



Indian Nation

*Native American Literature and
Nineteenth-Century Nationalisms*

Cheryl Walker

Indian Nation



New Americanists

A Series Edited by Donald E. Pease

Indian Nation



*Native American Literature and
Nineteenth-Century Nationalisms*
Cheryl Walker

Duke University Press Durham and London

1997

© 1997 Duke University Press All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper ∞

Typeset in Monotype Fournier by Keystone Typesetting, Inc.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

appear on the last printed page of this book.

This book is dedicated to the two Michaels:

Harper, my partner in life and literature, and

Cunningham, my Indian guide



The Indian is “the first and best blood of America.”

—Zane Grey

Lost in this [forlorn modernity] (and its environments)
as in a forest, I do believe the average American to be an
Indian, but an Indian robbed of his world.

—William Carlos Williams

The project of imagining themselves *Homines Americanis* posed unusual problems for the subjects of the new US. . . . The true Americans were American Indians. Iconography inscribed ideology; since the Renaissance, America had been represented not as a pious Puritan or a sturdy white husbandman but as a naked, voluptuous American Indian woman. To legitimate their possession of America's lands, their exercise of political suzerainty and their new national and political identities, Euro-Americans had to refuse that representation, establish themselves as the only true Americans and all other Americans, including that voluptuous American Indian woman, as marginal and hyphenated. —Carroll Smith-Rosenberg

Questions of power remain unresolved
where you have neither identity nor a way of
knowing what “identity” might be.

—Leslie Marmon Silko

[N. Scott] Momaday's self-portrait reveals a child inside, looking out at “Indians,” questioning how he can define himself as bi-cultural American. This confusion, this challenge, *is* an Indian identity in America, as much as the call for harmonies in the old ways or tribal integrities. —Kenneth Lincoln

Tribal imagination, experience, and remembrance,
are the real landscapes in the literature of this nation;
discoveries and dominance are silence.

—Gerald Vizenor



Contents

Preface and Acknowledgments xi

1. The Subject of America: The Outsider Inside 1

2. Writing Indians 25

3. The Irony and Mimicry of William Apess 41

4. Black Hawk and the Moral Force of Transposition 60

5. The Terms of George Copway's Surrender 84

6. John Rollin Ridge and the Law 111

7. Sarah Winnemucca's Mediations: Gender,
Race, and Nation 139

8. Personifying America: Apess's "Eulogy on King Philip" 164

9. Native American Literature and Nineteenth-Century
Nationalisms 185

Appendix: "The Red Man's Rebuke" 209

Notes 221

Works Cited 239

Index 249

Preface and Acknowledgments

This book has had a long germination period. I first started teaching Native American literature in the early 1970s, but I knew little then about nineteenth-century Indian texts. *Black Elk Speaks* was a work I deeply admired, so I included it in my survey of American literature and found that the students were equally impressed by it. Over the years I added other works from the twentieth century by such writers as Louise Erdrich, Paula Gunn Allen, and Leslie Marmon Silko. But I still postponed considering nineteenth-century texts.

It was not until I began to team-teach the introductory course in the intercollegiate American Studies Program at the Claremont Colleges that I became aware of nineteenth-century issues in Native American history and nationalism. These led me to formulate some preliminary ideas about “the outsider inside.” But when I finally put together my first proposal for a book on minority literature and American nationalist rhetoric, I had grandiose plans to examine not only Native American but also African American, Asian American, Latin, immigrant, and homosexual writers, a range of “outsiders” from both the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries. Needless to say, that project was far too ambitious. As I worked my way through the nineteenth century, exploring material by and about Native Americans as well as the increasingly large body of literature concerning nationalism, it became clear to me that I could not deal adequately with this material in one or even several chapters of a multidimensional project. Ultimately, the project became a book just about Indians. Where possible, I have tried to suggest crosscurrents in subaltern studies, but the focus has remained centered on Native Americans, in the nineteenth rather than twentieth century.

As this brief summary of a twenty-year process indicates, I approach Native American literature as a scholar and a teacher. I am not an Indian, and most of my prior professional work has concerned

poetry and issues of gender. Is it, then, inappropriate for me to write about Native American texts? The issues are complex, but I nevertheless believe that they can be addressed usefully by those who are willing to take the time to understand them, even if such people are not Native American themselves.

