

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Jefferson and the Indians: The Tragic Fate of the First Americans. By Anthony F. C. Wallace.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4443675c>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 25(4)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Oberg, Michael Leroy

Publication Date

2001-09-01

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/>

lic spaces. As a dweller of Minnesota (as a graduate student) and New York (her home), Buff was a witness to the public expression of identity formation/maintenance and to important forms of cultural resistance to the racially and nationally sanctioned ideals of citizenship. The similarities that she likely noticed (racialized people forming transnational identities, adapting technologies, and resisting certain national discourses) probably seemed fertile ground for further investigation and study; and she was correct.

If two such seemingly different communities can be brought together, questions naturally arise about what links can be made between other groups and between other sites of cultural production. Using her two main theoretically saturated terms, Buff is able to successfully convey the importance of the links between American Indian communities in Minneapolis and West Indian communities in Brooklyn, and to raise simultaneously the question of why their separation seemed so natural in the first place.

Natchee Blu Barnd

University of California, San Diego

Jefferson and the Indians: The Tragic Fate of the First Americans. By Anthony F. C. Wallace. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999. 416 pages. \$31.50 cloth; \$18.95 paper.

Anthony F. C. Wallace has written a number of important scholarly works over the course of a long and productive career. His famous *Death and Rebirth of the Seneca* (1970) is required reading for any student of the ethnohistory of early America, masterfully describing the changes in Seneca society in the decades after the American Revolution. In *Jefferson and the Indians*, Wallace turns his attention to the other side of the frontier, exploring the career of the philosopher, statesman, and president who did so much, Wallace argues, to shape the contours of this nation's Indian policy. His goal is to understand Jefferson's "many inconsistencies," and to reconcile the "scholar and admirer" of American Indians with "the planner of cultural genocide" (p. vii).

Wallace argues that Jefferson came of age in a world that viewed Indians as enemies and as obstacles to the speculative land ventures of gentlemen like himself. After the Revolution, Jefferson's rhetoric mellowed and he adopted a tone of "paternalistic solicitude" as he commenced his studies of Indian origins and his work on the *Notes on the State of Virginia*. Jefferson believed in Indian potential, Wallace argues, and that Native peoples could assimilate into American society if guided properly by the benevolent hands of the American republic. Service in the cabinets of Washington and Adams and later his presidency forced Jefferson to put his philosophical speculations to the test. Jefferson, Wallace argues, found it difficult to reconcile his desire to civilize the Indians with his need to acquire lands for the sturdy American yeomanry. In the end, Indians lost out as Jefferson advocated removal and land cessions by Indians as the only way to protect them from the aggressive violence of the frontier population.

Wallace does a nice job of placing Jefferson's thinking about Indians in a broad historical and intellectual context. Wallace points out that the Whiskey Rebellion of 1794 and the Alien and Sedition controversy of 1798, in which Jefferson in effect winked at popular defiance of federal authorities, revealed a belief in political decentralization that made it completely unthinkable to use force to prevent frontier encroachments on Indian land. For this, and other keen observations, Wallace is to be commended.

In the end, however, one walks away from *Jefferson and the Indians* deeply disappointed. The problem is more than the long digressions—the “Jesuit Tradition in Ethnography,” for example—that might easily have been excised from the text. It is that Jefferson is held responsible for all the sins of his era. *Jefferson and the Indians* reads like its author needed to hold someone accountable for the “tragic fate of the First Americans,” and that Jefferson would do. This is a great-man history with a vengeance and, as a number of recent studies have pointed out, the tangled relationship between scores of Indian groups, white frontier settlers, state and territorial governments, and the federal government seldom allows for so easy a casting of blame.

Wallace's indictment of Jefferson consistently goes beyond what the evidence supports. Certainly Jefferson produced Indian population figures in his *Notes* that were far too low, but Wallace's own evidence shows that Jefferson made a significant attempt to get things right. That he failed owes less to Jefferson's desire to diminish Indian numbers in order to justify the expansion of white settlement, as Wallace argues, than it did to the fact that Jefferson was far more often adrift in, rather than in command of, the intellectual currents that swirled around him. Though Jefferson's policies were destructive, as many historians have already pointed out, Wallace's attempts to hold him responsible for all the sins of his era simply does not stand up to close examination.

