistic neighbors.

In addition to an introduction and epilogue, *Demanding the Cherokee Nation* has seven chapters. Using a storyline that tracks the history of U.S. policies aimed at managing non-indigenous relations with the Cherokee Nation, Denson distinguishes “the story of Cherokee removal” as “only the beginning of the tribe’s long conversation with the United States about the Indian nation” (15). In each of his chapters, beginning with Removal and

its immediate aftermath and then moving through the period of civil war in the United States and into the early years of resistance to allotment, Denson tackles what he terms a “contradiction” (5) and “the paradox of Indian nationhood” (49): the sovereignty of indigenous nations and their political weakness in relationships with the United States. Devoting the bulk of his book to events unfolding after the civil war in the United States—chapters 3 through 7—Denson identifies a fascinating history of brilliant and adaptive discursive strategies aimed at taking advantage of the colonizers’ ambivalence. In their self-interested and gluttonous efforts to take apart indigenous nations, representatives of ongoing colonization were forced into the position of categorizing and objectifying—but, importantly, also acknowledging and sustaining—indigenous difference. Thus, *Demanding the Cherokee Nation* is a historical study of how certain Cherokee representatives exploited this “colonial ambivalence,” to borrow a term from Homi Bhabha, a key voice in postcolonial studies who uses concepts influenced by semiotics and Lacanian psychoanalysis to argue that cultural production is always most prolific where it is most ambivalent.

As a historian who borrows from American studies, literary criticism, and postcolonial theory (Bhabha in particular), Denson is at his best in chapter 5, “The Indian International Fairs” (an earlier version of which was published in *Western Historical Quarterly* 34, no. 3). He makes a case in chapter 5 that Cherokee individuals who participated in the Indian International Fair for about twenty years after 1874 in Muscogee, Creek Nation, “made the fair serve their paramount political goal, the maintenance of the [Indian] Territory as a collection of independent Indian nations” (150) with the Cherokee and Creek nations providing the leading example for those among them who were less “civilized” (read less assimilated to the cultures and economies of the United States). What makes this chapter especially remarkable is Denson’s insistence on how important the fairs were to the Cherokee persons who participated in them. Academic historians have overlooked their efforts and the Cherokee individuals who “exerted a measure of control over how the fair displayed their people” and who advocated the idea “that wardship was not the only alternative to extinction for Indian people” (169). They found in the emerging culture of an industrializing United States, he maintains, “new arguments for the maintenance of the Indian nation” (171).

In chapter 5, Denson places the annual fair held at Muscogee in two contexts: the history of Indian Territory and late-nineteenth-century relationships between the governments of indigenous nations and the United States, and the wider practice of displaying “Indian” life. Focusing on the creators of the fair—a group that included Joshua Ross—and the demographics of fair participants—judges, officers, speakers, event winners, and attendees—Denson takes issue with the historian Angie Debo, who earlier dubbed the fair a “white man’s project” (quoted on 153). He uses William Penn Adair to consider and depict the fair primarily as an educational institution, a forum for debating the future of Indian Territory and advancing a position held by certain Cherokee leaders, in the author’s words: “the possibility of Indian civilization and the ongoing success of the civilizing mission *in an Indian Territory made up of separate*

nations" (163; my emphasis). He argues that the fair instructed visitors through images, something that allows him to distinguish the fair at Muscogee from the world's fairs. "At Muskogee," Denson suggests, reflecting on ways in which Cherokees represented themselves and other indigenous nations, "the United State's position as the vanguard of civilization did not confer upon white Americans the right to control Indian people" (168).

The same might be said about the class of Cherokee people on which Denson relies—those individuals who addressed non-indigenous peoples through the "Cherokee literature of Indian nationhood." Their confidence in engaging with political culture in the United States left them in a position of failing to represent scores of Cherokees, as well as non-Cherokee Natives. In *Cultivating the Rosebuds: The Education of Women at the Cherokee Female Seminary, 1851–1909* (1997), which Denson fails to cite, Devon Abbott Mihesuah has shown us that many Cherokees did not favor assimilation. Those in charge after Removal, for instance, may have desired to make their little darlings over into Victorian ladies. Others were furious about such efforts. Relying on English-language political literature to build his case prevents Denson from substantially addressing the internal differences and dynamics among citizens of the Cherokee Nation.

Despite their diversity, since 1785 the citizens of the Cherokee Nation seem to have expressed themselves with a remarkable consistency through their representatives to the government of the United States and in their domestic politics. As Denson acknowledges in his epilogue, those members of the Cherokee Nation who participated in ratifying the 1999 constitution continue to demand a place for their nation in political relationships with the United States.

D. Anthony Tyee Clark

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

European Metals in Native Hands: Rethinking Technological Change, 1640–1683. By Kathleen L. Ehrhardt. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2005. 253 pages. \$29.95 paper.

The historical outcomes of Native American and European interactions remain grist for the mills of scholarly inquiry. Theoretical frameworks sensitive to indigenous points of view, coupled with methodologies that draw on multiple lines of evidence, allow researchers to probe familiar ground to obtain new results. Questions surrounding the dialectic of change and continuity, the dynamic relationships between Natives and Europeans, the role of human agency and technological innovation, and the encoded meanings of material culture are integral to understanding how Native peoples responded to their social, political, economic, and ideological entanglements after European contact.

In *European Metals in Native Hands*, Kathleen L. Ehrhardt examines these and related issues by focusing on the acquisition, distribution, production, use, and perceptions of the mid-seventeenth-century Illinois in their experience