In support of this position, let me introduce some comments I have found helpful from two recent articles that are part of the ongoing "authenticity" debates that have emerged in this era of multiculturalism. In "Scholarship and Native American Studies: A Response to Daniel Littlefield, Jr.," Arnold Krupat addresses the challenges that have been raised by some Native Americans to the infiltration of the field of Native American Studies by non-Indians. According to Krupat, Littlefield responds defensively to these challenges instead of understanding that (1) not all Indians agree with the challengers and (2) some of the challenges are rhetorical rather than substantive. Krupat's main point is that there is no logical (as opposed to political) reason why non-Indians should be excluded from Native American Studies as long as they do responsible work.

This is not to deny the importance (or the lived reality) of having the experience of being Indian; it is to point to the obvious fact that Indian experience is not always and everywhere the same, nor is it ever unproblematically given to consciousness (nor is consciousness unproblematically represented in writing, etc.). *All* experience must be interpreted, and even people who have the "same" experience—the inverted commas indicate the differences inevitable in any "sameness"—may interpret it differently, reaching very different conclusions. (85–86)

In "The Great Pretenders: Further Reflections on Whiteshamanism," Wendy Rose has given a dramatic firsthand account of her experiences of being challenged by non-Indians who insist that their "research" is more authentic than her own experiences of her culture. She is understandably vexed, for instance, by ethnographers who insist that "basket-hats are no longer worn by California Indian women. Yet, nearly every weekend such women attended the same social functions as I, wearing basket-hats that had been passed down through their families and, more importantly, were still being made"

(406). Rose is angry that “Simply *being* Indian—a real, live, breathing, up-to-date Indian person—is not enough” (413) to guarantee authenticity, as far as white people are concerned. Therefore, her own experience of Indianness is often set aside as simply anecdotal or eccentric in favor of the claims of white people who “do research,” or pretend to be “whiteshamans” and cater to stereotypical expectations concerning the way Indians are supposed to think and dress.

But, according to Rose’s argument, is authenticity guaranteed simply by possessing Indian blood? The answer here seems to be no; one must continue to live according to Indian customs and keep in contact with the community. Similarly, Rose does not insist that non-Indians stay out of the field of Native American Studies. She says simply: “We accept as given that whites have as much prerogative to write and speak about us and our cultures as we have to write and speak about them and theirs. The question is how this is done and, to some extent, why it is done” (416).

Like Krupat, another non-Indian, I am committed to Native American Studies and happy to be enlightened about my mistakes. Like Wendy Rose, I agree that a non-native scholar should be cautious about contradicting a native person whose experience is rooted in the indigenous culture itself. I hope that this book demonstrates my dedication to accuracy, my interest in revising the historical record most Americans have read, and my continuing commitment to expanding the literary canon.

Of course, there are genuine problems in being an outsider inside, even as a critic. Krupat and Rose help us think about some of the many knotty questions that plague the fields of multiculturalism today. Who should speak and what legitimacy does the speech of those who are not living the experience of oppression have? What is the difference between necessary generalization (e.g., in the abstractions “Indians” or “Euro-Americans”) and destructive essentialization? To whom (if anyone) does a culture belong? How does one distinguish between the desire to produce “noncoercive knowledge in the interests of human freedom”—to quote Edward Said (Krupat, “Response,” 98)—and the temptation to give oneself greater conceptual latitude in speaking “for others” than one is entitled to?

All these questions belong to the larger category of issues concerning authenticity. In this intellectual environment, questions might even be raised about the Native American authors I treat in this book. Since many of them rejected traditional ways to some degree, are they “real Indians”? Obviously, I think they are (and so do other scholars in the field); what I wish to show is that “real Indians” were of many different persuasions.

A provocative intervention in the authenticity debates is Rey Chow’s “Where Have All the Natives Gone?” Chow argues that the image of the native (she is usually speaking here of Asians) is never unproblematic in Western scholarship. As a starting point, she suggests that the gaze of the Western scholar is “pornographic” in the sense that Fredric Jameson uses the term when he alludes to the “mere naked body” uncovered by Western scholars when they take the native as their text. Chow says: “Whether positive or negative, the construction of the native remains at the level of image-identification, a process in which ‘our’ own identity is measured in terms of the degrees to which we resemble her and to which she resembles us. Is there a way of conceiving of the native beyond imagistic resemblance?” (130–31). In other words, can the “authentic native” ever speak?