Wallace might have strengthened his presentation by pointing out that Jefferson was trying to solve a problem that was, by the time he became president, already centuries old: how best to oversee the peaceful and orderly expansion of Anglo-American settlement. Indians and non-Indians, before and after Jefferson's presidency, competed for access to and control of frontier resources that they used in different and incompatible ways. During the colonial period, imperial governors tried to address this source of conflict by prohibiting purchases of Indian land without their consent, and they attempted in other ways to curb white encroachment on Native lands. Later, in 1796, an exasperated George Washington wrote near the end of his presidency that “scarcely anything short of a Chinese wall, or a line of troops, will restrain Land jobbers, and the encroachment of settlers upon the Indian territory” (George Washington to Timothy Pickering, 1 July 1796, in *The Writings of George Washington* 35, ed. John C. Fitzpatrick [Washington, DC, 1931], 112). Jefferson, too, tried to solve this problem, and he did so in ways that contained the “seeds of extinction” as he quietly advocated the removal of Indians to the west side of the Mississippi River. In believing that Indians and whites could not live together in peace, Jefferson certainly was not original.

And all this, of course, has been covered by many historians. Wallace's work, though elegantly written and well illustrated, adds little to our under-

standing of Jefferson's Indian policy. Readers interested in Jefferson and his policies toward Native Americans will be better served by consulting Bernard Sheehan's dated, but still extremely useful, *Seeds of Extinction* (1973).

Michael Leroy Oberg

State University of New York, Geneseo

People of the Wachusett: Greater New England in History and Memory 1630–1860. By David Jaffee. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1999. 320 pages. \$42.50 cloth.

Wedding one of the most venerable themes in American historiography—the impact on national development of the concerted movement onto “free land”—with two recent scholarly preoccupations—the situation of the thirteen colonies in their Atlantic context and the construction of historical memory—David Jaffee examines town founding in Wachusett (now northern Worcester County, Massachusetts) over the course of two centuries. Building upon both the first generation of community studies, which focused on the internal structures of a single locality, and the second, which took greater account of Indians and commercial networks, *The People of the Wachusett* investigates the ongoing process by which New England's settlements sprouted. That landscape's most distinctive features, Jaffee posits, derived from serial town settlement, the ongoing founding and replication of communities according to “a model understood by New England's settlers and supervised by the colonial authorities” (p. 1). Lacing analyses of social structure and the transition to capitalism with tales of Puritans and Indians, he ambitiously essays an *histoire totale* in which the march of towns (instead of Turner's heroic individuals) into the frontier undergirded institutional formation, congregational hegemony, commercialization, the Algonquians' retreat, and the molding of regional memory. Ambitiously conceptualized and exhaustively researched, the book intelligently rehearses some familiar themes without, however, achieving an interpretive breakthrough. The sum of its parts is greater than the whole.

Using the Wachusett as an exemplar, Jaffee contends that serial town settlement, promoted by boards of patriarch proprietors, created a distinctive vista: tiers of townships. The process began in the seventeenth century as English newcomers settled amicably beside resident Algonquians, an irenic arrangement dashed by Metacom's War (1675–1676), in which hundreds of Indians died and Euro-Americans suffered a higher percentage of casualties per 1,000 population than in any other conflict. That carnage ushered in a half-century during which New Englanders recovered the lands they had lost; during this brief period, town fathers were often “Indian fighters” on whom grateful colonists bestowed iconic status. Waged originally for purely defensive reasons, war became a means to collect bounties and amass land grants. As “progress” swept Native peoples away, town founding became increasingly “bureaucratic” (p. 101), dependent less on the exertions of farmer-warriors