Chow takes up two responses to this question, Homi Bhabha’s and Gayatri Spivak’s. Spivak argues that the subaltern cannot speak in Western discourse (which always co-opts the speaker and translates such speech into its own terms). Bhabha, by contrast, argues that the subaltern has always already spoken, because Western discourse is fractured and framed by its encounter with the Other. Chow finds both of these responses inadequate, however. One is too pessimistic, but the other is too optimistic in its erasure of all struggle.

Instead, Chow proposes that we consider the native as “an indifferent, defiled image” (145–46), silent, unperturbed, framed, resistant.

To insist on the native as an indifferent, defiled image is then to return to the native a capacity for distrusting and resisting the symbolic orders that “fool” her, while not letting go of the “illusion” that has structured her survival. To imagine the coexistence of defilement and indifference *in* the

native-object is not to neutralize the massive destructions committed under such orders as imperialism and capitalism. Rather, it is to invent a dimension beyond the deadlock between native and colonizer. (146)

In chapter 1 I will introduce my own approach to “the native” and to Native American texts. As will be spelled out in greater detail there, I have chosen to focus on two forms of discourse—“transpositional” and “subjugated”—which are, in a sense, contradictory. The contradiction is similar to that which Chow suggests in the pairing “indifferent, defiled.” I too wish to make room for agency and resistance. I too must deal with images, distortions, and their effects.

Perhaps the only way to avoid being captured by the reductivism of hegemony is by preserving the oxymoron: that is, the contradiction implied by two incompatible discourses within which it becomes clear there are gaps and fissures one cannot dismiss. That aporia, that silence, must give one pause, as Chow suggests when she says: “we should argue that it is the native’s silence which is the most important clue to her displacement. That silence is at once the *evidence* of imperialist oppression (the naked body, the defiled image) and what, in the absence of the original witness to that oppression, must act in its place by *performing* or *feigning* [i.e., pretending to serve] as the pre-imperialist gaze” (134).

In what follows I will periodically examine passages in Native American texts that I cannot “translate,” that is, identify and fit into a clear, systematic perspective. In such cases, I will usually ponder several possibilities, as I do with one section of Black Hawk’s autobiography which gives “his” views about African Americans. I hope that both my commitment to the struggle to translate (and thus enter into) Native American perspectives, and my willingness to refrain from expressing certainty about such translations, will be seen as part of the weave of Native American scholarship whose basic premises I support and share.

The research I did for this book involved a number of libraries and librarians whom I wish to acknowledge and thank here: the Huntington Library of Pasadena (Peter Blodgett), the Chicago Public Library (Connie Gordon), the Huntington Free Library in the Bronx (Mary

Davis), the Alderman Library of the University of Virginia, the Indiana University Research Library, the Wisconsin State Historical Society, the Chicago Historical Society, the Newberry Library, and the Rare Book Collection of the Honnold Library of the Claremont Colleges. Many people at these institutions took considerable time to answer my questions and search for materials. Special thanks go to Alfred Bendixen, who told me about the Southwest Museum in Los Angeles. Ultimately, their library (and Kim Walters in particular) were the most helpful to me in my search for Simon Pokagon's birchbark document "The Red Man's Rebuke."

I would also like to acknowledge the following people who gave me information helpful in the preparation of this manuscript: Jim Anaya, Jean Smith, Julie Liss, Nathalie Rachlin, Rita Roberts, Héctor Calderón, Stuart McConnell, and my students Sarah Goss and Robin Podolsky. Arnold Krupat, Suzanne Clark, Michael Harper, and Michael Cunningham read the entire manuscript and offered enormously useful advice. This book owes a great debt to the NEH Seminar on Postcolonial Literature given by Albert Wertheim at Indiana University in 1993 and to the Rockefeller Foundation, which made it possible for me to work during 1994 at the Study and Conference Center at the Villa Serbelloni in Bellagio, Italy. People in both places steered me to useful resources and refined my thinking about the issues addressed herein. I gratefully acknowledge the research funds I received from Scripps College (especially the Richard Armour Chair) and the support for scholarly activity provided by Mary W. Johnson. Special thanks go, as always, to my wonderful secretary Nancy Burson.