than on proprietors' success at advertising the virtues of their plots. As family after family raised their children on neighbors' produce and Calvinist pieties, serial town settlement became ensconced as the preferred means for extending and preserving New England's ways. Rates of town creation accelerated after the Seven Years War eradicated the French menace, but on Wachusett's northern margins, the transmission of traditional culture faltered. In Nova Scotia, the suppression of towns' autonomy by imperial officials nervous about "republican" tendencies, Massachusetts merchants' control over markets, and New Light Henry Alline's forays against Calvinist orthodoxies combined to frustrate the birth of typical New England towns. In New Hampshire, by contrast, although habitual forms of local government and yeoman farming did reemerge, Congregational hegemony disappeared with the advent of evangelical radicals—Freewill Baptists, Shakers, and the like—while the Revolution unleashed democratic urges that challenged the authority of established elites and capitalistic currents that transformed rural towns into commercial villages. Although Jaffee does not actually describe the denouement of serial town founding, he intimates that, by the early nineteenth century, the proprietorial mechanism for unerringly replicating New England's DNA was breaking down.

Historians have long recognized township formation as the carburetor running the engines of New England's expansion and cultural integrity, but no one has examined the process as exactly as Jaffee. Helping to demolish the myth that families and communities were economically self-sufficient, he demonstrates that from the outset communities forged exchange networks with natives, other localities, and the wider Atlantic world. Nor were towns created and populated as isolates. Proprietors in one laid out lots for family and friends in another; east and west "were linked together" as the former "sen[t] off migrants" to denizen the latter (p. 135). Acquisitive enterprise characterized proprietary activity from the get-go, Jaffee suggests, but he does not reconcile this observation with his equally valid contention that most settlers pursued land to provide their families a competence (a comfortable living), not to realize large profits. Some scholars have argued that entrepreneurial values arrived in New England's first ships, while others have asserted that notions of moral economy impeded wholesale acceptance of the capitalist spirit until the nineteenth century, a disagreement the book exhibits rather than resolves.

Jaffee proves more insightful about two other matters. By tracing Wachusett migrations beyond what became the United States, he develops a powerfully comparative perspective on why the time-honored moral configuration of Calvinism and capitalism did not travel well into the marchlands. His most original formulation ties the genesis of New England's historical memory to the parade of towns. The Wachusett produced a succession of notable writers who pioneered literary genres as they translated immediate experience into mythical pasts. Edward Johnson, a formative local historian, transcribed events in Woburn as God's wonder-working providence; Mary Rowlandson, the originator and arguably the finest practitioner of captivity narratives, inscribed her kidnap from Lancaster with cosmic significance; and Joseph

Dennie, leader of the “Walpole Wits,” initiated the use of vernacular language to convey local color while animadverting against commercialism and romanticizing Wachusett’s pastoral yore as it slipped away (if, indeed, it had ever existed). Each generation insinuated its ancestors into a freshly fashioned past, a process of serial remembrance that paralleled the process of creating towns. “The invention of New England,” Jaffee concludes, “had deep roots in the Wachusett” (p. 249).