I would also like to thank here four people who helped me to create a spiritual context that became increasingly precious to me during the writing of this book: Colin Thompson, Homer D. "Butch" Henderson, Peter Farmer, and Coleman Barks.

"And don't forget about us!" my daughter insisted. Ian (sixteen) and Louisa (thirteen) have given me great cause to be thankful and, as Louisa is fond of reminding me, they wish the Indians had won.

The complete text of Simon Pokagon's "The Red Man's Rebuke" (1893) is reprinted courtesy of the Southwest Museum (Ms 745).

"The Gift Outright" is from *The Poetry of Robert Frost*, edited by Edward Connery Lathem; copyright 1942 by Robert Frost; copyright 1970 by Leslie Frost Ballantine; copyright 1969 by Henry Holt and Company, Inc., and is reprinted here by permission of Henry Holt and Company, Inc. "Retrieving Osceola's Head—Okemah, Oklahoma, June 1985" by Wendy Rose was originally published in *boundary 2*, 19:3 (Fall, 1992), pp. 238–39, copyright 1985, and is reprinted by permission of Duke University Press.

I. The Subject of America

The Outsider Inside

American character is a particularly vexed subject, vexed because, on the one hand, we no longer wish to define Americans in terms of certain character traits, modes of behavior, physical types, and yet, on the other, we have never lost the desire to puzzle over the implications of ideas of the nation for a certain conception of the human being understood to represent those ideas. Whether or not we think of ourselves as “typical Americans”—and most of us don’t—many of us have had the experience of being so labeled when we travel abroad, causing us to ponder our own understandings of what America is and how we are affected by it. Black Americans find that in Africa they are often considered more “American” than “African American.” The children of immigrants, or even those who have themselves emigrated from other parts of the world, discover that they cannot easily shrug off the buffalo robe of “Americanization” when they visit friends and relations from their past. One never feels quite so American as when one is not in the United States. But what does it mean to be an American subject, the representative of certain conceptions about the nation? What aspects of one’s identity and one’s politics are not simply personal but national? At home we are all exiles. Abroad we seem, strangely, to be heard speaking only of “home.”

Even those for whom life in America¹ has been far from ideal, those subjected to a process of identity deformation that is connected in no small way to a conception of the nation as composed of insiders and outsiders, even these have had to think about their relation to national ideology and American subjectivity. The African American playwright Anna Deavere Smith writes: “It seems to me that American character lives in the gaps between us and to the degree to which we are willing to move between those gaps. It lives in our struggle to be together in our differences, even the non-negotiable ones” (8).

Thus, the subject of America must be seen as without a fixed con-

tent; rather than being representable as a particular set of characteristics, it becomes a conversation, perhaps, or a set of stories. Similarly, one might say, as Liah Greenfeld does, that “American nationalism was [and essentially is] idealistic nationalism” (449); therefore “nationhood” emerges and reemerges not as a historical entity or an accepted sequence of events but as a counterweight to history, a projection into the future always waiting to be realized. When the subject of America is raised abroad, it is often accompanied by head shakings of one sort or another as the gap is measured between American ideals of justice and equality and American practices seen as unjust and undemocratic. But these friends abroad misconceive the effect of these challenges. Rather than undermining the force of nationalist rhetoric, such grumbling is in fact a principal aspect of the discourse on American character, a familiar feature of what America is and has always been.

Nathaniel Hawthorne was one of those who, even in the nineteenth century, both idealized America and took her to task for a certain wayward individualism. Personifying America in the figure of the adulteress Hester Prynne, who wears the red A (perhaps identifying her territory), he admired its independent spirit but wondered about its memory and its capacity for moral commitment. In “The Custom House” essay that precedes the main text of *The Scarlet Letter*, Hawthorne also reflected on the double nature of America in his reading of the American eagle.

With the customary infirmity of temper that characterizes this unhappy fowl, she appears, by the fierceness of her beak and eye and the general truculency of her attitude, to threaten mischief to the inoffensive community; and especially to warn all citizens, careful of their safety, against intruding on the premises which she overshadows with her wings. Nevertheless, vixenly as she looks, many people are seeking, at this very moment, to shelter themselves under the wing of the federal eagle; imagining, I presume, that her bosom has all the softness and snugness of an eider-down pillow. But she has no great tenderness, even in her best of moods, and sooner or later,—oftener soon than late,—is apt to fling off her nestlings with a scratch of her claw, a dab of her beak, or a rangling wound from her barbed arrows. (23–24)

America is seen here as both the truculent federal eagle (the state), apt to scratch her offspring, and as "the inoffensive community" (the people) deeply connected to Hawthorne's sense of himself. So "America" is power and privilege, the misuse of these through arrogance or selfish inattention, and, as a third component, the silent majority who struggle on despite a less than nurturing environment. In *The Anatomy of National Fantasy*, Lauren Berlant argues that Hawthorne constructs America as "a domestic, and yet a strange and foreign place" (3), a space where the experience of "home" and "exile" inevitably meet.

Hawthorne found it odd that such an inhospitable creature as the federal eagle should attract so many new nestlings wishing to shelter themselves under its wing, but the same is true today. What's more, many writers from oppressed minorities in America have responded to America's hostility or exclusionist practices not by an attack on nationalist rhetoric but by asserting their right to be Americans and their fitness for contributing to the National Symbolic.² "I, too, sing America," wrote Langston Hughes,³ and the commitment reflected in these words has been echoed by Latins, Asians, Eastern Europeans, and many other groups and individuals seeking a home within a nation of immigrants. Alienation often engenders disaffection, but it has also produced attempts to seize the terms of the dominant discourse and redeploy them. Poor, Jewish, and homosexual in a country known for its wealth, its WASPs, and its celebration of the nuclear family, Allen Ginsberg wrote into his 1956 poem on his wildly eccentric experience of national identity a wonderful conclusion: "It occurs to me I am America," he said, and ended, "America I'm putting my queer shoulder to the wheel" ("America," 34).

I offer these thoughts by way of introducing what will strike some as a peculiar project: a book about conceptions of America and American nationalism in nineteenth-century Native American writing. The general assumption in the critical literature has been that Native Americans were the victims of nationalist discourse pure and simple, that they resisted attempts to impose an idea of nation that derived from European models on their native and essentially tribal structures of governance and knowledge, because such ideas obviously threatened many aspects of their cultures. But the truth is more com-

plicated than this view allows for, because by the end of the first third of the nineteenth century, there were several understandings of nation in play among both Euro-Americans and Native Americans. Let me suggest some of them here, though in subsequent chapters I will try to deepen and complicate these preliminary notions.

In his discussion of the evolution of the words “nation,” “national,” and “nationalism,” Raymond Williams clarifies the sense in which Western understandings of nation developed from the seventeenth century onward, during the precise period when Native Americans and Europeans were coming into conflict over this issue in the “New World.”

There was from [the seventeenth century] a use of the *nation* to mean the whole people of a country, often in contrast, as still in political argument, with some group within it. The adjective *national*, which is clearly political, is more recent and still alternates with the older *subject*. *Nationality*, which had been used in a broad sense from lC17, acquired its modern political sense in lC18 and eC19.

Nationalist appeared in eC18 and *nationalism* in eC19. Each became common from mC19. The persistent overlap between racial grouping and political formation has been important, since claims to be a *nation*, and to have *national* rights, often envisaged the formation of a *nation* in the political sense, even against the will of an existing political *nation* which included and claimed the loyalty of this grouping. It could be and is still often said, by opponents of *nationalism*, that the basis of the group’s claim is racial.⁴ (178–79)

Though developed in a European context, much of this is useful for our purposes as well. By the nineteenth century, American rhetoric conceived of the nation as both a political entity, with geographical dimensions and laws, and a people, whose “deep, horizontal comradeship”⁵ had to be identified and argued, even racially codified. However, there was great disagreement over who was qualified to be an “American” and what the nature of “America” really was.