Jaffee does not provide a satisfactory picture of historical remembrance, however, because he treats the construction of memory episodically rather than comprehensively. Were later writers conscious of participating in an ongoing reconfiguration of memory, or did they scribble in isolation? Put another way, did Johnson inaugurate an intellectually consolidated tradition whose imaginative portrayals evolved in tandem with Wachusett life, or did each author’s work present only time-bound idiosyncracies? Such criticism discovers the book’s major weakness: its myriad details never quite cohere into fully realized and consistent arguments. The implications of Wachusett town founding “are anything but democratic” (p. 3), Jaffee avers, yet he also contends that eighteenth-century town founding became a “democratic process” (p. 101)—a contradiction that springs from his failure to define “democratic,” explain how town meetings operated, and explore popular politics. Similar problems inhere in his rehearsing the term *venturesome conservatives* without explication. At times the phrase intends all of the “Bay Colony residents” (p. 131), yet elsewhere it takes in only a delimited group of literati or “town founders” (p. 236). The expression seems to denote an admixture of psychological daring and reverence for old ways—Puritans essayed the dangerous Atlantic “with conservative intentions” to “preserve their customary way of life”—yet the elements of each quality are unclear (p. 7). Does the “large-scale granting” (p. 131) of townships, an innovation of eighteenth-century townspeople, display the same sort of venturesomeness as does crossing the ocean, or antebellum orators’ sentimental refusal to demand “drastic alterations in economic arrangements and social relationships” (p. 249) a style of conservatism similar to the Walpole Wits’ cosmopolitan screed against “village provincialism”? (p. 236) Do such displays of innovativeness yoked with love of custom comprise repeated peculiarities or a pervasive cultural trait? In the end, Jaffee does not explain how serial town founding grounded New England’s cultural stability. Religious orthodoxy comprised “the cornerstone of town settlement,” he maintains, without mentioning the role played by either covenantal ideology or congregational discipline (p. 216). Moreover, his own evidence points to proprietaries and extended kinship networks as being equally important regulatory devices. Ultimately, his observations do not carpent a compelling analytic framework.

Readers of this journal will be most disappointed with Jaffee’s failure to “bridge” fully ethno- and social history (p. 2). He most succeeds in Part I, where his narrative of the two Nashaways—Algonquian and English—skillfully downplays the familiar tropes of Puritan rapacity and native resistance, revealing the communities’ mutual interdependence notwithstanding their radically different cosmologies. From that point, however, Jaffee is concerned

only with the Anglo-American perspective. Instigated by imperial competition, incessant warfare vitiated colonists' powers to distinguish among friendly and hostile Natives, fostering hatred of all. As the tomahawk's shadow lifted, fighting Indians became merely an occasion for military adventure, not a life-or-death struggle. That Indians vanish from the book when they disappear from English Wachusett makes perfect sense given Jaffee's primary interest in serial town founding, but the resulting inquiry does not constitute ethnohistory, which entails paying comparable attention to all participants in an historical event. Colin Calloway's *The Western Abenakis of Vermont, 1600–1800* illumines Algonquian Wachusett more capably. An account of serial town settlement that incorporates Native as well as English perspectives—no small task—remains to be written.

Charles L. Cohen

University of Wisconsin, Madison

Redskins: Racial Slur or Symbol of Success? By Bruce Stapleton. San Jose: Writers Club Press, 2001. 204 pages. \$16.95 paper.

In *Redskins: Racial Slur or Symbol of Success?*, Bruce Stapleton analyzes the controversy surrounding the use of Indian-themed mascots in sports with the central focus of the book being whether the name of the Washington professional team, the Redskins, is a derogatory term or a term of honor. The author examines the feelings of those who maintain that the term is a racial slur and the use of Indian-themed mascots is demeaning. He also examines the feelings of those who claim that the use of Indian names, images, and mascots in sports is not offensive and is, in fact, an honor.

Stapleton contends that these deep-seated feelings are overstated and that the issues are oversimplified by the involved parties. He pursues a course of examining the use of the term *Redskins* in American literature. His analysis of an Internet database of more than 4,000 books published over the past 150 years revealed that *redskins* or *redskin* was used 224 times. About 25 percent of these uses was classed as derogatory, while less than 3 percent was classed as positive. The remainder were placed into a benign or ambiguous category. Since 1930, the author finds that *redskins* has virtually disappeared from the American scene, with the exception of its usage in sports.

Stapleton also examines the historical events affecting Indians that occurred during the most frequent uses of the term in American literature. He finds a correlation between the occurrence of these events and the introduction and proliferation of Indian images, names, and mascots in American society. Interestingly, the emergence of Indian mascots coincided closely with government policies aimed at eradicating Indian cultures by assimilating this minority into American society. It was certainly not a period of honoring Indians, and in reality was one of their most demoralizing times.

Stapleton concludes from his analysis that *redskins* is a hateful term associated with more than 400 years of history ranging from the injustices of the