Native Americans had not traditionally understood nations as the West came to define them. Nor did race play much of a role in their thinking.⁶ In Indian oral traditions the nation originally meant simply

the people and the environment they inhabited, an environment without legislated boundaries. William Least Heat Moon tells a story about the Native American sense of “nation” in *PrairyErth* (a deep map):

The white man asked, *Where is your nation?* The red man said, *My nation is the grass and roots and the four-leggeds and the six-leggeds and the belly wrigglers and swimmers and the winds and all things that grow and don't grow.* The white man asked, *How big is it?* The other said, *My nation is where I am and my people where they are and the grandfathers and their grandfathers and all the grandmothers and all the stories told, and it is all the songs, and it is our dancing.* The white man asked, *But how many people are there?* The red man said, *That I do not know.* (16)

Though strikingly different, such a conception of nation shares some components with Euro-American ideas. Land, traditions, people, stories—these are also part of the national lexicon of Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur, Francis Parkman, and James Fenimore Cooper, white men whose writings served to define the nation for later generations of Americans. But Indians thought of the nation as constituted “in the early days,” an era lost in the mists of time. Furthermore, the relations among the various components of the nation were sacred, not political in a European sense. Each component—land, traditions, people, stories—was connected in a deep and mysterious way to the others.

Vine Deloria Jr. and Clifford Lytle describe the difference between Euro-American and Indian ideas of nation this way:

Because the tribes understood their place in the universe as one given specifically to them, they had no need to evolve special political institutions to shape and order their society. A council at which everyone could speak, a council to remind the people of their sacred obligations to the cosmos and to themselves, was sufficient for most purposes. . . . Indians had a good idea of nationhood, but they had no knowledge of the other attributes of political existence that other people saw as important. Most of all, Indians had no awareness of the complexity that plagued the lives of other peoples, in particular the Europeans. (9)

Using these representations of Native American ideas about "nation," we might conclude that there was no real convergence between Euro-American and Native American understandings. According to Benedict Anderson, this "good idea of nationhood" (to which Deloria and Lytle refer) is actually prenatal, reflecting a worldview more akin to the unself-consciously coherent sacralized communities that preceded modern political arrangements. It is precisely the fact that such communities "rooted human lives firmly in the very nature of things, giving certain meaning to the everyday fatalities of existence (above all death, loss, and servitude), and offering, in various ways, redemption from them" (*Imagined Communities*, 36) that for Anderson disqualifies them from modern nationhood. Nations, he argues, come into being when the West is desacralized due to the spread of capitalism and print culture, the multiple interrelations between writing, printing, and reading that are enmeshed in the market economy. The nation, then, operates in part as recompense for the loss of the religious certainties that allowed for integration between the self and the cosmos.

If Native Americans had been allowed to continue in their tribes as they had for centuries, it would indeed make little sense to introduce Indian conceptions of nationalism into a discussion of European ones. However, from the seventeenth century onward, traditional ideas had been modified by contact of varying sorts with white people. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, Indian-white relations were well advanced in most parts of the country east of the Mississippi. Furthermore, during the century the United States vastly expanded its empire so that by 1900 all indigenous peoples had been touched by American nationalism, mostly in negative ways.

The responses of Native Americans to white encroachment were varied. Some like the Pueblos first sought accommodation. Others resisted and went to war. The Cherokees were unusual in the degree to which they adopted aspects of white culture into their own national identity.⁷ But eventually all were forced to come to terms with the non-native conception of nation represented by America itself. Thus, the nineteenth century was a defining time for both Native Americans and their white counterparts. During this time Americans were ac-

tively engaged in the process of constructing a sense of “nationness” through iconography, art, writing, rituals, speeches, institutions, and laws.

What has not been adequately recognized before is that Native Americans also participated in this cultural process, sometimes in order to distinguish themselves from the invaders but sometimes in the interests of revising notions of America to include the tribes themselves. Thus, America in the nineteenth-century was intercultural in significant ways. In this kind of context, as Timothy Reiss puts it, “Cultural categories mingle and float. ‘Borders’ are more than just porous. Cultures are mutually defining. The fault of European cultures was to believe that they are not” (651).⁸

The mistake that Reiss refers to here may be seen not only in the nineteenth-century essentialism that demonized Native Americans as savages but also in more recent assumptions that Indians took no part in the discussions of national identity. Let me offer three recent examples of the persistence of the idea that Native Americans contributed little or nothing to the development of an American national discourse. In Larzer Ziff’s *Writing in the New Nation: Prose, Print, and Politics in the Early United States* (1991)—and let me say here that I have great respect for Ziff as a cultural historian—he articulates the view that print culture in the United States inevitably transformed the experience of immanence in Nature, admired by so many American writers, into fodder for an imperial cultural project destructive of, inter alia, Native Americans. In the chapter entitled “Captive Language,” he traces the transformation of Lewis and Clark’s journals into Nicholas Biddle’s *History of the Expedition under the Command of Captains Lewis and Clark* (1814). Though Lewis and Clark, like Timothy Dwight and Thomas Jefferson in Ziff’s earlier examples, were sympathetic to the Indians and admired many features of their culture, literary conventions and print culture itself, according to Ziff, sealed the fate of Native Americans.

The process of literary annihilation would be checked only when Indian writers began representing their own culture. As whites had utilized sign language to commence their dialogue with Indians, so Indians, finally,

would come to utilize the conventions of written English to restore dialogue to what *for a century after Biddle's History*, had been in reality a monologue with the Indian's voice supplied by the ventriloquizing culture of the white. (emphasis added, 173)

In truth, Native Americans began to express their views at least as early as the 1830s in texts published in English, some of which went into several editions. (Whether these texts were simply examples of another kind of ventriloquism is a question we must consider in some detail.) Furthermore, their speeches, delivered in many cities throughout the United States, were attended by large crowds and were subsequently both printed and reviewed in newspapers and journals, as examples of Indian oratory. Yet Ziff seems to believe that Indians were effectively silenced until the twentieth century.

Similarly, in *Manifest Manners: Postindian Warriors of Survivance* (1994), Gerald Vizenor (Chippewa)—the champion of postmodern mixed-blood narrators of Indian culture and identity—repeats Ziff's argument, though he takes notice (as Ziff does not) of William Apess's early example of Indian autobiography, in which Apess reflects at various points upon the nations. For Vizenor the production of literature outside the tribal context is inevitably a desecration because such "simulations" (Vizenor's word) present an absence, an absence partly accessed only by what Vizenor calls "trickster hermeneutics." "The stories that are heard [in tribal ceremonies] are the coherent memories of natural reason; the stories that are read are silent landscapes" (96), thus in need of hermeneutic voices.

Against the destructive simulations of nationalist dominance, which he names "manifest manners," postindian warriors create "a counter word culture" (20). "The postindian warriors bear their own simulations and revisions to contend with manifest manners, the 'authentic' summaries of ethnology, and the curse of racialism and modernism in the ruins of representation. The wild incursions of the warriors of survivance undermine the simulations of the unreal in the literature of dominance" (12).

The "postindian warriors" Vizenor addresses (and he has many interesting things to say about them) all come from the twentieth

century. He quotes Ziff extensively in creating his argument about the development of nineteenth-century American nationalist rhetoric, the literature of dominance that, Vizenor agrees, attempted to capture the Indian with words. But one struggles to resolve the seeming contradiction in Vizenor's argument between his poststructural contention that everyone—"postindian warriors" and "missionaries of manifest manners" alike—must deal in simulations and articulations of absence (13), and what seems to be a belief in authentic experiences of presence within tribal aural culture where "the shadows of tribal consciousness, and the shadows of names and natural reason are overheard" (96). It remains unclear whether Vizenor believes that nineteenth-century Indian writers had anything to offer in countering American nationalist "manifest manners" or whether, as seems more likely from his argument, postindian literature had to await an opportunity for "the new" that did not arrive until manifest manners had to some extent played its hand.

In my first two examples, Ziff and Vizenor agree that print culture effectively kept Native Americans from entering the cultural conversation during the nineteenth century; they hold out for a twentieth-century counterdiscourse as the beginning of Native American resistance to American nationalist rhetoric. My third example of the persistence of the view that Native Americans contributed nothing to the National Symbolic is *Removals: Nineteenth-Century American Literature and the Politics of Indian Affairs* (1991), in which Lucy Maddox argues that there were *two* discursive communities—Indian and white—but that they never converged. Though her work on Euro-American writers (especially Melville) is fascinating, she too seems to accept the idea that Native Americans were basically out of the national loop.

Maddox begins her study by talking about the problem of bringing Indian and white discourses together, claiming that the eastern Indians, in order to guard the nation, were mainly dedicated to frustrating efforts to construct and enforce laws, while the western tribes frustrated efforts at expansion. Thus, "the nation"—understood as the United States—inevitably developed in opposition to "the tribes." "The Indians, that is, continued to frustrate white America's efforts—